

Immigrants against immigration? The effect of naturalization on support for federal immigrant funding

Bouaoun, Syrine; Daunais, William; Maguiña Yacolca, Mariel; Pereira, Meghan

Abstract

We study the effect of naturalization (to Canadian citizenship) on support for immigrant funding. Using the 2021 Canadian Election Study, which surveys individuals on election attitudes, an ordinal probit regression model is constructed to identify whether naturalized Canadian citizens prefer more spending, the same spending, or less spending for immigrants, relative to non-naturalized immigrants (permanent residents). In accordance with the literature, we find significant causal evidence that naturalized immigrants prefer less government spending on immigrants than non-naturalized immigrants.

I. Introduction

We often think of the classic immigrant narrative as one that is primarily built on solidarity. Yet, immigrants who receive naturalized citizenship may be more critical of newcomers, which can affect their support for new immigrants and by extension, federal spending for them. The legal shift in identity, especially if they have worked hard to gain citizenship, can cause naturalized citizens to “turn” on their immigrant counterparts as they overcompensate to identify with the in-group (Kolbe 2016). Some theories also argue that anti-immigration can stem from feeling a need to be competitive with more recent immigrants (Meeusen 2019). In Canada, an aging population has pushed the government to increase immigration targets to boost the workforce. Critics are concerned about the impact on the current housing shortage and a tight job market.¹ Such concerns can prompt current residents to hold anti-immigration attitudes, spreading to discrimination and mistreatment, especially among more established immigrant groups. Since immigrants rely on such established groups, understanding attitudes towards immigrants can inform immigration policy and mitigate within-group discrimination, allowing Canadians to welcome diversity instead of turning it away. We begin by addressing the research question (Section II), followed by a comprehensive literature review (Section III). We then introduce the Canadian Election Survey dataset under data description (Section IV). In methodology, we discuss our main variables and establish the ordinal probit model (Section V). We are then led to results (Section VI) followed by a discussion (Section VII), which examines limitation, policy limitations, and established a strong conclusion.

¹ CBC: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/canada-immigration-targets-1.7015304>

II. Research Question

Does naturalization have a statistically significant impact on an individual's attitudes towards new immigrants in Canada?

We hypothesize that naturalized Canadian citizens will hold more anti immigrant sentiment relative to recent immigrants (permanent residents). We measure attitudes towards new immigrants using preferences in federal funding allocations for immigrants as a proxy variable. The following section will summarize some relevant literature which will support this question.

III. Literature Review

When considering this research question, it is important to understand the underlying theoretical motivation which will ground our econometric investigation. Extensive research and case studies on the relationship between naturalization and relative anti-immigration attitudes can be found all over the world, but are sparse and outdated in Canada: a gap we seek to fill in this paper. Two prevailing theories guide this research paper: (1) the legal shift that comes from naturalization pushes individuals to identify more with their host country (Kolbe & Crepaz, 2016; Politi, Chipeaux et al, 2020, Dierckx, Politi et al, 2022; Ong 2011) and (2) the perceived competition from newcomers can put pressure on perceived labor market competition for existing naturalized citizens (Scheve & Slaughter, 2001; Meeusen & Meuleman 2019; Strijbis & Polavieja, 2018). The latter is usually experienced for both naturalized and birthright citizens, but naturalized citizens may find a higher influx of immigrants daunting since they can be more visibly grouped with them.

3.1 Legal shift

In a European study, Kolbe and Crepaz (2016) test the “incorporation effect” to test whether being a naturalized citizen has a significant effect self-perception in their host country, and by extension, argue that the greater economic and political stake in their country's affairs employs a more “welfare chauvinistic” attitude—the idea that welfare should be reserved for citizens only—towards new immigrants who may be more dependent on social benefits. This is the most significant paper for our study since it is built on the same hypothesis and has a dependent variable based on funding, however we present a different approach to testing. The main results show that naturalized respondents are more consistent with foreign (or immigrant) respondents when determining whether newcomers should receive benefits on arrival (15% and 20% of respective naturalized and foreign respondents versus 6% of birthright citizens), but are more consistent with birthright citizens in determining how many benefits newcomers should receive after living and working for a year (both around 40% versus 53% for birthright citizens). The study uses a multi-level multinomial logit estimation (loosely defined as the probability of

choosing each alternative from a set of alternatives), with the dependent variable as “welfare chauvinism” and the independent variable as “incorporation” (i.e. 0 for foreign born, 1 for naturalized, etc), and controlled for social factors like unemployment and perception of immigrants through economic and cultural factors. The main takeaway from this paper is that we can expect naturalized citizens to fall somewhere between foreigners and birthright citizens when measuring anti-immigrant values.

