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Abstract

Chinese Independent Immigrants in Montreal: Staying or Leaving?

Shi Yuan Liu

Canadian immigration policy is regarded as an integral part of government planning and is influenced by the high demand for immigration and Canadian values as articulated in the legislation itself. This thesis examines the Canadian immigration laws with particular emphasis on the selection criteria for independent immigrants. It then analyses the integration barriers and assimilation experiences of Chinese immigrants who came to Montréal in the Skilled Worker Class after July 2002. It identifies reasons why many Chinese immigrants leave Montréal within 5 years from their arrival and provides recommendations for policy makers of how to reach the immigration objectives while minimizing the opportunity loss caused by underutilization of immigrants' skills.
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1.1. Why Canada Needs Immigration

Declining birth rates and a rapidly aging population are depleting the size of Canada's workforce. Analysts predict that by 2025, one million Canadian jobs could go unfilled (Tolley, 2006). With massive baby boom retirements on the horizon, someone has to pay their pensions and keep the tax dollars flowing for the social programs they will need in their old age. As a result, immigration is being seen, increasingly, as necessary for economic growth and well-being. While the Canadian government has adopted immigration policy for family class applicants and refugees, to meet its humanitarian and international obligations, the skilled worker class is designed to address the economic concerns and this class is the main focus of my paper.

The selection criteria for skilled workers are meant to screen applicants who will be able to become economically independent in Canada and thus fully contribute to the Canadian economy. Selecting immigrants, however important, is insufficient for their potential contribution to materialize. Of equal importance is the assessment and recognition of immigrants' skills, knowledge and experience once selected immigrants are in Canada. An accurate understanding and evaluation of credentials of immigrants play a key role in enabling these immigrants to integrate into Canadian society. find jobs and become
economically self-sufficient. When this happens, the individual benefits from earnings in keeping with his or her skills, and the economy benefits from the full productive use of those skills. When this does not happen, the full productive potential of the labour force goes unrealized, and the affected individuals and their families suffer lower incomes and standards of living. Economy and individuals suffer; the country suffers.

To understand impediments to immigrants' integration, the next three sections provide important factual information and briefly highlight the legal history of the treatment of immigrants, particularly from China, in Canada. These sections set up a contextual framework for the rest of the paper.

1.2. Racism Perpetuated through the use of Immigration Law

Many have commented on the fact that Canadian history is replete with examples of racism that were perpetuated through the use of immigration law (Razack, 2000; Aiken, 2003). According to bencher and Law Professor, Constance Backhouse, "immigration laws shaped the very contours of Canadian society in ways that aggrandized the centrality of white power" (Backhouse, 1999 at 15).

It was the first immigrants from Europe who brought with them the seeds of the racism that would have such devastating impact on the non-white peoples of what is now Canada, an impact that continues to be felt to this day.
Almost from the time when the Canadian government began to control immigration to Canada until the 1960s, explicitly racist laws and practices restricted the immigration of certain groups.

In 1907 a Canadian government delegation to Japan concluded a "gentlemen's agreement" whereby the Japanese government would voluntarily limit emigration of Japanese to Canada to 400 persons a year. During the Second World War, 22,000 Japanese Canadians were expelled from within a hundred miles of the Pacific, thousands were detained, and at the end of the war, "repatriation" to Japan was encouraged. 4,000 people left, two thirds of them Canadian citizens.

In 1908 the Canadian government adopted an Order in Council imposing a "continuous passage rule" which had the effect of excluding from immigration people who could not make a direct journey to Canada. One of the main targets of this measure was prospective immigrants from India, since there was at the time no direct voyage from India. In 1914 a group of 376 Indians challenged this restriction, arriving in Vancouver on board the Komagatu Maru. After two months in the harbour and an unsuccessful court challenge, they were forced to return.

During the years when the Nazis were in power in Germany (and immediately afterwards), Canadian immigration policy was actively anti-Semitic, with the result that Canada's record for accepting Jews fleeing the Holocaust is among the worst in the
Western world. Canadian policy towards Jewish refugees was summed up in the words of one official: "None is too many"\(^1\) (Abella & Troper, 1983).

Although in the 19\(^{th}\) century Canada represented freedom for some black Americans escaping slavery through the underground railroad, in the 20\(^{th}\) century immigration of persons of African origin was actively discouraged. A 1911 Order in Council prohibited "any immigrant belonging to the Negro race, which race is deemed unsuitable to the climate and requirements of Canada". This order was never proclaimed, but the same effect was achieved through measures such as penalties imposed on railway companies that distributed transportation subsidies to blacks, requirement for additional medical examinations, and the hiring of agents to actively discourage black Americans from coming to Canada.

In June 1919 the entry of Doukhobors, Mennonites and Hutterites was prohibited on the ground of their "peculiar habits, modes of life and methods of holding property". The prohibition lasted until 1922 in the case of Mennonites and Hutterites, longer for Doukhobors.

Until the 1960s, Canada chose its immigrants on the basis of their racial categorization rather than the individual merits of the applicant, with preference being given to immigrants of Northern European (especially British) origin over the so-called "black and Asiatic races", and at times over central and southern European "races". The goal of

\(^1\) The Canadian government did less than other Western countries to help Jewish refugees between 1933 and 1948. According to official statistics, of the millions of Jewish refugees struggling to flee Europe, only 5,000 entered Canada during this period, the lowest record of any Western country (None is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe 1933-1948 by Canadian historians Irving Abella and Harold Troper:1983).
excluding certain racialized groups was in part accomplished through the rigid enforcement of seemingly neutral immigration, health and financial requirements. For example, the "continuous journey" rule was strictly applied against Asians in the early 20th century, but not against Europeans. At the beginning of the 1920s, during a period of deep hostility towards Eastern Europeans, the rule was also enforced for a while against Europeans.

The brunt of racist controls and discrimination were borne by Chinese and it is considered in greater detail next.

1.2.1. First Chinese Arrivals in Canada


The first record of Chinese immigration to what is known as Canada today can be dated back to 1788. The renegade British Captain James Meares hired a group of roughly 70 Chinese carpenters from Macao and settled them on Nootka Sound, Vancouver Island, British Columbia, then an increasingly important European outpost on the Pacific coast.

The next more substantial wave of Chinese immigrants into British North America began in 1858. Most of these Chinese were "sojourners" in a sense, in that most of them planned
on returning to their homeland after working in British North America for a period of time. Many came to British Columbia as common labourers and most were paid only in vouchers so they were captives of the firm that imported them. Gold rushes at the BC interior also attracted a significant number of immigrants.

Many workers from Fujian and Guangdong Province arrived to help build the Canadian Pacific Railway in the 19th century as did Chinese veterans of the gold rushes. These workers accepted the discriminatory disadvantages of working long hours, lower wages than non-Chinese workers and dangerous working conditions such as explosions for the mountain passes, in order to support their families that stayed in China. Their willingness to endure hardship for low wages enraged fellow non-Chinese workers who thought they were unnecessarily complicating the labour market situations. From the passage of the Chinese Immigration Act in 1885, the Canadian government began to charge a $50 fee, later referred to as a Head Tax, for each Chinese person trying to immigrate to Canada.

The Government of Canada, under subsequent administrations, increased the tax to $100 and, then, $500, under the Chinese Immigration Act 1900 and the Chinese Immigration Act 1903, respectively. These taxes went into a Consolidated Revenue Fund and were spent by a government in which the payers had no representation since Chinese were not permitted to vote at the time (Mar, 1988:10; Munro, 1978).

---

2 In the early 1900s, the value of $500 was two years' salary.
3 The head tax rose to $100 in 1900 and to $500 in 1903 when the wages of a Chinese immigrant were only about $1.25 per day.
The Chinese were the only ethnic group that had to pay such a tax. These acts were regarded as examples of anti-Chinese legislation in Canada that were part of general institutional racism against the Chinese in Canada.

In 1923, the federal Liberal government of William Lyon Mackenzie King banned Chinese immigration completely with the passage of the Chinese Immigration Act of 1923.\(^4\) With this act, the Chinese became the only people that Canada specifically excluded on the basis of race. During the next 25 years more and more laws against the Chinese were passed. Most jobs were closed to Chinese men and women, so many Chinese opened their own restaurant and laundry businesses. In British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Ontario, Chinese employers were not allowed to hire white females, so most Chinese businesses became Chinese-only (Whitaker, 1987: 93).

Some of those Chinese Canadian workers settled in Canada after the railway was constructed. Most could not bring the rest of their families, including immediate relatives, due to government restrictions and enormous processing fees. Their contacts with non-Chinese were restricted as well, officially and unofficially. They established Chinatowns and societies in undesirable sections of the cities.

During the Great Depression, life was even tougher for the Chinese than it was for other Canadians. In Alberta, for example, Chinese-Canadians received relief payments of less than half the amount paid to other Canadians. Moreover, because The Chinese Exclusion

\(^4\) The head tax was ended by the *Chinese Immigration Act of 1923*, which stopped Chinese immigration altogether. Because of this, it is sometimes referred to by opponents as the *Chinese Exclusion Act*. 
Act prohibited any additional immigration from China, the Chinese men who had arrived earlier had to face these hardships alone, without the companionship of their wives and children. In 1931, for example, there were 1240 men to every 100 women in Chinese-Canadian communities. To protest The Chinese Exclusion Act, Chinese-Canadians closed their businesses and boycotted Dominion Day celebrations every July 1st, which became known as “Humiliation Day” by the Chinese-Canadians.

1.2.2. Acknowledgment that Chinese People Suffer “Grave Injustice” in Canada

The Canadian government repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act on May 14, 1947 (necessary with the enactment of the Canadian Citizenship Act 1946 on July 1, 1947)\(^5\) for two reasons: partly because Canada signed the United Nations’ Charter of Human Rights at the conclusion of the Second World War and the Chinese Exclusion Act contravened the UN Charter; partly because of a feeling of horror after Nazi culture-oriented death camps were discovered and especially in light of the contribution of Chinese communities in Canada during World War II. The same year, 1947, Chinese-Canadians were finally granted the right to vote in federal elections. However, it took another 20 years, until the points system was adopted for selecting immigrants, that the Chinese began to be admitted under the same criteria as any other applicants.

---

\(^5\) Before 1947, there was no legal existence of Canadian citizenship. The first act to deal with Canadian identity was the Immigration Act of 1910, but it was merely to facilitate government desire to populate Western Canada. The Naturalization Act of 1914 and the Canadian Nationals Act of 1921 provided a limited definition of a Canadian nationals and was made necessary to allow Canada to participate in the League of Nations and membership in the International Court of Justice.
After many years of organized calls for an official Canadian government public apology and redress to the historic Head tax, the minority Conservative government of Stephen Harper announced as part of their pre-election campaign, an official apology. On June 22, 2006, Prime Minister delivered a message of redress in the House of Commons, calling it a "grave injustice". Survivors or their spouses were paid approximately $20,000 CAD in compensation. There are only an estimated 20 Chinese Canadians who had paid the tax and were still alive in 2006 (Harper, 2006).

As no mention of redress for the 4,000 immediate families who were directly affected was made, the Chinese Canadian community continues to fight for redress from the Canadian government. A national day of protest was held on July 1, 2006 in major cities across Canada, with several hundred Chinese Canadians joining in local marches.

1.3. China – the Top Source Country

China has been consistently ranked number one source country for immigrants to Canada (Appendix I, Tables 1-3 (p. 159-161)). In 2006, 33,080 people immigrated to Canada from China (Table 1, p. 159). This constituted 13.2% of all immigrants who received permanent resident status in that year (Table 2, p. 160). This has been consistent trend from 1997 (Table 3, p. 161).

The Canadian 2006 Census reports that the census metropolitan area (CMA) of Montréal was home to the third-largest Canadian immigration population in Canada, with 740,400
Canadian immigrants, accounting for 12% of the country's total Canadian immigrant population. Montréal trailed only Toronto (37.5%) and Vancouver (13.4%). (Statistics Canada: 2006).

1.4. Canada’s Official Immigration Policy

Canada’s immigration policy is based on the premise that immigration contributes to Canada's economy and society and that there is a responsibility to manage immigration in the public interest. Among the contributions immigrants make to Canada are: to bring needed skills and international business linkages; to provide a source of population growth which contributes to an expanding economy; and to enrich Canada's multicultural tradition through cultural diversity. However, the policy also recognizes the importance of the effective economic and social integration of immigrants if these benefits are to be realized. Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC, 2007) makes explicit policy decisions to admit immigrants to Canada in the expectation that they will become fully participating citizens. Successful integration is considered the cornerstone to public acceptance of Canada’s immigration program.

Immigration policies must also reflect and be consistent with the Government’s broader policy directions and priorities, while at the same time taking account of and accommodating the needs of provinces in this area of shared jurisdiction. Thus, immigration policies are either directly supportive of Government priorities (e.g. by facilitating entry of highly skilled workers to ensure that Canada has access to the expertise needed to compete in a knowledge-based society) or at least not inconsistent
with the broad Government agenda and direction (e.g. by providing training to those immigrants who arrive without the skills needed to participate in Canada’s rapidly evolving economy).

1. 5. Contribution to the Field

What would my research contribute to the understanding of reasons why great number of Chinese immigrants leave Montreal within 5 years from their arrival? What factors do they consider in making the decision whether to stay in Montreal or leave? As a Masters student I had to ask myself these questions repeatedly during the course of 3 years that I spent to conclude this work. Seven years of my experience as an immigration consultant in a major law firm in China, as well as my personal adaptation experiences as an independent Chinese immigrant in Montreal were of monumental importance to comprehend the emotions, ideas and views of my fellow Chinese independent immigrants.

This study is the first one in the field to observe the immigration experiences of Chinese immigrants in Montreal who immigrated within the Skilled Worker class category within the last 5 years. For each individual, the immigration experiences are inevitably influenced by educational background, life experiences and personal character traits. Chinese immigrants may perceive their immigration experiences differently and their lived reality may be different from the perceptions of the CIC and academics. The
immigrants' experiences, hopes, realities and strategies can enrich and bring clarity to the understanding of why Chinese immigrants leave Montreal within 5 years.

Statistical analyses are used extensively in this work to determine correlation and causality between the selection criteria for the immigrants in the Skilled Worker category. Berry's acculturation model, Porter-Gorden's assimilation model and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs pyramid are used to analyze the assimilation experiences of immigrants who came in the Skilled Worker category from the Mainland China after July 2002. Particular attention is paid in this work to the relationship between immigration policy/laws and race/racism/class. The objective of this work is to define an optimum strategy for how to reach the immigration objectives while minimizing the opportunity loss caused by underutilization of immigrants' skills.

From such a perspective, the results would be a contribution to the field of immigrant selection and assimilation and would be useful for policy makers, new immigrants, policy analysts, academics and politicians.
2.1. Immigration laws

Immigration laws, by definition, incorporate the notion that states have the right to regulate the comings and goings of persons within their territory (Plender, 1988 at 62-63). The Supreme Court of Canada confirmed this perspective noting that "the most fundamental principle of immigration law is that non-citizens do not have an unqualified right to enter or remain in the country." (Chiarelli v. Canada (Minister of Employment & Immigration), [1992] 1 SCR. 711 at 733). Thus, immigration laws which place any type of restriction on entry into a state's territory inherently discriminate between citizens and non-citizens. As the Supreme Court noted in Andrews v. Law Society of British Columbia: "[d]iscrimination on the basis of nationality has from early times been an inseparable companion of discrimination on the basis of race and national or ethnic origin." (Andrews v. Law Society of British Columbia, [1989] 1 SCR 143 at 195). The restrictions on immigration chosen by a particular state are indicative both of the goals of immigration and the nature of the society that is envisioned by the policy and lawmakers of the country.

The notion that state sovereignty permits states to deny aliens entry within state territory has not gone unchallenged.
Current immigration legislation in Canada, the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* (IRPA), sets out specific criteria for immigrants and refugees and specifically excludes certain categories of individuals (*Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, SC 2001, c.27 [hereinafter “IRPA”]).

Apart from the issue of the perpetuation of racism within Canada through our historically racist immigration laws, there remains the question of the extent to which racism is a part of current immigration and refugee laws. As Constance Backhouse wrote in her book, *Colour Coded: A Legal History of Racism in Canada,* “the Canadian legal system has played a principal and dominant role in creating and preserving racial discrimination. Racism is a deeply imbedded, archly defining characteristic of Canadian history. This is a legacy that has contributed in tenaciously rooted and fundamental ways to the current shape of Canadian society” (Backhouse, 1999). In an era when both international law and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* [hereinafter “Charter”] prohibit discrimination based on race (*Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, part I of the *Constitution Act*, 1982, RSC 1985, app. II, no. 44), it is unlikely that one will find evidence of overtly racist laws and policies. Racial discrimination is usually found in systemic form and concealed in systems, practices, policies, and laws that may appear neutral on their face but have a serious detrimental effect on immigrants (Carasco et al, 2007). Table below sets forth examples of systemic racism and discrimination in refugee and immigration policies (Canadian Council for Refugees, 2000):

---

7 Examples are based on real cases, but names and other identifying details have been changed to protect identities.
## POLICIES WITH DIFFERENTIAL IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Differential Impact</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirement that Convention refugees produce “satisfactory identity documents” in order to be granted permanent residence</td>
<td>This requirement negatively affects certain groups of refugees:</td>
<td>Thousands of refugees from Somalia and hundreds of refugees from Afghanistan have been forced to wait years for permanent residence because there is no functioning government in their countries and such documents as the refugees do have are frequently discounted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Refugees who come from countries where identity is not traditionally established through official documents (notably African countries)</td>
<td>Subha fled to Canada from Sri Lanka with her young daughter and was granted refugee status. Her husband arrived one month after her and has been granted permanent resident status. Subha and her daughter however have not, on the grounds that they do not have identity documents, having lost them when their house in Jaffna was destroyed. They cannot get new documents because there is no functioning authority in Jaffna, the Sri Lankan embassy refuses to process the request and the central records in Colombo are so arranged that it is impossible to trace a record without knowing the number of the certificate. Subha and her daughter have now been in Canada five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Citizens of countries where there is no government authority that can issue the documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Groups who are less likely to possess such documents such as youth, women or people from rural areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The $975 Right of Landing Fee (ROLF) that all adult immigrants must pay in order to be granted permanent residence.</td>
<td>Given relative costs-of-living, rates of currency exchange and average annual income, ROLF amounts to a regressive flat tax which affects disproportionately immigrants from the South.</td>
<td>The $975 fee represents about 6 months’ salary for many Salvadorans. For a nurse or teacher in Sri Lanka, it might represent 10 months’ wages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Imposition of visa requirement on nationals of some countries wanting to travel to Canada. Some nationals (generally from southern countries) need visas and others (generally from "white countries") don’t. Southern countries account for 81% of countries whose citizens require visas in order to enter Canada, while predominantly "white" countries represent only 19% of countries requiring visas. By contrast, predominantly "white countries" make up nearly 50% of countries that do not require a visa.

**FAMILY REUNIFICATION**

| Requirement to present official documents (marriage certificates, adoption papers) in order to establish family ties. | This requirement negatively affects people who come from societies where marriage, birth and adoptions are not recorded through documents. |

The policies set out above are neutral, but even when applied neutrally, have a different and negative impact on some racialized groups.

Thus, the section on immigration laws has provided a theoretical base to form a conceptual framework and set the parameters for this study.

2.2. Canada’s Immigration System

The Canadian immigration program embodies three basic social, economic and humanitarian goals (Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, s. 3):

- to facilitate the reunion in Canada of Canadian residents with close family members from abroad
- to foster the development of a strong, viable economy in all regions of the country
to fulfill Canada's international legal obligations with respect to refugees and to uphold its humanitarian tradition

In 2006, Canada admitted 251,649 newcomers; 28 percent of these were the Family Class, nearly 55 percent were the Economic Class, and approximately 13 percent were Refugees. Table 4 (p. 162-163) and Figure 14 (p. 164) in Appendix 1 provide detailed information on annual immigration by category from 1997 to 2006.

In support of the immigration goals, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) administers to two major statutes: the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) and the Citizenship Act.

IRPA sets out specific criteria for immigrants and refugees and specifically excludes certain categories of individuals (Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, SC 2001, c. 27. IRPA states that the immigration program should protect the health and safety of Canadians and prevent the entry of people who pose a potential threat to Canada’s safety and security. In concert with IRPA, the Citizenship Act specifies who is a citizen of Canada and who may be granted Canadian citizenship by promoting citizenship values and through the process of granting citizenship.

IRPA was implemented on June 28, 2002, and in the months preceding its enactment, the selection process, particularly for the Skilled Worker Class, was given considerable attention. The Skilled Worker Class is an economic entry category and the class, as defined by the regulations, covers those applicants “who may become permanent

---

8 Economic Class, in turn, consists of: Skilled workers, Entrepreneurs, Self-employed, Investors, Provincial/territorial nominees, and live-in-caregivers (see Exhibit 2, p. 4)
residents on the basis of their ability to become economically established in Canada” (Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations (IRPR) s. 75(2)). Under the 1991 Canada-Québec Accord, Québec may determine its own selection criteria. Since none of the respondents came to Canada through the Quebec selection criteria, these criteria are beyond the scope of this paper.

Under IRPA, the selection criteria for the Skilled Worker Class emphasize human capital attributes and flexible skills, rather than the specific intended occupations of applicants, as the previous selection system did. It is believed that the new macro approach offers greater flexibility and is more responsive to labour market realities. The selection criteria for the Skilled Worker Class within the legal framework are examined next.

2.3. Legal Framework: Selection Criteria for Skilled Workers

Skilled workers are selected on the basis of a “points system” designed to predict their potential economic contribution to the country. The Regulations for the Federal Skilled Worker Class establish the selection criteria and prescribe the weight to be given to each selection factor. Subject to transitional rules, these requirements are applied to all applications for the Skilled Worker Class received after the coming into force of the IRPA and to applicants who had applied before the coming into force who have either not had a selection interview or had a decision by an officer to waive their selection interview. According to Citizenship and Immigration Canada, “[s]killed workers are people whose education and work experience will help them find work and make a home for themselves as permanent residents in Canada.” (CIC, 2006).
Members of the federal skilled worker class are newcomers who are selected as permanent residents on the basis of their ability to become economically established in Canada. A total of 105,949 skilled workers, and their families, were admitted to Canada in 2006 (Table 4, p. 162).

According to section 76 of the Regulations, an applicant under the skilled worker class is assessed based on six selection criteria: i) education; ii) proficiency in the official languages of Canada; iii) age; iv) experience; v) arranged employment; and vi) adaptability, to a maximum of 100 points. Applicants qualify for landed immigrant status if they achieve 67 points or higher (Department of Justice Canada, hereinafter “DOJ”: 2002). The six selection criteria are considered in greater detail below.

2.3.1. Education

Pursuant to subsection 78(2) of the Regulations, a maximum of 25 points are awarded for a skilled worker’s education. The points awarded are based on the level of the degree and the number of degrees or diplomas obtained by an individual (Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations. Department of Justice, Canada. Part 6, Economic Classes; Division 1, Skilled Workers, 2002). For example, an applicant who has earned a degree at a master’s or doctoral level and has completed a total of at least 17 years of full-time studies will be awarded the maximum of 25 points (Table 5 p. 165).

The Overseas Processing (OP) Manual instructs officers to assess programs of study and award points based on the standards that exist in the country of study (Overseas
*Processing Manual, OP-6, s. 10.2; p. 13.* The *Regulations* do not provide for a comparison of the applicant’s educational credentials to Canadian educational standards (OP-6, s. 10.2). 9 Furthermore, according to the *Overseas Processing Manual*, if an applicant has an educational credential, pursuant to the *Regulations*, but does not have the total “number of years of study required by the *Regulations*, [immigration] officers should award the number of points set out in the category that refers to the number of years of study completed by the applicant.” The *Overseas Processing Manual* provides two examples on this point and these examples are set forth in Appendix I, (p. 166).

Assessing the educational qualifications of foreign nationals is not always a straightforward matter. In *Edoshina* (Edoshina v. Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) (2003) 235 F.T.R. 295, [2003] F.C.J. No. 926 (F.C.T.D.), for example, the applicant had applied under the Independent-Skilled Worker category as a translator, National Occupational Classification ("NOC") 5125.1, or interpreter, NOC 5125.3. She had an undergraduate degree in the pedagogy of languages but no direct qualifications relating to translation. The applicant’s position was that her undergraduate degree qualified her to teach languages and that the ability and skills associated with teaching others how to express themselves in another language are related to the ability and skills associated with interpreting and translating. The Federal Court accepted the applicant’s argument that the applicant could, in principle, meet the NOC requirement with a degree in a related discipline. However, the Court was unable to conclude that the visa officer had erred in this case in deciding that the qualification to teach a foreign language did not

---

9 Canadian criteria should not be used to assess education credentials; for example, law degree is a first level degree – would be awarded 20 points
reflect the level of linguistic proficiency required of an interpreter.

Gozalie’s empirical research suggests that education obtained pre-immigration will have a smaller effect on earnings than education obtained post-immigration; positive returns from immigration increase when the education is obtained in Canada. However, Gozalie notes that negative returns from education that immigrants experience may be diminished when immigrants are selected from ‘elite’ countries, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany and Italy, which have labour market and education systems similar to Canada’s. Nonetheless, even among elite immigrants, “earnings ... rise at a slightly lower rate than that of their Canadian-born counterparts over time in Canada and the impacts of schooling ... prior to immigration are smaller than if these characteristics were obtained in Canada”(Gozalie, 2002).

Pendakur and Pendakur found that “among men and women, visible minority immigrants do worse than white immigrants, even if educated in Canada”(Pendakur and Pendakur, 1998). Even when they controlled for foreign schooling, the penalty to visible minority immigrants’ earnings remained. Thus, for visible minority immigrants, achieving earnings comparable to Canadian-born counterparts is a significant challenge, whether they have been educated in Canada or not.

A further challenge is the recognition of foreign credentials and education. Whether overtly, through outright non-recognition, or covertly, through discrimination or underutilization, immigrants may find that foreign education and training are less valuable than comparable Canadian training and education, or that their education and
training place them in significantly lower occupations than in their countries of origin (Reitz, 2001; p. 347-378). However, Hiebert notes that “while it is true that the education credentials of immigrants are frequently ignored in the Canadian labour market, participation rates and employment earnings rise steeply with higher levels of educational attainment” (Hiebert. 2004). In other words, while immigrants with foreign education and training may fare worse than the Canadian born, they will fare better than immigrants with less education and training. According to this view, while the non-recognition of foreign credentials and education is problematic and constitutes a waste of knowledge and talents, those immigrants with education and training are nonetheless better placed to succeed in the Canadian labour market than those without such credentials.

However, it is contrary to the very goal of Canada's immigration and multiculturalism policies – to welcome and integrate new Canadians – if one compares immigrants' labour market performance only to that of other immigrants and not in relation to the performance of native-born Canadians with comparable education and experience. Although caution must be exercised when comparing the performance of immigrants and non-immigrants to ensure that differences in life experience and opportunities are taken into account, measuring success based only on immigrants' performance in relation to other immigrants may foster marginalization.

Research has also shown that positive returns from education depend, in large part, on official language proficiency. Hiebert's work indicates that in the absence of official language proficiency, immigrants with higher education will not experience a positive return on earnings, particularly if they are unable to access settlement services, such as
language training (Hiebert, 2004). Similarly, Chiswick and Miller point out that education "may be of little, if any, value to an immigrant with no knowledge of the destination language" (Chiswick and Miller, 2000. p. 11 - 23). In their view, official language proficiency and education are complements in the labour market.

