Diaspora Experiences in Multicultural VS Melting Pot Societies:

Lessons from the Indian Diaspora in the U.S. and Canada

Masud Chand

Assistant Professor of International Business

Department of Management, Box 88

Wichita State University, Wichita, KS 67260, USA

Tel: 1-31-6978-7115   E-mail: Masud.chand@wichita.edu

Abstract

We examine the experiences of the Indian diaspora in the U.S. and Canada and explain how acculturation policy differences could have led to differing outcomes for diaspora activities in host countries. Using the different acculturation frameworks in these two countries as the basis for our historical analysis, we derive some lessons as to how differences in host country acculturation policies can lead to differences in integration outcomes for the diasporas and the host countries themselves.

Keywords: Indian diaspora, Acculturation, U.S., Canada, Melting pot, Multiculturalism

1. Introduction

The steady increase in immigrant and minority populations in both the U.S. and Canada has made acculturation policy an important issue in both countries. In fact, according to projections of the U.S. Census Bureau (2008), ethnic minorities will make up a majority of the U.S. population by 2042, up from about 26 % in 2006. The population of Canada is also becoming increasingly diverse, with Statistics Canada (2008) projecting that the proportion of Canada's visible minorities will rise from 13 % in 2001 to 20 % in 2017. In both of these countries, immigration will be one of the main drivers of population growth. This points to the increasing importance of integrating these new immigrants into the host country's society. In this paper, we conduct a historical analysis of the Indian diaspora in the U.S. and Canada, and determine some of the lessons that can be drawn from its experiences in two countries with similar cultures but different acculturation policies.

The Indian diaspora has been a very successful immigrant group in both the U.S. and Canada in terms of economic achievement and educational attainment. While both the U.S. and Canada have similar cultures compared to the Indian culture, as confirmed by the Hofstede (1980) framework (explained in greater detail in the acculturation section), the history of their efforts in dealing with minorities in general, and the Indian diaspora in particular, have been very different. We take a historic overview of how the treatment of the Indian diaspora has differed in the two countries, and how this could have led to differences in the diaspora's actions in regard to the host countries. We use the different acculturation frameworks adopted by the host countries as a basis for our analysis. We then discuss how these differences in policies may have affected the diaspora today, and what lessons this offers for the host countries and the diaspora itself.

The study is important for a number of reasons. In today's highly globalized economy, immigration barriers have been lowered and brain circulation is a fact (Tung, 2008). Thus the trend of higher immigration is likely to continue. Diasporas, through their use of social networks in both the home and host countries, have become vital conduits that drive trade and investment (Chand, 2010). In addition, with increasing efforts made by the mother countries of diaspora's to engage them, the role of diasporas in driving the relationship between the home and host countries has become even more important (Chand & Tung, 2011).

Since the year 2000, the Indian diaspora has emerged as a dynamic factor shaping relations between the home and host countries. During this period, the Indian population in both the U.S. and Canada has grown substantially, trade and investment ties grown exponentially and a number of prominent political figures of Indian descent emerged in both these countries. There are two important reasons for the emergence of Indian diaspora as an influential community. First, both

Indo-Canadians and Indian-Americans are a large and among the fastest growing populations in North America. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2011) the population of Indian-Americans had grown from 1,678,765 in 2000 to 2,843,391 in 2010, a growth rate of 69.37 %, the highest for any Asian American community, and among the fastest growing ethnic groups in the United States. Indian-Americans are the second largest Asian-American ethnic group, after Chinese-Americans. During 2000 to 2005, the Indo-Canadian population saw an increase of 35 %, in comparison to the 31 % growth rate for Chinese-Canadians, the next largest visible minority in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2006). Second, the Indian-American and Indo-Canadian communities are richer and better educated than the average American or Canadian. According to the U.S. India Political Action Committee (USINPAC), over 58 % of all Indian-Americans over the age of 25 had a college degree, compared to the national average of 26 %; over 40 % have a Masters or Doctoral degree compared to the national average of 10 % (USINPAC, 2009). 26 % of the Indo-Canadian population above the age of 15 holds a university degree, and 1 % holds a doctorate. This compares with about 12 % and 0.5 % respectively for the Canadian population as a whole above 15 (Statistics Canada, 2006). Due to their better economic position, they have become major contributors to political parties, and this makes an important difference when it comes to political influence. Thus, Indians in North America are rapidly acquiring political clout commensurate with their financial wealth.

According to the Government of India's National Portal for the Indian diaspora (2008), the Indian diaspora was estimated to be around 30 million people. The Indian government is increasingly recognizing the importance of the Indian diaspora and is taking steps to engage it with the mother country and leverage it as strategic asset.

2. Methodology

This paper uses comparative historical analysis of the Indian diaspora in the U.S. and Canada from the early twentieth century till about the modern day to derive some lessons as to how differences in host country acculturation policies can lead to differences in integration outcomes for the diasporas and the host countries themselves. Comparative historical analysis is a particularly useful methodology here since we are comparing social processes (acculturation policies and immigrant experiences) across times and places in order to create explanations that are valid beyond a particular time and place, by direct comparison to other historical events and reference to the present day. This is something at which the historical analysis method often excels in (Schutt, 2006). We use secondary sources for gathering our historical data.

3. The Indian Diaspora in the U.S.

The first large scale migration of Indians into the U.S. started at around the beginning of the 20th century. A large number of these initial Indian immigrants in the U.S. were Sikhs. Most of them had originally arrived in Vancouver, British Columbia (B.C.) with the idea that as subjects of the British Empire, they were free to settle anywhere within the Empire. However, they found that the fact that they were subjects of the British Empire did not mean anything in the Empire (Canada) itself and they were blatantly discriminated against (Lal, 1999). A large number of these immigrants then entered the U.S. through Seattle or San Francisco as the ships that carried them from Asia often stopped at these ports.

