

# *Multicultural Media Use and Immigrant Settlement: A Comparative Study of Four Communities in Ottawa, Canada*

**Rukhsana Ahmed & Luisa Veronis**

**Journal of International Migration  
and Integration**

ISSN 1488-3473

Int. Migration & Integration  
DOI 10.1007/s12134-016-0488-7



**Journal of International  
Migration and Integration**



 Springer

 Springer

**Your article is protected by copyright and all rights are held exclusively by Springer Science +Business Media Dordrecht. This e-offprint is for personal use only and shall not be self-archived in electronic repositories. If you wish to self-archive your article, please use the accepted manuscript version for posting on your own website. You may further deposit the accepted manuscript version in any repository, provided it is only made publicly available 12 months after official publication or later and provided acknowledgement is given to the original source of publication and a link is inserted to the published article on Springer's website. The link must be accompanied by the following text: "The final publication is available at [link.springer.com](http://link.springer.com)".**

# Multicultural Media Use and Immigrant Settlement: A Comparative Study of Four Communities in Ottawa, Canada

Rukhsana Ahmed<sup>1</sup> · Luisa Veronis<sup>2</sup>

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2016

**Abstract** Multicultural media serve as important sources of information for immigrant settlement. However, little is known about the role of multicultural media in the process of immigrant settlement. Our aim was to address this gap and to advance understanding of multicultural media use and immigrant settlement through a detailed empirical study involving four ethnocultural and immigrant communities (EICs)—the Chinese, Spanish-speaking Latin American, Somali, and South Asian—in Ottawa, Canada. Using a conceptual framework combining notions of immigrant contexts of reception, and immigrant settlement and information seeking, we present and analyze the findings of a large survey data set ( $N=1212$ ) comparing types of multicultural print, broadcast, and digital media use by immigration category, length of stay, and yearly household income. Based on our findings, we argue that variations exist in the use of multicultural media both within and across the four participating EICs; while factors such as availability of multicultural media as well as length of stay in Canada and, to some extent, household income play a role, immigration category is less significant. Furthermore, we advance that although EICs do use various types of multicultural media, they tend to favor digital media. These findings contribute to improved understanding of the role of multicultural media use in the everyday lives of EICs and provide directions for future research and for the development of relevant policies and practices to address immigrant information needs and facilitate their settlement process.

**Keywords** Multicultural media · Immigrant settlement · Ethnocultural and immigrant communities · Survey · Ottawa, Canada

---

✉ Rukhsana Ahmed  
rahmed@uottawa.ca

<sup>1</sup> Department of Communication, University of Ottawa, Desmarais Building, 55 Avenue Laurier East, Room 11147, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5, Canada

<sup>2</sup> Department of Geography, University of Ottawa, Simard 017, Ottawa, ON, Canada

## Introduction

Immigrant-receiving countries such as Canada have seen the arrival of increasingly diverse newcomers—in terms of socioeconomic, cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and religious origins (Statistics Canada 2013). These diverse population groups undergo a process of settlement which includes looking for information and services to participate in the economic, social, cultural, and civic life of their new society. In their search for settlement-related resources and services, immigrants rely on a diversity of information sources such as social networks, immigrant organizations, and various forms of media and communication technologies (Caidi et al. 2010). A growing body of research has documented the role of multicultural media in these processes, including in immigrants' learning of their new cultural environment (Dalisyay 2012; Lin et al. 2010; Moon and Park 2007), integration (Payne 2008; Viswanath and Arora 2000), civic engagement (Fleras 2011; Kong 2013; Yu and Ahadi 2010), construction of ethnic identity (Baffoe 2012; Croucher et al. 2009) in their new country, and formation of transnational ties to country of origin (Karim 2003; Shumow 2010). However, less attention has been devoted to studying the use of multicultural media and the settlement process of immigrant groups (Matsaganis et al. 2011; Wilkin and Ball-Rokeach 2006).

Our aim was to address this gap and to advance understanding of multicultural media use and immigrant settlement through a detailed empirical study involving four ethnocultural and immigrant communities (EICs)—the Chinese, Spanish-speaking Latin American, Somali, and South Asian—in Ottawa, the sixth largest Canadian entry point for foreign-born residents (Statistics Canada 2011, 2013). We adopt the term EICs to reflect the diverse population groups that make up today's Canada—cultural minority, immigrants and their descendants, and refugees. Using a conceptual framework combining notions of immigrant contexts of reception, and immigrant settlement and information seeking, we present and analyze the findings of a large survey data set ( $N=1212$ ) on access to and use of various types of media among the four EICs in Ottawa. Our study makes a significant empirical contribution in the field by adopting a comparative approach that examines (1) the patterns of multicultural media use within and across these four EICs; (2) the use of different types of multicultural media (broadcast, print, and digital); and (3) media use by immigration category, length of stay, and yearly household income. Based on our survey results, we argue that variations exist in the use of multicultural media both within and across the four participating EICs; while factors such as availability of multicultural media as well as length of stay in Canada and, to some extent, household income play a role, immigration category does not play a significant role. Furthermore, we advance that although EICs do use various types of multicultural media, they tend to favor digital media. These findings contribute to improved understanding of the role of multicultural media use in the everyday lives of EICs and provide directions for future research and for the development of relevant policies and practices to help address immigrant information needs and facilitate their settlement process.

In what follows, we first review the relevant literature and present our conceptual framework. We then describe our methodology, including the survey data used in the study. Next, we analyze our survey data results and discuss their empirical and conceptual significance for understanding the role of multicultural media in immigrant

settlement. Lastly, we reflect on the relevance of our findings for future research as well as for policy and practice.

## **Multicultural Media and Immigrant Settlement: A Conceptual Framework**

Our conceptual framework is built on the intersecting concepts of immigrant contexts of reception, and immigrant settlement and information seeking, which, together, will aid us in our examination of multicultural media use and their role for settlement purposes within and across different EICs. But first, we clarify the use of terminology.

### **Multicultural Media**

Multicultural media are also referred to as ethnic media, alternative media, local community media, immigrant media, minority media, diasporic media, and transnational media (Fleras 2009; Matsaganis et al. 2011). As Matsaganis and colleagues (2011) postulate, “Terms preferences are often related to how different countries understand differences between people based on their ethnic or racial background” (p. 8). Similarly, we adopt the term multicultural media in the context of Canada to reflect the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, under which all citizens have the freedom to preserve their cultural heritage and are encouraged to fully participate in the Canadian society. We argue that the term multicultural media is more inclusive and allows for a broader treatment of Canada’s culturally, ethnically, racially, and geographically diverse population groups. Since the use of media is vastly diverse within and across different EICs, in our study, multicultural media comprise all types of print, broadcast, and digital media and include a variety of programs (e.g., entertainment, news, economic and political shows, cultural programs, etc.). We adopted a broad geographic scope of multicultural media consumption practices that includes local, provincial, national, and international sources.

### **Immigrant Contexts of Reception**

The study of multicultural media and immigrant settlement comprises two interrelated aspects: the development of such media as EICs settle in a new society and immigrants’ use of these media in the settlement and integration process. According to Matsaganis et al. (2011), multicultural “media are part of immigrants’ settlement experiences, which take place in the particular context of reception immigrants face upon arrival in their new country” (p. 54). Immigrants’ contexts of reception—that is, experiences of higher or lower acceptance from the receiving societies—are a multi-dimensional process (Hallden et al. 2008; Matsaganis et al. 2011; Portes and Rumbaut 1996, 2001). Portes and Rumbaut (1996) describe the context of reception along three dimensions: (1) policies of the host government which can be hostile, neutral, or welcoming toward immigrants; (2) conditions of the host labor market which can have implications for short-term and long-term economic prospects of immigrants; and (3) characteristics of the settlement community which can affect the degree of

support, opportunities, and resources immigrants receive and possess to help them settle down in the host society.

Matsaganis et al. (2011) take this theorization of immigrants' contexts of reception and postulate four factors affecting immigrants' settlement experiences, which bear potential outcomes on the development of their multicultural media. These include: (1) government policy (restrictions to immigration, media regulations); (2) labor market conditions (economic prospects for immigrants, demand and opportunities for multicultural media production); (3) characteristics of the settlement community (degree of support, resources and opportunities for immigrants, including access to multicultural media); and (4) the larger society (attitudes toward immigrants and use of multicultural media as outlets to express community issues). That is, the production of multicultural media can develop symmetrically to the settlement of EICs. In turn, these media can serve as resources for immigrants and can help address issues that emerge during the settlement process. Existing research has examined the development of multicultural media in various receiving contexts (Matsaganis et al. 2011; Fokkema et al. 2012), including Canada (King and Wood 2013; Murray et al. 2007; Ahadi and Murray 2009; Fleras 2009). These authors recognize that ethnic media play an integrative role. Murray (2008) explains that ethnic media "act as information hubs, facilitating in-group and out-group contacts. They connect, providing a map to what is going on around them ... – information about home ownership, entrepreneurship, education" (p. 63). Extensive, mostly US-based research shows that ethnic media serve an important role as "a product of these groups' attempts to organize, communicate and facilitate their transition into American society" (Viswanath and Arora 2000, p. 40; see Lull 2013; Payne 2008; Rhodes 2010). Most of this work engages with debates about the role of multicultural media in facilitating or hindering immigrant integration, assimilation, and acculturation in US society; however, there has been less scrutiny into the use of these media in the settlement process itself.

### **Immigrant Settlement and Information-Seeking Practices**

A majority of studies investigates the use of traditional forms of ethnic media such as print newspapers (Ahadi and Murray 2009; Cover 2013; Viswanath and Arora 2000). Less research has inquired into how and why immigrants use a variety of print, broadcast, and digital media. More comparative studies are imperative given that, with the spread of new information and communication technologies, EICs today have access to an array of different types of media (Feng and Nza 2011; Giusti 2013; Jiang 2013; Lin and Song 2006). As a result, there has been increased interest in the role of multicultural media in supporting transnational networks (Adams and Skop 2008; Alegado 2009; Karim 2003, 2007; Shumow 2010; Smith 2013). Concomitantly, research conducted in Canada (Murray 2008; Ahadi and Murray 2009; Yu and Ahadi 2010), Europe (Dekker and Engbersen 2012), and the USA (Lin and Song 2006) indicates that multicultural media also serve a key role in supporting the development of local networks. According to Lin and Song (2006), multicultural media "facilitate immigrants' adaptation process by providing *local news and information* they can use in the host society" (p. 363, emphasis added). That is, multicultural media potentially represent a significant source of local information that can assist immigrants in the settlement process.

