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ABSTRACT

Thesis Title: The Social Resources of Immigrants: Effects on the Integration of Independent and Family Class Immigrants to Toronto, Canada from South Asia

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year of Convocation: 1999

Name: Stephanie M. Potter

Department: Sociology

University: University of Toronto

The central goal of this thesis is to examine the importance of a range of immigrant resources – not only human capital, but also social, financial, cultural and psychological resources – in the process of immigrant integration, and to determine how these resources affect the relative success of independent and family class immigrants. Most immigration research conceptualizes integration in objective economic terms to the exclusion of other domains, with a concurrent preoccupation with immigrants’ human capital resources; only recently has a competing explanation in the form of social resources emerged, though it remains understated. Using economic and well-being measures of integration, this thesis therefore addresses policy debates about the relative adaptability of these two immigrant classes, and contributes to a theoretically underdeveloped area by extending the definition of integration, and of the integration process, beyond the human capital model.

The analysis uses data from the South Asian Newcomer Study collected for this thesis, in which 109 face-to-face interviews were conducted with family and independent class South Asian immigrants. Findings indicate slight differences in human capital resources by immigrant class, though independent class respondents have higher levels of financial and cultural
resources. Respondents' network structures vary by class, with family class respondents reporting smaller, more dense, kin-dominated networks, and higher overall levels of social support. In terms of economic integration measures, independent immigrants are more successful, though high levels of certain types of human capital are a liability to achieving economic integration. Moreover, family class respondents' poorer economic performance is linked to the composition of their networks, which disadvantage them in this domain of integration, and not to their human capital levels. Overall, social network and human capital variables are the strongest predictors of economic integration, challenging researchers' preoccupation with the latter. In terms of levels of well-being, family class respondents report higher levels despite poorer economic outcomes; this is explained by their superior levels of social support, which are the strongest predictors in conjunction with a measure of cultural capital. Results support a multidimensional conceptualization of integration that acknowledges the independence of different domains. Theoretical and policy implications are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

This is a study of how immigrants use their personal resources in order to achieve economic integration and well-being in their host society, and has been designed to address three areas within the immigrant integration literature: the first and second concern the pervasiveness of economic analyses and human capital models of integration which ignore or minimize the importance of other individual resources and group processes. This study argues that, though some researchers have turned their attention beyond economic outcomes of integration and human capital resources that are applied to this process, this area of research is still developing, and continues to understate the importance of social resources in particular. The third area combines these two issues to address the policy implications of conceptualizing the immigrant integration process in economic terms, by focusing on differences in immigrant resources and integration strategies by class of immigration. This chapter briefly presents discussions in the three primary research areas with which this thesis is engaged, and then presents research questions, a comment on the data used, and a chapter outline.

ESTABLISHING THE MICRO-MACRO CONNECTION IN INTEGRATION RESEARCH

The importance of this study of immigrant integration lies in its efforts to expand researchers’ notions of the integration process beyond the economic, and to make explicit the interplay between social structural factors and individual autonomy in producing variations in integration outcomes. In so doing, it addresses an important debate in policy circles concerning the relative adaptive capacity of Canada’s two ‘managed’ immigration classes –
family and independent class immigrants – that is fundamentally entrenched in the traditional, human capital model of integration. Thus, while a reconceptualization of the integration process is considered to be important from a purely theoretical perspective, it is also deemed important because of the very practical implications that dominant theories have for the ways in which individual countries shape their immigration and integration policies – practical implications that have effects on the activities of organizations and individuals.

More explicitly, three basic concepts underpin this study. First, integration is considered to be a multidimensional process that includes, but is not confined to, the achievement of economic independence, with the ultimate goal immigrants’ sense of belonging and citizenship, and the opportunity to fulfil their human potential. Second, the integration experience depends on a variety of personal resources that the individual can bring to bear in developing their integration strategy. Third, integration takes place within a socio-political and economic framework that shapes the extent to which an individual can mobilize these resources – indeed, integration takes place within layers of social structure that shape and mediate the process as a whole. Though individually these are not entirely innovative ideas, it is in the development of the concept of immigrant resources, particularly in the form of social resources, the importance that different types of resources have for individual integration, and the ways in which resources and integration outcomes vary according to class of immigration, that this study makes a unique contribution.

*Beyond Economic Integration*

In envisioning integration as a multidimensional process, this study aims to address what could be termed a conceptual imbalance within the immigration literature. Immigrant
integration has been overwhelmingly conceptualized as an economic activity that can be objectively measured and assessed: relative to the native born and other immigrant groups, immigrants who have equivalent or higher employment rates or incomes, or equivalent or lower rates of social assistance, are said to be ‘integrated’. As important as these objective indicators of labour market inequality are, they disregard the immigrant’s own subjective assessment of their level of integration in Canada; though important aspects of the same process, subjective and objective measures of economic success are not necessarily highly correlated. As a prime determinant of international population movements on a macro scale, and of individual well-being on a micro scale, it is not surprising that most studies concern the economic domain of immigrant integration: using immigrant earnings as an objective indicator of overall integration, other components of individual incorporation into the host society, such as the political, cultural, and social, are expected to flow from the economic.

Yet, only a minority of researchers have investigated all or some of these other domains of integration, despite a general acknowledgement of their importance (e.g. Breton et al. 1990; Goldlust and Richmond 1973; Neuwirth 1986). Can immigrant integration be conceptualized as a unidimensional activity that is entirely dominated by the economic, or are there other important dimensions to this process? How do researchers theorize integration for immigrants who have no intention of engaging in labour market activities, and who cannot be assessed using the conventional yardstick of earnings relative to the native born, and to other immigrant groups? These are important questions to consider, questions which have been either ignored or incompletely addressed in the immigration literature. This research therefore takes issue with the exclusive objective, economic definition of integration, and includes a second domain that measures an individual’s subjectively defined
health. As well, a subjective measure of economic well-being – the respondent’s perception that their job in Canada is equivalent to that prior to migration – is also used. In expanding the definition of integration to include subjective and objective dimensions of economic achievement, in addition to the second separate subjective health domain, this research seeks to demonstrate that integration cannot, and should not, be reduced to the economic.

Beyond Human Capital Resources

Not only has immigration research emphasized the economic outcomes, but also the role of economically-applicable resources in affecting the process of integration. That is, in analyzing the determinants of immigrants’ economic success in the host country, researchers have focused on the importance of human capital characteristics common to studies of all types of labour market inequality (e.g. Borjas 1990; Chiswick 1992). Understanding the role of these human capital characteristics is of course essential, but I argue insufficient, to theorizing the process by which immigrants achieve various goals of integration. In order to address this second under-theorized area, this study expands the notion of immigrant resources beyond human capital, to determine the relative utility of four other forms: cultural, financial, psychological and social. The effects of these four other types of resources are examined in the presence of human capital resources, in an effort to determine whether these additions to the integration models indeed make a substantial contribution to our understanding of the integration process beyond that provided by human capital measures. By expanding the notion of resources, this study reflects a growing interest in analyzing non-human capital resources within the general sociological literature. In researching ethnic entrepreneurship and the ethnic economy specifically, Light and Karageorgis (1994) define
and detail various types of immigrant resources, and discuss the ways in which variations in levels of these resources can be used to explain differences in rates of entrepreneurship among different ethnic groups. Though I use somewhat different labels to denote similar types of resources, the approach used in this study is essentially the same, but is applied to the broader question of explaining differences in integration outcomes according to class of immigration.

The comparatively limited attention given to cultural, financial and psychological resource measures in models of integration has arguably been a result of their assumed connection to human capital levels. By contrast, the terms ‘social networks’ or ‘social capital’ have been used to explain several phenomena in immigration research, from immigration flows, particularly chain migration (Massey 1990), to ethnic entrepreneurship (e.g. Light 1974; Light et al. 1993; Portes 1987) and ethnic retention (Reitz 1980). Indeed, the concepts of social capital and social network resources have emerged as a distinctive and competing theoretical and analytical framework to the human capital one, as discussed in Portes’ 1995 review of conceptual developments in the area of economic sociology and immigration research. In a general sense, social capital as defined by Coleman (1988) is used to examine the interplay between individual immigrant decisions and the social structural context in which these decisions are made. This concept of structured social relations in which individuals are ‘embedded’ (e.g. Portes and Sesenbrenner 1993), and the importance of the strength of interpersonal ties for the types of resources that can be accessed through them (Granovetter 1973), have also received considerable attention within the economic sociology of immigration. Indeed, the majority of research addressing non-human capital – specifically, social – resources in immigration research has taken place within the
specific literature concerning the ethnic economy, and the ethnic enclave. Rather than seeing social resources as providing access to an enclave economy, this current study conceptualizes their utility within other domains of the general integration process. As such, it is an extension and elaboration of a significant body of immigration research.

Yet, while immigration researchers have been ‘thinking structurally’ for some time, one disadvantage has been the use of diverse measures and definitions of social networks and social capital, making the comparison of specific network processes difficult or awkward. In this study, I chose to draw on social network analysis methods which have been developed for the specific purpose of mapping (in this case) personal networks, in the hopes that by using a standard set of measures and concepts, the results emerging from this study may be more easily applied and compared to other research domains using the same approach. That is, just as in the area of labour market inequality, where the use of standardized human capital measures permits the comparison of studies on many different levels, it is proposed that a shared approach in the application of social network concepts to immigration research would advance current understanding of this ubiquitous international phenomenon. A growing number of researchers have applied such concepts and methods; this study aims to further this trend, and to advance the social network resource explanation of integration outcomes as a competing model to the traditional human capital one.

Theory into Practice

The development of the concepts of immigrant resources and of non-economic integration outcomes is important to theoretical advancement within immigration research, but also to the Canadian policy context, which essentially externalizes researchers’
preoccupation with human capital resources to the exclusion of the other four types developed in this study. Current immigration debates in Canada centre on the relative suitability of independent class immigrants (who are selected under the points system based on their high levels of human capital, and represent economic advantage) versus family class immigrants (who are sponsored by relatives in Canada and who, by implication, are human capital-poor and represent an economic drain for Canada). By questioning the ways in which other types of immigrant resources bear on the integration process, compared to human capital resources, this study tries to make explicit the dynamic between structural effects of immigration policy, and the actions of individual immigrants. It also tries to provide some empirical support for the contention of most researchers that independent class immigrants, with their higher levels of human capital, experience faster and superior economic integration in terms of earnings, but that over time, family class immigrants tend to ‘catch up’ (e.g. de Silva 1997; ECC 1991; Samuel 1994) – in effect, that the two classes of immigration may not in fact be that different.

Despite this evidence to the contrary, family class immigrants in particular are faced with much public hostility, particularly in times of economic downturn, as native born Canadians and others perceive immigrants to be taking jobs away from ‘more deserving’ Canadians. One reason for the continued debate is a lack of available quality information on the relative economic success of immigrants by class of immigration, largely because of the absence of the class of admission variable in the Canadian Census – probably the most widely used source of Canadian empirical data among academic and policy researchers alike. With only a smattering of studies examining the question of the economic integration of immigrants according to their class of admission, the public debate in particular has remained
largely based on anecdotal evidence as opposed to more objective, research-based information. Consequently, questions concerning the economic independence of different immigrant groups, and the concomitant social service needs of each, have been difficult to discuss in an objective manner. Governments’ abilities to address structural inequalities, through the introduction of integration programs and services, barrier-free immigration policies, and to participate in the public discourse surrounding the relative costs and benefits of immigration, have also been seriously limited.

This knowledge gap has led to an increasing number of people who are questioning the validity of immigrant class designations as they refer to an individual’s ability to integrate. That is, does an immigrant’s class of admission reflect objective lower human capital levels which necessitate that they apply as a family class, as opposed to independent, immigrant, or does this designation reflect an immigration lawyer’s counsel to apply as a family class immigrant because the processing time is lower? To what extent are other types of resources that are not used to screen immigrants as useful, or more useful, to their integration, and how are these resources related to an immigrant’s admission class?

In trying to understand immigration and integration processes, the interaction between structural factors, such as the effects of immigration policy, and individual ones, such as individual resources and immigrants’ abilities to make choices (human agency), is difficult to disentangle. How do researchers theorize the interplay between immigrants’ skills and abilities, and their capacities to mobilize these resources within the Canadian social structure? Viewing the social world from a structural perspective, the social network approach attempts to understand individual and group behaviours as these are shaped by structures, which are themselves created by individuals and groups. It is therefore a useful
tool in examining both the micro-structural processes involved in individual access to the resources that inhere in their social connections, as well as in examining the macro-structural effects of immigration policies on the resource content of immigrants accepted for admission within the family and independent classes. In effect, I believe that the social network approach can act as a conceptual bridge between the effects of immigration policies under which an individual is admitted, and the actual mobilization of their resources within the integration process. Combining an expanded understanding of what it means to integrate, of the resources that can be applied in this process, and of the ways in which these theoretical ideas play out on a macro scale through their incorporation into immigration policy, this study seeks to change the way that researchers and policy makers alike conceptualize immigrant integration.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

These developing areas within the immigration literature – in terms of conceptualizing both the process and outcome of immigrant integration along other dimensions besides the economic, in analyzing the utility of the class of immigration classification as an indicator of successful integration, and in the application of social network analysis to the problem of integration – present excellent opportunities for empirical exploration and theoretical development, both of which are exploited in this study. Three main research questions were developed concerning the objective and subjective integration of immigrants, and are addressed in this doctoral thesis. These are:
(1) Which class of immigration is most successful in terms of each of the four indicators of integration?

(2) What are the levels of various types of individual resources possessed by independent and family class immigrants?

(3) Which resources are most effective in facilitating an individual's ability to access the goals of integration as defined in this study?

Two domains of integration are analyzed and discussed in this thesis – the economic, and the subjective perception of overall health and well-being – comprised of four dependent integration variables: being employed, employment earnings, job equivalency, and overall health and well-being. The latter two are subjective measures, while the first two are commonly used objective measures. In addressing these three questions, this thesis makes theoretical, methodological and applied contributions: to the understanding of the process of immigrant integration, to the development and application of social network analysis techniques, and finally in the evaluation of current immigration policy in Canada.

THE DATA

The data analyzed in this study, called the South Asian Newcomer Study (SANS), were collected specifically for this thesis. The focus of the analysis concerns 109 semi-structured, face-to-face interviews that were conducted with South Asian immigrants to Toronto as members of either the family or independent classes. More than two thirds of these respondents (N=74) are part of a random sample of immigrants obtained from the Department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada's Immigrant Visa and Record of Landing
files, and released to the principal investigator for the purposes of this study. The balance of the sample was found using snowball sampling, settlement agency referral and advertising techniques.

Though not without flaws, the strengths of this data are many. (1) Uniquely, the SANS data are primarily based on a random sample, which lends considerable weight to the representativeness of the findings, despite the fact that the sample size is too small to make broad statistical generalizations. (2) It affords the analysis of differences in integration by class of immigration. (3) The use of standardized social network techniques facilitates the analysis of the impact of social structure and social connections on integration, and sheds new light on the dynamics of economic and subjective integration. (4) Subjective and objective measures of two dimensions of integration are used in conjunction, and are shown to provide a greater overall understanding of the integration process than would otherwise be obtained from a single-variable, objective measure.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

This thesis has seven chapters, including this, the introduction. Chapter Two reviews past research and articulates the conceptual framework used in this study, with emphasis on the social policy context, the development of various domains of integration, and of types of individual resources; particular attention is given to the formulation of social resources using the social network approach. Research questions and hypotheses to be addressed in the remaining chapters are also stated.

Chapter Three presents the methodological details of the study, including sampling, data quality, and variable operationalization. Greater details are provided on methods unique
to this study, such as sampling and the collection of social network analysis information. Strengths and weaknesses of the data, and of the survey techniques employed, are also discussed.

**Chapter Four** asks and answers the basic question "Who is doing better in Canada, independent or family class immigrants?", according to the definition of integration developed in preceding chapters. First, the relationship between the three economic indicators, and then between these and the subjective well-being indicator, is discussed. A rationale for including three separate economic variables is advanced, and is shown to provide a more comprehensive understanding of both the objective and subjective elements of economic integration. Then, levels of integration are presented by class of immigration, and then by five demographic background variables – gender, age, marital status, country of birth and number of years in Canada – which are used as control variables in subsequent multivariate analyses in Chapter Five.

**Chapter Five** addresses the question "Are there differences in the levels of individual resources possessed by these immigrants according to their class of immigration?". This chapter therefore makes the connection between an immigrant’s admission class and their levels of human, cultural, financial, psychological and social network resources. Analysis of variance tests are conducted, followed by multiple and logistic regressions (where appropriate) to determine the persistence of class differences in the presence of a limited number of control variables.