Although some Indians eventually naturalized to become U.S. citizens, in 1923, the Supreme Court in the United States v. Bhagat Singh Thind case ruled that people from India were aliens ineligible for citizenship. Using the "understanding of the common man" argument, it was decided that Congress never intended for Indians, as non-Whites, to be able to naturalize. After this ruling, not only were Indians denied the ability to naturalize, their new classification as Asian, rather than white, allowed the retroactive stripping of previously naturalized Indians of their American citizenship (Lal, 1999).

As public support from the western allies for India grew throughout World War II, and as India's independence came closer to reality, Indians argued for an end to their legislative discrimination. The support culminated in the signing into law of the Luce-Cellar Act by President Truman on July 2, 1946, which allowed naturalization to Indians. After the passage of the 1965 Immigration Act that abolished national origin quotas and opened large-scale immigration to non-European countries, another wave of Indian immigrants entered the U.S. in the 1970s and 1980s. The greater number of Indians between 1965 - 1980 were to arrive as professionals, though subsequently many more have come under family reunification preferential categories (Lal, 2006).

The Cold War created a need for engineers in the defense and aerospace industries in the U.S., as such engineers immigrated from India to fulfill these needs. Most of these Indian immigrants were not from Punjab but from other parts of India, mainly Gujarat (a north-western state) and southern Indian states. By the late 1980s and early 1990s Gujarati and South Indian immigrants outnumbered Sikhs and Punjabis as new arrivals, although these communities had pretty much even representation in overall Indian-American numbers (Lal, 2006).

According to the U.S. Census (2011), Indian-Americans today are one of the wealthiest and best educated communities in the United States. Their median household income was $ 88,538 compared with $ 44,684 for non-Hispanic white families. Despite being generally religious and having the highest average household income among all ethnic groups in the United

States, Indian-Americans tend to be more liberal and tend to vote overwhelmingly for Democrats. Polls before the 2004 U.S. Presidential election showed Indian-Americans favoring the Democratic candidate John Kerry over Republican George W. Bush by a 53 % to 14 % margin (nearly a 4:1 ratio), with 30 % undecided at the time (Asia Times, 2004). This margin was also supported by a an exit poll of 4 senate races (Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Virginia) in the 2006 election that showed that South Asians in these states voted Democratic by a 87 % - 13 % margin (Chaudhuri, 2007). This figure might be a little inflated in its support for Democrats in that South Asians included Indians, Bangladeshis and Pakistanis, and anecdotal evidence suggests that Bangladeshis and Pakistanis, as overwhelmingly Muslim communities, had a more negative image of the past Republican administration. The trend of Indian-American support for the Democrats continued in the 2008 elections. According to a poll by the National Asian American Survey (NAAS) conducted between August –September 2008, Democrat Barack Obama had a 53 % to 13 % lead over Republican John McCain with 33 % undecided. In terms of party identification, 39 % identified themselves as Democrats and 7 % as Republican (Mehra, 2008). Although there have been no specific exit polls of Indian-Americans for the 2008 elections, Asian Americans (of whom Indians were the third largest group after the Chinese and Filipinos) voted 65 - 32 for Barack Obama (CNN, 2008).

In the political field, Indian-Americans have not had much prominence until very recently. Despite voting overwhelmingly Democratic, the most prominent Indian-Americans have been Republicans. These include Bobby Jindal, Governor of Louisiana, who promotes himself as staunchly conservative, Governor Nikki Haley of South Carolina, who sees herself as a Christian conservative, Dinesh D'Souza, conservative author and former Reagan speech writer, who has in his writings held up Indians in the U.S. as model minorities for other minorities to emulate; and Ramesh Ponnuru, senior editor for the conservative *National Review* magazine. This dichotomy in the Indian community is interesting and important, because it could point to the number of different factors, sometimes conflicting, that could affect its political involvement and its motivations and ability to affect trade and investment ties. Being a highly religious group that puts great emphasis on family ties and traditional values, it would seem that they have more in common with the Republican party than the Democratic party. The fact that Indians are more entrepreneurial (Kauffman, 2007) and more free trade oriented (given their trade and investment ties with their mother country) should also cause them to be more Republican, which is usually seen as a more pro-business party. Yet voting patterns reveal that Indians are more likely to vote for Democrats. This could be influenced by the fact that most minorities in the U.S. are more likely to vote Democratic, and that most Indians may feel more at home with a party that attracts more minority and immigrant support. This would mean that in most cases, the Indian diaspora is more comfortable in a more multicultural setting, rather than as a model minority in a White majority setting. When Indians have risen up the political hierarchy though, such as in the case of the above mentioned politicians and commentators, they tend to be Republicans. This could imply that once the perception is that they are accepted within the mainstream community, Indians are more likely to vote their natural more conservative tendencies, rather than vote more in solidarity with other minorities.

Racial discrimination against Indian-Americans is not widespread, but is known to happen. There were some reports of attacks against Sikhs in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks on the U.S. One of the most media covered recent events of alleged prejudice against Indian-Americans occurred on August 11, 2006, when Senator George Allen of Virginia, running for re-election, singled out the Indian-American political staffer of his challenger in a crowd by calling him "macaca" (the French word for monkey which was used as a slur for colored people in Africa) and sarcastically saying, "Welcome to America" (CNN, 2006). Some members of the Indian-American community saw Allen's insult and the massive backlash that led to Allen losing his re-election bid, as a cultural turning point demonstrating the newfound confidence of Indian-born U.S. citizens (Leonard, 2006).

