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ABSTRACT

The Effects of Chinese Immigrants' Acculturation and Changes in Family Environment on Children's Product Influence in Family Purchase Decisions

Fungyee Claudia Chan

This study investigated the relationship among three major concepts, i.e., acculturation, family climate, and children's product influence. The acculturation construct was measured according to fathers', mothers' and children's responses. Family climate was measured by ten FES subscales. Four product areas were used to investigate children's product influence. Results indicated that mothers' acculturation level has the strongest impact on the family climate. The family environment has the most effect on children's purchase influence on purchase of expensive family products, while acculturation has no relationship with expensive children products. The mediating role of the family environment was weak. Only three FES subscales, i.e., moral religious emphasis, control, and independence appeared to be mediators of the acculturation and product relationship in the hypothesized direction. Results of the Family Incongruence Scores showed that the Chinese families are very traditional and acculturation does not strongly affect their level of family unity.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the recent decade, as the growth in immigration has become one of the most striking characteristics of Canadian demographics, the topic of cultural influences on consumption is attracting increasing attention. Culture has a major impact on family lifestyle and consumption behavior. A number of studies have documented this fact by researching Asian Americans (Lee 1989; Wong, Yokum and Saegert 1989), Hispanics (Deshpande, Hoyer, and Donthu 1986; Saegert, Hoover, and Hilger 1985; Wallendorf and Reilly 1983), and French Canadians (Tiger 1973; Mallen 1973; Schaninger, Bourgeois, and Buss 1985; Laroche, Joy, Kim 1989).

Since 1979 there has been a change in the composition of immigration coming into Canada. The Asian immigrants have been the largest component of the immigration flow. From 1989 to 1992, Hong Kong and China alone supplied nearly 150,000 immigrants to Canada. This means that in those 4 years almost one immigrant out of six was born in Hong Kong or China (Appendices 1, 2). And Canada's Chinese population is expected to continue increasing in the following decade. The estimated annual average disposable income of the Chinese population in Canada annually was about $2.62 billion from 1989-92, with an increase of $874 million in 1992 (Statistics Canada 1993). This surge of immigrants has important consequences on consumption behavior (Deshpande, Hoyer and Donthu 1986; Hirshman 1981; Wallendorf and Reilly 1983). With the increasing amount of Chinese consumers in the Canadian market, research in the area of
Chinese family decision making and consumption behavior is important in advancing our knowledge of consumer behavior in Canada.

Family consumption behavior is a major part of children's consumer socialization. Research has shown that children play a significant role in some family purchase decisions and their influence varies by product categories and decisional stages (Moschis 1987). Recent changes in family role structure and demographics have resulted in increased teenagers' influence on their parent's decisions and their relative involvement in family purchase decision making. In general, for products in which the child is directly involved in consumption, the child is expected to have at least some influence on the decision (Foxman & Tansuhaj 1988, Kim & Lee 1997).

To conclude, recent growth in Asian immigrants has created a need for marketing research on their consumer behavior. The Asian culture is totally different from the Canadian culture, which might lead to a lower level of acculturation. Moreover, in recent decades, the role of teenagers has become more important in family purchase decisions. Children are a part of the family, therefore, the study of their influence on family purchase decisions is necessary for a better understanding of family purchase decision making. Differences in the level of acculturation will affect the family environment, which in turn will influence the amount of influence that Chinese teenagers have in family purchase decisions.
**Purpose of this study**

The purpose of my thesis is to determine how teenagers' purchase decision-making process for several products would be affected by the acculturation level and changes in family environment. Using fathers', mothers' and children's (triadic measures) perceived degree of children's influence on the purchase of various products for the children and the family, this study will examine how this influence is affected by changes in the acculturation level of these three members of the family and by changes in the family environment brought in by the acculturation process.

The primary questions guiding this research are:

1. Does acculturation affect the Chinese family environment?
2. How do changes in the Chinese family environment affect the influence of children's family purchase decisions?
3. How does acculturation affect children's family product purchase decisions?
4. Can family environment act as a mediator between the acculturation and children's product influence relationship?
CHAPTER 2
BACKGROUND

Immigration policies of Canada

According to Aiken (1989), there have been five major stages of Chinese immigration into Canada:

1. Free immigration, 1858-1884
2. Restrictive stage, 1885-1923
3. Complete exclusion, 1923-1947
4. Sponsored immigration and quota system, 1947-1962
5. Immigration under point system, 1962- present

The first two large waves of Chinese immigration into Canada took place in 1858, when Chinese came from California to work in the gold mines of British Columbia, and from 1882 to 1885 when over 17,000 were brought into Canada under contract to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1894, the British Columbia Government disqualified Chinese from voting. In 1923, the Canadian Government passed the Chinese Immigration Act that remained in force until 1947. Under this act, the number of Chinese male immigrants was restricted to only a small number in specific occupational groups. They were not allowed to bring their families from China. Thus, Chinese families were separated. At that time, most Chinese immigrants were living in a century of discrimination. When the Chinese Immigration Act was repealed, the Chinese regained the right to vote. By 1967, new regulations of the Immigration Act granted immigrants
from all different countries the right to enter Canada on an equal status (Report on the Chinese Intercultural Seminar 1974).

In the last few decades, new immigration programs have been established by the Canadian government. The most popular one is the Business Immigration Program, which encourages prospective immigrants to settle in Canada, bringing their experiences and investment capital, thereby contributing positively to the economy. Applicants for this category are given preferential treatment. This program consists of three sub-categories which include the entrepreneur program, the investor program, and the self-employed program (Loo 1990).

The entrepreneurial program has existed since 1975. Yet, it was not until the mid eighties that applicants for Canadian permanent residence really took advantage of that program (Loo 1990). The majority of applicants who took advantage of this program were from Hong Kong. In the 1980's there was a dramatic increase in the number of applicants for Canadian permanent residence under the investor and entrepreneur programs, as Hong Kong residents became more conscious of the forthcoming political change in 1997, i.e., the handover of Hong Kong from British to Chinese rule. Therefore, they were seriously trying to secure overseas residence.

Under the investor program, an investor and his family would be admitted as immigrants under the following conditions: 1) if the investor had a successful track record in business in his native land, 2) a net worth of at least half a million dollars, and
3) invested $250,000 in an approved business for 3 years in Canada (Lai 1988). In 1986, about eighty investors applied to come to Canada under the investor category; more than one-third were from Hong Kong (Financial Post, Nov. 1986). For the past ten years, Hong Kong residents have constituted the majority of applicants under the investor and entrepreneur programs (Loo 1990).

In 1988, a revised immigrant investor program was announced. Under this program, qualified investors are eligible if they have a net worth of $500,000 and make an investment of $150,000, locked-in for three years. (Canada, minister of Employment and Immigration, news releases, April & May 1988).

In July 8, 1988, immigration rules were relaxed to help reunite families. For example, never-married sons and daughters of immigrants, regardless of age, are allowed to accompany their parents when they come to Canada, or join their parents already in Canada, as long as they are dependent on their parents.

In addition to Hong Kong, many Taiwan residents have also been applying for Canadian permanent residence under the business immigration program since they are also facing political turmoil within their country. These immigration programs proved to be very successful because it provided Canada with risk capital and international experience and helped create jobs in Canada.
Under a 1975 federal-provincial agreement, Quebec immigration office played a
dynamic role in recruiting and counseling immigrants destined for Quebec (Lai 1988).
Most Vietnamese refugees of Chinese origin were French-speaking and a large number of
them settled in Quebec.

In the last 10-15 years, the majority of immigrants to Canada have been Chinese
Researchers should therefore pay special attention to this growing Asian group. Besides
the economic benefits, they have also had a cultural impact on the Canadian society.

**Characteristics of Chinese Families in Canada**

During the late 19th century and the early 20th century, many of the Chinese left
their homeland and emigrated to Southeast Asia, Africa, as well as North and South
America. Most of the emigrants shared three common characteristics: they were poor;
they hoped to improve their economic welfare; and they perceived their migration as
temporary and intended to return to their home country after they accumulated enough
wealth. Many of these first generations left their family behind when they emigrated.
Others who raised a family in the foreign country, would send their sons back to China to
study. Before 1947, Chinese communities in Canada consisted mostly of single men
employed as unskilled laborers; virtually no family structure existed (Johnson 1979).
These overseas Chinese viewed their stay as temporary, thus, they never really
assimilated into the culture around them, remaining quite distinctive (Loo 1990). Also,
the first generation Chinese lived in a century of discrimination. According to Kung
(1962), the more bitter the discrimination, the less the Chinese desired assimilation.
The relaxation of immigration rules in 1947 and 1967 brought important and gradual changes to the Chinese community. Chinese families became more nuclear families, some even with grandparents, replacing the old “bachelor society” of single males. Arrivals from Hong Kong made way for a more westernized, heterogeneous community with less emphasis on ties to the old country and more emphasis on opportunity, social mobility and equality of status (Chan & Hagan 1982).

One important point regarding Chinese emigrants from the mainland in the latter 19th and early 20th century, which stills holds true for today’s emigrating Chinese, is that the Chinese family unit, which constitute a central core in society, places heavy emphasis on the continuation of the next generation (Loo 1990).

**Chinese immigrants in Montreal, Quebec**

In 1984, the Quebec government set up an office in Hong Kong to entice Chinese entrepreneurs to invest in Quebec (Lai 1988). A great majority of Chinese immigrants tended to make their homes in metropolitan cities. Chinese migration to Quebec has centered primarily in Montreal (1971 census). According to the 1986 inter-census of the Chinese population in Canada, Toronto with 143,000 ranked first, followed by Vancouver (109,000), Calgary (26,000), Edmonton (24,600), and Montreal (24,200).

According to Aiken (1989), Chinatown has been the symbol of Chinese values transplanted to a foreign city. The absence of a Chinatown or its decline is taken as evidence that the Chinese population is assimilating into the host society (Lee 1949). The
Montreal Chinese community has always been dispersed in the city with a partial concentration at some activities in Chinatown (Aiken 1989).

Quebec is distinct from other provinces with large Chinese populations in that almost 90% of the total provincial population is concentrated in a single center: Montreal. Within Quebec, the Montreal downtown area has always been the main focus of Chinese settlement. However, in recent decades, many Chinese residents have moved out to other parts of the city such as St. Laurent, LaSalle, and Brossard, instead of living close to Chinatown located in downtown Montreal.
CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

The consequences of migration are enormous. In the prolonged contact with the host culture, subcultures undergo changes as their norms and values are influenced and become more compatible with those of the mainstream culture (Laroche, Kim. Hui and Joy 1991). An immigrant coming to a new environment may soon find that many of the traditional values that s/he holds are no longer appropriate. This is the moment when the acculturation process starts to take place, when newcomers learn to adapt to the new environment while not necessarily losing all aspects of their original culture.

Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity is an important part of any culture change study. It is the aspect of culture change that focuses on how an ethnic group relates to its own group as a subgroup of the larger host society. Rosenthal and Feldman (1992), investigated the ethnic identity of the Chinese origin. They found that the second generation adolescent Chinese Americans, despite their higher degree of acculturation toward American society, did not differ from their first-generation counterparts in the perceived importance or positive valuation of the Chinese ethnic identity. Ethnic Identity may depend on the generation level (Isajiw 1974) and the race of immigrants. Identity may become stronger in members of visible minorities as they unite against discrimination, actual or perceived (Anderson 1981; Wardaugh 1983).
The assimilation perspective has postulated a unidirectional ethnic change toward the mainstream society (Park & Burgess 1969), which has suggested that this concept of ethnic identity will eventually disappear over time. However, recent literature has suggested that there should be two distinct dimensions underlying the process of ethnic change: 1) acculturation refers to the learning of the traits of the host society; and 2) ethnic identification refers to the maintenance of the original ethnic identity (Clark, Kaufman, & Piece, 1976; Constantinou & Harvey 1985; Keefe & Padilla 1987; Laroche, Kim, Hui, & Joy 1996). This multi-dimensional concept of ethnic change is closely related to an "ethnic pluralism" or "multicultural" perspective (Lambert & Taylor 1988). In fact, ethnic identification are forces that connects individuals to their old roots, while acculturation links them towards new roots (Laroche et al. 1996). In Canada and the United States, recent studies of various ethnic groups have shown that the adaptation process does not necessarily cause the loss of one's original ethnic identity (Lambert, Mermigis, & Taylor 1986; Lambert & Taylor 1988; Moghaddam & Taylor 1987, Wooden, Leon, & Toshima 1988).

**Acculturation Process**

The interrelated concepts of acculturation and assimilation must be considered in any analysis of the behavioral patterns of immigrant groups in a particular geographic area. **Acculturation** is the process by which a group takes on characteristics from the culture of another group. It occurs when continuous direct or indirect contact of groups of individuals having different cultures results in changes in the original culture patterns (Broom and Selznick 1963). Acculturation, as a part of ethnic change, is widely believed
to be multidimensional (Keefe & Padilla 1987; Mendoza 1989; Olmedo 1980), implying that the adaptation process is likely to occur at different rates in different sociocultural spheres. Acculturation does not proceed on an all-or-none basis, it may be acquired by an immigrant on a relative basis, i.e., this process would not erase the immigrant's previous identity, but adds another dimension to his/her original culture. The immigrant will learn the language, norms, and values of the host culture (Kiefer 1974; Padilla 1980; Triandis et al. 1982). Furthermore, it is a bi-directional process. People of both cultures will change in response to each others’ culture (Joy, Kim, Laroche 1990). Therefore, according to Keefe & Padilla (1987) and Laroche, Kim & Hui (1997), acculturation should be referred as the degree of acquisition of the customs of an alternative society. Berry’s (1980) typology of the acculturation mode (assimilation, integration, rejection, and deculturation), also based on a similar view, defined acculturation on two dimensions - retention of cultural identity and positive relationship to the dominant society.

Park and Burgess (1969) define **assimilation** as a "process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life." Assimilation is a sociological concept that could be divided into 3 stages (Roy 1962): 1) acculturation, which is the learning of language, norms, and value of the host culture. 2) Social integration is the participation in the social organizations of the host society. 3) Amalgamation is the ultimate goal of assimilation and occurs when the immigrant group relinquishes its ethnic identity and moves into the larger society and inter-cultural marriages occur (Berry 1980). During the early years of
immigration to America, immigrants assimilated together and created a national character (Gordon 1964). Some researchers view this as a continuing process whereby immigrants will eventually merge with the host culture over time (Glazer & Moynihan 1975; Gordon 1964).

According to Laroche, Kim, Hui and Joy (1991), the term ‘acculturation’ is more appropriate than ‘assimilation’ in describing intercultural encounters and cultural changes. Assimilation assumes unidirectional cultural changes, that is, immigrants are expected to move in the direction of standard values, norms and practices of the host society (Padilla 1980). Initially, researchers assumed that new immigrant groups would over a period of time, fully assimilate into the values and practices of the host society (Hui, Joy, Kim and Laroche 1991). Nonetheless, the history and experience of immigrants in North America does not follow this process; sharing experiences did not guarantee their acceptance into the mainstream (Hui, Joy, Kim and Laroche 1991). Acculturation focuses on the bi-directional cultural changes and it does not assume a loss of the original cultural values and norms by one group in the process of learning new ones. Thus, the term ‘acculturation’ is more appropriate to describe intercultural changes than ‘assimilation.’

Moreover, the level of acculturation may vary in different groups, depending on their real or perceived differences, their experience of prejudice, perception of racism, as well as the extent to which new values are imposed on them by the government (Schermershorn 1970).
In conclusion, previous ethnic studies appear to include at least two rather distinct concepts; the first refers to acculturation—the learning of cultural and social norms and values of the host society, and second is ethnic identification—the maintenance of the original ethnic identity (Laroche et al. 1996).

**Measurements of Acculturation**

Researchers have not yet arrived at a common or standardized approach to measure acculturation levels. The use of a multiple-dimension measurement is important to measure the concept of acculturation.

O’Guinn and Faber (1985) determined that communication is the most fundamental means by which individuals develop their understanding of a new culture. Communication, by definition, involves interaction with the environment. They developed two acculturation scales—general acculturation and consumer acculturation. Then they compared them in terms of 1) their association with Hispanic consumers’ attitudes, and 2) their exposure to and perceptions of Spanish language television commercials. In another study, Valencia (1985) also devised his own multi-item measurement of acculturation. He developed an index of ‘Hispanicness’, incorporating language use and preference, length of residence in the U.S and rate of intermarriage. In the U.S., Kim (1977) in her study of Korean immigrants in Chicago found that interpersonal communication with members of the host society and exposure to mass media significantly influenced the development of realistic perceptions and understanding of American culture and society.
Social communication (both interpersonal and mass communication) with the host society has been found to increase the rate of adaptation to the new environment (Kapoor and Williams 1979; Pedone 1980; Wen 1976). On the other hand, intra-ethnic communications (communication with persons from the same cultural background) was found to have an adverse effect on the ethnic member integration into the host society (Shibutani and Kwan 1965).

Lee (1989) has made a useful distinction between direct and indirect measure of acculturation. Direct measures include length of stay in the new country, the use of dominant language in most occasions, their preferred social relationships, and the ethnic composition of their neighborhood. Indirect measures include the use of media such as television, radio, newspapers and magazines.

**Chinese Canadians**

**Chinatown**

According to Aiken (1989), Chinatown has been the symbol of Chinese values transplanted to a foreign city. The absence of a Chinatown or its decline is taken as evidence that the Chinese population has been assimilated into the host society (Lee 1949). The Montreal Chinese community has always been dispersed in the city while partially concentrating some activities in Chinatown (Aiken 1989).
Language use

Though, there is increased usage of English at home, Cantonese or Mandarin are still the major language used, Chinese families still value preserving the Chinese cultural origin.

Economic Life

Although most Chinese Canadians immigrate to this country under the investor and entrepreneur programs, Chinese-Canadians earned less than the Canadians in terms of mean income, in spite of earlier data indicating that they, in comparison with the total Canadian population, were higher in labor force participation, level of schooling, and education attainment (Verma, Chan and Lam 1984).

Family

Family life can be described as the pivot of Chinese culture (Rosenthal & Feldman 1992). Family cohesion was related to the psychological well-being of family members (Jacob 1975; Moos & Moos 1976). Other means to preserve the Chinese family system include dependence on the family, unquestioned acceptance of parental authority, preservation of the status quo and profound loyalty (Bond & Hwang 1986; Harrison, Serafica, & McAdoo 1982). In China, conformity not only tends to govern all interpersonal relations, but it also enjoys social and cultural approval (Hsu 1981).

Family conflicts might occur due to differences in the parent-child communication pattern between the East and West. McLeod and Chaffee (1972)
developed a typology characterizing parent-child communication structure and consequent socialization as a combination of two communication patterns: socio-oriented and concept-oriented. In a socio-oriented communication family environment, the child avoids controversy and does not argue, since he or she does not want to risk offending others. This is the basis of the communication pattern in the Chinese family, whereas in a concept-oriented communication structure, the child is encouraged to develop his or her own ideas. According to Foxman, Tansuhaj & Ekstrom (1989), the Western children in a concept-oriented family do have greater influence relative to parents in family purchase decisions than children in a high socio-oriented family (e.g., Chinese).