The immigrant class differences in resource levels determined in Chapter Five are then applied to the full integration model in **Chapter Six**. Where immigrant class differences were found to exist, the question addressed in Chapter Six is "Which resources
are most useful in achieving which integration outcomes?". That is, what do class differences in resource levels mean for an individual's ability to integrate successfully? Do higher resource levels automatically translate into greater integration success? And if so on one indicator of integration, what about on all four? This final analysis chapter therefore incorporates the information from chapters Four and Five, and addresses the question about why certain groups are more integrated than others, with the answer lying somewhere in their relative ability to mobilize their resources.

Finally, in Chapter Seven I synthesize and summarize the important results. Attention is given to both theoretical and policy implications of this research. I then suggest a future research agenda to flow from these findings.
CHAPTER TWO:
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this chapter is to outline the conceptual framework upon which this thesis is based, with appropriate examination of relevant literature. In this study, there is an implicit connection between immigration theory and immigration policy; between micro-structural processes of immigrant integration, and macro-structural processes of immigrant selection; between individual choice and structural constraints. Canadian immigration policy is seen as an externalization of the dominant human capital model of population movements, and of subsequent immigrant integration within the host society – particularly as this model emphasizes the human capital resources of the independent class of entrants to Canada, who are screened for specific characteristics that are associated with economic success. The economic focus of this policy is seen as both a product, and a source, of academic and public debates surrounding the relative integrative capacities of independent and family (sponsored) class immigrants, and so serves as an important contextual backdrop to the integration process as it is experienced by individual immigrants.

It is with the aim of addressing the debate concerning the relative integrative abilities of the independent and family classes, and so the externalization of academic and policy preoccupations with the economic model of integration, that this study adopts the specific tasks of developing the concept of integration beyond the economic domain, and of the concept of immigrant resources beyond human capital. The following chapter therefore develops the conceptual framework for this study, beginning with a description of the scope and magnitude of immigration to Canada; from this, the impact of structural embeddedness on integration,
particularly as it is represented by immigration policy assumptions and debates, is discussed. This leads into the definition of integration used in this study, and an argument for its expansion beyond the economic domain. The discussion then moves from extending researchers' conceptualization of the *outcomes* of migration to the *process of resource mobilization* by individual immigrants, where a parallel argument for an elaboration beyond the human capital model is made. This section draws on research in several areas to make the case for this extension, with particular emphasis on the importance of social resources that accrue as a result of relational embeddedness. It is argued that these different resources are essential for the development of strategies for integrating into Canadian society, because they connect the immigrant to the labour market, and to informal and formal modes of need satisfaction, such as co-ethnic community contacts and immigrant settlement agencies. This entails the synthesis of a significant body of research from the economic sociology of immigration, with specific concepts and methods from social network analysis.

The application of a structural approach to theorize the dynamic between contextual constraints and individual choice in the integration process is thus accomplished in two ways: through the analysis of how immigration policy shapes immigrant resources, and at the micro level, how the social contexts of individuals, as defined by their social networks, mediate the mobilization of their personal resources in achieving specific integration goals. Having proposed a method of elaborating specific theoretical areas within the immigrant integration literature, research questions and hypotheses are presented.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The Scope of Immigration to Canada

As an instrument of considerable political, social and economic importance, immigration to Canada continues to capture significant amounts of attention in both public and academic circles. Immigration to Canada has historically been comprised of three components: the economic dimension, through the supply of skilled workers to areas of the economy where native born expertise was absent; the demographic dimension, by the supply of people to a population reproducing below replacement rate; and the political dimension, by fostering positive international relations through welcoming refugees and other displaced persons. The relative importance of each of these dimensions has shifted over the years, but each has remained integral to Canadian demographic, social and economic policy-making.

With these shifting priorities, the composition of migration to Canada has also fluctuated, though the volume has remained relatively stable as a proportion of the Canadian population, and in recent years, in terms of absolute numbers of entrants. Canada continues to admit one of the highest proportions of immigrants per capita in the world, with numbers reaching 240,138 in 1993 (slightly under the projected total of 250,000; Citizenship and Immigration 1993a). Early in Canadian history, immigrants originated from the United States and Britain, though small numbers were admitted from China, Western and Eastern Europe, and East India as early as the late nineteenth century, albeit amidst great controversy. Despite this early, though minor, diversification of source countries, until the early 1970s, immigrants to Canada came almost exclusively from English-speaking British, or Western European, countries. From 1968 to 1988, the top five source countries changed from being dominated by Britain, the USA, Italy, Hong Kong and Germany, to Hong Kong, India, Poland, Britain and the
Philippines (please see Table 2.1 – Avery 1994:171). In 1993, the top five countries of immigration were Hong Kong, India, the Philippines, Taiwan and China (Citizenship and Immigration 1993a:5).

One way in which reactions to immigrant diversification are expressed is in changes to immigration policy, which have followed anything but a linear transformation toward increasing liberalism. Early in Canadian history, certain groups were subjected to harsh exclusionary measures, such as the Chinese, on whom a "head tax" was imposed because they were thought "inassimilable" (Beaujot 1991; Bolaria and Li 1988). Over the years, Canadian policy wavered between excluding various groups on the basis of their "undesirability", and admitting these same groups based on their reputation for hard work and adoption of Canadian values, reflecting an implicit economic bias in the policy (Avery 1994; Hawkins 1989).

Table 2.1:
Rank and Proportion of Immigrants to Canada by their Country of Origin, 1968-1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Citizenship and Immigration Canada 1993a (column 3); Avery 1994 (columns 1 and 2).
Explicit exclusionary practices were maintained through the Great Depression until after the Second World War, at which time Canada responded to the huge demand for refugee claims more altruistically than after the First World War, while also recruiting large numbers of immigrants from Holland, Germany, Italy, Greece, and Portugal (Avery 1994). No longer as isolationist in outlook, and with a sizeable established immigrant population, Canada looked to these "new" immigrants for their economic viability, which provided much of the incentive for the expansion of the immigration policy.

Yet, this expansion had an exclusively European flavour, and under the direction of Mackenzie King, a distinctly conservative approach. King was most concerned with the "absorptive capacity" of the country’s native born population, and with Canadians’ desire to avoid "a fundamental alteration in the character of their population though mass immigration from the Orient", and insisted that Canadians were perfectly within their right to select ‘desirable’ immigrants: "[a]n alien has no ‘fundamental human right’ to enter Canada. This is a privilege." (Avery 1994:171)

During the 1960s, immigration policy explicitly emphasized the selection of immigrants with skills suitable for labour market integration. The 1966 White Paper called for the "recruitment of workers with a relatively high level of education and training", regardless of their racial or ethnic origins, setting the foundation for the current ‘points system’ (Avery 1994:179). By 1980, the establishment of the points system and quotas according to three classes of immigration – family, independent\(^1\) and refugee – demonstrated the most dramatic shift in Canadian policy, and explicitly ruled out the discrimination of

\(^1\) For definitions of the independent and family classes, please see Appendix A.
applicants based on their country of origin, ethnicity, race or religion (Avery, 1994; Hawkins 1989).²

This policy reflects a revitalized approach to demographic and economic policies, in which immigrants were to play an important role. Human capital resources – such as education, occupation and language skills – are the criteria of selection for the independent class of immigrants, those destined to fill skill gaps in the Canadian labour market and give Canada an edge in international competition. Initially at least, the policy also emphasized the family reunification component; since then, controversy has raged over the suitability and viability of such immigrants to Canadian society, many of whom have been accused of imposing extreme hardship on the Canadian welfare system. Family class immigrants and refugees, who presumably hold less economic promise, are the target of most public anxiety, despite government statements regarding the need to support the immigrant family unit, and of humanitarian obligations to the international community. Public support for these latter two classes of admission therefore waxes and wanes depending on the economic and political climates.

Structural Factors Affecting Immigrant Integration – Immigration Policy

The central focus of this research concerns the integration of immigrants to Canadian society, and the ways in which immigrants’ resources facilitate, or impede, this process, all of

² Some justification for the exclusion of refugees is necessary. Effectively, these first two classes of immigration are the “managed” classes; governments are less willing to appear to be shirking their moral obligation to aid those less fortunate, and while fears over mass influxes of refugees will undoubtedly reappear periodically, it is unlikely that this component of Canadian immigration will ever be significantly altered. As well, refugee studies have also traditionally been a distinct area, based on the presumption that their migration experiences are unique (although some have argued that many so-called immigrants are simply economic refugees – see Koser 1997). It is, however, likely that the findings from this study would be applicable on many levels. Finally, restrictions in the size of the sample used in this study limit the degree of stratification possible.
which takes place within a particular socio-economic and political context: this process is depicted in Figure 2.1. These contextual elements are defined in Figure 2.1 as “Socio-Economic and Political Context”, of which the policy class of admission is the focus in this study. In effect, migrants’ abilities to mobilize the resources at their disposal will be potentially affected by a variety of structural constraints, including immigration policy, but also the philosophy and organization of settlement and integration programs, the accessibility of health and social programs, the global integration of economies and consequent reasons for migration, and the presence of discrimination and racism in the labour market, and in society in general.

For example, the economic prosperity of the receiving state has serious implications for the type of settlement experience an immigrant will face. In times of recession, like those Canada has recently experienced, public opposition to immigration rises as people seek to blame someone for their own inability to find employment (e.g. Jasso and Rosenzweig 1997). Such public attitudes are often expressed as prejudice, discrimination and racism against newcomers, and even against second- and third-generation descendants of immigrants. These attitudes are sometimes reflected in public policy changes, such as the introduction of restricted immigration by country of origin in the 1900s, or the lowering of immigration levels as in the 1980s (Bolaria and Li 1988). The announcement to reduce the number of family class immigrants in 1995 reflected a growing, and largely unfounded, public concern about the impact of this class of immigrant on the Canadian economy.

Moreover, other structures within the host society have been shown to be significant barriers to immigrant integration and to the mobilization of resources. In particular, the absence of a standard accreditation system, discrimination, and the requirement for Canadian work experience in order to be hired (CEIAC 1991; Economic Council of Canada 1991; Liu 1996)
comprise serious impediments to immigrant integration. Difficulties having credentials recognized have particular consequences for certain categories of professionals in Canada, who have been selected for their high levels of human capital, which are subsequently invalidated by Canadian professional associations. Though not exclusively, such difficulties affect certain members of the independent class in particular, in effect negating the very process by which they were admitted to Canada.

Likewise, the organization and accessibility of social welfare services, and of immigrant settlement services, shapes the settlement experience of members of immigrant classes differently. Bach and Argiros (1991:323) point to terms of eligibility for financial assistance and the distinction between those who “may become self-sufficient, if by that we mean independent of publicly-provided cash assistance, but still be financially strapped or impoverished” – in effect, the working poor. In their experience (with refugees), the strategy of ‘front end loading’ during the first two years of settlement by taking language courses and job training is the key determinant of subsequent economic progress (Bach and Argiros 1991:336), a finding also supported by Beach and Worswick (1993) and Worswick (1996) concerning other classes of immigrants. Therefore, policies and programs which restrict access to these essential means of achieving economic success are in effect mediating the individual’s ability to fully use the resources at their disposal.

A similar situation exists in Canada in relation to settlement service provision. Currently, there are two main bodies that provide formal settlement services to newcomers (what Oakley and Rajan (1991:34) call “artificially constructed social support”): ethno-specific and mainstream organizations. Studies have documented that large gaps exist between these so-called ‘two solitudes’: while ethno-specific organizations provide culturally-sensitive and -
specific services, these are often not up to the standard provided by those in the mainstream (Bergin 1988; Doyle and Visano 1987; Shearer 1987). Conversely, mainstream services typically do not have the financial resources, training or expertise to deal with the concerns or perspectives of culturally distinct minorities. The extent to which these two "systems" are integrated and co-ordinated has a considerable effect on newcomers' access to formal social services, especially because of their role as information gatekeepers, a topic about which there is scant academic research.

In effect, problems with the settlement system, such as inadequate co-ordination of services at the local level, and the non-availability of most informational materials in the immigrants' languages of use, persist despite the introduction of new language and settlement programs (Abella 1984; Boyd et al. 1994; Burnaby et al. 1987; CEIAC 1991; McDade 1988; Yelaja et al. 1988). Research also indicates that discrimination of immigrants is pervasive throughout Canadian society (Abbott 1989; Billingsley and Muszynski 1985; Boyd 1992; Henry and Ginzberg 1985; Reitz and Breton 1994), and that most immigrants' needs are not being met by the formal service system (Belfiore et al. 1985; Bergin 1988; DeSantis 1990; Doyle and Visano 1987; Kramer 1991; Medeiros 1991). All of this research, however, has largely ignored how these issues play out according to an individual's class of admission, leaving the larger debate uninformed by these findings.

Finally, a country's immigration policies will affect not only the type of people who are attracted to Canada, but by valuing certain types of individual resources over others, may have implications for the integration strategies chosen by immigrants, and the types of personal resources that they mobilize in the process. As such, an immigrant's class of entry may have little to do with their actual resource (i.e. human capital) levels, and more to do
with the practical issues of applying under the category which appears to offer the fastest means of acceptance; such a practice would effectively call into question many of the expectations of economic performance by immigrant class.

In fact, the debate over the relative adaptability of family versus independent class immigrants rests squarely on the assumption of the primacy of human capital resources. Without reliable and consistent data, however, it is difficult for anyone engaged in this debate to argue beyond largely anecdotal evidence. The small number of studies that have been conducted indicate that family and independent class immigrants’ performances in the labour market are not all that different from their native born counterparts (Abbott 1989; ECC 1991), although unpublished Citizenship and Immigration data from the 1991 Census place family class immigrants below independents in terms of initial employment rates and wages. Renaud et al. (1993) found that independent migrants have a higher probability of employment over the course of the first year of residence (60.8% versus 53.1%), as well as higher initial salaries ($8.81 per hour compared to $6.97 per hour) (Renaud et al. 1992). However, in terms of time to first household salary, family class immigrants take an average of only 1.9 weeks, compared to 7 weeks for independent class immigrants, perhaps because upon arrival, family class immigrants are more likely to join an existing household (Renaud et al. 1992).

Some American studies present a similar story, in which family class immigrants may be just as likely to be employed as independent immigrants over the long term, though their wages are lower (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1995; Passel and Clark 1994; Sorensen et al. 1992). Specifically, Sorensen et al. (1992) used 1980-81 data from the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the US Census to ask three related questions: What is the

---

3 Caution should be exercised when comparing Canadian and American immigration data, however, given the different characteristics of the two populations.
differential economic success of the different admission categories?; Are members of these categories located in different labour market sectors?; and What are the differential effects of these two admissions categories on the economic success of native born workers? Overall, they find that employment-preference immigrants earn more, and are more likely to be employed as professionals and managers than family reunification immigrants, but that their rates of employment are otherwise similar. Secondly, they find that the overall effect of these immigrants on native born earnings and employment rates is small, but differs slightly by immigrant class. Native born white incomes are slightly raised as a result of this immigration, while black and Hispanic wages are depressed. Conversely, economic immigrants have a slight negative effect on the employment rates of white native born males and no effect on those of minority native born males, while family class immigrants have no effect on either group’s rates of employment.

In a similar vein, using Immigrant-Naturalization Cohort (INC) data from the INS, Jasso and Rosenzweig (1995) studied male immigrants to the US between 1977 and 1990 who arrived within economic and family reunification categories. Due to the longitudinal nature of their data, they were able to track the progress of these immigrants, while the study by Sorensen et al. (1992) is cross-sectional. Like their predecessors, they find the initial labour market status of the economic immigrants to be higher, but that over time the gap between the two categories of immigrants closes significantly, with economic immigrants experiencing serious downward mobility. In attempting to explain this trend, the authors take the example of immigrants who arrive as physicians, and point to policy changes in the US which required these immigrants to take a qualifying examination set by the National Board of Medical Examiners which native born physicians admittedly would have difficulty passing. Thus, they point to the similar
problem with fair accreditation in Canada noted above. Overall, they conclude that "our results suggest that the distinction based on labour market needs in terms of the contributions of immigrants to the economy may be less important than is commonly thought if attention is paid to the post-immigration experiences of these two groups" (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1995:109).  

Thus, while evidence appears to indicate that independent migrants do much better initially in terms of wage and employment rates, other findings point to an eventual convergence of the family and independent classes over the long term. What makes it possible for such a convergence to occur? While some immigrants are successful at overcoming them, what barriers continue to be insurmountable to others, and for what reasons? The debate over the relative adaptability of the two immigrant classes supports the investigation of more than the human capital model of integration.