In order to better understand the role of multicultural media in immigrant settlement, it is important to define the notion of immigrant settlement. Settlement refers to the process whereby new immigrants or refugees get settled into the new society (Caidi et al. 2010; Wayland 2006). Generally, immigrant settlement is understood in terms of short-term goals and as the everyday experiences of immigrants, including finding housing and employment, searching for services, learning the local language, and so on (Caidi et al. 2010; Papillon 2002). It is useful to conceptualize settlement as a temporal process immigrants undergo upon arrival in a new country that involves a continuum of activities resulting from newcomers' specific needs associated with settlement-related information, resources, and services (Caidi et al. 2010).

In the Canadian context, three intersecting phases are identified in the settlement process, which involve different needs and adaptation processes (Mwarigha 2002; Wayland 2006). In the *immediate* phase, immigrants' needs tend to be more urgent in nature (early settlement services, including finding shelter, language instruction, developing social networks) and require adjusting to the new city, culture, and environment. In the *intermediate* phase, immigrants have more advanced needs (employment-specific language instruction, training to upgrade existing skills, access to the labor market) and need to acclimatize, learn about, and manage to deal with the new cultural and social environment. In the *long-term* phase, immigrants are more inclined to have the need to belong meaningfully by actively participating in the cultural, social, economic, and political life of the receiving society. In other words, the settlement-related information needs of immigrants are diverse and complex, especially considering the temporal nature of settlement and the overlapping phases through which the process unfolds.

Based on a synthesis of existing research, Caidi et al. (2010) found that immigrants' settlement-related information seeking falls under two categories: "orienting information seeking"—which relates to everyday life events and the broader social, cultural, and political contexts of their new country, as well as country of origin—and "problem-specific information seeking"—which refers to finding solutions to individual problems or performing specific tasks, including the search for information about housing, health and legal services, language training, employment, education, and so on. Considering that immigrants' settlement-related information needs vary from being pressing, critical, transitional, and/or integrative, attempting to meet these needs could be a challenge. Among a variety of information sources, including human, organizational, and technological (Caidi et al. 2010), multicultural media can play an important role in meeting the different settlement-related information needs by educating and orienting "newcomers to their new community and its resources" (Matsaganis et al. 2011, p. 15). Existing research clearly suggests that multicultural media can play an important role in immigrants' settlement process, especially by providing important settlement-related information and resources at various stages. However, Caidi et al. (2010) point out that existing research on immigrants' information needs focuses on specific ethnocultural groups within specific contexts and tends to overlook the differences within and across diverse communities. Such differences are important because, as Matsaganis et al. (2011) remind us, the settlement and information needs of different groups vary significantly. Accordingly, Caidi et al. (2010) call for more comparative research to investigate differences across categories such as "age, gender, employment, socioeconomic conditions, and class of entry into source country" (p. 505). Our study

responds to this call by examining multicultural media use and immigrant settlement *within* and *across* four EICs in Ottawa, Canada, while also paying attention to use patterns for *various types* of media. Specifically, our two main research objectives are to: (1) compare types of multicultural print, broadcast, and digital media use within and across the four EICs in Ottawa, with a focus on local multicultural media outlets, and (2) examine similarities and differences in the responses among the four EICs by immigration category, length of stay, and yearly household income.

## Methodology

### Research Context

The findings presented here are part of a broader collaborative, interdisciplinary project—the Ottawa Multicultural Media—conducted in partnership with the City of Ottawa, whose aim is to examine the role of multicultural media in fostering the settlement, integration, and well-being of Ottawa's EICs. In 2011, the foreign-born represented 22.6 % of Ottawa's population—just above the national average of 20.6 % (Statistics Canada 2013). That same year, in 2011, the City launched the Ottawa Immigration Strategy (OLIP n.d.), a community action plan and strategy to tackle local immigration needs through a partnership between the City and key local stakeholders such as service providers. It is important to mention that in the province of Ontario, the role of municipal government in the settlement and integration of immigrants was first recognized with the signing of the Canada-Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA) in 2005 (Veronis 2013). The COIA explicitly acknowledged the need to involve cities and local institutions in the integration process and thus provided resources to do so. Against this backdrop, we initiated our study in order to understand the role of multicultural media in assisting in the settlement process of four EICs in Ottawa. We selected the four participating communities based on the fact that they represent Ottawa's largest visible minority groups (Chinese, Somali, and South Asian) and are fast growing (Spanish-speaking Latin American).

### Survey Materials and Procedures

From May 2012 to January 2013, we administered 1600 surveys in Ottawa's Chinese, Spanish-speaking Latin American, Somali, and South Asian communities (400 per community) using paper and electronic forms. A total of 1212 usable surveys were retained with a response rate of about 75 %. Participants were recruited through a combination of strategies, including posters, flyers, and advertisements; e-mail messages and letters of information; webpage and social media postings; word of mouth; and attendance at community events and workshops. Eligible participants self-identified as being from a Chinese, Spanish-speaking Latin American, Somali, or South Asian background, were living in Ottawa, 18 years old and over, and able to communicate their experiences in English. Survey items and procedures were approved by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Ethics Board at the University of Ottawa. Participants were required to sign an informed consent form, and as an incentive to complete the survey, they had the option to participate in a prize draw.



## Measures

In addition to socio-demographic questions, the survey questionnaire included questions about media access, multicultural and English and/or French language media consumption habits, and reasons for consuming multicultural media. For this study, we analyze participants' responses to survey items pertaining to types of multicultural media consumption and most popular local multicultural media outlets. For their multicultural media consumption, participants were asked to indicate the types of ethnic language media they consume and the most commonly used sources; the response options used in this study included: the Internet, radio, online radio, TV, online TV, newspaper, and online newspaper. For the purpose of our study, we will use information related to the most popular local multicultural media sources. The consumption of print media was measured by responses to newspaper use. The consumption of broadcast media was measured by responses to use of TV and radio. The consumption of digital media was measured by responses to use of the Internet, online radio, online TV, and online newspaper. Our analysis relies on descriptive statistics to address the research objectives. Specifically, we use a combination of tabulated description (tables) and statistical commentaries (reports of findings) in order to summarize our groups of data.

## Results and Analysis

### Selected Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants

The four EICs included in this study are well represented among the 1212 survey participants, although members of the Chinese community are slightly more represented (at 29.1 %) compared to the Latin American (23.1 %), Somali (23.1 %), and South Asian (24.4 %) communities (see Table 1).

Women are somewhat overrepresented in the total sample (at 58.7 %) and across three communities: the Chinese (55.2 %), Latin American (59.8 %), and especially Somali (73 %). Those between ages 18 and 29 years are most represented across the sample (at 45.9 %), whereas those 50 years and older are somewhat less represented. In the Somali community, the youngest group—ages 18–29 years—is overrepresented at 63.8 %. For the Latin American community, the largest group are those aged 30–49 years at 59.4 %.

Participants are generally highly educated: 36 % had a post-secondary degree and 30.2 % had completed graduate school. The results, however, differ between communities; the Chinese, Latin American, and South Asian participants feature higher levels of educational attainment compared to Somali participants. Explanation for this difference may be found in the immigration categories. Compared to the other communities, the Somali community features a more significant share of participants who arrived as refugees (37.9 %). In contrast, the Chinese, Latin American, and South Asian communities show a higher proportion of economic migrants, most likely skilled workers. Altogether, the most prominent immigration category is family reunification (26.3 %) followed by the category “other” (22 %), which includes primarily international students. The latter is especially well represented in the Chinese and Latin American communities, which also coincides with higher levels of education.