The theme of racial discrimination, at least to a limited extent, was also found by Chacko (2007) in her interview-based study of Indian immigrants in the high-tech sector who had moved back to India from the United States. She found that some Indian interviewees mentioned security concerns in the post 9/11 period when Indian-Americans who were mistaken for Arabs were discriminated against. The media focus on outsourcing of jobs to India also drew negative attention to the Asian Indian community. Incidents of this kind made some Indians feel unwelcome; they believed that they were now viewed with suspicion and their loyalty to the United States questioned.

4. The Indian Diaspora in Canada

The Indo-Canadian community started around the beginning of the 20th century. The pioneers were men, mostly Sikhs from the Punjab, who were veterans of the British Indian Army. In 1902, many of them had traveled through Vancouver across Canada for the coronation celebrations of Edward VII as part of the Imperial entourage, and on their return to India brought back stories of the rich soil and favorable climate in B.C., similar to Punjab. Between 1903 and 1908, almost 5,000 Indians, mostly male Sikhs from Punjab, came to B.C. to work on the railroad, in lumber mills or in forestry (Naidoo & Leslie, 2006). As subjects of the British Empire, they expected equal treatment within all its borders, in line with Queen

Victoria's 1858 declaration that throughout the empire the people of India would enjoy equal privileges with white people without discrimination of color, creed or race(Singh, 1991).

However, upon arrival mainly to B.C., the first Sikh immigrants faced widespread racism by the local white Canadians. The restrictions by the Canadian government gradually increased on Indians, and policies were put in place in 1907 to prevent Indians who had the right to vote from voting in future general elections (Sikh-Canadian History, 2006). In 1908, the Canadian government implemented the 'continuous journey' rule prohibiting the entry of those who did not come to Canada by continuous journey from their country of origin (Naidoo & Leslie, 2006). Since at that time all steamships traveling from India, China or Japan had to refuel in Hawaii, there were no direct trips to Canada from India that satisfied the continuous journey rule. This was done mainly to prevent the further immigration of Indians into Canada; since India and Canada were both parts of the British Empire, Canada could not directly over rule British Imperial policy. In 1914, the Komagata Maru, a steam liner carrying 376 passengers from the Punjab region of India arrived in Vancouver. In line with the continuous journey rule, most passengers were not allowed to land in Canada and were returned at gunpoint to India. This was one of the most notorious incidents in the history of exclusion laws in Canada designed to keep out immigrants of Asian origin (Sikh-Canadian History, 2006).

Policies changed rapidly during the second half of the 20th century. The Canadian government re-enfranchised the Indo-Canadian community with the right to vote in 1947. In 1967, all immigration quotas based on specific ethnic groups were done away with. Canada introduced an immigration policy that was based on a point system, with each applicant being assessed on their trade skills and the need for these skills in Canada. This allowed Indians to immigrate in large numbers (Sikh Canadian History, 2006). The Indo-Canadian population stood at 713,000 in 2001 (Statistics Canada, 2001), and had increased to 962,670 by 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2006). The Greater Toronto Area with 484,655 Indo-Canadians and the Greater Vancouver Area with 181,895 Indo-Canadians are home to the majority of Indo Canadians (Statistics Canada, 2006). Although the vast majority of Indo-Canadians are either recent immigrants from India, or second and third generation Indo-Canadians, there are groups of Indo-Canadians that have moved from other parts of the world. In the 1970s, 50,000 Indian Ugandans, mostly of Ismaili Muslim background, were forced out of Uganda by the dictator Idi Amin and were not permitted to resettle back in India by the Indian government. As a result, most of them opted to settle in the U.K. (about 30,000) or Canada (about 7,000) (Rangaswamy, 2005). The average household income for Indo-Canadians at CAD $ 41,748 is about 16 % higher than the national median household income of $ 35,996 (Naidoo & Leslie, 2006).

Indo-Canadians tend to be very involved politically at local, provincial and federal levels, in contrast to Indian-Americans. As of 2011, there were 8 Indo-Canadian Members of Parliament in the Canadian House of Commons and 2 Federal cabinet ministers (Times of India, 2011). Indo-Canadian politicians have been elected to parliament as members of all the three major national political parties (Elections Canada, 2006). Prominent Indo-Canadian politicians include Ujjal Dosanjh, a former Premier of B.C. and Minister of Multiculturalism, federal MPs Parm Gill, Jasbir Sandhu, Nina Grewal, Yasmin Ratansi, and B.C. Attorney General Wally Oppal.

5. Acculturation

One of the most popular measures of culture is the value survey by Geert Hofstede (1980). Between 1967 and 1973, he executed a large survey regarding national values differences across the worldwide subsidiaries of IBM and compared the answers of 117,000 IBM matched employees samples on the same attitude survey in different countries. Using the results of his 40 country study, Hofstede (1980) constructed four distinct dimensions of culture as an underlying framework to identify and explain differences in cultural patterns observed across countries. Hofstede's power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism and masculinity dimensions define a specific set of values which describe some aspect of culture and human activities. Later, with Michael Bond, he added a fifth dimension to his framework, known as Long Term Orientation (sometimes also known as Confucian Dynamism) (Hofstede, 2001). A brief description of Hosftede's five dimensions is given below:

- **Power Distance** focuses on the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations expect and accept that power is distributed unequally. A high power distance ranking indicates that inequalities of power and wealth have been allowed to grow within society. In large power distance countries the less powerful accept power relations that are more autocratic and paternalistic (Hofstede, 1991).