2.3.2. Language Proficiency

Section 79 of the Regulations (DOJ: 2002) requires a skilled worker applicant to specify which official language is to be considered his or her first official language of Canada. In addition, a skilled worker must either have his or her language proficiency assessed by a designated institution or a skilled worker must provide other evidence in writing of his or her proficiency in the language or languages. An applicant is awarded points based on his or her ability to speak, listen, read and write in his or her first and second official language. For example, four points are awarded for high proficiency in each of speaking, listening, reading and writing in the first official language, and two points are awarded for each category in the second official language. The maximum number of points that can be awarded under the language category is 24 points (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s.79) (Table 6, p. 167 - 169).

Immigration officers may no longer assess language proficiency at interview (Overseas Processing Manual, OP-6, s. 10.11).10 Officers must either: i) rely on the results of a test done by an approved testing organization as conclusive evidence of an applicant’s

---

10 Although officers are not permitted to change language point awards themselves, the Manual includes detailed instructions for dealing with cases where significant discrepancies become evident between claimed and actual language proficiency.
level of language proficiency; or ii) evaluate written evidence of proficiency submitted by the applicant against the Canadian Language Benchmarks/Standards Linguistiques Canadiens (DOJ: 2002; Regulations, s.79(1)(a)). Immigration officers are further instructed that they must not

i) consider any claim made by the applicant that the test results are an inaccurate reflection of their true abilities;

ii) override the test results and substitute their own evaluation of language abilities;

or

iii) accept the results of any language test that is not administered by an organization that has been approved by CIC (Overseas Processing Manual, OP-6, s. 10.4).

If the applicant provides a written explanation and supporting documentation in lieu of test results, an officer must assess the documentation against the Canadian Language Benchmarks 2000, and/or the Standards Linguistiques Canadiens 2002 (Overseas Processing Manual, OP-6, s. 10.4). The onus is on the applicant to satisfy the immigration officer of the claimed language proficiency (Overseas Processing Manual, OP-6, s. 10.4).

The following guidelines are provided in the Overseas Processing Manual:

i) where the applicant has been raised, educated and employed in an environment where one of the official languages is in predominant use, a written explanation will usually suffice to establish high proficiency in that language;

ii) in situations where an applicant may claim some expertise in an official language primarily through education and/or employment, officers will make use of knowledge of local conditions to assist them in assessing the validity of such claims …; and

iii) … in most cases where language proficiency is not patently obvious from the applicant’s background, self-serving declarations, third party
testimonials and/or other claims not supported by detailed and objective evidence will be of little probative value in establishing high or moderate proficiency (Overseas Processing Manual, OP-6, s. 10.4.).

Research findings indicate that immigrants who arrive in Canada knowing an official language are more likely to succeed in the Canadian labour market. In a review of studies on the relationship between immigrant's second language acquisition and labour market performance, DeVoretz found that “proficiency in one or both of Canada's official languages has a consistently positive effect on both immigrant earnings and employment opportunities” and, moreover, that “the rates of return from second language acquisition are large” (DeVoretz, 1995). In addition, as Chiswick and Miller point out, “Destination language proficiency can have indirect impacts on labour market earnings through the effect on the productivity of other forms of human capital [such as] schooling and labour market experience” (Backhouse, 1999 at 15).

During consultations on the new Act, the Commissioner of Official languages intervened to emphasize the importance of functional bilingualism in Canada's two official languages, particularly for immigrants choosing to settle in official language minority communities. This intervention resulted in an increase in the number of points awarded for the second official language, from 4 to 8 (Quell, 2002, p. 27).

However, research has found that the relationship between language proficiency and annual earnings is not strictly linear. For example, Chiswick and Miller note that there are differences in earnings even among those immigrants who can conduct a conversation in an official language. Specifically, immigrants who can conduct a conversation in an official language and generally use an official language at home earn more than those
immigrants who can conduct a conversation in an official language, but generally use a non-official language at home (Harvey and Blakely, 2001). Still, most researchers support a selection system based primarily on official language proficiency as it is agreed that this is the single best predictor of future economic success in Canada. By setting pass mark at 67 points, the selection criteria for the Skilled Worker Class virtually excludes those applicants with limited or no proficiency in an official language (Hiebert, 2004).

Nonetheless, Pendakur and Pendakur have shown that knowledge of an official language is not always a guarantee of economic parity. Their research indicates that “knowledge of minority languages is correlated with lower earnings for men and women in Canada's three largest cities [Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver]” even when knowledge of an official language is held constant. In other words, immigrants who speak both an official and a non-official language tend to earn less than those who speak only an official language, although this negative return diminishes as the local linguistic population grows. Pendakur and Pendakur argue that the negative return on non-official language proficiency is a result of discrimination in the labour market, which may be based on culture as much as on colour, and that large enclaves of linguistic groups may minimize this discrimination by sensitizing the population to accent and other cultural artifacts (Pendakur and Pendakur, 1998).

2.3.3. Employment Experience

According to section 80 of the Regulations, “up to a maximum of 21 points shall be awarded to a skilled worker for full-time work experience, or the full-time equivalent for
part-time work experience, within the 10 years preceding the date of their application” (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s. 80). Points are awarded based on the number of years of experience completed by the applicant. (Table 7, p. 170).

Pursuant to subsection 75(2) of the Regulations, a skilled worker must have at least one year of continuous full-time experience or the equivalent in part-time employment in one or more occupations, other than a restricted occupation, that are listed in the Skill Type 0 (Management Occupations) or Skill Type A (professional occupations) or B (technical, skilled trades and paraprofessional occupations) of the National Occupational Classification [NOC] (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s.75(2)). Applicants with occupations corresponding to Skill Level C, which includes intermediate level clerical or supportive functions; or Skill Level D, which consists of elemental sales or service and primary labourer occupations are not eligible for the Skilled Worker Class.

The National Occupational Classification is maintained by Human Resources and Skills Development Canada and includes an elaborate description of more than 500 occupations in Canada, including the occupational duties, skills, aptitudes, and work settings for each occupation. Each entry in the NOC provides a “lead statement” and a description of the main duties of an occupation. The “lead statement” is a general description of the occupation. In addition, the lead statement provides information relating to the type of industry or establishment where the occupation may be found (Human Resources and Skills Development Canada: 2001). If an applicant fails to demonstrate that they have occupational experience in at least one of the designated occupational classifications of the NOC, namely Skill Type 0, A or B, then this is an automatic ground for refusal of the
application. In order to qualify on the occupational criteria, the applicant must have performed all of the “actions” described in the lead statement for the occupation, they must have performed a substantial number of the “main duties” for the occupation, and finally they must have performed all of the “essential duties” of the occupation.

The relationship between experience and potential earnings exhibits many of the characteristics present in the relationship between education and potential earnings. Gozalie (2003) points out that while experience from source countries with labour market systems similar to Canada's pays a higher return than experience from other countries, returns on post-immigration experience are greater than those for pre-immigration experience. Employers in Canada may not recognize experience attained abroad, or may value it less than Canadian experience. However, Chiswick and Miller (2000) argue that “experience acquired abroad can be more profitably transformed into higher earnings where the immigrant has shifted fully to the use of an official language in everyday life in Canada. Where an immigrant cannot conduct a conversation in an official language, pre-immigration experience, like educational attainment, is not associated with higher earnings” (Tolley, 2003. p. 1 - 8). This demonstrates, once again, the centrality of official language proficiency to labour market success.

2.3.4. Age

Section 81 of the Regulations requires that an individual be awarded points based on his or her age (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s.81). The maximum number of points an individual may receive is 10 points. According to the Regulations an individual who is
between the ages of 21 and 49 will receive the maximum number of points (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s.81). There is, therefore, a significant age bias in the selection criteria which assigns less value to applicants who are less than 21 years of age or more than 49 years of age. The presumption in the selection criteria is that persons between the ages of 21 and 49 years are most likely to successfully establish themselves in Canada. (Table 8, p. 171).

Although doubtless most researches would agree that immigrants in their 'working years' are most able to contribute to the Canadian economy, there may be some disagreement over the age range outlined in the selection criteria and what precisely constitutes one's 'working years'. Research by Joseph Schaafsma and Arthur Sweetman indicates that 'age at immigration matters' because younger immigrants are more likely than older immigrants to receive education and acquire experience in Canada and are thus less susceptible to the devaluation that research suggests older immigrants experience. They also note that younger immigrants may acculturate more easily than older immigrants and suggests, as well, that younger immigrants are often highly motivated, which leads them to outperform other immigrants and in some cases, the native born (Schaafsma and Sweetman, 1999). Schaafsma and Sweetman's research suggests that immigrants who settle in Canada before the age of 10 experience the lowest earnings differential of all immigrants. Among visible minority immigrants, those who immigrated before the age of 10 do not experience a reduction in earnings relative to other immigrants, but visible minority immigrants who arrive later in life do. Schaafsma and Sweetman suggest that earnings differentials for visible minority immigrants may be a result of age at immigration, rather than necessarily discrimination.
2.3.5. Arranged Employment

The term "arranged employment" is defined in section 82 of the Regulations as "an offer of indeterminate employment in Canada" (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s.82.). Pursuant to section 82 of the Regulations, an individual will be awarded a 10-point bonus for arranged employment if Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC) provides a permanent confirmation, in the form of a labour market opinion, that there is a shortage in Canada of the skills required to fill the position. In addition, the Regulations require that a skilled worker either already hold a work permit or, if the skilled worker does not hold a work permit and does not intend to work in Canada prior to the issuance of the permanent resident visa, the worker must have been offered a job that is approved by an officer based on an opinion provided by HRSDC (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s.82(2)). An offer of employment will be approved by an officer if it is established that the offer of employment is genuine; the employment position is not part-time or seasonal; and the wages and working conditions of the employment are sufficient to attract and retain Canadian citizens (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s.82(2)(c)), (Table 9, p. 172 - 173).

Although research on the relationship between arranged employment and labour market success is scant, Gozalier has argued that some immigrants may be disadvantaged in the Canadian labour market, particularly in the period immediately following their arrival, because they lack the network and knowledge about local conditions that would facilitate employment placement. Arranged employment, which may mitigate a newcomer's need
for networks and other connections to obtain employment, therefore is likely a predictor of potential success in the Canadian labour market.

2.3.6. Adaptability

A maximum of 10 points is awarded based on an applicant’s adaptability. According to section 83 of the Regulations, points will be awarded to a skilled worker based on the educational credentials of his or her spouse or common-law partner (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s.83). In addition, points will be awarded if the skilled worker or his or her spouse or accompanying common-law partner has previously studied in Canada for at least a two year duration at a post-secondary institution in Canada (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s.83(3)). Similarly, points will be awarded if the skilled worker or his or her accompanying spouse or accompanying common-law partner previously engaged in at least one year of full-time work in Canada under a work permit (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s. 83(4)). Furthermore, points will be awarded if the skilled worker or his or her accompanying spouse or common-law partner has a relative residing in Canada who is a Canadian citizen or a permanent resident of Canada (DOJ: 2002, Regulations, s. 83(5)) (Table 10, p. 174 – 175).

However, the criteria do not assess where the education was obtained, and research suggests that there may be tenuous relationship between education not obtained in Canada and potential earnings. In addition there is no assessment of spousal official language proficiency, which has been strongly linked to potential earnings and higher returns on immigrant education. In the absence of such an assessment and financial
support for spousal language training, it may be more difficult for the spouse to be successful in the Canadian labour market, regardless of his or her level of education, and particularly if the education was not acquired in Canada.

Awarding points for previous work or study in Canada by the spouse or the Principal Applicant recognizes the positive benefits derived from prior Canadian experiences and the relationship between these experiences and more successful integration. Research indicates that immigrants with Canadian work or study experience are more likely to succeed in the labour market.

Finally, it is likely that a family relationship in Canada would enhance immigrants' ability to integrate and, as a result, would have a positive effect on their potential economic contribution to Canada. Research on “network capital” has found that contacts in the host country do make a significant difference in integrating, particularly for lower-income ethnic immigrants. However, Ooka and Wellman argue that it is heterogeneous networks, rather than networks composed only of members from an immigrant's own ethnic group, that are of the greatest benefit (Ooka and Wellman, 2004. p. 3-17).

2.3.7. Settlement Funds

The government expects economic immigrants to be self-supporting while they establish themselves in Canada. With the exception of applicants with arranged employment in Canada, skilled worker applicants are required to provide proof of funds at the time they submit their application. Regulation 76 (1)(b) indicates that the applicant is required to
demonstrate that they have the "minimum necessary income" to support themselves and their family members for six months. The actual amounts are calculated with reference to Statistics Canada's current annual Low Income Cut-Off (LICO) as established for urban areas with a population of over 500,000 – and based on the size of the applicant's family. Table 11 (p. 176) shows the amounts required in 2006.

2.4. Skilled Workers versus Other Newcomers

Although the intent of the selection process in Canada's immigration system is to select those immigrants who are most likely to succeed in Canada, some newcomers will nonetheless fare better than others and, indeed, better than some native-born Canadians. This is a result of a complex set of factors, including discriminatory experiences, the ability to form networks in Canada and access to support services that facilitate integration. As such, the selection process is only a predictor of future success and not a determinant.

Indeed, some newcomers have fared surprisingly well, in spite of lower levels of education and language proficiency (Hiebert, 2004). Others have not fared as well, in spite of official language proficiency and higher levels of education (Pendakur and Pendakur, 1998). Hiebert's study shows the utility and benefit of offering a full range of settlement services, such as welfare and language training, to newcomers. He found that refugees who arrived in British Columbia with no proficiency in an official language nonetheless did quite well in the labour market and hypothesizes that the wide range of settlement services offered to refugees facilitates official language acquisition and offsets
their initial lack of proficiency. He therefore recommends “increasing settlement services [to immigrants], especially in the area of social support and language training, in an effort to better prepare immigrants for the work force” (Hiebert, 2004).

Similar conclusion can be reached from David Ley's study of business immigrants to British Columbia. He notes that, contrary to media reports and some scholarly research, business immigrants, who include investors, entrepreneurs and self-employed applicants, may have not fared very well in the province. Available evidence suggests that many were unemployed and living off savings or investments in their countries of origin, some had spouses who had returned without their families to their countries of origin, and most were discouraged about their economic prospects in Canada. Ley points out that one of the central problems was the lax selection criteria, including only limited requirements for official language proficiency, education and experience. Because business immigrants are viewed as self-supporting, they are expected to finance their own language training, which is often not feasible, given their minimal earnings and, when employed, the need to work long hours in order to achieve a degree of success (Ley, 2000; p. 4 – 11).

2.5. Criticism of the Selection System

In an empirical research conducted for Metropolis Project, Bauder showed that the vast majority of Canadians could not enter Canada as skilled workers. His exercise indicated that even though Canadians enjoyed advantages over foreigners, such as speaking at least one of the two official languages and having arranged employment in Canada, only 26 percent of Canadian-born men and 20 percent of Canadian-born women over the age of
18 would qualify for immigration under the new skilled-workers program (Sarditz, 2004. p. 22 - 26).

Critics of the selection system for Skilled Workers argue that it is too restrictive and that too few immigrants will be admitted as a result. This is seen as especially problematic given concerns over the "brain drain" and the shortage of skilled workers in Canada; researchers have argued that immigration is one way to offset the loss of native-born Canadian skilled workers, particularly if immigrants' skills and credentials are recognized and utilized (Reitz, 2001. p. 1 - 14; 18 - 25). In the prepublished regulations for IRPA, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration recommended raising the pass mark for Skilled Workers from 70 points to 80 points, but in the final regulations, the pass mark was set at 75 (67 since 2003) to respond to concerns that anything higher could prevent the immigration of many skilled workers to Canada. In spite of this change, the criticisms have persisted.

In addition, a gender-based analysis of Bill C-11 (the Bill that preceded IRPA) noted that "awarding points on the basis of formal education, training and patterns of paid labour force participation does not always take into account barriers that women face in accessing those opportunities in source countries" (CIC: 2006). Gender stratification, unpaid domestic labour and interruptions in paid employment to bear and raise children may all have disadvantageous effects on female applicants under the Skilled Worker Class. On the other hand, the emphasis that the selection system places on education, rather than paid labour force experience, will likely have a positive effect on female applicants.
Other observers criticize the criteria, arguing that points should be awarded for additional or different criteria, such as the existence of a settlement plan and support from community organizations or intended future study in Canada. According to this view, other attributes, which are not assessed by the current selection criteria, may contribute to an immigrant's economic success in Canada (Tolley, 2003).

2.6. Immigrant Adaptation and Influential Factors

Immigrant integration as the Canadian government policy is, in fact, one of the possible outcomes of immigrant adaptation. Immigrant adaptation is such a multifaceted phenomenon that many factors, such as government policy, personal decision and the attitudes of the host society, could change its course of development and the direction. With different philosophy and ideology from different sectors, there would be different forms or outcomes of immigrant adaptation. Thus, this section begins with the discussion on immigrant adaptation, then, identifies the adaptation factors and the modes of adaptation, and finally unfolds the different aspects of integration.

2.6.1. Defining Adaptation

When encountering a new environment and culture, people would instinctively respond in various ways. These responses are generally identified as adjustment, reaction, and withdrawal. In the case of adjustment, people make changes in the direction to reduce conflicts and seek harmony with the environment, and a harmony between different cultural groups. Contrary to adjustment, in the case of reaction, immigrants try to change
the environment and culture according to their needs. Withdrawal from the arena happens when immigrants either want to reduce the pressure of environment or are excluded by the host culture. These responses indicate that adaptation is people trying to fit into a new environment and culture (Li, 1999: 13).

As far as human interaction is concerned, in the course of continuous and first-hand contact between two distinct cultural groups, there are inevitably cultural changes in either a group or an individual to gain harmony. This cultural change, which results from cultural contact, is described in social psychology as acculturation. Simply put, cross-cultural adaptation is the generic term used to refer to both the process of dealing with acculturation and outcome of the acculturation (Berry, 1987:43).

2.6.2. Adaptation Factors

Although interaction and change are identified as two important key words in adaptation or acculturation, the primary question in adaptation is that who should change and in what direction. Although in cultural interaction changes inevitably happen in every culture involved, it is important to note that most research discusses the cultural changes of immigrants. This may be simply because the era of invasion and colonization is gone and nowadays, in most cases, people migrate for personal safety, peace or better life. Thus immigrants possess inevitably weak vitality and are supposed to change, no matter whether they come to the new land voluntarily or involuntarily, and no matter which country they migrate to. In contemporary societies, the only realistic alternative is that
immigrants change in order to adapt to the host society (Berry, 1990; Berry & Sam, 1997; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Honeyford, 1988; Kim, 1988).

Although immigrants are the agents of cultural change, they do not have complete power to choose the direction of change. Beside immigrants themselves, there are two other factors influencing the directions or outcomes of adaptation; these factors are government policies and acculturation orientations of the host society members, with the former as a decisive one. Halli and Driedger (1999) assert that “Government policies and approaches that lead to successful integration are part of the adjustment process.” Indeed, state immigration and settlement policies can have a decisive impact on the acculturation orientation of both immigrants and members of the host society (Berry & Sam, 1997; Bonin, 1976; Bourhis, et al., 1997; Boutang & Parademetriou, Halli & Driedger, 1999; Harles, 1997).

State immigration and settlement policies are generally shaped within one of four clusters of state ideologies: pluralist, civic, assimilationist, and ethnist (Bourhis et al., 1997; Breton, 1988; Driedger, 1989; Helly, 1993; Rao, Richmond & Zubrzycki, 1984). Each of the four ideological clusters is likely to produce specific public policies concerning the acculturation of immigrant groups. Under the context of state policies, immigrants and members of the host community develop their acculturation orientation (Li, 1999).
2.6.2.1. Pluralism Ideology

The first cluster expects that immigrants adopt the public values of the host country. However, this ideology also upholds that the state has no mandate in defining or regulating the private values of citizens, whose individual liberties in personal domains must be respected. One premise of this approach is that it is considered of value to the host community that immigrants maintain key features of their cultural and linguistic distinctiveness while adopting the public values of the host majority. Another premise is that it is equitable that state funds be distributed to support both majority and immigrant group ethno-cultural activities. Canada is an example of a pluralistic society with multiculturalism as a mechanism for tolerance of minority cultures.

2.6.2.2. Civic Ideology

Civic ideology shares two important features of pluralism ideology:

1) the expectation that immigrants adopt the public values of the host country; and
2) that the state has no right to interfere with the private values of its individual citizens.

However, this ideology is characterized by an official state policy of nonintervention in the private values of specific groups of individuals including those of immigrant and ethno-cultural minorities. United Kingdom is seen as an example of a country espousing a civic ideology (Li, 1999).
2.6.2.3. Assimilation Ideology

There exists no widely accepted definition of what constitutes assimilation. *Webster's New World Dictionary* defines assimilation as "the cultural absorption of a minority group into the main cultural body" whereas the *Petit Robert* speaks of "absorption" and "intégration." *Webster's* defines the verb to assimilate as *to become like or alike, to be absorbed and incorporated.*

In *Vision d'avenir*, Bernard (1990:15) provides a culturally based definition of the concept:

> Assimilation ... is the complete absorption of a person or group into the culture of another group. The community replaces its original cultural identity with that of the dominant group. Moreover, the integration does not necessarily involve the loss of cultural identity, but signifies rather a smooth insertion into the receiving society. The phenomena of acculturation and assimilation comprise several degrees between the complete adherence of an individual to the schema of his original culture and his total adherence to the schema of another culture.

Like the pluralism and civic ideologies, this ideology also includes the expectation that immigrants adopt the public values of the host country. However, it expects immigrants to abandon their own cultural and linguistic distinctiveness for the sake of adopting the culture and values of the dominant group consisting of core of the nation state. The USA, although it is slowly shifting away from original assimilation policies to a civic position, is still widely used as a distinguishing example of assimilation ideology (Li, 1999).

2.6.2.4. Ethnist Ideology

The fourth cluster shares the first two features of the assimilation ideology:
1) immigrants must adopt the public values of the host nation
2) the state has a right to limit the expression of certain aspects of private values, especially those of immigrant minorities.

Unlike the three ideologies examined above, the ethnical ideology usually defines a nation as being composed of a kernel ancestral ethnic group as determined by birth and kinship. Thus, immigrants who do not share this common kinship may never be accepted as legitimate citizens of the state, legally or socially. Most homogenous countries, such as Japan, Israel, and Germany, are seen to belong to this ideology.

Among the four ideologies, only pluralistic and civic societies allow people of various cultural backgrounds living together to form a multicultural society. However, even though the friendly and supportive policies have a decisive role in immigrant acculturation, the attitude of host culture members can never be neglected, because they are the very people with whom immigrants have contact on a daily basis. Indeed, state policies cannot represent the choice of every social member, whether in a democratic or authoritative social setting. Hence, attitudes of host culture members will greatly influence the course of immigrant adaptation (Li, 1999).

2.6.3. Major Modes of Adaptation

When individuals settle into a new culture, they have to respond to new values and beliefs that may differ significantly from those left behind. Since emigration is an individual action, the adaptation strategies such as adjustment, reaction and withdrawal are seen in various forms that reflect personal diversity. In most cases, to function in a
new culture, the newcomer may choose to adjust some of his or her expectations and behaviors, and start the process of adaptation.

On the premise of a pluralistic social system, this process of adaptation, or acculturation, will be in the modes of assimilation, separation, marginalization and integration. Assimilation and integration usually take place in many spheres of a newcomer’s life for him or her to be accepted by the individuals and institutions, which comprise the host society. However, newcomers’ different perspectives and different experiences on arrival in the host country, and the political environment and the attitudes of the host society would lead to reaction quite often in the form of separation, or lead to withdrawal in the form of marginalization (Berry 1997; Bourhis et al., 1997; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Honeyford, 1988; Thomas, 1992).

2.6.3.1. Assimilation

Assimilation takes place when newcomers voluntarily or involuntarily give up their heritage culture in order to move into the host culture. For the host society it implies the absorption of the migrant minority into the dominant culture for a homogeneous society. Complete assimilation, because it involves a total surrender of ethnic identity, imposes a sometimes painful sacrifice on immigrants and inevitably brings acculturation stresses (Berry 1997; Bourhis, et al., 1998).

Though the nature and concepts of assimilation are under continuous discussion, there has been considerable amount of confusion. R. Park and E. Burgess (1921) 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 life” (Park, 1921: 735).

Green (1952), in his discussion of assimilation, made a perceptive differentiation between cultural behavior and social structural participation. He argued that persons and groups may “acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups,” and meanwhile they may be excluded from “sharing their experience” and noticed themselves indefinitely delayed in being “incorporated with them in a common cultural life.” While many memories, sentiments, and attitudes of the host society are common property in Canada, the matter of sharing experience and being incorporated in a common life is somewhat limited in two ways: first, by an unwillingness on the side of the host society; second, by a desire of the new arrivals to foster social participation among themselves. Thus, although it is usually the host society which creates barriers to social participation, the immigrant groups may likewise do so for themselves (p. 66).

As Kent (1953) indicated 55 years ago, assimilation is a process of absorption. It is a process by which one body integrates a foreign body so that the original identity of the latter is lost and it becomes an indistinguishable part of the absorbing body (p. 239). Smith (1939) suggests that there is somewhat of a “regular or natural order in the assimilative process.” “External assimilation” occurs first. This refers to the more superficial aspects of culture, such as dress, eating customs, gestures, and mannerisms (p. 124). The second stage, according to Zhu (1997), should be called “internal assimilation.”
which means a person has not only superficially, but mentally accepted the culture. For instance, after marrying a Canadian women and living out of Montreal Chinatown, a mainland Chinese student now enjoys most positive aspects of mainstream cultural society. He holds himself out not as Chinese but as Canadian, even though he is Chinese in origin (comment in questionnaire).

According to Porter (1965), assimilation can be divided into two types: cultural and structural. Cultural assimilation illustrates the extent to which the immigrants absorb the culture of the mainstream society (p. 72). In this assimilative process, a mutual effect may occur on both the immigrants and the host society. Structural assimilation is an absorbing process by which the immigrants distribute themselves in the institutional structure of the host society. Comparing the terms “internal assimilation” and “external assimilation” used by Smith (1939), who emphasized the process and depth of assimilation, Porter focused on types and contents of assimilation from the perspectives of cultures and social structures.

It appears that the differentiation argued by Green is crucial because the careful distinction between cultural behavior and social structure is relevant to the question:

What has been the assimilation process for the Chinese immigrants in their experience in Montréal? Such a distinction was conceptualized by Gordon (1964) in his discussion of the nature of the American pluralist society as the difference between “behavioral assimilation” and “structural assimilation” as defined by Porter. In the assessment of the assimilation of an immigrant group into mainstream society, Gordon stressed the importance of the difference between cultural behavior and social structure (pp. 67-71).
Gordon further suggested that culture and social structure are closely related and in a constant state of dynamic interaction since the norms and values of a society determine the nature of social relationship (p. 33). The structure of a society comprises the "set of crystallized social relationships which its members have with each other ... and which relates them to the major institutional activities of the society (p. 31)."