**Table 1** Selected demographic characteristics of survey participants ( $N=1212$ )

| Demographic characteristics  | All communities<br>( $N=1212$ ) |      | Chinese community<br>( $n_1=353$ ) |      | Latin American<br>( $n_2=281$ ) |      | Somali community<br>( $n_3=282$ ) |      | South Asian community<br>( $n_4=296$ ) |      |
|--|---------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|------|---------------------------------|------|-----------------------------------|------|--|------|
|  | <i>n</i>                        | %    | <i>n</i>                           | %    | <i>n</i>                        | %    | <i>n</i>                          | %    | <i>n</i>                               | %    |
| <b>Sex</b>   |                                 |      |                                    |      |                                 |      |                                   |      |  |      |
| Female   | 711                             | 58.7 | 195                                | 55.2 | 168                             | 59.8 | 206                               | 73.0 | 142                                    | 48.0 |
| Male   | 497                             | 41.0 | 156                                | 44.2 | 113                             | 40.2 | 74                                | 26.2 | 154                                    | 52.0 |
| No response  | 4                               | 0.3  | 2                                  | 0.6  | 0                               | 0.0  | 2                                 | 0.7  | 0                                      | 0.0  |
| <b>Age (years)</b>   |                                 |      |                                    |      |                                 |      |                                   |      |  |      |
| 18–29  | 556                             | 45.9 | 159                                | 45.0 | 72                              | 25.6 | 180                               | 63.8 | 145                                    | 49.0 |
| 30–49  | 407                             | 33.6 | 94                                 | 26.6 | 167                             | 59.4 | 57                                | 20.2 | 89                                     | 30.1 |
| 50–64  | 106                             | 8.7  | 24                                 | 6.8  | 25                              | 8.9  | 33                                | 11.7 | 24                                     | 8.1  |
| 65 and more  | 85                              | 7.0  | 56                                 | 15.9 | 5                               | 1.8  | 3                                 | 1.1  | 21                                     | 7.1  |
| No response  | 58                              | 4.8  | 20                                 | 5.7  | 12                              | 4.3  | 9                                 | 3.2  | 17                                     | 5.7  |
| <b>Education level</b>   |                                 |      |                                    |      |                                 |      |                                   |      |  |      |
| No high school diploma   | 58                              | 4.8  | 14                                 | 4.0  | 7                               | 2.5  | 29                                | 10.3 | 8                                      | 2.7  |
| High school graduate <sup>a</sup>                                  | 337                             | 27.8 | 76                                 | 21.5 | 66                              | 23.5 | 124                               | 44.0 | 71                                     | 24.0 |
| College/vocational training/post-secondary/university <sup>b</sup> | 436                             | 36.0 | 166                                | 47.0 | 75                              | 26.7 | 104                               | 36.9 | 91                                     | 30.7 |
| Graduate/professional degree                                       | 366                             | 30.2 | 93                                 | 26.3 | 127                             | 45.2 | 23                                | 8.2  | 123                                    | 41.6 |
| No response  | 15                              | 1.2  | 4                                  | 1.1  | 6                               | 2.1  | 2                                 | 0.7  | 3                                      | 1.0  |
| <b>Immigration category</b>  |                                 |      |                                    |      |                                 |      |                                   |      |  |      |
| Economic immigrant   | 241                             | 19.9 | 74                                 | 21.0 | 70                              | 24.9 | 24                                | 8.5  | 73                                     | 24.7 |
| Family   | 319                             | 26.3 | 117                                | 33.1 | 71                              | 25.3 | 48                                | 17.0 | 83                                     | 28.0 |
| Refugee  | 174                             | 14.4 | 2                                  | 0.6  | 46                              | 16.4 | 107                               | 37.9 | 19                                     | 6.4  |
| Other  | 267                             | 22.0 | 115                                | 32.6 | 79                              | 28.1 | 11                                | 3.9  | 62                                     | 20.9 |
| Not applicable   | 149                             | 12.3 | 10                                 | 2.8  | 10                              | 3.6  | 80                                | 28.4 | 49                                     | 16.6 |
| No response  | 62                              | 5.1  | 35                                 | 9.9  | 5                               | 1.8  | 12                                | 4.3  | 10                                     | 3.4  |
| <b>Length of stay in Canada</b>                                    |                                 |      |                                    |      |                                 |      |                                   |      |  |      |
| 0–1 year   | 174                             | 14.4 | 68                                 | 19.3 | 54                              | 19.2 | 7                                 | 2.5  | 45                                     | 15.2 |
| 2–5 years  | 254                             | 21.0 | 112                                | 31.7 | 72                              | 25.6 | 14                                | 5.0  | 56                                     | 18.9 |
| 6–10 years   | 155                             | 12.8 | 55                                 | 15.6 | 58                              | 20.6 | 5                                 | 1.8  | 37                                     | 12.5 |
| 11–20 years  | 279                             | 23.0 | 79                                 | 22.4 | 60                              | 21.4 | 84                                | 29.8 | 56                                     | 18.9 |
| 21 years or more   | 155                             | 12.8 | 16                                 | 4.5  | 25                              | 8.9  | 80                                | 28.4 | 34                                     | 11.5 |
| Not applicable   | 149                             | 12.3 | 10                                 | 2.8  | 10                              | 3.6  | 80                                | 28.4 | 49                                     | 16.6 |
| No response  | 46                              | 3.8  | 13                                 | 3.7  | 2                               | 0.7  | 12                                | 4.3  | 19                                     | 6.4  |
| <b>Yearly household income (in Canadian dollars)</b>               |                                 |      |                                    |      |                                 |      |                                   |      |  |      |
| Less than \$20,999   | 471                             | 38.9 | 209                                | 59.2 | 78                              | 27.8 | 90                                | 31.9 | 94                                     | 31.8 |
| \$20,000–39,999  | 190                             | 15.7 | 35                                 | 9.9  | 52                              | 18.5 | 68                                | 24.1 | 35                                     | 11.8 |
| \$40,000–59,999  | 142                             | 11.7 | 18                                 | 5.1  | 30                              | 10.7 | 56                                | 19.9 | 38                                     | 12.8 |
| \$60,000–79,999  | 118                             | 9.7  | 24                                 | 6.8  | 37                              | 13.2 | 23                                | 8.2  | 22                                     | 7.4  |
| \$80,000 and more  | 189                             | 15.6 | 52                                 | 14.7 | 58                              | 20.6 | 20                                | 7.1  | 59                                     | 19.9 |

**Table 1** (continued)

| Demographic characteristics          | All communities<br>( <i>N</i> = 1212) |      | Chinese community<br>( <i>n</i> <sub>1</sub> = 353) |      | Latin American<br>( <i>n</i> <sub>2</sub> = 281) |      | Somali community<br>( <i>n</i> <sub>3</sub> = 282) |      | South Asian community<br>( <i>n</i> <sub>4</sub> = 296) |      |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------|---|------|--|------|--|------|---|------|
|                                      | <i>n</i>                              | %    | <i>n</i>  | %    | <i>n</i>   | %    | <i>n</i>   | %    | <i>n</i>  | %    |
| No response                          | 102                                   | 8.4  | 15  | 4.2  | 26   | 9.3  | 13   | 4.6  | 48  | 16.2 |
| Official language proficiency        |                                       |      |   |      |  |      |  |      |   |      |
| <i>English</i>                       |                                       |      |   |      |  |      |  |      |   |      |
| Little or no knowledge of English    | 53                                    | 4.4  | 30  | 8.5  | 5  | 1.8  | 9  | 3.2  | 9   | 3.0  |
| Elementary or basic level of English | 101                                   | 8.3  | 61  | 17.3 | 18   | 6.4  | 15   | 5.3  | 7   | 2.4  |
| Intermediate level of English        | 217                                   | 17.9 | 116   | 32.9 | 46   | 16.4 | 25   | 8.9  | 30  | 10.1 |
| Fluent level of English              | 625                                   | 51.6 | 75  | 21.2 | 151  | 53.7 | 204  | 72.3 | 195   | 65.9 |
| Advanced level of English            | 209                                   | 17.2 | 69  | 19.5 | 60   | 21.4 | 28   | 9.9  | 52  | 17.6 |
| No response                          | 7                                     | 0.6  | 2   | 0.6  | 1  | 0.4  | 1  | 0.4  | 3   | 1.0  |
| <i>French</i>                        |                                       |      |   |      |  |      |  |      |   |      |
| Little or no knowledge of French     | 697                                   | 57.5 | 303   | 85.8 | 122  | 43.4 | 99   | 35.1 | 173   | 58.4 |
| Elementary or basic level of French  | 203                                   | 16.7 | 29  | 8.2  | 62   | 22.1 | 60   | 21.3 | 52  | 17.6 |
| Intermediate level of French         | 120                                   | 9.9  | 8   | 2.3  | 44   | 15.7 | 34   | 12.1 | 34  | 11.5 |
| Fluent level of French               | 116                                   | 9.6  | 2   | 0.6  | 28   | 10.0 | 72   | 25.5 | 14  | 4.7  |
| Advanced level of French             | 46                                    | 3.8  | 3   | 0.8  | 19   | 6.8  | 13   | 4.6  | 11  | 3.7  |
| No response                          | 30                                    | 2.5  | 8   | 2.3  | 6  | 2.1  | 4  | 1.4  | 12  | 4.1  |

*N* = respondents from all communities; *n*<sub>1</sub>, *n*<sub>2</sub>, *n*<sub>3</sub>, *n*<sub>4</sub> = respondents from individual communities

<sup>a</sup> Also includes those who answered that they had completed some college/vocational training/post-secondary education, but did not complete their studies

<sup>b</sup> Also includes those who answered that they had completed some graduate studies, but did not complete their program

It is important to take into consideration differences in the length of stay in Canada. A large share of participants were recent arrivals—35.4 % had been in Canada for 5 years or less; this is especially the case for the Chinese and Latin American communities. In contrast, a larger share of Somali participants had been in Canada for more than 11 years (58.2 %) or was born in Canada (28.4 %; shown as “not applicable” in the table).

A significant proportion of total participants fall in the lower-income level categories. Differences, however, exist between the communities. Among the Chinese participants, almost 60 % reported that their annual household income was below Canadian \$20,999. There is also a large share of Somali participants who reported lower incomes. In contrast, the Latin Americans and South Asians show a larger proportion of participants who reported annual household incomes over Canadian \$80,000.

Most participants were fluent in English (51.6 %) or had intermediate (17.9 %) or advanced (17.2 %) levels of English. But compared to the other communities, the Chinese community has a lower proportion of participants who had fluent or

advanced level of English. Generally, participants had lower levels of French language skills.

While not representative of the four EICs in Ottawa, our sample includes participants who fall under a variety of categories in terms of immigration class, length of stay, and household income that will inform the analysis of our survey results pertaining to types of multicultural media consumption and most popular local multicultural media sources.

### Local Multicultural Media Outlets

To complement our analysis, our survey inquired about multicultural media sources used, and we found that a number of local multicultural media sources were most popular among our participants. But it is important to mention that the availability of different types of locally produced multicultural media varies between the four EICs in Ottawa, with significant implications for the consumption of such media. The four communities have some access to local multicultural broadcast radio and TV stations.<sup>1</sup> Yet, differences exist across the four communities with regard to print ethnic language newspapers and local news websites. For example, the Chinese community has most access to such media compared to the other groups, including two local ethnic language newspapers<sup>2</sup> and a web portal.<sup>3</sup> The Somalis have more limited access with one ethnic language newspaper<sup>4</sup> and one web portal.<sup>5</sup> In the Latin American community, there are two local ethnic language newspapers,<sup>6</sup> but no local news website. South Asians have access to an ethnic language newspaper<sup>7</sup> and a website for news and information.<sup>8</sup> Although a discussion of the production of multicultural media in Ottawa is beyond the scope of this paper, this information helps to contextualize our results on multicultural media consumption within and across the participating EICs. After an overview of general trends, our focus will be on three types of multicultural media: print (newspapers), broadcast (TV and radio), and digital media (Internet and online newspapers, radio, and TV).