- **Individualism** focuses on the degree the society reinforces individual or collective achievement and interpersonal relationships. A high individualism ranking indicates that individuality and individual rights are paramount within the society. Individuals in these societies may tend to form a larger number of looser relationships. (Hofstede, 1991)

- **Masculinity** focuses on the degree the society reinforces, or does not reinforce, the traditional masculine model of male achievement, control, assertiveness and power, as opposed to traditional female values such as quality of life, environment, nurturing and concern for the less fortunate. A high masculinity ranking indicates the country experiences a high degree of gender differentiation (Hofstede, 1980).

- **Uncertainty Avoidance Index** focuses on the level of tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity within the society - i.e. unstructured situations. Hofstede defines uncertainty avoidance as ". . . the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations" (Hofstede, 1991:113). In high uncertainty avoidance cultures, structures are established which minimize the level of uncertainty faced by individual. (Hofstede, 1980).

- **Long-Term Orientation** focuses on the degree the society embraces, or does not embrace, long-term devotion to traditional, forward thinking values. High long-term orientation indicates thrift and perseverance. A low long-term orientation ranking indicates respect for tradition, fulfilling social obligations and saving face (Hofstede, 2001).

While Hofstede's dimensions have been at times criticized for their applicability in all situations, their reduction of national cultures to averages and their inability to capture sub national differences (McSweeney, 2002; Schwartz, 1994; Tung & Verbeke, 2010), the fact remains that Hofstede's dimensions are among the most widely used cultural frameworks and have been used more extensively than competing cultural dimensions (e.g.,; Schwartz, 1994; Smith, Peterson & Schwartz, 2002; Tang & Koveos, 2008; Trompenaars, 1993). According to Kirkman, Lowe, & Gibson (2006:286), Hofstede's framework stands out in cross-cultural research because of its 'clarity, parsimony, and resonance with managers'. The values for the different dimensions of Hofstede's framework for India, the U.S. and Canada are given in Table 1.

Looking at the scores of the Hofstede dimensions, it is clear that the Indian and host communities have significant cultural differences on a number of dimensions. Indians score significantly higher than the Americans or Canadians on power distance. This would mean that they are generally much more accepting of inequality of wealth and power distribution in society. Indians also score significantly lower on individualism, which means the societal collectivism and the importance of families is much higher in the Indian culture. The high long term orientation of Indians means that that they are likely to place a higher value on thrift and perseverance than the host societies. As the very different Indian and host country cultures come into contact with each other, they go through a process of acculturation, which is what we next turn to.

The term acculturation was originally proposed by anthropologists (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936) to refer to group-level phenomena involving change that results from contact between two different. Acculturation is the process of cultural and psychological change that follows intercultural contact (Berry, 2003). Cultural changes include alterations in a group's customs, and in their economic and political life. Psychological changes include alterations in individuals' attitudes toward the acculturation process, their cultural identities (Phinney, 2003) and their social behaviors in relation to the groups in contact.

Immigrant groups are not always free to choose how to acculturate, as their experience depends to a large extent on the acculturation policy of the host country. The acculturation policy of the host country can have a large impact on the diaspora's feeling of being at 'home' and in its motivations towards the home and host countries (Chand, 2010). The host country might make certain restrictions that constrain the choices that immigrants can make. We now look at some of the ways in which the dominant community could deal with immigrants trying to acculturate in mainstream society.

The dominant community can have a number of different possible attitudes towards the acculturation that can take place. These take place along two main dimensions - cultural maintenance and cultural contact. Berry et al. (1987) defined cultural maintenance as referring to the extent to which cultural (ethnic) identity and characteristics are considered to be important and to which their maintenance is strived for. Cultural contact concerns the extent to which immigrants choose to be involved in other cultural groups, or remain primarily among themselves. The acceptance of cultural diversity and integration by the larger society defines the attitude of mutual accommodation known as multiculturalism. When assimilation is the preferred outcome by the dominant community, it is termed the melting pot (when strongly enforced, it can be termed the 'pressure cooker'). When separation is enforced by the dominant group, it is termed segregation. When marginalization is imposed by the dominant group, it is a form of exclusion (Bourhis et al, 1997).

The United States has historically been seen as a 'melting pot'. The term melting pot was first used in Israel Zangwill's 1908 play of that name:

> *"There she lies, the great Melting-Pot--Listen! Can't you hear the roaring and the bubbling?... Ah, what a stirring and a seething! Celt and Latin, Slav and Teuton, Greek and Syrian, black and yellow...Jew and Gentile.... East and West and North and South, the palm and the pine, the pole and the equator, the crescent and the*

> cross--how the great Alchemist melts and fuses them with his purifying flame! Here shall they all unite to build
> the Republic of Man and the Kingdom of God" (Salins, 1997).

The view that assimilation was the preferred outcome for immigrants was echoed more recently by President George W.
Bush while campaigning for his 2006 immigration bill:

> "One aspect of making sure we have an immigration system that works, that's orderly and fair, is to actively
> reach out and help people assimilate into our country… That means learn the values and history and language
> of America… When you hear people like me talking about assimilation, that's what we're talking about,
> helping people assimilate into America, helping us remain one nation under God" (White House, 2006).