Regarding family size, the census data indicate that Chinese-Canadians have consistently raised families of relatively small size, a pattern conforming to the Canadian norm (Verma, Chan and Lam 1984).

**Chinese parents**

There is no doubt that the father is the dominant figure in the typical Chinese family despite all the changes resulting from modern trends. Although the equality of women is recognized in principle, the man still retains first place in the family (Lang 1946). The concept of a Chinese father is that of a provider, who is supposed to be kind and sympathetic (Cheng 1946). Chinese also believe that the father is the authority figure in the household. Since children's behavior reflects on their parents, it is the absolute responsibility of the parents to have close supervision, control and discipline over their children (Cheng 1946).
The concept of a Chinese mother is that of a good housekeeper who spends little money, takes care of the family and is tolerant and forbearing (Cheng 1946). Therefore, at home, women occupy a central position in ritual life. She is expected on one hand to be warm and caring for her children, and, on the other hand, submissive toward her husband (Lang 1946). However, according to Kriger & Kroes (1972), concerning kids’ training and discipline, the Chinese mother places higher values on strictness and control of behavior, and is more likely to show her expression of hostility or rejection towards the child. The Chinese mother uses verbal, hands or body movements as signs of rejection more often. These tools are considered to be effective measures to train the children and bring them to honor their family and themselves (Kriger and Kroes 1972).

Little research has been done on the Canadian Chinese family, specifically on the acculturation of Chinese families after immigration. One study conducted in Singapore indicated that Chinese immigrants are particularly resistant to family role deviance and adhere to a more traditional family role orientation. In general, the Singaporean Chinese couples still have traditional family roles, women are expected to be homemakers having to concentrate more on domestic activities rather than on their own occupational activities, whereas men are regarded as the breadwinner who should focus on occupational efforts (Freeman 1970). This is in direct contrast to the family roles of Anglo-Americans, who have moved toward either autonomous or egalitarian roles (Woodside and Motes 1979).
Rodman's (1972) "theory of resources in cultural context" helps to explain the linkage between acculturation and the resulting behavior of individuals. It states that the level of acculturation acts as a contingency variable affecting the relationship between socioeconomic status and family members' relative influence. The theory suggests that as the husband from modified patriarchal societies such as Hong Kong and Singapore achieves a higher status level (which represents socialization into more modern attitudes and values), his relative influence in decision making decreases (Cooney et al. 1982).

Chinese and Western families tend to differ in their child rearing practices, family organization and relationships. In particular, Chinese parents are more frequently power assertive and restrictive, and are less frequently autonomy-granting and child-focused than Western parents (Kriger & Kroes 1972; Rosenthal & Feldman in press; Yang 1986).

**Chinese children**

In the Chinese culture, individuality is not emphasized. Traditionally, Chinese family focuses on the interdependence of family members and places family and collective needs above those of the individual. The importance of loyalty and submission by children to parental wishes are treasured (Feldman and Rosenthal 1990). The expressions of individual needs and desires are considered selfish if they conflict with those of the family. Chinese teenagers are socialized to accept authority, especially that of the family, social obligation, and conformity to the rules of good conduct (Chen & Yang 1986; Harrison, Serafica & McAdoo 1982; Hsu 1981; Yang 1986). There is a
strong emphasis on moral training and a concern that children learn impulse control and avoid the expression of strong emotions and feelings (Kriger & Kroes 1972).

Chinese and Western teenagers place emphasis on different values; especially towards individualism-collectivism. Values refer to generalized and relatively enduring beliefs concerning what is desirable or undesirable. They are standards that guide and determine behavior on a long-term basis towards some goals in preference to others (Feather 1980; Rokeach 1973). According to Schwartz & Bilsky (1987), individualism is served by the domains of enjoyment, achievement, self-direction and presumably, social power. While collectivism is served by restrictive conformity and pro-social domains. Chinese teenagers place a high value on collective welfare and social concern (Bond 1988; Chinese Culture Connection 1987; Yang 1986), while Western teenagers place a relatively high value on independence and tend to devalue conformity to authority and social custom (Feather 1980; Rokeach 1973; Rosenthal, Bell, Demetriou & Efklides 1989).

In the Western family, individual growth and development is valued and children are encouraged to become physically and psychologically separated from their parents (Jung, 1984; Steinberg & Silverberg 1986). Children are also expected to be self-reliant and independent at an early age (Alwin 1988; Rosenthal & Bornholt 1988).
Family Environment

Immigration and acculturation are related to the changes of the family and its environment. A number of studies have used the Family Environment Scales (FES, Moos & Moos 1974) to conduct research in this area. FES assesses the social climates of all types of families. It measures the interpersonal relationships among family members, the directions of personal growth emphasized in the family, and the basic organizational structure of the family.

Some studies have found that the first generation of Chinese immigrant youth emphasizes more structure and achievement compared to Anglo-Americans and Anglo-Australians who are reported to be more independent and recreational oriented (Chiu, Feldman & Rosenthal 1992; Rosenthal & Feldman 1990). However, the second generation Chinese youth compared to the first generation reported less support and organization but more control. Family support and structure were constantly related to the youth's well-being in all the three groups.

This shows that the level of acculturation will affect the values and lifestyles of youth. As the family accepts the culture of the host country, their youth may react differently. Recent empirical work has also indicated that under the impact of modernization and acculturation after migration, the values of Chinese teenagers may change with more acceptance of values such as independence, dominance, achievement, and individualism (Ho & Kang 1984; Yang 1986). Despite the impact of modernization, another FES study found that Chinese teenagers residing in Hong Kong and also in
America show significantly later age expectations for behavioral independence than their Western counterparts (Feldman & Quatman 1988; Feldman & Rosenthal 1990).

In a study of Italian families living in Australia, those that preserve the cultural values score higher on achievement, religious emphasis, and organization but lower on intellectual and recreational orientation compared with the Anglo-Australian families. In another study involving Latino families in the United States, highly acculturated families, had a higher expectation for performance and a stronger emphasis on intellectual and recreational pursuits (Rueschenberg & Buriel 1989). Arnold & Orozco (1988) also found that among the more acculturated Latinos families, their levels of expressiveness are higher.

An important task for Chinese immigrants and their descendants is to adapt to their new cultural environment as quickly as possible, so that they can live comfortably in the new country. Immigrant adaptation to a new culture was considered a special case of socialization, or to be more exact 're-socialization', which involves a number of changes in aspects of psychological functioning (Taft 1985, 1986). This process was viewed in terms of changes in attitudes, values and cultural identification; the acquisition of new social skills and behavioral norms; changes in reference and membership group affiliation, and emotional adjustment to a changed environment (Taft 1986).

According to Moos & Moos (1994), the extent to which a family absorbs the values of the host country is a major issue when migrating to another country. Casella
and Kearins (1993) found that the family environments were basically the same between
the Italian immigrants living in Australia and the Italians living in Italy. These findings
suggest that these immigrants strongly preserved their cultural values. Moos & Moos
(1994) also suggested that families that were more involved with the external community
and participated in native activities, tended to be more acculturated. Rueschenberg &
Buriel's (1989) findings agreed that acculturation can lead to closer ties to the external
community, and without having harmful effects on internal family functions or on
religious values.

Many family rules and values and even traditional role structures that were
effective in the country of origin (i.e., Hong Kong) may prove to be less adaptive in the
culture and circumstances of the country of adoption (i.e., Canada) (Moos 1986). Some
family's functioning rules may be able to remain unchanged. However, often many other
rules will have to undergo changes, which will, in turn, affect the role structure and
distribution of power within the family. Nevertheless, some of the traditional patterns are
maintained because they become central to the family's identity, as a sort of cohesive
ritual. Other rules might have to remain because the family has not been able to develop
new rules and ways to cope with the new environment (Moos 1986).

Families, as the main socialization agents, convey not only their norms and
culture at large, but also the specific styles, modes and values that constitute an ad hoc,
family-specific view and perception of the world and of its own history (Moos 1986).
Thus, it is not surprising to observe delays in the family's adaptive process, which will
become more apparent when a second generation is raised in the country of adoption (i.e., Chinese teenagers), (Moos 1986). According to Moos, if this process of adoption takes place in an environment that reflects the norms and values of the new country (Canada), what has been delayed by the first generation (i.e., the parents), might lead to intergenerational conflicts of values.

According to R.H. Moos, the author of the FES, this scale has numerous practical uses and research applications, although the scale is usually used in clinical settings such as research on psychotherapy and counseling distressed, abused, alcoholic families. Malin (1979) studied families with a delinquent or runaway adolescent in a residential treatment facility. Filstead (1979) investigated families with an alcoholic member. Wetzel (1977) conducted research using families with a depressed member as the subject. Some research has been conducted using sub-samples of Caucasian, minority, and ethnic groups. Using the Form R, i.e., the real form of FES scale which measures people's perception of their current family environment, researchers can compare the family perceptions between the males and females and compare the family profiles of two kinds of families in two different cultures.

Past researchers have used the FES to study the distinctive features of different kinds of normal families. Reinhart (1977), investigated the differences in family environment using single-parent versus two-parents families. Moos & Moos (1981), studied the black versus Mexican-American families. Other studies used FES in other disciplines and settings. One study used FES to conduct an analysis of the physical living
environments, including perceptions of family members as the major users of the household facilities (Melson, Inman, & Kemp, 1977). Another study by Fowler (1980), studied the relationship between family environment and behavior problems among pre-kindergarten children. A lot of research use FES to compare results between respondents in various settings. One example is Tabackman's (1976/77) research on the comparisons between average families with average teenagers and average families with highly endowed teenagers using both the Real and Ideal form of the FES.

FES has also been applied to families in different cultures. FES has been translated into Dutch, Italian, German, Spanish, and Hebrew. Engfer, Schneewind, and Hinderer (1977), used the German version; while Geffen and Lange (1978) conducted studies in the Dutch version. In this thesis, the FES scale was translated into Chinese, in order to administer it to Chinese immigrants in Montreal, Canada.

Teenagers' Socialization

Consumer Socialization is the process by which consumers acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to operate in the marketplace. Adolescence, is believed to be a crucial period in socialization (Campbell 1969).

Consumer Socialization Agents

Using the social learning model, teenagers' consumer socialization focuses on the sources of influence, i.e., commonly known as 'socialization agents'-- transmitting attitudes, motives and values to the learner. This model assumes that learning takes place
during the person's interaction with the socialization agents in numerous social settings (Moschis 1978). There are different socialization agents, such as television, peers and family that assist in the development of selected consumer skills of teenagers.

**Mass Media** plays a major role in the consumer socialization of children. According to some studies, (Moschis 1978 and Ward & Wackman 1971), learning from TV is related to what teenagers use the television for, especially the advertisements' content. Studies also supported Bandura's (1971) finding, that young people learn the 'expressive' or 'adaptive' elements of consumption from TV. They tend to pay more attention to TV because they can learn more about the social uses of the products, which in turn, will avoid social rejection, especially among their peers. Moschis (1978) also pointed out that newspaper readership may be a function of the consumer skills, knowledge, and attitudes that they have already acquired.

**Peer Influence** is a crucial socialization agent. According to Moschis (1978), teenagers might not only learn the expressive aspects of consumption from their peers, but also their interaction with peers seems to lead to materialistic attitudes. His research further suggested that interpersonal interaction with peers about consumption matters may make teenagers more aware of goods and services in the marketplace and of the buying processes. Moschis and Moore (1979) found that the more peer interactions the teenagers have, the stronger the development of his/her materialistic values.
Family is very important in teaching teenagers "rational" aspects of consumption. Family factors are crucial because parenting practices and family relationships have a great impact on the family environment. These family environment factors are the major influences in the socialization of children and teenagers (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). According to Foxman, Tansuhaj & Ekstrom (1989), the family is viewed as a dynamic social group in which parents and children both teach and learn. Certain factors such as cultural origin, family environment, and acculturation level shape the nature and content of communication within this social unit. By affecting what family members teach and learn, these factors will affect teenagers' roles in family purchase decisions.

- Reciprocal Influences between Parents and Children

When investigating family communication effects on consumer learning, Moschis (1987), suggested that family influences are reciprocal, instead of unilateral. Thus, in discussing about family influences, both parental influences on the child and the child's influence on the parents have to be mentioned. In Nelson's (1978) study, children were found to have significant involvement in family decisions to eat out throughout the decision process; parents appeared to have the final decision and determine cost. Moreover, Belch, Belch & Ceresino (1985), also found that fathers and mothers clearly dominated the decision making process, while the children had relatively more influence in the initial stage. Szybillo & Sosanie (1977) found that role relationships between husbands, wives, and children vary over stages in the buying process and buying decisions.
• Parents’ Influence on Children

The effects of parental influence on children have been the focus of several studies. Ward and Wackman (1972) used mothers as the respondents and found that child’s purchase influence decreases with age, depending on the product categories. Ward and his colleagues (1977) examined the methods mothers use to teach children consumer skills, e.g., giving lectures on consumption matters. Also, Szybillo, Sosanic, and Tenenbein (1977) by using wives as the respondents, found that 80% of families reported that their children help decide on eating out. Moschis and his associates also examined the effects of family communication patterns regarding consumption on consumers' skill acquisition. The results suggested that the family may affect the adolescent’s ability to filter puffery in advertising. Another study examined the effects of family influence processes in adolescent consumer socialization. They found that different learning mechanisms or influence processes may be used to transmit consumer cognition and behaviors from parents to child. Parents are less likely to teach children communication skills, children are expected to learn these skills through observations (Moschis & Moore 1979a and 1979b; Moschis, Moore & Smith 1984).

• Children’s Influence on Parents

For the effects of children on parental consumer learning, Ward and Wackman (1972) studied the effects of a child's product requests on the mother's behavior. Likewise, Atkin (1978) studied child-initiated communication on the mother's purchasing behavior for cereal products. Children were found to play a dominant role in family
cereal selection in the supermarket. Such yielding to children's requests might have a long-term effect on the parents' behavior modification. Darley and Lim (1986) found that children have great influence in leisure activity choice. Foxman and Tansuhaj (1988) used mothers and children as respondents and found that children have some influence in a broad variety of purchase decisions; their level of influence varies by product, user and perceived importance. These findings are consistent with Riesman & Roseborough's (1955) concept of retroactive socialization in which the child serves as an agent of change in parental consumer behavior.

**Children's involvement in Family Purchase Decisions**

In this area of research, an understanding and evaluation of a child's level of involvement in family purchase decision is obtained by examining the influence that s/he exerts in family decisions (Sharma 1989). However, their level of involvement is usually perceived by himself/herself and other members of the family in which the product purchase decisions are made.

Children's level of influence in family purchase decision is usually reported by their parents. Parents usually perceive themselves to have greater influence in any family purchase decision because according to the resource theory (Blood and Wolfe 1960; Spiro 1983), an individual that processes more resources in a social unit will have greater influence in decisions in that unit. In most families, parents are the major source of family income, thus, it is natural for them to assume greater purchase influence.
Mother and teenagers have been found to show differences in their perception of children's influence on family purchase decisions (Foxman and Tansuhaj 1988). Husbands who spent a lot of time outside the home may feel some self-acted guilt and perceive children having more influence on family purchase decisions (Jenkins 1978). In general, the less authoritarian the spouse the more influence is allocated to the children.

Also, children often overestimate their influence on family purchase decisions (Foxman, Tansuhaj and Ekstrom 1989). This kind of over-estimation may be product specific, or may result when the child is directly affected by the purchase decisions, or the child may play different roles at different stages (Jenkins 1978). Even though disagreement still exists in mothers' and fathers' perceptions on the level of their children's influence on family purchase decision, their gaps were much smaller, when comparing with the discrepancy that occurs between parents and children's perceptions.

All these past studies of family members' perception of their relative influence in family decision making show a lack of convergence in multiple reports. This will cause serious threat to the validity in family studies when using multiple respondents in depicting the structure of family decision influence. In a recent study, Kim & Lee (1997), used multiple respondents, multiple-item data to investigate the children's purchase influence in the family. The authors proposed an approach that can be used to develop valid triadic measures (father, mother and child as respondents) of children' influence in various categories of product purchase decisions.
Traditional Role Specialization in Product Purchase Behavior

Past research findings indicate that traditional role specialization influences purchase behavior in three major ways. First, it affects which spouse has dominance with respect to specific products. For example, husbands/fathers have dominated in purchase decisions for such product categories as insurance (Bonfield 1978; Davis and Rigaux 1974; Green et al. 1983), automobiles (Davis 1970; Green et al. 1983; Sharp and Mott 1956; Wol gast 1958), and TV (Woodside and Motes 1979). Whereas, wives/mothers have dominated in purchase decisions for products associated with the homemaker role, such as appliances (Green et al. 1983; Wol gast 1958), groceries (Bonfield 1978; Davis and Rigaux 1974; Green et al. 1983; Sharp and Mott 1956), and washing machines (Woodside and Motes 1979). The relative influence on a purchase decision is higher for a spouse who is highly involved in the purchase and wants to reflect his or her individual interests through this purchase decision (Quall 1987).

Second, traditional role specialization affects which spouse has dominance with respect to product attributes. Within the family, men have traditionally been task-oriented leaders, while women have led in social and emotional behavior. Therefore, in purchase decisions husbands/fathers tend to concern themselves with relatively important and functional product attributes (e.g., price) while wives/mothers concentrate on relative minor, aesthetic product attributes (e.g., color) (Davis 1970; Hempel 1974; Munsinger et al., 1975; Woodside and Motes 1979).
As for children, in general, product importance and product knowledge will affect children's relative influence in family decisions. According to Krishnamurthy (1981), if a person is more involved with a product, then s/he will be more active in the product decision process.

A 1987 national survey found that adolescents influenced their family purchase decisions for a number of products, such as vacation and travel (60%), magazine subscriptions (55%), videocassette recorders (47%), and stereo equipment (37%). In the same study (Marketing News 1987), about 540 teenage female respondents (half of the total female subjects), reported that they do grocery shopping for the family weekly and 24% said they made most of the brand selections. Moreover, children were also found to have minimal influence in some of the product categories, such as furniture, major appliances, automobiles, groceries, family savings, life insurance, choice of family doctor, and family accounting (Jenkins 1978).

Besides, consumer socialization studies also have revealed that parents' influence on children varies according to the child's knowledge of the product and perceptions' of product importance. Parents' influence has been found to increase with high-risk products or products of which the child has relatively little knowledge (Moschis and Moore 1979).

Moreover, the results of Ward & Wackman (1972) study revealed that children's influence attempts tended to decrease with age, while mother's yielding tended to increase. Also, they found that children's requests for products and mothers' granting of
these requests to be closely related to the child's involvement, interest and usage of the product.