According to Gordon (1964), cultural assimilation is the "change of cultural patterns to those of the host society" and structural assimilation is "the large scale entrance into cliques, clubs, and institutions of the host society" (p. 71). Gordon concludes that cultural assimilation is likely to be the first kind of assimilation to occur when a minority group arrives in a new society. After the cultural assimilation, structural assimilation leads to economic, social, marital, identificational and all other types of assimilation. The assimilation process an ethnic group is subjected to can be divided into seven subprocesses, where the assimilated (p. 70):

1) change their cultural patterns (including religious beliefs) to those of the host society;

2) take on large-scale primary group relationships with the host society, i.e., fully enter into the societal network of groups and institutions, or societal structure, of the host society;

3) intermarry and interbreed in the mainstream society;

4) develop a sense of peoplehood, or ethnicity, of the host society in place of their previous ethnic sense;

5) reach a point where they encounter no discriminatory behavior;

6) reach a point where they encounter no prejudiced attitudes; and

7) do not raise demands about the nature of the mainstream public or civic life and issues that involve value and power conflict with the people in the host society.
Each of these subprocesses of assimilation differs not only by degree but also by depth of psychological experience. Each subprocess may constitute a particular stage or type of the assimilation process (Sohoni, 2000). Synthetically, based on the review of theoretical opinions from Gordon and other sociologists such as Smith and Porter, the framework of assimilation process can be schematically represented in the following diagram:
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Under the Cultural Assimilation in the left column, language assimilation refers to the process of adopting the language of the host society. Language adoption is usually the crucial beginning step for cultural assimilation. When an immigrant starts to change their original clothing in order to fit in a host society, they are in the process of clothing assimilation. Dietetically, when an immigrant is willing to add the common food of the mainstream society into their traditional diet, they are in the process of dietetic assimilation. Custom assimilation refers to the process of adapting to the customs such as gestures and greeting habits of a mainstream society. Religious assimilation refers to the process in which the immigrants begin to accept the religious beliefs and observances of a mainstream society.

Under the Structural Assimilation in the right column, institutional-attitude assimilation refers to the process in which the immigrants reach a point where they encounter no racial prejudice. In the process of behavioral-attitude assimilation, there is an absence of discrimination from the host people against the immigrants. Identificational assimilation refers to the process when the immigrants gradually develop a sense of peoplehood based exclusively on a host society. In the process of civic assimilation, the immigrants do not raise demands which involve value and power conflict with the people in a host society. Marital assimilation refers to the process in which the immigrants intermarry on a large scale with the people of a host society, and their descendants are amalgamated or interbread with the people in the host society (Zhu, 1997).

The diagram suggests that the process of assimilation is a movement from external assimilation to internal assimilation via both cultural and structural accesses. The cultural
access emphasizes the adoption of common cultural life of a host society. The structural access focuses on the incorporation in the social network of cliques, clubs, and institutions of a host society. The internal assimilation is the final stage of the entire process, which is built up gradually by each individual subprocesses between the external and internal stages.

However, the degrees of assimilation do differ. The depth of immersion depends on the individual situation and characteristics of the person involved. There are logical directions of assimilation. Its components and degrees are determined by such variables as ability and willingness of personal adjustment, educational background, cultural heritage, financial foundation and new social contacts. The process of assimilation is influenced positively or negatively by a person’s motive. Cultural assimilation does not necessarily precede structural assimilation for certain individuals although for groups they do. They may occur simultaneously. The original identity of the assimilated may not essentially be lost, even though the whole process of internal assimilation is completed (Zhu, 1997).

2.6.3.2. Separation

The other end of acculturation continuum is separation. It is the term used for immigrants’ adaptation of avoiding the host culture. This acculturation orientation implies barriers between ethnic groups. It happens when the newcomers retain their heritage culture and remain apart from the host culture. Separation is indicative of willingness to be accepted by the host society, and has the nature of reaction. When there
is separation, newcomers isolate themselves in terms of setting up relationship with other social groups even partially in the host society (Thomas, 1992).

2.6.3.3. Marginalization

The term "marginality" was first introduced by Robert Park in 1928. Park’s "marginal man" is "on the margin of two cultures and two societies which never completely [interpenetrate and fuse]" (Park 1928: 892, Brackets in original quote). Park described the marginal man as one with "spiritual instability, intensified self-consciousness, restlessness, and malaise" (893).

2.6.3.3.1. Encapsulated Marginality

Janet Bennett conceptualized the term cultural marginality as encompassing two outcomes: *encapsulated marginality* and *constructive marginality* (Bennett 1993). *Encapsulated marginality*, according to Bennett’s framework, is indicative of a loneliness, alienation, self-segregation, and internal distress. She identifies "the degree of similarity between internalized cultures as a factor in the intensity of disintegration for the encapsulated marginal" (Bennett 1993: 114). Thus, the more vastly different two cultures are from one another, the more prone an individual is to "internal culture shock" (112).
2.6.3.3.2. Constructive Marginality

The second type of marginality, according to Bennett, is a person who takes an active role in consciously constructing his or her identity (Bennett 1993). This type of individual, termed the *constructive marginal*, is said to move or shift effortlessly between cultural identities and create an "integrated multicultural existence" (McCaig 2000: 13).

Bennett emphasized the "self-differentiation" and assumption of "personal responsibility" in making life choices, aiding in the ability to shift frames of cultural reference with ease (Bennett 1993). Within her framework, she suggests that the ideal situation is one in which people look to their own self-reference and awareness for their identity, as opposed to the established definitions provided by singular cultures (Bennett 1993).

2.6.3.3.3. Marginalization Mode

In marginalization mode, groups lose or reject both their traditional culture and that of the larger society (Berry & Sam, 1997). This strategy is characterized by little possibility or interests of immigrants in cultural maintenance, but in vain to merge into the dominant culture because of racial discrimination or exclusion. When imposed by the larger society, it is tantamount to ethnocide and constitutes classical marginality. This outcome of acculturation is often accompanied by a feeling of alienation, loss of identity, and a good deal of collective and individual confusion and anxiety.

However, research suggests that some immigrants who dissociate themselves from both their ethno-cultural origin and the host majority may choose to do so. They prefer to
identify themselves as individuals rather than members of either an immigrant group or the host majority (Moghaddam, 1992; Triandis, Bontempo, Villarelal, Asai & Lucca, 1988). Many Chinese scholars and immigrants feel proud of a marginal position between Western culture and Eastern culture because that position allows them to make greater contribution to the world (Lee, 1994; Li, 1994; Wong, 1994). Moise and Bourhis (1996) group these people as individualists, given that such immigrants refuse to be bounded by either in-group or host majority ascriptions (Bourhis et al., 1997).

2.6.3.4. Integration

Integration is an ideal outcome of acculturation, a strategy many countries and most immigrants prefer. The integration strategy from the immigrants’ perspective reflects a desire to maintain key features of the immigrant cultural identity while actively adopting the principles and values of the host society and modifying their own (Bourhis et al., 1997; CIC. 1996; Ho, Chen & Bedford, 2000). Integration also implies that immigrants embrace and celebrate cultures of other minority groups.

Even though the integration process is not smooth, given that the acculturation orientation of the dominant culture members would affect the immigrant acculturation process, immigrants suffer much less acculturation stress when they integrate than when they adopt other options. Therefore, this mode enables immigrants to settle down and to begin making contributions to society in a relatively shorter time. This is the very reason that immigrant integration is widely recognized as the ideal model of immigrant adaptation (Berry, 1997; Bourhis et al., 1997; Harles, 1997; Rao et al., 1984). However it
is not easy for immigrants to integrate into the host society; immigrants often face significant barriers to integration (Li, 1999).

2.6.4. Integration - Starting Point

Immigrant integration is a participation in the sphere of social life. Marshall’s (1973) conception of citizenship rights has been widely employed in immigrant integration. He asserts that citizenship comprises civil rights, political rights, and social rights. Civil rights concern individual freedom: liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice. Civil rights lead to political rights, which concern the rights of democratic participation. Political rights enable the working class to obtain social rights covering “the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a citizen being according to the standards prevailing in society” (Marshall, 1973:72).

In Canada, civic, economic, and social rights are granted first, with political rights constituting the last layer in the sequence (Hammar, 1990). Therefore, in investigating immigrants’ incorporation into their host societies, attention should be paid to immigrants’ access to civic and, particularly, to economic and social rights (Isbister, 1996:196). Access to economic rights enables immigrants to enter and compete in the labor market. Access to social rights includes eligibility for government programs, such as education in public schools, health benefits, and welfare and social insurance schemes (Neuwirth, 1999:53).
That immigrants enjoy, in principal, the same civic, economic, and social rights as citizens also means that they integrate into Canada from these perspectives. In view of globalization and the restructuring of the economy, the dimensions of economic and social integration are considered to be the primary factors in the overall integration of immigrants from nontraditional source countries. A number of researchers hold that the economic integration of immigrants in the host society constitutes an essential dimension of the general process of integration.

Neuwirth (1999) defines economic integration of immigrants as their participation in the economic opportunity structure. Thus, immigrants who exercise their economic rights or enter the labor force but experience long term or periodic unemployment are considered as wanting in economic integration. Piche and Belanger (1995 in Neuwirth, 1999) identify three sets of factors that affect immigrants’ economic integration. The first set is related to the global context affecting receiving as well as sending societies, such as international relations, globalization of changes. The second set derives from the context in sending societies both at the macro- (ex: level of economic development, educational level, etc.) and micro-level (ex: pre-migration characteristics). The third set refers to the context in receiving societies, also both at the macro- (ex: immigration policies, degree of pluralism, etc.) and the micro-level (ex: post immigration characteristics).

Since economic integration of immigrants is dependent on their personal characteristics (selectivity, age, education, language, etc.) and the nature of the receiving society (levels of skills, needs of labor, extent of closure towards outsiders), two distinct processes are at work in immigrants’ economic integration. The first one is access to jobs, and the second
is human capital factors operating in the expected direction. Immigrants' economic integration, or the exclusion from it, would affect their social integration.

Social integration is defined as participation in the social institutional sphere of society. In order to participate, immigrants must first acquire the necessary competence to follow the social and cultural practices which structure the public aspects of life in an industrialized society. Equally important, the kind of economic integration immigrants are able to achieve would be the primary factor influencing their participation in the social-institutional sphere. Therefore, immigrants' economic integration combined with their educational background is particularly significant.

2.7. Different Perspectives on Immigrant Integration

Up to date, no consensus has been reached on the notion of immigrant integration. The Canadian government believes in the adaptability of certain immigrant groups and regards immigrants' financial self-sufficiency as the first integration indicator. Among researchers, some perceive integration as an interactive process, others regard it a personal learning process. Still others argue it is the incorporation of needs and services. These perspectives are discussed next.

2.7.1. Integration – a Canadian Approach

The Canadian Government declared in 1994 that immigrant integration is a Canadian approach (CIC, 1994). For a multiethnic federation as Canada, with a French-English
balance at the basis of the social system, immigrant integration is a must. Complete assimilation of immigrant is difficult since there is no agreed norm to which they could conform. The balance between the charter groups could easily be disturbed if immigrants were to assimilate more into one group than the other (Thomas, 1994:107-8).

Another reason for Canada to emphasize integration is the radically changed racial, ethnic and cultural character of Canada’s immigrants. Since 1975, immigrants from Third World countries have outnumbered immigrants from Europe each year. The data compiled by CIC indicate that 79.0% in 2004, 88.6% in 2005, and 80.5% in 2006 of the total inflow were nonwhite (Table 12, p. 177-178; Figure 15, p. 179; Table 13, p. 180-181; Figure 16, p. 182). As a result, more than half of the total populations of immigrants who now live in Canada are no longer of European origin (2006 Canada census).

In 2005 Report, CIC asserts that integration is “a process of mutual adjustment by both newcomers and society (CIC, 2005). However, as CIC further explains, the weight of integration is always on the side of immigrants:

... the concept of “integration” implies a political desire and commitment to encourage newcomers to adapt to Canadian society and to be received by Canadian and their institutions without requiring newcomers to abandon their cultures to conform to the values and practices of the dominant group, as long as the adherence to immigrants’ cultures does not contravene Canadian laws (CIC, 2005:12).

The CIC asserts that integration process comprises a number of factors, including the commitment to adapt to life in Canada; the ability to communicate in one of Canada’s official languages; contribution to the economic and social fabric; economic and social
self-sufficiency; sharing the principles, traditions, and values such as freedom, equality, and participatory democracy (CIC, 2005).

Integration as such, according to CIC, begins when an immigrant first applies to come to Canada and continues beyond the acquisition of citizenship and achievement of full participation in Canadian society (CIC, 2005). However, in order to shrink the government expenditures, to slow and then reverse the growth in annual debt, and to stimulate an internationally competitive economy, the immigration policies, especially with coming into force of IRPA in 2002, have been broadly oriented toward “ensuring that newcomers to Canada can integrate and contribute to Canada as quickly as possible, without adding to the burden on social programs” (Kiselev, 2005:32).

Thus, the primary goal of immigrant integration, from government’s perspective, has been immigrants’ self-sufficiency and economic contribution into Canadian economy. A number of scholars, however, question whether immigrants could really enjoy political, economic, and social rights when the government’s policies focus on economic aspects of contribution while ignoring the immigrants expectation on settlement in Canada (Kiselev, 2005).

2.7.2. Integration – an Interactive Process

The interactive model suggests that immigrant integration is by no means a personal effort but harmonized acculturation orientations of both the host majority and immigrant groups within a suitable government integration policy environment. It also asserts that
both sectors could influence the policy making towards their acculturation orientations (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Hardwood, Giles & Bourhis, 1994).

An interactive model has been developed based on Berry's acculturation framework. John Berry's (1997) acculturation framework was first established by Redfield, Linton & Herskovits (1936) and continues to be cited widely as a benchmark measure (Ghuman, 1998; Phinney, 1990). Built upon two of the four fundamental assumptions of the multicultural policy presented by Pierre Elliot Trudeau in 1971,11 Berry's framework considers the questions: 1) Is it considered to be of value to maintain cultural identity and characteristics? (bonding) and 2) Is it considered to be of value to maintain relationships with other groups? (bridging). From these two issues he lays out a framework that identifies four styles or strategies for navigation of the acculturation process. As seen in the Chart reproduced below, Berry considers Integration, Assimilation, Separation, and Marginalization as the possible options one may adopt with respect to these two central questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension 1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it considered to be of value to maintain cultural identity and characteristics?</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension 2</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it considered to be of value to maintain relationships with other groups?</td>
<td>Segregation</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11 On October 8, 1971, Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau introduced the Canadian policy of 'Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework'. This policy was designed to produce a solution to the ongoing fighting between English and French advocates in politics and government. http://members.shaw.ca/RenaisssanceServices/acculturation.htm
In various studies it has been reported that integration most clearly demonstrates a "substantial relationship with positive adaptation" (Berry, 1997, p. 24), while it also appears to be "the most effective strategy if we take long term health and well-being as indicators" (Schmitz cited in Berry, 1997, p. 25). Phinney, Chavira, and Williamson (1992) have reported that integration remains positively correlated with self-esteem for "minority" group members (e.g. Hispanics, Blacks and Asians) while assimilation correlated negatively with self-esteem for these groups.

Marginalization contrarily has been associated with poor positive adaptation where individuals who are characterized by marginalization tend to be shut off or cut out of both traditions, having few or no connections for the development of positive social support and recognition (Berry, 1997; Sam & Berry, 1996). While Berry, Kim, Power, Young & Bujaki (1989) point out that marginalization is not easily defined, they state that it is most centrally characterized by confusion, anxiety, striking out against the larger society, and by feelings of alienation, loss of identity, and acculturative stress.

Acculturative stress has been measured extensively by Berry and colleagues, indicating a variety of relationships with other demographic and societal variables [Berry, Kim, Minde & Mok, 1987; Berry, Poortinga, Segal & Dasen, 1992; Phinney & Kohatsu, 1997]. These variables include the nature of larger society (e.g., Multicultural vs. Assimilationist) which has been demonstrated to have an impact on the acculturation of individuals and groups. It has been shown that culturally plural societies (vs. monistic ones, for example Japan) provide more support for social and cultural groups and also have greater tolerance (multicultural ideology), both of which tend to foster integration.
and less assimilation stress. Other important individual and group variables considered by Berry, et al. (1992) are: reason for migration, age at arrival, phase of acculturation, gender, social support. It has been reported that those who migrate voluntarily (immigrants and sojourners) experience less stress than those who migrate involuntarily (refugees) (Berry, et al., 1992). Further, those individuals who arrive at younger ages tend to adjust more readily to life in the new setting than those who arrive later in life (Tonks & Paranjpe, 1999). Early and middle phases of acculturation may also be more stressful along with having lesser education and social support (Berry, et al., 1992). Finally, women and girls tend to report having experienced more stress along with greater dissatisfaction than do men and boys (Rosenthal, Ranieri, & Klimidis, 1996).

2.7.3. Integration – a Personal Learning Process

Many researchers see immigrant integration as a learning and growth experience (Bar-Yoself, 1968; Bochner, 1982; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Kim, 1988; Thayer, 1975; Tu, 1992). This is a process of socialization and desocialization, acculturation and deculturation, or learning and unlearning – as named by different researchers. It involves modifying previously learned attitudes, norms, values, beliefs and behavior patterns. It also involves obtaining new life skills and coping with problems which were not present in the home country. In this personal learning and growth process, the success is rooted in the personal integration competence, adaptive predispositional factors and host environmental conditions (Argyle, 1980; Bochner & Orr, 1979; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Kim, 1988; Rao et al., 1984).
Integration competence is composed of knowledge of the host environment, affective co-orientation with the host culture, and behavioral capability to perform various interactions in the host environment. Each factor would affect the other and together form an individual's integration competence.

Knowledge of the host communication system refers to the knowledge of the host language, host non-verbal behavior, and communication rules. Cognitive complexity can be defined as the structure of immigrants' knowledge/thoughts/ideas. During the process of cultural learning, immigrants increase their internal information-processing capacity and recognize their cognitive patterns as distinct from those of host culture. This gradually leads to "perspective taking" and "co-orientation reaction" with members of the host society. Affective co-orientation with the host culture is related to adaptation motivation, affirmative self-other attitude, and aesthetic emotional appreciation to the host milieu. Along with the above three capabilities, immigrants gain behavioral capacity to express the internal cognitive and affective experiences outwardly in communicating with other persons, verbally or non-verbally.

Predisposition decides that immigrants respond to host environment differently and have various adaptation experiences. Three factors have direct bearing on immigrant integration, namely, cultural and racial background, personal attributes, and preparedness for change. Cultural similarity or disparity and perceptions held by host community toward certain ethnic groups are important integration factors. Equally important, the degree or openness and resistance would also influence immigrant integration. For the preparedness, formal education experience is highlighted as schooling suggests the
cognitive capacity for new learning and mental resourcefulness. The preparedness also includes motivation of practical and cultural information, the host society and language training (Li, 1999).

However, integration learning does not happen in a vacuum, and host environment serves as the foreground or social context in which immigrants mobilize their resources and to which they strive to integrate in the host society. Two host environmental conditions directly pertinent to the immigrant adaptation are receptivity and conformity pressure. Environmental receptivity offers a positive or negative climate of openness and acceptance affecting housing, employment and interpersonal contacts of immigrants. Society varies in permissiveness, plasticity or tolerance, in allowing immigrants to deviate from its normative cultural patterns. Pluralistic societies tend to manifest a substantially high tolerance level toward cultural diversity, thus providing supportive environment for integration and cultural learning.

2.7.4. Integration – Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Immigrant integration is also seen as a process to meet needs at different integration stages. As newcomers are uprooted and transplanted into a new environment, whether involuntarily (as in the case of refugees) or voluntarily (as in the case of other immigrants), they experience certain needs that should be met to achieve participation and membership in the host society. These needs can be represented in a pyramid, which is commonly called Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs.
Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Pyramid is shown below (reproduced from “Time for Change” Encyclopedia). The pyramid illustrates five levels of human needs. The most basic are physiological and safety / security, shown at the base of the pyramid. As one moves to higher levels of the pyramid, the needs become more complex.

2.7.4.1. Physiological Needs

Physiological needs are the very basic needs such as air, water, food, sleep, sex, etc. When these are not satisfied we may feel sickness, irritation, pain, discomfort, etc. These feelings motivate us to alleviate them as soon as possible to establish homeostasis. Once they are alleviated, we may think about other things.
2.7.4.2. Safety Needs

Safety needs have to do with establishing stability and consistency in a chaotic world. These needs are mostly psychological in nature. We need the security of a home and family. However, if a family is dysfunctional, family members cannot move to the next level because they have safety concerns. Love and belongingness have to wait until they are no longer in fear. Many in our society cry out for law and order because they do not feel safe enough to go for a walk in their neighborhood. Unfortunately many people, particularly those in the inner cities, are stuck at this level.

2.7.4.3. Need to Belong

Love and sense of belonging are next on the ladder. Humans have a desire to belong to groups: clubs, work groups, religious groups, family, gangs, etc. We need to feel loved (non-sexual) by others, to be accepted by others. Performers appreciate applause. We need to be needed. We see numerous examples in advertising where our need for group belonging is tied to consumption of a particular product.

2.7.4.4. Esteem Needs

There are two types of esteem needs. First is self-esteem which results from competence or mastery of a task. Second, there is the attention and recognition that comes from others. This is similar to the sense of belonging level, however, wanting admiration has to do
with the need for power. People who have all of their lower needs satisfied, often drive very expensive cars because doing so raises their level of esteem.

2.7.4.5. Self-Actualisation

The need for self-actualisations is "the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming." People who have everything can maximize their potential. They can seek knowledge, peace, aesthetic experiences, self-fulfilment, oneness with God etc. It is usually middle-class to upper-class students who take up environmental causes, go off to a monastery, etc. (Maslow, 1970:34).

Maslow’s needs hierarchy indicates that at different levels of the hierarchical order — survival, safety, social, esteem and self-actualization, immigrants have different needs in five spheres of life: physical/mental well being, linguistic, economic, civic/social welfare, and privacy/sociability.

2.8. Integration Barriers

Immigrants' integration includes both economic and social integration. This process involves not only the individual characteristics of immigrants but also people in the hosting society. The recognition of their foreign education credentials is the first step for new immigrants to integrate into the host country’s labour market. Although Canada has its own foreign recognition system to select skilled immigrants, a considerable number of studies demonstrated that well-educated professional immigrants faced lots of barriers in
finding suitable jobs. Their foreign education credentials and work experience were undervalued and sometimes were not accepted (Galarneau and Morissette 2004; Kunz 2003; Hum and Simpson 2004; Worswick 2004). Moreover, Canadian experience has more value than educational background in the eyes of employers, even though they do not deny the value of educational equivalence. The education-job mismatch rates of new immigrants, especially female immigrants, are higher than those of native Canadians. As a result, new immigrants’ earnings are lower than native Canadians (Li 2003; Galarneau and Morisette 2004). Many newcomers find that they have to update their profession or trade in Canada to meet Canadian academic or occupational standards. Some new immigrants, who want to update their skills, have to take the first unskilled and low-wage job that they could find because they cannot suffer the expensive tuition fees (Brouwer 1999).

2.8.1. Integration Process

The integration process depends on both the immigrants’ individual characteristics and the groups in receiving society (Penninx 2003). Penninx defines immigration integration as follows:

“Integration is the process by which immigrants become accepted into society, both as individuals and as groups. This definition of integration is deliberately left open, because the particular requirements for acceptance by a receiving society vary greatly from country to country. The openness of this definition also reflects the fact that the responsibility for integration rests not with one particular group, but rather with many actors—immigrants themselves, the host government, institutions, and communities, to name a few (Penninx 2003, para. 2).
According to the above definition, an immigrant’s integration process is influenced by her/his individual characteristics and the receiving country’s interactions and institutions. Penninx (2003) suggests that the receiver society has much impact on immigration assimilation with its institutional structure and the way it reacts to newcomers. Thus the process of integration of immigrants takes place at both the individual and the collective level. The individual level involves housing, employment, education and social and cultural adaptation to the new society. The collective level concerns the general public institutions of the hosting societies or cities; for example, the educational system or institutional arrangements in the labour market.

However, research on integration demonstrates that a number of barriers prevent new immigrants from accessing professional occupations that correspond to their credentials and work experience. Lack of the necessary resources and assistance to transfer their skills, and lack of Canadian work experience are the biggest barriers for new immigrants to integrate into the Canadian labour market (Brouwer, 1999; Salaff, Greve and Xu, 2003; Galarneau and Morissette, 2004; Wang and Lo, 2004a). Although residents enjoy the same civic, economic, and social rights as citizens, they do not get the same job opportunities as Canadian-born. This is especially true for immigrants from Asia and Southeast Asia. The following studies suggest that discrimination operates through differential recognition of labour market qualifications and in a discriminatory process of recognizing credentials. The immigrants’ original country is one of the important factors influencing immigrants’ assimilation (Bauer, Lofstrom, and Zimmermann, 2000). Canadian immigration policies are based on immigrants’ labour market characteristics and the requirements of its labour market. (Bauer, Lofstrom, and Zimmermann, 2000)
found that only immigrants, enjoying similar economic development, schooling system, language and culture, can assimilate very fast into the Canadian labour market.

2.8.2. Non-recognition of Foreign Educational Credentials and Training

Many highly educated and skilled professional immigrants are unemployed or underemployed in Canada due to the non-recognition of foreign educational credentials and training, and different technological and professional standards (Brouwer, 1999). Many engineers end up in jobs which do not require their skills and experience. Furthermore, many immigrants have difficulties obtaining occupational licenses because they are unfamiliar with the regulatory bodies, employers, and academic institutions. Brouwer (1999) points out five main barriers for foreign trained professionals in attempting to gain access in their fields:

- lack of information for newcomers about how to access a profession or trade, including licensing standards and requirements
- difficulty in gaining recognition of foreign academic credentials by Canadian academic institutions, occupational regulatory bodies and employers
- difficulty in gaining recognition of foreign work experience by occupational regulatory bodies and employers
- the absence of institutionalized, arm’s-length appeals processes for those unfairly denied entry to regulated occupations
- lack of access to adequate, occupation-specific educational/training upgrading, language training and testing (Brouwer, 1999 p. 7).
The reasons why new immigrants experience the above difficulties in getting a professional job can be explained by the following:

1. When skilled immigrants get points for their education and training, occupation, and their qualification from Visa officers at local Canadian consulates or embassies, they believe they can find professional jobs or trade in Canada. In fact, this recognition does not link to "an individual's ability to practice an occupation in Canada" (Brouwer, 1999 p. 7);

2. The major problems for immigrants to get their certifications in Canada are "the process of certification varies from trade to trade and from province to province" and the lack of "trade-specific language training and testing" (Brouwer, 1999 p. 9). Some competency tests place emphasis on testing language facility rather than the ability to do the job;

3. Some professions in public health, safety, and welfare, require licenses. Foreign-trained people have to assess their credentials through some organizations if they want to work in these fields. If their credentials are lower than the provincial standard, they need to acquire further training or education; if their credentials are equal or higher than the standards, they must take an exam or a series of exams. In addition, Canadian work experience is a necessary condition for working in these fields;

4. Canadian academic institutions conduct “their own criteria and approach to foreign credentials” and some community colleges give advanced standing to prospective foreign trained students. Some immigrants have to give up retraining or updating their knowledge due to the fact that the tuition fee is considered to be too big burden for them.

5. Certifications are not enough for newcomers to get professional jobs because previous Canadian experience has more value in the eyes of employers when
they hire new employees. "Overqualified" is another excuse used by employers to refuse newcomers (Brouwer, 1999).