Policies intended to achieve assimilation require minority groups to conform to the dominant culture to achieve full
citizenship (Fredrickson, 1999; Verkuyten, 2005), which may require minority group members to forfeit their cultural
roots to support and maintain the dominant culture. Assimilation presumes that the dominant culture's values, principles
and practices are a model for all to emulate (Fredrickson, 1999). It can also sometimes set rigid boundaries on group
membership. In some cases, it is connected to ethnoculturalism that maintains that Americans are white,
English-speaking Protestants of northern European ancestry (Smith & Edmonston, 1997). Gordon (1964) argued that
there is one unidirectional pathway to successfully assimilating into the U.S. economic and social structure and that
acculturation not only preceded but was necessary for structural incorporation. In the assimilation process, immigrants
lose their ethnic distinctiveness, become ever more indistinguishable from the host society and eventually adopt an
American identity. However, as the immigrant groups assimilate, they can also over time subtly change the cultural
values of the dominant community.

In contrast to the American preference for assimilation, Canada's official policy has been one of multiculturalism. Two
weeks after President Bush's previously mentioned statement on immigration, the Conservative Prime Minister of
Canada had a very different message at the opening of the World Urban Forum in Vancouver. The context of Stephen
Harper's speech was the recent discovery of the terrorist plot in Toronto. Prime Minister Harper offered a vigorous
defense of sustained immigration and multicultural policy: "Canada's diversity, properly nurtured, is our greatest
strength" he observed, asserting continued support for immigration and multiculturalism (Mickleburgh, 2006).

Contrary to assimilation, multiculturalism (sometimes termed cultural pluralism) celebrates inter-group differences as a
valuable resource and a foundation for cultural strength. Accordingly, multiculturalism strives to be fully inclusive, with
all cultures having a reciprocal relationship - a healthy balance of give and take (Berry, 1984; Fredrickson, 1999).
Within a truly multicultural society, there is no dominant culture that takes precedence over any other (Berry, 1984).

The origin of Canadian multiculturalism was to some extent unintended. In 1960, to address the growing challenge of
Quebec nationalism during the 'quiet revolution' of growing self-expression in that province, the federal government set
up a Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. As public hearings were held across the country,
representation was made by Ukrainian-Canadians and other groups of non-British and non-French ethnicity challenging
the conventional national assimilation model of Anglo- and Franco-conformity. By 1961 citizens outside these two
'charter groups' accounted for 25 % of the national population and immigration trends, notably after the 1967 reforms,
suggested this share would grow steadily. Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, in a speech in the Canadian Parliament in
October 1971, reversed the bicultural recommendations of the Royal Commission, ushering in multiculturalism as
official government policy. This was later inscribed into the 1982 Canadian Constitution where article 27 of the
Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms asserts a declaration of rights "… in a manner consistent with the
multicultural heritage of Canadians". Other legislative institutionalizations were the 1988 Multiculturalism Act and the
1995 Employment Equity Act. In recent years the appointment by the Prime Minister of immigrant women who are
visible minorities as Governor General of Canada, the Queen's official representative in Canada's constitutional
monarchy, has provided symbolic and highly visible institutionalization of cultural diversity as a national norm. The
federal department Citizenship and Immigration Canada promotes multiculturalism. Its website announces
multiculturalism as:

> "Canadian multiculturalism is fundamental to our belief that all citizens are equal. Multiculturalism ensures
> that all citizens can keep their identities, can take pride in their ancestry and have a sense of belonging.
> Acceptance gives Canadians a feeling of security and self-confidence, making them more open to, and
> accepting of, diverse cultures." (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2008).

Multiculturalism is often seen to be a defining characteristic of Canadian identity (Li, 2003). Moreover, it continues to
receive strong popular endorsement as a positive contribution to integration. A stratified random sample of 1,500
Canadians in September 2006 showed that 76 % agreed that multiculturalism aids immigrant integration, 76 % that it

aids equal participation in society, 74 % that it assists a sense of national belonging, 69 % that it assists national identity and citizenship, 69 % that it enhances the identification of shared values and 64 % that it aids in social cohesion. The survey also revealed that professional and university-educated respondents were more positive in their assessment, while low income and retired Canadians were less supportive (Jedwab, 2006). No national political party in Canada opposes immigration and there has been no downward revision in annual entry targets in the transitions between Conservative and Liberal federal governments over the past 15 years.

It is also possible that multiculturalism is fostering more tolerance towards immigrants. In the 2010 Trans Atlantic Trends Immigration Survey, for example, 56% of Americans but only 32% of Canadians agreed that immigrants take away jobs from locals (National Post, 2011). In another survey on immigrant integration, Canada place third behind Sweden and Portugal on the latest Migrant Integration Policy Index, a benchmark study on integration that measures a range of indicators, from political engagement and paths to citizenship to public education. The United States ranked ninth overall on the survey (Migrant International Policy Index, 2012).

However, multiculturalism is not without its critics in Canada. There is some anxiety that "multiculturalism is an exercise in postmodern identity politics that fragments the nation-building project" (Devoretz, 2006:6). There has also been some immigrant opposition to multiculturalism. These critics disagree with the cultural essentialism of multiculturalism, seeing not only the benign project of cultural recognition, but also a more troubling (if unintended) consequence that reproduces cultural difference, thereby prescribing the appropriate cultural repertoire for any hyphenated Canadian. This argument was raised most persuasively by Neil Bissoondath (1994:11) in *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism,* where he argued that his Trinidadian past should have no bearing on his Canadian present. Rather he wanted to be a simple Canadian, unencumbered by ethnic expectations. He charged that multiculturalism contributed to the "containment, marginalization and ghettoization of essentialized immigrant identities". Despite these criticisms, multiculturalism is the official policy of the Canadian government and widely accepted by the Canadian population (Li, 2003; Jedwab, 2006).