Summary

Therefore, the model of the integration process developed in this study is predicted to vary among the identified demographic subgroups, depending on 1) the specific resources possessed by the individual, and 2) the structural barriers to gaining the necessary competencies for independence, as represented by policy class of admission. The central structural question addressed by this study is To what extent do differences in immigrant resources and levels of integration reflect Canadian immigration policy assumptions concerning these two immigrant classes? The following sub-section develops the definition of integration used, and

---

While Jasso and Rosenzweig (1995) point to the possible importance of the family reunification immigrants' networks in their upward mobility, they are unable to investigate these. Similarly, Sandefur and Tienda (1988) also point to the benefits of pooled family resources in ensuring family category success over the long term. According to these authors, the focus of US immigration policy since the mid-1960s on family, rather than independent, immigrants, has been central to controlling immigrant poverty, precisely because of the economic benefit of the extended family.
advances a rationale for conceptualizing integration as a multidimensional process, of which two domains will be analyzed in subsequent chapters.

Defining Integration

Many terms have been used to describe the process referred to in this study as integration, such as assimilation, incorporation, adaptation, adjustment and settlement. The general process of population movements with which these terms are associated occurs on many levels simultaneously. Most abstractly, such movements can be separated into the effects on those doing the moving (individual immigrants and their societies), and on those doing the receiving (again, at individual and structural, or group, levels). The above terms refer to changes that occur within the receiving society, and so exclude those that occur on an international level; within this specific context, each varies slightly in its emphasis on changes in the individuals doing the migrating, and in individuals and structures within the receiving society.

In order to avoid the negative connotations of the assimilation term that infer the abandonment of ethnic attachments, language and culture in favour of those belonging to the “ethnic majority”, and because of its increased use in government and academic research documents, the term integration is used to refer to a reciprocal process involving the insertion of an individual into an existing structure that may entail changes to the individual’s identity and behaviour, and that may result in changes to the structure itself. More specifically, the

---

5 There are those who would dispute the distinctiveness of these terms; for recent examples, see Alba and Nee 1998; Gans 1998; Rumbaut 1998.

6 In their multivariate study of immigrant integration, Goldlust and Richmond (1974) use the term "adaptation" for what I am calling integration. They, too, were trying to separate themselves from terminology to which negative connotations have been attached: namely, the term assimilation.
integration process referred to throughout this thesis concerns changes within the host society involving the individual immigrant only, though others may examine the same process from the perspective of immigrant groups (e.g. Breton 1991; Reitz 1980), or from the perspective of the receiving society (e.g. Reitz and Breton 1994).

Different stages can be identified within the overall integration process. Because these can vary widely from one individual to another, these will be discussed as a loosely connected series of transitions toward the ultimate goals of economic and personal well-being. Initial phases of integration include the satisfaction of basic personal needs such as housing, emergency health care, food, financial support, and freedom from personal danger. These must be accomplished within the first couple of months of arrival, though the achievement of these goals at this stage is often very temporary. As time passes, and individuals gain increasing competence in coping with the immediate trauma of the migration experience, their adjustment process takes on additional elements of integration, as people strive to reach their potential in the country of immigration. This new stage can include both objective and subjective dimensions of different domains of the integration process, such as migrants' satisfaction with their present state, their perceived acceptance and incorporation into their communities, and their objective success in achieving critical goals such as economic independence, employment equivalent to their qualifications, and official language competence. Figure 2.1 depicts this process over time by showing two stages of integration 'outcomes', though in reality the number of stages likely varies for each immigrant.

Integration here conceptualized is therefore not limited to the abandonment of ethnic identity and participation in mainstream institutions, which could be called “direct individual” integration. Individuals can also be said to be integrated if they are incorporated into their
ethnic community on a variety of levels, called "community level" integration (Breton 1991), \textit{if and only if} their ethnic community is \textit{itself} integrated into the mainstream of Canadian society. For example, in Canada, the Jamaican black community continues to be socially marginalized, so that if individuals are well-integrated into that community, they too will be marginalized. By contrast, the Jewish community is fairly well-integrated (Reitz 1990), and a person who is integrated into that community has a high probability of being well-integrated into mainstream Canadian society. Integration, as used in Gordon’s (1964) work on assimilation and in this study, therefore entails some achievement of economic, social and political parity with members of the mainstream society, which \textit{may}, but \textit{need not}, entail the abandonment of ethnic identity and attachments. In a very fundamental way, integration as defined refers to the \textit{objective} experience of achieving parity on a variety of levels with the native born population, in addition to the \textit{subjective} dimensions of perceived acceptance and satisfaction with this objective experience. The broader concept of integration is more than the simple satisfaction of basic needs: it also refers to immigrants’ daily experiences in on-going and long-term interaction with Canadian society in trying to achieve a sense of belonging and of citizenship.

Many studies have undertaken the description and analysis of the degree of integration achieved by different ethnic groups. While “successful integration” has predominantly been conceptualized in economic terms – as the objective achievement of parity with the native born population in terms of economic, occupational and social mobility – other important domains of integration have been identified at academic and policy levels, including the economic, social, political, cultural, and spatial (e.g. Breton et al. 1990; Goldlust and Richmond 1974; Jansen and Richmond 1990; Lieberson 1970; Neuwirth et al. 1988; Renaud and Carpentier 1994). Portions of Gordon’s (1964) theoretical work still apply to the process of integration in these domains,
particularly in his definition of three types of assimilation: the behavioural, in which immigrants obtain a sense of peoplehood corresponding to that of the dominant group; the cultural, defined as acculturation, or the transmission of cultural beliefs and practices to all groups involved in the intergroup contact; and the structural, which involves the adoption of primary relationships with the dominant group by the immigrants, where the first two types are posited as precursors to the last.\textsuperscript{7} The currency of Gordon's (1964) theory is evident in its ability to explain processes of mutual accommodation in the transference of culture, as in the phenomenon of "hyphenated Canadians" who retain both their sense of ethnic heritage, in addition to acquiring a common sense of "peoplehood" with fellow Canadians, and to describe the incorporation of immigrants into mainstream Canadian society at all levels – political, economic and social.\textsuperscript{8} However, Gordon's emphasis on the abandonment of ethnic identity in order to achieve full integration into Canadian society is rejected in this study. Rather, his premise that integration is comprised of variable and distinct elements is considered applicable to the integration process experienced by current waves of immigrants.

Goldlust and Richmond (1974) used an approach that also viewed integration as a multidimensional process. These authors conducted a survey in Metropolitan Toronto between 1969 and 1970 of a total of 11,852 immigrants in two phases (weighted data are reported in their findings). Their sample included both foreign born and native born immigrants.

\textsuperscript{7} While the words used to describe this process have shifted from assimilation (as he uses it) to accommodation and integration, the dimensions proposed by Gordon retain their relevance. However, in this study the word assimilation will not be used, in particular because it confounds the abandonment of ethnic identity with participation in mainstream Canadian social institutions. In fact, these are separable phenomena.

\textsuperscript{8} A recent paper by DeWind and Kasinitz (1997) synthesizes several papers dealing with the past few decades' theoretical reformulations of the concepts dealing with this process I am generally calling integration, including "assimilation", "incorporation", and "acculturation". Regardless of the words used, their general point is that the issues being discussed remain remarkably the same over the course of this time period. Nevertheless, I believe that word choice does affect the conceptualization process, and so will use the term integration.
respondents belonging to a variety of ethno-linguistic groups, of which they reported on eleven. Similar to this study, they measured pre-migration factors, structural constraints in the receiving country, ethnic group characteristics, and different individual-level resources among the immigrants themselves as predictors of integration.

Indicators of integration were separated into objective and subjective measures. Objective integration outcomes included indicators of political, social, cultural and economic integration, which the authors argued would intersect with the immigrant’s length of residence in Canada to affect their subjective integration (see Figure 2, Goldlust and Richmond, 1974:198). These authors separated subjective integration into three parts: identification (with the new country), internalization (of values and norms), and satisfaction with the immigration and integration process. This last dimension of subjective integration arguably is related to relative comparisons with the immigrant’s life prior to migration, as well as to particular reference groups here in Canada. Such a subjective assessment of the immigrant’s success in Canada is undoubtedly connected to their expectations prior to migration – of the freedoms and opportunities available in Canada, and the quality of interactions with other Canadians, for example.

Using this multidimensional definition of integration, these authors found remarkable commonality in the explanatory variables related to each. Indeed, human capital variables were consistently found to be major determinants in the objective economic dimensions of integration (such as income and occupational status) and of social network composition (such as similarity of network members to respondent). Length of residence (or time in Canada) was the leading determinant of the more subjective indicators – “satisfaction” (general and relative gratification with life in Canada), and “identification” (commitment to Canada) – as
well as of “cognitive acculturation” (English ability) and “motility” (neighbourhood integration) (see Table 4 in Goldlust and Richmond 1974:214-215). Other indicators were also significant predictors of integration (which are not explicitly presented in their paper), but these summary findings are interesting as they point to similar underlying factors in achieving different domains of integration.

Each of the five domains of integration described above — the economic, social, political, cultural and spatial — is considered to be important in understanding the entire integration experience, within which the role of individual resources is expected to differ. Moreover, the distinction between subjective and objective dimensions associated with each domain of integration is considered essential to developing a comprehensive understanding of the migration process. For the sake of conceptual clarity, the following discusses all five domains of integration and related research in each area, though this thesis analyzes just two of these domains: the economic, and subjective health and well-being.

Domains of Integration

The relationship between human capital and stratification has been a focus of academic research on immigrants in Canada, and has centred on immigrants’ rates of labour market integration, the role of the ethnic enclave in economic success and ethnic mobility (e.g. Light 1974; Portes 1987), and rates of ethnic identity retention (e.g. Breton et al. 1990; Porter 1965). There is general agreement among researchers that economic independence is of primary importance to integration: without access to the labour market, immigrants become marginalized at all levels of society (Abella 1984; Reitz 1980). This potential marginalization can be conceptualized from the perspective of the individual, the family, and the ethnic group
(though that is not to say that these are mutually exclusive): each approach results in slightly
different explanations for economic success or failure, in some cases comprising almost a
separate body of research within the immigration literature (such as that concerning the ethnic
economy).

At the individual level, an immigrant’s success in achieving access to the labour market
is typically assessed in relation to members of other immigrant groups, and to the native born
population, while explanations for the individual’s level of integration relate mainly to
individual qualities, such as level of human capital investment. In general, immigrants with
higher levels of education and skill tend to adjust more quickly (e.g. Simon 1989; Reitz 1980,
1990). In more specific terms, American and Canadian studies point to a period of adjustment
in which immigrants typically experience less return to their human capital than the native born
population, followed by equivalent or superior economic achievements in the labour force
(Borjas 1990; Globerman 1992; Porter 1965; Richmond and Kalbach 1980; Simon 1989; Sloan
and Vaillancourt 1994; for more pessimistic projections of immigrant labour market integration,
see Abbott and Beach 1993, and Baker and Benjamin 1994). According to Beach and
Worswick (1993), who use data from the 1973 Job Mobility Survey conducted by Statistics
Canada, these findings hold more truth for male immigrants. In studying the economic
integration of husbands and wives, these researchers have found that wives face better initial
economic outcomes and flatter earnings-experience profiles overall, comparing favourably to
their native born counterparts, except for highly-educated immigrants who receive on average 9
to 17 percent lower returns to their human capital investment (Beach and Worswick 1993:47).
Though the approach to integration taken in this study incorporates micro and macro factors, it
is fundamentally an analysis of integration at the individual level.
Fewer studies have approached the question of economic independence from the perspective of the immigrant family, although analyses by Renaud and Carpentier (1994) and Renaud et al. (1993) indicate that after about three years, there is a trend toward the stable employment of husband and wife, with the dual income acting as an “element of protection” from serious economic hardship. Renaud and Carpentier (1994) also found that married males have greater access to the labour market through the sponsorship system than their female counterparts, many of whom are excluded from the labour market by the domestic division of labour and traditional value systems. This type of “family investment strategy” is also observed by Worswick (1996) [and alluded to in Beach and Worswick (1993)]. Worswick (1996) uses data from the 1981 and 1991 Canadian Censuses to produce synthetic cohort data which serves as a close proxy for unavailable longitudinal data, and examines the economic integration of husbands and wives over time. He finds what appears to be a strategy of wives taking jobs directly upon arrival that may pay well, but offer less opportunities for advancement, while husbands spend time investing in host-country specific human capital – such as job re-training or skill up-grading. In fact, he finds that the immigrant wife plays an essential role in supporting the family, with immigrant wives contributing a higher proportion of the family income than native born wives (Worswick 1996:392).

At the level of the ethnic group, explanations for economic success or failure centre on the characteristics of the ethnic community and the role of ethnic attachments and networks. Much debate has raged around the benefits or constraints brought to bear by strong co-ethnic ties as they apply to immigrant occupational mobility, inside and out of the ethnic enclave (e.g. Model 1985; Sanders and Nee 1987; Portes and Sesenbrenner; Light and Bhachu 1993; Reitz 1980; Reitz and Sklar 1997). Porter (1965) and Gordon (1964) both depict ethnicity as a
mobility trap, arguing that cultural assimilation – the abandonment of ethnic identifiers such as accent and dress – leads to structural assimilation – participation in social, political and economic institutions of the dominant society; indeed, it is for their assumed greater propensity to structurally assimilate that many policy analysts emphasize high levels of education and skill, and so the independent class.\(^9\) However, assimilation theory has been disputed by those pointing to other variables to explain ethnic stratification, such as educational and regional disparities in Canada (Darroch 1979), labour market structure in the United States (Portes and Bach 1985), and social connections in the formation of ethnic enterprise (Light 1974; Model 1985).

By contrast, ethnic identification can serve as a survival strategy if ethnic group members use their ethnicity as a rallying point for collective action, particularly to achieve economic independence (Reitz 1980). Furthermore, separating analyses of economic success into objective measures of occupational status and income, Reitz (1990) uses survey data collected in Toronto in the late 1970s and finds that the enclave economy may result in good earnings potential for some, such as the Chinese, but may create disadvantages in terms of occupational mobility. In fact, Reitz (1990) finds considerable variation in the effects of ethnic concentration among the more established ethnic groups in Canada (i.e. Italians, Germans, Ukrainians), noting that occupational status mobility and high levels of income do not necessarily co-occur. He attributes these variations to any combination of factors, including: the abandonment of ethnic occupations and concomitant mobility; a mobility trap within ethnic
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\(^9\) As such, this perspective can be effectively incorporated into the individual approach to integration discussed above, because it is individual resources as these are separated from their ethnic origins that are seen to be most useful in achieving the goals of integration.
occupations; and the formation of new ethnic occupations which may provide new opportunities for mobility.

There is some overlap between studies examining the role of ethnic retention and economic outcomes, and those concerning cultural integration – a second important domain. Today, multiculturalism encourages immigrants and ethnic group members to retain as much or as little of their heritage as they desire, while Canadian immigration policy explicitly denounces any exclusion on the basis of race or ethnic affiliation. The cultural integration of immigrant groups is therefore less of an immigration policy issue than it was historically, when groups were selected, not on the basis of their ability to contribute to the economy, but on their ability to assimilate culturally – indeed, to “disappear” into Canadian society. Nevertheless, cultural retention continues to be of considerable interest to immigration researchers. Numerous studies have investigated the extent of ethnic identity retention, and by extension ethnic social networks, after subsequent generations in the country of immigration, such as Alba (1990), Lieberson and Waters (1990), and Breton et al. (1990). Most of these studies find decreasing significance of ethnic identity with ethnic group members the longer they, or their ancestors, have been in the country of immigration – that is, they point to high levels of behavioural and cultural assimilation (Breton et al. 1990). The effect of time on fostering cultural assimilation can be seen in terms of increasing connections to non-co-ethnic Canadians, connections which afford the immigrant information about and contact with dominant Canadian culture and values. This cultural knowledge facilitates immigrant access to social institutions, and particularly to information about mainstream occupations. Social connections to members of the mainstream can be extremely important to acquiring necessary cultural knowledge.
By contrast, other research indicates a different understanding of the role and expression of ethnic identity in the lives of the children of second and third generation immigrants. Gans (1979), echoed by others, has pointed to the different value placed on ethnic identity which, for many third generation “ethnics”, plays more of a symbolic role than for previous generations. Whereas ethnic identification can be a reaction to social marginalization by the dominant group, and therefore essential to first generation immigrants as a source of ethnic solidarity and economic security (e.g. Reitz 1980; Rex et al. 1987), for members of later generations who have integrated structurally and culturally, their ethnic identity serves as an expressive personal characteristic which is situational in nature – at times emphasized, suppressed at others. Individuals which practice situational expression of their ethnic identity may be integrated at the community level only, or they may simply live in both the mainstream and the ethnic community at once, each fulfilling different needs in the individual.