Mehotra & Torges (1977) also found that variables that would increase the chances of parental yielding to children's influences tended to be product specific. Atkin's observational study (1978) discovered that the success rate of the child in obtaining the desired cereal increased with the age of the child. Another study by Nelson (1978) examined the relative influence of parents and children in family decision making to eat out. The results supported the early findings of Syzbillo et al. (1977) & Jenkins (1978) that the extent of children's influences varied with the specific subdecision area and the product/service category.
CHAPTER 4
HYPOTHESES

Based on the literature review, a general framework was developed to study how children's influence on family purchase decisions varies as a function of differences in the acculturation level (of fathers, mothers, and children) and changes in the family environment (the 10 FES subscales, underlying the Relationship, Personal Growth, and System Maintenance dimensions) after immigration. Following this framework, the following hypotheses will be tested:

H1: The acculturation level of fathers, mothers, and children is related to the family environment.

H1a: The higher the fathers', mothers', and children's acculturation level, the lesser emphasis on Cohesion, Moral Religious Emphasis, Organization and Control.

H1b: The higher the fathers', mothers', and children's acculturation level, the greater the emphasis on Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, and Active Recreational Orientation.
First, this hypothesis intends to investigate the relationship between acculturation level and the family climate. Family climate has a powerful influence on how well a family and individual family members adapt to change, especially during transitions in family life such as immigration (Moos & Moos, 1994). Immigration and acculturation can lead to changes in family relationships (Moos & Moos, 1994). After immigrating to Canada, the most important task for the Chinese immigrants is to adapt to their new cultural environment. As indicated by Taft (1985; 1986), this process of acculturation is a resocialization process which involves changes in social skills, attitudes, values, cultural identification, and behavioral norms.

Therefore, I expect that Chinese families, as they acculturate, will try to loosen their emphasis on traditional family environment and lessen the preservation of Chinese culture. Consequently, I would expect a lesser emphasis on Cohesion, Moral Religious Emphasis, Organization and Control to keep the family unity, but, at the same time, I would also expect more emphasis on Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, and Active Recreational Orientation which reflect a more Western style family environment.
H2: Children's influence in family purchase decision (in 4 product areas) is related to family environment (all 3 FES dimensions).

H2a: The lesser the emphasis on Cohesion, Moral Religious Emphasis, Organization, and Control, the greater the product influence of the children;

The FES Cohesion subscale (Relationship dimension) measures the extent to which family members are committed to the family. According to Reitz (1980), the Chinese are different from most European groups in North America in that mobility does not seem to reduce their cohesion level. The FES Moral Religious Emphasis subscale (Personal Growth dimension) measures how the family actively discusses and emphasizes ethical and religious issues and values. According to Kung (1962), obedient devotion to the dominant person or elder in the family is the major moral emphasis in the Chinese families. Service and self-sacrifice are characterized as the ideal Chinese family relations. Family members are expected to be mutually watched in order to maintain a satisfactory moral balance in the family (Kung 1962). The FES Organization and Control subscales (System Maintenance dimension) measures the structure and degree of control within the family. Chinese and Western families tend to differ in their family organization and relationships. Particularly, Chinese parents are often less independence-granting and child-focused, and are often more power assertive and more confining than Western parents (Kriger & Kroes, 1972; Rosenthal & Feldman, in press; Vernon, 1982; Yang, 1986). According to Ch'u (1961) and Chen (1973), social order and control in
Chinese families were maintained by the family heads not by a system of equal justice. Even nowadays, in China, there continues to be an emphasis on ideology, mediation, and informal social control as effective ways of maintaining family order (Chen 1973, Lubman 1967). However, greater level of acculturation may lead to a lesser focus on these four FES subscales and consequently, I would expect the level of children's influence in family purchase decision to increase.

**H2b: The more the emphasis on Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation and Active Recreational Orientation, the greater the product influence of the children.**

The FES Expressiveness and Conflict subscales (Relationship dimension) measures the extent to which family members feel that they belong to and are proud of the family, whether open expression exists within the family, and the level of conflict interactions in the family. In Chinese families, the expression of individual needs and desires is considered selfish, and diverse opinions are not welcome. According to Kung (1962), if the household is composed of many members holding different opinions, it is likely to become a symbol of disunity among the family. Thus, Chinese teenagers have no voice in the family decisions and are socialized to accept authority, especially that of the family (Chen & Yang, 1986; Harrison, Serafica & McAdoo, 1982; Hsu, 1981; Yang, 1986). According to Chan and Hagan (1982), the Chinese in Canada treasures continuing relationships between members, especially those who know each other, and are still valued during times of conflict. In settling a dispute, Chinese usually follow the social
control mechanisms and try to develop compromise solutions. The FES independence, achievement orientation, intellectual-cultural orientation and active-recreational orientation subscales (Personal Growth dimension) measures the family emphasis on certain developmental processes which may be trained by family living. Traditionally, Chinese family focuses on the interdependence of family members and place family and collective needs above those of the individual. In the Chinese culture, individuality is not emphasized. The Chinese family is fundamentally cooperative to the highest extent. Each member of the family shares the domestic expenses and does his/her best to support the whole (Kung, 1962). Though Chinese are constantly becoming better adjusted to Canadian way of living, certain uncommon Chinese attitudes remain (Kung, 1962). Even though children in this country have much more freedom, their parents, who are still greatly interested in their welfare, will do everything possible to maintain a wholesome family environment and preserve discipline. After immigration, Chinese parents are still the ones who make the final purchase decisions. As indicated in the literature, these six FES subscales measure family climate in a totally different direction to what the Chinese families emphasize. Hence, I would expect that as Chinese families put more emphasis on these six FES subscales, the more freedom they will give to their children. Consequently, the level of children's influence in family purchase decision will increase.
H3: Children's influence in family purchase decision (in 4 product areas) is positively related to the acculturation level of fathers, mothers and children's.

According to Chan & Hager (1982), after immigration, Chinese children face pressures from two great forces. On one hand, there is pressure from home not to conform to the Western culture, on the other hand, there is also enormous pressure from school and peer-group to conform to the Western norms and values. Recent empirical work indicates that under the impact of modernization and acculturation after their migration, the values of Chinese teenagers may be changing, with more acceptance on values such as independence, dominance, achievement, and individualism (Ho & Kang, 1984; Yang 1986). Chinese and Western teenagers place emphasis on different values; especially towards individualism-collectivism. Chinese teenagers place a high value on collective welfare and social concern (Bond, 1988; Chinese Culture Connection, 1987; Yang, 1986), while Western teenagers place relatively a high value on independence and tend to devalue conformity to authority and social custom (Feather, 1980; Rokeach, 1973; Rosenthal, Bell, Demetrious & Efklides, 1989). With daily contact with native people, as well as through learning the Western values at school, Chinese children tend to be more likely to acculturate over time. This is because peer influence is another important socialization agent besides the family (Moschis 1978). When Chinese children become more acculturated, more autonomy will be demanded, and this will lead to a greater influence in Chinese family purchase decision. Therefore, children's influence in family purchase decision is positively related to the acculturation level of the Chinese adolescent.
The concept of a Chinese father is a provider of the family (Cheng 1946), therefore, after immigration, it is essential for Chinese fathers to join the labor force of the host country so as to maintain the family’s standard of living. According to Kung (1962), Chinese mothers are usually employed after immigration, and the number increases yearly. Daily contact with people from the native society will affect the fathers’ and mothers’ acceptance towards Western culture; which in term will affect the acculturation level of these men and women. In the Western family, individual growth and development is valued and children are encouraged to become physically and psychologically separated from their parents (Jung 1984; Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986) and to be self-reliant and independent at an early age (Alwin, 1988; Rosenthal & Bornholt, 1988). Thus, when Chinese fathers and mothers become more acculturated, the more influence their children have on family purchase decisions.

**H4: The effect of acculturation of fathers, mothers and children on children's influence in family purchase decisions (in 4 product areas) is mediated by the unique Chinese family environment (10 FES subscales).**

This is an exploratory hypothesis aiming at investigating the linkage between the entire thesis framework. The first question is: Can acculturation serve as an antecedent of changes in immigrants’ family that will affect the family climate or environment? In fact, studies cited for hypothesis 1 tend to support this logical reasoning. The importance of acculturation towards different ethnic groups such as Italian, French and Greek families have been widely studied, and results have lent support that acculturation has an impact
on immigrants' family (Laroche et al. 1996). Given that acculturation will affect the family environment after immigration, variations in acculturation level will in turn lead to changes in the family environment.

The next question is: Can the impact of acculturation on the family environment be moderated by factors such as unique Chinese family attitudes or general immigrants' attitude after immigration? In fact, from the FES immigration studies, research has found that most immigrants, irrespective of ethnicity, would like to preserve their own cultural values (Moos & Moos, 1994). Therefore, the question here is: Does preservation of culture among Chinese immigrants hinders the effect of acculturation?

The mediation by unique Chinese family environment does not eliminate the possibility that acculturation will affect the children's influence in family product purchase decisions directly. The effect on how family environment will affect children's product influence is being tested in hypothesis 2, the logic behind this hypothesis is supported by previous studies. There is no doubt that family is the most important socialization agent that will affect children's influence in family product purchase decisions (Moschis, 1978). To conclude, this forth hypothesis aims at examining the mediating role of the family environment.
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample

A total of 335 sets of questionnaires were distributed. The sample consisted of family triads, i.e., father, mother, and a teenage child, living in the Greater Montreal area. Past studies (Davis 1971, 1976) have indicated that two family members can disagree in evaluating purchase decision influence. Children were included as respondents in this study in order to give a broader and more realistic assessment of their influence in family purchase decisions. Moreover, studies of family decision making have often found disagreements between respondents' ratings of different family members influence in purchase decisions (Belch et al. 1985; Davis 1976; Davis & Rigaux 1974). This is because those who report children' influence might have a certain amount of influence on how their children felt (Foxman, Tansuhaj & Ekstrom 1989). As in some early studies of husband-wife decision making or parental yielding to children's requests, conclusions were drawn based solely on the self-reported responses of just one family member, usually the wife or mother (Atkin 1978). Fathers are included in more recent studies due to the increasing recognition of their importance in the child rearing process and their importance as members of the family system (Lamb 1981). Besides, in immigrant families, it is the father who is more likely to be exposed, through his workplace, to values held by other groups in the new country. These new sets of values might create conflict with his old culture. Hearst (1985) found that this shift towards the new cultural values might not be shared by mothers. Thus, in this study all three family members'
ratings of influence are examined. In a recent study by Kim and Lee (1997), the authors have developed family triadic measures by using fathers', mothers' and children's responses to measure children's influence in four categories of product purchase decisions. The study used multiple respondent, multiple item data in order to ensure convergence in multiple reports. Their results exhibited desirable levels of convergent and discriminant validity.

Teenagers were chosen for this study because they are at the age group with full cognitive development (Piaget 1970). They have also shown to understand economic concepts (Strauss 1952), and consumer skills related to information processing (Wackman & Wartella 1977). They are also expected to model their behavior on that of adults to a certain extent (Lerner and Shea 1982). Besides, the adult form R of family environment scale (FES) requires the subject to be at least 13 years old, in order to complete the form. Otherwise, children are required to do another set of children FES form R questionnaire. Due to financial constraints, this study only includes Chinese teenagers from 13-19 years old.

**Data Collection Procedure**

Data used in this study were collected in the Summer at 1997 through the cooperation of a Chinese Language school and a Chinese church, both located in Montreal. Three hundred sets of questionnaires were delivered to the teachers with the consent of the school's principal and supervisor. The teachers distributed the packages containing a cover letter asking all three members of the family to fill out the
questionnaires, and students were asked to return the questionnaires to school in the following week. Additionally, 35 sets were handed out at a church, and the same instructions were given. There are two versions of the questionnaire, one in English and one in Chinese. To ensure idiomatic equivalence of the Chinese and English questionnaires, back translation was used, i.e., questionnaires were translated from English to Chinese and from Chinese back to English. Each respondent was given a choice to complete the questionnaire in the language that they feel most comfortable with. Each version of the questionnaire requiring about 15-20 minutes to answer was pretested and found easy to understand. The three questionnaires in each package had the same identification number starting from #001 to #335, and distinctive codes were used to differentiate the identity of father, mother and child. (See Appendix 3 -- for samples of the questionnaire).

Measures

The questionnaire contained four sections. The first section included 28 acculturation measures covering five underlying dimensions of English usage at home, Chinese culture attachment level, Canadian identity, Level of comfort in using English, and Social activities in the English community. Although many definitions of acculturation exist, according to Laroche, Kim, Hui and Joy (1991), there is no standardized method for measuring the concept. Some methods are based on subjective measures such as self-report. But others use objective measures such as length of stay and language preference. Table 1.0 presents the five groups of acculturation measures used in this research.
Language use patterns (i.e. English usage at home. Level of comfort in using English) of individual social communication was measured by the subjects’ response to the given statements on a five point scale which ranged from 1=disagree strongly to 5=agree strongly. The statements measured language use patterns in the following contexts:

1. with spouse
2. with children
3. with relatives
4. with English-Canadians
5. when reading newspapers
6. when reading magazines
7. when watching movies
8. when watching video tapes

For the ethnicity (attachment to Chinese identity) measures, respondents were also asked to indicate their level of agreement using a 5-point Likert scale (1=disagree strongly; 5=agree strongly) with the following statement:

1. I consider myself to be Chinese
2. I feel very proud of my Chinese cultural background
3. I think of myself as Chinese first and as Canadian second
4. The Chinese culture has the most positive impact on my life
5. I would like to be known as "Chinese"

6. I am still very attached to the Chinese culture

The acculturation dimension - Canadian identity, i.e. strong attachment to the Canadian culture was also measured with two statements using the 5-point Likert scale:

1. I consider myself to be Canadian

2. I would like to be known as "Canadian."

The social dimension (social activities in the English community) used a number of statements to measure the Chinese interactions' patterns with English Canadians in different social settings. The same 5-point Likert scale was used.

The second section of the questionnaire included 21 children's decision influence measures covering *four a priori* classified categories of products--inexpensive products for the child, inexpensive products for the family, expensive products for the child, and expensive products for the family. According to Kim and Lee (1994), "this categorization was based on past findings that children's influence tends to vary depending upon the product user (i.e., children themselves or the family) and the amount of purchase expenditure" (Beatty and Talpade 1994; Foxman, Tansuhaj, and Ekstrom 1989a, 1989b; Foxman and Tansuhaj 1988; Jenkins 1979). Table 1.1 presents the four product categories.
The question used in the parent’s questionnaire was: “Between you (both you and your spouse) and the child who brought this questionnaire to you, who decide what to buy for the following products? (1=We, i.e., my spouse and I decide entirely; 3=We and our child jointly; 5=Our child decides entirely)” For the teenager’s questionnaire, the question was written in the following way: “Between you and your parents, who decide what to buy for the following products? (1=My parents entirely; 3=My parents and I jointly; 5=Myself entirely).” According to Kim and Lee (1994), these measures can tap children's relative influence vis-a-vis their parents as perceived by children themselves and their parents.

Section three of the questionnaire included the Family Environment Scales. The FES (Moos & Moos, 1974) is a 90-item true-false instrument. It consists of 10 subscales assessing three underlying constructs. Each subscale consists of nine true-false items and each one measures an aspect of the family environment as perceived by the respondent. The subscales are summarized in Table 1.2. These ten subscales can be grouped into three dimensions. First, the relationship dimension assesses the extent to which family members feel that they belong to and are proud of their family, the extent to which there is open expression within the family, and the degree to which conflictual interactions are characteristic of the family. Second, the personal growth dimension measures the emphasis within the family on a certain developmental process which may be fostered by family living. Third, the system maintenance dimension reflects the structure or organization within the family and the degree of control which is usually exerted by
family members among each other. Raw scores for each subscale are computed by adding the responses for each item in that scale.

Moos and Moos (1974) have reported satisfactory reliability and validity for the scale by drawing conclusions from various samples including different types of families such as ethnic families and single-parent families.

The last section of the questionnaire consisted of personal and demographic questions. The demographic questions contained in the parents’ questionnaires included their age, years of marriage, type of family, number of children, total family income, working status, highest level of education, levels of education received in English, place of birth, number of years residing in Canada, last place of residency before moving to Canada, most comfortable languages and French speaking ability. The children’s personal information consisted of: age, number of siblings, siblings that are older than the child, level in school, type of school attending at present, working status, monthly income, place of birth, number of years residing in Canada, last place of residency and most comfortable language use.
CHAPTER 6
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Analysis Part 1: Demographic profile

Out of the 335 sets of questionnaires distributed, a total of 109 family triads sets were returned. The teenagers' sample consisted of male and female primary and high school students, with an average age of 15.61 and an age range of 13 to 19. Male children accounted for 41.3% and female 58.7%. Only 33.9% of the children attended English school, 65.1% attended French school, with one missing case. Seventeen respondents (15.6%) had a part-time job, and others were unemployed. The average monthly income for those part-time workers was $186.82. The children respondents have resided in Canada for an average of 6.28 years.

About 60.6% of the fathers and 71.6% of the mothers were in the age group of 41-50. The average years of marriage for the parents were 20 years. The number of years resided in Canada were 11.42 years for the mothers and 12.56 years for the fathers. Only 38.5% of the fathers' and 29.3% of the mothers have completed above high school level. Around 85.3% of the fathers and 82.6% of the mothers felt most comfortable speaking Cantonese. For French speaking ability, only 9.2% of the fathers and 12% of the mothers ranked themselves good to very good in their ability to speak French. The mean household income, as reported by both the fathers and the mothers, was about $30,001 -- $40,000. See Table 1.3.
Analysis Part 2: Factor Analysis

Method

For both the acculturation and product variables, factor analysis was used to reduce the data into a smaller and a more meaningful set of components and to discover dimensions underlying these many variables. The reliability and validity of the data can be improved by factoring the data. After conducting factor analysis, the resulting factors for the acculturation and product dimensions were used to construct indices to be used as new variables in later regression analyses.

Results

a) Acculturation dimension

Factor Analysis was conducted on all the 28 ethnicity items, in order to find a simple structure for categorizing them. The goal was to develop a family-level measure having interpersonal agreement among the 3 groups of respondents with respect to the content of the measure, and a high level of reliability for all three subsamples involving fathers, mothers, and children. For this purpose, factor analyses were conducted separately for each subsample to investigate the underlying dimensions of the items, and also to compare the findings across the three groups.

After conducting the initial analysis, items of factors obtained were examined for content validity with other items loading highly on the same factor. Ambiguous loading items were deleted and correlations within the items of each factor were calculated. Items showing low correlations and/or inconsistency with other items of the factor were also
deleted. Finally, to confirm the reliability of the resultant factors, Cronbach Alphas were calculated.

Initially, factor analysis was conducted on all the 28 ethnicity items. Factor analysis with varimax rotation initially produced 5 factors with eigenvalues greater than one. Each item was then checked for content consistency and size of factor loading with the rest of the items with high loadings on the same factor. The two items with ambiguous factor loading and/or inconsistent content were deleted. The 2 items deleted were: item #20: Of all the people I come in contact with on a day-to-day basis are mostly English-Canadians. and item #28: I feel very attached to all aspects of the English-Canadian culture. Then, the same factor analysis procedure was repeated on the remaining 26 items. The factor analysis this time revealed that the 26 acculturation items could be grouped in 5 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and accounting for 69.9%, 74.1% and 66.5% of the total variance for fathers, mothers and children respectively.