Dierckx, Politi et al (2022) is similar, but frames the question in terms of social mobility: “socially mobile individuals tend to distance themselves from their former immigrant ingroup” (Dierckx, Politi et al 2022), and in turn, support stricter immigration policy. Using a sample of recently naturalized immigrants in Sweden, respondents were measured on procedural fairness, host national identification, and anti-immigration attitudes. Among two studies, two key results in the first study are relevant to this review: (a) naturalized citizens who found that the naturalization process as fair and impartial were more likely to have restrictive views on immigration policy, and (b) the effect was facilitated by increasing host country identification.

Just and Anderson (2015) turn to a competing motivation: naturalized citizens are likely to feel a sense of kinship and solidarity with newcomers, especially since they understand the struggle of being born into a different country and having the experience of uprooting their entire lives in search for greater opportunity. Additionally, they may be more sympathetic and approving of immigrants who have made a similar decision as them to make the choice to migrate. Using the same European survey (ESS) as Kolbe and Crepaz (2016), they find opposite results: citizenship is negatively linked with immigration support among foreign born respondents.

Across these papers we find a few commonalities: the respondents were all located in Europe, naturalized citizens lay somewhere in the middle between immigrants and birthright citizens, and the characteristics of the naturalization process itself can explain more about immigrant attitudes than the consequences of naturalization. This research paper differs in that we will be focusing on Canada and measuring where naturalized citizens stand on *funding* for new immigrants relative to immigrants and birthright citizens. Undersing support for funding can have more rigid policy implications than just measuring a bias against immigrants. We understand that naturalized citizens may not have any ill-will towards immigrants, rather they may just want them to work harder and not rely on welfare. We address a gap in understanding views on anti-immigration through the frame of government budget allocation instead of how much social benefits an immigrant should receive, differing from Kolbe and Crepaz (2016) in that spending on immigrants includes social benefits (welfare) but also encompasses much more (i.e. job networks, language classes, integration support).

3.2 Competition

Another prevailing body of work focuses on perceived labor market competition from immigrants as a threat to naturalized citizens, measuring anti-immigrant attitudes through whether naturalized citizens view newcomers as a competitive threat. Meeusen et al (2019) find that Turkish and Moroccan Belgians specifically hold anti-immigration attitudes towards Eastern Europeans, in fact, more than half believe that migrants take their jobs (55%) and ruin the reputation of other migrants (53%), and a whopping 37% of respondents believed that the Belgian border should be shut down. This contributes to a growing body of work on within-group anti-immigration attitudes. Scheve & Slaughter (2001) use an ordered-probit model in which the expected mean of the unobserved preferred immigration level is hypothesized to be a linear function of the respondent's skills alongside a vector of demographic identifiers. They found that less skilled workers prefer more reductionist immigration policy, while more skilled workers as a whole are slightly less reductionist. This result is important when considering our control variables, to help account for the nature of the respondent's occupation or their income level as a quantity that affects their perception of immigrants as competition.

IV. Data Description: Canadian Election Survey

The data utilized in this study originates from the Campaign Period Survey (CPS) of the Canada Election Study (CES) 2021, administered through Qualtrics, an online survey platform. Spanning from August 17 to September 19, 2021, the CPS engaged 20,968 respondents sourced through the Leger Opinion panel. Survey limitations can arise in multiple ways, impacting the accuracy and integrity of the answers provided by participants. Some examples include:

- I. **Selection:** How was the survey sample chosen? What is the size of the sample? Was the sample broad enough to encompass diverse perspectives and yield meaningful insights?
- II. **Response:** To what extent are participants influenced by leading factors introduced by the surveyor, such as the phrasing of questions, their format, and the respondents' inclination to conform socially? (Qualtrics, 2023)

There are various ways in which these limitations can be mitigated; the Canadian Election Study (CES) carefully considered them when conducting the Campaign Period Survey (CPS). Highlighted below are some important design limitations.