This trend toward symbolic and situational ethnicity may, however, be limited to groups which do not experience the double burden of ethnic and racial discrimination, or who do not experience what Portes and Zhou call “segmented assimilation” (Portes and Zhou 1993). For particularly marginalized groups such as blacks, the incentive to maintain and reinforce ethnic and racial identification may remain salient, while for others, such as white European immigrants, their “difference” has all but disappeared in subsequent generations. Indeed, visible minority status continues to be a significant determinant of cultural retention (Breton et al. 1990), probably in reaction to persistent economic and social discrimination (Abella 1984; Billingsley and Muszynski 1985; Henry and Ginzberg 1985). Visible minority immigrants may be prevented from developing valuable social connections to mainstream community members
through their exclusion from various social institutions, exclusion based on perceived differences and racism (Reitz and Sklar 1997).

Newcomer participation in the social and political systems of the host country is also integral to the integration process, a third domain of integration. Indicators include involvement in the educational system, the use of community services, and participation in community organizations. Political participation, in particular, can serve as a means of collective action in order to achieve group needs and goals, and is highly related to the spatial concentration of ethnic groups (see below). Research has shown how increasing numbers and concentrations of ethnic groups in the US and Canada have had significant effects on political platforms, with ethnic enclaves acquiring considerable political influence at times (Bailey and Katz 1969; Breton 1991; Enloe 1973; Lieberson 1980; Zimmer and Aldrich 1987). With the policy of Multiculturalism in Canada, such collective action is in fact fostered by the Federal government, which in effect funds ethnic groups to, in turn, lobby the government for other resources.

The degree of social and political integration experienced by an individual immigrant is also related to the degree of institutional completeness of the ethnic community – or, to the extent to which an ethnic group has developed parallel and separate social structures which fulfil basic social and economic needs (Breton 1964). These institutions may include schools, religious organizations, businesses, health and social service agencies, all of which are directed by and for the ethnic community. While ethnic social and political participation is one way in which the immigrant can establish a level of integration into the host society, participation in, and use of, ethno-specific institutions can also be a measure of integration. As argued above, separation between the ethnic and the mainstream does not automatically imply segregation, with equal access to services being one indicator of parallel, but equivalent, institutions.
Immigrant connections to the ethnic community do not preclude ties to the mainstream society. However, where access to, and standards of, service are not equal, exclusive use of co-ethnic institutions may indicate problems integrating. Thus, an individual who has social connections and concomitant exclusive involvement in an ethnic community with a high level of institutional completeness would exemplify "community integration", as long as the community itself was integrated into Canadian society. Otherwise, such an individual would not be integrated, and would be marginalized as a direct consequence of their ethnic group's institutional completeness. This study does not address this distinction, but it remains important to the overall conceptual framework.

Not far removed from factors affecting the cultural and social integration of immigrants are those which determine their residential and spatial location, and therefore their first experiences in Canada. As a fourth area of integration, residential location of immigrants is central to their cultural and social integration, because of the opportunities offered by proximity to the dominant group in the acquisition of new cultural values and skills, such as official language knowledge (Balakrishnan 1982; Breton et al. 1990; Olson and Kobayashi 1993). Typically, immigrants first settle close to fellow ethnic-group members, a practice which provides both emotional and instrumental support through their social contacts at early stages of settlement - support which may extend to their long-term integration into Canadian society in employment, or which may reduce in significance once the newcomer develops connections outside of the ethnic group (or structurally assimilates). The construction of these ethnic neighbourhoods has the advantage of concentrating informational, social and economic resources, and support, at both the individual and group levels, as in the case of institutionally complete communities (Breton et al. 1990; Hiebert 1993). Indeed, the importance of chains of
migration to the development of ethnic neighbourhoods (e.g. MacDonald and MacDonald 1974) has long been seen as an alternative to explanations of ethnic residential concentration focused more on the results of discrimination (Massey and Denton 1993) or ethnic difference.

Depending on the degree of marginalization as opposed to distance between the ethnic community and the mainstream society, this concentration can have both positive and negative effects on integration. Residential concentration which prevents all contact with the mainstream society can be a serious hindrance to the integration of the individual, and of the ethnic community, as discussed above. The marginalization and segregation of the American Black population is an extreme example of the negative effects of racism combined with geographic separation (Lieberson 1980), which some argue is the primary determinant of social inequality in the US (Massey and Denton 1993). Conversely, analyses conducted by Fong (1997) appear to contradict the negative effect of residential segregation on integration in Canada, pointing instead to neutral effects. Of course, US findings will be influenced by distinctive historical and structural factors, and may not be applicable to the Canadian situation.

Summary

Despite an overwhelming emphasis on economic integration and ethnic identity within immigration research, research exists in each of the five domains of integration identified above. Two main omissions pervade the immigration literature, however: (1) a reliance on objective indicators to the exclusion of subjective indicators of immigrants’ integration success; and (2) unidimensional conceptualizations of the integration process, even where authors recognize the importance of other domains of integration, and a subsequent lack of understanding of the relationship between these different domains.
Specifically, **What is the connection between economic, and other domains of integration?** **How are subjective and objective indicators of the same domain of integration related?** **What effects do differences in the resources of the two immigrant classes have on each of these domains of integration?** These areas of research are underdeveloped partially as a result of data availability and quality issues, but the imbalance may also reflect overwhelming public concern with the economic impacts of immigration, to the exclusion of other essential components of the integration process. These are two areas of research in which this study aims to make a contribution. The next section defines and discusses the concept of immigrant resources, and their role in the integration process, with particular emphasis on human capital and social network resources.

*Defining Immigrant Resources*

Resources are defined as tools which, depending on their characteristics, help or hinder the achievement of certain goals; here, these goals are related to the integration of immigrants. Resources may take a variety of forms, such as level of education, skills, work experience and English language competence (human capital); money and other assets (physical capital); and knowledge of Western/North American customs, values and beliefs (cultural resources); elements of personality (psychological resources); social networks and social support (social capital); and are likely to vary along demographic characteristics including ethnic and racial lines, country of origin, gender and age, and by class of immigration – if only because the immigration policy actively “selects” for some of these characteristics.
Some resources may be related to achieving a specific goal: a high level of education may result in the acquisition of skilled employment. Conversely, social networks may act as a means to other resources: a social connection to a company owner may not in and of itself result in skilled employment, but may provide access to a series of other connected individuals, one of whom may offer such employment. Thus, while some resources may provide direct access to a goal, others may serve as direct access to a goal or as a means to mobilize other resources, which themselves provide direct attainment of a goal. Social network resources are an example of the latter, facilitating direct and indirect accomplishment of specific integration goals.

For example, an individual may have high levels of education and training in a particular occupation, which would constitute a human capital resource, but may not have the cultural knowledge related to hiring practices in Canada, which would constitute a lack of cultural resources; likewise, a human capital-rich person may lack the social connections necessary to get information about job openings despite their education and skills, which would constitute a deficit of social capital. Thus, being able to mobilize a particular skill or ability may be contingent upon the activation of other components of the immigrant’s resource repertoire, a factor with implications for the types of abilities for which immigration policy selects.

As stated in the section on the economic domain of integration, whether integration is constructed as an individual, family or ethnic group phenomenon has implications for the types of explanations that are developed. In analyses taking individual integration as their focus, individual-level explanations, largely in the form of human capital resource models, predominate. By contrast, particularly in the area of the ethnic economy and ethnic entrepreneurship where the level of analysis concerns ethnic group characteristics and processes, a coherent, competing theoretical model in the form of social capital and social networks has
recently emerged, largely as a result of research by Portes (1987; Portes and Bach 1985; Portes and Sesenbrenner 1993), Massey (1990), and Light (1974; Light and Bhachu 1993; Light and Karageorgis 1994). The development of the social capital and social network explanation in this area can be seen as directly resulting from the utility of these concepts to theorize and conceptualize micro and macro structural processes – in this case, the flow of resources at the group and individual levels toward the accomplishment of collective and individual economic goals. In this research area, the concept of resources has therefore been expanded, though it would be difficult to argue that the dominant human capital explanation has been supplanted by others.

For example, Light and Karageorgis (1994) apply the concept of immigrant resources to an understanding of differential ethnic group success within the ethnic economy. Like the approach advocated here, they employ a broad definition of resources that includes, but is not confined to, human capital. In their framework, human and financial capital can be seen as originating within class and ethnic resources: the former includes the skills, attitudes, values and knowledge that accompany an individual’s position in the class structure (as a member of the bourgeoisie versus working class), and which help to shape their aspirations for such goals as higher education and professional employment. Ethnic resources are “sociocultural and demographic features of the whole group” that are actively used by ethnic entrepreneurs, or from which they passively benefit; among other elements, these include marriage and family systems, ethnic solidarity, social capital, trust and cultural assumptions (Light and Karageorgis 1994:659).

Many of these ethnic group level resources reflect individual resources defined in this study, such as cultural and social network resources, though measures of social capital refer
to the ethnic community as a whole, rather than to personal networks. The authors argue that the differential success of ethnic entrepreneurship can in effect be explained to the extent that levels of these resources vary according to individual (e.g. gender) and ethnic group characteristics. Similarly, though investigated from the perspective of the individual, this study emphasizes the role of individual resources in achieving integration goals; by assessing the role of social capital, I too am implicitly incorporating group resources as these are accessed by individuals within their personal helping networks. Thus, while our definitions of resources may differ somewhat (as a result of differences in the level of analysis undertaken), in effect I apply the same approach to the broader question of explaining the role of different types of resources in the process of immigrant integration.

Types of Resources

Most research on immigration routinely incorporates elements of human capital, and some includes measures of physical capital and cultural resources. Human capital is the combined investment that a person makes in themselves in the form of education, work experience and specific skill development over the course of their life. Human capital analyses usually try to account for differences in income, promotions, and labour market concentration and participation between native born and foreign born populations by measuring, among other variables, their levels of education, skill, occupational prestige, linguistic ability, and experience (e.g. see Abbott 1989; Beach and Worswick 1993; Bach and Argyros 1991; Baker and Benjamin 1994; Borjas 1990; Chiswick 1992; Coulson and Devoretz 1993; Goldlust and Richmond 1974; Nogle 1993; Porter 1965; Worswick 1996). Typically, women’s human capital as defined above is lower than men’s, because of the dual role of mother/housekeeper and employee which
most women play in Western society. Work stoppages necessitated in order to bear and raise children place women at a distinct disadvantage relative to men in the labour market, as do informal practices that place less value on women’s education and career advancement, and effectively bar them from informal networks which are increasingly essential to accessing scarce and vital information (Boyd 1992; Worswick 1996).

Human capital resources are seen to be extremely important in achieving economic integration, and in accessing the mainstream labour market in particular. This importance is reflected in immigration policy and the points system, and is supported by previous research pointing to the relative success of well-educated, highly skilled immigrants. Human capital resources may be seen as indirectly linked to cultural integration: more educated immigrants will tend to possess more Western values (more cultural resources as defined below), which may make it easier for them to adopt specific “Canadian” behaviours and attitudes which facilitate their cultural integration. Highly skilled and educated immigrants are also more likely to be employed in the mainstream economy, and so to integrate structurally (that is, socially and politically). Finally, human capital resources may affect the spatial integration of immigrants only insofar as they are economically integrated: individuals may live in an ethnic enclave, but work in mainstream society, although the opposite is unlikely.

Representing the outcome of human capital investments, financial capital as an individual resource is one that has received less attention in the literature, perhaps because of its link with the latter (although with the introduction of the entrepreneur and business subclasses, this resource appears to be implicitly valued, if not for its use in effecting immigrant integration, then for its potential to enrich Canadian society). By contrast, financial resources as they are accessed through social networks have received a lot of attention.
within research on the ethnic enclave and the ethnic economy, in the form of rotating credit
systems or other comparable means by which immigrant membership within a specific ethnic
community determines access to financial resources upon which to base entrepreneurial
activities (e.g. Light 1974; Light and Karageorgis 1994; Portes 1987; Portes and Sesenbrenner
1993; this is discussed in more detail below). Thus, while the role of an individual’s financial
capital in integration is as yet unclear, it is likely important in achieving economic
integration, as well as in providing access to powerful social networks which may in turn
facilitate social and cultural aspects of integration.

A third type of individual resource occurs in the form of cultural capital. Cultural capital
research focuses on an individual’s cultural repertoire – values, customs and beliefs which are
highly correlated with their human capital (Erickson 1996). Most research in this area has
stemmed from Bourdieu (1980), and has focused on its effect on marriage patterns, social
hierarchy, and crime and deviance (e.g. DiMaggio and Mohr 1990; Hagan 1994; Fernández
Kelly 1995). In a somewhat different vein, in this study “cultural resources” refer to the
immigrant’s knowledge and experience with Western liberal-democratic values and beliefs and
customs – also called “relational/mass culture connections” (Fawcett 1989). Re-stated, these
cultural resources can be seen as useful to the extent that an immigrant understands, adopts, and
applies the cultural definitions, symbols and customs of the dominant culture, toward the
attainment of their integration goals.

Depending on their class of immigration, knowledge which is beneficial to immigrants’
integration will vary. For example, business immigrants will need to be well-versed in the
business culture dominant in North America, as well as that specific to the sector of the
economy in which they will be working, in order to facilitate economic, and possibly cultural,
integration. For most migrants, knowledge of meritocratic principles and credentialism in North America, in addition to the important role played by personal networks, will facilitate their social and political (structural) integration, as in educational and labour market institutions. It is likely that immigrants with more cultural resources will integrate behaviourally (though not necessarily abandoning their ethnic identity), and in so doing will be more likely to have social connections beyond their ethnic network to mainstream society. As mentioned above, cultural resources are likely associated with human capital – more highly educated and employed individuals are more likely to have had the opportunity to travel and learn about Canadian (Western) practices and values.

Certain psychological characteristics associated with risk-taking and immigration are also important to business and economic success. In this study, psychological resources refer to an individual’s personality type – their sense of autonomy, mastery, and self-control. All of those who have migrated make a definitive statement about themselves and their lives by leaving their country of origin. For example, relative to those remaining in their countries of origin, they are “deviant” because of their decision to leave; they are risk-takers, and can be seen to have high levels of autonomy in that they actively try to change their lives in order to achieve specific goals.

To date, there are few studies which take psychological resources as an explicit topic of investigation within the immigration literature. In the area of work and occupations, however, considerable attention has been given to the ways in which an individual’s psychological make-up predicts occupational success (e.g. Kohn et al. 1983). From a different perspective, Pearlin and Schooler (1978) used psychological measures to determine the role of mastery and self-esteem in developing coping responses to stresses and strains: in the specific area of
occupational stress, they have found that an individual’s personality resources are more
important than the specific coping mechanism developed in predicting emotional distress. In
a general sense, psychological resources would be expected to positively affect an individual’s
level of economic integration, but it is unclear if they would do so independent of the
individual’s other resources: that is, psychological resources might act to mediate the effects of
other more directly relevant resources, such as human capital and social networks, in achieving
economic success. In terms of affecting well-being, it is unclear whether psychological
resources would keep an individual’s outlook positive in the face of other stresses (such as
economic), so that an immigrant would feel well and subjectively assess themselves as such
despite other stresses, or whether higher self-esteem and mastery would actually help an
individual achieve success in an objective sense. In fact, several processes may be in effect:
most recently, Noh and Avison (1996) applied the stress process paradigm to examine the
relationship between integration stresses and immigrant mental health. In their study of
Korean immigrants to Toronto, these authors investigated the roles of psychological and
social resources as mediators of social stressors on levels of depression. They found that
psychological resources (self-esteem and mastery) and social support from co-ethnics have a
deterrent effect, in that they directly reduce levels of distress by inhibiting stressful
occurrences, or by ensuring that these are not stressful in their outcome.

Finally, social capital is a person’s ability to access scarce resources. Ignoring
Coleman’s overly-positive formulation, his central premise – that social capital inheres in the
structure of relations between and among actors – provides a way of examining immigrants’
abilities to mobilize and access resources from the people to which they are connected
(Coleman 1988:S98). The fact that individuals are embedded in social relations at the micro
level – what Granovetter (1990) refers to as relational embeddedness – invokes the understanding that resources flow through personal contacts, or social networks. That the structures of personal networks vary according to individual characteristics, and as a result of macro contextual factors (such as the structure of social institutions and policies), has implications for the types, and flow, of resources available within the networks.