We have so far looked at the history of the Indian diaspora in the U.S. and Canada, and the differences in acculturation policy between the two countries. In the next section, we take a look at how the differences in acculturation policies could have led to some of the differences in the actions and outcomes for the diasporas in the two countries

6. Outcomes from Differences in Acculturation Policy

The Indian diaspora has been a remarkably successful modern diaspora in both the U.S. and Canada. In terms of economic progress and educational attainment, it is one of the most successful minority groups in both countries. However, as the history of the two diasporas has revealed, interesting differences have emerged between the two. The key ones can be summarized as follows:

- The Indian diaspora in the U.S seems to have had more economic success, in terms of per capita income as well as in comparison to the majority community. This has been built to a large extent on its strong educational attainment. While the diaspora in Canada has been successful overall, it has not had as much relative success in economic terms as the diaspora in the U.S.

- In contrast, the diaspora in Canada is much more prominent politically. While currently the only elected Indian-American politicians of national prominence are Bobby Jindal, Republican Governor of Louisiana and Nikki Haley Republican Governor of South Carolina (there are none in Congress or the Federal Cabinet), there are 8 Indo-Canadian MPs in the Canadian House of Commons representing all major political parties and 2 Federal Cabinet Ministers. In fact, historically, Indo-Canadians have been much more involved politically at both the provincial and federal levels, in contrast to Indian-Americans.

- This disconnect between the economic and political success could be explained by the difference in acculturation policies between the two countries. Multiculturalism might cause immigrants and their descendants to see themselves as having more of a stake in the host society, even as people different from the majority community, thus encouraging them to seek public office. The melting pot might foster greater assimilation that benefits them economically, but at the expense of feeling a part of a separate cultural group. Thus in this situation, the diaspora would be extremely successful in the community without actually seeing its distinct ethnic group as a part of it.

- Integration of immigrants into the host country also seems to work better under multiculturalism, as reflected by overall attitudes towards immigrants as well as the scores on the Migrant Integration Policy Index. In addition, high profile cases of discrimination and cultural insensitivity seem to occur with greater frequency under the melting pot; however, it should be added that both the U.S. and Canada have strong laws against discrimination that are strictly enforced.

- On the other hand, when it comes to lobbying for the home country, the lobbying efforts of Indian-Americans spearheaded by the USINPAC are much stronger than lobbying by Indo-Canadians. A case in point that illustrated the rising influence of the Indian diaspora in the U.S. was the 2006 effort by the Bush administration to supply civilian nuclear technology to India. This was a special measure that required Congressional approval. Led by the Indian diaspora, an intense lobbying effort was mounted on behalf of India. Although there were major geopolitical issues behind the passage of the bill that allowed this, one of the major drivers behind its success was the lobbying effort put in by the India diaspora. President Barack Obama, then a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said before the vote that "there appears to be a very coordinated effort to have every Indian-American person that I know contact me" (Forsythe & Trehan, 2006). This could be because despite being in a melting pot society, that is supposed to help immigrants blend into the host culture, the majority of the Indian-American community is relatively more recent, and thus has more ties to the home country. It could also be because home countries would logically devote more efforts to cultivate their diaspora in the larger and more influential country.

- Another important difference in the political field is that while Indo-Canadians have been elected to office for all three major national parties with diverse ideologies, Indian-Americans who are prominent in the political field, such as Bobby Jindal, Nikki Haley, Dinesh D'Souza, and Ramesh Ponnuru, tend to be very conservative. One reason for this could be that in a multicultural society, since there is no dominant culture, individuals from any ethnic group are comfortable with their varying political philosophies. However, in a melting pot, the desire to conform to the dominant community's norms; to be a 'model minority', might cause successful individuals from certain minority groups to identify more with the dominant culture as a method to fit in as they move up the socioeconomic ladder. This could also be the reason for the paradox that we see among Indian-American voters, who tend to vote Democratic, and their prominent politicians, who tend to be Republican.

- The high concentration of people from certain regions of India (for e.g., Punjab) in Canada could also be an indirect result of the policy of multiculturalism, since succeeding generations find it easier to maintain their regional culture. This could make Canada more appealing as a destination for certain regional groups. In the U.S., on the other hand, because of the emphasis on assimilating into the mainstream society, it is more difficult to preserve regional cultures over generations. Because of this, there is less regional concentration and a greater geographic spread of the diaspora under the melting pot.

- The policy of multiculturalism with its desire to promote greater cultural dialogue and tolerance, could also paradoxically be contributing to greater separation in some instances. Because of the previously mentioned concentration of people from certain regions from India in Canada, it is more likely that Indo-Canadians live in 'Little Indias', as opposed to Indian-Americans, where the melting pot policy makes 'Little Indias' less likely and integrated neighborhoods more the norm, especially for 2nd and 3rd generation Indians. Thus multiculturalism might be unwittingly fostering what Bissoondath (1994) referred to: a well meaning ghettoization of ethnic people. While every community participates in the public discourse, the emphasis shifts to the group, rather than the individual.

- Multiculturalism seems to be fostering a more open attitude towards immigration in the host country. The openness to immigrants is reflected in the previously cited surveys which demonstrate a markedly more tolerant attitude towards immigrants in Canada. This could be because multiculturalism is seen as a defining feature of a distinct Canadian, as opposed to a British or French, national identity, while the melting pot seems to encourage the idea of a uniform society which is still changed over time by the newly arrived components of the 'pot'. This difference in attitudes though could also partially be a cause for multiculturalism, rather than simply an effect.