These 5 factors could be labeled as: Social activities in the English community, English usage at home, Chinese culture attachment level, Canadian identity, and level of comfort in using English. Cronbach's alphas ranged from 0.7705-0.9462, confirming that there was a high degree of internal consistency in the factors. A critical value of 0.60 was used. As indicated by Nunnally (1967) an alpha coefficient of 0.50 to 0.60 is already sufficient to justify internal consistency and coefficient values beyond 0.80 are not necessary. Results are shown in Table 1.4. The one factor measuring the Chinese culture
attachment level was categorized under the ethnic identification dimension and was not used as an acculturation dimension in the analyses.

**b) Children's influence in the product categories**

Factor Analysis was also conducted for the 21 product items. Cronbach Alphas were calculated in order to measure the internal consistency of the factors and also to verify the quality of the chosen items as product measures. By using correlation results and item inspection, items which revealed poor content validity and/or showed ambiguous loadings with the rest of the items loading highly on the same factor were deleted.

With the responses from the 3 subsamples, i.e., fathers, mothers and children, on the 21 measurement items measuring children's influence in four groups of product purchases, the first task was to detect the underlying dimensions of these measures. Same as with the acculturation items, the goal here was to develop a family-level measure that showed a high level of interpersonal agreement among the 3 subsamples with respect to the content of the measure and a high level of reliability for all three subsamples involving fathers, mothers, and children. For this purpose, factor analyses were conducted separately for each subsample to examine the underlying dimensions of the items and to compare the findings across the three groups. Four factors were extracted in all cases. Initial analysis produced inconsistent factor patterns for the three groups.
Then, item purification was conducted aiming at finding a same factor pattern with the same product influence items for the three subsamples. This process required examining the factor pattern matrices obtained for the three groups and deleting those items that showed loading values below 0.4 on any of the four factors. Those that did not belong to the same group in all three subsamples were deleted, and the resulting factor patterns were reexamined. Several iterations of item analysis resulted in 16 variables and a factor pattern similar for the three subamples. The 5 deleted items were: #14: What movie the family should go to. #19: Which restaurant to go to for the family dinner. #20: Where to go for a family vacation. #8: Soft drinks for the family, and #21: Computer games for this child. The three sets of factors explained 68.7%, 63.9%, and 62.7% of the total variance respectively for fathers, mothers, and children data.

These 4 factors could be defined as: Inexpensive Products for the Child, Inexpensive Products for the Family, Expensive Products for the Child, and Expensive Products for the Family. Cronbach reliability coefficients ranged from: 0.7295-0.8299. A critical value of 0.60 was used. Results are shown in Table 1.5

Analysis Part 3: Family Environment Scale

The Family Environment Scale (FES; Moos & Moos 1974) consists of 10 subscales (Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation, Moral-Religious Emphasis, Organization, and Control). Each subscale uses nine true-false items to measure a respondent’s perception about an aspect of the family environment. These 10
subscales are further classified under one of the three dimensions: Relationship Dimensions, Personal Growth Dimensions and System Maintenance Dimensions (Moos & Moos 1974).

Raw scores for each subscale for each member are obtained by adding the number of correct responses. Then, an average family raw score is calculated for each subscale (Moos & Moos, 1994). Family average raw scores can be transformed to standard scores using the conversion tables by Moos & Moos (1994). In these tables, each individual raw family score is ascribed an equivalent standardized score. See Appendix 4.

In this study, FES scores were computed in both raw and then converted to standard scores. FES is an appropriate scale for this study because Moos & Moos (1974) have reported satisfactory reliability and validity for this scale on results from a variety of samples, i.e., a "normative sample". The Cronbach's alphas of this study's 10 FES subscales were as follows: Cohesion = 0.754, Expressiveness = 0.638, Conflict = 0.767, Independence = 0.517, Achievement Orientation = 0.605, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation = 0.807, Active-Recreational Orientation = 0.752, Moral-Religious Emphasis = 0.851, Organization = 0.775, and Control = 0.758.
Analysis Part 4: Multiple Regression Analysis

Method

Multiple regression analysis was deemed the most appropriate technique to test the main framework of this study. The data were analyzed for relationships between the various independent factors which related to: a) Acculturation dimensions: Fathers’ acculturation, Mothers’ acculturation and children’s acculturation. b) The 3 FES dimensions, i.e., Relationship, Personal Growth, and System Maintenance which are based on the 10 FES subscales (Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active Recreational Orientation, Moral Religious Orientation, Organization and Control); and the four dependent factors measuring children’s influence in family purchase decisions: Inexpensive children’s products, Inexpensive family products, Expensive children’s products and Expensive family products. According to Hair et al (1992), regression analysis is a popularly recognized statistical technique and a powerful analytical tool that practitioners and researchers use to analyze the relationship between one dependent variable or factor and one or more independent variables or factors.

Since there were a number of dependent variables involved in this study, in order to develop a model to predict assessed value, it was essential to use stepwise regression. Stepwise regression attempts to find the "best" regression model that includes the fewest number of explanatory variables which permits an adequate interpretation of the dependent variable of interest (Berenson and Levine 1989). That is, in stepwise
regression, variables or factors are either "added to" or "deleted from" the regression model at each step of the model-building process, and stopped when no variables can be added to or deleted from the last model fitted. The last model is considered to be the "best fitting" model (Berenson and Levine 1989).

Stepwise regressions were run to test each hypothesis. Hypothesis four for investigating the mediating role of FES was tested using a similar procedure used by Zhang (1996) on the mediating role of ad attribute in the humor-attitude towards brand relationship. The sets of regression equations were as follows:

For Hypothesis 1:

- Family Environment(10 regressions by 10 FES subscales) = \( a + b_n^* \) Acculturation (3 acculturation groups) + error

For Hypothesis 2:

- Children's Product Influence(4 regressions by 4 product areas) = \( a + b_n^* \) Family Environment(10 FES subscales) + error

For Hypothesis 3:

- Children's Product Influence(4 regressions by 4 product areas) = \( a + b_n^* \) Acculturation (3 acculturation groups) + error

For Hypothesis 4:

- Children's Product Influence(4 regressions by 4 product areas) = \( a + b_n^* \) Acculturation (3 acculturation groups) + \( b_n^* \) Family Environment(10 FES subscales) + error
Note:

1. The small n indicate the number of variables for each factor, i.e., 3 for acculturation, 10 for family environment and 4 for children's influence in different product areas.

2. All regression analyses were run by using both raw and standard scores for validation purpose.

3. The notations for all the variables are provided in Table 1.6

Results

Results were analyzed by grouping the individual variables according to 3 major categories:

**Acculturation level**: of fathers, mothers and children.

**Family environment**: a) Relationship dimension which is measured by cohesion, expressiveness, and conflict subscales. b) Personal Growth dimension which is measured by independence, achievement orientation, intellectual-cultural orientation, active recreational orientation, and moral religious emphasis subscales. C) System Maintenance dimension, which is measured by organization, and control subscales.

**Children's product influence in family purchase decisions**: classified by inexpensive product for the child, inexpensive product for the family, expensive product for the child, and expensive product for the family.
The stepwise regression was the best analysis method on account of the large number of independent variables involved in this study, and to eliminate the problem of multicollinearity, since an examination of the correlation matrix showed significant correlations among many of the independent variables.
**Results of hypothesis 1:** The acculturation level of fathers, mothers and children is related to the family environment.

The first set of regressions was performed to examine the relationship between family environment using the 10 FES subscales (criterion variable), and acculturation level, i.e., of the fathers, mothers and children (predictor variables).

The regression equations using raw and standard scores yielded similar results, except for children's acculturation that appeared in the Control subscale equation when using standard scores. The dependent variables (10 FES subscales) used in these 10 regression equations measured the 3 underlying dimensions, i.e., Relationship, Personal Growth, and System Maintenance of the family environment. See Table 1.7a and 1.7b for raw and standard scores results.

Overall, hypothesis 1 is partially supported. For the FES **Relationship dimension**, results did not support hypothesis 1a in the hypothesized direction. Only cohesion (COH) was found to have a positive relationship, instead of a negative one (as predicted) with mothers' acculturation level (MACCULT). This shows that as the mothers become more acculturated, the more and not lesser the cohesive level in the family environment would be. The other two subscales, expressiveness and conflict (EXPR and CONF) which also measured the same dimension were found not to have any relationship with either fathers', mothers' or children's acculturation level. To conclude, the FES **Relationship dimension** was found to have some relationship, but not in the
hypothesized direction, to mothers' acculturation level, and no relationship with fathers' and children's acculturation level.

For the **FES Personal Growth dimension**, the results show support for hypothesis 1. Out of the 5 subscales that measure this dimension, 4 were included in the stepwise regressions. Among these 4 subscales, three of them i.e., independence, intellectual-cultural orientation, and active-recreational orientation supported hypothesis 1b. These three subscales (IND, INT, ACT) were found to be positively related to either fathers', mothers' or children's acculturation level (FACCULT, MACCULT, CACCULT). As for hypothesis 1a, instead of a negative relationship as predicted, a positive relationship was found between the mothers' acculturation level and moral religious emphasis (MOR). Among the three acculturation groups, mothers' acculturation was found to have the strongest relationship with the FES Personal Growth dimension. Out of the above 4 regression equations, 3 were found to have a positive relation with mothers' acculturation level: intellectual-cultural orientation, active-recreational orientation and moral religious emphasis subscales (INT, ACT, MOR). To conclude, as the fathers', mothers' or children's acculturation level increases, the more emphasis they will place on Independence, Intellectual-Cultural orientation and Active Recreational Orientation of the FES Personal Growth dimension, which are more Westernized family values, but at the same time, a strong traditional family unity is also maintained by an increased, and not decreased, focus on Moral Religious emphasis which disconfirmed hypothesis 1a.
For the FES System Maintenance dimension (ORG, CONT), stepwise regression results indicated that acculturation level of the three groups of respondents is related to the family environment, but not in the hypothesized direction. Both of the subscales were found to have positive relationship, instead of a negative one with mother’s acculturation level, but none with the fathers’ acculturation level. In conclusion, as mothers get more acculturated, they tend to foster more organization and control within the family. These results rejected hypothesis 1a, which predicted that as the acculturation level increases, the emphasis on organization and control will decrease.

Seven out of the 10 FES subscales were found to have a positive relationship with the acculturation level. Only expressiveness, conflict, and achievement orientation didn’t have any relationship with the acculturation level. This indicates that what these three subscale measures may be irrelevant to most Chinese families. One interesting finding is that the acculturation level of Chinese mothers is always the most important element that affects family climate. Mothers’ acculturation always has the highest significance level when compared to fathers’ and children’s acculturation. This finding is supported by literature (Lang 1946), mothers occupy a central position in the ritual life of the Chinese families and they are the ones who take care of every aspect of the family. Thus, the mothers’ acculturation level strongly affects the family climate of the Chinese families. Overall, hypothesis 1a is rejected. All the 4 subscales (COH, MOR, ORG, CONT) have positive relationships, instead of negative ones with acculturation. Hypothesis 1b is partially supported with strong support for the FES Personal Growth dimension.
Results of hypothesis 2: Children's product influence in family decisions is related to family environment.

The second set of regressions aimed at examining the relationship between children's product influence, i.e., the 4 product areas (criterion variable) and family environment, i.e., the 10 FES subscales (predictor variables). Same as above, results for both sets of equations (standard and raw scores) provided similar results, except for the expensive family items (EXFAM) equation, in which slight differences have occurred.

For hypothesis 2a, results indicated that for inexpensive products for the child (INCHILD), relationships are found between 3 FES subscales: independence, intellectual-cultural orientation and moral religious emphasis (IND, INT and MOR) and inexpensive items for the child. This regression supported part of this hypothesis as only moral religious emphasis was found to be negatively related to inexpensive children products. As the family focus less on the moral religious emphasis, the greater the children's product influence on inexpensive children products will be. For both (INFAM) inexpensive products for the family and (EXCHILD) expensive products for the child, results have indicated a negative relationship does exist between these two product categories and control (CONT). As the family emphasizes less on control, the greater the children's product influence will be on inexpensive family products and expensive children products. These results do indicate a partial support for hypothesis 2a. For (EXFAM) the expensive family product, relationships were found between this product class and 2 FES subscales from raw scores results. They are: moral religious emphasis
(MOR) and organization (ORG). And from standard scores, negative relationships were found between moral religious emphasis (MOR) and control (CONT) with expensive family products. For the expensive family product category, results provided some support for hypothesis 2a, a negative relationship was found between this product area and 2 subscales, they were: moral religious emphasis and organization. This indicates that the lesser the family focus on moral religious emphasis and organization, the more influence children have on expensive family products. However, if we use only the raw scores regressions, cohesion (COH) was found to have a positive relationship with the expensive family products. This means that as the family place more value on cohesion, the greater the children’s purchase influence on expensive family products. Overall, hypothesis 2a is partially supported as moral religious emphasis, organization and control did indicate a negative relationship with either one of the 4 product categories.

Hypothesis 2b was also only partially supported. The more the family focus on independence (IND), the greater the children’s purchase influence on inexpensive product for the child (INCHILD). Expressiveness (EXPR) and Independence (IND) were also found to have a positive relationship with expensive family products (EXFAM). This indicates that as the family places more emphasis on these 2 subscales, the greater the children’s purchase influence on expensive family products. For inexpensive family products (INFAM) and expensive products for the child (EXCHILD), no relationship was found between any of these 6 hypothesized subscales and these 2 product areas. However, for intellectual-cultural orientation (INT), instead of a positive relationship as predicted, a negative relationship was found between this subscale and inexpensive
product for the child. This shows that as the family put more focus on intellectual-cultural orientation, the less product influence the children have. Moreover, conflict (CONF), achievement orientation (ACH) and active recreational orientation (ACT) in hypothesis 2b were found to have no relationship with any of the 4 product categories. Overall, only expressiveness and independence supported my predictions.

To conclude, hypothesis 2 is partially supported. The linkage between the ten FES subscales and the 4 product categories is not strong, except for expensive family products, for which the family environment has a lot of forces on the level of children's product influence. Results show that the FES has more effect on children's product influence when purchasing expensive family products (EXFAM) than all the other three product areas. See Tables 1.8a and 1.8b for raw and standard scores results.

Results of hypothesis 3: Children's product influence in family purchase decision is positively related to acculturation level

A third set of regressions was conducted to examine whether a positive relationship exists between children's product influence, i.e., the 4 product areas (criterion variable) and acculturation level. i.e., of the fathers', mothers' and children's (predictor variables). Both sets of regressions using raw and standards scores yielded the same results.
Hypothesis 3 is only partially supported, this is because only 3 product areas i.e., inexpensive products for the child, inexpensive family products and expensive family products (INCHILD, INFAM, AND EXFAM) were found to have a positive relationship with either fathers’ or children’s acculturation level, but not with the mothers’. Mothers’ acculturation level was found to have a negative relationship with inexpensive products for the child. As the mothers become more acculturated, the lesser the children's product influence on inexpensive children products. This is because even after immigration, mothers still are the ones who take care of every internal aspect of the Chinese families, to a great extent, they still want to control every household purchase, even for minor ones, so as to maintain their family position. Positive relationship was discovered in children's acculturation and inexpensive products for the child. This shows that as the children become more acculturated, the more influence they will have on the purchase of inexpensive children products. For inexpensive family products, a positive relationship was found between fathers' acculturation and this product category. Hence, as the fathers become more acculturated, the more the children will influence the purchase of inexpensive family products. Expensive family products were positively associated with children's acculturation. Same as for the inexpensive children's product, as children become more acculturated, the more influence they will have on the expensive family products. Acculturation was found to have no effect on expensive children's products (EXCHILD). To conclude, children's acculturation level has a positive effect on expensive family items and inexpensive products for the child. Fathers' acculturation level has a positive effect on inexpensive family products, while mothers' acculturation
level has an inverse effect on inexpensive items for the child. See Tables 1.9a and 1.9b for raw and standard scores results.

**Results of hypothesis 4:** The effect of acculturation on children's product influence in family purchase decisions is mediated by the unique Chinese family environment.

A fourth set of regressions was run to examine the mediating effect of family environment. This was done by investigating the relationship between children's product influence (criterion variable) and acculturation level and family environment (predictor variables).

This hypothesis was based on Zhang's research (1996) framework on the mediating role of ad attitude in the humor-attitude towards brand relationship. In that author's research, regression analyses were conducted to investigate: 1) whether perceived humor (independent variable) have an effect on the hypothesized mediator (ad attitude), 2) how the changes in the mediator (ad attitude) will affect the brand attitude (dependent variable), 3) whether the relationship between the dependent and independent variables would no longer be significant once the changes in the dependent variable noted by the mediator was partialled out. The mediating role of ad attitude in the humor-brand attitude relationship could be confirmed once these three relationships could be proven (Baron and Kenny 1986).
Based on this Zhang’s framework, the purpose was to find whether acculturation level (measured by fathers', mothers' and children’s acculturation factors) and the children’s product influence in family purchase decision (in 4 product categories) is mediated by the unique Chinese family environment (measured by the 10 FES subscales). Refer to Figure 1.0 and Tables 2.0a and 2.0b for raw and standard scores results.

After comparing the results of the 4 sets of regression equations, using raw scores, results indicate that the mediating role of the family environment barely exists. Using raw scores regressions, the mediating role of 2 FES subscales were found. In the last regression sets when all the variables were included, after the significant effect of the hypothesized mediator intellectual-cultural orientation (INT) was partialled out, mothers' acculturation (MACCULT) was found not to be significant. Therefore, intellectual-cultural orientation can be concluded as one of the mediators in the mothers' acculturation and inexpensive items for the child relationship. The mediating role of intellectual-cultural orientation (INT) was found: the higher the mothers' acculturation level, the more they emphasize intellectual-cultural orientation in their families, which in turn, leads to lesser influence their children have on inexpensive items for the child. Therefore, as the mothers become more acculturated, the lesser their children's influence will be on the inexpensive children’s product. This is understandable because Chinese mothers want to maintain a strong level of control in every major and also minor aspects within the family. The second mediator was independence (IND). Same as with the intellectual-cultural orientation, when the significant effect of the hypothesized mediator independence was partialled out, children's acculturation was not significant. Thus, the
mediating role of independence between the children's acculturation and expensive family items relationship was found. The more the children are acculturated, the more independence they demand from their families, which in turn, will lead to have more children's influence on expensive family items. And the higher children's acculturation level, the more influence they will have on expensive family items.