4.1 Selection

The CES tailored the sample to accurately reflect the diversity of the Canadian population, employing region-specific quotas, with particular attention to linguistic diversity considerations in Quebec. Additionally, to prevent measurement error, each question in the survey had the option "Don't know/Prefer not to answer" which allows participants to not feel

the need to answer incorrectly. Finally, the Canadian Selection Study dropped observations for non-citizens and non-permanent residents from the data set.

4.2 Response

Response limitations occur when survey respondents provide answers that align with the survey questions, yet these responses may not accurately reflect their true beliefs or thoughts (Qualtrics, 2023). To mitigate this bias, the Canadian Election Study employed various techniques. For instance, instead of using simple dichotomous responses, the study used multiple-choice answers, allowing participants to more accurately express their beliefs. Furthermore, the study addressed question order bias which arises when connected questions are sequenced in a specific order. The risk is that participants, having answered one question in a particular way, may feel compelled to respond similarly to related follow-up questions. To counteract this, the CES used randomization tools provided by the online survey platform Qualtrics. This precaution is particularly crucial as respondents' perspectives on different forms of government spending play a vital role in the subsequent analysis. Failing to tackle question order bias could compromise the integrity of both the control and dependent variables.

V. Methodology

5.1 Data Cleaning

To process the data, we used RStudio and the package dplyr mainly. We selected the variables that were relevant to our study and dropped NaN values as well as responses like “I don’t know/prefer not to answer.”

5.2 Dependent and Independent Variable

We use an individual’s preferred level of government funding for immigrants as a proxy variable for attitudes towards immigrants. The dependent variable is the individual's expressed preference regarding the extent of governmental financial support allocated to immigrants. In the CES dataset, the answer to the question: “How much should the federal government spend on immigrants and minorities?” (*cps21_spend_imm_min*) is the dependent variable. The possible answers are: (1) spend less, (2) spend about the same as now, and (3) spend more.

The independent variable must be related to the individual’s citizenship status. The question “Are you a (1) Canadian citizen, (2) Permanent resident, or (3) Other” (*cps21_citizenship*) was used concurrently with the question “Were you born in Canada” (*cps21_bornin_canada*) to create a new qualitative variable: (1) Canadian-born citizen, (2) naturalized citizen, and (3) permanent resident. This independent variable takes the form of a dummy variable where naturalized citizen is the benchmark.

5.3 Control Variables

5.3.1 Defense Spending

The response to this question unfolds along two distinct dimensions. On one hand, the preferred level of government funding for immigrants is contingent upon the individual's overall stance on government spending. Should an individual have a negative perspective on government expenditure in general, any form of governmental financial allocation, including for immigrants, is likely to be disfavored. Conversely, a positive disposition toward government spending may predispose an individual to endorse an increased level of financial support for immigrants. The underlying assumption is that an individual's stance on government spending is influenced by the allocation of funds to defence. In other words, those with a negative view of defence spending are likely to have a similar sentiment toward overall government expenditure. Consequently, the question *cps21_spend_defence*: "How much should the federal government spend on defense?" proves to be a suitable control for this issue. Respondents can choose from the options: (1) spend less, (2) spend about the same, and (3) spend more.

5.3.2 Perceived Financial Situation

Drawing from existing literature, citizens may view new immigrants as labour market competition. Anti immigration is heightened if they believe they are particularly financially vulnerable (3.2 Competition). Increased competition in the labor market may directly impact their employment opportunities and wage prospects, posing a significant economic threat. Several questions from the CES survey, as outlined in appendix 1, could serve as potential control variables for measuring anti-immigrant attitudes in the broader population. The rationale behind controlling for the perceived economic threat experienced by both birthright citizens and immigrants is grounded in the understanding that those facing economic challenges are generally more susceptible to economic competition from newcomers. However, the term "economic challenges" can be defined in two contrasting ways. Household income can serve as a proxy for one's economic well-being with lower household income related to a more precarious financial situation. Alternatively, the concept that an individual's perceived income reflects their personal financial situation, irrespective of the actual income level, is closely tied to the economic challenge. This implies that even individuals with a moderate or high income may feel economically challenged if their perceived income falls short of their expectations or societal norms. Thus, the "economic challenge" is not solely determined by objective financial metrics such as household income, but is influenced by the individual's subjective interpretation of their own financial standing. Considering these two potential understandings, the control variable for economic challenges will be derived from responses to the questions *cps21_own_fin_retro* and *cps21_own_fin_future* in the CES survey: "Over the past year, has your financial situation: (1) got better, (2) stayed about the same, (3) got worse, or (4) don't know/ prefer not to answer" and

“Over the next year, do you think your financial situation will: (1) get better, (2) stay about the same, (3) get worse, (4) don’t know/prefer not to answer.”