7. Conclusion

This paper has, through examining the history of the Indian diaspora in two culturally similar societies with different acculturation models, attempted to explain how differences in host country acculturation policies can lead to differences in how the diaspora interacts with the host society and its outcomes. While Indians under both policies have been successful in economic and educational terms, there are clear differences in their overall outcomes. Multiculturalism as a policy seems to lead to greater political participation by minority groups, while the melting pot may promote greater economic success at the expense of political participation. Political participation in the melting pot is also more likely to take the form of lobbying for the home country. The melting pot may lead minority groups to identify more with the dominant group and attempt to be accepted as the 'model minority', while multiculturalism is more likely to foster a sense of all ethnic groups and cultures being equally valid, and somewhat better integration outcomes. However, multiculturalism can also lead to greater self segregation of ethnic groups into uniform neighborhoods and burden minority individuals with stereotypical expectations of their ethnic group.

The historical analysis of diasporas, as carried out in this paper, can provide us with a powerful tool that we can use to evaluate the acculturation policies of host countries. The lessons from this paper should in future be used to compare the experiences of other ethnic groups present in both countries to determine if they hold true across communities. This historical analysis can also be extended to diasporas present outside of North America. Given the rising levels of immigration and the increasing efforts by emerging economies to engage and leverage their diasporas, this is an issue whose importance will continue to increase in the foreseeable future.

References

Asia Times. (2004). Asian Americans lean towards Kerry. [Online] Available: http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Front_Page/FI16Aa01.html (November 7, 2011)

Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *International Migration Review.* 21. 491-511. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2546607

Berry, J. (1984). Cultural relations in plural societies: Alternatives to segregation and their socio-psychological implications. In M. Brewer & N. Miller (Eds.). *Groups in contact* (pp. 11-27). New York: Academic Press.

Berry, J. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. Chun, P. Balls, P. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.). *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement and applied research* (pp. 17-37). Washington, DC: APA Press.

Bissoondath, N. (1994). *Selling illusions: The cult of multiculturalism in Canada.* Toronto, ON: Penguin Books.

Bourhis, R., Moise, L., Perreault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Towards an Interactive Acculturation Model: A Social-Psychological Approach. *International Journal of Psychology.* 32. 369-386. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/002075997400629

Chacko, E. 2007. From brain drain to brain gain: reverse migration to Bangalore and Hyderabad, India's globalizing high tech cities. *Geo Journal,* 68: 131-140. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10708-007-9078-8

Chand, M. (2010). Diasporas as drivers of national competitiveness in emerging economies. In T. M. Devinney, T. Pedersen, & L. Tihanyi (Eds.). *Advances in International Management: The Past, Present and Future of International Business and Management* (pp. 583-602). Volume 23. New York: Emerald.

Chand, M. & Tung, R. L. (2011). Diasporas as the Boundary-Spanners: The role of Trust in Business Facilitation. *Journal of Trust Research.* 1 (1). 107-129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21515581.2011.552461

Chaudhuri, P. (2007, May 5). South Asians living in the U.S.A. favor democrats. *Hindustan Times.* [Online] Available: http://www.hindustantimes.com/StoryPage/StoryPage.aspx?id=520e5d4b-316f-4281-8a78-7939e1d79cfe&&Headline= South+Asians+living+in+USA+favour+Democratsv (November 15, 2009)

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2008). Canadian multiculturalism: An inclusive citizenship. [Online] Available: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/citizenship.asp (November 9, 2009)

CNN (2006). Virginia Senate Race. [Online] Available: http://www.cnn.com/2006/POLITICS/08/16/allen.volunteer/index.html (November 7, 2011)

CNN (2008). Exit Polls. [Online] Available :http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/results/polls/ (November 7, 2011)

DeVoretz, D. (2006). A history of Canadian recruitment of highly skilled immigrants: 1980 - 2001. Discussion Paper No. 2197, July, *Institute for the Study of Labour*, Bonn.

Elections Canada (2006). Electoral insight. [Online] Available: http://www.elections.ca/eca/eim/article_search/article.asp?id=146&lang=e&frmPageSize=&textonly=false (November 12, 2010)

Forsythe, M., & Trehan, V. (2006). Friends in high places help India. *International Herald Tribune, July 17.* http://www.iht.com/articles/2006/07/17/bloomberg/sxrupee.php (November 6, 2009)

Fredrickson, G. (1999). Models of American ethnic relations: A historical perspective. In D. A. Prentice & D. T. Miller (Eds.). *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 23-34). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values.* London: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind.* London: McGraw-Hill International.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions and organizations across nations, 2nd edition.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jedwab, J. (2006). *Le multiculturalisme au Canada.* Montreal, QC: Association for Canadian Studies.

Kauffman Foundation (2007). Kauffman index of entrepreneurial activity. [Online] Available: http://www.kauffman.org/pdf/kiea_62907.pdf (September 8, 2009)

Kirkman, B., Lowe, K., & Gibson, C. (2006). A Quarter Century of Culture's Consequences: A Review of Empirical Research Incorporating Hofstede's Cultural Values Framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*. 37 (3). 285-320. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400202

Lal, V. (1999). Manas: India and its neighbors. [Online] Available: http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/southasia/Diaspora/roots.html (November 8, 2011)

Lal, V. (2006). United States of America. In B. Lal (Ed.). *The encyclopedia of the Indian diaspora* (pp. 314-326). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Leonard, A. (2006). Hail maccaca. [Online] Available: http://www.salon.com/tech/htww/2006/11/09/macaca_mutiny/index.html (November 8, 2009)