<sup>1</sup> These are: (a) Chin Radio Ottawa 97.9FM, which offers multicultural/multilingual programming serving 40 distinct ethnocultural communities in over 20 different languages; (b) CKCU 93.1 FM and CHUO FM 89.1, which are campus-based community radio stations (at the Carleton University and University of Ottawa respectively), serving many different communities in Ottawa, including ethnocultural, by broadcasting multicultural/multilingual programming; and (c) OMNI Television, which is owned by Rogers Media, a private media company; it has multicultural TV stations offering a variety of multicultural/multilingual programming.

<sup>2</sup> These are: *Canada China News* (published weekly, available in print format with some contents available in online format) and *Health Times* (published weekly, available in print format with some contents available in online format).

<sup>3</sup> *Come from China* ([www.comefromchina.com/](http://www.comefromchina.com/)) is popular among the Chinese as a source of news and information.

<sup>4</sup> *Safari Post* is published monthly and available in both print and online formats.

<sup>5</sup> The web portal *Hiiraan Online* ([www.hiiraan.ca/](http://www.hiiraan.ca/)) is used by the Somalis to gather news and information.

<sup>6</sup> These are: *Eco Latino* (published monthly, available in print format only) and *Mundo en Español* (published bimonthly, available in online format only).

<sup>7</sup> The *CanAsian Times* is published weekly, available in print format only.

<sup>8</sup> *South Asian Connection* ([www.southasianconnection.ca/](http://www.southasianconnection.ca/)).

## General Trends Across Media Types Within and Across Communities

**By Type of Media** Out of the three types of media, digital media have the highest levels of consumption across the four communities (ranging 60–80 % for the Internet), broadcast TV ranks second (ranging 25–42 %), followed by print newspapers (ranging 20–30 %), and broadcast radio ranks last (ranging 9–19 %), with variations depending on the categories.

**By Community** The Chinese community generally consumes multicultural media at higher rates compared to the other communities. In contrast, the Somali community features the lowest levels of consumption for each of the three types of media. The Latin American and South Asian communities generally fall in between. They display comparable digital media consumption rates; South Asians, however, show higher print media consumption rates than Latin Americans, and they are also ahead of the Chinese for broadcast TV.

### Print Media: Newspapers

**General Trends** The consumption rate of multicultural print newspaper (Table 2) is highest among the Chinese community and lowest among the Somali community. These trends may be explained by the fact that the Chinese have most access to local ethnic print media while also facing language barriers. In contrast, the Somalis have more limited access to local ethnic print media. The Latin American and South Asian communities fall somewhere in between, with some variations depending on the categories.

**By Immigration Category** Those in the family reunification category consume most print newspapers (at 34 %), followed by those in the economic category (at 30 %). While these trends apply to the Chinese community—with relatively higher rates of 60 % for the family class and 58 % for the economic migrants—no consistent trends seem to emerge across the other communities. For Latin Americans, those in the economic category consume less print newspapers (13 %) than those in the family class (30 %), refugee (26 %), “other” (24 %), and those born in Canada (20 %). In the case of Somalis, the rates are remarkably low, except for those who reported “other” (18 %). In the South Asian community, the economic category features the highest consumption rate (29 %), followed by the category “other” (21 %) and family class (19 %).

**By Length of Stay** There appears to be more of a trend when it comes to length of stay in Canada. Those who are very recent arrivals (up to 1 year in Canada) generally consume less print newspapers than those who spent 2 years and more; the South Asian community stands out with the highest newspaper consumption rate among the most recent arrivals (at 24 %, followed by the Chinese at 21 %). Albeit variations depending on the categories, across the four communities the newspaper consumption rates tend to increase with length of stay in Canada.

**Table 2** Types of multicultural media use by immigration category, length of stay, and yearly household income ( $N = 1212$ ): percentage of survey participants who consume print media—newspaper

|  | All communities<br>( $N = 1212$ ), % ( $N$ ) | Chinese community<br>( $n_1 = 353$ ), % ( $n_1$ ) | Latin American<br>community $n_2 = 281$ ,<br>% ( $n_2$ ) | Somali community<br>( $n_3 = 282$ ), % ( $n_3$ ) | South Asian community<br>( $n_4 = 296$ ), % ( $n_4$ ) |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Immigration category</b>                          |  |   |  |  |   |
| Economic immigrant                                   | 30 (241)                                     | 58 (74)   | 13 (70)  | 0 (24)   | 29 (73)   |
| Family   | 34 (319)                                     | 60 (117)  | 30 (71)  | 4 (48)   | 19 (83)   |
| Refugee  | 11 (174)                                     | 50 (2)  | 26 (46)  | 4 (107)  | 11 (19)   |
| Other  | 23 (267)                                     | 23 (115)  | 24 (79)  | 18 (11)  | 21 (62)   |
| Not applicable                                       | 3 (149)                                      | 0 (10)  | 20 (10)  | 0 (80)   | 4 (49)  |
| No response  | 19 (62)                                      | 17 (35)   | 20 (5)   | 8 (12)   | 40 (10)   |
| <b>Length of stay in Canada</b>                      |  |   |  |  |   |
| 0–1 year   | 18 (174)                                     | 21 (68)   | 11 (54)  | 0 (7)  | 24 (45)   |
| 2–5 years  | 30 (254)                                     | 39 (112)  | 22 (72)  | 0 (14)   | 27 (56)   |
| 6–10 years   | 30 (155)                                     | 40 (55)   | 33 (58)  | 0 (5)  | 16 (37)   |
| 11–20 years  | 28 (279)                                     | 70 (79)   | 18 (60)  | 4 (84)   | 18 (56)   |
| 21 years or more                                     | 20 (155)                                     | 50 (16)   | 36 (25)  | 6 (80)   | 26 (34)   |
| Not applicable                                       | 3 (149)                                      | 0 (10)  | 20 (10)  | 0 (80)   | 4 (49)  |
| No response  | 24 (46)                                      | 31 (13)   | 50 (2)   | 8 (12)   | 26 (19)   |
| <b>Yearly household income (in Canadian dollars)</b> |  |   |  |  |   |
| Less than \$20,999                                   | 26 (471)                                     | 44 (209)  | 19 (78)  | 3 (90)   | 14 (94)   |
| \$20,000–39,999                                      | 20 (190)                                     | 37 (35)   | 29 (52)  | 1 (68)   | 26 (35)   |
| \$40,000–59,999                                      | 16 (142)                                     | 22 (18)   | 33 (30)  | 4 (56)   | 18 (38)   |
| \$60,000–79,999                                      | 25 (118)                                     | 54 (24)   | 24 (37)  | 13 (23)  | 23 (22)   |
| \$80,000 and more                                    | 25 (189)                                     | 40 (52)   | 24 (58)  | 0 (20)   | 22 (59)   |
| No response  | 17 (102)                                     | 33 (15)   | 4 (26)   | 0 (13)   | 23 (48)   |

$N$  = respondents from all communities;  $n_1$ ,  $n_2$ ,  $n_3$ ,  $n_4$  = respondents from individual communities

**By Household Income** It is again difficult to discern any clear trends across the communities since consumption rates range between 16 % (in the Canadian \$40,000–59,999 category) and 26 % (in the less than Canadian \$20,999 category). Among the Chinese, there are high consumption rates both for those in the lower- and higher-income categories. For Latin Americans and, to some extent, for South Asians, those in the middle categories consume more than those at either end. In the case of the Somalis, those earning between Canadian \$60,000 and \$79,999 are most likely to consume newspapers (at 13 %).

### **Broadcast Media: TV and Radio**

**General Trends** Both within and across the EICs, broadcast TV consumption rates are higher than for radio (Table 3). In contrast to the other types of multicultural media, the South Asian community leads with the highest TV consumption rates (ranging from 24 % to 68 %), followed by the Chinese (12–51 %), Latin American (15–50 %), and the Somali community (0–40 %). The rates for broadcast radio are somewhat lower, but they are relatively similar across the four communities, with some variations depending on the categories. It is important to note that, in some cases, the rate of no response for broadcast media consumption was high.

**By Immigration Category** No particular trends seem to emerge for broadcast media consumption by immigration category, whether within or across the communities. The highest TV consumption rates tend to be among those who came under family reunification (40 %) or as economic migrants (35 %). Depending on the communities, the highest TV consumption rates are among economic migrants (South Asian at 58 %), family reunification (Chinese at 51 % and Somali at 23 %), or those born in Canada (Latin American at 50 %). Across the four communities, the highest radio usage rates are for economic migrants and “other” (both at 15 %). When looking at the communities, radio consumption is highest among economic migrants for the Chinese (20 %), family reunification for the Somalis (21 %), refugee for the Latin Americans (17 %), and “other” for the South Asians (23 %), with some variations in the other categories.

**By Length of Stay** When it comes to length of stay, there is somewhat of a trend where consumption rates increase with the number of years spent in Canada, both within and across the communities. This trend is somewhat stronger for TV (42 % for those who spent 11–20 years in Canada and 37 % for those who spent more than 21 years) than for radio (highest at 19 % for those who spent 21 years or more in Canada). The number of years spent in Canada seems to clearly play a role in the TV consumption rates for the South Asian, Chinese, and Latin American communities. For the Somalis, however, the highest TV consumption rate (29 %) is among recent arrivals (0–1 year). It is interesting to note that those born in Canada also consume TV in the Latin American (50 %), South Asian (39 %), and Chinese (30 %) communities. For radio, the trend of gradual increase over time is less strong; this said, those who spent more time in Canada feature higher radio consumption rates across the four communities, albeit with some variations. The rates are generally low for those born in Canada.