2.8.3. Provincial Level Gaps in Recognizing Qualification and Experience

In addition to the above individual factors that influence immigrants in job hunting, there are some gaps affecting qualification and experience recognition based on the provincial level. The Government of Manitoba has adopted a framework called 'Strategy on Qualifications Recognition' which addresses the following barriers (Canadian Labour and Business Centre, 2003):

→ Access to information: information regarding qualifications recognition available to immigrants, and information available to institutions responsible for assessing qualifications, being difficult to obtain and understand;

→ Qualifications assessment and recognition practices: problems with criteria and standards, unfair treatment, and inadequacy of assessment mechanisms and procedures creating barriers;

→ Costs and resources: not enough information about the costs and resources associated with credentials recognition;

→ Complexity of the challenge: issues of translation and authentication of qualifications, and the autonomous nature of assessing institutions representing additional barriers; and

→ Attitudes and approaches: comfort with status quo, complacency and a lack of a sense of urgency, and the existence of ethnocentrism and stereotyping (CLBC, 2003 p. 3).

Understanding and evaluating foreign trained skills, knowledge and experience plays a key role for immigrants to find jobs (Sangster, 2001). The fact that immigrants’
credentials and training are not being fully accepted in Canada has impeded immigrants' employment (McDade, 1988). McDade (1988) points out that foreign trained persons are required to be re-valued for apprenticeship training and they are also required to have more experience than those trained in Canada before examination. Some professional certifications were given stringent standards to foreign-trained people; they were required to fulfill all the examination requirements and a longer period of practical experience.

2.8.4. Stringent Standards for Certification

Individuals and their families must suffer lower incomes and standards of living if their foreign skills and experience are not accepted by employers. According to the survey of the Canadian Labour and Business Centre (CLBC), Sangster (2001) found that, "Canadian employers use a wide variety of approaches to assess the education and experience credentials of foreign-trained candidates" (Sangster, 2001 p. 6). The main points of employers are the following:

1) in health and engineering fields, licensing processes were too restrictive;
2) immigrants' lack of sufficient information about occupational certification practices in Canada;
3) prior to immigration, a self-assessment would help immigrants to determine where their credentials fit in Canadian terms;
4) immigration policy assessment place emphasis on paper credentials, ignoring the barriers immigrants are bound to face in transforming these credentials into Canadian labour market;
5) employers pay minimum, if any, attention on provincial credential assessment.
2.8.5. Social Barriers

Recognition of foreign credentials demands not only formal certification by licensing bodies and regulatory agencies in jobs, but also social recognition by employers, colleagues and co-workers in workplace even if certification is not required (Li, 2003). Although Québec has the most complex equivalency services in Canada (Brouwer, 1999), according to the survey results of Mansour there is no direct link between an immigrant getting equivalency and the capacity for them to integrate into the labour market (Mansour, 1996). Mansour finds little value in equivalency certification because immigrants rarely find jobs through their equivalency certifications. As Mansour points out, “Qualification alone will not get you the job you want” because most employers believe that prior Canadian work experience has more value than the equivalency certificate (Mansour, 1996).

Foreign trained people face differential treatments from native Canadians in the labour market; for example, they “encounter discrimination in employment and in access to services on the basis of their language characters” (Li, 2003). Discrimination is another barrier for new immigrants in getting a professional job. Minority immigrants do not have the same chance as Canadians to receive job offers even though they can speak both official languages fluently because of their accents, their colour, and their origin. Immigrants who were born in the US, UK, Europe, and those who immigrated between the ages of 15 and 24, their post secondary credentials were accepted (Li, 2003 p. 113-115). Non-recognition of foreign credentials not only led to new immigrants’ failure to get professional jobs, increasing education-job mismatch rate, and decreasing earnings,
but also increased the fiscal loss of the host country. The mismatch between new skilled immigrants and their actual occupations in Canada results in “substantial costs” both to individuals and host society.

According to a report by Price Waterhouse which was commissioned by the Ontario government, failure to recognize foreign academic credentials alone (not to mention foreign work experience) results in significant losses to the Ontario economy due to:

- increased costs to the welfare system and social services
- losses to employers who are unable to find employees with the skills and abilities they desperately require
- costs associated with unnecessary re-training for foreign-trained individuals
- the loss of potential revenue from foreign-trained individuals who are unable to work and contribute to the tax base and other parts of the economy (Brouwer, 1999, p. 5).

2.8.6. Language Barrier

Apart from foreign credential non-recognition, language proficiency is another important factor for new immigrants to integrate into the Canadian labour market. Research findings indicate that official languages proficiency is helpful for immigrants’ both economic performance and social integration (Boyd, 1999; Neuwirth, 1999; DeVoretz, 2000). Language proficiency contributes to immigrants’ abilities to integrate into the Canadian economy and to achieve social integration (Boyd, 1999). Recent immigrants, whose official language is not English or French, are most likely to be unable to communicate in English or French. Boyd (1999) regards language as a kind of tool which
can enhance the capacity to obtain all kinds of information. Knowing an official language can help new immigrants to get information related to their lives in the host country such as health care, social programs, employment opportunities, and civic and legal rights. At the same time, lacking language skills can also influence immigrants’ economic capital. In general, the higher the level of official languages, the higher labour force participation rate (Boyd, 1999). Conversely, immigrants without official language skill only can work for their own enclaves or lower skilled fields.

2.8.7. Integration and Macroeconomic Conditions

Immigrants’ economic integration is influenced not only by individuals and employers but also the macroeconomic condition of the host country. Most studies ignored the impact of macroeconomic conditions when they compare the economic performance of recent immigrants with the early cohorts (Aydemir, 2003). Aydemir explores the effects of macroeconomic conditions on immigrants’ integration in the labour market. Macroeconomic conditions influence labour force participation decisions whether immigrants are able to join the labour market or the job skills that they have. The length of immigrants’ assimilation is not only determined by immigrants’ human capital but also by the macro-economic conditions at the time they arrive and at the time of survey.

Macroeconomic conditions have a stronger impact in immigrant cohort labour market outcomes than individual qualities (Hum and Simpson, 2004). The weaker labour market demand influences the integration of recent cohorts. The integration path of immigrants is conditioned by the performance of the economy at the time when they arrive to Canada.
(Hum and Simpson, 2004). Non-recognition of foreign credentials, language proficiency, and macroeconomic conditions are not the only barriers to immigration integration. Economic assimilation is only part of integration. Successful integration is required for the receiving society to prepare the ground for the immigrants' economic and labour market contributions as well as their social and political incorporation. Meaningful and successful integration pursues an effective economic incorporation (Kunz, 2003, 34).

2.9. Chinese Immigrant Adaptation

The Literature Review reveals that immigrant adaptation is by no means a simple process. It is a personal decision within a plural social setting and affected by both external factors, such as political and economic situations and the degree of acceptance of the host society, and internal factors, such as willingness, readiness, and demographic variables, like education, etc. So, this part includes (1) the policy environment for Chinese immigrants and their characteristics, and (2) their present adaptation state. The data has been drawn from the research conducted on Chinese immigrants from Taiwan, Hong Kong and Mainland China, or other places, such as Vietnam as a whole from cultural perspective. The simple reason is, to date, there are very few studies conducted specifically on immigrants from Mainland China, or on independent immigrants.

2.9.1. Policy Environment

Chinese immigrants had been a least preferred group in the history of Canadian immigration. There were several legislations especially targeting Chinese. The Chinese
Immigrant Act in July 1885 required every person of Chinese origin to pay a head tax to discourage and restrict Chinese from entering Canada. (Mar, 1988:10; Munro, 1978).

The Royal Commission on Chinese and Japanese Immigration concluded in 1902 that Asians were unfit for full citizenship...obnoxious to a free community and dangerous to the state (Whitaker, 1987: 93). Legislation in 1923 made it virtually impossible for Chinese or people of Chinese descent to enter Canada. Those Chinese who were domiciled in Canada traditionally were prohibited from voting in BC and federal elections. Even the second generation of Chinese, raised and educated in Canada, was denied the right of citizenship and the right to work in many professions such as medicine, and pharmacy.

On May 14 1947, Ottawa repealed the 1923 Chinese Immigration Act, and subsequently abolished many discriminatory laws and regulations against the Chinese. After 1967 the federal government adopted the universal point system to select immigrants on the basis of qualification rather than racial origin, many Chinese immigrants were admitted into Canada as professionals and skilled workers.

2.9.2. Social Environment

2.9.2.1. The Comments about Chinese Immigrants

Plenty of data on Canadian immigration history have recorded that Chinese immigrants were mistreated, but very few provide the reasons. The confusion from the reading of the history of Canadian immigration policy rose as Li (1998) predicated, “today it seems
almost incomprehensible that people first brought to the country to alleviate labor shortages could have been seen as so threatening that municipal, provincial, and federal governments would pass extensive laws to restrict their rights and single them out for exclusion” (p. 3).

In the work of Kelly and Trebilcock (1998), the complaints about Chinese immigrants were found wide in range from willing to accept low wages to poor hygiene:

The Chinese workers were relatively easy to secure, were more servile than most other workers, and were willing to work at wages 30-50 per cent lower than those paid to white laborers’ (p. 94).

...in the face of growing public opposition, Macdonald agreed to appoint a royal commission to examine the issue. The commission began its deliberation in the summer of 1884. A wide cross-section of witnesses, including politicians, lawyers, police officials, judges, clergymen, businessmen, and workers, testified that the Chinese were dirty, disease-ridden, dishonest, immoral, and totally incapable of integrating within the larger community. Their uncleanness was reportedly evident in almost all aspects of their lives, from the raw sewage that ran through their residential areas to their use of human excrement as manure for their vegetable gardens. Their habit of living in crowded dwellings, and sleeping several to a bed, was offered as additional evidence of their disregard for personal hygiene as well as of their lack of moral scruples. The Chinese way of living, it was claimed, compromised the safety of other communities. The noxious diseases alleged to be carried by large numbers of the Chinese, such as smallpox, cholera, and leprosy, brought with them from Asia, could spread quickly in their overcrowded, unsanitary living areas, contaminating other residential districts and putting the health of the general public at great risk.

It was also alleged before the commission that the Chinese gambled compulsively and kept gambling-houses for this purpose and for the purposes of prostitution. One Nanaimo justice of the peace went so far as to assert that ‘nearly the whole of their females that leave China are professed prostitutes, from children ten or twelve years of age to old hags’. Their use of opium was advanced as further evidence of their depravity. The fact that these vices were purportedly attracting white people was regarded as reason enough for the termination of Chinese immigration lest more Canadian youth be corrupted by such practices. Union representatives and other workers appearing before the commission
complained that the competition provided by Chinese workers drove wages down and put whites out of work’ (p. 95-6).

The Province of British Columbia is the place where Chinese immigrants first landed, and it is also the place where they were severely discriminated against. As early as 1875, a law passed to disenfranchise Chinese to vote in any provincial elections (Lai, 2000).

Residents of British Columbia claimed that, giving the burgeoning population of China, the West was in danger of being overrun by Chinese immigrants whose moral depravity, poor hygiene, and willingness to work for low wages threatened the physical health and economic well-being of the white race (Kelly & Trebilcock, 1998 :110).

Hawkins (1987) comments that Chinese unwittingly played a major role in the evolution of the immigration policies of Canada as they represented the first significant movement of non-European immigrants to arrive in Canada, through they were not settlers initially. The early Chinese immigrants arrived in Canada were organized in a very ancient and complex family lineage system which commanded life long loyalty and profoundly affected their manner of emigrating. Although they worked shoulder to shoulder with their white coworkers, they lived, worked, dressed and used what leisure they had much as they did in China. Their co-workers as well as a growing section of public opinion were not prepared to accept a wholly alien race with a different language, clothing customs and way of life, cutting in on their territory, taking a share of their profits, and generally depreciating working and living conditions. Soon many of them began to see the Chinese not only as alien, but as evil and dangerous as well. In their view, the Chinese were the possessors of « dark and hideous vices» and the bearers of “loathsome diseases.” These attitudes became firmly entrenched and were a major factor in the
development of discriminatory immigration polices directly against all non-whites in the late 19th and 20th centuries (Hawkins, 1987:90-91).

Li (1998) comes to the issue with sharp points. That Chinese were not accepted was not so much their cultural characteristics but ideological, political, social and economic reasons. First of all, the racial discrimination against Chinese was rationalized by ideology stressing the superiority of white over non-white. Secondly, the racial discrimination against Chinese rationalized racial exploitation so to ensure that menial tasks in industrial production were performed by a marginalized racial group at a relatively low cost. Thirdly, racial antagonism was aimed at eliminating the competition that white workers faced from the Chinese. Further, the head tax brought substantial financial gains for the government-between 1886 and 1943, the total revenue collected from the Chinese was $23 million. Moreover, union organizers and politicians used the issue of Chinese exclusion as a means of consolidating union organization and winning political support. Still, many politicians exploited the Chinese issues to advance their political careers. A good example occurred in 1879: Noah Shakespeare, a member of the Victoria City Council, formed the Anti-Chinese Association to exclude the Chinese, which won him political success first as mayor of Victoria, then as a member of Parliament (Li, 1998 p. 37-42).

2.9.2.2. The National Mood about Immigration

It seems for decades, the national mood has not strongly supported Canadian immigration and integration policies. Not all Canadians welcome immigrants with open arms, even
though they are immigrants or descendants of immigrants themselves. The Ipsos-Reid poll, which was conducted in March 2001 for the federal government, showed 39% Canadians felt that immigration increased unemployment among people already living in Canada (Time Colonist, August 17, 2001 p. A3). The Leger Marketing survey conducted in February 2003 indicates that 54% of Canadians think the country welcomes too many immigrants, compared with 26% who believe not enough are accepted. Another 20% of respondents did not know or did not answer (National Post, March 18, 2002: 4; Toronto Star, March 18, 2002: 18). Several national surveys conducted in Canada from 1974 to 1991 indicate that even though integration is the state policy and has gained support from the majority of Canadians, there are still a noticeable number of people who are not in favor of these policies. The disagreeing group ranged between 31 percent to 59 percent in several national surveys, e.g. 1974 by Berry et al; 1987 by Bibby; 1979 by Decima; 1985 and 1989 Environics Surveys; 1989 by Fletcher; Globe and Mail and CBC News 1991 poll (Kalin & Berry, 1994). The obstacles along the way of immigrant assimilation are apparent.

2.9.2.3. The Hierarchy of Acceptance

The host population does not perceive immigrants from different national origins as equal. The national surveys conducted in Canada from 1974 to 1991 (1974 by Berry et al.; 1987 by Bibby; 1979 by Decima; 1985 & 1989 Environics Surveys; 1989 by Fletcher; Globe & Mail & CBC News 1991 poll) indicate that there is an acceptance and tolerance of racial hierarchy among Canadians, with European ethnic groups at top and Chinese, Canadian Indians and East Indians at the bottom. The situation has not changed
much in the 21st century. In a Leger Marketing survey, 61% say they are more favorable to immigration of people from Western Europe (National Post, March 18, 2002:4; Toronto Star, March 18, 2002:18). Other numbers were Eastern Europe (56%), Latin America (53%) Asia (50%) and North Africa (47%), while 34% favor Arab countries (National Post, March 18, 2002:4; Toronto Star, March 18, 2002:18).

2.9.3. Racism and Discrimination

It is difficult to measure the scope of racism and discrimination. Direct discrimination is often hidden due to the illegality of its actions. Indirect or systemic discrimination, arising from structural barriers internal to organizations, is revealed only through analysis. The effects of discrimination are just as difficult to measure. Available data is scarce and debatable. For example, while prejudice and discrimination have a certain effect on the unemployment rate of cultural communities that are its victims, they are not the only factors that enter into play.

However, there are numerous indicators of the reality of racial discrimination in Canada. Racialized persons experience disproportionate poverty, over-representation in the prison population, under-representation in the middle and upper layers of political, administrative, economic and media institutions, and barriers to accessing employment, housing and health care.\textsuperscript{12} Courts have recognized that racism exists in Canada.\textsuperscript{13} For


example in *R. v. Parks* (1993), 15 O.R. (3d) 324 at 342 the Ontario Court of Appeal stated:

> Racism is a part of our community's psyche. A significant segment of our community holds overtly racist views. A much larger segment subconsciously operates on the basis of negative racial stereotypes. Furthermore, our institutions reflect and perpetuate those negative stereotypes. These elements combine to infect our society as a whole with the evil of racism.

Tribunals have frequently noted that: "Discrimination is not a practice which one would expect to see displayed overtly"14 and that it is "often subversive and subtle".15 It has long been established in Canadian law that intent or motive to discriminate is not a necessary element for finding that a discriminatory act took place. It is sufficient if there is a discriminatory effect to the conduct.16 Racial discrimination need only be one of several reasons for the decision or treatment received.17

Some scholars estimate that discrimination is the greatest obstacle to the integration of immigrants (Frideres, 2005 at p. 65-68). According to a study done in June 2005 for the Ministère de l’Immigration et des Communautés culturelles, one Quebecer in five from cultural communities said he was the object of discriminatory acts during the year preceding the survey (Jolicoeur et associés, 2005).

---

According to the Ethnic Diversity Survey, individuals from all visible minorities across Canada feel they are victims of discrimination or unjust treatment, including 50% of Blacks, 35% of Southeast Asians, 29% of Latin Americans and 26% of Arabs. In the Montréal Census Metropolitan Area, 31% of visible minorities responded that they had been victims of discrimination.  

Racialization extends to people in general but also to specific traits and attributes, which are connected in some way to racialized people and are deemed to be “abnormal” and of less worth. Individuals may have prejudices related to various racialized characteristics. In addition to physical features, characteristics of people that are commonly racialized include: accent or manner of speech, name, clothing and grooming, diet, beliefs and practices, leisure preferences, places of origin, citizenship (Castagna and Dei, 2000, at 35).

Many different definitions of racism exist. They differ in complexity and emphasis and can often be very difficult to understand. However, definitions of racism all agree that it is an ideology that either explicitly or implicitly asserts that one racialized group is inherently superior to others.

Racist ideology can be openly manifested in racial slurs, jokes or hate crimes. However, it can be more deeply rooted in attitudes, values and stereotypical beliefs. In some cases

---

18 The Ethnic Diversity Survey was done in 2002 by Statistics Canada for the Canadian Heritage Minister. The sample included about 42,500 persons aged 15 and over in the ten provinces.
these beliefs are unconsciously maintained by individuals and have become deeply embedded in systems and institutions that have evolved over time.

Racism differs from simple prejudice in that it has also been tied to the aspect of power, i.e. the social, political, economic and institutional power that is held by the dominant group in society. In Canada and Ontario, the institutions that have the greatest degree of influence and power, including governments, the education system, banking and commerce, and the justice system are not, at this time, fully representative of racialized persons, particularly in their leadership (Canadian Human Rights Commission, 2007).

Racism often manifests in negative beliefs, assumptions and actions. However, it is not just perpetuated by individuals. It may be evident in organizational or institutional structures and programs as well as in individual thought or behaviour patterns. Racism oppresses and subordinates people because of racialized characteristics. It has a profound impact on social, economic, political and cultural life.

Racism exists at a number of levels (Henry, 2004), in particular (1) individual, (2) institutional or systemic, and (3) societal (also described as cultural/ideological):

At the individual level, racism may be expressed in an overt manner but also through everyday behaviour that involves many small events in the interaction between people. This is often described as “everyday racism” and is often very subtle in nature.

At the institutional or systemic level, racism is evident in organizational and government policies, practices, and procedures and “normal ways of doing things” which may directly or indirectly, consciously or unwittingly, promote, sustain, or entrench differential
advantage for some people and disadvantage for others. Systemic or institutional
discrimination consists of patterns of behaviour, policies or practices that are part of the
social or administrative structures of an organization, and which create or perpetuate a
position of relative disadvantage for racialized persons (Agocs, 2004). These appear
neutral on the surface but, nevertheless, have an exclusionary impact on racialized
persons. However, systemic discrimination can overlap with other types of discrimination
that are not neutral. For example, a discriminatory policy can be compounded by the
discriminatory attitudes of the person who is administering it. As the Report Unequal
Access points out: “Systemic or institutional discrimination is a major barrier to racialized
groups, particularly in the employment context.”

At a societal level, racism is evident in cultural and ideological expressions that underlie
and sustain dominant values and beliefs. It is evident in a whole range of concepts,
ideas, images, and institutions that provide the framework of interpretation and meaning
for racialized thought in society. It is communicated and reproduced through agencies of
socialization and cultural transmission such as the mass media (in which racialized
persons are portrayed as different from the norm or as problems), schools, universities,
religious doctrines and practices, art, music, and literature (Henry et al., 1998, at 56-57).

The problem of racism is exacerbated by what the Unequal Access Report calls the
“Common Myths” and misconceptions about racism which create a climate that prevents

---

20 Unequal Access: A Canadian Profile of Racial Differences in Education, Employment and Income,
Report Prepared for the Canadian Race Relations Foundation by the Canadian Council on Social
Development (Toronto: Canadian Race Relations Foundation, 2000).
any kind of effective response to racial inequality. These Myths are summarized in Table 14 (p. 183).

2.9.4. Perceptions of Chinese Immigrants

To set the stage, this part begins with the issue of acculturation orientations and patterns of Chinese immigrants. It is followed by the discussion on their integration competence. Finally, it summarizes their unique characteristics.

2.9.4.1. Acculturation Orientation and Patterns

Chinese immigrant integration and Chinese identity has been a long time focus among researchers, and several external and internal factors that affect their adaptation have been identified. The external factors are the “push” of the discriminative policies and Canadian host society environment (Tu, 1994; Wong, 1994; Wu, 1994), and the unfavorable political situation of China, Taiwan and Hong Kong (Li, 1994; Tu, 1994), and the “pull” of the governments of these places with political and material incentives to attract Huaqiao (overseas Chinese) and Huaiyi (naturalized Chinese in foreign countries) back (Tu, 1994; Wong, 1994). The internal factors include purposes of immigration, the culturally “home” complex and the degree of Chineseness (Li, 1994; Wong, 1994; Sun, 1985).

The impact of both external and internal factors on Chinese immigrants leads to different forms and degrees of adaptation. Wong (1994) summarizes these forms in the cultural
bound notions around *gen* (root): *Luo ye gui gen* (fallen leaves go back to their roots); *Zhan cao chu gen* (to cut the grass and dig up its root); *Luo di shen gen* (to settle down and grow roots); *Xun gen wen zu* (to search for root and ancestors).

*Luo ye gui gen* (fallen leaves to back to their roots) is the sojourner or internal separation mentality. Returning to and being recognized by the homeland is a high social and cultural value inculcated from childhood on (Tu, 1994; Wong 1994). It is vital to the structuring of one’s existence and to the formation of identity in a collective society like China where everyone is bound by interpersonal relationships and how to be perceived by others (Sun, 1985). Racism and discrimination of the host society has reinforced this mentality and these people become more determined to stand proud as Chinese.

Those who came abroad for economic gain often hold this mentality, especially when China, Taiwan and Hong Kong attract them back with certain privileges and incentives. In the old days, Chinese immigrants built Chinatown not only as protection but also as alternative of home and place to sustain their heritage and their sense of identity.

Nowadays, the lingering *Luo ye gui gen* mentality is owing to politics and conventional thinking about race and culture. Many Chinese immigrant who have assimilated into the host population are still labeled Chinese and are subjected to suspicion, discrimination, or exclusion from sociopolitical participation (Wu, 1994).

Opposite the sojourner mentality stands *Zhan cao chu gen* (to cut the grass and dig up its root), the assimilationist mentality most commonly associated with the second generation Chinese and those who immigrated at an early age. Through education and interaction.
these people became aware of the sharp difference – racially, culturally, socially, and legally – between them and their Caucasian peers. These differences soon led to comparisons and the making of value judgments and choices. The overwhelming superiority of the dominant white society over their community, perceived as repressed and backward, dictated their choices. Very quickly, they become ashamed of their personal appearance, the values and behaviors they were taught in Chinese culture, and their community. The need to be accepted by white society became their primary obsession. Some went so far as to anglicize their Chinese family names, suppress their Chinese language ability and accent, dissociate themselves from their relatives and Chinese friends, and take advantages of modern cosmetology by dyeing their hair, altering their eyelids, nose, and lips (Wong, 1994). This mentality will last as long as public policy, media depiction, school curricula, and academic disciplines continue to provide preferential treatments for Caucasians.

_Luo di shen gen_ (to settle down and grow the roots) or accommodation refers to some Chinese immigrants who have successfully planted their roots in the host society. This mentality calls for a commitment to permanence, accommodating to local life styles and cultural values, and contributing to the well-being of the host society (Wong, 1994). It is a survival strategy in an alien setting, when one is unable to leave but is struggling to integrate into the local community even if the host society continues to show intolerance or hostility toward Chinese immigrants.

_Luo di shen gen_ seems quite natural among educated professional men and women. But it often requires that these professionals master modern ideas and technologies to operate
fully within Western institutions. However, there is a growing group of Chinese professionals and others who work comfortably with non-Chinese. This group has been influenced by other factors, notably by their having gone to the same school as non-Chinese (Wong, 1994:135). The success of root planting of either group is largely dependent on the receptivity of the host society and on the changing relations between the host country and China (Wong, 1994:206).

For years, there was a yearning inside Chinese intellectuals for a historically, culturally, and racially more complete home. However, they are neither willing nor able to fully melt into mainstream society. Meanwhile they are trying to shake off the burden of being Chinese (Li, 1994; Tu, 1994), but still play heroic role as cultural transmitters, guardians of the well-being of the people, and articulator of universal human values (Tu, 1994:27).

What they prefer is a stance called Chinese cosmopolitanism, a self-chosen marginality within the context of the Pacific Rim as a large internationalized region of intermingling economies and cultures – both ancient and modern, Asian and Western. This cosmopolitanism, a self-chosen marginality allows them to embrace both a fundamental intellectual commitment to Chinese culture and a multicultural receptivity, which effectively cuts across all conventional national boundaries (Lee, 1994).

2.9.4.2. The Integration Competence

It appears that the big barrier in integration for Chinese immigrants is English language skills. Based on the study of 46 foreign students from eight countries, White and White (1981) indicate that nationality is an important factor related to skill in the use of the
English language. In this study, 45 percent of the Chinese students judged their English usage to be the chief problem in adjustment, compared with none of the Indians students. This finding supports a previous study by Sue and Kirk (1972) on 236 Chinese American students. The study found that these students exhibited greater quantitative than verbal skills. These students also expressed more interest and chose majors predominantly in the physical science and engineering fields, and avoided occupation demanding communication in verbal-linguistic form (Sue & Kirk, 1972).

Another integration competence factor – cultural exposure – influences the language ability. In their study, Chiswick and Miller (1992) examined exposure prior to migration, time units of exposure in Canada, and the intensity of exposure per unit of time in Canada. They found that the language proficiency of Chinese immigrants was 10 percent lower than the language proficiency of other Asian immigrants who came from countries that had been under American, British or French colonial administrations or occupations. The language deficiency of the Chinese immigrants is further exacerbated by the linguistic distance between Mandarin and the official languages of Canada (p. 46).

In Yao’s (1979) study, Chinese immigrants showed less change in the intrinsic traits (value systems, use of mother tongue) than the extrinsic traits, such as integrated residences, membership of professional organizations, social acceptance and economic position. It implies that Chinese immigrants would strongly stick to their culture of origin and hence integration would be the best strategy for them.
2.9.4.3. Characteristics of the Chinese Immigrants

A quantitative study conducted by Tu (1992) on the adaptation of Mainland Chinese graduate students at the University of Victoria indicates that command of English, length of stay in Canada, and amount of financial aid from Canadian sources are positively related to adjustments and assimilation.