Indeed, at the individual level, the structure of an individual’s network (called an egocentric network) has been shown to greatly affect the types of resources that can be accessed through it. An egocentric network is comprised of all of a person’s social contacts with immediate and extended family members, friends, neighbours, co-workers and acquaintances (Wellman 1988). The individuals with which ego – the individual at the centre of the network – is connected are called alters, and the actual relationships are called ties. One way of classifying an individual’s network ties is to distinguish between kin versus non-kin ties, the premise being that kinship ties are based on relations of obligation as well as emotional attachment, and so are likely to provide access to larger amounts and a greater variety of social support (Wellman and Wortley 1992). Of course, this distinction is imperfect, because in modern society families are often geographically or emotionally distant, with their functions being replaced by other intimate contacts actively cultivated by the individual (Wellman 1979; Wellman et al. 1988). Researchers therefore also differentiate between ties according to their strength, which allows for the possibility that friends and kin (typically immediate kin) can be social intimates and are called ‘strong ties’, while extended kin, co-workers, neighbours and other acquaintances generally play peripheral or specialized roles in an individual’s network, and are typically called ‘weak ties’ (Granovetter 1973).
Significantly, the strength of a tie has implications for the type of social support that can be expected to flow along it. Strong ties generally occur among social similars, and therefore connect people of similar economic, cultural and social status. Such contacts provide people with access to information which is likely to be shared by all of the strongly connected network members (Burt 1992; Granovetter 1973; Lin 1982). By contrast, weaker contacts connect social dissimilars: the more heterogeneous a person’s network (that is, the more diverse the network members), the more likely is the individual to have access to information which they would not ordinarily possess. As such, stronger, more intimate ties are said to provide large amounts of social support, while weaker ties are said to provide access to scarce resources, such as information on job openings (Granovetter 1973; 1985).

Thus, a network’s structure can be described based on the relative occurrence of these tie-level characteristics. Characteristics that have been found to be important to understanding the flow of resources through the network are its size, density, composition, and predominance of weak or strong ties. Larger networks provide people with access to more individuals, and so potentially to more support; most importantly, larger networks are more likely to have a higher proportion of ‘weak ties’ that serve as bridges to scarce information, particularly in the context of occupational mobility (e.g. Granovetter 1973). Networks with a predominance of strong kinship ties have also been found to be associated with high levels of all kinds of social support (Wellman and Wortley 1990). Very dense networks (a high degree of interconnectivity among network members) are said to be
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10 These effects have been found to vary by social class, however: weak ties are particularly effective for the advancement of people of subordinate occupational position or lower economic class, because weak ties generally connect these people to dissimilar others (i.e. those of higher social prestige). Among the social elite, strong ties can serve to cement access to other potentially powerful individuals, contacts which concentrate wealth and resources among a powerful few (Clement 1975).
associated with kinship, smaller size, and larger amounts of social support (Wellman 1979),
while low density is more typical of loosely structured, larger non-kin dominated networks
which do not necessarily preclude the provision of social support, as argued by Wellman
(1979), and Wellman and Potter (1999), but which may depending on the proportion of weak
versus strong ties.

The structure and content of social networks also vary according ego’s social roles,
position in the life course (age), and gender. Seniors tend to have social networks dominated
by kin (as people age, friends move away or die), though if older neighbours exist, they tend
to be network members (Fischer 1982). Among those in the younger age groups, the
principle of homophily tends to hold, so that younger people tend to associate with those of
similar age, marital and parental status (Fischer 1982; Wellman and Wortley 1990). Women
usually have more kin-based network members, as they tend to be the “kin-keepers” in the
family, organizing family events and staying in touch with distant relatives – tasks which are
also associated with working in the home, though these do tend to persist even for women
working outside of the home. Women with children tend to be connected to their neighbours
with children, through their children’s friendships, day-cares and schools. By contrast, men
tend to have more network ties to co-workers, and smaller networks overall than women
(Wellman and Wellman 1992). These differences, though general, point to the importance of
the couple as a unit in accessing different social resources through their social networks,
distinctive resources which can be very important to the integration of the immigrant family
as a whole.

From a macro-structural perspective, Grieco (1998:706) examines the structural
contexts affecting social network formation. Specifically, she investigates the factors
determining whether a migrant network becomes an ethnic community, to which the
“auspices of migration” are central. These migration auspices refer to “the social, economic,
political and historical contexts within which migration begins and proceeds”, and determine
the types of individuals who undertake to migrate, and by extension the types of social
networks that individuals arrive with, and develop, in the host society (Grieco 1998:706).
Auspices which emphasize the movement of individuals as opposed to groups, she argues,
determine the preponderance of strong versus weak ties occurring in the group: those
movements composed of strong ties will be more likely to develop into ethnic communities,
while those containing more weak ties will be forced to interact with mainstream society,
resulting in “the more rapid assimilation and integration of members (Grieco 1998:706).
Despite her assumption of a connection between ‘assimilation’ and the abandonment of
ethnic identity which does not necessarily operate (e.g. Breton et al. 1990), Grieco’s (1998)
link between macro structural processes and those operating at the ethnic group, and then
individual network level, help to conceptualize the dynamic between embeddedness and
social networks.

One problem with Grieco’s approach is that it tends toward an overly-positive
depiction of the potential of dense, kin-based ethnic social networks (1998). Also theorizing
the effects of the structural context on integration outcomes, research by Menjivar (1997) in
fact cautions against the reduction of networks to cure-alls. In her study of Salvadoran
immigrants to San Francisco, she found that the effectiveness of kinship network support was
seriously modified by what she refers to as “the structural context of reception”, which includes
“immigration policies, local labour market opportunities, and the politics of the receiving
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11 These auspices might be considered characteristics of Granovetter’s (1990) "structural embeddeness”,
though he was referring more to group-level structures than international structures and policies.
Immigrant networks comprised of alters who were equally or more financially disadvantaged as a result of poor local economic opportunities and restrictive social policies collapsed, leaving the newcomer to fend for themselves. Thus, an immigrant’s network is only as useful as it is rich in economic, social, and other resources, all of which are shaped by the context of reception.

The economic sociology of immigration has enjoyed considerable conceptual and theoretical development from the fruitful synthesis of structural concepts from social network analysis, with immigration theories concerning group and individual processes that form the basis for the construction of the ethnic economy and enclave. It is the unique ability of social network analysis to embody the tension between large and small-scale structures and processes that cements its relevance to this area of research, as evidenced by research into the role of ethnic networks in chain migration (e.g. Massey 1990) and in the creation and maintenance of ethnic communities within the host country (e.g. Grieco 1998; Reitz 1980).

Yet, probably the most developed area of immigration research is in the area of the economic sociology of immigration. Here, research into the ethnic economy, ethnic entrepreneurship, and the ethnic enclave has developed a coherent set of debates concerning the competing effects of ethnic identity retention (and so social networks) on immigrant economic integration (for an excellent conceptual review, see Portes 1995). According to some, the ethnic enclave serves as an essential source of social and emotional solidarity at a time when immigrants face serious problems accessing the mainstream economy, due to accreditation problems, language barriers, low levels of education and training, and the requirement for Canadian experience (Bonacich 1972; Light 1974; Model 1985; Portes 1987; Portes and Jensen 1987). These problems do not even begin to account for discrimination and prejudice which,
according to several studies, persist, yet another reason for some migrants to concentrate job-finding efforts in the "safer" enclave economy (Billingsley and Muszynski 1985; Henry and Ginzberg 1985; Reitz and Breton 1994). Thus, at one level, the ethnic enclave economy may be an expression of social networks within the ethnic community, and as such, may facilitate the integration of immigrants into their community. As discussed above, such community integration may facilitate direct individual integration, if the community itself is not marginalized within Canadian society.

Conversely, other researchers question the utility of the ethnic economy in achieving economic integration, which they characterize by low wages, poor working conditions, low skill and little mobility relative to the primary labour market (Bates 1994; Light and Bhachu 1993; Sanders and Nee 1987; Waldinger 1994). A few studies have documented the enclave's utility for only select ethnic groups, indicating that there may be cultural or other characteristics which mitigate against the benefits of the ethnic enclave (Light 1974; Model 1985; Reitz 1990; Tsukashima 1985). In terms of ethnic entrepreneurship, Model and Light have both found that American Black individualism is one such characteristic which appears to impede the potential utility of co-ethnic social connections, compared to the Jewish (Model 1985), Japanese and Chinese business successes (Light 1974). In their more recent study of Hispanic and Asian immigrants in Los Angeles, Sanders and Nee (1996) found that family connections are important in starting a business, as they provide access to more financial capital. This strategy they found to be particularly important for groups whose human capital was not recognized in the host market. By contrast, in their study of ethnic entrepreneurship, though, Zimmer and

---

12 Of course, not even the ethnic enclave is totally safe. Exploitative situations involving co-ethnic employers also exist, and can sometimes be the most difficult situations to leave, given accompanying obligations of ethnic and kinship loyalty. Nevertheless, the enclave is typically conceptualized as a supportive environment.
(1987) argue that ethnic ties are inconsequential to understanding small business ownership in England, eclipsed as they are by class resources; whether this conclusion is country-specific is not discussed.

Further analysis on the data used in Reitz (1990) – the Ethnic Pluralism Study – tests for the relative costs and benefits of eight measures of “ethnic attachment”, of which two measures reflect a social network perspective: “close ethnic ties” and “ingroup friends” (Reitz and Sklar 1997). These authors find, once again, that the effects of ethnic networks are not consistent across all ethnic origins, by gender, or for all dependent variables measured. In fact, they find that two non-visible minority groups experience the greatest objective costs to their ethnic maintenance: European-origin immigrant men who retain the use of their ethnic language experience lower economic returns to their human capital, while European-origin immigrant women experience an economic penalty for retaining ethnic networks (Reitz and Sklar 1997:266).

The authors wrestle with these findings, and with the realities of many members of visible minority groups (which they refer to as racial minorities) who clearly experience discrimination and structural constraints to their mobility in many spheres of social life. They conclude that the costs of ethnic maintenance to economic outcomes, while ambiguous, may also be distinctive from the social costs, or “the exclusion of minority group members from informal groups, social networks, and community organizations and institutions typically dominated by members of the majority ethnic and racial group (Reitz and Sklar 1997:267). To understand the effects of ethnic maintenance on economic integration, they ultimately draw on Granovetter’s (1973; 1995) weak tie hypothesis: such connections have been found to be most useful in getting employment, and may not be at all limited by the maintenance of ethnic
networks, an argument which may effectively discount assertions about the restrictiveness of enclave employment.

Therefore, while the effects of the ethnic enclave have been shown to be beneficial for some – specifically immigrants with low levels of human capital – other research indicates that the enclave ultimately limits the economic achievement of ethnic group members, while still more research indicates ambiguous effects. The task of this study, however, extends beyond the economic domain, to the investigation of individual integration in general; it is to apply the concepts of social networks, social capital, and the notion of embeddedness to an investigation of the factors shaping the individual social resources of family and independent class immigrants, and the ways in which differences in their social resources translate into different integration strategies, and outcomes. As this study applies to individual rather than ethnic group processes, then, it serves as an extension of a significant body of immigration research.

Within the area of immigrant economic integration, we can predict that strong ties among family and other co-ethnics – immigrants who are behaviourally or culturally assimilated only – are likely to provide contacts to other co-ethnics in the labour market, as well as significant amounts of social support, and to therefore positively affect economic integration (House et al. 1988; Pescolido 1986; Uehara 1990). Based on the weak tie theory, immigrants working exclusively in co-ethnic businesses are more likely to experience barriers to their advancement unless they become structurally integrated into the mainstream economy, precisely because enclaves provide contacts to others of similar social and economic status (Bates 1994; Gordon 1964; Model 1985; Portes and Sesenbrenner 1993; Sanders and Nee 1987). This is indeed the case according to Mostacci-Calzavara, who found that the utility of co-ethnic contacts in finding a job declined with the average income of the ethnic group, compared to
Asian immigrants between 1979 and 1987, and found that self-employed Asian immigrants
relying on a minority clientele, or on social contacts, were most likely to have failed businesses.
Indeed, he found that the use of networks was characteristic of the smaller firms, while the
success of the larger Asian firms resulted from large investments of capital and the high
educational qualifications of their owners, pointing to the continued significance of human
capital characteristics (Bates 1994).

Similarly, immigrant women who work in ghettoized occupations such as textiles are
surrounded by others in comparable situations: their contacts for employment among these
women are likely to only reinforce their economic marginalization. Embedded in, and
magnifying, the problem of co-ethnic business is the lack of access to English and French
language learning, a significant barrier to mainstream labour market and social integration. This
also explains the success of immigrants who have structurally assimilated (Gordon 1964): they
have cultivated contacts with social dissimilars from “mainstream” society who are able to
provide the immigrant with access to scarce informational resources in, for example, the labour
and housing markets.

Beyond the economic sphere, social networks, particularly in the form of kinship ties,
have been shown to be essential to immigrant women’s survival and social integration
(O’Connor 1990; Pescolido 1986; Vega et al. 1991). Stress and mental health literature
discusses the effects of immigration on the well-being of immigrants, although again, the
systematic collection of network-specific information is relatively absent (Canada 1988a;
Canada 1988b; Nguyen 1987; Noh and Avison 1996). The negative impacts of strong ties are
illustrated by inter-generational conflict within ethnic groups: relations among close family and
friends can become extremely strained as some integrate at different rates, and older ethnic
group members may accuse younger members of rejecting their ethnic identity. As well,
immigrant sponsors may experience severe economic hardship in trying to provide for their
own, and their sponsored, families, particularly in difficult economic periods (such negative
effects of ‘embeddedness’ are also discussed in Portes and Sesenbrenner 1993).

As argued by decline theory, urbanism is likely to disintegrate ethnic identification:
social ties extending beyond the ethnic community are likely to facilitate cultural integration of
immigrants, as they provide access to information and social contact situations between the
immigrant and native born Canadians. These situations can result in the transfer of information
and Canadian values which the immigrant can use to access other mainstream social situations
and institutions. In his study of networks and urbanism, however, Fischer (1982:202-204)
found that immigrants in the city tended toward ethnically-bounded networks: minority
subcultures in general are afforded access to many more social similars in the city than in the
countryside, and so tend to seek out and maintain these contacts. Fischer’s results support
subcultural theory, then, which argues that urbanism tends to bolster ethnic identification.
However, Fischer’s study did not include an examination of immigrants per se, but of ethnic
Americans, and so it is unclear how generalizable his findings are to the present study.

Thus, social networks are likely to affect the integration of immigrants differently,
according to the domain of integration investigated. Depending on the goals of the
immigrant, he or she may choose to selectively adopt mainstream attitudes and behaviours in
specific situations only, in order to penetrate the mainstream economy, social and political
institutions, while retaining “ethnic” behaviours and attitudes which facilitate access to ethnic
community social support. This “selective” integration on the part of immigrants, and the
strategies which individuals use to achieve specific goal of integration, are central to this study. If these ideas are applied to the use of networks to achieve instrumental goals of integration, independent immigrants would be more likely to rely on non-kin and weak ties for integration assistance, and so be more likely to receive less amounts of such support, a hypothesis which is supported by the findings of Bauer and Zimmermann (1997). In their study, immigrants with higher education were less likely to settle near relatives or friends, and were therefore less likely to rely on the help of their kinship networks. By contrast, based on policy assumptions that the family class join pre-fabricated networks here in Canada, such respondents would be more likely to have kin-based networks, and to rely on them for assistance getting employment. As for other more sensitive integration tasks, requiring emotional support or financial assistance, independent and family class immigrants would be equally likely to draw upon strong kinship ties. Mutual obligation and emotional attachments between network members and respondents should facilitate the provision of these types of support, which are difficult to elicit from more casual acquaintances – or “weaker” ties.

There is no doubt that accounting for human capital differences in economic analyses is essential to understanding the variation in incomes, occupational prestige and mobility trajectories of different members of society. It is not hard to see, however, that in most cases there are other factors at work, and that to understand the process of income attainment, satisfaction with community involvement and overall health and well-being (among other goals of integration), analysts must go beyond traditional economic indicators. Boyd (1989) makes a strong case for the inclusion of social network resources in research on immigrant integration, while others have expanded beyond indicators of economic resources to include linguistic and other forms of cultural capital (Fawcett 1989) and social capital (e.g. Reitz and
Sklar 1997; Tsukashima 1985; Vega et al. 1991), or a combination thereof (e.g. Goldlust and Richmond 1974; Light and Karageorgis 1994). In effect, it is the way in which immigration policy explicitly incorporates economic assumptions of the importance of human capital resources to the integration process (which itself is conceived in primarily economic terms) that cements the importance of measuring the utility of many types of resources in the integration process — if only to provide empirical evidence upon which to base the assumptions. The application of social network concepts within this study of immigrant integration is therefore an extension and elaboration of a body of immigration research, within which social capital and networks have comprised an important conceptual and theoretical framework for some time.