**Table 3** Types of multicultural media use by immigration category, length of stay, and yearly household income ( $N = 1212$ ): percentage of survey participants who consume broadcast media—TV and radio

|  | All communities<br>( $N = 1212$ ), % ( $N$ ) |          | Chinese community<br>( $n_1 = 353$ ), % ( $n_1$ ) |          | Latin American community<br>( $n_2 = 281$ ), % ( $n_2$ ) |         | Somali community<br>( $n_3 = 282$ ), % ( $n_3$ ) |          | South Asian community<br>( $n_4 = 296$ ), % ( $n_4$ ) |         |
|--|--|----------|---|----------|--|---------|--|----------|---|---------|
|  | TV   | Radio    | TV  | Radio    | TV   | Radio   | TV   | Radio    | TV  | Radio   |
| <b>Immigration category</b>                          |  |          |   |          |  |         |  |          |   |         |
| Economic immigrant                                   | 35 (241)                                     | 15 (241) | 30 (74)   | 20 (74)  | 21 (70)  | 13 (70) | 21 (24)  | 17 (24)  | 58 (73)   | 11 (73) |
| Family   | 40 (319)                                     | 11 (319) | 51 (117)  | 9 (117)  | 28 (71)  | 10 (71) | 23 (48)  | 21 (48)  | 45 (83)   | 11 (83) |
| Refugee  | 22 (174)                                     | 13 (174) | 50 (2)  | 0 (2)    | 26 (46)  | 17 (46) | 17 (107)   | 13 (107) | 42 (19)   | 5 (19)  |
| Other  | 25 (267)                                     | 15 (267) | 16 (115)  | 11 (115) | 29 (79)  | 14 (79) | 18 (11)  | 27 (11)  | 39 (62)   | 23 (62) |
| Not applicable                                       | 26 (149)                                     | 5 (149)  | 30 (10)   | 0 (10)   | 50 (10)  | 0 (10)  | 15 (80)  | 4 (80)   | 39 (49)   | 8 (49)  |
| No response  | 15 (62)                                      | 11 (62)  | 0 (35)  | 0 (35)   | 20 (5)   | 20 (5)  | 17 (12)  | 25 (12)  | 60 (10)   | 30 (10) |
| <b>Length of stay in Canada</b>                      |  |          |   |          |  |         |  |          |   |         |
| 0–1 year   | 17 (174)                                     | 9 (174)  | 12 (68)   | 6 (68)   | 17 (54)  | 13 (54) | 29 (7)   | 0 (7)    | 24 (45)   | 11 (45) |
| 2–5 years  | 23 (254)                                     | 11 (254) | 21 (112)  | 4 (112)  | 15 (72)  | 13 (72) | 7 (14)   | 29 (14)  | 38 (56)   | 20 (56) |
| 6–10 years   | 33 (155)                                     | 12 (155) | 33 (55)   | 13 (55)  | 28 (58)  | 17 (58) | 0 (5)  | 0 (5)    | 46 (37)   | 30 (37) |
| 11–20 years  | 42 (279)                                     | 15 (279) | 51 (79)   | 22 (79)  | 40 (60)  | 8 (60)  | 17 (84)  | 17 (84)  | 68 (56)   | 2 (56)  |
| 21 years or more                                     | 37 (155)                                     | 19 (155) | 50 (16)   | 19 (16)  | 40 (25)  | 16 (25) | 25 (80)  | 18 (80)  | 59 (34)   | 26 (34) |
| Not applicable                                       | 26 (149)                                     | 5 (149)  | 30 (10)   | 0 (10)   | 50 (10)  | 0 (10)  | 15 (80)  | 4 (80)   | 39 (49)   | 8 (49)  |
| No response  | 28 (46)                                      | 17 (46)  | 31 (13)   | 15 (13)  | 50 (2)   | 50 (2)  | 8 (12)   | 17 (12)  | 37 (19)   | 16 (19) |
| <b>Yearly household income (in Canadian dollars)</b> |  |          |   |          |  |         |  |          |   |         |
| Less than \$20,999                                   | 27 (471)                                     | 8 (471)  | 31 (209)  | 5 (209)  | 28 (78)  | 14 (78) | 13 (90)  | 10 (90)  | 30 (94)   | 10 (94) |
| \$20,000–39,999                                      | 31 (190)                                     | 13 (190) | 26 (35)   | 11 (35)  | 29 (52)  | 17 (52) | 18 (68)  | 12 (68)  | 66 (35)   | 9 (35)  |
| \$40,000–59,999                                      | 31 (142)                                     | 15 (142) | 17 (18)   | 22 (18)  | 37 (30)  | 7 (30)  | 14 (56)  | 20 (56)  | 55 (38)   | 13 (38) |
| \$60,000–79,999                                      | 29 (118)                                     | 19 (118) | 29 (24)   | 25 (24)  | 30 (37)  | 14 (37) | 17 (23)  | 26 (23)  | 45 (22)   | 18 (22) |
| \$80,000 and more                                    | 36 (189)                                     | 16 (189) | 27 (52)   | 25 (52)  | 22 (58)  | 10 (58) | 40 (20)  | 10 (20)  | 56 (59)   | 15 (59) |
| No response  | 34 (102)                                     | 14 (102) | 40 (15)   | 13 (15)  | 15 (26)  | 4 (26)  | 31 (13)  | 0 (13)   | 44 (48)   | 19 (48) |

$N$  = respondents from all communities;  $n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4$  = respondents from individual communities



**By Household Income** Although not always consistent, there seems to be somewhat of a trend when looking at consumption of both TV and radio in relation to yearly household income. Across the four communities, TV rates are 27 % for the lowest income group and reach 36 % for the highest income group (with some inconsistencies for the middle income groups). In the case of radio, the lowest income group displays a rate of 8 %; the highest rate (19 %) is for those with an income of Canadian \$60,000–79,999. However, there are variations when looking at each community. For the Chinese community, the lowest income group displays the highest TV consumption rate at 31 %. In the case of the South Asian and the Latin American communities, it is those with middle incomes that feature the highest rates. The trend is clearer for radio consumption, and it is strongest in the Chinese community, with the rates rising from 5 % for the lowest income bracket to 25 % for the two top income groups. For the Latin American, Somali, and South Asian communities, there are higher consumption rates among the middle income groups, in addition to those earning less than Canadian \$20,999 in the Latin American community.

To sum up, these data seem to suggest a few trends. First, broadcast TV and radio consumption rates tend to be higher for those in the economic and family reunification categories. Then, there are some relations between length of stay in Canada and yearly household income, with some variations within and across the communities.

## Digital Media

**General Trends** Digital media (including the Internet, online radio, TV, and newspapers) are by far the most consumed type of media across the four communities (Table 4).

**By Type of Digital Media** Specifically, the Internet is the most consumed type of digital media, with rates between 70 % and 88 % across various categories. Online TV and newspapers follow, with rates between 20 % and 31 % depending on the categories. Online radio features lower consumption rates that range between 10 % and 22 % (with one instance of 26 %) depending on the categories.

**By Community** The Chinese community leads with the highest digital media consumption rates, especially for the Internet (ranging 77–92 %), followed by online TV (ranging 31–50 %), newspaper (11–39 %), and radio (ranging 6–17 %), with some variations depending on the categories. The Latin American and South Asian communities follow close behind, including for use of the Internet. Some differences, however, emerge for the other types of online media. Latin Americans show a preference for online newspapers (26–48 %), followed by radio (11–33 %) and then TV (16–30 %). For South Asians, the consumption of online newspapers (at 14–37 %) also comes ahead of radio (12–24 %) and TV (10–29 %), with some variations depending on the categories. For Somalis, Internet consumption rates are also highest (40–70 %), followed by online radio (14–29 %), newspaper (8–29 %), and TV (8–29 %), with some variations depending on the categories. It is important to note that, in some cases, the rate of no response was high.

**Table 4** Types of multicultural media use by immigration category, length of stay, and yearly household income (N= 1212): percentage of survey participants who consume digital media—Internet, online radio, online TV, and online newspaper

| Immigration category                          | All communities (N= 1212), % (N) |              |           |                  | Chinese community (n <sub>1</sub> = 353), % (n <sub>1</sub> ) |              |           |                  | Latin American community (n <sub>2</sub> = 281), % (n <sub>2</sub> ) |              |          |                  |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------------|---|--------------|-----------|------------------|--|--------------|----------|------------------|
|   | Internet                         | Online radio | Online TV | Online newspaper | Internet  | Online radio | Online TV | Online newspaper | Internet   | Online radio | Internet | Online newspaper |
|   |                                  |              |           |                  |   |              |           |                  |  |              |          |                  |
| Economic immigrant                            | 75 (241)                         | 15 (241)     | 22 (241)  | 20 (241)         | 88 (74)   | 12 (74)      | 38 (74)   | 14 (74)          | 74 (70)  |              |          | 17 (70)          |
| Family  | 69 (319)                         | 16 (319)     | 27 (319)  | 19 (319)         | 77 (117)  | 6 (117)      | 43 (117)  | 13 (117)         | 75 (71)  |              |          | 29 (71)          |
| Refugee                                       | 55 (174)                         | 16 (174)     | 14 (174)  | 17 (174)         | 100 (2)   | 0 (2)        | 0 (2)     | 0 (2)            | 72 (46)  |              |          | 13 (46)          |
| Other   | 80 (267)                         | 22 (267)     | 24 (267)  | 25 (267)         | 90 (115)  | 17 (115)     | 31 (115)  | 17 (115)         | 77 (79)  |              |          | 28 (79)          |
| Not applicable                                | 34 (149)                         | 7 (149)      | 8 (149)   | 6 (149)          | 30 (10)   | 0 (10)       | 10 (10)   | 0 (10)           | 70 (10)  |              |          | 0 (10)           |
| No response                                   | 66 (62)                          | 13 (62)      | 29 (62)   | 15 (62)          | 86 (35)   | 11 (35)      | 40 (35)   | 11 (35)          | 60 (5)   |              |          | 0 (5)            |
| Length of stay in Canada                      |                                  |              |           |                  |   |              |           |                  |  |              |          |                  |
| 0–1 year                                      | 80 (174)                         | 10 (174)     | 26 (174)  | 21 (174)         | 90 (68)   | 6 (68)       | 34 (68)   | 15 (68)          | 80 (54)  |              |          | 11 (54)          |
| 2–5 years                                     | 88 (254)                         | 22 (254)     | 31 (254)  | 25 (254)         | 92 (112)  | 15 (112)     | 44 (112)  | 14 (112)         | 83 (72)  |              |          | 31 (72)          |
| 6–10 years                                    | 71 (155)                         | 19 (155)     | 24 (155)  | 27 (155)         | 78 (55)   | 13 (55)      | 42 (55)   | 24 (55)          | 67 (58)  |              |          | 28 (58)          |
| 11–20 years                                   | 61 (279)                         | 14 (279)     | 21 (279)  | 14 (279)         | 77 (79)   | 10 (79)      | 39 (79)   | 10 (79)          | 65 (60)  |              |          | 22 (60)          |
| 21 years or more                              | 55 (155)                         | 19 (155)     | 12 (155)  | 17 (155)         | 75 (16)   | 19 (16)      | 6 (16)    | 0 (16)           | 84 (25)  |              |          | 16 (25)          |
| Not applicable                                | 34 (149)                         | 7 (149)      | 8 (149)   | 6 (149)          | 30 (10)   | 0 (10)       | 10 (10)   | 0 (10)           | 70 (10)  |              |          | 0 (10)           |
| No response                                   | 48 (46)                          | 15 (46)      | 15 (46)   | 17 (46)          | 85 (13)   | 8 (13)       | 8 (13)    | 15 (13)          | 50 (2)   |              |          | 0 (2)            |
| Yearly household income (in Canadian dollars) |                                  |              |           |                  |   |              |           |                  |  |              |          |                  |
| Less than \$20,999                            | 70 (471)                         | 13 (471)     | 24 (471)  | 14 (471)         | 82 (209)  | 11 (209)     | 39 (209)  | 13 (209)         | 79 (78)  |              |          | 17 (78)          |
| \$20,000–39,999                               | 63 (190)                         | 12 (190)     | 19 (190)  | 18 (190)         | 89 (35)   | 6 (35)       | 37 (35)   | 11 (35)          | 71 (52)  |              |          | 19 (52)          |
| \$40,000–59,999                               | 60 (142)                         | 26 (142)     | 20 (142)  | 24 (142)         | 83 (18)   | 17 (18)      | 22 (18)   | 11 (18)          | 70 (30)  |              |          | 33 (30)          |
| \$60,000–79,999                               | 74 (118)                         | 19 (118)     | 21 (118)  | 25 (118)         | 92 (24)   | 8 (24)       | 50 (24)   | 29 (24)          | 84 (37)  |              |          | 27 (37)          |