When using standard scores in the regressions, 3 (FES subscales) mediators were found, they were: independence (IND), moral religious emphasis (MOR) and control (CONT). In the last standard regression sets when all the variables were included, and the significant effect of the hypothesized mediators were partialled out. children's and mothers' acculturation were not significant. Therefore, in the children's acculturation and expensive family items relationship, two FES mediators are found, independence (IND) and control (CONT). Here, as above, the same mediating role of independence (IND) exists between children's acculturation and expensive family items. Another mediator, control (CONT), was also found in the children's acculturation and expensive family items relationship, children's acculturation has a negative effect on control, which in turn, has a negative effect on expensive family items. Results indicate that as the children become more acculturated, the less control they face in the family, which will lead to lesser family control on the expensive family items. Hence the more the children are acculturated, the more influence they will have on the expensive family items. As for independence, results showed that as the children become more acculturated, the more independence they enjoy in the family, which will give them more influence on the expensive family items. The last mediator was moral religious emphasis (MOR) in the
mothers' acculturation and inexpensive products for the child relationship. When the significant effect of the hypothesized mediator, moral religious emphasis was partialled out, mothers' acculturation was found to be not significant. Thus, the mediating role of moral religious emphasis was found. The higher the mothers' acculturation level, the more they will stress moral religious emphasis within the family, which in turn, will lead to a lesser children's influence on inexpensive products for children.

In light of the above results, it can be concluded that the mediating role of family environment in this research framework has little support.

**Covariance Results**

The questionnaire continued various demographic variables. In an attempt to assess the relationship to acculturation, three regression analyses were run with fathers' acculturation, mothers' acculturation and children's acculturation as the dependent variables and the following demographic variables as independent variables: fathers' age (FAGE), fathers' employment status (FENPLOY), fathers' education level (FEDUC), mothers' age (MAGE), mothers' employment status (MENPLOY), mothers' education level (MEDU), children's age (CAGE), number of siblings (CSIBL), number of older siblings (COLDER) AND children's grade at school (CGRADE). First, the parents' age (FAGE, MAGE) was chosen because younger Chinese parents are usually less traditional. Also, if the Chinese parents are employed (FENPLOY, MENPLOY) in the Canadian market, they will have more opportunities to interact with other Canadians. Of course, the parents education level (FEDUC, MEDUC) will have an effect on the
children's product influence, if they are educated, it will be easier for them to understand and accept the host culture and values. As for the children's age (CAGE), when they are younger, their parents will have more control on their behavior and give them less freedom. Whether the child that completed the survey have any siblings (CSIBL) may have an effect on his/her level of product influence. If they have a few brothers or sisters, the individual product influence level of this child will decrease. Especially when this child has older siblings (COLDER), his/her product influence will become less, as their brothers and sisters get older, they are the first ones to whom the parents will grant more freedom and voice in the family. Finally, the child's grade (CGRADE) also will affect their level of purchase influence, as he/she gets into higher grade, the more freedom s/he will demand from the family.

The regression results in Table 2.1 indicate that mothers' and fathers' age and education are significantly related to acculturation level: the younger the fathers and mothers, the higher their acculturation level, and the more educated the fathers and the mothers, the more acculturated they become. Parents' level of employment did not have any effect on acculturation. As for the children, the younger s/he is the more acculturated they become, whereas the higher the grade they attend, the more they are acculturated. The presence of siblings and older siblings did not have an impact on the acculturation level of the child.

Given the strong correlation of these demographic variables with acculturation, it was decided not to include them as covariates in the model.
Family Incongruence Score

In order to explain why the mediator role of family environment does not exist in
this study, the Family Incongruence Score, which is also from Moos and Moos (1974)
was calculated. The adult family members, especially partners in a family, usually show a
good agreement in describing their family environment (Moos & Moos, 1974).
Therefore, in this study, it is interesting to investigate how closely the Chinese family
members in a family agreed on the characteristics of the family’s social climate,
particularly after immigrating to Canada. Differences in acculturation level for the 3
groups of respondents might exist, this might lead to changes in the level of agreement
regarding the Chinese family environment, even though family harmony is the key in
Chinese culture. By calculating the Family Incongruence Score, the level of disagreement
within the Chinese immigrant families can be revealed.

Family incongruence score is calculated in the following manner (Moos & Moos,
1994): The 10 FES subscale scores of each possible pair of family members are
compared, i.e., fathers and mothers, fathers & children, and mothers and children, in this
case; then the absolute difference between each pair of family members for each subscale
is summed. Finally, the mean of these incongruence scores is calculated to obtain the
Family Incongruence Score. Both the standard scores and raw scores for the Family
Incongruence Score were computed in this study. (See Appendix 5 for Family
Incongruence Score standard score conversion tables, Moos & Moos, 1994)
The mean and standard deviation of this study's family incongruence score are 13.14 and 6.19 respectively. Compared with Moos and Moos’ (1994) study of 1432 normal families, whose mean and standard deviation are 15.31 and 5.30 respectively, my results indicate that the level of disagreement in my sample is lower than that of normal families. This implies that Chinese families are very cohesive in nature. This might help explain why acculturation has a limited impact on the family climate of these families, and why the mediator role of family environment barely exists.

The use of multiple respondents in this study has tried to eliminate the biased depiction of family influence structure by using multiple measures and items that are commonly perceived by all the 3 groups respondents. Having such a lower than average family incongruence score among the Chinese families indicates that the level of discrepancies in family members’ perceptions of a family climate was lower than normal families, and it also suggests a higher multi-rater reliability for this study.
CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSIONS

Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate how teenagers’ influence in family purchase decisions would be affected by acculturation level and changes in the family environment. Four sets of hypotheses were formulated to examine the relationships among these three major concepts.

As the results indicated for hypothesis 1, the acculturation level of the mothers and the children has a positive relationship to the family environment. However, this relationship is not found in all the 10 subscales and not by all the three family members at the same time. The acculturation level has the strongest impact on the FES Personal Growth dimension which reflects a more Western style family environment. And the most important acculturation agents are the mothers, as their acculturation level has the greatest impact on the family environment. Acculturation through the mothers also tend to reinforce some FES subscales that keep the Chinese family unified, this might be the reason why hypothesis 1a is rejected. As indicated in previous studies, Chinese mothers still occupy a central position in the family and they serve as an important ritual symbol of the family life (Lang 1946, Cheng 1946). Therefore, even after immigration, they still serve as the most important socialization agent within the Chinese family, they are the ones to take care and to manage all family matters and child training. This is supported by Moos and Moos’ (1994) findings, which suggested that the basic parenting behavior
would not change even under special circumstances like immigration. Family life can be described as the pivot of Chinese culture (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1991), and a study by Rosenthal and Feldman (1991) also found that both the first and second generation Chinese immigrants still tended to have more structured and more controlling family environments than the non immigrants groups. Chinese are more interested in maintaining their own culture and are less acculturated even after they immigrate (Freeman, 1970). One study conducted in Singapore, indicated that Chinese immigrants are particularly resistant to family role deviance and adhere to a more traditional family orientation (Freeman, 1970). Casella and Kearins (1983) also found that the family environment of Italian immigrants in Australia did not differ from that of Italian families still living in Italy. These findings suggest that the immigrants are more likely to preserve their cultural values.

The second hypothesis is only partially supported. It aimed at examining the relationship between children’s product influence, i.e., the 4 product areas and family environment. Overall, the linkage between the FES subscales and the 4 product categories is not strong, except for expensive family items for which the family environment has more impact on the children’s product influence. This exception is supported Moschis, Moore and Stephens (1977) findings, that teenagers will have more freedom and control in the product categories which are relevant to their own recreation, but for those high priced and high social risk items such as expensive family products in this study, teenagers’ purchase freedom greatly depends on adult family members who
control the family environment, which will strongly affect the children's level of product purchase influence as a result.

The results for hypothesis 2 revealed that for expensive family items, the more cohesive the family and the more emphasis on expressiveness, the more influence children have in these purchase decisions. While a more emphasis on moral religious emphasis and organization, leads to lesser children's influence on the purchase on these expensive family products. A strong family control environment is conducive to lesser children's influence on inexpensive family items and expensive children's products. More emphasis on expressiveness will lead to more children's product influence on expensive children's items. Results for the inexpensive products for children tended to be ambiguous and not logically interpretable. In summary, five FES subscales appear to have an effect on children's influence on purchase decisions, depending on the product category: control, expressiveness, cohesion, moral religious emphasis, and organization.

These findings strongly supported the traditional Chinese family values; Chinese and Western families tend to differ in their family organization and relationships. Particularly, Chinese parents are often less independence-granting and child-focused, and are often more power assertive and more confining than Western parents (Kriger & Kroes, 1972; Rosenthal & Feldman, in press; Vernon, 1982; Yang, 1986). Thus, as the Chinese parents are more controlling, the less product influence their children will have in family purchase decisions.
As implied by Moos and Moos (1994), cohesion, expressiveness, conflict and independence subscales are based on Western values which measure family relationship and level of personal growth by Western standards. However, good and harmonious traditional family relationship in Chinese families are measured by a completely different sets of values. The Chinese family system values members’ dependence on the family, unquestioning acceptance of parental authority, preservation of the status quo and profound loyalty (Bond & Hwang, 1986; Harrison, Serafica, & McAdoo, 1984). In China, conformity not only tends to govern all interpersonal relations, but it also enjoys social and cultural approval (Hsu, 1981). My results indicate that the subscales of expressiveness and independence (one from the FES relationship dimension, while the other from the FES personal growth dimension), have a positive relationship with the children’s product influence and possibly indicate the existence of acculturation because traditional Chinese do not treasure values like expressiveness, conflict and independence. This confirmed Arnold and Orozco (1988) findings which suggested that expressiveness was higher among Latino families that were more acculturated. Therefore, an inspection of the sample’s country of origin might help to provide some insight to these results. If most of the immigrants’ families came from Hong Kong or Singapore, they may be acculturated to Western values before they come to Canada, thus, the acculturation effect to English-Canadian might be magnified in this case. It is possible that better educated and less traditional Chinese are more likely to immigrate to Western countries which treasures more values like expressiveness, conflict and independence.
For hypothesis 3, acculturation level was found to have some positive relationship with children's product influence. For expensive children items, acculturation does not have any effect. The more the mothers' are acculturated the lesser their children's influence in the inexpensive children products. According to Cheng (1946). Chinese mothers are the ones who take care of the family and they need to take care of every internal aspects of family life. Therefore, it will be logical to interpret this finding (when mother acculturation level is negatively related to inexpensive children' product), no matter how acculturated the Chinese mothers were, still, they do want to keep their status and symbolic position at home. they are the only ones to take care of everything, especially for their children. Chinese and Western families tend to differ in their child rearing practices, family organization and relationships. In particular, Chinese parents are more frequently power assertive and restrictive, and are less frequently autonomy-granting and child-focused than Western parents (Kriger & Kroes, 1972; Rosenthal & Feldman, in press; Vernon, 1982; Yang, 1986). According to Rosenthal and Feldman (1991), Chinese teenagers living in the West seemed to have lost their autonomy and were expected to have achievement within the family when comparing with their Western schoolmates. Consistent with other researches on immigrants, Rosenthal, Bell, Demetrious and Efklides (1989) and Rosenthal, Demetrious and Efklides (1989) have indicated that immigrants parents exposed to a new culture are quite concerned about the possibility of their children acculturation. In order to protect the loss of cultural continuity and to maintain their authority, immigrant parents may result in more control and involvement in everything related to their children.
In general, the hypothesis 3 test results did supported Moschis and Moore’s (1979) results which showed that parent’s influence were found to increase with high-risk products or products that the child has little knowledge of. And the role relationship between fathers, mothers and children might vary over stages in the purchase process and purchase decisions (Szybillo and Sosanie 1977).

A mediating role of intellectual-cultural orientation, independence, moral religious emphasis and control between acculturation (mothers and children) and products (expensive family items and inexpensive children products) appeared to be present when looking at the regressions with raw and standardized FES scores.

When compared with Casella and Kearins (1993) results which suggested that Italian immigrants liked to preserve their own values, in fact, Chinese also prefer to do so. They are more interested in their maintaining their own culture even after they immigrated (Freeman 1970). The high level of congruency in the Chinese family environment help explain why, regardless of the degree of acculturation among family members, the Chinese family environment still remains highly unified by the unique Chinese culture which emphasized on family harmony and cohesion, and relatively unaffected by acculturation forces on children's product influence in family purchase decisions. This finding did not support the previous literature that the key and critical issue after immigration is to absorb the values of the host culture. According to these researches, many family rules and values and even traditional role structures that were effective in the country of origin (i.e., Hong Kong) may prove to be less adaptive in the
culture and circumstances of the country of adoption (i.e., Canada) (Moos 1986). Some family's functioning rules may be able to remain unchanged. However, often many other rules will have to undergo changes, which will, in turn, affect the family climate and environment. In this study, results indicated that to the Chinese in Canada, it seems that preservation of their traditional family values and rules are more important than acculturation to the native society.

Limitations and Future Research

Past research tended to use multiple-respondent with single-item data which has led them highly susceptible to unreliability due to perceptual discrepancies among family members. The comparison of the responses for fathers and mothers in Belch et al. (1985) shows that fathers and mothers are basically in agreement with regard to their perceptions of children's influence in family purchase decision. However, children tend to overestimate their own influence and also overstate the influence of each parent. This study has used multiple-respondent, multiple-item measurement approaches in assessing family constructs which help to eliminate part of the perceptual discrepancies among the family members, and ultimately lead to higher reliability. The children's product influence measures came originally from Kim and Lee's (1997) framework, these measures were designed to capture the children's influence relative to the parents and the total influence among the family members. For future research, I would suggest to design separate measures for each group of respondents. Less measurement error is likely to result with more specific measures designed to capture the relative influence of each decision participant (Corfman 1991, Kim and Lee 1997).
Moreover, the 28 ethnicity items aimed at measuring the acculturation of Chinese immigrants towards English Canadian culture. The city where the immigrants chose to settle has an impact on their level of acculturation. This is the place where they came into frequent contact with people from the host society. This study was conducted in Montreal, Quebec where immigrants have to confront a unique situation unlike immigrants to other Canadian cities. In Montreal, there exists two different cultures, i.e., French and English, and 65.1% of the children respondents attend French school, thus, if this study was to measure the French acculturation effect, the results might be more apparent for children.

There is not doubt about the effectiveness of Family Environment Scale in assessing when family is encountering a transition like immigration. According to Moos and Moos’ (1974) instructions to administer the test, instead of self administration by respondents as in this study, all respondents from the same family should complete the 90 items of Form R in the same room, and the administrator should observe the administration and ensure that each person is completing the FES correctly. For feasibility purposes, this study was self-administered by the respondents, brief explanations were only given in the covering letter, hence, the accuracy in completing the FES greatly depended on the respondents' intelligence and/or understanding. Fortunately, in order to compensate for this weakness, all the 90 FES items and administration instructions were translated into Chinese, this helped to eliminate part of the self-administration problems. Moreover, the Family Incongruence Score may also be affected
by self-administration. Future research on family environment should try to have this FES test administered according to Moos and Moos' instructions.

According to Rosenthal and Feldman (1991), teenagers from Chinese immigrants families, disregarding their country of origin, do perceive their families as more structured and controlling and stressing more on achievement than the nonimmigrant Chinese and Westerners. This emphasis on control and achievement is consistent with part of the traditional Chinese family pattern. Thus, same as in the Rosenthal and Feldman's study, bias in the teenagers' respondents might result.

As indicated by Rosenthal and Feldman (1991), differences do exist between the perceptions about their family environment for the first and second generation Chinese. The first-generation Chinese-Australians perceived that they had a more structured family environment rather than a controlling and conflictual one. According to Moos, if the family's acculturation process has been delayed by the first generation (i.e., the parents) intergenerational conflicts of values might occur. Yet, the second-generation Chinese-Americans perceived their family environment as more controlling with their parents monitoring their activities. In my study, the respondents' generation background was not asked, therefore, there is no indication regarding the generation of the Chinese immigrants in Montreal, except for what we can only infer from the years of their residency. Although social class is not explicitly explored, it plays a critical role in providing the parameters of children's purchase influence for the families surveyed. The first generation of Chinese immigrants who have less education and lower skills will tend
to engage in blue collar jobs. However, the second generation immigrants have more education and opportunities to get employed in white collar tasks. Future research should investigate this part since differences in the acculturation level may exist between first and second generation immigrants.

In my study, some of the respondents may be acculturated in their last place of residency already. As a variety of last places of residency did exist in this study; it will be useful to re-classify them into different regions and examine their effects accordingly. Therefore, a further investigation of the country of origin and last place of residency of the respondents is strongly suggested in future studies.

Finally, this thesis is the first study that tries to link acculturation, family environment and children's product influence together in one framework. The major analysis method used to test the linkage between these three constructs is multiple regression. This is an easier way to handle a large number of variables, but the weakness is that the researcher has to interpret the linkage between the whole framework by using results from different regressions. I would recommend using LISREL as the major analysis method in future research, since this method can handle a large number of variables simultaneously and may give a better interpretation of the whole framework.
Conclusion

As stated by McCracken (1988), consumption is a cultural phenomenon. All changes that result from intercultural encounters, i.e., immigration, will have a direct and important consequence on consumption patterns and practices. Since consumption is influenced by cultural factors, immigrants’ consumption should not only reflect the values of their original cultures but also reveal some values of the host society.

Therefore, in a multicultural society like Canada, acculturation which measures the level of cultural changes, must be seen as a bi-directional process whereby interaction of different subcultures have reciprocal influence over one another. Moreover, there is no doubt that family is the most important consumer socialization agent. In this study, the use of the FES scales helps to assess the family climate of the Chinese immigrants in Canada. Consequently, by assessing the changes in the Chinese family environment after immigration, researchers will be able to predict the level of relative consumption influence that the teenagers have in the family on different product category.
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1. Social activities in English community

- I get together with English-Canadians very often.
- My closest friends are English-Canadian.
- Most of the people at the places I go to have fun and relax are English Canadian.
- Most people I visit are English-Canadian.
- Most of my friends are English-Canadian.
- I speak English with most of my friends.
- I participate in activities of an English-Canadian church or association.
- Most of the people who visit me are English-Canadian.
- Of all the people I come in contact with on a day to day basis, most are English-Canadians.

2. English usage at home

- I speak English to my children
- I speak English to my spouse
- In general, I speak English to family members.
- I speak English at family gatherings.
- I speak English when I am angry.
- I use the English language when talking about a personal or emotional problem with family members.

3. Chinese culture attachment level

- I feel very proud of my Chinese cultural background
- I think of myself as Chinese first and as Canadian second
- The Chinese culture has the most positive impact on my life
- I would like to be known as “Chinese”
- I consider myself to be Chinese
- I am still very attached to the Chinese culture

4. Canadian identity

- I consider myself to be Canadian
- I would like to be known as “Canadian”
- I feel very attached to all aspects of the English-Canadian culture.