Summary

The investigation of the differential effects of financial, cultural, personal and social network resources on integration outcomes is conducted with the purpose of comparing each with the effects of human capital resources. As the centrepiece of Canadian immigration policy, and of the majority of immigration research, this study challenges the dominance of the human capital model, and of human capital resources, in predicting economic achievement and levels of health and well-being. In their place, this study proposes that social network resources in particular will have equal, if not larger, explanatory powers. In effect, this study asks To what extent do non-human capital immigrant resources explain variations in levels of integration?
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

This discussion of immigration research has noted several gaps in knowledge related to immigrant integration. The theoretical importance of conceptualizing integration as a multidimensional process is established, though not reflected in any great volume of research. The importance of different types of individual resources, particularly social contacts, to the integration process, is also supported by previous research. The significance of analyzing the integration process by class of admission to an evaluation of immigration policy has also been demonstrated.

The foregoing conceptual framework also gave a detailed description of different domains of integration. Five were discussed, of which two will be analyzed for the purposes of this dissertation, as stated above. As arguably the foundation for subsequent integration success, finding a job, earnings and perceptions of job equivalency serve as measures of the economic domain of the overall ‘integration’ dependent variable. To fulfil one of the original objectives of this study, which was to broaden the concept of integration beyond the economic domain, the respondents’ subjective perceptions of their well-being serves as the second dependent variable. By including the analysis of the relationship between immigrant policy class, resources and integration, this study accounts for one (of many) structural factors which I have also argued impact on the overall integration process.

The many research questions generated by the preceding discussion of the integration literature have been summarized into three questions that are central to this investigation:

(1) Which class of immigration is most successful in terms of each of the four indicators of integration?

---

13 Time permits the analysis of only a fraction of the variables collected in his study. Subsequent analyses will focus on the other dimensions of integration described in the conceptual framework.
(2) How do the individual resources possessed by independent and family class immigrants differ?

(3) Which resources are most effective in facilitating an individual’s ability to access the goals of integration as defined in this study?

The three main tasks ensuing from these questions are:

(1) To describe the relative integration of respondents by their immigrant class in terms of the four dependent integration variables developed in this thesis;

(2) To measure, describe, and compare the five types of resources by class of immigration, with an emphasis on social networks and human capital resources;

(3) To determine which resources are most useful in (i) finding employment, obtaining a good income, and in obtaining an equivalent job to that held prior to migration; and in (ii) achieving a high level of subjective health and well-being.

Based on the preceding review of the literature, identification of research questions and thesis goals, specific research hypotheses emerge. These are stated for each dependent variable, and for each class of admission, below.

**Hypotheses**

The primary comparison for all analyses is class of immigration. While other comparisons will be made (namely by gender, age, country of birth and length of time in Canada), the following hypotheses relate to this primary variable of interest. Though hypotheses regarding the effects of each of the five types of variables were discussed in a general sense above, the following hypotheses concern the effects of human capital and social network resources specifically.
(1) **Level of Integration by Class of Immigration:**

**A. Economic Integration**

H1 A higher proportion of independent immigrants should be employed; and

H2 these jobs should lead to higher earnings, because of their expected higher levels of human capital.

H3 Independent immigrants may have a harder time obtaining employment that is equivalent to that held prior to migration, because they are more likely to be competing with native born workers for professional jobs, and so are more likely to face barriers to the practice of their profession.

**B. Subjective Perceptions of Overall Health and Well-Being**

H4a Independent immigrants are expected to show higher levels of satisfaction with their integration in Canada, *when they achieve their economic goals*; otherwise I expect their levels of satisfaction to be lower than family class immigrants’.

H4b Conversely, family class immigrants are likely to have moderate to high rates of satisfaction compared to independent immigrants, regardless of their economic outcomes, because they likely arrive in Canada with lower expectations than their independent counterparts.
(2) Immigrant Class Resource Differences:

H5 Independent immigrants are expected to have higher initial levels of human capital – including education, skill, occupational prestige and linguistic ability – upon arrival than members of the family class.

H6 Because they are related through level of education, independent immigrants are also expected to have higher levels of financial capital, cultural capital, and psychological resources.

H7a A higher proportion of family class immigrants are expected to know someone in Canada prior to migration, in particular immediate family.

H7b Family class immigrants are expected to have larger social networks; and their networks are expected to be kin-based. By contrast, independent immigrants are expected to have smaller networks that are non-kin based (comprised of friends, acquaintances, co-workers).

H7d Family class immigrants are expected to receive greater overall support from their networks due to relations of obligations imposed by the kinship relationship.

(3) Utility of Resources in Achieving Integration:

A. Economic Integration

H8a Human capital variables are expected to be the strongest predictors of being employed and of earnings, to the exclusion of other resources.
H8b Human capital variables are expected to be positively, but weakly associated with job equivalency, but not among the most highly qualified and educated professionals.

H9 Cultural, financial and psychological resources should be positive predictors of each area of economic integration.

H10 Networks at immigration should be negative predictors of economic integration because of the predominance of kinship ties in both independent and family class networks.

H11 Kin-dominated social networks are expected to be negatively associated with all three economic measures of integration, because of their lower likelihood of containing useful job information beyond that already possessed by the respondent.

H12 Larger networks are expected to be positively associated with all three measures of economic integration, because of their greater likelihood of containing "weak ties".

H13 More supportive networks are expected to be negatively associated with all three measures of economic integration, because of the possible link between economic disadvantage and the need for support, and because more supportive networks are also likely to be kin-dominated.
B. Subjective Perceptions of Overall Health and Well-Being

H14 The higher human capital levels of independent class immigrants are expected to have a positive impact on their subjective well-being, because of the superior economic outcomes with which they are expected to be associated.

H15 Higher cultural, financial and psychological resources should positively affect levels of well-being through economic success.

H16 Networks at immigration should be positive predictors of health and well-being because of the preponderance of kinship ties among both independent and family class networks.

H17 The kin-based social networks of the family class are expected to have a positive impact on their overall health and well-being, while the non-kin based networks of the independent class are expected to be associated with lower levels of well-being, due to the established link between well-being and social support.

H18 Network size is expected to be negatively associated with well-being, because larger networks will be less likely to contain strong ties that tend to be more supportive.

H19 Amount of social support, in particular emotional support, is expected to have a positive effect on well-being.

SUMMARY

The preceding presented the conceptual framework developed for this study.

Immigration was shown to be a persistent and permanent feature of Canada's history, and
was shown to fulfil three main goals, of which the economic is currently the most valued and emphasized. Moreover, immigration policy was posited as one of many structural constraints directly affecting the immigration and integration processes, to the extent that admission criteria are based on accepted notions of the importance of human capital resources to the integration process, as opposed to empirically based conclusions. Indeed, the tension between the structural constraints of these admission requirements and individual migrants’ abilities to make rational decisions affecting their integration was presented as one of the central dynamics being investigated by this study.

The concept of integration was distinguished from previous notions of assimilation, though affinities with this and other terms were acknowledged. Within the immigration process, integration was defined to be an inherently multidimensional, reciprocal process that takes place over time, and whose components vary principally according to characteristics of the individuals immigrating, and of the individuals and structures within the receiving society. I argued that studies have over-emphasized the economic domain of integration as representing the entire integration experience. Five domains of integration and related research were presented, of which two – the economic, and overall health and well-being – were selected for analysis in this dissertation. Within these two domains, the relationship between subjective and objective dimensions of integration was raised and shown to be an area of research that has not been adequately explored, particularly in the area of economic integration.

To explain variations in immigrant integration, the concept of immigrant resources was introduced and extended beyond standard human capital measures to include those of financial, cultural, psychological and social network capital. The question of how resource
levels vary according to an immigrant's class of immigration, and then are used by immigrants to achieve their integration goals, is the principal causal process being modelled in this study. The link between class of admission and presumed levels of resources was articulated, and I argued that again, the economic explanation for differences in levels of integration has been overdone. Instead, I proposed that other resource types, in particular social network resources, offer alternative and potentially equally powerful explanations of integration outcomes.

Finally, underdeveloped areas emerging from the review of the integration literature were summarized, articulated as three definable questions, and translated into three goals of the study. I then stated hypotheses concerning the abilities of the immigrant class members to integrate as defined by the two domains of integration; according to the expected differences in the levels of resources possessed by each; and according to their relative utility of each resource type to the achievement of each of the integration outcomes.

The next chapter provides information about the research methods used to conduct this study. First, data collection, sampling, and sample quality issues are all discussed. This is followed by the operationalization of the variables used in the analysis which is presented in the balance of the thesis.
INTRODUCTION

This thesis explores the topic of immigrant integration as it is played out in the context of individuals’ lives, and so for the most part takes a micro-structural approach. For both theoretical and methodological reasons, it was necessary to conduct primary research: specifically, the unavailability of desired measures of integration, individual resources, and of the class of immigration variable, and the desire to apply specific social network methods to the investigation of social resources. The data used for this study were collected by the author through the South Asian Newcomer Study (SANS).

This chapter gives detailed information on how the data collection was carried out for this study. A discussion of sampling issues is followed by a short section on interviewing, and then a much more involved section on variable definition and operationalization; other technical details are included in footnotes for interested readers. Within the section on variable operationalization, considerable attention is given to the collection of the social network data. This is done because they have an enormous impact on the type of information collected, and many are unfamiliar with social network methods. Finally, the strengths and weaknesses of the methodological techniques employed are assessed.

DATA COLLECTION

The Data

The majority of the data for this study were collected between January and June 1997 in the form of 109 semi-structured, face-to-face interviews with South Asian newcomers to
Metropolitan Toronto. To qualify for the study, these South Asian newcomers had to have arrived no sooner than January of 1992, and no later than July of 1996; had to be born in Bangladesh, India, Pakistan or Sri Lanka; had to be between the ages of 18 and 65; and had to have arrived as either independent or family class immigrants (no refugees were interviewed, for reasons described in Chapter Two).  

Why South Asian Newcomers?

South Asian newcomers were selected for several reasons. In order to investigate current settlement and integration issues, an immigrant group that is highly represented in Canada and a part of the current immigrant stream was desired. This excluded West-European or British immigrants from consideration. As shown in Table 2.1 in Chapter Two, India was one of the top five source countries for immigrants to Canada in 1993, which also included Hong Kong, China, and the Philippines (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 1993a). Of these four countries, India was the most attractive because of the high level of English proficiency among Indian immigrants, thereby fulfilling another requirement that the interviews be conducted in English due to limited funding. Moreover, the flow of Indian immigrants to Toronto is at a high level and has been sustained over several years, permitting the examination of a group that is at least partially established (as opposed to a completely recent immigrant group), but also part of the current flow. Immigrants from India also arrive in both independent and family policy classes, an important fact given the study’s interest in

---

1 Despite these restrictions, four interviews fall outside of these parameters, two conducted during the pre-test in 1996 (they arrived earlier than 1992), and two conducted at the end of the data collection (because of the difficulty in finding Sri Lankan independent class respondents, two individuals in Canada slightly less than two years were interviewed, one of whom was living in the city of Hamilton).
examining policy issues. This study was also interested in examining gender differences in integration strategies, which is permitted by the overall gender balance among this immigrant group (unlike, for example, the Filipino group that is predominantly female and entering Canada to fulfil a specific economic function as nannies). Finally, having established the suitability of the immigrants from India for the study, it then became apparent that to compare the data collected in this study to Canadian Census information, a broader definition of "South Asian" would be necessary, because of the aggregation of the Census country of birth data. Given that the flow of immigrants to Toronto from Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka is also sizeable, it was decided that the country of birth definition would be expanded to include these other three countries.

The Random Sample

The challenge for any study wishing to conduct a survey is to develop a sampling frame which is representative of the population of interest – in this case, relatively recent immigrants to Metropolitan Toronto from South Asia (as defined by the four countries listed above). Random sampling is considered the optimal method of obtaining such a sample, but in reality most studies are unable to meet its rigid specifications and must rely on some measure of scientific creativity to achieve their ultimate goal: to be able to draw conclusions from their study which can be applied to a broader population than that which they interviewed.

Like other hard-to-sample populations, the difficulty in sampling specific immigrant groups lies in the fact that, other than government records of legal immigrants, there are no "lists" of immigrants which are not biased by the list-maker. That is, there may be a list of
South Asian immigrants using a certain temple, or belonging to a certain business organization, or belonging to a certain cultural association, but that list does not include all South Asian immigrants that arrived in Metropolitan Toronto during the time period of interest, and in the immigrant classes of interest (the same goes for the other variables of stratification). For reasons of practicality, studies of immigrants typically make use of snowball samples (e.g. Head 1980), samples based on service use (Renaud et al. 1993), or based on complex census tract calculations (Breton et al. 1990), to name a few.

In Canada, the government-maintained database of legal entrants, compiled from completed immigration documents, is known as the Immigrant Visa and Record of Landing files: it resides with the Department of Citizenship and Immigration (CIC). This is the most complete list of legal immigrants to the country, and because this study is only interested in legal immigration, the issue of immigrants who do not fill out a form does not affect its utility. A request was made to CIC to release the names of a sample of individuals conforming to the specifications above (including their contact numbers where possible) from their landing documents database for the purposes of interviewing them; it is from this master list that a sampling frame was developed, and a sample drawn.²

Sampling proceeded in proportion to the group’s occurrence in the master sample, so that the final sample selected for this study reflects the composition of the immigrant entrants to Metropolitan Toronto during the period of interest, according to CIC records. Thus, the original sample provided by CIC had approximately 50% Indian, 20% Pakistani and 30% Sri

² A sub-sample of names with Toronto area telephone numbers was drawn, reducing the size of the initial sampling frame considerably. The final sampling frame sizes by country of origin are as follows, with the original number of names for each in brackets: Bangladesh=53 (259); India=818 (3303); Pakistan=425 (1593); Sri Lanka=448 (1911), for a total sampling frame of 1744 (7066).
Lankan immigrants, with less than 4% originating from Bangladesh. The final sample of people actually interviewed in this study reflects this distribution in the main, with minor deviations: 5.5% (N=6) were born in Bangladesh, 22.9% (N=25) were born in Pakistan, 28.4% were born in Sri Lanka and the remaining 43.1% (N=47) were born in India.

In order to obtain the randomly sampled respondents for the study, a total of 731 calls were made, with a majority of them ending in wrong numbers or numbers that were out of service; on occasion, the individual had moved and their new number was forwarded to the study, but this was rare. Of the 145 individuals for whom there were correct numbers and who were contacted, 74 (51.03%) agreed to participate in the study, and were actually interviewed. Table 3.1 gives the response rates by country of origin for the randomly sampled respondents only.

**Supplementing Random Sampling**

In some cases – such as with Sri Lankan independent immigrants – it was difficult to reach the required quota of respondents. Such difficulties included finding enough women who had arrived as independent class immigrants, and in particular, it was hard to find Sri Lankan male independent class immigrants. Not only was the list of names provided by CIC in this particular sub-group exhausted (this also happened with the Bangladeshi sample, men

---

3 A small number of respondents joined the sample during the pre-test, in which volunteers were solicited to be interviewed by advertising in South Asian newspapers across Metropolitan Toronto. A list of these organizations was obtained through a CASSA (1995) publication, and used in conjunction with the South Asian Guide: The Business Resource Book (1994). The response to these ads, which were placed in 13 newspapers, resulted in nine interviews (two others were ineligible). As a strategy for contacting this population, then, advertising in these South Asian papers was not successful. This could be related to the level of English ability among South Asians who read these papers, but also to the fact that the study was being conducted by a non-South Asian organization. There is also evidence that immigrants, in particular those originating from countries with suspect government or law-enforcement practices, may be more reluctant to discuss something as sensitive as their immigration experience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Agreed To Participate</th>
<th>Refused to Participate</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total calls referred to here (N=145) include only those calls made which successfully reached the individual whose name appeared in the sampling frame. That is, this calculation does not include the hundreds of calls which ended in wrong numbers, numbers no longer in service, or where the individual had subsequently moved out of the area (return-migrated, migrated to another country, or moved within Canada).
and women); names were also solicited from previously interviewed respondents, and from organizations serving South Asians. Often individuals from the random CIC list were reached, and were willing to be interviewed, but they were disqualified because they had arrived earlier than was indicated in the CIC sample. That is, the CIC sample was supposed to include only individuals who had landed in Canada during and after 1992, but on several occasions, the screening questions revealed that the potential respondent had arrived considerably earlier. This specific scenario was replayed on several occasions, indicating a problem with the information in the CIC database which has yet to be resolved. It is important to note that in such cases, the difference between the individual’s real year of entry and CIC’s information was not insignificant. In some cases, according to the CIC database, the individual came to Canada in 1992, but once contacted, said they had been in Canada since the early or late eighties; in some cases this discrepancy was even larger.