Table 4 (continued)

|                          | All communities ( $N = 1212$ ), % ( $N$ )             |              |           |                  | Chinese community ( $n_1 = 353$ ), % ( $n_1$ ) |              |           |                  | Latin American community ( $n_2 = 281$ ), % ( $n_2$ ) |              |           |                  |
|--------------------------|---|--------------|-----------|------------------|--|--------------|-----------|------------------|---|--------------|-----------|------------------|
|                          | Internet  | Online radio | Online TV | Online newspaper | Internet                                       | Online radio | Online TV | Online newspaper | Internet  | Online radio | Online TV | Online newspaper |
| \$80,000 and more        | 65 (189)  | 17 (189)     | 20 (189)  | 23 (189)         | 79 (52)  | 13 (52)      | 29 (52)   | 10 (52)          | 71 (58)   |              |           | 24 (58)          |
| No response              | 54 (102)  | 14 (102)     | 16 (102)  | 16 (102)         | 87 (15)  | 13 (15)      | 27 (15)   | 20 (15)          | 12 (26)   |              |           | 15 (26)          |
|                          | Latin American community ( $n_2 = 281$ ), % ( $n_2$ ) |              |           |                  | Somali community ( $n_3 = 282$ ), % ( $n_3$ )  |              |           |                  | South Asian community ( $n_4 = 296$ ), % ( $n_4$ )    |              |           |                  |
|                          | Online TV   | Online radio | Online TV | Online newspaper | Internet                                       | Online radio | Online TV | Online newspaper | Internet  | Online radio | Online TV | Online newspaper |
| Immigration category     |   |              |           |                  |  |              |           |                  |   |              |           |                  |
| Economic immigrant       | 16 (70)   |              | 34 (70)   |                  | 54 (24)  | 21 (24)      | 8 (24)    | 8 (24)           | 70 (73)   | 12 (73)      | 16 (73)   | 16 (73)          |
| Family                   | 19 (71)   |              | 36 (71)   |                  | 48 (48)  | 19 (48)      | 17 (48)   | 8 (48)           | 64 (83)   | 16 (83)      | 17 (83)   | 20 (83)          |
| Refugee                  | 28 (46)   |              | 26 (46)   |                  | 44 (107)                                       | 17 (107)     | 7 (107)   | 9 (107)          | 74 (19)   | 16 (19)      | 26 (19)   | 37 (19)          |
| Other                    | 20 (79)   |              | 38 (79)   |                  | 45 (11)  | 18 (11)      | 18 (11)   | 9 (11)           | 69 (62)   | 23 (62)      | 15 (62)   | 27 (62)          |
| Not applicable           | 20 (10)   |              | 20 (10)   |                  | 31 (80)  | 6 (80)       | 5 (80)    | 4 (80)           | 33 (49)   | 10 (49)      | 10 (49)   | 8 (49)           |
| No response              | 0 (5)   |              | 20 (5)    |                  | 42 (12)  | 17 (12)      | 17 (12)   | 17 (12)          | 30 (10)   | 20 (10)      | 20 (10)   | 20 (10)          |
| Length of stay in Canada |   |              |           |                  |  |              |           |                  |   |              |           |                  |
| 0–1 year                 | 24 (54)   |              | 30 (54)   |                  | 57 (7)   | 14 (7)       | 29 (7)    | 0 (7)            | 71 (45)   | 13 (45)      | 18 (45)   | 24 (45)          |
| 2–5 years                | 22 (72)   |              | 39 (72)   |                  | 71 (14)  | 29 (14)      | 7 (14)    | 21 (14)          | 89 (56)   | 23 (56)      | 21 (56)   | 29 (56)          |
| 6–10 years               | 17 (58)   |              | 38 (58)   |                  | 40 (5)   | 20 (5)       | 0 (5)     | 0 (5)            | 70 (37)   | 14 (37)      | 11 (37)   | 19 (37)          |
| 11–20 years              | 17 (60)   |              | 23 (60)   |                  | 46 (84)  | 15 (84)      | 11 (84)   | 8 (84)           | 55 (56)   | 11 (56)      | 14 (56)   | 20 (56)          |
| 21 years or more         | 16 (25)   |              | 48 (25)   |                  | 48 (80)  | 18 (80)      | 10 (80)   | 10 (80)          | 59 (34)   | 24 (34)      | 18 (34)   | 18 (34)          |

Table 4 (continued)

|   | Latin American community ( $n_2 = 281$ ), % ( $n_2$ ) |                  |          | Somali community ( $n_3 = 282$ ), % ( $n_3$ ) |           |                  | South Asian community ( $n_4 = 296$ ), % ( $n_4$ ) |              |           |                  |
|---|---|------------------|----------|---|-----------|------------------|--|--------------|-----------|------------------|
|   | Online TV   | Online newspaper | Internet | Online radio                                  | Online TV | Online newspaper | Internet   | Online radio | Online TV | Online newspaper |
| Not applicable                                | 20 (10)   | 20 (10)          | 31 (80)  | 6 (80)  | 5 (80)    | 4 (80)           | 33 (49)  | 10 (49)      | 10 (49)   | 8 (49)           |
| No response                                   | 50 (2)  | 50 (2)           | 42 (12)  | 25 (12)                                       | 26 (12)   | 8 (12)           | 26 (19)  | 16 (19)      | 21 (19)   | 21 (19)          |
| Yearly household income (in Canadian dollars) |   |                  |          |   |           |                  |  |              |           |                  |
| Less than \$20,999                            | 18 (78)   | 26 (78)          | 41 (90)  | 11 (90)                                       | 6 (90)    | 3 (90)           | 65 (94)  | 14 (94)      | 15 (94)   | 18 (94)          |
| \$20,000–39,999                               | 19 (52)   | 35 (52)          | 35 (68)  | 10 (68)                                       | 4 (68)    | 3 (68)           | 80 (35)  | 11 (35)      | 29 (35)   | 29 (35)          |
| \$40,000–59,999                               | 30 (30)   | 40 (30)          | 41 (56)  | 29 (56)                                       | 14 (56)   | 20 (56)          | 68 (38)  | 21 (38)      | 21 (38)   | 24 (38)          |
| \$60,000–79,999                               | 19 (37)   | 43 (37)          | 57 (23)  | 22 (23)                                       | 17 (23)   | 4 (23)           | 64 (22)  | 14 (22)      | 0 (22)    | 14 (22)          |
| \$80,000 and more                             | 21 (58)   | 40 (58)          | 60 (20)  | 5 (20)  | 5 (20)    | 10 (20)          | 49 (59)  | 17 (59)      | 15 (59)   | 22 (59)          |
| No response                                   | 15 (26)   | 23 (26)          | 15 (13)  | 0 (13)  | 1.5 (13)  | 0 (13)           | 46 (48)  | 17 (48)      | 13 (48)   | 15 (48)          |

$N$  = respondents from all communities;  $n_1$ ,  $n_2$ ,  $n_3$ ,  $n_4$  = respondents from individual communities

**By Immigration Category** Immigration category does not seem to play a major role in terms of digital media consumption. For the Internet, the rates are generally quite high for all the communities, including for those who came as refugees; refugees even displayed higher rates than other categories in the South Asian community (74 %). There is some variation when it comes to the other types of online media. In the Chinese community, economic and family class migrants and those in the category “other” (international students) show high online TV consumption rates, followed by online radio and newspaper. In the case of Latin Americans, those in the economic, family, and “other” categories have higher online newspaper use rates followed by online radio, while the refugee category has higher online TV consumption rates. In the Somali community, these online media are consumed mostly by those in the economic, family, and “other” categories. For South Asians, those who came as refugees display higher online newspaper and TV consumption rates, while those in the “other” category consume mostly online newspapers and radio.

**By Length of Stay** Although the trend is not always consistent, there is a tendency for recent arrivals to display higher digital media consumption rates across the four types of digital media than those who spent more time in Canada (albeit with some variations). This is especially true with regard to Internet consumption. With some variations, this trend, in relation to length of stay in Canada, is also visible for the consumption of other types of digital media across the four communities.