5.3.3 Political Beliefs

Another factor to consider as a control variable is the respondents' ideological convictions. Typically, right-wing orientations are associated with a greater endorsement of conventional values and practices, perceiving immigration as a symbolic threat to a nation, leading to more skeptical perspectives on new arrivals (Just and Anderson 2015). The CES survey's question *cps21_lr_scale_bef_1* inquires about participants' self-placement on a scale of 1 to 10, where 0 signifies left and 10 signifies right. This self-placement will serve as a control for political ideology, since left-leaning ideologies tend to be supportive of pro-immigration policy while the opposite tends to be true for right-wing ideologies.

5.3.4 Demographics

Two additional standard demographic control variables were added to the model: age and gender. Women tend to have a less favorable view on immigration while younger people tend to have a more favorable view (Valentova 2014).

The absence of a variable causes omitted variable bias if it is correlated with the independent variable and a determinant of the dependent variable. In Table 1, we summarize our control variable and the reasons behind their presence.

Table 1: Control Variables		
Control Variable	Correlated with independent variable	Determinant of dependent variable
Age and gender	Most immigrants to Canada are men and immigrants tend to be younger. (StatsCan 2022)	Women tend to hold more anti immigration views, and younger people tend to support it more.
Defense spending	Defense is a right granted to citizens only.	Those who support spending for defence may support other forms of government spending.
Political beliefs	Immigrants tend to be more socially conservative than Canadian-born people, especially with populist leaders (Erl 2021).	People with more right-wing political beliefs are less likely to support immigration.
Personal financial situation	New immigrants have less wealth on average than Canadians. (Zhang 2003).	People with less financial satisfaction are less likely to support immigration.

5.3 Mitigating Omitted Variable Bias

The research question is geared toward estimating a causal effect; therefore, some assumptions must be met to ensure the internal validity of the results. The internal validity of the regression analysis hinges on the unbiased and consistent estimation of regression coefficients for the target causal effect, along with standard errors that generate confidence intervals at the desired level (Watson and Stock, 2020). Essential standard assumptions, such as independent and identically distributed variables and the absence of large outliers, are satisfied by the survey design which includes randomization and the selection process. Additionally, a crucial assumption for reducing estimator variances is the absence of perfect or imperfect multicollinearity. Careful variable selection, choosing appropriate control variables while avoiding linear dependencies among them, ensures the accurate estimation of regression coefficients.

The most important assumption that must be met to ensure internal validity is that there is no correlation between the error term and the independent variable. The conditional mean expectation assumption can arise in multiple settings ranging from misspecification and omitted variable bias. Omitted variable bias arises when a variable that both determines Y and is correlated with one or more of the included regressors is omitted from the regression. This bias persists even in large samples, so the OLS estimator is inconsistent. How best to minimize omitted variable bias depends on whether or not variables that adequately control for the potential omitted variable are available. The appropriateness of each control variable used to mitigate omitted variable bias are summarized in Table 1.

5.4 Ordered Probit Model

Frequently, dependent variables take on an ordinal nature, lacking continuity in the sense that the coding metric applied to them may not hold substantive meaning (Jackman, 2000). A common instance is found in scales measuring the degree of agreement with a particular viewpoint, categorized as strongly disagree, disagree, neither disagree nor agree, agree, and strongly agree. Such scales emerge due to the absence of a natural unit of measurement for attitudes. The ordered probit model proves to be a fitting approach for analyzing ordinal dependent variables. The fundamental concept involves a latent, continuously distributed random variable that underlies the ordered response, representing the inclination to agree (Daykin and Moffatt, 2002). Maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) is employed to determine the distributional parameters of this latent variable. Thresholds then divide the real line into distinct regions corresponding to the various ordinal categories. The latent continuous variable, denoted as y_i^* , is expressed as a linear combination of predictors (x) and a disturbance term following a standard Normal distribution:

$$y_i^* = x_i\beta + e_i, e_i \sim N(0, 1) \forall i = 1, \dots, N$$

Like the models for binary data, we are concerned with how changes in the predictors translate into the probability of observing a particular ordinal outcome.