Contrary to the findings of many other researchers, Tu (1992) reveals in her study that social interaction with the host community has a significant negative association with adaptation (p. 52-53). This result confirms Breton’s (1964) notion of institutional completeness that an ethnic community can provide all the services required by its members, thereby obviating the need to use host institutions. It also evidently implies a certain degree of sojourner mentality or sensitivity to potential racial discrimination.

There is considerable disparity between the core values and behavioral norms of western and Chinese cultures. Results from a study conducted in the United States showed that Chinese-Americans believe that the rewards of life are contingent upon some sort of social force beyond personal control (Kuo, Gray & Lin 1976). Liem (1980) and Triandis, Vassiliou, Vassiliou, Tanaka, and Shanmugam (1972) report similar findings in their study on Vietnamese who have been influenced by Taoism’s “Do nothing and everything will be accomplished spontaneously.” This doctrine leads to a defeatist attitude, particularly when faced with apparently insurmountable difficulties.
Confucianism also provides a model for social relations, based on the doctrine of San Cong, which prescribes three important sets of loyalty and filial piety relationships to be conducted: those between ruler and subject, father and son, and husband and wife. The first leads Chinese employees to regard their employer as someone who is to be obeyed without question. At the same time, they expect their employer to be a role model. The second set of relationships and the third set could be the source of family relation conflicts, and these concepts are all at odds with western cultures (Liem, 1980; Triandis, et al., 1972).  

2.9.4. Current Situation of Immigrant Integration

Overall, the immigrant integration in Canada is not optimistic. The Canadian Council on Social Development released the result of a federally funded study on February 25, 2002 that showed that in 1998, the proportion of university graduates among all immigrants, including refugees, was substantially higher than for Canadians. For immigrant men, the proportion was 36%, double the 18% for Canadian men, and for immigrant women it was 31% among those who had arrived after 1986. Indeed, “The large gaps in earnings between recent visible minority immigrants and other Canadians cannot be explained by inferior levels of formal education” because “The point system used for selecting

---

21 Confucius (lit. "Master Kung," 551 BCE – 479 BCE) was a Chinese thinker and social philosopher, whose teachings and philosophy have deeply influenced Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Vietnamese thought and life. His philosophy emphasized personal and governmental morality, correctness of social relationships, justice and sincerity. These values gained prominence in China over other doctrines, such as Legalism or Taoism during the Han Dynasty. Confucius' thoughts have been developed into a system of philosophy known as Confucianism. It was introduced to Europe by the Jesuit Matteo Ricci, who was the first to Latinise the name as "Confucius."
immigrants brings many highly educated people to Canada.” (National Post, February 25, 2002:A6)

Data from Toronto Chinese Professionals Society indicates that more than 50% of the new immigrants from the Mainland China live below the Canadian poverty line. Nevertheless, the government seems confident that it is a temporary problem. The draft Citizenship and Immigration Canada report, which is based on tax records, says “Skilled workers adapt quickly, exceeding the Canadian average as soon as three or four years after arrival” (Globe & Mail, April 9, 2002:A7).

The former Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (2002-2003), Denis Coderre, is reported to plan to reduce the number of skilled workers from China and other Asian countries but to attract from Europe and South America. The media reveal that a former Canadian Visa Officer in Beijing comments that the Canadian government does not want too many Chinese immigrants (www.news.creaders.net).

2.10. Relation between Theories and the Present Study

This section analyses the relationship, derived from the literature, between the theories and actual integration of Chinese independent immigrants. The analysis confirms the significance of this study on Chinese independent immigrants. Then a theoretical framework for this study is built on the review of literature and the analysis.
2.10.1. Significance of the Study

Although statistics has revealed that from 1990 on immigrants’ economic performance is declining and up to 50% of new Chinese immigrants reported to live below the poverty line (Statistics Canada, 2006), there is little research found to explain the reasons. The research is especially scarce on the Chinese immigrants in general and the Chinese independent immigrants in Montréal in particular. Are Chinese immigrants staying or leaving from Montréal several years after their arrival? What are their options and plans and why? There is a need of qualitative research to find the answers to these questions. A qualitative study on the Chinese independent immigrants is necessary because (1) they form the largest number of immigrant inflow from the late 1990s (Table 1-3, pp. 159-161); (2) there is a discrepancy between the current integration situation and well-grounded assumption that these “the best and brightest” can quickly and smoothly integrate into the Canadian society; (3) one of the direct ways to know a phenomenon is through the eyes and experiences of those living them (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001; Tuckman, 1999).

2.10.2. Conceptual Framework

The literature review indicates that immigrant adaptation is primarily a responding choice of immigrants within host countries with different ideologies. This choice is greatly affected by state policies and attitudes of the host society members, and it leads to different forms of adaptation. The literature review shows that integration is one of the adaptation outcomes. This outcome results in the harmonious interaction among
government policies, the acculturation orientations of both members of the host society and immigrants. Thus, integration is the preferred adaptation form for a plural society, such as Canada, and most of the immigrants.

This provides a framework to investigate the adaptation modes of the Chinese independent immigrants. Given Canada's history of discrimination against Chinese, the negative attitudes of the host society in the past and only 50% of social approval of immigration from China at present, the acculturation orientation of the Chinese independent immigrants should be examined within the context of the Canadian political and social environment. What adaptation choice do they make and why? How do they live with their choice, such as gui gen, chu gen, shenggen, or xun gen? How do they perceive their choice?

Different forms of immigrant integration and assimilation offer a conceptual framework for better understanding of integration/assimilation as personal learning, social participating, and a new identity-forming process. In this process, the government policies and the host members' attitudes are the important learning and participating environment. Meanwhile, the adaptation competence of immigrants is equally or even more important, because it is immigrants who adapt/assimilate into a host society and directly benefit from success or suffer from failure.

This competence includes the preparation before immigration such as motivation, knowledge of Canada, proficiency in English or French, and professional skills. It also includes flexibility, cognitive capacity, social skills and openness for learning and
problem solving during the whole process of integration. Inevitably, immigrants have certain needs at the different stages of adaptation. As long as they are aware of this hierarchy of adaptation and needs, they would have a degree of certainty and readiness, and try to meet the needs through their own efforts or the assistance from available social services and their network.

The Chinese independent immigrants have been selected for their adaptation competence. However, only some have assimilated, few have integrated, and many suffer marginalization or segregation. How and to what extent is their competence related to their success or not-yet success in Canada? What needs have been met and how? What needs have not been met and why? How do they perceive their success or not-yet-success and what do they plan to do next?

The ideal version of adaptation, according to the Chinese intellectuals, is Chinese cosmopolitanism and a self-chosen marginal identity. On this marginal ground, they have a bigger vision, and feel psychologically secure and culturally privileged. Is this the adaptation / assimilation stance taken by Chinese independent immigrants in Montréal?

2.11. Summary and Questions

The literature reviewed indicates that, to date, very little direct research relevant to the purpose of this study has been undertaken. Since education, language proficiency and work experience are the key elements in the point system of immigrant selection, people may take it for granted that the independent immigrants would not have any problems to
adapt to Canadian society. However, the market performance of immigrants shows the opposite, especially when the Canadian government emphasizes economic immigrant integration.

The literature on immigrant adaptation indicates that integration / assimilation is a choice made not only by immigrants but also by the government and host community. The government's policies, immigrants' willingness, the attitudes of the host community and interaction among these three factors could lead to different adaptation paths from assimilation to marginalization/segregation. Even when integration becomes the choice of immigrants, the process requires competence, diligent learning, and supportive political and social environment. Also, at different integration stages, there would be various needs to be met.

Qualitative research is needed to find out if the above are the factors that hinder the success of adaptation of the Chinese independent immigrants. The research methods are described in the next chapter.
This study is a qualitative inquiry designed to explore the experiences and assimilation process of Chinese independent immigrants in Montréal to identify the causes and reasons why so many Chinese immigrants leave Montréal only a few years after their arrival. This chapter examines the qualitative research paradigm and elaborates upon phenomenological research design. It then defines the role of the researcher and sets boundaries of the study and data collection. After discussion of ethical considerations, it outlines data collection strategies and data analysis procedures. Finally, it discusses the issues of verification, limitations and reporting in the last three parts.

3.1. Qualitative Research Paradigm

Qualitative inquiry is usually conducted to understand a particular social situation, event, interaction, role or group (Creswell, 1994; Locke, Spirduso & Silverman, 1987). Qualitative inquiry refers to both interactive and non-interactive approaches (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). While the former is an in-depth study using face-to-face techniques to collect data from people, the latter, also known as analytical research, investigates concepts and events through an analysis of documents. The current study utilizes an interactive approach in which detailed questionnaires were distributed and comprehensive data obtained in order to understand the complex adaptation and decision-making process of Chinese immigrants in Montréal.
3.2. Subjects: Sites and Respondents

As the subject of this thesis, Chinese independent immigrants across Montréal were selected as respondents to provide data for this research project. The qualified respondents had the following characteristics:

a) They immigrated to Canada not earlier than July 2002
b) Their first destination in Canada was Montréal
c) They immigrated in the Skilled Worker class (either as principal applicant or as a dependant)
d) Their country of origin was mainland China

3.3. Instrumentation

The basic data were obtained from a qualitative questionnaire. It was designed to produce data to answer the major research questions and sub-questions.

The decision to use a questionnaire as a key tool to collect data and opinions for this thesis was based on the careful consideration and comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of a questionnaire. For instance, the most obvious convenience of using a questionnaire in a survey is the cost. The advantages of a questionnaire seem more numerous than its disadvantages and they can be summarized as follows:

1. Wide coverage for minimum cost in time, effort and money;
2. Wide geographic contact with respondents;
3. Easier access to the respondents who are not easily available for interview;
4. Greater validity through more representative samples due to wider coverage;
5. Collection of more thoughtful and sincere answers than in interview;
6. More suitable in situations where the respondents may require more time to recollect information and to carefully think about their replies, which may not be possible in interviews;
7. Greater uniformity in the manner in which questions are posed;
8. Less bias because the questions are more carefully worded that in interviews;
9. Ease of tabulation and data entry for analysis by computer;
10. More sense of privacy to respondents

The use of questionnaires, however, has a number of disadvantages and they are discussed in the next section.

3.4. Limitations of questionnaires

The use of the questionnaire in this research is based on the assumption that the respondents will provide truthful answers. This means that the respondents were willing and able to offer truthful answers. Consideration of this assumption is vital throughout this discussion. However, as Berdie and Anderson (1974) pointed out, due to the nature of questionnaires, it is difficult to check the reliability and validity of a questionnaire response. Other limitations like response rate and variable independence may also negatively influence the accuracy of the results from this research (pp. 20-22). The disadvantages of a questionnaire include:

1. Problems of low response rate;
2. Possibility of misinterpretation of questions;
3. Uncompleted replies;
4. No measure to identify whether the questionnaire is answered by a qualified respondent or someone else;
5. No follow-through on misunderstood questions or missed answers;
6. No observation of apparent reluctance or evasiveness;

Another limitation is the number of respondents. If this research could obtain 200 completed questionnaires, the results from the data analysis would be more accurate, even though 100 samples are enough for this kind of survey.

3.5. Presentation of Questionnaire to Respondents

On balance, the advantages of using questionnaires for this thesis outweigh the disadvantages. Moreover, the use of the questionnaire to collect data for this research proved to be efficient and without major problems – further evidence that the choice of questionnaire was appropriate for this research.

A well-planned and carefully constructed questionnaire increases the response rate of a survey and also greatly facilitates the analysis of the collected data. As Levine and Gordon (1958) contend, “the appearance of the questionnaire frequently determines whether it is read or discarded. Once the respondent takes the effort to read it, he has some psychological commitment to complete it” (p. 571). Therefore, a great effort was put to design questionnaire for this research carefully and according to the specific goals and objectives of this research. The author also took into account culturally-nuanced responses attributable to Chinese people. For example, compared to English or French Canadian, a Chinese person is much less direct in expressing his or her views and is much less likely to give an outright ‘no’ as an answer.
Each questionnaire was enclosed with a bilingual letter in both English and Chinese (Appendix II, p. 195, p. 196). The questionnaire contained 57 questions for respondents to complete and return via mail or in person (Appendix II, pp. 197-211).

A. **An invitation letter and consent form:** Basic purposes and methods were provided to respondents in the letter and respondents were expected to sign the consent form so as to meet the approval of the Ethics Committee, Concordia University.

B. **Demographic and factual questions:** These questions included personal information about age, educational background, career, gender, previous and present social status and income, etc.

C. **Questions about assimilation:** These questions were designed mainly to answer the research question and its sub-questions (Questions 11-15; 18; 28; 33; 41; 44; 54).

D. **Questions about personal adjustment:** These questions were used to analyze and explain the Chinese immigrants’ intentions, aspirations, and plans. In order to have the most reliable data, varying levels of answers were designed for one question. For example, four variables were used to measure their language abilities in English and French (Q 16, Q 17). Similarly, for Questions 13-14, each response category had five levels: never, few times per month, once every week, several times every week, every day.

3.5.1. Research Questions and Sub-questions

The design of the questionnaire for this thesis is based on the research question: Why Chinese immigrants leave Montréal?
According to the research question and to test theories related to assimilation and adjustment using the case of the Chinese immigrants in Montréal, the questions in the questionnaire were designed by considering the following sub-questions of the research:

(1) How are the Chinese immigrants identified by Canadian communities?
(2) What are the reasons / circumstances that led to their immigration to Canada?
(3) Why did they choose to reside in Montréal?
(4) What were their social status / position in China?
(5) How does their social status / position in China compares to that in Canada?
(6) To what extent, if any, was the education and work experience acquired in China helpful in Canada?
(7) What are the barriers to transferring their skills acquired in China into Canadian labour market?
(8) What is their degree of assimilation / adaptation to the local community in Montréal?
(9) What are their plans for foreseeable future?
(10) Were their immigration expectations met, and if not why?
(11) If they intend to leave Montréal, are they planning to go back to China, move to other Canadian provinces, or establish residence in another country?
(12) What are the main reason(s) that Chinese immigrants leave Montréal?
(13) What are the defining characteristics of those who want to leave?

3.5.2. The Selected Tools for Data Treatment

Correlation coefficient qualifies the strength of the linear association between two sets of variables. Given a set of observations \((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\), the formula for computing the correlation coefficient is given by:
\[ r = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum \left( \frac{x - \bar{x}}{s_x} \right) \left( \frac{y - \bar{y}}{s_y} \right) \]

The correlation coefficient always takes a value between -1 and 1, with 1 or -1 indicating perfect correlation (all points would lie along a straight line in this case). A positive correlation indicates a positive association between the variables (increasing values in one variable correspond to increasing values in the other variable), while a negative correlation indicates a negative association between the variables (increasing values in one variable correspond to decreasing values in the other variable). A correlation value close to 0 indicates that the relationship between the variables is random (Edwards, A. 1976: 33-46).

Since the formula for calculating the correlation coefficient standardizes the variables, changes in scale or units of measurement will not affect its value. For this reason, the correlation coefficient is often more useful than a graphical depiction in determining the strength of the association between two variables (Press, W. 1992: 630-633)
3.6. Procedures: Questionnaire Collection and Data Analysis

3.6.1. Questionnaire Distribution, Coverage and Response Rate

148 questionnaires were distributed in geographically dispersed areas of Montréal. These questionnaires were distributed through three channels: 1) in person; 2) trusted friends who handed the questionnaires to qualified respondents; 3) Canada Post. The major reasons for selecting the three channels were that these channels were not only economic but also reliable because of the sense of personal contact, responsibility and trustworthiness of the selected distributors and collectors.

By the deadline of October 31, 2007, 107 questionnaires were completed and returned. The gross response rate was 72% and the validity rate was 70% for data entry and analysis by Microsoft Excel. According to the characteristics of this kind of research, such a response rate is high and it shows that the administration of the questionnaire distribution/collection was effective, practical and successful.

Among 107 copies were collected, 3 were discarded because they had been completed by non-qualified respondents, leaving 104 copies duly completed by qualified respondents. Thus, the data of these 104 copies, which is 70% of the total number of distributed questionnaires, were entered into Microsoft Excel program as valid data for further analysis.
3.6.2. Data Analyses

After the questionnaires were collected from the respondents, there were two challenges. The first was how to judge the quality of the measurements and the collected data. The second was how to determine the levels of measurements.

A. Assessing the quality of how the data was measured and collected

The two most common criteria to judge how the quality of data is measured are: reliability and validity. Reliability refers to the consistency of a measurement, which may measure a variable (such as educational level) very consistently under similar conditions. This measurement is considered reliable. Conversely, a measurement is regarded less reliable if it cannot consistently measure a variable under the same conditions. If a variable measures what it is supposed to measure, it will produce accurate results. Then the measurement is considered valid. The conclusion that a measurement has validity is a conclusion that it truly measures what it is supposed to measure and that it measures it accurately. Thus, valid measurement of variables produces data that, when analyzed correctly, can generate valuable knowledge. Reliability and validity are closely related. If an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure, it is valid, and by definition, it must also be reliable. (Weinbach and Grinnell, 1995 p. 6.) Reliability and validity are not only considered the two major criteria for measurement, but also present the measurement characteristics of the instrument.
The conceptualization of the research question for this thesis determined the selection of the most relevant variables, such as assimilation, adjustment, and education. Valid and reliable measurement tools embodied in Microsoft Excel made it possible to summarize research findings accurately and analyze the relationships that appeared to exist among variables, using charts and tables.

However, prior to Microsoft Excel analysis, it was necessary to make a determination in reference as to how precisely each variable would be measured. Determination of the variables' level of measurement was crucial because it provided direction as to the type of analyses that could be undertaken. Some variables, by their nature, cannot be precisely measured, while others can be measured precisely. For example, via the questionnaire, the variable educational level could be defined precisely by determining the number of years of formal education that a respondent reached (Q 8). Alternatively, measurement of the educational level could be as simple as asking a respondent for their highest level completed (Q 7).

B. Levels of Measurement

The level of measurement of a variable in mathematics and statistics is a classification that was proposed in order to describe the nature of information contained within numbers assigned to objects and, therefore, within the variable. The levels were proposed by Stanley Smith Stevens in his 1946 article *On the theory of scales of measurement* (Stevens, 1975). According to Stevens' theory of scales, different mathematical operations on variables are possible, depending on the level at which a variable is
measured (Babbie, 2004). There are four levels of measurement a variable can take: (1) nominal, (2) ordinal, (3) interval, and (4) ratio (Weinbach and Grinnell, 1995 p.10).

i) Nominal Measurement

The first level is nominal measurement, which is the least precise level of measurement. Its values (i.e. categories) are discrete, or distinct, from each other. Nominal measurement is a system of classification that categorizes variables into subclasses. Variables such as gender, occupation, marital status, and educational levels were treated as nominal variables in this thesis research. A nominally measured variable must have at least two or more values, which should be distinct, mutually exclusive, and mutually exhaustive. That is, each respondent must appropriately answer only one of the values or categories, and there must be an appropriate category for each case. For example, there were only two classes of the nominal variable gender – male or female, as in the 1st question in the questionnaire (Appendix II, p. 197). These two categories were clearly exhaustive and mutually exclusive, as every respondent could be classified into either one of the categories (exhaustiveness) but only one (exclusiveness). Another example of a question in the questionnaire that would produce only nominal measurement is the 26th question quoted hereinafter:

26. Which of the following best describes the reason(s) you immigrated to Canada?

A) to improve my career
B) to improve my education
C) to acquire better education for my children
D) to join my family
E) to gain better business development chances
F) others (please specify) ____________________________________________
In nominal measurement, numbers or other symbols, such as English letters, are assigned for convenience and as merely value labels.

ii) Ordinal Measurement

The second level of measurement is ordinal measurement, which implies that a variable not only takes on different values but also that the values have some distinct quantitative meaning. With ordinal measurement, it is possible to rank order the values that the variable assumes from high to low or from most to least. The following example from the questionnaire produce ordinal measurement:

**17. How do you evaluate your own French proficiency according to the following components?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical terms</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. How much did you know about the demand in your professional field in the Canadian labour market before you immigrated to Canada?

A) nothing  
B) almost nothing  
C) a little  
D) somewhat  
E) a lot  
F) very much

47. How long did it take for you to get your first job?

A) less than 6 months  
B) six months to 1 year  
C) 1 year to 2 years  
D) 2 years to 3 years  
E) 3 years to 4 years  
F) Over 4 years

Value labels used with ordinal measurement make it possible to identify not only the differences between variables sub-classes but also their relative positions. In contrast, nominal measurement can only classify a variable into value categories that reflect simple differences in kind. It is important to note that ordinal value labels neither indicate absolute quantities nor assume equal intervals between them. For instance, the question 17th from questionnaire (reproduced above) produced scales that ranked the French language proficiency of a respondent according to a set of categories ranging from “None” to “High”. Since the proficiency does not necessarily represent equal intervals, it does not indicate that the difference between “Basic” and “Moderate” is the same as the difference between “Moderate” and “High”. The different values of an ordinal variable do not indicate either their absolute quantities or the exact distances that separate one category from another.
iii) Interval Measurement

The third level of measurement is interval measurement. Like ordinal measurement, interval measurement also classifies and rank orders properties of variables; in addition, it places them on an equally spaced continuum. Unlike ordinal measurement, interval measurement has a uniform unit of measurement, such as one year, two kilometers, three hours and so on. With an interval level variable, a respondent can be judged to have “more” or “less” of a given property than another respondent. In addition, units can be specified exactly more or less. For example, the question 8 from the questionnaire produces interval level measurement:

8. How many years of post-secondary education did you receive in China?

A) None
B) Two years
C) Three years
D) Four years
E) Six years
F) Seven years
G) More than seven years (Please specify) __________

Question 8, reproduced above, shows that interval measurement indicates how far the values of a variable are from one another. However, it does not indicate the absolute magnitude of a property possessed by any particular person or object. This is possible only with the 4th measurement – ratio measurement.

iv) Ratio Measurement

Ratio measurement can provide the most precise type of measurement. The numbers assigned to objects have all the features of interval measurement and also have
meaningful ratios between arbitrary pairs of numbers. Operations such as multiplication and division are therefore meaningful. The zero value on a ratio scale is non-arbitrary.

Variables measured at the ratio level are called ratio variables. Most physical quantities, such as mass, length or energy are measured on ratio scales; so is temperature measured in kelvins, that is, relative to absolute zero. The central tendency of a variable measured at the ratio level can be represented by its mode, its median, its arithmetic mean, or its geometric mean; as with an interval scale, however, the arithmetic mean gives the most useful information. Social variables of ratio measure include age, length of residence in a given place, number of organizations belonged to or number of church attendances in a particular time (Velleman, P. F. & Wilkinson, L., 1993; Briand, L. & El Emam, K. & Morasca, S., 1995).

Question 51 from the questionnaire may produce ratio level measurement:

51. Which of the following best describes your current annual income and what type of income you receive (employment, investment, loan / bursary, child / spousal support etc.). Please indicate every type of income that applies and note the amount. For example, if your employment income is $18,000 and your investment income is $3,000, you would then circle C) and indicate employment ($18,000), investment ($3,000).

G) less than $10,000
H) $10,000 - $19,999
I) $20,000 - $29,999
J) $30,000 - $39,999
K) $40,000 - $49,999
L) $50,000 - $59,999
M) more than $60,000

However, most of the data treated by Microsoft Excel for social work practice and educational research does not need the ratio level (Weinbach and Grinnell, p. 10, 1995).
3.6.3. Computer Analysis in the Research Process

The entire process of completing this research project was streamlined with the aid of various computers and their programs. From the initial formation of the research question, through the preparation of the proposal, literature review, questionnaire design, data analysis by Microsoft Excel, and completion of the thesis writing with the references, computers and software applications were extensively utilized. They provided efficiency, convenience, and speed for the accomplishment of this thesis.

Besides computers and questionnaires, other information sources and technology were used. ProQuest, Internet micro-fiche, micro-film, photocopiers were also indispensable to collect relevant references and data from university libraries, government departments, electronic publications, World Wide Web sites, and other resources. Interviewees and discussants at relevant conferences were also important sources of data for this research.

3.7. Summary

In this Chapter, the qualitative research paradigm, research methodology, questionnaire design, correlation coefficient, levels of measurement, data collection and research process have been described. The subsequent chapter will present the graphical and statistical analyses of assimilation / integration process.
CHAPTER FOUR:
DATA ANALYSES

This chapter contains the results and discussions of the research project. Descriptive analysis of the sample is presented in charts and tables with explanations and additional information provided by respondents to questions that have an option of a descriptive response (Q 29; Q 33; Q 34; Q 37; Q 39; Q 50; Q 52 – 54; Q 56; Q57).

4.1. Graphical Analyses

In the process of analysis and discussions, this chapter also presents the author’s opinions based on the author’s seven years of experience in China as an immigration consultant and extensive involvement in Chinese community in Montréal.

Figure 1: Gender of Respondents

Female, 43, 41%
Male, 61, 59%
Figure 1 indicates that almost 60% of the respondents are males. This number reflects the percentage of genders that are able to score the passing mark under the CIC selection criteria for skilled workers. As I discussed in the Literature Review, out of the six selection criteria, the highest number of points is awarded for education (25), and work experience (21). These selection criteria are biased in favor of males. In China, especially in rural areas, male students have always outnumbered female students in any level of school due to traditional and social reasons. As a consequence, males also outnumber females in most professional jobs and thus are more likely to score greater number of points under both “education” and “work experience” criteria.

It is worth noting here that an immigrant in the skilled worker category can enter Canada either as a principal applicant, or as a dependent. The difference between a principal applicant and a dependent is that specific selection criteria are used to assess a principal applicant, but not her/his dependent(s). It is therefore important that the most eligible member of the family (i.e. the person who is likely to accumulate the most points) apply as a principal applicant, and designate the other family members as dependents. Within a family unit, the wife and children are likely to immigrate as dependents.

Out of the 104 qualified questionnaires I collected, 85 respondents came to Canada as married couples. In 68% of cases, males were the principal applicants (Questionnaire, Q2). This is shown in the next figure.
Figure 2: Gender of Principal Applicant

The fact that in 68% of cases families chose males as a principal applicant further substantiates the view that the selection criteria are biased against female applicants. As shown in Table 15 (p. 184-185), Table 16 (p. 186-187), and Figure 17 & Figure 18 (p. 188), Male Skilled Workers have consistently outnumbered the Female Skilled Workers. For example, in 2006, 31,053 male skilled workers came as a principal applicant whereas only 13,110 (29.7%) female skilled workers came to Canada as principal applicants.

Despite their high education and training many of the Chinese immigrant women in my sample (spouses of the principal applicants who completed the questionnaires) did not enter Canada under the “skilled worker” category. Rather, they entered as dependents of their husbands who are the principal applicants under the economic class category. This is so because “skill” is “constructed and negotiated through ideological and political processes” (Arat-Koc 1999: 284). Gender biases in definitions of education, work, and
skill means that women’s skills and personal qualities are either excluded or undervalued. Hence the immigration processes reproduces and structures inequality within the family by rendering one spouse (typically the wife) legally dependent on the other (Ng, 1993).