For this reason, some snowball sampling was introduced. Names were solicited from previously interviewed respondents, and from interviewers: they were asked if they knew of anyone who might qualify for the study, and who might be interested in being interviewed. It

---

4 Reasons for this discrepancy could be related to the difference between the time at which an individual actually applies to be a landed immigrant, and the time at which they initially arrive in the country. For example, some may arrive as tourists, students, as refugee claimants or on temporary work permits, and may subsequently change their status at a later date by applying for landed immigrant status. A recent article by Ellis and Wright (1998) discusses the differences in US Census definitions of when immigrants ‘came to stay’ versus their date of immigration, and argues that the two should not be considered equivalent for a variety of reasons, some of which are related to immigrant perceptions of when they decided to stay as opposed to legal definitions of when they immigrated. The problem experienced in sampling from the CIC Landing Document information is similar to some of those discussed by these authors, in that the difference between the official immigration date (recorded by CIC and included in the sample of names released to this study), and the year in which the immigrant actually entered the country, is sometimes very great. That the differences are greatest among the Sri Lankan sample could be related to a change in their application status (from refugee to landed immigrant, for example). The broader problem discussed by Ellis and Wright (1998) is not of concern for the current study: only immigrants who actually arrived in the year specified as their year of immigration are included, so there is no danger of confounding the experiences of those who have been in Canada for a number of years prior to officially immigrating here.
was stressed that any referrals had to be individuals known only slightly, or not at all by the respondent; it was not the goal of this study to interview a small clique of friends or relatives, and so every effort was made to ensure that any referrals were indeed at most acquaintances of the original respondent. In some cases, another family member was interviewed in place of the individual who appeared in the CIC sample, particularly if the person contacted was disqualified because of age or length of time in Canada, but also if their time constraints did not permit them to participate. These substitutions occurred in less than five cases.

Finally, the third way in which people were contacted was through agencies serving South Asians. One of the original study questions related to which class of immigration is more likely to use settlement services as a strategy in their integration. Only a small number of individuals in the random sample reported settlement service use, so a different strategy was adopted of soliciting names directly from South Asian settlement agencies as part of a quota sampling technique. A list of these agencies was obtained from CASSA (1995). Of the thirteen contacted, only two agencies actually provided a total of eight names, of which six were interviewed for the study (others did not meet sample requirements).5

Representativeness of the Sample: Comparing to the 1991 Canadian Census

The main reason that “South Asian” is defined as comprising people from Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka is because they are so identified in the Canadian Census.6

---

5 The final number of respondents who reported using settlement services was too small to conduct any analysis beyond general comments; this component of the study was therefore dropped. The question of settlement service use is one that should nevertheless be investigated in the future.

6 Other countries included in the Census definition of South Asian, but not included in this sample, are The Republic of Nepal and Bhutan. The proportion of immigrants arriving from these two countries is
Descriptive statistics in Table 3.2 comparing the two samples indicate that they are similar on many demographic dimensions. Specifically, the SANS dataset has a slightly smaller proportion of women (44.4% versus 46.4% in the 1991 Census). The mean age of the two samples is almost identical (36.81 versus 36.40 in the Census), though the SANS dataset has a higher proportion of individuals in the 30 to 39 age range (46.2% versus 33.2% in the Census), while the Census has a high proportion of individuals in the 20 to 29 age range (36.2% versus 24.7% in the SANS). The SANS data set has a higher proportion of married individuals (77.1% versus 73.4%) and a lower proportion of widowed respondents (1.8% versus 3.3%), in keeping with the slightly different age structures of the samples.

While it is not possible to break the Census sample down by country of birth, the samples were compared by religious affiliation. The SANS sample has a smaller proportion of Hindu and Sikh respondents than the Census (35.8% versus 42.0% and 10.1% versus 27.1% respectively), with higher proportions of Islamic and Buddhist respondents (25.7% versus 13.0% and 4.6% versus 0.6% respectively). This difference in the sample proportions of Sikh and Muslim respondents may be connected to the distribution of respondents across the four countries of origin. It could be that the proportion of Indian respondents in the Census is higher than in the SANS sample, and Indian respondents tend to be Hindu or Sikh, while the comparatively small, and their exclusion from the SANS study is not considered a threat to the comparability of the two samples.

The Census sample is drawn from the 3% 1991 Individual Public Use Microdata File (PUMF), available on-line through the University of Toronto data library. A sample stratified along the same characteristics as the SANS dataset was drawn, though a narrowing of the sample to the four countries in the SANS sample was not possible due to aggregation of data in the Census. The Census sample was selected based on the year of immigration variable in the Census (which was set to greater than or equal to 1986, taking having arrived in 1991 as being less than one year in Canada). As such, the SANS and Census samples do not include the same immigrant cohort, and as such some variation may exist in their levels of individual resources as a result of changing immigration policies or other international events.
Table 3.2:
Comparison of South Asian Sample from 1991 Canadian Census and South Asian Newcomer Study (SANS) Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>1991 Canadian Census Data</th>
<th>SANS Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class of Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-68</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education (years)</strong></td>
<td>955</td>
<td>12.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earnings</strong>$^2$ (Cnd $)$</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>11,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Employed</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL N</strong></td>
<td>955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^2$ If this value is calculated based on the number of respondents currently employed at the time of the interview, N=68, the mean earnings is $26,912.
SANS sample may over-represent Pakistani respondents compared to the Census, who tend to be Muslim. As previously stated, it is not possible to determine the exact composition of the Census sample by country of origin because of the aggregation technique used to maintain anonymity, so these possibilities cannot be verified — nor is it possible to determine the effect of these religious differences on the comparability of the two samples.

While the mean number of years in Canada is similar among the samples (3.23 in the SANS versus 3.38 in the Census), the Census has a much more even distribution of individuals across the six years of interest, while the SANS dataset is comprised of respondents who have been in Canada somewhat longer: 34.4% of the individuals in the Census have been in Canada one year or less, while 45.9% of SANS respondents have been in Canada four or five years. This difference must be taken into account when comparing the two samples on other dimensions of integration.

Finally, when we compare the mean number of years of education in the two samples, the SANS sample has a distinctly higher level (16.12 years versus 12.70 years) of education than the Census sample. Again, we might look to the differing age structures of the two samples. As well, the higher mean education level in the SANS sample might be a sampling effect, with higher educated people more likely to agree to participate in the interview than less educated people. Indeed, when screening respondents the issue of the importance of an education was raised on more than one occasion by the potential respondent, which might support this explanation. Lastly, the immigrant class variable is unavailable in the Census, making it impossible to determine whether there is a policy effect at work in which a higher proportion of independent immigrants occur in the SANS versus the Census samples. If this
was the case, policy assumptions would explain the higher educational level in the SANS as a result of the higher levels of education found among the independent class immigrants.

**Sample Size, Statistical Significance and the Interpretation of Results**

The sample used in this study is small. Though some bias exists against smaller samples in the social sciences, partially because of misconceptions about the reliability of results and tests of statistical significance (Wilkerson and Olson 1997), these issues are associated more with the methods used to collect the data, than with the sample size as such. Indeed, many have published influential works that have been based on far fewer individual observations than used in the SANS.

Nevertheless, it is important to understand that there are certain limitations associated with conducting statistical analyses using this sample. Most of the statistical techniques applied in this study are based on assumptions that the sample is random. One drawback with the SANS data is that while the majority of respondents were randomly sampled, this is not the case for the whole sample. Yet, this is reduced to a minor problem when other factors are considered. First, the use of the CIC sampling frame to obtain the randomly sampled portion means that in terms of representativeness, the SANS sample is superior to, and less biased than, others not based on such a good frame; in fact, this is one of few studies permitted access to the CIC database, and so is unique in this sense. Second, the comparison of the SANS sample to the Canadian Census Data indicates that despite not being a perfectly random sample, the two data sources are extremely comparable. This suggests, again, that the SANS data is in fact highly representative of the South Asian population in Canada (as defined by the sample criteria), and that random variations in the SANS data have not affected
its reliability. The fact that it is not perfectly random should not, therefore, prevent the
application of such statistical techniques, but these should be used with the understanding that
some associated assumptions (of normally distributed error terms, for example) may be
somewhat in violation.

Further, despite not being of a magnitude to permit generalization beyond these
interviews, the statistical tests applied to this data are the most rigorous: analysis of variance,
t-tests, and regression are all parametric tests, which assume normal distributions in the data
(again, a matter of how the sample was collected, not the number of observations). This
sample more than meets minimal requirements for conducting these parametric tests, though
some (such as the $F$ test for equality of variances) are more sensitive to violations of
probability theory assumptions (which may be a minor issue here, as discussed above)
(Bohrnstedt and Knoke 1994). However, in conducting analyses with a small sample, the
power of the statistical tests used is lower than if a larger sample had been used. That is, there
is an increase in the chance of committing Type II Error – of ignoring real differences in the
data. I have chosen to interpret as “statistically significant” – as interesting to talk about, or
meaningful – findings using levels of probability ranging between $\alpha=0.01$ and $\alpha=0.10$,
whereas typically researchers use a more stringent criterion of $\alpha=0.05$ as the basis for the
largest confidence interval in which they accept that a finding is different from that which
could be expected by chance.\footnote{Indeed, in some instances I apply even less stringent criteria if, for example, the effects of a regression coefficient are large, or if differences of means appear to be large enough as to indicate something different about the two samples from which the means are drawn. By expanding the probability level, I am also increasing the chance that I will falsely reject the hypothesis of no difference, when in fact it is true (this is Type I error, and is equal to the selected value for $\alpha$). It is a matter of balancing statistical rigour with interpretation and understanding of the data as these are reflected, not only in the statistical analysis, but in the discussions held with respondents.} In effect, by using typical levels of probability (between
\( \alpha = 0.01 \) and \( \alpha = 0.05 \) to determine the significance of results, I would risk ignoring real findings from the data, because a larger ‘treatment effect’ is required in a small versus large sample to reach an equal level of statistical significance.\(^9\) Thus, throughout the three analysis chapters, I refer to statistically significant and non-significant findings, but also treat as meaningful those which (1) reflect expectations that have been confirmed by previous research; (2) in the absence of previous research, those which make intuitive sense; and (3) those which are confirmed by the qualitative information obtained from the interviews. Given the strengths of the data, I do so with the knowledge that ultimately, conclusions drawn from this study must remain tentative and indicative of trends that may or may not apply to all South Asian immigrants, or to all immigrants in general.

*Interviewing*

Once a sample of names was drawn from the larger CIC sample, individuals were telephoned by the principal investigator and asked if they would be interested in participating in the study. Respondents were told that the study was part of doctoral research at the University of Toronto, and were apprised of all issues of confidentiality and anonymity, with an emphasis on the voluntary nature of the interview.\(^{10}\) Questions related to sample selection

---

\(^9\) This is because, in calculating statistical significance, sample size is used in the denominator of the formula. According to Norušis (1990a:162), “If the sample sizes in the two groups are small or the variability large, even substantial differences may not be detected. Significant \( t \) values are obtained when the numerator of the \( t \) statistic is large when compared to the denominator. The numerator is the difference between the sample means, and the denominator depends on the standard deviations and sample sizes of the two groups. For a given standard deviation, the larger the sample size, the smaller the denominator. Thus, a difference of a given magnitude may be significant if obtained with a sample size of 100, but not significant with a sample size of 25.”

\(^{10}\) The opening statement was similar in each screening, but was slightly modified depending on the individual’s level of comprehension, interest and reaction. Please see Appendix C for the full statement used.
and the release of their names by CIC were answered as best as possible; only one individual objected to his name having been released, and, though he supported the research and agreed to participate in the study, made a formal complaint to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

This study used a semi-structured interview schedule to conduct face-to-face interviews with each respondent. The majority of these interviews took place in the homes of the respondents, although each was given the option of being interviewed on the University campus or in a local coffee shop or other public place. The geographic locations of the interviews ranged all over Metropolitan Toronto, from Scarborough to Mississauga, as far North as Brampton, with one interview taking place in Hamilton. The average length of the interviews was approximately two hours. Table 3.3 summarizes of this information.

*Interview Materials*

Each interview package contained a consent form, which was read and signed by both the respondent and the interviewer, a questionnaire and a network response booklet in which responses were recorded by the interviewer alone, and a respondent booklet. The respondent used the respondent booklet as an aid to answering questions with multiple responses; the interviewer prompted the respondent to turn to the relevant page of the booklet when appropriate. This cut down on the number of times the interviewer had to repeat response

---

11 This interview was conducted with a Sri Lankan independent class male. An exception was made to include him despite his location in order to achieve a higher proportion of respondents in that stratum.

12 All of the interviews were conducted by individuals interviewed, hired and trained by the principal investigator. Of a total of eleven interviewers (including the principal investigator), seven interviewers were of South Asian origin, one was of Asian origin, and three were of Anglo-European descent; two interviewers were male. The principal investigator conducted the most interviews (36.7%).
Table 3.3: Description of South Asian Newcomer Study Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Information</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Length (hours)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's Home</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Space</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
categories, and also actively involved the respondent during the lengthy interview in a way which may have helped to maintain their attention and interest. Interviews were timed from beginning to end, and were adjourned for brief breaks when necessary.

The interview schedule used in this survey is set in two parts: the respondent section, which lasts approximately 45 minutes to one hour, asks about the respondent’s demographic history, pre-immigration and immigration history, and then a series of questions relating to each of the five types of resources (human capital, financial capital, psychological resources, cultural resources and social network resources), and relating to the integration tasks (economic, cultural, spatial, socio-political, emotional, and health and well-being). The second half of the interview schedule, the social network section, begins by probing for any additional ties that might have assisted the respondent, and then proceeds to ask detailed demographic questions about individual network members, and then questions about the quality and content of the respondent’s ties (relationships). This section lasts between 30 minutes and one and a half hours, depending on the number of ties generated in the first half of the interview. The full questionnaire appears in Appendix D.

VARIABLE DEFINITION AND OPERATIONALIZATION

As outlined in the theoretical framework (Chapter Two), one of the primary goals of this study is to move away from conceptualizing integration in purely economic terms. Others (e.g. Boyd 1989; Jansen and Richmond 1990) have indicated a similar interest in broadening the scope of the definition of integration. This section describes the key dependent, independent and background variables used in subsequent analyses, and shows how they were
operationalized in this study to effectively represent more than the economic dimension of integration. Descriptive statistics for all variables are presented in Table 3.4.

*Dependent Variables: Defining Immigrant Integration*

Chapter Two argues that to fully understand the process of immigrant integration, we need to broaden its definition beyond the economic domain, which is central, but not sufficient, to describing the integration process as a whole. Information was collected concerning five domains of integration – economic, socio-political, cultural, spatial, and physical and psychological well-being. Interest and space constraints mean that the analysis reported here concentrates on just two of these: the economic, and a subjective component representing respondents’ overall health and well-being. These dependent variables, and some general descriptive information, are elaborated upon below (see Table 3.4 for descriptive information for these variables). Goldlust and Richmond (1974) collected information on similar dimensions of integration, though their format was somewhat different.

**Economic Integration**

Employment earnings are typically used as an indicator of immigrant integration. In general, higher income means higher occupational prestige, a better standard of living, and all of the advantages that come with more disposable income (better physical and mental well-being, more leisure time, and so on). While employment income is indeed an excellent objective indicator that permits the comparison of different groups’ and individuals’ economic achievements, earnings may not tell the whole economic integration story. For example, they may not coincide with respondents’ own assessment of their level of integration, which may
Table 3.4: Descriptive Statistics for Analysis Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Labour Force</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Employed(^3)</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent Job(^4)</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Employment Income(^3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,912</td>
<td>15,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,059</td>
<td>27,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Health and Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant Class (Family)</strong></td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital – At Immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University Degree at Immigration</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Before Immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Management</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Labouring</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige of Job Held Before Migration</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years of Job-Specific Experience</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessed English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital – At Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years of Education</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Some Schooling in Canada</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation After Immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Management</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Labouring</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige of Job in Canada</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Full-Time Jobs Held Since Coming To Canada</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Jobs Currently Held</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Money Brought to Canada</td>
<td>$15,858</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Percentages for Currently Employed are based upon the number of respondents in the labour force (N=84); 62.4% of the whole sample was currently employed.

\(^4\) This value is calculated based on respondents employed at the time of the interview, N=68, of which only 59 had valid responses.

\(^5\) This value is calculated based on the number of respondents currently employed at the time of the interview, N=68.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Locus of Control</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Someone in Canada</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Immediate Family in Canada</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Extended Family in Canada</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital – At Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Percent Kin</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Immediate Kin</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Extended Kin</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Friends</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Acquaintances</td>
<td>3.84 E-02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Formal Ties</td>
<td>3.28 E-02</td>
<td>7.57E-02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Network Support</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Emotional Support</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Financial Support</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Job Information Support</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Settlement Support</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Housing Support</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Density</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Cases</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be linked to other factors such as pre-migration occupational prestige or income levels, job satisfaction, and other expectations for their economic achievement in the host country. An individual immigrant’s income may be higher than the average Canadian income, but less than that earned prior to migration, or may merely be the result of multiple jobs, earned in a demeaning and unfulfilling occupational setting, or may not permit the maintenance of the lifestyle to which the individual was accustomed prior to arrival in Canada. Thus, while establishing the factors affecting employment income is important to an understanding of the barriers faced by new immigrants, such a conceptualization of economic integration is nevertheless incomplete. For this reason, three variables are used as the primary dependent measures of economic integration – two objective, and one subjective. These are currently employed, employment earnings, and whether the respondent’s job was equivalent to previous employment before coming to Canada, respectively.