5. Level of comfort in using English

- The newspaper/magazines I read are mostly in the English language
- The movies/video tapes I see are mostly in the English language
- Socially, I feel at ease with English-Canadians.
- I am very comfortable dealing with English-Canadians.
| Table 1.1  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Products Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Expensive products for the family</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The family car  
A house for the family  
A television set for the family  
A stereo system for the family  
Where to go for a family vacation |
| 2. **Expensive products for the children** |
| A stereo system for this child  
A bicycle for this child  
A Walkman for this child  
Computer games for this child  
Clothes for this child |
| 3. **Inexpensive products for the family** |
| Toothpaste for the family  
Shampoo for the family  
Breakfast cereal for the family  
Ketchup for the family  
Soft drinks for the family  
What movie the family should go to  
Which restaurant to go to for the family dinner |
| 4. **Inexpensive products for the children** |
| Records for this child  
What movie this child should go to  
Magazines for this child  
Shoes for this child |
### Table 1.2

**Family Environment Scale Subscale Descriptions**

#### Relationship Dimensions

1. **Cohesion**  
   The extent to which family members are concerned and committed to the family and the degree to which family members are helpful and supportive of each other.

2. **Expressiveness**  
   The extent to which family members are allowed and encouraged to act openly and to express their feelings directly.

3. **Conflict**  
   The extent to which the open expression of anger and aggression and generally conflictual interactions are characteristic of the family.

#### Personal Growth Dimensions

4. **Independence**  
   The extent to which family members are encouraged to be assertive, self-sufficient, to make their own decisions and to think things out for themselves.

5. **Achievement Orientation**  
   The extent to which different types of activities (i.e. school and work) are cast into an achievement oriented or competitive framework.

6. **Intellectual-Cultural Orientation**  
   The extent to which the family is concerned about political, social, intellectual and cultural activities.

7. **Active Recreational Orientation**  
   The extent to which the family participates actively in various kinds of recreational and sporting activities.

8. **Moral Religious Emphasis**  
   The extent to which the family actively discusses and emphasizes ethical and religious issues and values.

#### System Maintenance Dimensions

9. **Organization**  
   Measures how important order and organization is in the family in terms of structuring the family activities, financial planning, and explicitness and clarity in regard to family rules and responsibilities.

10. **Control**  
    Assess the extent to which the family is organized in a hierarchical manner, the rigidity of family rules and procedures and the extent to which family members order each other around.
### Table 1.3
#### Demographic Profile

1) **The Age of the Parents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>Percent of Fathers</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>Percent of Mothers</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **Age of the child as a respondent**

   Mean age: 15.61 years old

3) **Average years of marriage**

   Fathers' mean: 20.48 years
   Mothers' mean: 20.29 years

4) **The Total family income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Categories</th>
<th>Percent of Fathers</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $20k</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30k</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40k</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50k</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60k</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70k</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80k</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 80k</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Categories</th>
<th>Percent of Mothers</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $20k</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30k</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40k</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50k</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60k</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70k</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80k</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 80k</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) **Number of children**

   Fathers' mean: 2.54
   Mothers' mean: 2.54

6) **The Parents highest level of education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent of Fathers</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partial high school or less</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial community college/technical school/CEGEP</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed community college/technical school/CEGEP</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial University</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed/University or more</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.3 continue

#### Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>percent of mothers</th>
<th>cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partial high school or less</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial community college/technical school/CEGEP</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed community college/technical school/CEGEP</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial University</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed /university or more</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Levels of education received in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>percent of fathers</th>
<th>cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high School</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior high School</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college/technical school/CEGEP</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parents Place of Birth

- Fathers’ mean: 2.35 indicated mostly are born in Mainland China.
- Mothers’ mean: 2.39 indicated mostly are born in Mainland China.
- Children’s mean: 2.32 indicated on average are also born in Mainland China.

#### Years of residency in Canada

- Fathers’ mean: 12.56 years
- Mothers’ mean: 11.42 years
- Children’s mean: 6.28 years

#### Parents last place of residency before moving to Canada

- Fathers on average are from either Hong Kong or Mainland China.
- Mothers on average are from Mainland China.
- Children on average are from Mainland China.

#### Most comfortable language

- Fathers’ mean: 1.94 which indicated either Mandarin or Cantonese
- Mothers’ mean: 1.90 which indicated either Mandarin or Cantonese
- Children’s mean: 3.48 which indicated either English or French

#### Parents’ French speaking ability

- Fathers’ mean: 1.60 indicated either do not speak French at all or speak poorly
- Mothers’ mean: 1.66 indicated either do not speak French at all or speak poorly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings FA</th>
<th>Factor Loadings MA</th>
<th>Factor Loadings CH</th>
<th>Mean Standard Deviation FA</th>
<th>Mean Standard Deviation MA</th>
<th>Mean Standard Deviation CH</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1: Social Circle in English Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My closest friends are English-Canadian.</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>2.0097</td>
<td>1.8381</td>
<td>2.2952</td>
<td>0.9317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get together with English-Canadians very often.</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>2.5728</td>
<td>2.4095</td>
<td>2.8952</td>
<td>0.9174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the people at the places I go to have fun and relax are English Canadian</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>2.5825</td>
<td>2.4381</td>
<td>2.9524</td>
<td>0.9179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people I visit are English-Canadian</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>1.9029</td>
<td>1.781</td>
<td>2.1714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of my friends are English-Canadian</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>2.3204</td>
<td>2.1238</td>
<td>2.8857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English with most of my friends</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>2.0971</td>
<td>2.0571</td>
<td>3.0381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in activities of an English-Canadian church or association</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>1.8447</td>
<td>1.7429</td>
<td>2.0857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the people who visit me are English-Canadian</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>1.8738</td>
<td>1.7143</td>
<td>2.1143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2: English usage at home</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the English language when talking about a personal or emotional problem with</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>1.6916</td>
<td>1.5701</td>
<td>1.8889</td>
<td>0.9462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0676</td>
<td>0.9724</td>
<td>1.0707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English at family gatherings</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>1.6636</td>
<td>1.5514</td>
<td>1.7593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I speak English to family members</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>1.8037</td>
<td>1.7103</td>
<td>1.9074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English to my children</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>1.9159</td>
<td>1.8785</td>
<td>1.8889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English to my spouse</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>1.757</td>
<td>1.6355</td>
<td>2.5093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English when I am angry</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>1.757</td>
<td>1.6636</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.4 continue
Acculturation Factor Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings FA</th>
<th>Factor Loadings MA</th>
<th>Factor Loadings CH</th>
<th>Mean Standard Deviation FA</th>
<th>Mean Standard Deviation MA</th>
<th>Mean Standard Deviation CH</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha FA</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha MA</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha CH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3: Chinese culture attachment</strong></td>
<td>0.801 0.828 0.729</td>
<td>4.2661 4.2037 3.4815</td>
<td>0.9393 1.048 1.1396</td>
<td>0.8348</td>
<td>0.8851</td>
<td>0.7982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chinese culture has the most positive impact on my life</td>
<td>0.782 0.832 0.723</td>
<td>4.055 4.213 3.9167</td>
<td>1.0873 1.1111 1.0333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be known as &quot;Chinese&quot;</td>
<td>0.701 0.8 0.697</td>
<td>4.2477 4.1296 3.7685</td>
<td>0.9345 1.0598 1.0643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still very attached to the Chinese culture</td>
<td>0.692 0.849 0.719</td>
<td>4.3211 4.2593 4.037</td>
<td>0.9117 1.0445 1.0132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very proud of my Chinese cultural background</td>
<td>0.679 0.695 0.691</td>
<td>4.3578 4.3241 3.9722</td>
<td>0.8663 1.0031 1.1394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think of myself as Chinese first and as Canadian second</td>
<td>0.657 0.787 0.612</td>
<td>4.5505 4.6204 4.4074</td>
<td>0.7875 0.77 0.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be Chinese</td>
<td>0.657 0.787 0.612</td>
<td>4.5505 4.6204 4.4074</td>
<td>0.7875 0.77 0.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4: Canadian identity</strong></td>
<td>0.7705 0.8268 0.7756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be Canadian</td>
<td>0.883 0.867 0.757</td>
<td>3.5505 3.5229 3.7037</td>
<td>1.1012 1.2141 1.0874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be known as &quot;Canadian&quot;</td>
<td>0.884 0.911 0.836</td>
<td>3.5596 3.6055 3.3981</td>
<td>1.1582 1.2173 1.1352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 5: Level of comfort in English</strong></td>
<td>0.7973 0.8158 0.8234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very comfortable dealing with English-Canadians</td>
<td>0.511 0.538 0.762</td>
<td>2.6667 2.5 3.1963</td>
<td>1.2679 1.213 1.2243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The newspaper / magazines I read are mostly in the English language</td>
<td>0.408 0.49 0.587</td>
<td>2.3056 2.1509 3.0187</td>
<td>1.3287 1.2709 1.4665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially, I feel at ease with English-Canadians</td>
<td>0.533 0.498 0.669</td>
<td>2.9907 2.717 3.3551</td>
<td>1.2342 1.2631 1.1595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The movies / video tapes I see are mostly in English language</td>
<td>0.371 0.721 0.585</td>
<td>2.5 2.4245 3.1121</td>
<td>1.1721 1.2263 1.2982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Factor Loadings</td>
<td>Mean Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Expensive item for family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The family car</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>1.934</td>
<td>1.8426</td>
<td>1.7757</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stereo system for the family</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>2.3868</td>
<td>2.537</td>
<td>2.4206</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A television set for the family</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>2.1862</td>
<td>2.1776</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A house for the family</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>1.8688</td>
<td>1.9167</td>
<td>1.8598</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Expensive item for child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bicycle for this child</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>3.4815</td>
<td>3.6075</td>
<td>3.7156</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stereo system for this child</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>3.4259</td>
<td>3.486</td>
<td>3.3578</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>1.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A walkman for this child</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>3.5741</td>
<td>3.8318</td>
<td>3.9633</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Inexpensive item for family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shampoo for the family</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>2.6606</td>
<td>2.5926</td>
<td>2.5688</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>1.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth paste for the family</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>2.1743</td>
<td>2.0741</td>
<td>2.0459</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketchup for the family</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>2.7523</td>
<td>2.6481</td>
<td>2.2936</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>1.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast cereal for the family</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>3.1193</td>
<td>3.3611</td>
<td>2.9266</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>1.397</td>
<td>1.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Inexpensive item for child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records for the child</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>4.1019</td>
<td>4.1121</td>
<td>4.3396</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What movie this child should go to</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>3.6574</td>
<td>3.785</td>
<td>4.1698</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>1.229</td>
<td>1.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes for this child</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4393</td>
<td>3.7358</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>1.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines for this child</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>3.9065</td>
<td>4.4434</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes for this child</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>3.7963</td>
<td>3.9439</td>
<td>4.0849</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.6
Notations for all variables

Acculturation Variables

FACCULT= fathers' acculturation level  
MACCULT= mothers' acculturation level  
CACCULT= children's acculturation level

Family Environment Variables

COH= cohesion  
EXPR= expressiveness  
CONF= conflict  
IND= independence  
ACH= achievement orientation  
INT= intellectual-cultural orientation  
ACT= active recreational orientation  
MOR= moral religious emphasis  
ORG= organization  
CONT= control

Product Variables

INCHILD = inexpensive products for the child  
EXCHILD= expensive products for the child  
INFAM= inexpensive products for the family  
EXFAM= expensive products for the family

Demographic Variables (Covariance)

FAGE= fathers' age  
FENPLOY= fathers' employment status  
FEDUC= fathers' education level  
MAGE= mothers' age  
MENPLOY= mothers' employment status  
MEDUC= mothers' education level  
CAGE= children's age  
CSIBL= number of siblings  
COLDER= number of older siblings  
CGRADE= children's grade at school
### Table 1.7a

**Raw Score Regression Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Regression Coefficient (t-value)</th>
<th>One-way Adjusted R2 (F-value)</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COH</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.091 (2.393)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>5.823 (13.286)</td>
<td>0.0473 (5.725)</td>
<td>0.0187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>CACCULT</td>
<td>0.0375 (1.523)</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>4.422 (12.99)</td>
<td>0.014 (2.32)</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>FACCULT</td>
<td>0.065 (1.301)</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.106 (2.106)</td>
<td>0.019 (5.845)</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>3.157 (5.845)</td>
<td>0.109 (6.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.101 (2.658)</td>
<td>0.005 (7.365)</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>3.218 (7.365)</td>
<td>0.06 (7.064)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.0866 (2.281)</td>
<td>0.012 (5.204)</td>
<td>0.0248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>3.23 (7.41)</td>
<td>0.042 (5.204)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.075 (1.733)</td>
<td>0.043 (3.003)</td>
<td>0.0864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>5.772 (11.633)</td>
<td>0.021 (3.003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.069 (1.591)</td>
<td>0.057 (2.533)</td>
<td>0.1149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.7b
Standard Score Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Regression Coefficient (t-value)</th>
<th>One-way sig. T</th>
<th>Adjusted R2 (F-value)</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COH</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.613 (2.321)</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.0224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>43.177 (14.242)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>CACCULT</td>
<td>0.317 (1.588)</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>31.025 (11.233)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>FACCULT</td>
<td>0.533 (1.627)</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.598 (1.81)</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>33.248 (9.377)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.529 (2.806)</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.0061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>38.227 (17.309)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.455 (2.027)</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>41.011 (15.909)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.462 (2.022)</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>50.053 (19.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.965 (2.518)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CACCULT</td>
<td>-0.764 (-2.104)</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>46.956 (10.203)</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.8a

**Raw Score Regression Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Regression Coefficient ($t$-value)</th>
<th>One-way sig. T (F-value)</th>
<th>Adjusted R$^2$</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2: Family Environment</td>
<td>Children's Product Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCHILD</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>(2.426)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT</td>
<td>-0.311</td>
<td>(-1.628)</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
<td>(1.321)</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>17.258</td>
<td>(9.396)</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>(3.047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFAM</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>-0.469</td>
<td>(-2.242)</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>12.239</td>
<td>(13.137)</td>
<td>0.0391</td>
<td>(5.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCHILD</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>-0.401</td>
<td>(-2.597)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>12.475</td>
<td>(18.186)</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>(6.746)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXFAM</td>
<td>COH</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>(1.754)</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>(2.124)</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>(2.459)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>-0.476</td>
<td>(-2.562)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>-0.425</td>
<td>(-2.147)</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>(2.179)</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>(4.194)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.8b
**Standard Score Regression Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Regression Coefficient (t-value)</th>
<th>One-way sig. T</th>
<th>Adjusted R² (F-value)</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCHILD</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>0.087 (2.273)</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT</td>
<td>-0.047 (1.6)</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>-0.059 (-1.617)</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>20.081 (8.44)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.056 (3.006)</td>
<td>0.0341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFAM</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>-0.057 (-2.065)</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>12.991 (9.637)</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.032 (4.263)</td>
<td>0.0416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCHILD</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>-0.043 (-2.118)</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>12.668 (12.872)</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.034 (4.486)</td>
<td>0.0367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXFAM</td>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>0.068 (2.107)</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>0.049 (1.507)</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>-0.069 (-2.198)</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>-0.041 (-1.83)</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>8.485 (3.342)</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.116 (4.247)</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 1.9a
### Raw Score Regression Results

### H3: Acculturation → Children's Product Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>One-way sig. T</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Sig. F (F-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCHILD</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>-0.234 (-2.374)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CACCULT</td>
<td>0.202 (2.163)</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>18.243 (15.263)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>(3.424)</td>
<td>0.0369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFAM</td>
<td>FACCULT</td>
<td>0.189 (2.073)</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>8.164 (7.428)</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>(4.298)</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCHILD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXFAM</td>
<td>CACCULT</td>
<td>0.133 (1.896)</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>6.518 (6.679)</td>
<td>0.0274</td>
<td>(3.594)</td>
<td>0.0612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1.9b
#### Standard Score Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Regression Coefficient ($t$-value)</th>
<th>One-way Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>Sig. F ($F$-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCHILD</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>-0.234 (-2.374)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CACCULT</td>
<td>0.202 (2.163)</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>18.243 (15.263)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>(3.424) 0.0369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFAM</td>
<td>FACCULT</td>
<td>0.188 (2.073)</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>8.164 (7.428)</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
<td>(4.299) 0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCHILD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXFAM</td>
<td>CACCULT</td>
<td>0.133 (1.896)</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>6.518 (6.679)</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>(3.594) 0.0612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>Unstandardized Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>One-way sig T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COH</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>(0.293)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>5.532</td>
<td>(13.299)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>CACCULT**</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>(1.533)</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>4.432</td>
<td>(12.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>FACCULT</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>(1.301)</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MACCULT*</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>(2.106)</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>(3.845)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>(2.656)</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>3.218</td>
<td>(7.769)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>(2.291)</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>(7.43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>(1.722)</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>5.772</td>
<td>(11.833)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>(1.581)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>3.416</td>
<td>(8.843)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1: Accult</td>
<td>FES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: FES</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Accult</td>
<td>Prod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Accult</td>
<td>FES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.0b: Standard Score Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H1: Accult</th>
<th>FES</th>
<th>H2: FES</th>
<th>PROD</th>
<th>H3: ACCULT</th>
<th>PROD</th>
<th>H4: ACCULT</th>
<th>PROD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Unstandardized Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>One-way t-value</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Unstandardized Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>One-way t-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COH</td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>(2.221)</td>
<td>INCHILD</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>(2.273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>43.177</td>
<td>(14.242)</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>(1.568)</td>
<td>MOR*</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>(-1.417)</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>31.025</td>
<td>(11.233)</td>
<td>INFAM</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>(-2.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INT</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>(1.627)</td>
<td>EXCHILD</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>(-2.118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>(1.91)</td>
<td>EXFAM</td>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>(2.107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>33.268</td>
<td>(9.377)</td>
<td>EXFAM</td>
<td>CONTA</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>(1.507)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>(2.608)</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>(-2.207)</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>(2.029)</td>
<td>EXFAM</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>(2.342)</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>50.053</td>
<td>(19.017)</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>(-2.104)</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND***</td>
<td>0.0534</td>
<td>(1.498)</td>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>(-2.241)</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>(2.241)</td>
<td>CONT**</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>(-1.909)</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>(1.909)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** R² values are not provided in the table.
# Table 2.1

**Demographic Regression Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Regression Coefficient (t-value)</th>
<th>One-way sig. T</th>
<th>Adjusted R2</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACCULT</td>
<td>FAGE</td>
<td>-1.023947 (-1.691)</td>
<td>0.04725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEDUC</td>
<td>0.694079 (3.072)</td>
<td>0.00145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>13.915285 (5.269)</td>
<td>0.09862</td>
<td>(5.70446)</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACCULT</td>
<td>MAGE</td>
<td>-1.562556 (-2.060)</td>
<td>0.02125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEDUC</td>
<td>1.063656 (3.966)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>14.12752 (4.819)</td>
<td>0.15926</td>
<td>(9.14550)</td>
<td>0.00015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACCULT</td>
<td>CAGE</td>
<td>-0.886818 (-1.571)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CGRADE</td>
<td>1.187488 (2.239)</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>15.401934 (3.485)</td>
<td>0.06248</td>
<td>(3.86571)</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Major Source Countries
Principaux pays sources

- Taiwan 7,456 (2.0%)
- India / Inde 12,675 (5.0%)
- Vietnam / Viêt-Nam 7,681 (3.2%)
- Philippines 13,273 (5.2%)
- Hong Kong 38,910 (15.4%)
- China / Chine 10,429 (4.1%)
- U.S.A. / États-Unis 7,537 (3.0%)
- Poland / Pologne 11,876 (4.7%)
- Gr. Britain / Gr.-Bretagne 7,138 (2.8%)
- Sri Lanka 12,635 (5.0%)
- Others / Autres 123,230 (48.7%)
### Appendix 2

#### Countries from which more than 4,000 Immigrants were Admitted in Canada During the Last Four Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>83,126</td>
<td>18,418</td>
<td>27,813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>65,946</td>
<td>14,605</td>
<td>22,111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>60,227</td>
<td>16,105</td>
<td>11,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>51,767</td>
<td>12,319</td>
<td>14,209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>50,840</td>
<td>12,374</td>
<td>13,717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>38,669</td>
<td>10,684</td>
<td>6,616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>35,644</td>
<td>9,210</td>
<td>7,814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>26,233</td>
<td>6,804</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>26,051</td>
<td>4,401</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>24,326</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Azores Madeira)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>22,033</td>
<td>5,384</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>21,838</td>
<td>4,931</td>
<td>7,046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>20,149</td>
<td>4,709</td>
<td>6,021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>20,115</td>
<td>4,806</td>
<td>5,697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>17,997</td>
<td>3,659</td>
<td>7,019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>13,102</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>12,615</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>11,470</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>11,060</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>10,667</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>3,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>10,103</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>5,309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>10,048</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>9,918</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>9,845</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>9,561</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>9,022</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>3,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>9,848</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>7,299</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>6,431</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>6,232</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>5,641</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>5,382</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5,312</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>5,206</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>5,083</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>4,615</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>4,569</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>2,495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4,569</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>4,212</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>4,212</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>771,501</td>
<td>197,469</td>
<td>219,905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary data as of August 31, 1992.