The analysis of the coefficients can be done after some manipulation of the data. The average marginal causal effect (AMCE) in an ordered probit model measures the average change in probability of moving from one category to another in an ordinal dependent variable due to a unit change in an independent variable. Put simply, the AMCE indicates how a change in the independent variable influences the probability of moving across the ordered categories of the dependent variable on average across the entire sample. In order to fit the model, we used the function `polr` from the package `MASS`.

The following equation corresponds to model (5) and models (1)-(4) correspond to simplified versions of this equation.

$$Y_i = \Phi \left(\beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Canadian-born})_i + \beta_2(\text{Permanent Resident})_i + \beta_3\text{Age}_i + \beta_4\text{Woman}_i + \right. \\ \left. \beta_5(\text{More Defence})_i + \beta_6(\text{Same Defence})_i + \beta_7(\text{Political Views})_i + \right. \\ \left. \beta_8(\text{Finance Got Worse})_i + \beta_9(\text{Finance Stayed Same})_i + \right. \\ \left. \beta_{10}(\text{Finance Will Get Worse})_i + \beta_{12}(\text{Finance Will Stay Same})_i \right)$$

VI. Results

6.1 Results

Table 2: Preferences over spending on immigrants					
Note: ** indicates significance at the 1% level and * indicates significance at the 5% level. ²					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Canadian-born	-0.28** (0.05)	-0.25** (0.05)	-0.24** (0.05)	-0.33** (0.05)	-0.35** (0.05)
Permanent Resident	0.52** (0.10)	0.46** (0.10)	0.51** (0.10)	0.65** (0.11)	0.64** (0.11)
Age		-0.01** (0.00)	-0.01** (0.00)	-0.00** (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Woman		0.15** (0.03)	0.11** (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	0.10** (0.03)
Spend more in defence			-0.80** (0.05)	-0.44** (0.05)	-0.30** (0.05)
Spend the same in defence			-0.31** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)
Political Views (0 left, 10 right)				-0.25** (0.01)	-0.25** (0.01)
Financial situation got worse					-0.71** (0.05)
Financial situation stayed the same					-0.28** (0.04)
Financial situation will get worse					-0.77** (0.06)
Financial situation will stay the same					-0.24** (0.04)
Intercept 1 2	-1.11	-1.40	-1.67	-2.78	-3.24
Intercept 2 3	1.04	0.76	0.53	-0.44	-0.83
AIC	31710.46	31612.47	31283.97	30066.79.	29496.95

² The standard errors reported are not from the Quasi-MLE version of the ordinal probit model, also known as the heteroskedastic ordinal probit model. Therefore, these standard errors are not robust for heteroskedasticity.

Table 3: Causal Effects					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Canadian-born (Less Spending)	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06
Canadian-born (About the Same Spending)	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
Canadian-born (More Spending)	-0.05	-0.04	-0.04	-0.05	-0.05
Permanent Resident (Less Spending)	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08	-0.10	-0.10
Permanent Resident (About the Same Spending)	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03	-0.03
Permanent Resident (More Spending)	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.13	0.12

6.2.1 Interpretation

The research question investigates the influence of naturalization on an individual's preferred level of government funding for immigrants. Multiple regression analyses were conducted to validate our findings, which suggest that naturalized Canadian citizens want less funding for immigrants under the current political administration than permanent residents.

While holding all other factors constant, on average and relative to naturalized citizens, a Canadian-born citizen has a 0.06 (Table 3[5]) higher probability of favoring a reduction in immigration spending, while a permanent resident has a 0.10 (Table 3[5]) lower probability of favoring a reduction in immigration spending. Similarly, relative to naturalized citizens and under constant conditions, Canadian-born citizens, on average, demonstrate a 0.05 (Table 3[5]) lower probability of favoring increased spending on immigrants, whereas a permanent resident exhibits a 0.12 (Table 3[5]) higher probability of preferring increased spending on immigrants.

This interpretation substantiates the initial hypothesis: naturalized Canadian citizens tend to position themselves between foreign-born individuals and birthright citizens when it comes to spending on immigrants. These results are significant at the one-percent level.