**By Household Income** No major trends emerge when looking at digital media consumption in relation to yearly household income, although some variations exist when looking at particular types of media and specific communities. Generally, yearly household income does not seem to play much of a role when it comes to Internet consumption, especially for the Chinese and Latin Americans. Income, however, appears to play a role in the Somali community where the rates increase somewhat with higher ranges of income, with 41 % for the bottom bracket and 60 % for the top bracket. The South Asians seem to stand out insofar as the highest income bracket displays the lowest Internet consumption rate in the community.

In the Chinese community, no noteworthy trend appears when it comes to consuming online TV, newspaper, and radio. For Latin Americans, the online newspaper, radio, and TV rates are somewhat higher for the higher income brackets. Similarly, Somalis in the lowest income brackets consume less online newspaper, TV, and radio than those with higher incomes. For South Asians, there are noteworthy variations depending on the categories, with no distinct trend emerging from the data; those who earn less than Canadian \$20,999 and between Canadian \$60,000 and \$79,999 consume less of these digital media than the other categories. While the trends are not consistent, it appears that income does not play an important role for Internet consumption, but it may play a role for consuming online newspapers, TV, and radio, with some variations depending on the communities.

To summarize, digital media seem to be favored across all the communities, with a strong and relatively consistent use of the Internet across the four EICs and various categories. To some extent, immigration category, length of stay in Canada, and income play a role in the use of online newspaper, TV, and radio, with some variations within and across the four communities.

## Discussion

This study aimed to advance understanding of multicultural media use and immigrant settlement through a comparative examination of four EICs—the Chinese, Spanish-speaking Latin American, Somali, and South Asian—in Ottawa. Altogether, our findings support the assertion of Caidi et al. (2010) regarding the challenge in making generalizations within and across immigrant groups about their information needs. The results of our survey clearly demonstrate that multicultural media use varies within and across EICs depending on the types of media, immigration experiences, and socioeconomic backgrounds of their members. In so doing, our findings challenge the often simplistic tendency of homogenizing diverse EICs (Caidi et al. 2010) which could undermine understanding of the different settlement-related information needs, the use of multicultural media in meeting these, and the potential role that these media can play in the settlement process (Matsaganis et al. 2011). In the following, we discuss the results of the descriptive statistical analysis in relation to specific objectives of the study and implications for research, policy, and practice.

Considering the multidimensional process of immigrants' context of reception—whether experiencing higher acceptance or lower acceptance from receiving societies—it is important to identify the sources of information immigrants use while settling into the new country. Our first objective was to compare types of multicultural print, broadcast, and digital media across the four communities. The findings reveal that while survey participants use various types of multicultural media, the consumption of digital multicultural media is high across members of the EICs. Specifically, the Internet is the most consumed type of digital multicultural media by participants across the communities. Other important types of multicultural media consumed were broadcast TV, print newspapers, and broadcast radio, in that order. We thus argue that members of EICs tend to use various types of multicultural media to meet their settlement-related information needs and, in particular, that digital multicultural media and the Internet may provide significant resources to assist them in the settlement process. In light of this, it appears imperative for future research to examine in more depth how and why EICs use multiple different types of media resources and their role in providing orienting and problem-specific information at various stages of the settlement process. Specifically, more studies are needed on EICs' use of digital multicultural media and the Internet—thus moving away from the tendency to focus on ethnic print media to study the provision of local news and information (Lin and Song 2006; Huston and NEPMCC 2012).

The second objective was to examine similarities and differences in the responses within and across the four communities by immigration category, length of stay, and yearly household income. The findings clearly demonstrate that multicultural media constitute part of the immediate, intermediate, and long-term settlement experiences of these EICs, but with noticeable variations both within and across the communities. To start, the Chinese community generally consumes all three types of multicultural print, broadcast, and digital media at the highest rate, and the Somali community at the lowest rate. Two observations can be made from these findings: first, the availability of multicultural media could have contributed to the higher or lower consumption rates of these media, and, second, other factors, in this case language skills in the Chinese community, can play a role in the consumption of multicultural media.

Overall, it is important to note that immigration category does not appear to play a significant role in relation to multicultural media consumption, at least compared to income and length of stay where we can see more of a trend. In the following, we elaborate on this point for each type of media. With regard to multicultural print newspaper consumption, very recent arrivals (up to 1 year in Canada) generally consume at lower rates than those who spent 2 years and more. However, there are some variations within the communities; for example, recent arrivals in the South Asian and Chinese communities have the highest consumption rates, while Latin Americans have higher rates among those who spent 6–10 years and more than 21 years in Canada. These patterns could be explained by factors such as availability of, access to, and quality of print media (which are lower among the Latin American and Somali communities compared to the Chinese and South Asians), and possibly language barriers (in the case of the Chinese).

When it comes to broadcast multicultural media, TV consumption rates are higher than those of radio, both within and across the four communities. Years spent in Canada plays a role in TV use, with some variations across the communities. Interestingly, the South Asian community has the highest TV consumption rates, with a gradual increase with the number of years spent in Canada; the Somali community has the lowest TV consumption rates that demonstrate an increase–decrease–increase pattern with the number of years spent in Canada. With regard to radio use, across the four communities, years spent in Canada and income appear to play a role; the higher consumption rates are generally found among those who spend more time in Canada and the lower rates generally found among those in the lowest income bracket, with a gradual increase among the higher income groups.

More significantly, our survey results demonstrate that the Internet was the most popular digital multicultural media form, widely and consistently used across the four communities and various categories, and generally more so among recent arrivals—those who spent 0–1 year and 2–5 years in Canada. This pattern is consistent with the Statistics Canada's 2007 Canadian Internet Use Survey (2011) finding that immigrants, particularly recent immigrants, were active users of the Internet. However, when compared to other forms of digital media such as online newspaper, TV, and radio, our survey findings reveal variations within the communities. For example, while the Chinese, Somali, and South Asian communities showed a preference for the Internet (especially those who spent more time in Canada) over the other forms of digital media, the Latin American community favored online newspapers. Interestingly, while, in the Somali community, Internet use rates increase somewhat with higher ranges of income, those in the highest income bracket in the South Asian community display the lowest use rate. This finding can suggest that although income differences are often associated with Internet access—with those in the higher income bracket having more Internet access compared to those in the lower income bracket (Statistics Canada 2011)—for immigrants, Internet use rates may also be associated with literacy barriers and lack of knowledge and ability to use the Internet (Matsaganis et al. 2011).

Based on these findings, we argue that more attention needs to be paid to the demographic characteristics of EICs in order to advance understanding of multicultural media use in settlement processes. In addition to immigration category, length of stay, and income (which were the focus of our study), other factors need to be examined,

such as language skills, level of education (including literacy and digital skills), age and generation, and possibly cultural traditions, among others. In other words, to improve understanding of multicultural media use and immigrant settlement, it is important to contextualize studies in relation to both the contexts of reception (including availability of multicultural media) and the socioeconomic and cultural makeup of EICs.

In turn, these findings can provide government and settlement agencies, and other local, community, and multicultural organizations serving EICs in Ottawa and beyond, important insights into designing and communicating settlement-related messages and information throughout the immigration process. Particularly, attention should be paid to exploit multiple media platforms such as the Internet, broadcast TV, print newspapers, and broadcast radio in order to reach out to various member groups within and across these communities. Considering the findings on the Internet use, it seems, as also observed by Veenhof et al. (2008), the Internet can serve as an important resource for EICs for not only facilitating various communication activities, including maintaining connections with family and friends overseas, but also for providing ethnic language cultural content which may not be readily available for recent immigrants in the new country. Nevertheless, both immigration policy makers and media practitioners (both multicultural and mainstream) should take into account considerations relating to levels of literacy and gaps in digital skills when using the Internet to reach out and communicate settlement-related information to EICs.

### **Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

There are a number of limitations to our study. First, we examined multicultural media use and immigrant settlement within and across four EICs in the context of Ottawa. The sample is not representative of the EICs in Ottawa, or in Canada. Although Ottawa is the sixth largest entry point for immigration to Canada and the fact that the Chinese, Somalis, and South Asians constitute the three largest visible minority groups in Canada and the Spanish-speaking Latin American is a growing immigrant group, other metropolitan areas and other EICs may have different patterns in multicultural media consumption related to settlement. Thus, future research should recruit participants from other EICs located across other census metropolitan areas in Canada. Second, the majority of the participants were female and relatively young (between the ages 18 and 29 years). This overrepresentation in the sample may have skewed the findings. Therefore, future research should consider recruiting a more heterogeneous and representative sample for better generalizability of study findings. Third, our study focused on multicultural media consumption trends by media types and made comparisons within and across communities as they relate to issues of settlement. Future research should consider investigating questions related to the process of acculturation and identity construction along a continuum of settlement stages. Finally, as a first step, the findings of this study only offer tabulated descriptions, graphical descriptions, and statistical commentaries to summarize participants' multicultural media consumption trends within and across the communities related to settlement. Future research should rely on inferential statistics to complement our findings by extending beyond summarizing emerging patterns from the data and making conclusions regarding relevant hypotheses, and thus provide a more in-depth



understanding of multicultural media consumption and settlement and contribute to increasing knowledge in this area. In addition, the use of qualitative methods such as interviews and focus groups with both producers of multicultural media and members of EICs could help shed light on the potentials and limitations of multicultural media use in the settlement process.

## Conclusions

Despite these limitations, our study sheds light on the role multicultural media play in the day-to-day life of the Chinese, Spanish-speaking Latin American, Somali, and South Asian communities in Ottawa. We provide significant empirical evidence supporting the argument that variations exist in the consumption of multicultural media—including types of media used and across categories such as immigration class, length of stay, and yearly household income—within and across these four EICs. This comparative evidence can assist government and settlement agencies, and other local, community, and multicultural organizations serving immigrants in Ottawa and beyond, to help address immigrant information needs and facilitate their settlement process. In particular, local governments can utilize the available multicultural media, which serve as important resources for both newcomers and longer established immigrants (Caidi et al. 2010; Lin and Song 2006; Lull 2013; Matsaganis et al. 2011; Rhodes 2010), to provide information about municipal services related to public health, recreational programs, garbage and snow removal, zoning, and by-laws, among others. Our findings also demonstrate that immigrants in this study do make some use of local multicultural media outlets which may help them in their settlement and inclusion into and/or participation in the new country, especially in their immediate community.