### International Immigrants to the Province of Ontario by Place of Birth, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>11,920</td>
<td>20,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>16,944</td>
<td>25,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Europe</td>
<td>8,371</td>
<td>28,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>11,028</td>
<td>15,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>10,561</td>
<td>20,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>67,167</td>
<td>123,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and Central America</td>
<td>6,781</td>
<td>18,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>10,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, U.S.S.R., Greece, Yugoslavia, East Germany, Slovenia, Bosnia-Hercegovina, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Albania, Bulgaria and Romania.
2 Includes Israel, Lebanon, Syria, Cyprus, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, Yemen Arab Rep., Yemen Dem. Rep. and the Arab Emirates.

Source: Employment and Immigration Canada, Immigration Statistics, annual publication.
Appendix 3
Questionnaire Samples
English Version
**FATHER QUESTIONNAIRE**

**SECTION 1:** The following statements describe how you may feel about yourself and conduct daily activities in the multicultural environment of Canada. Please read each statement and indicate how strongly you personally agree or disagree with it by circling an appropriate number. If at any point you do not know the answer, your best estimate will be good enough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be Canadian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very proud of my Chinese cultural background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think of myself as Chinese first and as Canadian second</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chinese culture has the most positive impact on my life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be known as “Chinese”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be known as “Canadian”</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still very attached to the Chinese culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English to my children</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English to my spouse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, I speak English to family members.  

| The newspaper / magazines I read are mostly in the English language | 12                | 13            |
| The movies / video tapes I see are mostly in the English language | 13                | 14            |
| I speak English at family gatherings                             | 14                | 15            |
| I speak English when I am angry                                  | 15                | 16            |
| I use the English language when talking about a personal or emotional problem with family members. | 16                | 17            |
| I speak English with most of my friends                         | 17                | 18            |
| Most of my friends are English-Canadian                         | 18                | 19            |
| Most of the people at the places I go to have fun and relax are English Canadian | 19                | 20            |

Of all the people I come in contact with on a day to day basis, most are English-Canadians.  

| Socially, I feel at ease with English-Canadians                  | 20                | 21            |
| I get together with English-Canadians very often                | 21                | 22            |
| I participate in activities of an English-Canadian church or association | 22                | 23            |
| My closest friends are English-Canadian                         | 23                | 24            |
| Most of the people who visit me are English-Canadian            | 24                | 25            |
| Most people I visit are English-Canadian                        | 25                | 26            |
| I am very comfortable dealing with English-Canadians            | 26                | 27            |
| I feel very attached to all aspects of the English-Canadian culture | 27                | 28            |
**SECTION II:** Between you (both you and your spouse) and the child who brought this questionnaire to you, who decides what to buy for the following products? Please circle the number on each scale that is closest to your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>We (my spouse and I) decide entirely</th>
<th>We and our child jointly</th>
<th>Our child decides entirely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothes for this child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records for this child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth paste for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shampoo for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes for this child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast cereal for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketchup for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft drinks for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stereo system for this child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bicycle for this child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Walkman for this child
The family car
What movie the family should go to
Where the family should go
A house for the family
A television set for the family
A stereo system for the family
Magazines for this child
Which restaurant to go to for the family dinner
Where to go for a family vacation
Computer games for this child
SECTION IV: Demographic data for statistical purpose

1. What is your age?
   ___ 20-30
   ___ 31-40
   ___ 41-50
   ___ 51-60
   ___ over 60

2. Sex: ___ Male
       ___ Female

3. How long have you been married? ______ years

4. Are you a single parent family? ___ Yes ___ No

5. How many children do you have? ______

6. What was the total family income?
   ___ under $20,000
   ___ $20,001-30,000
   ___ $30,001-40,000
   ___ $40,001-50,000
   ___ $50,001-60,000
   ___ $60,001-70,000
   ___ $70,001-80,000
   ___ over $80,000

7. Are you employed: Full time ___ Part time ___ Not working ___

If employed, what type of work do you do for what type of company?
(Example: A sales representative for an automobile dealership)

8. What is your highest level of education?
   ___ Partial high school or less
   ___ Completed high school
   ___ Partial community college/technical school/CEGEP
   ___ Completed community college/technical school/CEGEP
   ___ Partial university
   ___ Completed university or more

9. Which of the following levels of education that you received were in English?
   ___ Never
   ___ Elementary School
   ___ Junior high school
   ___ Senior high school
   ___ Community college/technical school/CEGEP
   ___ University

10. Where were you born? ________________________

11. If not born in Canada, how long have you been residing in Canada? _______ years

12. Last place of your residency before you moved to Canada: (if not born in Canada) ________________________

13. Which language do you feel most comfortable with? (Check only one)
    ___ Mandarin ___ Cantonese ___ English
    ___ French ___ Other (specify) ___________________

14. How would you assess your ability to speak French?
    ___ Do not speak French at all
    ___ Poor ________________________
    ___ Good ________________________
    ___ Very Good ________________________

Thank you for your participation!
**MOTHER QUESTIONNAIRE**

**SECTION 1:** The following statements describe how you may feel about yourself and conduct daily activities in the multicultural environment of Canada. Please read each statement and indicate how strongly you personally agree or disagree with it by circling an appropriate number. If at any point you do not know the answer, your best estimate will be good enough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very proud of my Chinese cultural background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think of myself as Chinese first and as Canadian second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chinese culture has the most positive impact on my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be known as &quot;Chinese&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be known as &quot;Canadian&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still very attached to the Chinese culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English to my children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English to my spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, I speak English to family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The newspaper / magazines I read are mostly in the English language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The movies / video tapes I see are mostly in the English language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English at family gatherings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English when I am angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the English language when talking about a personal or emotional problem with family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English with most of my friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of my friends are English-Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the people at the places I go to have fun and relax are English Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of all the people I come in contact with on a day to day basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most are English-Canadians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially, I feel at ease with English-Canadians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get together with English-Canadians very often.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in activities of an English-Canadian church or association.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My closest friends are English-Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the people who visit me are English-Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people I visit are English-Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very comfortable dealing with English-Canadians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very attached to all aspects of the English-Canadian culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION II: Between you (both you and your spouse) and the child who brought this questionnaire to you, who decide what to buy for the following products? Please circle the number on each scale that is closest to your answer.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>We (my spouse and I) decide entirely</th>
<th>We and our child jointly</th>
<th>Our child decides entirely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothes for this child</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records for this child</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toothpaste for the family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shampoo for the family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes for this child</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast cereal for the family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketchup for the family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft drinks for the family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stereo system for this child</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bicycle for this child</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Walkman for this child</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The family car</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What movie this child should go to</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What movie the family should go to</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A house for the family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A television set for the family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stereo system for the family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines for this child</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which restaurant to go to for the family dinner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where to go for a family vacation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer games for this child</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV: Demographic data for statistical purpose

1. What is your age?
   ___ under 20       ___ 21-30       ___ 31-40
   ___ 41-50       ___ 51-60       ___ over 60

2. Sex: ___ Male       ___ Female

3. How long have you been married? _____ years

4. Are you a single parent family? ___ Yes       ___ No

5. How many children do you have? ______________________

6. What was the total family income?
   ___ under $ 20,000       ___ $ 20,001-30,000       ___ $30,001- 40,000
   ___ $ 40,001-50,000       ___ $ 50,001-60,000       ___ $ 60,001- 70,000
   ___ $ 70,001-80,000       ___ over $ 80,000

   " Are you employed:       Full time _____ Part time _____ Not working _____

If employed, what type of work do you do for what type of company?
(Example: A sales representative for an automobile dealership)

5. What is your highest level of education?
   ___ Partial high school or less
   ___ Completed high school
   ___ partial community college/technical school/ CEGEP
   ___ completed community college/technical school/ CEGEP
   ___ partial university
   ___ completed university or more

9. Which of the following levels of education that you received were in English?
   Never
   ___ Elementary School
   ___ Junior high school
   ___ Senior high school
   ___ community college/technical school/ CEGEP
   ___ University

10. Where were you born? ______________________

11. If not born in Canada, how long have you been residing in Canada? _____ years

12. Last place of your residency before you moved to Canada: (if not born in Canada) ______________________

13. Which language do you feel most comfortable with? (Check only one)
   ___ Mandarin       ___ Cantonese       ___ English
   ___ French         ___ Other (specify) _____

14. How would you assess your ability to speak French?
    ___ Do not speak French at all
    ___ Poor
    ___ Good
    ___ Very Good

Thank you for your participation!
CHILD QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 1: The following statements describe how you may feel about yourself and conduct daily activities in the multicultural environment of Canada. Please read each statement and indicate how strongly you personally agree or disagree with it by circling an appropriate number. If at any point you do not know the answer, your best estimate will be good enough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very proud of my Chinese cultural background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think of myself as Chinese first and as Canadian second</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chinese culture has the most positive impact on my life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be known as &quot;Chinese&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be known as &quot;Canadian&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still very attached to the Chinese culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English to my parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English to my brothers &amp; sisters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I speak English to family members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The newspaper / magazines I read are mostly in the English language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The movies / video tapes I see are mostly in the English language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English at family gatherings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English when I am angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the English language when talking about a personal or emotional problem with family members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak English with most of my friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of my friends are English-Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the people at the places I go to have fun and relax are English-Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of all the people I come in contact with on a day to day basis.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most are English-Canadians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially, I feel at ease with English-Canadians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get together with English-Canadians very often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in activities of an English-Canadian church or association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My closest friends are English-Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the people who visit me are English-Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people I visit are English-Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very comfortable dealing with English-Canadians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very attached to all aspects of the English-Canadian culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION II:** Between you and your parents, who decide what to buy for the following products? Please circle the number on each scale that is closest to your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>My parents entirely</th>
<th>My Parents and I jointly</th>
<th>Myself entirely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothes for you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records for you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toothpaste for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shampoo for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes for you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast cereal for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketchup for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft drinks for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stereo system for you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bicycle for you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Walkman for you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The family car</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What movie you should go to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What movie the family should go to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A house for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A television set for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stereo system for the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines for you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which restaurant to go to for the family dinner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where to go for a family vacation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer software for you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV: Demographic data for statistical purpose

You are ___________ years old.

You are a _______ male _______ female

How many brothers and sisters do you presently have living with you at home? ________

How many are older than you? _______________

What is your grade? _______________

What type of school do you attend? _______________ English _______________ French

Do you have a job? No ________ Yes, part-time __________ Yes, full-time __________

If yes, approximately how much do you make per month? $ __________

Where were you born? _______________

If not born in Canada, how long have you been living in Canada? _______________ years

Last place you lived in before moving to Canada (if not born in Canada) _______________

What language do you feel most comfortable with?

____________ Mandarin ______________ Cantonese ______________ English

____________ French ______________ Other (specify) ______________

Thank you for your participation!
Chinese Version
父親問卷

以下各句子都有可能形容你對自己及生活在加拿大多元文化社會的一些意見。請小心閱讀每一句子，然後圈上適當號碼以表示對該句子的贊同或不贊同程度。如對任何句子有問題，請與圈上的數字作為

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>質疑之同意</th>
<th>質疑之不同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我認为自己是中國人。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我認为自己是加拿大人。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我的中國文化使我感覺到十分驕傲。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我討論自己的中國文化時感到十分自豪。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我對自己的生活產生負面的看法。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我對自己生活產生正面的看法。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我希望別人把我當成加拿大人。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我希望別人把我當成中國人。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英語與我的女兒交談。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英語與我的配偶交談。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我一般用英語與我的家庭成員交談。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我的閱讀的報紙及雜誌大部分是英語。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我的觀看的電影及錄影帶大部分是英語。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會在家裡講英語。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會在家裡讀英語。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>每逢與家人談論個人及感情問題時，我會用英語。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我用英語與大部份朋友交談。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我的大部分朋友都是說英語的加拿大人。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在我常去的地方所見到的大部分是說英語的加拿大人。</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

在你家中，你與你的配偶，與那位與你同住的孩子之間，由誰決定購買以下的東西？請小心閱讀每個

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>由我們</th>
<th>由我們與孩子</th>
<th>由孩子全權</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>一起決定</td>
<td>決定</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孩子的玩具</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孩子的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家庭的車子</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家庭的電視機</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家庭的收音機</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家庭的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孩子的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家庭的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孩子的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孩子的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孩子的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家庭的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孩子的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孩子的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家庭的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孩子的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孩子的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家庭的書籍</td>
<td>☐  ☒  ☑  ☐  ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
內部
以下有九十項有關於家庭的句子，請你決定那項是適合於你的家庭。如果是適合形容你家庭或人至
上適合，請在(是)上圈上，不適合的句子或比較不適合的，請在(否)上圈上。

某些句子是適用於部分家庭成員，但卻不適用於其他家庭成員，如果對於大部份家庭成員是對的，
請在(是)上圈上。對於大部份家庭是不對的，請在(否)上圈上。若句子適用於一半的家庭成員，請
作出決定圈上你認為比較合適的選擇。

請記住：我們是希望知道你個人對於自己家庭的觀感。所以，請不必考慮其他家庭成員的觀感，只
需提供你個人對於自己家庭的意見。

1. 家庭成員喜歡互相幫忙。
2. 家庭成員將自己的想法埋藏在心裏。
3. 家庭成員經常吵架。
4. 我們很少單獨行動。
5. 我們幾乎任何事也應該全力以赴做到最好。
6. 我們經常討論社會與政治上的問題。
7. 我們經常一起在客廳度過週末與晚上。
8. 家庭成員經常有去教堂，猶太教會堂或主日學的習慣。
9. 家庭活動是經過詳細的計劃。
10. 家庭成員很少互相命令對方。
11. 我們時常在家中消磨時間。
12. 我們可以在家中說任何事。
13. 家庭成員很少公開發怒。
14. 在我們家中，我們鼓勵獨立。
15. 我們家庭極著重於積極面對人生。
16. 我們很少去聽講座，看舞臺劇或音樂會。
17. 朋友們經常來我們的家吃飯或探望。
18. 我們不在家中祈禱。
19. 我們經常保持清潔與整齊。
20. 在我們家中沒有少許規則可遵循。
21. 我們很盡力做家事的事。
22. 在我們家中很少放棄怒氣而不怒怒他人。
23. 家庭成員有時會在發怒時扭扭東西。
24. 我們各自為自己打算。
25. 一個人賺錢的多與少對於我們並不重要。
26. 我們家人對學習新事物非常重視。
27. 在我們家中沒有人熱衷於運動，如棒球，保齡球。
28. 我們經常討論聖誕節，逾越節或其它節日的宗教意義。
29. 在我們家中很少尋找物件。
30. 在我們家中有一位成員決定大多數的問題。
31. 我們一家人非常團結。
32. 我們會互相傾訴我們的私事。
33. 家庭成員很少發怒。
34. 我們在家中可以隨意出入。
35. 我們深信有競爭才有進步。
36. 我們對文化活動不感興趣。
37. 我們經常去看電影，體育活動，露營等。
38. 我們不信有天堂或地獄的存在。
39. 守時在我們家中非常重要。
40. 在我們家中有一套特定的做事方法。
41. 我們很少自顧做家中事。
42. 我們有時會一起做家事。
43. 家庭成員經常互相批評。
44. 家庭成員很少私底下有爭吵。
45. 我們每週都有次數家庭聚會。
46. 我們很少作賢妻的討論。
47. 我們每天一起去上班。
48. 家庭成員有特殊的情色觀念。
49. 家庭成員常改變意見。
50. 我們家家規重家庭規律。
51. 我們家庭成員互相支持。
52. 如你在家中投訴，家裏會有人感不安。
53. 家庭成員有時會打架。
54. 家庭成員很少為升遷和學校成績而愁。
55. 家庭成員很少為升遷和學校成績而愁。
56. 其中一位家庭成員有玩樂器。
57. 家庭成員很少參與工作和學校以外的活動。
58. 我們相信有些是難以接受的。
59. 家庭成員定時各自的家庭聚會。
60. 在家庭聚會上，家庭成員也有平等的發言權。
61. 在我們家中很少團體精神。
62. 家庭中應該有公開決策。
63. 如在家中有意見上的分歧，我們會盡量減少磨擦和不愉快。
64. 我們家庭成員間有競爭性的共同利益。
65. 在我們家中並不大太努力爭取成果。
66. 家庭成員經常到朋友家。
67. 家庭成員間有很好的親密關係。
68. 在我們家中，長期性的聚會也有不同的看法。
69. 我們對每位成員有清楚的規定。
70. 我們能在家中做任何喜歡的事。
71. 我們很合得來。
72. 家庭成員間有很好的親密關係。
73. 家庭成員時常希望別過其他家庭一樣。
74. 在我家中，我們很少自己做。
75. 「先工作，後遊戲」是我們家裏的規律。
76. 在我家裏，看電視比讀書重要。
77. 家庭成員時常外出。
78. 在我家裏，聖經是一本非常重要的書。
79. 我們並不犯熱性，錯誤。
80. 我家的規則銀行非常嚴謹。
81. 很多家庭都把家庭放在家人的身上。
82. 在我家裏，有很多自發性的討論。
83. 在我家裏，我們相信家庭決策是不能解決問題的。
84. 在我家裏，我們不鼓勵自己發言。
85. 家庭成員時常與他人比較在事業上或學業上的成就。
86. 家庭成員間喜歡音樂，藝術和文學。
87. 家庭成員間喜愛閱讀，看電視，聽音樂。
88. 家庭成員間信任。
89. 吃過飯後我們會立刻洗碗。
90. 在我家裏不能擅作主張。
以下的問題祇爲統計用途。