In the fifth regression presented in Table 2, although the control variables lack a straightforward interpretation, all variables, except for age, demonstrate significance at the one-percent level. Specifically, government spending on defense, an individual's perception of their financial situation, and political views all exhibit statistical significance.

Finally, it is worth noting that as we add control variables, the coefficients and particularly the marginal causal effects are kept stable. Implying that the coefficients of our independent variables are capturing the effects of being a naturalized citizen, a Canadian-born citizen, or a permanent resident, rather than other factors.

6.2.2 AIC

The AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) is a statistical measure used for model selection. It balances the goodness of fit of the model with its complexity. A lower AIC value indicates a better trade-off between model fit and complexity. The AIC is computed as follows:

$$AIC = 2k - 2\ln(L)$$

where $\ln(L)$ denotes the natural logarithm of the maximum likelihood function. On one hand, a more complex model with additional parameters can potentially capture more nuances and intricacies within the data, resulting in a better fit to the sample data. However, the AIC penalizes models for the number of parameters used. On the other hand, a simpler model with fewer parameters might not perfectly capture all the intricacies present in the data, potentially leading to an underfit model with a maximum likelihood value.

In the fourth regression displayed in Table 2, the inclusion of political views significantly decreases the AIC and brings about substantial changes in the coefficients associated with the key independent variables, namely, Canadian-born and permanent residents. The findings support the theory that political views influence people's attitudes towards immigrants, as right-wing orientations are associated with a greater endorsement of conventional values and practices, perceiving immigration as a symbolic threat to a nation, and thus more skeptical of newcomers. In the final analysis, although the AIC proves valuable for comparing models, it remains crucial to weigh other factors such as theoretical relevance, goodness of fit, and the contextual nuances of the analysis.

6.2.3 Conclusion

In summary, the above findings corroborate the hypothesis that on average, keeping other factors constant and relative to naturalized citizens, permanent residents favour more spending for immigrants and Canadian-born citizens prefer less spending for immigrants. It's crucial to note that, despite the consistency with existing literature, this paper's results have limitations explored in the next section.

VII. Discussion

7.1 Limitations

- I. *Dataset.* The sample size of immigrants and naturalized citizens are smaller than that of birthright citizens (444 and 1,570 respondents versus 13,217 respondents, respectively), which may make conclusions about the former two groups more difficult to generalize.
- II. *Model.* This report measures attitudes at one point in time. It would be helpful to have panel data on naturalized citizens before and after naturalization, to truly measure the effect of naturalization on immigrant attitudes. While Canadian Election Studies are conducted during each election cycle, we would need to be sure that we are tracking the same set of individuals across time periods. This would help us understand whether the legal shift—as theorized earlier—or the number of years an individual has lived in the host country matters for attitudes towards immigrants. Another potential improvement to the model would be to use the heteroskedastic ordinal probit, a model that allows for heteroskedastic standard errors.

7.2 Next Steps

This report controlled for various factors (see Table 1) that were measurable given our dataset. However, there will also be unobserved variables beyond the data that cannot be controlled for and may cause omitted variable bias:

- I. *Country of birth.* The country of origin of immigrants coming to Canada may have an effect on what their attitudes towards immigrants may be. Consider the following thought experiment: immigrants in the past came mostly from Countries A and B—countries that were accepting of immigrants—but immigrants in the last few years come from Countries C and D, which tend to be less accepting of immigrants. Then, immigrants from A and B would have already naturalized, making the group of naturalized citizens prefer more spending towards immigrants due to their country of origin, and immigrants from country C and D less supportive of immigrant funding. Therefore, the effect of being a permanent resident on reluctance to spend more on immigrants is overstated due to the country of birth, biasing down the coefficient of permanent residents.
- II. *Education.* We know that Canada’s permanent residency point system rewards more educated individuals, which could create a bias towards more educated naturalized citizens and permanent residents relative to birthright citizens. If increased education is associated with more “liberal views,” then this overstates the effect of being a

Canadian-born citizen on reluctance to spend on immigrants, causing the coefficient for Canadian-born citizens to be biased downwards.

- III. *Assimilation.* The longer an individual resides in the host country, the more assimilated they will be. If there is a significant amount of permanent residents that have resided in Canada for an extended period of time (more than minimum requirement for naturalized), then they can be considered as assimilated as naturalized citizen, understating the effect of being a permanent resident, biasing the coefficient of permanent residency downwards. Other factors that contribute to assimilation, like homeownership, education, personal relationships, and one's personality are unobserved in the dataset and could not be controlled for.