Figure 3: Educational Level Prior to Immigration

Figure 3 shows that 85% of the respondents are university educated. The high number of university graduates among Chinese immigrants who landed in Canada after 2000 is consistent with 2005 CIC Report. The Report (CIC: 2005) states that there are large differences in educational attainment between the Canadian-born and various groups of immigrants. The Report further points out that the share of very recent immigrants with a minimal education is smaller than the share of the Canadian-born. According to the
Report, the Canadian-born are more likely than immigrants to have some high school, a high school diploma, or a college or trade diploma. Very recent immigrants, however, boast a remarkable number of university graduates. The Report concludes that the high proportion of university graduates is most likely a result of immigrant selection, with much emphasis on education in the economic category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than grade 9</th>
<th>Some high school</th>
<th>High school diploma</th>
<th>College or trade diploma</th>
<th>University degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants *</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* landed in Canada in 2000-2005

The difference in the percentage of university graduates between the CIC Report and my sample (41% versus 85%) is most likely attributed to the fact that my sample includes only those immigrants who were selected in the Skilled Worker category (where, with the passing mark of 67 points, education factor carries maximum of 25 points), whereas CIC Report encompasses immigrants in all categories.
Figure 4 shows that 68% of respondents had an academic training prior to immigration in either management (13%), commerce (15%), engineering (22%), or computer science (18%). This is consistent with major fields of study of both Canadian-born and immigrants across Canada. The 2005 CIC Report reveals the following data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canadian-born and Immigrants: Major Filed of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian-born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: English Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical terms</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 shows the English Language Proficiency level broken down into eight components. Out of eight components, of prime importance are speaking, reading, listening and writing. These are the components that immigrants’ language proficiency level is assessed on in the selection process. Most of these components are interrelated with other components. For example, writing is interrelated with grammar; speaking is interrelated with translation. Indeed, there is a strong correlation in performance based on these components. A person who scores well on one component is very likely to score well on other components. There is, however, one exception. The knowledge of technical terms is not interrelated with any of the seven components. In fact, over 75% of respondents stated that their English Language Proficiency level on seven components is
"moderate" or "high" whereas on technical terms 85% stated that their proficiency level is "none" or "basic".

The knowledge of "technical terms" is not assessed under selection criteria and this may be the reason why those immigrants that score the passing mark of 67 points still experience difficulty in finding professional employment in Canada.

Figure 6: French Language Proficiency

Figure 6 shows that close to 90% of respondents indicated that their French Language Proficiency level is "none" or "basic". The respondents scored the best on the "reading" component. This perhaps is attributed to the similarity in spelling of English and French.
words, which allowed respondents to recognize similar words. The fact that the second and third best responses were "vocabulary" and "translation" substantiates this view, because given the similarity in spelling of roots of many words it is possible to figure out the meaning of a word in French if the respondent knows what this word means in English.

Figure 7: People that an immigrant knew in Montréal prior to his or her arrival

Figure 7 shows that 89% of respondents knew somebody in Montréal prior to their arrival. The factor of whether an applicant knew someone in the intended place of settlement is assessed under the selection criteria. Thus, it is very likely that people who scored the passing mark of 67 points received some points under this criterion. The fact that the respondents knew someone in Montréal prior to their arrival also suggests that
the respondents had at least some information about local customs, labour demand and social conditions of the destination place.

Figure 8: Plans about Education

18% of respondents indicated that they intend to pursue English language training. This further substantiates my analyses of Figure 5 (English Language Proficiency) that even though an applicant scores well under the English language assessment in the selection process, this language level is insufficient to find and keep a professional job in Montréal. The major problem, as discussed on pp. 120-121, is the very poor knowledge of technical terms. The selection system ignores this problem.
11% of respondents indicated they are pursuing, or intend to pursue in the near future, French language training. Every one of these respondents also stated they intend to live in Montréal in foreseeable future.

46% of respondents said they want to pursue an academic degree program. The respondents indicated two reasons for this choice: 29% of this group stated the education they received in China was not recognized in the Canadian labour market and hence they want to acquire Canadian credentials; 17% (29%+17%=46%) stated they intend to pursue an academic program in order to receive loans and bursaries from the Aide Financière aux Études.

13% of respondents were considering a vocational program.

7% of respondents stated they were taking or planned to take a training provided by their employer.

Only 5% of the respondents said they have no plans for education.
Figure 9: Current Annual Income

Figure 9 shows that 70% of women (9+21 out of 43 in my sample) have an annual income below $20,000 whereas only 15% of men (2+7 out of 61 in my sample) fall into that category. 64% of men (25+14) reported their annual income between $20,000 and $39,000. It is important to note that every one of the respondents who make over $40,000 indicated that over 20% of that income comes from investment.

These numbers are consistent with the numbers reported by the Montréal Census in 2006.

| Immigrants by period of immigration and Canadian-born - average income by gender, Montréal Census Metropolitan Area, 2005 |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Canadian-born                   | Women  | Men    | Total  |
| Immigrants                      | $24,320| $37,580| $30,690|
| a) immigrated 1986-1995         | $19,950| $31,330| $25,850|
| b) immigrated 1996-1999         | $23,460| $37,110| $29,900|
| c) immigrated 2000-2005         | $16,940| $24,270| $20,540|
|                                 | $14,680| $22,800| $18,900|
The table above shows that an average income of people who immigrated between 2000 and 2005 was $18,900, with women earning $14,680 and men earning $22,800. In my sample, the average income of women was $14,250 and an average income of men was $23,220. By contrast, a Canadian-born women was making, on average, $24,320 and Canadian-born men $37,580.

Figure 10: Age of the Respondents

Age is one of the six criterion assessed under the selection system. Figure 10 reveals that 79% of the respondents were between the ages of 25 and 40. This is consistent with national average (CIC: 2006). While the maximum number of points is awarded to applicants between the ages of 21 and 49, CIC Report states that close to 80% of new immigrants who were admitted under the selection system are between the ages of 25 and 40. The reason for that is probably because the applicants outside this age range, though
they score maximum number of points under the age criterion (10 points), are unable to score sufficient points under other criteria. For instance, applicants who are under the age of 25 normally score very few points on “work experience” while applicants who are over 40 do very poorly on “language proficiency” (and “work experience” and “language proficiency” carry the maximum weight of 21 and 24 points respectively).

Becoming a Canadian Citizen

Out of 104 qualified respondents, 83 indicated in response to Q 39 that they either received or are eligible to apply for Canadian citizenship. However, out of these 83 respondents, only 51 did in fact receive or applied for Canadian citizenship; that is 31 respondents (39%) eligible for Canadian citizenship stated they do not want to be a Canadian citizen in the foreseeable future. That compares to 17% of all newcomers who landed in Canada in 2001 or later and who chose not to become a Canadian citizen (CIC: 2005). The 39% rate among Chinese immigrants in Montréal is consistent with the CIC 2005 Report indicating that 40% of Chinese immigrants in Canada choose not to become Canadian citizens. The reason why many Chinese immigrants choose not to become Canadian citizens is because China does not recognize dual citizenship and becoming Canadian citizen means automatically giving up Chinese citizenship. As well, children born in Canada while the immigrant parents are still citizens of China will be citizens of China, but not if their parents have become Canadian citizens.
Figure 11: Shopping Pattern of Chinese Immigrants in Canada

The data for Figure 11 is derived from the responses on question 11 in the questionnaire.

This figure illustrates that while the respondents shop at major stores predominantly once every 6 months (for Sears, 61) to once every 3 months (for Zellers, 42), 39 respondents said they shop in Chinese stores once per month and 54 respondents said they shop in Chinese stores once per week.
Figure 12: Food-buying Pattern of Chinese Immigrants in Canada

The data for Figure 12 is derived from the responses to question 12 in the questionnaire.

This figure shows the food-buying pattern of the respondents. On average 71%\textsuperscript{22} said they shop at a major Montréal food store at least once per week, whereas 91%\textsuperscript{23} said they buy food in Chinatown at least weekly.

This indicates that while majority of Chinese immigrants have integrated into the host society they are not assimilated because they preserved their Chinese identity. In fact,

\begin{align*}
22 \quad & (31+35+13)/104=0.76 \text{ Maxi} \\
& (34+29+29)/104=0.83 \text{ Provigo} \\
& (23+41+14)/104=0.75 \text{ IGA} \\
& (9+29+33)/104=0.68 \text{ Metro} \\
& (3+17+36)/104=0.54 \text{ SuperC} \\
& 3.55/5=71\% \\
23 \quad & (9+49+37)/104=91\%
\end{align*}
while majority of the respondents buy food in major Montréal food-stores, they at the same time shop in Chinatown. Many respondents have commented that the store they attend least frequently is SuperC because of its inconvenient locations.

Figure 13: What Food Chinese Immigrants Use to Prepare Meals.

This figure indicates that most respondents are integrating into the host society but are not assimilating. 68 respondents said they prepare Chinese food for their meals every day only 14 respondents said they eat western food on a daily basis. However 93 (28 + 53 + 14) respondents said that they enjoy western food at least once per week. This suggests that while Chinese immigrants are integrating into the host society, they still retain their Chinese food habits.
4.2. Statistical Analyses

To determine the correlation of the selection criteria (Education, Language Proficiency, Work Experience, Age, Arranged Employment, and Adaptability) described in Table 5 (p. 165) through Table 10 (p. 174-175) in Appendix I, the correlation coefficient was used. The data for this analysis was obtained from the responses to Q 10. These responses, and their graphical correlations, are reproduced in Table 17 (p. 189-192), Figure 19 (p. 193) and Table 18 (p. 194).

Correlation coefficient qualifies the strength of the linear association between two sets of variables. The correlation coefficient always takes a value between -1 and 1, with 1 or -1 indicating perfect correlation.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education / Language Proficiency</th>
<th>0.819</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of 0.819 between Education and Language Proficiency indicates strong positive relationship between these two sets of variables. That means that people that have higher education score higher on language proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education / Work Experience</th>
<th>-0.511</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of -0.511 between Education and Work Experience indicates significant negative relationship between these two sets of variables. That can be explained by the fact that to achieve Masters or Doctoral degrees, it takes 5 and 8 years respectively and people that had spent that time on education had not had enough time to acquire the work

---

24 The correlation coefficient is described in detail in section 3.5.2.
experience (those few that scored high on both Education and Work Experience, scored 0 on Age).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education / Age</th>
<th>-0.090</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of -0.090 between Education and Age indicates that the negative relationship between these two sets of variables is weak. Since Education and Work Experience have significant negative correlation, it suggests that Canadian employers are reluctant to hire a person with little or no practical experience and that is why the correlation of Education and Arranged Employment is negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education / Arranged Employment</th>
<th>-0.630</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of -0.630 between Education and Arranged Employment indicates significant negative relationship between these two sets of variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education / Adaptability</th>
<th>-0.440</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of -0.440 between Education and Adaptability indicates significant negative relationship between these two sets of variables. Since cultural traditions are heavily embedded in education, the higher the education the more difficult for the new immigrants to change and adapt to the new environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Proficiency / Work Experience</th>
<th>-0.602</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of -0.602 between Language Proficiency and Work Experience indicates significant negative relationship between these two sets of variables. As with Education /
Work Experience, people that had spent time to acquire education and language skills had not had enough time to acquire the work experience.

\[
\text{Language Proficiency / Age} \quad -0.138
\]

The correlation of -0.138 between Language Proficiency and Age indicates significant negative relationship between these two sets of variables. This indicates that younger generation has better language skills than the older generation.

\[
\text{Language Proficiency / Arranged Employment} \quad -0.424
\]

The correlation of -0.424 between Language Proficiency and Arranged Employment indicates significant negative relationship between these two sets of variables. It can perhaps be explained by the fact that people who score higher on language proficiency, score lower on work experience and work experience is more important to secure employment than language skills. In fact, language proficiency has significant negative correlation of -0.602 with work experience.

\[
\text{Language Proficiency / Adaptability} \quad -0.434
\]

The correlation of -0.434 between Language Proficiency and Adaptability indicates significant negative relationship between these two sets of variables. The explanation is similar to that of Education and Adaptability. The correlation between Education and Language Proficiency is 0.819, which means that the higher the education the more proficient a person is in language. As explained above, education is embedded with the cultural traditions and therefore for better-educated people, who are also more proficient
in language, it is more difficult to adapt to the new environment and different cultural traditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience / Age</th>
<th>-0.124</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of -0.124 between Work Experience and Age indicates significant negative relationship between these two sets of variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience / Arranged Employment</th>
<th>0.670</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of 0.670 between Work Experience and Arranged Employment indicates that the relationship between these two sets of variables is positive and highly significant. It suggests that in selecting a candidate to make a job offer, Canadian employers place significant weight on work experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience / Adaptability</th>
<th>0.045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of 0.045 between Work Experience and Adaptability indicates that the relationship between these two sets of variables is positive but not significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age / Arranged Employment</th>
<th>-0.056</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of -0.056 between Age and Arranged Employment indicates that the relationship between these two sets of variables is negative but not significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age / Adaptability</th>
<th>-0.287</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The correlation of -0.287 between Age and Adaptability indicates significant negative relationship between these two sets of variables. That means that for older people, who spend larger parts of their lives in China, it is more difficult to adapt to Canadian culture.
The correlation of 0.451 between Arranged Employment and Adaptability indicates a strong positive relationship between these two sets of variables. Indeed, for people who have secured professional employment it is much easier to adapt. In fact, from the moment they received a job offer, their adaptability process has begun.

The statistical analyses show that average correlation among the selection criteria is 0.38. This number was obtained from adding the absolute values of 15 correlations described above and dividing the sum by the number of correlations, namely 15. An average close to 1 would be indicative that some of the criteria are redundant. However, an average of 0.38 suggests that many of the selection criteria are interrelated but are not redundant.

4.3. Importance of French Language Proficiency

Since the dominant view among researchers and policy analysts is that “official language proficiency is the single best predictor of future economic success in Canada” (Hiebert, 2004), I hypothesize that proficiency in French language is highly correlated with the economic success of Chinese immigrants in Québec. To test this hypothesis, I select 10 respondents who scored the highest number of points for French language proficiency under the selection criteria (Q 10). 9 out of 10 of these respondents also achieved the highest score on Q 17, where the respondents were asked to evaluate their own French language proficiency. I then compare the economic performance in Québec of those 10 respondents who knew French with the rest of the respondents. In response to Q 50, 73
respondents said that only 50% of their work experience acquired in China was recognized in Canada and 20 respondents said that the extent of recognition was 25%. By contrast, 8 out of 10 of French proficient respondents said that the extent of recognition of their work experience was 75%. Similarly, 9 out of these 10 respondents said that 75% of their education credentials was recognized in Canada, whereas 68 respondents said that 50% of their education credentials was recognized in Canada and 27 respondents said that the extent of recognition was only 25%.

This analyses show that the language barrier is the major impediment to recognition of work experience and education credentials.

Furthermore, in response to Q 51, a median respondent said they were making between $20,000 and $29,000 per year. However, 6 out of 10 respondent who were proficient in French said they were making between $40,000 and $49,000 per year and 2 of these 10 respondents said they were making between $50,000 and $59,000. This further substantiates the view that the language proficiency is “the single best predictor of economic success.” In Quebec, the best predictor of economic success is proficiency in French language.

4.4. Berry’s Acculturation Model Analyses

Immigrant acculturation is a complex process. It is a personal decision within a plural social setting and affected by both external factors, such as political and economic situations and the degree of acceptance by the host society, and internal factors, such as
willingness, readiness, and demographic variables, like education. The respondents were asked the following two questions:

19. Do you think it is considered to be of value to maintain cultural identity and characteristics?
   A) Yes
   B) No

20. Do you think it is considered to be of value to maintain relationships with other groups?
   A) Yes
   B) No

These questions were designed to conduct the analyses within the framework of Berry’s acculturation model as set out in the chart on page 58. For ease of reference, this chart is reproduced below, with numbers in parentheses indicating the responses. The explanations how the results were obtained follow the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it considered to be of value to maintain cultural identity and characteristics?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it considered to be of value to maintain relationships with other groups?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Integration (17)</td>
<td>Assimilation (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Segregation (4)</td>
<td>Marginalization (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Dimension 1 (Q 19), 21 respondents answered “yes” and 83 respondents answered “no”. Out of the 21 respondents that answered “yes” on Dimension 1 question, 17 answered “yes” and 4 answered “no” on Dimension 2 (Q 20). Out of the 83 respondents
that answered “no” on Dimension 1 question, 75 said “yes” and 8 said “no” on Dimension 2 question. This can schematically be represented as follows:

```
Dimension 1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dimension 2

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The results plotted in Chart indicate that only 17 respondents fall into “Integration” category. This is further supported by the response to Q 42, where 88 respondents said they experience “difficulty integrating into Canadian society”, even though they do their best to improve their language proficiency (Q 22). 75 respondents fall into “Assimilation” category and assimilation process is analyzed in greater detail next.

4.5. Assimilation Process Analyses

This section analyses responses to questionnaire in the framework of the Gordon-Smith-Porter Assimilation Model represented on page 47.
4.5.1. Cultural Assimilation

Under the Cultural Assimilation in the left column, language assimilation refers to the process of adopting the language of the host society. English and French are the languages of the host society in Montréal and Questions 16, 17 and 18 were designed to determine the language assimilation.

In response to Q 16, 75% of the respondents indicated that their English language proficiency level on seven components (grammar, writing, reading, listening, speaking, vocabulary and translation) is “moderate” or “high”. This is a strong indicator of language assimilation and the reason for that is that the majority of respondents knew English prior to immigration. In fact in response to Q 10 (A), 82% of the respondents said they scored 13 points (out of 16) or higher on points awarded for the first official language under the selection criteria. Indeed, without good knowledge of an official language it is almost impossible for an applicant to score a passing mark of 67 points. Similarly, almost 90% of the respondents said that their French language proficiency level is “none” or “basic” (Q 17), and this is consistent with their response to Q 10 (B) where 93% of the respondents stated that they scored 3 points (out of 8) or lower on French language proficiency under the selection criteria. This is further supported by the response to Q 6, where 92% of the respondents answered that they learned English in China. However, in response to Q 18, 94% of the respondents said they speak Mandarin at home. This shows that on English-language component majority of the respondents are integrating into the host society because they acquire the language of the host society.
while still preserving their native Mandarin. However, the acquisition of the French language is very weak (Q 17).

Clothing assimilation refers to the process when an immigrant starts to change their original clothing in order to fit in a host society. While 78% of the respondents said they wear Chinese clothes “sometimes” or “rarely” (Q 15), many respondents commented that both casual and professional attire in China is very similar to that in Canada and “often” or “most of the time” they wear their usual clothes. However, 73 % of respondents said they “never shop” at Bay, Moores or Sears (Q 12) but commented that most of their clothes they brought with them from China. This shows a strong convergence in clothing between China and Canada and most of the respondents would not have to go through the integration / assimilation process on that factor.

Dietetically, when an immigrant is willing to change their traditional diet on the common food of the mainstream society, they are in the process of dietetic assimilation. 71 % of respondents said they buy food at Maxi, Metro, Provigo, SuperC or IGA at least “once per week” (Q 12; Figure 12), while 91% said they buy food in Chinatown with the same frequency. Many respondents commented that proximity to a food-store and especially the price, Chinese food being less expensive, are important considerations in choosing where to buy food.

This is consistent with the responses to Q 14. While 68 respondents said they consume Chinese food every day, only 14 respondents said they enjoy western food on a daily basis. However, 93 respondents said they prepare meals from western food at least once
per week. This is indicative of the process of integration, not assimilation, because respondents introduce into their diet local food while preserving their taste for traditional Chinese cuisine.

Custom assimilation refers to the process of adapting to the customs of a mainstream society. 95% of the respondents said they celebrate Chinese New Year’s Day and 83% said they celebrate Chinese National Day (Q 11). Only 77% celebrate Canada National Day and the prime reason for that celebration is to enjoy the downtown festivities. The percentage of respondents who attach any significance to New Year, Christmas, Halloween, Easter or Remembrance day (aside from the fact that some of these days are statutory holydays) varies from 14% to 21%. This is indicative of a very slow progress in custom assimilation. Moreover, 87% said they make new friends in Montréal through existing friends (Q 27). As most of the respondents’ friends are Chinese, the new friends they make are also Chinese. In fact 79% said they have 1 to 5 non-Chinese friends and only 12% said they have 6 to 10 friends that are not of Chinese descent (Q 28). This further substantiates the fact that the degree of custom assimilation is low.

Religious assimilation refers to the process in which the immigrants begin to accept the religious beliefs and observances of a mainstream society. Only 1 respondent indicated she was attending Witnesses Jehovah’s gatherings and 103 respondents answered “none” to the question about their religious affiliation (Q 41). The overwhelming consistency in responses is not surprising. Every participant of this survey came from Mainland China; they were brought up in a politico-economic system with central economy where,
through the state-controlled media, the Communist regime endlessly regurgitated the propaganda that religion was the "opiate of the masses."^{25}

4.5.2. Structural Assimilation

Under the Structural Assimilation in the right column (p. 47), institutional-attitude assimilation refers to the process in which the immigrants reach a point where they encounter no racial prejudice. In response to Q 43, 93% of respondents find that the biggest problem they face in Montréal is "non-recognition of foreign credentials". This is consistent with responses to Q 50 where 70% of the respondents said that only 50% of the work experience they had acquired in China was recognized in Canada and 19% said that Canadian employers only recognized about 25% of their experience from China. Similarly, 65% said that only about 50% of their academic credentials from China had been recognized in Canada and 26% said that only 25% of their education is recognized in Canada. Many respondents commented that they find it frustrating that their work experience and education credentials were recognized by the immigration assessment officers but are not recognized by the Canadian employers. Overwhelming majority of the respondents find it to be systemic discrimination, as they commented in Q 44.

In the process of behavioral-attitude assimilation, there is an absence of discrimination from the host people against the immigrants. Question 44 was designed to examine this point. 83% said they have experienced, and indeed been victimized, through racial discrimination. This is consistent with responses to Q 31 and Q 33. In responses to Q 31,

^{25} Marx, Karl. February 1844. A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher.
71% reported having experienced cultural barriers with the host society. In response to Q 33, only 19% said they take part in “activities organized by local community” and 83% said they take part in “activities organized by Chinese community”. This further demonstrates that most of the respondents experience cultural differences with the host people. Respondents repeatedly mentioned hidden or overt racism (Q 44) as well as overt racism in the workplace (Q 50). For example, 28 respondents talked about the unofficial screening of résumés based on Chinese-sounding names. Other participants mentioned that as members of visible minorities, they are often considered over-qualified for jobs and 16 respondents believed that this could be a pretext to circumvent job competition processes.

This is significantly higher than the national average and than racial discrimination in Québec of other minorities. The finding presented in the report on the national Engagement Plan for a Racism-Free Workplace reveal that there is abundant evidence of racial discrimination across Canada and particularly in Québec. The report suggests that visible minorities face considerable barriers in gaining access to jobs for which they are qualified and that their talents, education and abilities are too often underutilized. A survey commissioned by the Dominion Institute and conducted by Ipsos-Reid to mark the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination on March 21, 2005 found that 17% of Canadian adults or approximately 4 million people consider themselves as having been the victims of racism in their communities or workplaces” (Ipsos News Center; March 21, 2005 at pp. 15-17). Issues of concern include lack of recognition of educational credentials and work experience acquired abroad, under-employment, unemployment and unequal pay. The Report specifically states:
The greatest barrier for members of visible minorities seeking employment was seen to be the non-recognition of immigrants' qualifications and the absence of adequate assessments of prior learning. This was discussed frequently across the country. It appeared most acute in Toronto and Montreal. Language skills and proficiency were another difficulty, particularly in Québec.  

Identificational assimilation refers to the process when the immigrants gradually develop a sense of peoplehood based exclusively on a host society. Many respondents commented that they feel marginalized and discriminated against based primarily on their Chinese appearance and heavy accent. One respondent reported that she was involved in a disagreement with a co-worker over the phone and was told by a manager that her accent could be interpreted to be "hard and rude" on the ears. The Chinese woman was very offended by this characterization of her accent and the fact that her accent was being blamed for provoking the disagreement. When she insisted on an apology from the manager, she was perceived by management to be "volatile", "difficult" and "aggressive" and had been singled out for performance management. She reported the incident to the Canadian Human Rights Commission. The Commission responded that "while the Canadian Human Rights Code does not include "language" as a prohibited ground of discrimination, language can be an element of a complaint based on the grounds of ancestry, ethnic origin, place of origin and race" and "... accents or manners of speech can be racialized characteristics." This is consistent with responses and comments to Q 44 where 83% of the respondents said they have experienced racial discrimination. It therefore follows that identificational assimilation is very weak.

In the process of civic assimilation, the immigrants do not raise demands which involve value and power conflict with the people in a host society. While most of the respondents do not raise demand, it is apparent from their responses to questionnaires that they suffer from subversive and subtle discrimination, primarily stemming from stereotypes about immigrants of Chinese descent. Hence, the civic assimilation is virtually non-existent.

Marital assimilation refers to the process in which the immigrants intermarry on a large scale with the people of a host society. Out of 104 respondents, only 2 stated that they were married to a “Canadian” and one stated that she had a “Canadian” partner. By any stretch of the English language can that be described as “intermarriage on a large scale” and therefore marital assimilation is also very weak. This can perhaps be in part explained by the fact that every participant of the survey had been in Montréal for a maximum period of 5 years (Q 4 was specifically designed to eliminate respondents who had been in Montréal for longer than 5 years).

The diagram suggests that the process of assimilation is a movement from external assimilation to internal assimilation via both cultural and structural accesses. The cultural access emphasizes the adoption in the common cultural life of a host society. The structural access focuses on the incorporation in the social network of cliques, clubs, and institutions of a host society. The internal assimilation is the final stage of the entire process, which is built up gradually by each individual subprocesses between the external and internal stages. The analyses reveal that that the respondents experience considerable difficulties in assimilation process.
4.6. Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Analyses

This section analyses responses to questionnaire in the framework of the Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Model represented on page 63.

A key aspect of the Maslow’s Model is the hierarchical nature of the needs. The lower the needs in the hierarchy, the more fundamental they are and the more a person will tend to abandon the higher needs in order to pay attention to sufficiently meeting the lower needs. For example, when person is ill, he cares little for what others think about him: all he wants is to get better.

The five needs of the Model are described in sufficient detail on pages 62-65 and graphically represented on page 63.

The respondents were asked two direct questions about their “needs” in Canada and in China:

52. What “Needs” are you concerned about at the moment?

53. What “Needs” were you concerned about just prior to immigration?

Five response choices were offered for each question:

A) Physiological needs — very basic needs such as air, water, food, sleep, sex, etc.

B) Safety needs — have to do with establishing stability and consistency in a chaotic world (includes security body, of employment, of resources, of morality, of the family, of health of property)
C) Love / Belonging needs → friends, family, sexual intimacy / belonging to clubs, work groups, religious groups

D) Esteem needs → self-esteem, confidence, achievement, respect of others, respect by others;

E) Self-actualization → morality, creativity, spontaneity, problem solving, lack of prejudice;

92 respondents chose answer B) Safety needs in response to Q 52. In response to Q 53, 69 respondents chose answer D) Esteem needs and 23 respondents chose answer E) Self-actualization. This shows that most of the respondents were upper or upper-middle class in China but stepped down into lower or lower-middle class in Canada. This is further substantiated by other responses.

In response to Q 40, 72 respondents said that their financial lifestyle in Canada is “50% or more worse than in China”. Indeed, in Q 7 the respondents were asked to indicate their academic major in China. In Q 21, the respondents were asked to indicate their professional position(s) in China right before immigration. The correlation coefficient between these two sets of variables is 0.9126; this shows that in China most of the respondents worked in their professional field after graduation.

While 87 respondents said they found their first job within 6 months to 1 year (Q 47), 76 respondents said they did not have a professional job (Q 49) and consequently they were doing non-skilled work (Q 48).

In response to Q 51, 33 respondents indicated that their annual income is below $20,000, most of whom further indicated that over 60% of that income comes from loans and
bursaries. Majority of the respondents, 48, said they make between $20,000 and $39,000 per year. However, many respondents in that category stated that they work 60 to 70 hours per week. Every one of the respondents in that category indicated that they consider such employment temporary.

4.7. Conclusion

The correlation analyses in this section suggest that the selection criteria are interrelated but are not redundant. However, these criteria are not very accurate predictor of immigrants' economic success, as evidenced by the difficulties the respondent experience in their assimilation process. One reason for this may be the lack of recognition by the local employers of work experience and educational credentials acquired abroad. This factor is not assessed under the selection criteria. Second, French language proficiency carries disproportionately small weight under the selection criteria whereas French language is indispensable for most of the professional employments in Québec. The knowledge of technical terms is not assessed under the selection scheme at all. Finally, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs pyramid was used in this section to analyze the social status, and cognitive skills it implies, of the respondents in China and then compare it to the respondents’ social status in Canada.
The findings of the study are presented in this chapter under different themes. They are in order of policy implications, the respondents’ perceptions of integration, adaptation motivation, adaptation preparation, expectations and the reality, factors that aid or hinder adaptation, adaptation strategies and needs.

5.1. Policy Implications

The relationship between selection criteria and eventual outcomes is complex, but the research does show that certain attributes are more plausible predictors of immigrants' potential economic contributions and well-being than others.

Official language proficiency appears to be one of the key determinants of labour market success in Canada. Given the emphasis on language proficiency in the selection criteria, it is likely that Skilled Workers will fare well in the Canadian labour market, particularly if their education and experience are obtained in Canada or in source countries with systems similar to Canada's. However, this does not mitigate the challenges that Skilled Workers face in terms of the valuing and utilization of their skills or the differential earnings of visible minority immigrants versus non-visible minority immigrants and native-born Canadians, nor does it mitigate the challenges faced by the spouses and
dependants of Principal Applicants, who are not assessed on the basis of their language proficiency and may have difficulty accessing language training.

At the same time, given that the adaptability criteria reward those applicants with educated spouses because it is believed that they will be capable of contributing to the Canadian economy, spousal official language proficiency should be assessed. Spouses who lack official language proficiency, regardless of their education, may be unable to succeed in the labour force. In addition, research has found that earnings are highest among immigrants who generally speak an official language at home. Thus, it would perhaps be beneficial to award points to spouses who can conduct a conversation in the official language of the Principal Applicant as this increases the probability that this language will be used at home. However, increasing the number of points that spouses can contribute favours married and cohabiting couples over single applicants and may effectively permit immigration by weaker Principal Applicants with applications that are supplemented by points from their spouses.

Given that immigrants experience higher positive returns from education attained in Canada, the selection system could award additional points for Canadian education, or for intended future study in Canada. In addition, a promotional campaign aimed at foreign students studying at Canadian institutions may attract applicants with existing Canadian education. Further, research suggests than more should be done to encourage Canadian industries to recognize, value and utilize the education and training that immigrants bring to Canada. Based on the analyses, seven recommendations can be made to improve the selection criteria and adaptation process:
1. Reward applicants with relevant work experience by awarding higher points for that which is recognized by Canadian employers;

2. Reward applicants with an education from a system that is similar to Canada's by awarding more points for education credentials that are recognized by Canadian employers;

3. Place greater emphasis on employer sponsorship as part of the admission of skilled workers;

4. Institute bridge-training programs to top up immigrants' skills or fill in the gaps across a wider range of occupations;

5. Provide more support for credential-assessment services to improve their labour market effectiveness;

6. Improve public awareness of the problems faced by skilled immigrants in integrating into the Canadian labour market and the consequences of this;

7. Provide comprehensive Web-based and other sources of information for immigrants, both before and after their arrival in Canada;

Selecting immigrants however important, is not sufficient for their potential contribution to materialize; of equal importance is establishing efficient programs to aid the newcomers to integrate / assimilate into the host society.

5.2. Perceptions of Integration

The answers to the questionnaires reveal that the respondents perceived integration differently from both other respondents and the Canadian government. The respondents
believed that integration was imperative for independent immigrants. They also pointed out an integration hierarchy in which immigrants were situated at different tiers with different goals to accomplish; a self-chosen marginality between the mainstream culture and the Chinese culture, learning and changing, or objectives that are impossible to accomplish for the first generation of immigrants. Within these perceptions, the participants also declared their attitudes, actions, and plans.

5.2.1. Integration – Necessity for Skilled Worker Class

The perception that it is imperative for immigrants in the Skilled Workers Category to integrate into the host society was rooted in the fact that immigrants in this category perceive themselves different from immigrants in other categories. Indeed, family class immigrants were admitted based on having family members in Canada who are financially capable to support them; refugees were admitted based on having a well-founded fear of persecution in their country of origin; business immigrants were admitted based on their business experience and available funds; whereas Skilled Workers were admitted based, in large part, on the need of their professional skills, work experience and language proficiency required in the Canadian job market. It is therefore indispensable for the immigrants in the Skilled Worker Class to integrate into the local community in order to find professional employment, thus fulfilling their legitimate expectations. In fact, 92% of respondents said it was “extremely important” for them to integrate into the host society.
5.2.2. Integration Hierarchy

In terms of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, most respondents have surpassed the physiological needs, such as buying food, shopping, and similar day-to-day needs. The respondents appear to have no difficulty to fulfill these basic needs because, having passed through the selection criteria for Skilled Workers, they possess sufficient language proficiency and cognitive skills. 92 respondents indicated that they are concerned with steady income, permanent job, and financial security. This corresponds to the second level in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. By contrast, 69 respondents said they were at the Self-Actualization level and 23 respondents said they were at the Esteem level just prior to immigration. This indicates that the immigrants in the Skilled Worker category were upper-middle or high class in China but fell to lower-middle or lower class in Canada.

From response to Q 26, it is evident that most of the respondents immigrated to Canada in expectation of better career, education, future for their children – a higher standard of living. For many respondents, however, this expectation has not materialized. For example in response to Q 40, 72 respondents indicated that their financial lifestyle in Canada is “50% or more worse than in China” and in response to Q 34, 88 respondents said they are “not satisfied” with their life in Montréal. That is the reason why 67 respondents said they want to move from Montréal in the foreseeable future (Q 36). 23 respondents said they want to move to Toronto, 6 to Vancouver, 19 to the US, 11 back to China and 8 to other places (Q 35). Every one of the respondents said the reason for moving was what in Maslow’s language is advancing higher in the pyramid of needs.
Indeed, the famous Canadian novelist, Yann Martel (2001), captured it perfectly in *Life of Pi* when he said:

Why do people move? What makes them uproot and leave everything they have known for a great unknown beyond the horizon? Why climb this unknown Mount Everest of formalities that makes you feel like a beggar? Why enter this jungle of foreignness where everything is new, strange and difficult? The answer is the same the world over: people move in the hope of a better life.

The hope of a better life for many Chinese immigrants has not materialized in Montréal and that is why they choose not to make Montréal their permanent home. In fact, 65% of Chinese immigrants leave Montréal within 5 years from their arrival.

5.2.3. Cultural Marginality

Misconceptions or stereotypes that occur as a result of accent and appearance foster false impressions, thus marginalizing Chinese immigrants’ cultural experiences. Most of the respondents described as “negative” first experiences with the "outside," many of whom lived in an exclusive community with only brief exchanges with members of the mainstream culture. Those who had gained employment described hesitancies and initial resistance to socializing with non-Chinese co-workers. This was likely the result of racism and discrimination on the part of the mainstream workers.

Only two respondents discussed their early experiences interacting with mainstream culture in positive terms. Their experiences differ from the others described above for the following reasons: one respondent moved with her family to a mainstream community as an international student and thus, lived in this community until for five years; the second
respondent was a professor and resided in Westmount, a non-Chinese, mainstream neighborhood. Thus, one may make the assumption that these two respondents not only had more frequent contact with those in mainstream, but were accepted because they were living within mainstream society and assumed some similar norms and values. Most of the respondents believed that their marginality was rooted in their life style and experiences, particularly education, that they acquired in China. Even though up to 25 points are awarded to immigrants in the selection process for education, CIC does not appear to take into account cultural aspects imbedded in education. More nuanced analyses reveal that education is laden with culture and also a tool to pass on cultural traditions. Consequently, the higher the level of education an immigrant had received in China, the harder it might be for that person to give up their original culture to integrate into the mainstream culture. Thus the integration is significantly harder for immigrants in the Skilled Worker category because 85% of respondents said they had obtained a University degree in China.

5.2.4. Can First Generation Immigrants Integrate?

78% of respondents felt that integration was impossible for first generation immigrants because of cultural differences, heavy accent and often hostile attitude of mainstream society. Many respondents encounter argument that “immigrants place excessive demand on social welfare system” or that “immigrants bring down the wages since they are willing to accept the lower pay”. Another issue that pose significant problem is that most of the Chinese immigrants do not speak French. This at times angers, or irritates, the French-speaking people in Montreal. Thus, 94% of respondents reported that they do not
believe it is possible for the first generation immigrants to integrate into the local society, particularly in Montreal where it is necessary to speak both English and French.

5.3. Assimilation Difficulties

Assimilation difficulties come from both immigrant individuals and the institutions and regulations of the host-county. Immigration policy which is based on the selection of immigrants without taking into account their countries of origin would affect the process of immigrants’ assimilation in the host country. Discrimination comes from race, accent, and colour that separate immigrants from mainstream locals. Devalued foreign credentials not only impede newcomers’ integration into the labour market but also increase the cost of immigration for the Canadian government. Because of non-recognition of educational credentials and home-country experience, many immigrants end up accepting jobs that do not require their professional skills. However, an effective process of foreign credential and experience recognition must be a part of the strategy to economic integration of immigrants.

5.4. Response to Racism

As great stigma attaches to allegations of racism, there is a tendency to deny its existence generally or in a particular situation. However, effective response to racism must clearly acknowledge that it persists in Canada, and in Montreal in particular. In its more
entrenched forms the racism is often unconsciously applied and its operation is often unrecognized by even those practising it. It is therefore imperative that racism not be treated as aberrant behaviour or a set of deviant attitudes on the part of a deviant individual – a so-called “rotten apple” within the system. Failing to recognize the complex, subtle and systemic nature of racism impedes effective action against it.

Evidence of systemic discrimination may be found in the policies, practices and decision-making processes. These may be either formal or informal in nature.

The Supreme Court of Canada has made it clear that systems must be designed to be inclusive of all persons. It is no longer acceptable to structure systems in a way that assumes that everyone is a member of the dominant group and then try to accommodate those who do not fit this assumption. Rather the racial diversity that exists in Québec should be reflected in the design stages of programs so that barriers are not created.

As a corollary to the notion that inclusive design should be used from the outset, where barriers already exist within systems and structures, they should be actively identified and removed.

Therefore, an organization has a responsibility to ensure its practices create inclusiveness, and not merely make exceptions to allow individuals to fit into an existing system. Barriers should be prevented at the design stage and where systems already exist, organizations should be aware of the possibility of systemic barriers and actively seek to identify and remove them.
5.5. Conclusion and Implications

It is critical to ensure that decision-making structures provide incentives to innovate and act in a timely fashion. Also, action must be taken to minimize the barriers to employment created by racial prejudice. Market forces alone are unlikely to resolve the problem of underutilization of immigrants’ skills quickly, because the existing incentives for employers to do so do not take into account the societal costs of failure of the immigration policy. To bring about the changes required, the agencies and governments involved must collaborate. While some of these initiatives are already on the public agenda, the potential costs of failure have not yet been fully recognized.

While Canada should continue to welcome Chinese immigrants, it is imperative to ensure that the numbers and qualifications of those who come in fact serve the best interests of the country. As well, it is important that the Skilled Workers are selected in a manner that provides them with reasonable prospects of employment in the fields for which they are qualified. The fact that significant numbers of skilled immigrants are presently having difficulty finding suitable jobs not only suggests that many of the major gaps in the work force which they came to fill do not in fact exist, but may also discourage well-qualified immigrants from coming here in the future.
Appendix I
Table 1

Permanent Residents by Top Source Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China, People's Republic of</td>
<td>18,526</td>
<td>19,790</td>
<td>29,148</td>
<td>36,750</td>
<td>40,365</td>
<td>33,307</td>
<td>36,256</td>
<td>36,429</td>
<td>42,292</td>
<td>33,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>19,615</td>
<td>15,375</td>
<td>17,457</td>
<td>26,123</td>
<td>27,904</td>
<td>28,838</td>
<td>24,593</td>
<td>25,575</td>
<td>33,148</td>
<td>30,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>10,872</td>
<td>8,184</td>
<td>9,205</td>
<td>10,119</td>
<td>12,928</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td>11,989</td>
<td>13,303</td>
<td>17,525</td>
<td>17,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>11,239</td>
<td>8,089</td>
<td>9,303</td>
<td>14,201</td>
<td>15,354</td>
<td>14,173</td>
<td>12,351</td>
<td>12,795</td>
<td>13,575</td>
<td>12,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>4,776</td>
<td>5,533</td>
<td>5,828</td>
<td>5,911</td>
<td>5,294</td>
<td>6,013</td>
<td>7,507</td>
<td>9,262</td>
<td>10,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>7,486</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>5,909</td>
<td>5,617</td>
<td>5,746</td>
<td>7,889</td>
<td>5,651</td>
<td>6,063</td>
<td>5,502</td>
<td>7,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4,657</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>4,478</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>4,725</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>6,062</td>
<td>5,665</td>
<td>6,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td>4,917</td>
<td>7,217</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>9,608</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>7,089</td>
<td>5,337</td>
<td>5,819</td>
<td>6,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>4,273</td>
<td>4,438</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>5,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>4,345</td>
<td>4,428</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>4,127</td>
<td>5,028</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>4,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>5,071</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td>4,728</td>
<td>5,849</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>4,968</td>
<td>4,448</td>
<td>4,135</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>4,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>4,431</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>5,689</td>
<td>5,466</td>
<td>5,658</td>
<td>4,964</td>
<td>4,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>3,735</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td>3,782</td>
<td>3,523</td>
<td>4,073</td>
<td>3,877</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>3,685</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>2,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>13,324</td>
<td>7,193</td>
<td>5,483</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>2,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>22,250</td>
<td>8,087</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>1,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia (former)</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>4,745</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 10 source countries</strong></td>
<td><strong>118,070</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,490</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,461</strong></td>
<td><strong>121,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>134,285</strong></td>
<td><strong>123,228</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,055</strong></td>
<td><strong>123,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>144,449</strong></td>
<td><strong>135,346</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other countries</strong></td>
<td>97,968</td>
<td>86,705</td>
<td>91,496</td>
<td>105,939</td>
<td>116,356</td>
<td>105,823</td>
<td>102,296</td>
<td>112,067</td>
<td>117,790</td>
<td>116,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>216,038</td>
<td>174,195</td>
<td>189,957</td>
<td>227,459</td>
<td>250,641</td>
<td>229,051</td>
<td>221,351</td>
<td>235,824</td>
<td>262,239</td>
<td>251,649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China, People's Republic of</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia (former)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 10 source countries</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other countries</strong></td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, People's Republic of</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia (former)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facts and Figures. 2006 Immigration Overview: Permanent Residents
Table 4  
Annual Immigration (Permanent Residents) by Category 1997 to 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and partners</td>
<td>30,137</td>
<td>28,321</td>
<td>32,832</td>
<td>35,294</td>
<td>37,762</td>
<td>32,742</td>
<td>38,735</td>
<td>43,999</td>
<td>45,405</td>
<td>45,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fianc(e)es</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons and daughters</td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>3,951</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>3,646</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>3,037</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>2,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and grandparents</td>
<td>20,220</td>
<td>14,201</td>
<td>14,487</td>
<td>17,769</td>
<td>21,341</td>
<td>22,234</td>
<td>19,384</td>
<td>12,732</td>
<td>12,474</td>
<td>20,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>2,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family class</td>
<td>59,979</td>
<td>50,855</td>
<td>55,277</td>
<td>60,613</td>
<td>66,795</td>
<td>62,280</td>
<td>65,112</td>
<td>62,260</td>
<td>63,357</td>
<td>70,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers - principal applicants</td>
<td>44,969</td>
<td>35,958</td>
<td>41,545</td>
<td>52,125</td>
<td>58,911</td>
<td>52,971</td>
<td>45,377</td>
<td>47,889</td>
<td>52,268</td>
<td>44,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>60,679</td>
<td>45,307</td>
<td>50,950</td>
<td>66,468</td>
<td>78,323</td>
<td>69,757</td>
<td>59,846</td>
<td>65,556</td>
<td>77,974</td>
<td>61,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs - principal applicants</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>7,599</td>
<td>4,848</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>4,529</td>
<td>4,482</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>2,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed - principal applicants</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors - principal applicants</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>2,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>4,073</td>
<td>3,309</td>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>4,572</td>
<td>3,402</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>4,428</td>
<td>7,016</td>
<td>5,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/territories nominees - principal applicants</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>4,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/territories nominees - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>5,404</td>
<td>8,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in caregivers - principal applicants</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>3,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in caregivers - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>3,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic immigrants</td>
<td>128,351</td>
<td>97,910</td>
<td>109,251</td>
<td>136,292</td>
<td>155,720</td>
<td>137,862</td>
<td>121,045</td>
<td>133,744</td>
<td>156,310</td>
<td>138,257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government-assisted refugees                     | 7,711 | 7,432 | 7,444 | 10,671 | 8,697 | 7,505 | 7,506 | 7,411 | 7,416 | 7,316 |
Privately sponsored refugees                      | 2,742 | 2,267 | 2,348 | 2,933 | 3,576 | 3,050 | 3,252 | 3,116 | 2,976 | 3,337 |
Refugees landed in Canada                        | 10,634| 10,182| 11,797| 12,993| 11,897| 10,546| 11,267| 15,901| 19,935| 15,892|
Refugee dependants                               | 3,221 | 2,962 | 2,809 | 3,497 | 3,749 | 4,021 | 3,959 | 6,259 | 5,441 | 5,947 |
Refugees                                        | 24,308| 22,843| 24,398| 30,094| 27,919| 25,122| 25,984| 32,687| 35,768| 32,492|
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retirees - principal applicants</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OROC and PDRC* - principal applicants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OROC and PDRC* - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary resident permit holders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H and C** cases</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>9,209</td>
<td>7,133</td>
<td>6,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other H and C cases outside the family class / Public Policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other immigrants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216,038</td>
<td>174,195</td>
<td>189,957</td>
<td>227,459</td>
<td>250,641</td>
<td>229,051</td>
<td>221,351</td>
<td>235,824</td>
<td>262,239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Deferred removal orders and post-determination refugee claimants
**Humanitarian and Compassionate
Figure 14  Permanent Residents by Category (Showing Percentage Distribution)

## Table 5

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor One: Education</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have a Master’s Degree or Ph.D. <strong>and</strong> at least 17 years of full-time or full-time equivalent study.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have two or more university degrees at the bachelor’s level <strong>and</strong> at least 15 years of full-time or full-time equivalent study.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have a three-year diploma, trade certificate or apprenticeship <strong>and</strong> at least 15 years of full-time or full-time equivalent study.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have a university degree of two years or more at the bachelor’s level <strong>and</strong> at least 14 years of full-time or full-time equivalent study.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have a two-year diploma, trade certificate or apprenticeship <strong>and</strong> at least 14 years of full-time or full-time equivalent study.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have a one-year university degree at the bachelor’s level <strong>and</strong> at least 13 years of full-time or full-time equivalent study.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have a one-year diploma, trade certificate or apprenticeship <strong>and</strong> at least 13 years of full-time or full-time equivalent study.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have a one-year diploma, trade certificate or apprenticeship <strong>and</strong> at least 12 years of full-time or full-time equivalent study.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You completed high school.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definitions

**Full-time studies:** At least 15 hours of instruction per week during the academic year, including any period of training in the workplace that forms part of the course of instruction.

**Full-time equivalent studies:** The length of time that it would have taken to complete a program of study on a full-time basis, but was actually completed on a part-time or accelerated basis.
Example

10.2. Education

Officers should assess programs of study and award points based on the standards that exist in the country of study. The Regulations do not provide for comparisons to Canadian educational standards;

If the applicant has an educational credential referred to in a particular paragraph in R78(2) but not the total number of years of study required by that paragraph, officers should award the number of points set out in the paragraph that refers to the number of years of study completed by the applicant [R78(4)].

Example: 1. If an applicant has a Master’s Degree, but only 16 years of education, an officer would go down to the category for which the applicant meets the total number of years and, using this example, award 22 points;

Example: 2. If an applicant has a four-year Bachelor’s degree and 16 years of education, an officer would award 20 points, as a single two, three, or four-year university credential at the bachelor’s level, combined with at least 14 years of full-time study, is worth 20 points;

Table 6

Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Two: Official Languages</th>
<th>Maximum 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Official Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High proficiency (per ability)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate proficiency (per ability)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic proficiency (per ability)</td>
<td>1 to maximum of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No proficiency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible maximum (all 4 abilities)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Official Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High proficiency (per ability)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate proficiency (per ability)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic proficiency (per ability)</td>
<td>1 to maximum of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No proficiency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible maximum (all 4 abilities)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Proficiency

The ability to communicate and work in one or both of Canada’s official languages is very important to you, as a skilled worker. Abilities in English, French or both will help you in the Canadian labour market.

Language proficiency is one of the six selection factors for skilled workers. You will be awarded up to 24 points for your basic, moderate or high abilities in English and French. You will be given points based on your ability to:

- listen;
- speak;
- read; and
- write.
Description of Each Level of Ability

Use the following chart to assess your skill levels according to the Canadian Language Benchmarks. Follow the links for a description of each skill level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH: You can communicate effectively in most social and work situations.</td>