Li, P. (2003). The multiculturalism debate. In P. Li (Ed.). *Race and ethnic relations in Canada* (pp. 148-77). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's Model of National Cultural Differences and Their Consequences: A Triumph of Faith – A Failure of Analyses. *Human Relations*. 55 (1). 89-118. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726702551004

Mehra, A. (2008). Obama trounces McCain 4 to 1 among Asian Indians. *Little India* [Online] Available: http://www.littleindia.com/news/148/ARTICLE/4180/2008-10-20.html (November 7, 2009)

Mickleburgh, R. (2006). Harper defends Canadian diversity. *Globe and Mail, 20 June.*

Migrant International Policy Index (2012). Countries. [Online] Available: http://www.mipex.eu/countries (January 19, 2012)

Naidoo, J. & Leslie, J. (2006). *The Encyclopedia of the Indian Diaspora.* B. Lal (Ed.). (pp. 327-335). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

National Portal for the Indian Diaspora (2008). [Online] Available: http://india.gov.in/overseas/diaspora/nri.php (November 8, 2009)

National Post (2011). [Online] Canadians view immigration more positively than US, Europe. http://news.nationalpost.com/2011/02/03/graphic-canadians-view-immigration-more-positively-than-u-s-europe/(January 24, 2012)

Overseas Indian Affairs Ministry (2008). [Online] Available: http://india.gov.in/overseas/diaspora/nri.php (August 25, 2010)

Phinney, J. (2003). Ethnic identity and acculturation. In K. Chun, P. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.). *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement and applied research* (pp. 63-81). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Rangaswamy, R. (2005). Immigrant and refugee cultures around the world. In M. Ember, C. Ember, & I. Skoggard (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Diasporas*. New York: Springer.

Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist.* 38. 149-152. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.1936.38.1.02a00330

Salins, P. (1997). Assimilation, American style-multiculturalism and ethnic relations. *Reason, February.* [Online] Available: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1568/is_/ai_19192454 (November 3, 2010)

Schutt, R. K (2006). *Investigating the social world: The process and practice of research.* London: Sage Publications.

Schwartz, S. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: new cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and application* (pp. 85-119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Science Publishers.

Sikh Canadian History (2006). [Online] Available: http://www.explorasian.org/history_sikhcdn.html (November 8, 2009)

Singh, K. (1991). The Ghadr rebellion. [Online] Available: http://www.sikhpioneers.org/rebellion.html (November 8, 2009) Printed previously in Illustrated Weekly of India, Feb 26, 1961, 34-35.

Smith J. & Edmonston, B. (1997). *The new Americans.* Washington, DC: National Academic Press.

Smith, P., Peterson, M., & Schwartz, S. (2002). Cultural Values, Sources of Guidance and Their Relevance to Managerial Behaviour: A 47-Nation Study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology.* 33 (1). 188-208. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033002005

Statistics Canada (2001), Census of Canada 2001. [Online] Available: http://ceps.statcan.ca/english/census01/home/index.cfm (November 8, 2009)

Statistics Canada (2006), Ethnic origin (247), single and multiple ethnic origin responses (3) and sex (3) for the population of Canada, provinces, territories, census metropolitan areas and census agglomerations, 2006 census - 20% sample data. [Online] Available: (November 8, 2009)

Statistics Canada (2008), Canadian demographics at a glance. [Online] Available: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/91-003-x/2007001/4129904-eng.htm (November 8, 2010)

Tang, L. & Koveos, P. (2008). A Framework to Update Hofstede's Cultural Value Indices: Economic Dynamics and Institutional Stability. *Journal of International Business Studies.* 39 (6). 1045-1063. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400399

Times of India (2011). 2 Indo-Canadians become federal cabinet ministers. [Online] Available: http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2011-05-20/us-canada-news/29563911_1_indo-canadians-deepak-obhrai-bra malea-gore-malton (January 19, 2012)

Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture, understanding cultural diversity in business.* London: Nicholas Brealey.

Tung, R. L. (2008). Brain Circulation, Diaspora and International Competitiveness. *European Management Journal.* 26. 298-304. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2008.03.005

Tung, R. L. & Verbeke, A. (2010). Beyond Hofstede and GLOBE: Improving the Quality of Cross-Cultural Research. *Journal of International Business Studies.* 41 (8). 1259-1274. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2010.41

U.S. Census Bureau (2008), An older and more diverse nation by mid century. [Online] Available: http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/population/012496.html (August 28, 2011)

U.S. Census Bureau. 2011. Census shows growth among Asian Indians. http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/census/2011-05-12-asian-indian-population-Census_n.html (16 December 2011)

U.S. India Political Action Committee (2009). Indian-Americans: Vital statistics. [Online] Available: http://www.usinpac.com/indian_americans.asp (August 27, 2011)

Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. J*ournal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 88. 121-138. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.121 PMid:15631579

White House (2006). President Bush discusses immigration reform. [Online] Available: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/06/20060607.html (August 26, 2009)

Note 1. The Indian government's attitude towards the diaspora is captured by these words on the Overseas Indian Affairs Ministry's Website: "The Indian Government recognizes the importance of the Indian diaspora, who despite being away from India is making her shine on a global platform. The Indian diaspora has brought economic, financial and global benefits to India"

Table 1. India, Canada and the U.S. on Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions

	India	**U.S.**	**Canada**
Individualism	49	91	80
Power Distance	77	40	39
Masculinity	56	62	52
Uncertainty Avoidance	40	46	48
Long Term Orientation	61	29	23

Source: geert-hofstede.com