This project considered the appropriate control variables given the literature, the data available in the dataset, and our research question. However, as mentioned above there are potential uncontrolled factors. As with any study that uses real world data, the perfect model does not exist, so we are hesitant to ensure that the assumption (the error is fully independent of the explanatory variable) of the ordinal probit is fully satisfied. Nevertheless, our study obtains results which are consistent with the existing literature.

7.3 Policy Implications

Utilizing the Canada Election Study 2021 dataset and employing an ordinal probit regression model, this study sought to examine the influence of naturalization on attitudes toward federal immigrant funding. Our findings reveal that naturalized Canadian citizens tend to position themselves between foreign-born individuals and birthright citizens, as hypothesized: in other words, naturalization does have a statistically significant impact on attitudes towards new immigrants, an impact investigated through a proxy.

The implications of this study hold significance for policymakers, especially in the context of the forthcoming elections. The impact of naturalization on within-immigrant communities can help to inform future immigration policy, specifically by ensuring that new immigrants can have a base of naturalized citizens from the same culture that will not “abandon” them. Our results show that because naturalized citizens consistently remain in between immigrants and birthright citizens, they can be an important mechanism for new immigrants to lean on in their transition to citizenship; this is something that policy makers must note when considering integration into Canadian society. Crafting policies which integrate the economic and social needs of immigrants while addressing concerns of naturalized citizens regarding welfare allocation may foster greater social cohesion and support within Canadian communities.

References

- Kolbe, M., & Crepaz, M. M. (2016). The power of citizenship: How immigrant incorporation affects attitudes towards social benefits. *Comparative Politics*, 49(1), 105-123.
- Dierckx, K., Politi, E., Valcke, B., Van Assche, J., & Van Hiel, A. (2022). The “ironic” fair process effect: A perceived fair naturalization procedure spurs anti-immigration attitudes through increased host national identification among naturalized citizens. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 25(2), 379-398.
- Just, A., & Anderson, C. J. (2015). Dual allegiances? Immigrants’ attitudes toward immigration. *The Journal of Politics*, 77(1), 188-201.
- Ong, P. M. (2011). Defensive Naturalization and Anti-Immigrant Sentiment: Chinese Immigrants in Three Primate Metropolises. *Asian American Policy Review*, 22.
- Scheve, K. F., & Slaughter, M. J. (2001). Labor market competition and individual preferences over immigration policy. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83(1), 133-145.
- Meeusen, C., Abts, K., & Meuleman, B. (2019). Between solidarity and competitive threat?: The ambivalence of anti-immigrant attitudes among ethnic minorities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 71, 1-13.
- Strijbis, O., & Polavieja, J. (2018). Immigrants against immigration: Competition, identity and immigrants’ vote on free movement in Switzerland. *Electoral Studies*, 56, 150-157.
- Bolzman, C., Sarrasin, O., Green, E. G., Politi, E., & Visintin, E. P. (2018). Competition-and identity-based roots of anti-immigration prejudice among individuals with and without an immigrant background. *International Review of Social Psychology*.
- Valentova, M., & Alieva, A. (2014). Gender differences in the perception of immigration-related threats. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 39, 175-182.
- Daykin, A. R., & Moffatt, P. G. (2002). Analysing ordered responses: A review of the ordered probit model. *Understanding Statistics*, 1(3), 157-166.
- Survey bias types that researchers need to know about.* (2023, October 31). Qualtrics. <https://www.qualtrics.com/experience-management/research/survey-bias/>
- Watson, M. W., & Stock, J. H. (2020). *Introduction to Econometrics*. Pearson Education.

- Jackman, S. (2000). Model for Ordered Outcomes. Stanford Political Science 200C.
<https://web.stanford.edu/class/polisci203/ordered.pdf>
- Erl, C. (2021). The people and the nation: The “thick” and the “thin” of right-wing populism in Canada. *Social Science Quarterly*, 102(1), 107-124.
- Statistics Canada. (2022). Canada at a Glance. Accessed December 6th, 2023.
<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/12-581-x/2022001/sec2-eng.htm>
- Zhang, Xuelin. (2003). The Wealth Position of Immigrant Families in Canada. Statistics Canada.
<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/catalogue/11F0019M2003197>