Finally, we offer important implications for policy and practice. Given the fact that the EICs in our study do make use of multicultural media, although differences exist within and across communities in the type and degree of use, these media can function as important sources of information for immigrants by fulfilling their: (a) orienting information needs such as in everyday life contexts in the new country and (b) problem-specific information needs to help solve individual problems or perform specific tasks. Thus, municipal governments could be more proactive in partnering with local multicultural media producers to increase their community outreach and utilize the diverse media sources to facilitate immigrant settlement. Since immigrants' settlement-related information needs vary from being urgent to critical, transitional, and/or integrative, the findings of our collaborative project provide useful evidence to design informed policies and practices and to create community-oriented action initiatives capable of fostering long-term immigrant integration and inclusion.

**Acknowledgments** We acknowledge the funding received from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) for the broader project of which this study is a part. We also acknowledge the collaboration and dedication of everyone involved with the project. A special acknowledgement is extended to our survey participants, project team, research assistants, partners, collaborators, and volunteers.

**Compliance with Ethical Standards** Research Ethics Board approval has been obtained from the University of Ottawa to conduct this study.

**Funding** This study was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC, Project no. 890-2010-0137).

**Conflict of Interest** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## References

- Adams, P. C., & Skop, E. (2008). The gendering of Asian Indian transnationalism on the Internet. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, 25(2), 115–136. doi:10.1080/08873630802214131.
- Ahadi, D., & Murray, C. (2009). Urban mediascapes and multicultural flows: assessing Vancouver's communication infrastructure. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 34(4), 587–611.
- Alegado, K. (2009). *Somalia and the digital world*. Unpublished International Media Research Paper. www.plu.edu/~aledadkt%2Fdocuments%2Fsomalia%2520and%2520the%2520digital%. Accessed 22 April 2015.
- Baffoe, M. (2012). Projecting their own images: the role of the Black ethnic media in reconstructing the identities and images of ethnic minorities in Canadian society. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, 5(1), 28–52.
- Caidi, N., Allard, D., & Quirke, L. (2010). The information practices of immigrants. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST)*, 44, 493–531.
- Cover, R. (2013). Community print media: perceiving minority community in multicultural South Australia. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 27(1), 110–123.
- Croucher, S. M., Onmmen, D., & Steele, E. L. (2009). An examination of media usage among French-Muslims. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 38(1), 41–57.
- Dalisay, F. (2012). Media use and acculturation of new immigrants in the United States. *Communication Research Reports*, 29(2), 148–160.
- Dekker, R., & Engbersen, G. (2012). *How social media transform migrant networks and facilitate migration*. Working Paper, International Migration Institute, University of Oxford.
- Feng, Y. L., & Nza, V. E. (2011). Impact of Spanish-Speaking media technologies on Latino university students' bicultural identity development. *Journal of Border Educational Research*, 10(1), 192–214.
- Fleras, A. (2009). Theorizing multicultural media as social capital: crossing borders, constructing buffers, creating bonds, building bridges. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 34(4), 725–729.
- Fleras, A. (2011). *The media gaze: representation of diversities in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Fokkema, T., Lessard-Phillips, L., Bachmeier, J. D., & Brown, S. K. (2012). The link between the transnational behaviour and integration of the second generation in European and American cities. Does the context of reception matter? *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 2(2), 111–123. doi:10.2478/v10202-011-0033-x.
- Giusti, M. (2013). The Web as a channel to connect the current and traditional cultural consumptions. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 103, 1210–1219.
- Hallden, K., le Grand, E., & Hellgren, Z. (2008) (Eds.). *Ethnicity and social divisions: contemporary research in sociology*. New Castle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Huston, G. A., & National Ethnic Press and Media Council of Canada (NEPMCC). (2012). *Canada's ethnic media: fostering dialogue, forging the engagement and integration of new Canadians, uniting our communities in Canada's diversity and multiculturalism responsibility: a national socio-economic report on Canada's community-based ethnic/third language media*. North York, Ontario: National Ethnic Press and Media Council of Canada. <http://www.nepmcc.ca/press%20release/td2012.htm>. Accessed 1 April 2015.
- Jiang, Y. (2013). The use of Weibo to connect Chinese communities in Australia by Australian politicians. *Asian Pacific Public Relations Journal*, 14(1–2), 69–84.
- Karim, K. H. (Ed.). (2003). *The media of diaspora. Transnationalism*. London: Routledge.

- Karim, K. H. (2007). Nation and diaspora: rethinking multiculturalism in a transnational context. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 2(3), 267–282.
- King, R., & Wood, N. (Eds.). (2013). *Media and migration. Constructions of mobility and difference*. London: Routledge.
- Kong, S. (2013). Space of possibilities: civic discourse and multicultural citizenship in locally produced Chinese television programs in Metro Vancouver. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 14(1), 119–138.
- Lin, W. Y., & Song, H. (2006). Geo-ethnic storytelling: an examination of ethnic media content in contemporary immigrant communities. *Journalism*, 7(3), 362–388.
- Lin, W. Y., Song, H., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2010). Localizing the global: exploring the transnational ties that bind in new immigrant communities. *Journal of Communication*, 60(2), 205–229.
- Lull, J. (2013). *Media, communication, culture. A global approach* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Matsaganis, M., Katz, V. S., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2011). *Understanding ethnic media: producers, consumers, and societies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Moon, S., & Park, C. Y. (2007). Media effects on acculturation and biculturalism: a case study of Korean immigrants in Los Angeles' Koreatown. *Mass Communication & Society*, 10(3), 319–343.
- Murray, C. (2008). Media infrastructure for multicultural diversity. *Policy Options*, 29(4), 63–66.
- Murray, C. Yu, S., & Ahadi, D. (2007). *Cultural diversity and ethnic media in BC*. A report to Canadian Heritage Western Regional Office. <http://www.bcethnicmedia.ca/Research/cultural-diversity-report-oct-07.pdf>. Accessed 19 May 2015.
- Mwarigha, M. S. (2002). *Towards a framework for local responsibility: taking action to end the current limbo in immigrant settlement: Toronto*. Toronto: Maytree Foundation. [http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:t10vovYavvgJ:www.urbancenter.utoronto.ca/pdfs/eLibrary/Maytree\\_Immigrant-Settlement.pdf+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca](http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:t10vovYavvgJ:www.urbancenter.utoronto.ca/pdfs/eLibrary/Maytree_Immigrant-Settlement.pdf+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca). Accessed 25 March 2015.
- Ottawa Local Immigration Partnership (OLIP) (n.d.). *Ottawa immigration strategy*. <http://olip-plio.ca/what-we-do/ottawa-immigration-strategy/>. Accessed 6 May 2015.
- Papillon, M. (2002). *Immigration, diversity and social inclusion in Canada's cities*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks. [http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:kMK0R88gqdsJ:cprn.org/documents/17243\\_en.pdf+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca](http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:kMK0R88gqdsJ:cprn.org/documents/17243_en.pdf+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca). Accessed 26 March 2015.
- Payne, G. (2008). Mediated communication and integration of diasporic communities: toward a theoretical model. *Global Media Journal*, 8(14). <https://lass.calumet.purdue.edu/cca/gmj/sp09/gmj-sp09-payne.htm>. Accessed 15 March 2015.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1996). *Immigrant America: a portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: the story of the immigrant second generation*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Rhodes, L. D. (2010). *The American press: shaping the American dream*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Shumow, M. (2010). "A foot in both worlds": transnationalism and media use among Venezuelan immigrants in South Florida. *International Journal of Communication*, 4, 377–397. [http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:\\_pmrf9LvqQ4J:www.shatterbe.lt/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Foot-in-both-worlds.pdf+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca](http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:_pmrf9LvqQ4J:www.shatterbe.lt/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Foot-in-both-worlds.pdf+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca). Accessed 15 March 2015.
- Smith, R. C. (2013). Comparing local-level Swedish and Mexican transnational life: an essay in historical retrieval. In L. Pries (Ed.), *New transnational social spaces: international migration and transnational companies in the early twenty-first century* (pp. 37–58). New York: Routledge.
- Statistics Canada (2011). Canadian Internet use survey 2010. *The Daily*, May 25. Accessed 20 March 2015.
- Statistics Canada. (2013). *Immigration and ethnocultural diversity in Canada*. Analytical document. National Household Survey, 2011. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-010-x/99-010-x2011001-eng.pdf>. Accessed 1 March 2015.
- Veenhof, B., Wellman, B., Quell, C., & Hogan, B. (2008). *How Canadians' use of the Internet affects social life and civic participation* (29 pp.). Connectedness Series, Statistics Canada, cat. no. 56F0004M, no. 16. Percentage of Internet/email users who used the Internet in the previous month to communicate with family and friends, Canada, 2003. In Statistics Canada. Accessed 1 April 2015.
- Veronis, L. (2013). The border and immigrants in Ottawa–Gatineau: governance practices and the (re)production of a dual Canadian citizenship. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 28(2), 257–271.
- Viswanath, K., & Arora, P. (2000). Ethnic media in the United States: an essay on their role in integration, assimilation, and social control. *Mass Communication & Society*, 3(1), 39–56.

- Wayland, S. V. (2006). *Unsettled: legal and policy barriers for newcomers to Canada. A Joint Initiative of Community Foundations of Canada and the Law Commission of Canada*. Ottawa: Law Commission of Canada. <http://www.cfc-fcc.ca/doc/LegalPolicyBarriers.pdf>. Accessed 26 March 2015.
- Wilkin, H. A., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2006). Reaching at risk groups: the importance of health storytelling in Los Angeles Latino media. *Journalism*, 7, 299–320.
- Yu, S., & Ahadi, D. (2010). Promoting civic engagement through ethnic media. *PLATFORM: Journal of Media and Communication*, 2(2), 54–71.