<td>Speaking: High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE: You can communicate comfortably in familiar social and work situations.</td>
<td>Speaking: Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC: You can communicate in predictable contexts and on familiar topics, but with some difficulty.</td>
<td>Speaking: Basic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your First and Second Official Languages

If you have some abilities in both the English and French language, decide which language you are more comfortable using. This is your First Official Language. The other is your Second Official Language.

Calculate Your Language Points

Use the descriptions from the table above to score your language abilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Official Language</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High proficiency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate proficiency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic proficiency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Note: You can score a maximum of only two points in total for basic-level proficiency.

| No proficiency                  | 0        | 0         | 0       | 0       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Official Language</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High proficiency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate proficiency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic proficiency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Note: You can score a maximum of only two points in total for basic-level proficiency.

| No proficiency                  | 0        | 0         | 0       | 0       |

**Language ability documentation**

If you are claiming language skills on your application, you **must** provide **conclusive proof** of your language skills. You must choose one of two options to do this. You can:

1. take a language test by an approved organization; or
2. provide other written documentation that supports your claim.

We strongly recommend that you take a language test from an approved organization if you are claiming skills in a language that is not your native language.
Table 7

Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Three: Experience</th>
<th>Maximum 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Four: Age</th>
<th>Maximum 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 to 49 years at time of application</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 2 points for each year over 49 or under 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age (maximum 10 points)

You will be awarded selection points based on your age at the time when the visa office received your application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 17 years of age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years of age</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years of age</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years of age</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years of age</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 49 years of age</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years of age</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 years of age</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 years of age</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 years of age</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 53 years of age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Arranged Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Five: Arranged Employment In Canada</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have a permanent job offer that has been confirmed by Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC).</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are applying from within Canada and have a temporary work permit that was:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issued after receipt of a confirmation of your job offer from HRSDC; or</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you have a temporary work permit that was exempted from the requirement of a confirmed job offer from HRSDC on the basis of an international agreement (e.g., NAFTA), a significant benefit to Canada (e.g., intra-company transfer) or public policy on Canada’s academic or economic competitiveness (e.g., post-graduate work).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some situations, you can be awarded selection points for a job that you have arranged for before applying for permanent residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Arranged Employment</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are working in Canada on a temporary work permit that was issued after receipt of a confirmation of your job offer from Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC).</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditions**

- Your work permit was valid at the time you applied for a permanent resident visa and at the time the visa, if any, was issued.
- Your employer has offered you a permanent job once the permanent resident visa is issued.
- You are currently working in that job.
You are working in Canada on a temporary work permit that was exempted from the requirement of a confirmed job offer from HRSDC on the basis of an international agreement (e.g., NAFTA or GATS), a significant benefit to Canada (e.g., intra-company transfer) or public policy on Canada’s academic or economic competitiveness (e.g., post-graduate work).

Conditions

- Your work permit was valid at the time you applied for a permanent resident visa and at the time the visa, if any, was issued.
- Your employer has offered you a permanent job once the permanent resident visa is issued.
- You are currently working in that job.

You are working in Canada on a temporary work permit that does not fall under either of the two situations above.

Conditions

- Your employer has offered you a permanent job once the permanent resident visa is issued.
- Your employer has had the permanent job offer confirmed by HRSDC.

You do not currently hold a work permit, and you do not intend to work in Canada before being issued a permanent resident visa.

Conditions

- The employer has offered you a permanent job once the permanent resident visa is issued.
- The employer has had the permanent job offer confirmed by HRSDC.
- You meet the Canadian licensing or regulatory requirements necessary for the job.

Note

- You cannot arrange for an HRSDC confirmation. Your employer must do this.
Table 10

Adaptability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Six: Adaptability</th>
<th>Maximum 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse’s or common-law partner’s education</td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum one year full-time authorized work in Canada</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum two years full-time authorized post-secondary study in Canada</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have received points under the Arranged Employment in Canada factor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family relationship in Canada</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You may be awarded selection points if you can show that you or your dependants will adapt easily to living in Canada.

Note: You can only count points from each category once. You can claim points from a category either for you, or for your spouse or common-law partner, but not for both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptability Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse or common-law partner’s level of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secondary school (high school) diploma or less: 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A one-year diploma, trade certificate, apprenticeship, or university degree and at least 12 years of full-time or full-time equivalent studies: 3 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A two or three-year diploma, trade certificate, apprenticeship, or university degree and at least 14 years of full-time or full-time equivalent studies: 4 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A master’s degree or PhD and at least 17 years of full-time or full-time equivalent studies: 5 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous study in Canada</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You, or your accompanying spouse or common-law partner, completed a program of full-time study of at least two years’ duration at a post-secondary institution in Canada. You must have done this after you were 17 years old and with a valid study permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need to have obtained an educational credential for these two years of study to earn these points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous work in Canada</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You, or your accompanying spouse or common-law partner, completed a minimum of one year of full-time work in Canada on a valid work permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arranged employment</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You can claim five additional points if you have arranged employment as described in Factor 5: Arranged Employment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relatives in Canada</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You, or your accompanying spouse or common-law partner, have a relative (parent, grandparent, child, grandchild, child of a parent, sibling, child of a grandparent, aunt or uncle, or grandchild of a parent, niece or nephew) who is residing in Canada and is a Canadian citizen or permanent resident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Maximum 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass Mark</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/skilled/qual-5.html
Table 11

Settlement Funds
Low Income Cut-Off (LICO) for 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Family Members</th>
<th>Funds Required (in Canadian dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$12,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$18,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$21,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$24,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>$26,910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>6,061</td>
<td>5,163</td>
<td>5,834</td>
<td>7,058</td>
<td>7,809</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>7,463</td>
<td>7,903</td>
<td>7,623</td>
<td>8,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>32,423</td>
<td>27,377</td>
<td>29,608</td>
<td>32,531</td>
<td>35,264</td>
<td>36,644</td>
<td>38,685</td>
<td>34,073</td>
<td>36,543</td>
<td>43,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>10,356</td>
<td>8,023</td>
<td>8,757</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>10,040</td>
<td>7,834</td>
<td>7,387</td>
<td>7,447</td>
<td>7,167</td>
<td>7,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2,495</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>4,145</td>
<td>4,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>8,641</td>
<td>7,725</td>
<td>8,125</td>
<td>9,095</td>
<td>10,054</td>
<td>8,630</td>
<td>8,587</td>
<td>9,114</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>7,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source area not stated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family class</td>
<td>59,979</td>
<td>50,895</td>
<td>55,277</td>
<td>60,613</td>
<td>66,795</td>
<td>62,280</td>
<td>65,112</td>
<td>62,260</td>
<td>63,357</td>
<td>70,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>23,121</td>
<td>19,284</td>
<td>18,998</td>
<td>23,412</td>
<td>30,706</td>
<td>30,603</td>
<td>25,384</td>
<td>27,590</td>
<td>28,650</td>
<td>31,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>75,317</td>
<td>49,008</td>
<td>59,077</td>
<td>78,661</td>
<td>87,728</td>
<td>71,210</td>
<td>62,242</td>
<td>66,479</td>
<td>87,738</td>
<td>69,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>4,932</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>5,956</td>
<td>7,473</td>
<td>8,041</td>
<td>7,313</td>
<td>8,453</td>
<td>8,205</td>
<td>7,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>2,977</td>
<td>3,804</td>
<td>4,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>22,511</td>
<td>23,076</td>
<td>23,635</td>
<td>25,686</td>
<td>27,554</td>
<td>26,061</td>
<td>24,402</td>
<td>28,241</td>
<td>27,912</td>
<td>25,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source area not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic immigrants</td>
<td>128,351</td>
<td>97,910</td>
<td>109,251</td>
<td>136,292</td>
<td>155,720</td>
<td>137,862</td>
<td>121,045</td>
<td>133,744</td>
<td>156,310</td>
<td>138,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>7,975</td>
<td>7,662</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>10,340</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td>8,822</td>
<td>9,536</td>
<td>12,593</td>
<td>11,439</td>
<td>10,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>7,201</td>
<td>6,219</td>
<td>7,264</td>
<td>9,326</td>
<td>9,858</td>
<td>10,204</td>
<td>10,167</td>
<td>12,159</td>
<td>11,848</td>
<td>10,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>3,712</td>
<td>4,596</td>
<td>7,630</td>
<td>7,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>7,321</td>
<td>7,576</td>
<td>7,184</td>
<td>8,137</td>
<td>5,683</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>3,177</td>
<td>4,007</td>
<td>2,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source area not stated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>24,308</td>
<td>22,843</td>
<td>24,398</td>
<td>30,094</td>
<td>27,919</td>
<td>25,122</td>
<td>25,984</td>
<td>32,687</td>
<td>35,768</td>
<td>32,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>1,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>3,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>1,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source area not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other immigrants</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>9,209</td>
<td>7,133</td>
<td>6,794</td>
<td>10,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>37,799</td>
<td>32,597</td>
<td>33,557</td>
<td>40,911</td>
<td>48,239</td>
<td>46,340</td>
<td>43,678</td>
<td>49,531</td>
<td>49,275</td>
<td>51,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>117,100</td>
<td>84,220</td>
<td>96,592</td>
<td>120,742</td>
<td>132,949</td>
<td>119,061</td>
<td>113,735</td>
<td>114,577</td>
<td>138,054</td>
<td>126,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>17,426</td>
<td>14,045</td>
<td>15,282</td>
<td>17,008</td>
<td>20,211</td>
<td>19,473</td>
<td>20,349</td>
<td>22,255</td>
<td>24,636</td>
<td>24,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>4,776</td>
<td>5,533</td>
<td>5,828</td>
<td>5,911</td>
<td>5,294</td>
<td>6,013</td>
<td>7,507</td>
<td>9,282</td>
<td>10,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>38,675</td>
<td>38,540</td>
<td>38,992</td>
<td>42,964</td>
<td>43,296</td>
<td>38,870</td>
<td>37,569</td>
<td>41,902</td>
<td>40,908</td>
<td>37,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source area not stated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>216,038</td>
<td>174,195</td>
<td>189,957</td>
<td>227,459</td>
<td>250,641</td>
<td>229,051</td>
<td>221,351</td>
<td>235,824</td>
<td>262,239</td>
<td>251,649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 15

Permanent Residents by Category and Source Area, 2006 (by Number)
Table 13

by Percentage Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source area not stated</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family class</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source area not stated</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic immigrants</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source area not stated</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source area not stated</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other immigrants</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Central America</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and the United Kingdom</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source area not stated</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category not stated</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Permanent Residents by Category and Source Area, 2006 (Showing Percentage Distribution)

Facts and Figures 2006. Immigration Overview: Permanent Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most common myths and misconceptions about racism and racial discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Racism is exaggerated and except for exceptional cases or the actions of a “few bad apples” racism does not exist in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>People in Canada are “colour blind” and do not even notice race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mentioning the existence of racism or racial discrimination or taking proactive measures to address racism or racial discrimination constitutes reverse racism towards White people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Racialized people are less credible and their assertions must be more carefully scrutinized and investigated or must be corroborated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Racialized people play the “race card” to manipulate people or systems to get what they want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Racialized people are too sensitive, tend to overreact or have a “chip on their shoulder”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Racialized people themselves, and not racism or racial discrimination, are at fault for their disadvantage or state of “otherness”, commonly known as “blaming it on the victim”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Immigration is bad for Canada as immigrants take jobs away, commit more crime, are a drain on the system or do not fit into our society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>If a racialized person has been treated acceptably in the past, then discriminatory treatment cannot take place in the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 15

Male Permanent Residents by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and partners</td>
<td>11,817</td>
<td>10,734</td>
<td>12,283</td>
<td>13,015</td>
<td>13,955</td>
<td>11,859</td>
<td>13,772</td>
<td>16,028</td>
<td>17,096</td>
<td>17,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiancé(e)s</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons and daughters</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>1,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and grandparents</td>
<td>8,445</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>5,903</td>
<td>7,295</td>
<td>8,928</td>
<td>9,551</td>
<td>8,287</td>
<td>5,368</td>
<td>5,612</td>
<td>8,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family class</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,089</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,895</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,461</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,289</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,288</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,876</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,728</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,043</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,516</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers - principal applicants</td>
<td>31,852</td>
<td>26,059</td>
<td>31,008</td>
<td>39,601</td>
<td>44,439</td>
<td>39,640</td>
<td>33,505</td>
<td>34,372</td>
<td>37,070</td>
<td>31,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>24,260</td>
<td>17,589</td>
<td>19,033</td>
<td>24,630</td>
<td>29,323</td>
<td>26,813</td>
<td>23,097</td>
<td>26,114</td>
<td>31,723</td>
<td>25,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs - principal applicants</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed - principal applicants</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors - principal applicants</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>1,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>2,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/territories nominees - principal applicants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>3,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/territories nominees - spouses and dependents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>3,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in caregivers - principal applicants</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in caregivers - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>2,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic immigrants</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,828</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,676</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,538</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,943</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,077</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,905</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,896</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately sponsored refugees</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees landed in Canada</td>
<td>6,292</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>6,862</td>
<td>7,512</td>
<td>6,894</td>
<td>6,058</td>
<td>6,429</td>
<td>8,715</td>
<td>10,835</td>
<td>8,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee dependants</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>2,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugees</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,489</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,127</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,924</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,239</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,792</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,977</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,561</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,691</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees - principal applicants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees - spouses and dependants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROC and PDRCC* - principal applicants</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROC and PDRCC* - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary resident permit holders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H and C** cases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>2,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other H and C cases outside the family class / Public Policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>2,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other immigrants</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>3,892</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>3,263</td>
<td>5,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Males**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>106,306</th>
<th>84,983</th>
<th>93,039</th>
<th>112,352</th>
<th>123,619</th>
<th>112,757</th>
<th>106,503</th>
<th>114,171</th>
<th>127,776</th>
<th>122,146</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Deferred removal orders and post-determination refugee claimants
**Humanitarian and Compassionate
### Female Permanent Residents by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses and partners</td>
<td>18,305</td>
<td>17,579</td>
<td>20,546</td>
<td>22,278</td>
<td>23,807</td>
<td>20,883</td>
<td>24,963</td>
<td>27,971</td>
<td>28,309</td>
<td>28,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fianc(e)és</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons and daughters</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>1,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and grandparents</td>
<td>11,762</td>
<td>8,217</td>
<td>8,581</td>
<td>10,474</td>
<td>12,412</td>
<td>12,083</td>
<td>11,097</td>
<td>7,364</td>
<td>6,862</td>
<td>11,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family class</strong></td>
<td>35,851</td>
<td>30,976</td>
<td>33,804</td>
<td>37,318</td>
<td>40,738</td>
<td>37,989</td>
<td>40,235</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>38,314</td>
<td>41,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers - principal applicants</td>
<td>13,117</td>
<td>9,899</td>
<td>10,537</td>
<td>12,524</td>
<td>14,472</td>
<td>13,331</td>
<td>11,871</td>
<td>13,517</td>
<td>15,198</td>
<td>13,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>36,419</td>
<td>27,718</td>
<td>31,916</td>
<td>41,837</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>42,944</td>
<td>36,749</td>
<td>39,442</td>
<td>46,251</td>
<td>36,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs - principal applicants</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>4,657</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed - principal applicants</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors - principal applicants</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>4,328</td>
<td>3,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/territories nominees - principal applicants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/territories nominees - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>5,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in caregivers - principal applicants</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>2,426</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>3,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in caregivers - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic immigrants</strong></td>
<td>61,523</td>
<td>46,510</td>
<td>51,413</td>
<td>63,615</td>
<td>73,182</td>
<td>64,194</td>
<td>57,101</td>
<td>63,667</td>
<td>75,405</td>
<td>66,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-assisted refugees</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>3,453</td>
<td>3,529</td>
<td>5,131</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>3,596</td>
<td>3,553</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>3,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately sponsored refugees</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees landed in Canada</td>
<td>4,342</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>4,488</td>
<td>4,838</td>
<td>7,186</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>7,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee dependants</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>3,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugees</strong></td>
<td>10,818</td>
<td>10,507</td>
<td>11,193</td>
<td>13,967</td>
<td>12,995</td>
<td>11,883</td>
<td>12,192</td>
<td>15,710</td>
<td>17,207</td>
<td>15,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees - principal applicants</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROC and PDRCC* - principal applicants</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROC and PDRCC* - spouses and dependants</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary resident permit holders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H and C** cases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other H and C cases outside the family class / Public Policy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>3,929</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>3,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other immigrants</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>5,317</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>5,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>109,692</td>
<td>89,187</td>
<td>96,902</td>
<td>115,100</td>
<td>127,014</td>
<td>116,291</td>
<td>114,846</td>
<td>121,651</td>
<td>134,463</td>
<td>129,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Deferred removal orders and post-determination refugee claimants  
** Humanitarian and Compassionate

The rules for the admission of immigrants and refugees deal with three basic categories that correspond to the three main program objectives: reuniting families, promoting economic development and protecting refugees. They are usually referred to as Family Class, Economic Immigrants and Refugees. Other classes of immigrants established for humanitarian or public policy reasons may also be defined by regulation. Currently, these classes include Provincial Nominees, Live in Caregivers, Post-Determination Refugee Claimants in Canada Class and Undocumented Convention Refugees in Canada.
Table 17

Responses to Question 10: Score Under the Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>ARRANGED EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>ADAPTABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% | 79.96% | 67.45% | 71.10% | 36.71% | 6.27% | 19.33% | 70.21%
Responses to Question 10: Graphical Representation

- EDUCATION
- LANGUAGE
- EXPERIENCE
- AGE
- ARRANGED EMPLOYMENT
- ADAPTABILITY
Table 18

Responses to Question 10: Correlation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education / Language Proficiency</td>
<td>0.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education / Work Experience</td>
<td>-0.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education / Age</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education / Arranged Employment</td>
<td>-0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education / Adaptability</td>
<td>-0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Proficiency / Work Experience</td>
<td>-0.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Proficiency / Age</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Proficiency / Arranged Employment</td>
<td>-0.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Proficiency / Adaptability</td>
<td>-0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience / Age</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience / Arranged Employment</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience / Adaptability</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age / Arranged Employment</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age / Adaptability</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged Employment / Adaptability</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II

(Questionnaire)
Department of Geography

Date: 01 September 2007

Dear Respondent:

I am conducting a survey for my Master’s thesis at Concordia University and I would like to invite you to participate in this study. My survey is part of an academic project that studies the integration of new Chinese immigrants in Montréal.

This survey is anonymous. Please do not write down your name and feel free to answer as frankly as you wish. It takes around 20 to 30 minutes to complete this survey.

- You can stop or withdraw from completing this survey at any time without any negative result to impact you.
- The information taken from this survey will only be used for the purpose of my academic thesis and will be kept confidential.
- For questions provided with the pre-code options, please answer by checking the proper options.
- Other questions require short answer (You may write in English, French, or Chinese in this section).

This survey is being conducted with the approved of Department of Geography at Concordia University. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the department chair, Dr. Alan Nash, at (514) 848-2424 ext. 2050.

Yours truly,

Shiyuan Liu (Graduate Student)

1455, de Maisonneuve Blvd. W.
Montréal, Quebec H3G 1M8
亲爱的读者：

您好！我是 Concordia 大学地理系的研究生，这份调查问卷主要是为我的毕业论文收集数据，我希望能够得到您的合作。

论文的主要内容是调查中国新移民在 Montreal 地区融入当地社会的情况。我非常感谢您的参与和帮助。这是一份无记名问卷，请您不要填写您的名字。填写这份问卷大约需要 20-20 分钟。请您如实回答问卷中的问题。

1. 您可以随时终止填写问卷，不论您是否完整填写问卷都不会给您带来任何不良后果。

2. 所有的信息只用于我的毕业论文研究，不会泄露给任何人做其他用途。

3. 选择题您只需选择正确答案。

4. 您可以用中文，英文或法文填写非选择题。

这份问卷已经得到 Concordia 大学地理系的许可，如果您有任何疑问和问题，请您直接和系主任 Dr Alan Nash 联系，电话：514- 8482424 转 2050。地址：Montreal 市 Maisonneuve 街 1455。邮政编码：H3G 1M8。

此致

敬礼

刘世媛

01/09/2007
1. What is your gender?
   A) Male
   B) Female

2. If you applied to immigrate to Canada as a married couple, who was the principal applicant?
   A) Male spouse
   B) Female spouse
   C) I was single

3. How old are you?
   A) under 25 years
   B) between 25 and 30 years
   C) between 31 and 35 years
   D) between 36 and 40 years
   E) over 40 years

4. How long have you been in Montréal?
   A) Less than 1 year
   B) Between 1 year and 2 years
   C) Between 2 years and 3 years
   D) Between 3 years and 4 years
   E) Between 4 years and 5 years
   F) More than 5 years

5. What was your education level before you immigrated to Canada?
   A) High school completed
   B) College but no degree
   C) Bachelor’s degree
   D) Master’s degree
   E) Ph.D.
   F) Other
6. What language did you learn in China?
   A) English  
   B) French  
   C) English and French  
   D) Other language  
   E) Did not learn any foreign language

7. What was your academic major in China?
   A) Computer science  
   B) Engineering  
   C) Medicine  
   D) Commerce  
   E) Management  
   F) Law  
   G) Social science  
   H) Art  
   I) Anthropology  
   J) Geography  
   K) Other (please specify) ___________________________________________

8. How many years of post-secondary education did you receive in China?
   A) None  
   B) Two years  
   C) Three years  
   D) Four years  
   E) Six years  
   F) Seven years  
   G) More than seven years (Please specify) ________________

9. Where did you get your education before you immigrated to Canada?
   A) Only in China  
   B) East Asian countries  
   C) North America  
   D) Europe  
   E) Australia  
   F) Other country(s) (Please specify) ____________________
10. What was the score of the principal applicant in your family under the selection criteria for Skilled Workers for

A) Education ........................................... /25
B) Language Proficiency ............................... /24
   a) English ............ /16
   b) French ............ /8
C) Work Experience ........................................... /21
D) Age ......................................................... /10
E) Arranged Employment .................................. /10
F) Adaptability ............................................... /10

11. Which of the following holidays and festivals you celebrate in Canada?

A) New Year’s Day on January 1
B) Christmas Day on December 25
C) Chinese New Year’s Day
D) Chinese National Day on October 1
E) Canadian National Day on July 1
F) Halloween
G) Mid-Autumn Festival
H) Easter
I) Remembrance Day

12. How often do you shop in Zellers, Canadian Tire, Sears, Moores, Bay and/or at Chinese stores?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping place</th>
<th>Never shop</th>
<th>Once every 6 months</th>
<th>Once every 3 months</th>
<th>Once per month</th>
<th>Once per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zellers</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Tire</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moores</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Stores</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(please specify)
13. How often do you buy food in Maxi, Metro, Provigo, IGA, and/or Chinatown?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping place</th>
<th>Never buy</th>
<th>Few times per month</th>
<th>Once every week</th>
<th>Several times every week</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxi</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provigo</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGA</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuperC</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(please specify)

14. How frequently do you prepare meals from Western, Eastern, and/or Chinese food(s) in Canada?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never eat</th>
<th>Few times per month</th>
<th>Once every week</th>
<th>Several times every week</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western food</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern food</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese food</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(please specify)

15. How often do you wear Chinese clothes?

A) Most of the time (80% +)
B) Often (60% - 80%)
C) Sometimes (30%-59%)
D) Rarely (below 30%)
E) Never
16. How do you evaluate your own English proficiency according to the following components?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical terms</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How do you evaluate your own French proficiency according to the following components?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical terms</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. What language(s) do you normally speak at home? Please circle all that applies.

A) English
B) French
C) Chinese (Mandarin)
D) Other ____________________________
19. Do you think it is considered to be of value to maintain cultural identity and characteristics?
   A) Yes
   B) No

20. Do you think it is considered to be of value to maintain relationships with other groups?
   A) Yes
   B) No

21. Your professional position(s) in China right before immigration was/were

   A) Lawyer
   B) Medical doctor
   C) Manager
   D) Businessman
   E) Engineer
   F) Policy Adviser
   G) Anthropologist
   H) Computer scientist
   I) Other (Please specify) _________________________________

22. How are you improving your English and / or French?

   A) watching TV/ listening radio
   B) talking to people who do not speak Chinese
   C) studying individually at home
   D) taking language courses
   E) other ways
   F) all of the above ways

23. Where had you worked before you immigrated to Canada?

   A) In China only
   B) East Asian countries
   C) North America
   D) Europe
   E) Australia
   F) Other countries
24. How much did you know about the demand in your professional field in the Canadian labour market before you immigrated to Canada?

A) nothing
B) almost nothing
C) a little
D) somewhat
E) a lot
F) very much

25. Which of the following best describes people you knew in Montréal prior to your arrival?

A) friends
B) classmates
C) ex-colleagues
D) relatives
E) all of the above
F) did not know anybody

26. Which of the following best describes the reason(s) you immigrated to Canada?

A) to improve my career
B) to improve my education
C) to acquire better education for my children
D) to join my family
E) to gain better business development chances
F) others (please specify) 

27. How do you make new friends in Montreal?

A) in school
B) in religious organization(s)
C) through existing friends
D) at work
E) other (please specify) 

28. How many non-Chinese friends do you have in Montreal?

A) More than 10
B) Between 6 to 10
C) Between 1 to 5
D) none
29. What is your future plan(s) for education?

A) Vocational training  
B) English language training  
C) French language training  
D) Academic degree programs  
E) Other  
F) No plan(s)

Why ________________________________

30. What help have you received from a social organization (circle all that apply)?

A) Job information  
B) Workshops for job hunting/interview  
C) Language training  
D) Advice / counseling  
E) No help  
F) Other (please specify) ________________________________

31. What is the biggest problem you have faced in Montréal?

A) Language  
B) Job  
C) Climate  
D) Culture  
E) I do not have problems in Montreal  
F) Other (please specify) ________________________________

32. Why are you staying in Montréal?

A) I have job in Montréal  
B) I want to acquire education in Montréal  
C) I like this city  
D) The welfare is better than in other places  
E) My family members like this city  
F) Other (please specify) ________________________________
33. Have you taken part in any of the following activities in Montréal?

A) Activities organized by Chinese community
B) Activities organized by local community
C) Activities organized by academic association
D) I did not take part in any activity
E) Other (please specify) ____________________________

Why ____________________________

34. Are you satisfied with your life in Montréal?

A) Very satisfied
B) Somewhat satisfied
C) Neutral (neither satisfied nor unsatisfied)
D) Not satisfied
E) Not satisfied at all

Why ____________________________

35. Where do you plan to move?

A) other city/province in Canada
B) back to China
C) the United States
D) other country
E) not sure
F) I do not have any plan for moving

If you answered A) to D), please specify reason(s) ____________________________

36. When do you plan to move?

A) after finishing my study
B) after acquiring the Canadian citizenship
C) after I get job offer in the other place
D) in the foreseeable future
E) I do not have any plans for moving
37. In your opinion, what is the best city for new immigrants to live in Canada?

A) Toronto
B) Vancouver
C) Montreal
D) Calgary
E) Other city (please specify) __________________________

Why ____________________________________________________

38. If you had to immigrate to Canada again, would you have done anything differently?

A) Yes
B) maybe
C) not sure
D) No

39. How important for you to acquire Canadian citizenship?

A) very important
B) important
C) unimportant
D) I do not want to acquire Canadian citizenship
E) not sure

Why ____________________________________________________

39. How important for you to acquire Canadian citizenship?

40. Compared to your (financial) lifestyle in China, what is your lifestyle in Canada?

A) 50% or more better than in China
B) 20% better than in China
C) the same as in China
D) 20% worse than in China
E) 50% or more worse than in China
41. What is your religious affiliation?
A) Catholic
B) Orthodox
C) Jewish
D) Buddhist
E) Muslim
F) None
G) Other(s) (please specify) _______________________________________________________________________

42. If you want to return to China someday, which of the following best describe the reason(s) for your return?
A) Chinese culture
B) friends, relatives, and network relationship
C) the Chinese polices for returnees
D) China has more job opportunities than Canada in my field
E) difficulty integrating into Canadian society
F) Other(s) (please specify) _______________________________________________________________________

43. What are the problems or difficulties that you faced while looking for a job in Montreal?
A) not having Canadian Experience
B) language barriers
C) scarcity of available jobs
D) did not know how to find a job in Canada
E) non-recognition of foreign credentials
F) I did not have problem in finding a job in Montreal
G) other (please specify) _______________________________________________________________________

44. Have you experienced any of the following discrimination(s) when you were looking for a job?
A) age
B) racial
C) gender
D) other
E) I have not experience any discrimination
45. Have you worked in Montréal?
   A) No  →  Skip to question 51
   B) Yes

46. How did you get your first job in Montréal?
   A) job agency
   B) job advertisement (e.g. internet, newspaper)
   C) word of mouth
   D) by cold call
   E) job fair
   F) others (please specify)

47. How long did it take for you to get your first job?
   A) less than 6 months
   B) six moths to 1 year
   C) 1 year to 2 years
   D) 2 years to 3 years
   E) 3 years to 4 years
   F) Over 4 years

48. What kind of job are you doing currently?
   A) general (non skilled job)
   B) semi-professional job
   C) professional job
   D) self-employment
   E) sales/marketing/services
   F) other (please specify)
   G) I currently do not have job

49. How long did it take you to get your first professional job after arriving to Montréal?
   A) less than 6 months
   B) six moths to 1 year
   C) 1 year to 2 years
   D) 2 years to 3 years
   E) 3 years to 4 years
   F) Over 4 years
   G) I do not have a professional job
50. To what extent the work experience and education credentials you acquired in China were recognized in Canada?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Recognition</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Credentials</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why ____________________________________________

51. Which of the following best describes your current annual income and what type of income you receive (employment, investment, loan / bursary, child / spousal support etc.). Please indicate every type of income that applies and note the amount. For example, if your employment income is $18,000 and your investment income is $3,000, you would then circle C) and indicate employment ($18,000), investment ($3,000).

A) less than $10,000 ___________________________________________________________________
B) $10,000 - $19,999 ___________________________________________________________________
C) $20,000 - $29,999 ___________________________________________________________________
D) $30,000 - $39,999 ___________________________________________________________________
E) $40,000 - $49,999 ___________________________________________________________________
F) $50,000 - $59,999 ___________________________________________________________________
G) more than $60,000 ___________________________________________________________________
52. What “Needs” are you concerned about at the moment?

A) Physiological needs → very basic needs such as air, water, food, sleep, sex, etc.
B) Safety needs → have to do with establishing stability and consistency in a chaotic world (includes security body, of employment, of resources, of morality, of the family, of health of property)
C) Love / Belonging needs → friends, family, sexual intimacy / belonging to clubs, work groups, religious groups;
D) Esteem needs → self-esteem, confidence, achievement, respect of others, respect by others;
E) Self-actualization → morality, creativity, spontaneity, problem solving, lack of prejudice;

Please comment why ____________________________________________________________

53. What “Needs” were you concerned about just prior to immigration?

A) Physiological needs → very basic needs such as air, water, food, sleep, sex, etc.
B) Safety needs → have to do with establishing stability and consistency in a chaotic world (includes security body, of employment, of resources, of morality, of the family, of health of property)
C) Love / Belonging needs → friends, family, sexual intimacy / belonging to clubs, work groups, religious groups;
D) Esteem needs → self-esteem, confidence, achievement, respect of others, respect by others;
E) Self-actualization → morality, creativity, spontaneity, problem solving, lack of prejudice;

Please comment why ____________________________________________________________

54. How important for you to integrate into the host society?

A) extremely important
B) important
C) unimportant
D) I do not need to integrate into the host society
E) not sure

Why ____________________________________________________________
55. By how much the level of difficulties you faced after immigrating to Canada was above or below of what you had expected?

A) 100% or more than I had expected  
B) 50% more than I had expected  
C) 25% more than I had expected  
D) About as I had expected  
E) 25% less than I had expected  
F) 50% less than I had expected  
G) 100% less than I had expected

56. Do you have any suggestion to those people who plan to immigrate to Canada?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

57. Please provide additional comments you think might be helpful in studying the integration of new Chinese immigrants in Montreal.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this survey


Chiarelli v. Canada (Minister of Employment & Immigration), [1992] 1 SCR. 711 at 733.


Marx, Karl. (February 1844). A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher.


Marx, Karl. (February 1844). A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher.


Metropolis Conference, January 15, 1999, at Simon Fraser University Harbour Centre, Vancouver, B.C.


National Post (March 18, 2002). Too many immigrants: majority says in new poll 54% support tighter rein, by Donald McKenzie, p. 4.


Overseas Processing Manual, OP-6, s. 10.2; Website: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/manuals/op/op06e.pdf


221


Smith v. Mardana Ltd. CHRR Doc. 05-094 (Ont. Div. Ct.).


The Ethnic Diversity Survey was done in 2002 by Statistics Canada for the Canadian Heritage Minister.