1. 你的年紀是：
   - 20歲或以下
   - 21-30歲
   - 31-40歲
   - 41-50歲
   - 51-60歲
   - 60歲或以上

2. 性別： 男  女

3. 已婚年數：  年

4. 你的家庭是否單親家庭？ 是  否

5. 人口數：

6. 在去年，你的家庭總人息是：
   - $20,000以下
   - $20,001-$30,000
   - $30,001-$40,000
   - $40,001-$50,000
   - $50,001-$60,000
   - $60,001-$70,000
   - $70,001-$80,000
   - $80,000以上

7. 你的就職情況：  全職工作  兼職工作  沒有工作

   如你有就業，請填寫你的工作性質和公司種類填寫在下：
   （例：汽車零售商的汽車推銷員）

8. 你的最高教育程度：
   - 高中程度或以下
   - 高中畢業
   - 預科學院/工業學院程度
   - 預科學院/工業學院畢業
   - 大學程度
   - 大學畢業或以上

9. 你曾在何等教育程度時接受英語教學？
   - 從未
   - 小學
   - 初中
   - 高中
   - 預科或工業學院
   - 大學

10. 你的出生地點：

11. 如你的出生地點不在加拿大，請填寫在加拿大已居住的年數：  年

12. 如你的出生地點不在加拿大，請填寫移民來加之前原居地：

13. 下列的哪一種語言是你最喜愛的？
   - 漢語（普通話）
   - 漢語（廣東話）
   - 英語
   - 法語
   - 其他言語（請列明）

14. 請評估你的法語會話能力？
   - 不懂說法語
   - 劣
   - 流利
   - 非常流利

多謝你的參與！
母親問卷

以下各句子都有可能形容你對自己及生活在加拿大多元文化社會的一些意見，請小心閱讀每一個句子，然後劃上適當號碼以表示對該句子的贊同或不贊同程度。如對任何句子有問題，請以問下的判斷為準。

我認為自己是中國人。
我認為自己是加拿大人。
我認為自己的中國文化傳統感到十分驕傲。
我認為自己首先是中國人，然後才是加拿大人。
中國文化對我的生活產生最大的正面影響。
我希望別把我看成中國人。
我希望別把我看成加拿大人。
我仍然非常依於中國文化。
我用英語與我的兒女交談。
我用英語與我的配偶交談。

我一般用英語與我的親朋好友交談。
我所閱讀的報章及雜誌大部份是英文。
我所看的電影及錄影帶大部份是英語。
我會在家庭聚會時說英語。
當發怒時，我都會說英語。
當與家人談及個人及情感問題時，我会用英語。
我用英語與大部份朋友交談。
我的大部份朋友都是說英語的加拿大人。
在我周遭的地方碰到的大部份是說英語的加拿大人。

在我日常生活所接觸到的大部份是說英語的加拿大人。
我覺得與說英語的加拿大人交往是無拘無束的。
我日常接觸的都是說英語的加拿大人。
我經常參加由說英語的加拿大人所辦的活動。
我卻是愛的朋友都是說英語的加拿大人。
到我家來的大部分都是說英語的加拿大人。
我經常去說英語的加拿大人之家作客。
我覺得與說英語的加拿大人交往十分輕鬆自在。
我十分接受英語加拿大文化。

乙部

在你會與你的配偶及那位與你交際問卷給您的孩子之間，由誰決定購買以下的東西？請小心閱讀每項物品，然后劃上適當號碼。

由我們 由我們與孩子 由孩子全權決定

全權決定 一起決定 決定

孩子的衣服
孩子的音樂錄音帶
家庭所用的牙膏
家庭所用的洗顏水
孩子的鞋
家庭所用的麥米片早餐
家庭所用的番茄醬
家庭所用的汽水
孩子的文具
孩子的筆架

孩子的耳機收音機
家庭的音響
孩子要去觀賞的電影
家庭要去觀賞的電影
家庭的房間
家庭的電視機
家庭的音樂器材
孩子的國外刊物
家庭到外國時餐廳的選擇
家庭到外國時旅行
孩子的電腦遊戲軟件

1 2 3 4 5
岡田
以下有十九題有關於家庭的句型，請你決定哪項是適合於你的家庭。如果是適合形容你家庭或大至
上合適，請在(是)上標上，不適合的句子或比較不適合的，請在(否)上標上。

某些句子是適用於部份家庭成員，但卻不適用於其他家庭成員，如果對於大部份家庭成員是對的，
請在(是)上標上，對於大部份家庭是不對的，請在(否)上標上。若句子適用於一半的家庭成員，請
作出決定標上你認爲比較合適的選擇。

請注意，我們是希望你知道你個人對於自己家庭的觀感。所以，請不必理會其他家庭委員的觀感，只
須提供你個人對於自己家庭的意見。

1. 家庭成員喜歡互相幫忙。 
   2. 家庭成員將自己的想法埋藏在心裏。 
   3. 家庭成員經常吵架。 
   4. 我們很少單獨行動。 
   5. 我們感覺任何事也應該全力以赴做到最好。 

   是 / 否

6. 我們經常討論社會與政治上的問題。 
   7. 我們經常一起在家度過週末與晚上。 
   8. 家庭成員經常有去教堂，或談論宗教或主日學的習慣。 
   9. 家庭活動是經過詳細的計劃。 
   10. 家庭成員很少互有命令對方。 

   是 / 否

11. 我們時常在家中聚會。 
12. 我們可以在家作任何事。 
13. 家庭成員很少公開發怒。 
14. 在我們家中，我們鼓勵獨立。 
15. 我們家庭長者能積極地面對人生。 

   是 / 否

16. 我們很少上禮拜堂、看電影或音樂會。 
17. 朋友們經常來我們的家中飯或探望。 
18. 我們不在家中祈禱。 
19. 我們經常保持清潔與整齊。 
20. 在我們家中只有少許規例要遵從。 

   是 / 否

21. 我們很盡力做家事。 
22. 在我們家中不常發泄怒氣而不激怒他人。 
23. 家庭成員有時會在發怒時投機東西。 
24. 我們各自以自己打掃。 
25. 一個人賺錢的多少少對我們並不重要。 

   是 / 否

26. 我們家人對學習新事物非常重視。 
27. 在我們家中沒有人熱衷於運動，如棒球、保齡球。 
28. 我們經常討論聖誕節、遼越節或其它節日的宗教意義。 
29. 在我們家中很少尋找物件。 
30. 在我們家中有一位成員決定大多數的問題。 

   是 / 否

31. 我們一家人非常團結。 
32. 我們會互相傾訴我們的私事。 
33. 家庭成員很少發怒。 
34. 我們在家中可以隨意出入。 
35. 我們深知有競爭才有進步。 

   是 / 否

36. 我們對文化活動不感興趣。 
37. 我們經常外歺電影，體育活動，露營等。 
38. 我們不信任天堂或地獄的存在。 
39. 守時在我們家中非常重要。 
40. 在我們家中有一套特定的做事方法。 

   是 / 否
41. 我們很少日常做家中的事。
42. 我們有時會特別一時衝動而行事。
43. 家庭成員經常互相誇讚。
44. 在我們家中很少私人空間。
45. 我們每次也難下一次能做得更好。

46. 我們很少作智諜的討論。
47. 我們每位家庭成員也有一種預期。
48. 家庭成員有個別差別的對親觀念。
49. 家庭成員時常改變念頭。
50. 我們的家庭教訓家規。

51. 我們家庭成員互相支持。
52. 如你在家裏抱怨，家裏會有人感不安。
53. 家庭成員有時打架。
54. 當有問題時家庭成員只倚靠自己解決。
55. 家庭成員很少為升職和學校成績而憂心。

56. 其中一位家庭成員有玩樂器。
57. 家庭成員很少參與工作和學校以外的活動。
58. 我們相信有些事是難以談論的。
59. 家庭成員的門窗有時也需保持良好。
60. 在家庭決策上所有家庭成員也有同等的發言權。

61. 在我們家中很少有興趣。
62. 金錢與支出在家中是公開談論的。
63. 如我們家中有高雅的魚缸，我們會盡量減少動物維持和平氣氛。
64. 我們家庭成員關於個人的權利。
65. 在我們家中並不太久努力爭取成果。

66. 家庭成員經常到別家裏。
67. 家庭成員會為興趣而修補課程（學校以外）。
68. 在我們家中每人對興趣方面也有不同的看法。
69. 我們對每位成員的責任也有清楚的介定。
70. 我們能在家中做任何喜愛的事。

71. 我們混合得來。
72. 與家人談話時，我們都很慎重。
73. 家庭成員時常需別無其他家人。
74. 在我家中很難做回自己而不傷害家人的感受。
75. 「先工作，後遊戲。」，是我們家裏的規則。

76. 家庭成員時常外出。
77. 家庭成員聖經是一部非常重要的書。
78. 我們並不是很小心處理金錢。
79. 家庭的規則極之嚴。

81. 很多時間和注意是放在家人的身上。
82. 在我們家中有許多自發性的討論。
83. 在我們家中，我們相信大人爭持並能解決問題。
84. 在我家裏並不鼓勵自己去爭取權益。
85. 家庭成員時常與他人比較在事業上或學業上的成就。

86. 家庭成員很喜歡音樂、藝術和文學。
87. 我們最满意的娛樂是看電視或聽音樂。
88. 家庭成員相信犯了罪一定會受到懲罰。
89. 吃過飯後我們會立刻洗碗碟。
90. 在我們家裏不能違背主張。

是 / 否
丁部

以下的問題係為統計用途。

1. 你的年紀是:
   - 20歲或以下
   - 21-30歲
   - 31-40歲
   - 41-50歲
   - 51-60歲
   - 60歲或以上

2. 性別：____男 ____女

3. 已婚年數：____年

4. 你的家庭是否單親家庭？ ____是 ____否

5. 子女人數：____

6. 在去年，你的家庭總入息是為：
   - $20,000以下
   - $20,001-$30,000
   - $30,001-$40,000
   - $40,001-$50,000
   - $50,001-$60,000
   - $60,001-$70,000
   - $70,001-$80,000
   - $80,000以上

7. 你的就職情況： ____全職工作 ____兼職工作 ____沒有工作

   如你有就業，請將你工作性質和公司類別填寫在下：
   （例：汽車零售業的汽車推銷員）

8. 你的最高教育程度：
   - 高中程度或以下
   - 高中畢業
   - 預科學院/工業學院程度
   - 預科學院/工業學院畢業
   - 大學程度
   - 大學畢業或以上

9. 你曾在何等教育程度時接受英語教學？
   - 从未
   - 小學
   - 初中
   - 高中
   - 預科或工業學院
   - 大學

10. 你的出生地點： ___________

11. 如你的出生地點不在加拿大，請填寫在加拿大已居住的年數： ____年

12. 如你的出生地點不在加拿大，請填寫移民來加認前的原居地： ___________

13. 下列的哪一種語言是你最喜用的？
   - 漢語（普通話）
   - 漢語（廣東話）
   - 英語
   - 法語
   - 其他言語（請列明）

14. 請你評估你的法語會話能力？
   - 不懂說法語
   - 劣
   - 流利
   - 非常流利

多謝你的參與！
兒童問卷

以下各句子都可能形容你對自己及生活在加拿大多元文化社會的一些意見。請小心閱讀每一句子然後塗上適當號碼以表示對該句子的贊同或不贊同程度。如對任何句子有問題，請以問號的判斷為準。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>質之不贊同</th>
<th>極之贊同</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

我認為自己是中國人。
我認為自己是加拿大人。
我為自己的中國文化背景感到十分驕傲。
我認為自己首先是加拿大人，然後才是中國人。
中國文化對我的生活產生最大的正面影響。
我希望別人把我當成中國人。
我希望別人把我當成加拿大人。
我仍然非常依賴中國文化。
我用英語與我的父母交流。
我用英語與我的兄弟姐妹交流。
我一般用英語與我的家庭成員交流。
我所閱讀的報章及雜誌大部份是英語。
我所看的電影及節目大部份是英語。
我會在家庭聚會時說英語。
每當我發怒時，我都會說英語。
每當與家人談及個人及情感問題時，我會用英語。
我用英語與人壓迫朋友交流。
我所擁有的朋友都是說英語的加拿大人。
在我熟悉的地方所遇到的大部份是說英語的加拿大人。

我在日常生活中接觸到的大部分是說英語的加拿大人。
我覺得與說英語的加拿大人交往是無拘無束的。
我接觸的都是說英語的加拿大人。
我經常參加說英語的加拿大人在舉辦的活動。
我的好朋友都是說英語的加拿大人。
我跟加拿大人的人成分做為說英語的加拿大人。
我經常與說英語的加拿大人交際。
我覺得與說英語的加拿大人交往十分輕鬆自在。
我十分接受英語加拿大文化。

在你與父母之間，由誰決定購買以下的東西？請小心閱讀每項物品，然後塗上適當號碼。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>由父母</th>
<th>由父母與我</th>
<th>由我全權決定</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

我的衣服
我的音樂錄音帶
家庭所用的牙膏
家庭所用的洗頭水
我的鞋
家庭所用的麥片早餐
家庭所用的番茄醬
家庭所用的汽水
我的零錢
我的電車

我的耳環收音機
家庭的車子
我應去觀看的電影
家庭應去觀看的電影
家庭的房屋
家庭的電視機
家庭的音響器材
我的閱讀刊物
家庭出外用語所維持的選擇
家庭應去那家旅行
我的電腦遊戲軟件
家庭成員喜歡互相幫忙。
家庭成員將自己的想法埋藏在心裏。
家庭成員經常吵架。
我們很少單獨行動。
我們感覺任何事也應該全力以赴做到最好。

6. 我們經常討論社會與政治上的問題。
7. 我們經常在一起在家裡度過週末與晚上。
8. 家庭成員經常去教堂，猶太教會或主日學的習慣。
9. 家庭活動是經過詳細的計劃。
10. 家庭成員很少互相命令對方。

11. 我們常在家中開發時間。
12. 我們可以在家中做任何事。
13. 家庭成員很少公開發怒。
14. 在我們家中，我們鼓勵獨立。
15. 我們家庭極著重積極地面對人生。

16. 我們很少去劇院，看舞劇或音樂會。
17. 朋友們經常來我們的家吃飯或探望。
18. 我們不在家中吃飯。
19. 我們經常保持清潔與整齊。
20. 在我們家中只有少許規則要遵從。

21. 我們盡力做家事。
22. 在我們家中很難發怒與激怒他人。
23. 家庭成員有時會在發怒時把東西。
24. 我們各自爲自己打算。
25. 一個賺錢的多與少對我們並不重要。

26. 我們家人對學習新事物非常重視。
27. 在我們家中沒有熱衷於運動，如少棒隊，保齡球。
28. 我們經常討論聖誕節，逾越節或其它節日的宗教意義。
29. 在我們家中很難尋找物件。
30. 在我們家中有一位成員決定大多數的問題。

31. 我們一家人非常團結。
32. 我們會互相傾訴我們的私事。
33. 家庭成員很少發怒。
34. 我們在家中可以随意出入。
35. 我們家庭有競爭才有進步。

36. 我們對文化活動不感興趣。
37. 我們經常去電影，體育活動，舞會等。
38. 我們不信有天堂或地獄的存在。
39. 有些在我們家中非常重要。
40. 在我們家中有一套特定的做事方法。
41. 我們很少自顧做家中的事。
42. 我們不時會逢一時衝動而行事。
43. 家庭成員經常互相批評。
44. 在我們家中很少私人空間。
45. 我們每次也期望下一次能做得更好。

46. 我們很少作重要的討論。
47. 我們每位家庭成員也有一種好的習慣。
48. 家庭成員有很強烈的責任觀念。
49. 家庭成員常改變念頭。
50. 我們的家庭遵守家規。

51. 我們家庭成員都互相支持。
52. 如你在家裏提出，家庭會有人感到不妥。
53. 家庭成員不時會打架。
54. 當有問題時家庭成員只簡單自己解決。
55. 家庭成員很少為升職和學校成績而憂心。

56. 其中一位家庭成員有玩樂器。
57. 家庭成員很少參與工作和學校以外的活動。
58. 我們相信有些事是難以貫念的。
59. 家庭成員定時各盡的房間整理好。
60. 在家庭決策上所有家庭成員也有平等的發言權。

61. 在我們家中很少有圍坐精神。
62. 金錢與支出在家中是公開的。
63. 如我們家中有意見上的分歧，我們會盡量減少摩擦和爭吵。
64. 我們家庭成員互相謙遜。
65. 在我們家中並不鼓勵努力爭取成果。

66. 家庭成員經常到圖書館。
67. 家庭成員會有興趣而讀書課程（學校以外）。
68. 在我們家中不應在對興趣方面有不同的看法。
69. 我們對每個成員的責任也有清楚的界定。
70. 我們能在家中做任何喜愛的事。

71. 我們很合得來。
72. 與家人談話時，我們都很謙遜。
73. 家庭成員常希望能騰出其他家人一塊。
74. 在我家中誰應做回自我而不能傷害家庭的關係。
75. 『先工作，後遊戲』是我們家里的規則。

76. 在我家裏，看電視比閱讀重要。
77. 家庭成員常外出。
78. 在我家裏聖經是一部非常重要的書。
79. 我們並不懶乎處理問題。
80. 我家的規則是嚴格的。

81. 很多時間和注意是放在家人的身上。
82. 在我家裏有很多自發性的討論。
83. 在我家裏，我們相信大聲爭吵並不能解決問題。
84. 在我家裏並不鼓勵為自己爭取權益。
85. 家庭成員常與其他人比較在事業上或學業上的成就。

86. 家庭成員學會喜愛音樂、藝術和文學。
87. 我們最主要的娛樂是聊天或聽收音機。
88. 家庭成員相信犯了錯一定會受到懲罰。
89. 吃過飯後我們會立刻洗碗。
90. 在我們家裏不能講粗話。
1. 你的年紀是：

2. 你的性別是： 男  女

3. 你有多少兄弟姊妹與你同住？

4. 你有多少弟弟與姐妹？

5. 你讀幾年級？

6. 你就讀什麼學校？  英文  法文

7. 你有否工作？  否  是，兼職  是，全職

8. 如你有工作，你每月的收入大約為多少？  $ 

9. 你在那裏出世？

10. 如你不是在加拿大出世，那你來加拿大有多久？  年

11. 你來加拿大前是在那裏居住？

12. 你最喜用那種語言？

   通用話  廣東話  英語

   法語  其它（請說明）

多謝你的參與！
### Appendix 4

**Form R Raw Score to Standard Score Conversion Table (Normal Family Sample: \( N = 1,432 \))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Expressiveness</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Independence</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Intellectual-Cultural Orientation</th>
<th>Active-Recreational Orientation</th>
<th>Moral-Religious Emphasis</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>