The first objective measure of economic integration examines whether an individual is employed. Getting a job – any job – is a first step for most immigrants to establishing themselves in their host countries. Previous research shows that employment rates among the immigrant policy classes follow a pattern closely tied to number of years in Canada, such that independent class immigrants usually are employed faster and in greater proportion, given their pre-selected labour-market suitability, followed by a gradual closing of the gap by family class immigrants over time (e.g. de Silva 1997; Renaud and Carpentier 1994). Because this study is cross-sectional in design, it is not possible to determine any changes over the long-term. It is therefore expected that family class respondents will have lower employment rates compared to independent class respondents, based in particular on their lower levels of human capital. Social network theory would likely predict a similar outcome by class, but based on
the closed nature of family class connections that would be expected to be kin-dominated, thereby providing little useful job information not already held by the respondent.

The second objective measure of economic integration is employment income, or earnings, probably the most widely used indicator of immigrant integration (e.g. Borjas 1990; de Santis 1997; Reitz 1990). The income levels of immigrants are typically compared to their native born counterparts, and upon reaching parity, or surpassing the income levels of the native born, immigrants are typically considered to be integrated, or at least well on their way to economic self-sufficiency and all of the advantages that this brings. It is impossible to summarize the entire body of research that has investigated the question of immigrant employment earnings, but based on the human capital model of integration, family class, female, younger respondents who have arrived most recently are likely to report lower mean incomes than their independent class, male, older, more established counterparts. Such were the findings of the ÉNI study conducted by Renaud et al. (1993), in which they did not report the dollar value differences due to the longitudinal, probability-based nature of their analysis. Over time, the earnings gap between the two classes would be expected to close, though it is unlikely that the time frame examined within this study will permit such an observation. It may also be that the earnings of certain groups of professionals, regardless of immigrant class, will be depressed as a result of accreditation problems, though based on the human capital model of integration as embodied in immigration policy, this would be expected to affect a larger proportion of independent class immigrants. Based on social network theory, independent class immigrants are also expected to report higher earnings related to their more diverse social context: contact with a diverse group of individuals is expected to result in access to information and jobs in more prestigious, and therefore better-paying, sectors.
The third measure of economic integration taps the immigrants’ subjective perceptions of their economic success, insofar as they have obtained jobs equivalent to those held prior to their arrival in Canada. Academic research on the success of immigrant economic integration rarely examines the equivalency of the immigrant’s employment in Canada, but rather simply looks at whether an individual is employed. Notable exceptions include the work by Richmond (1964) and Renaud et al. (1992) (for an alternative in the policy literature, see McDade 1988). However, obtaining equivalent work, or at least employment in keeping with human capital investment, is an important element in the individual’s attainment of their human potential, and of long-term integration and incorporation into Canadian society. As argued above, policies which select immigrants based on specific credentials, but which are then powerless to facilitate the practicing of these skills and abilities, create waste both personally for the immigrant, and for the Canadian economy.

For example, a medical doctor may arrive from abroad and be unable to practice medicine in Canada. This individual may turn to entrepreneurial activities, and may in fact become successful in this newfound area of employment. However, whether the individual feels as if they are integrated likely depends on the degree to which they resent not being able to practice their profession or trade, as opposed to whether they are able to make a good living in Canada. Based on the human capital model of integration, independent class immigrants are expected to have higher levels of job equivalency, though this is likely somewhat complicated for respondents who are trained in professions that are highly restrictive in assessing foreign-earned credentials (such as medical doctors). Based on the social network perspective, immigrants with a lower proportion of family members in their social networks are expected to have a better chance at obtaining equivalent jobs, because
they are more likely to have access to a variety of different individuals in their networks, some of whom may act as ‘weak ties’ to superior job opportunities (Granovetter 1973): this should be more characteristic of independent class immigrants.

Lastly, household income is used as a measure of economic well-being among respondents not in the labour force, because there are no individual level measures of such integration when examining this sample sub-group. Studies have documented family survival strategies whereby people employed in low-skill, low-wage jobs are able to maintain a family as a result of the pooling of economic resources (e.g. Fernández Kelly 1994; Reitz 1980; Renaud and Carpentier 1994; Sandefur and Tienda 1988; Worswick 1996). With fewer family network members in Canada and higher individual employment incomes, independent immigrants are expected to have equivalent household incomes to family class members. Thus, while this variable can serve as a general indicator of an individual’s economic situation – whether they live in poverty or wealth – it is nonetheless an indicator of household, not individual, integration.  

Part of this analysis involves being able to correctly identify respondents who are active in the labour force, and so this variable is defined first. Unemployment figures can mask underlying trends of labour market entrance and exit, due to life course events such as child birth, schooling or retirement, or due to an unfavourable labour market climate which forces an individual to stop looking for employment altogether. This study includes a measure of the number of people actually in the labour market (either working or seeking employment)

13 For present purposes, the use of this household income variable is problematic. This variable reflects the resources of the household rather than those of the individual, and so addresses different types of questions. Despite these obvious difficulties, the household incomes of respondents not in the labour force will be presented in order to provide some general indication of their economic well-being in Canada.
versus those who, though unemployed, do not consider themselves to be actively seeking employment (and so should not be considered in analyses of occupational outcomes). These variables are described in detail below.

**Operationalization**

**Labour Force Status**

The in the labour force variable is a dichotomy indicating that a respondent is either currently active (working) or, if unemployed, currently looking for work, versus those who are not employed and are not looking and who would not be working even if a job was available to them. In this sample, 77.1% (N=84) reported that they were in the labour force. Of those who were not in the labour force, the majority (N=13, 52.0%) were homemakers, eight (32.0%) were students and four (16.0%) were retired.

**Employed Currently**

Respondents were asked if they were employed at the time of the interview. The variable employed currently is a dichotomous variable defined as employed currently=1, not employed currently=0. More than half of the respondents were employed at the time of the interview (68 of 109, or 62.4%), constituting 81.9% of those in the labour force.

**Employment Income**

Respondents were asked to select a category from a list of incomes that best estimated their personal employment income in the previous year, before taxes. This strategy was used, as opposed to asking for an exact figure, because previous research indicates income to be a highly sensitive issue that is best asked indirectly. Categories ranged from 1=no income to
$135,000 and above (the full listing of response categories can be found in the questionnaire in Appendix D). Since actual incomes were not collected, but only a range in which respondents’ incomes fall, mid-points were then assigned to each income category, effectively translating this variable into a continuous dollar value. The mean income reported is $20,550, the median is $17,500, and the standard deviation 20,978.

**Job Equivalency**

Respondents were asked “in your opinion, is this job equivalent to the last job you had before coming to Canada, in terms of the skill and expertise required to do the job?”. Of those who reported current or past employment in Canada, a minority reported that their job was equivalent to previous work experience (N=24, 27.9%), with 7.0% (N=6) reporting that their job in Canada was superior. The majority (N=40, 46.5%) of respondents said that their job was not equivalent to the one they had before immigrating. These responses were subsequently translated into a dichotomous variable used for analysis, where 0=Not equivalent and 1= Equivalent or better. Less than half of respondents who had had a job in Canada (N=70) reported their job to be equivalent (42.9%); of respondents currently employed at interview with valid responses (N=59), 45.8% reported an equivalent job. Another way of measuring job equivalency would have been to compare the occupational prestige scores computed based on the jobs reported by the respondent both pre- and post-migration. This method might be considered a more objective approach, and therefore potentially more accurate in determining the true comparability of the two jobs. However, it is precisely the subjective nature of the job equivalency measure used that was desired in the analysis, to off-set the more objective measures of being employed and employment income: certainly there are objective elements to integration that do not necessarily coincide with the immigrant’s subjective perceptions of their situation, which this job equivalency variable tries to measure.

---

14 Nine (10.5%) reported that they did not know if the job was equivalent.

15 Another way of measuring job equivalency would have been to compare the occupational prestige scores computed based on the jobs reported by the respondent both pre- and post-migration. This method might be considered a more objective approach, and therefore potentially more accurate in determining the true comparability of the two jobs. However, it is precisely the subjective nature of the job equivalency measure used that was desired in the analysis, to off-set the more objective measures of being employed and employment income: certainly there are objective elements to integration that do not necessarily coincide with the immigrant’s subjective perceptions of their situation, which this job equivalency variable tries to measure.
Household Income

Similar to the question on employment income, respondents were asked to select the category that best represented their total annual household income before taxes. The same response categories were used as for the employment income question, and the conversion of the categorical information done for the employment income variable was repeated for this variable. Responses ranged from a low of “no income” (reported by two respondents) to a high of “$135,000 and above” (also reported by two respondents), with a median income of $40,000, a mean of $42,059 and a standard deviation of 27,520.

Overall Subjective Integration

The second domain of integration that this study reports upon is a combination of two factors which reflect an individual’s overall health and sense of well-being in Canada, and arguably taps their satisfaction with their life in a general way. As discussed in Chapter Two, integration is largely determined by one’s economic well-being, but also includes physical and emotional health. A minority of other researchers have tackled the question of immigrant integration from a broader perspective, including the ÉNI study conducted by Renaud et al. (1992; 1993) which measured a variety of objective domains of integration, including health outcomes. Perhaps most closely related to the SANS theoretical framework, the study conducted by Goldlust and Richmond (1974) also included subjective indicators of well-being.

There are studies which examine specific health outcomes of immigrants, but these are conducted less as part of research on immigrant integration generally, and more as part of epidemiological, or specifically health-related research (e.g. LaVeist 1994; Pescolido 1986; Vega et al. 1991; Yelaja 1988). Recent work by Noh and Avison (1996) points to the applicability of the stress process paradigm to the understanding of immigrant psychological distress, incorporating measures of ethnic social support as possible mediators in the stress process. This research creates an interesting link between the immigration and the health and well-being literatures, and intersects with the model developed in this dissertation.
and successful integration, which were related to the immigrant's satisfaction with specific elements of their lives— their housing, neighbourhood and jobs—as well as with comparisons to their economic and social situation prior to migration. These researchers found satisfaction scores to be mainly a function of the length of time an immigrant had been in Canada, with those in Canada less than five years much less likely to be satisfied. Satisfaction was also positively related to the amount of contact with kin, while education and perceptions of, or experience with discrimination were negatively associated with satisfaction (Goldlust and Richmond 1974:213).

It is difficult to make predictions of well-being among this sample, because of the multitude of factors associated with such an indicator. Immigrants with high expectations of success in Canada may be more likely to feel poorly as a result of poor economic performance; immigrants who have been in Canada longer may also be more likely to feel frustrated and stressed if they have yet to achieve their economic goals, while those who have been successful economically, but have not yet had the time or energy to develop their community or ethnic networks, may also feel more negatively about their well-being. From interviews, many immigrants discussed the all-importance of economic well-being that had to take precedence over all other facets of life, including the religious and social, and that once they had mastered the economic dimension they intended to return to these other dimensions of their lives. Yet, the proven salience of social support (e.g. Lin and Ensel 1989; Noh and Avison 1996; Vega et al. 1991) is expected to play an important role in the improvement of levels of well-being in spite of economic stress. Thus, on the one hand, if overall well-being is as intimately connected with economic success as most previous research assumes, independent immigrants will be more likely to be subjectively well-integrated than family class
respondents. However, if these domains of integration are indeed distinct, family class immigrants may be more likely to be subjectively integrated as a result of their embeddedness in family support structures, despite any economic hardship imposed by lower levels of human capital, and poorer economic success.

*Operationalization*

**Overall Health and Well-Being**

The overall health and well-being variable is a 12-point scale composed of two health-related questions. Respondents were asked to describe their health and well-being (in two separate questions) as follows: "How would you describe your overall [health/well-being] since coming to Toronto?". Response categories for both questions were coded 1=I feel very well, 2=I feel well, 3=I feel somewhat well to 6=I feel very unwell. Similar responses were observed for both variables: for the well-being variable, 71.6% reported feeling well or better; in terms of health, 72.4% also reported feeling well or better. However, a higher proportion reported physical ill-health than a poor overall sense of wellness, with 15.6% versus 7.3% reporting that they felt somewhat unwell or worse. These questions were adapted in part from DaVanzo et al. (1994) and Renaud et al. (1993).

To create the overall health and well-being variable, the two individual variables had to be recoded so that a high value indicated good health. They were then summed to create the 12-point scale, with a mean of 9.70, median of 10.00 and standard deviation of 2.13. The Pearson correlation coefficient is 0.61, which is considered more than adequate for this analysis.
Independent Variables: Documenting Immigrant Resources

The conceptual framework in Chapter Two outlined the reasons for including measures of immigrant resources beyond human capital variables. Information was collected on five different types of resources in all: human, financial, cultural, psychological, and social network capital. Before describing the variables, I will outline once again the logic behind the model of integration used in this study, and the role of these independent variables in this process.

As depicted in Figure 2.1 in Chapter Two, individuals are expected to arrive in Canada with a set of resources at their disposal, and these are expected to vary depending on their policy class of admission and on characteristics of the individual – such as their gender, age, country of origin and marital status (other factors undoubtedly affect this process, such as reason for migrating, but for reasons of sample size I am forced to keep the number of variables to a minimum). These resources are then hypothesized to have differing effects upon the dependent variables measuring immigrant integration. The resources with which immigrants arrive are called “initial resources” or “resources at immigration” or “resources at Time 1”, and are distinct from those which immigrants acquire after their arrival. For example, level of education is measured at the time of arrival, and is an indicator both of human capital acquired outside of Canada (foreign credentials) and of initial levels of human capital that immigrants use when looking for work in Canada. As times passes, an individual may pursue additional educational qualifications: respondents were asked what was their level of education at the time of the interview. This second variable is thus an indicator of Canadian credentials, and of resources which have accumulated over time (“resources at
interview” or “resources at Time 2”). It should be clear from this that the concept of resources is not static, but one which constantly evolves with the immigrant’s experiences.

Social network resources are measured at immigration, in terms of whether the respondent knew anyone in Canada before immigrating; after this, the social support derived from the helping network relates to the accomplishment of specific integration tasks which occur over time, but which do not necessarily coincide with a specific second measurement period. Because social resources are generated through asking questions about specific integration tasks, the longer an individual has been in Canada, the more likely it is that they will have experienced a larger number of these. Finally, financial resources are measured at the time of immigration (how much financial capital did the respondent bring into Canada), and again at the time of the interview (respondent’s employment income; respondent’s household income): notably, these two income variables are considered dependent variables in terms of short-term economic integration goals, moving to intervening variables when later integration is considered in the form of overall health and well-being. Not all of the resources are measured at two points in time: psychological and cultural resources are measured using only one set of questions at the time of the interview.

The following will provide some explanation for the concepts measured, a description and rationalization of the operationalization of the concepts (where appropriate), and finally a description of the resulting variables used in the analysis.
Policy Class of Admission

Family Class

This sample is stratified by class of immigration, to the exclusion of refugees. This variable is of considerable theoretical and policy importance to this study, due to assumptions about independent and family class immigrants’ capacities to integrate based (primarily) on their levels of human capital. As well, this variable measures the effects of structural factors affecting the immigration and integration processes, and so is essential in making the macro-micro link between social structural constraints, and individual autonomy. Though not considered a ‘resource’ as are the other independent variables, its importance to the study’s conceptual framework requires it to be highlighted separately from other demographic, or background, variables.

Operationalization

Respondents were asked “Did you arrive as an independent or a family class immigrant?”. As with the country of birth variable, the class variable was used to screen potential respondents, so its use during the questionnaire was strictly as a check on the respondent’s eligibility to participate. Despite having been screened, a couple of respondents reported different classes of immigration during their interviews, though none reported refugee status. More than half of the sample (57.8%, N=63) arrived as family class immigrants (sponsored), and the balance (N=46) came as independent immigrants (including N=3 investors, N=4 entrepreneurs, N=25 professionals and N=3 assisted relatives). Of

---

17 Assisted relatives are not technically considered independent immigrants, but are grouped with independent immigrants in this sample. The two respondents who arrived as assisted relatives initially informed the principal investigator that they were independent applicants during the screening process, and due to the difficulty finding respondents for the study it was decided to keep them in the sample once the interview was under way. There are differences in the application processes for independent applicants and
those arriving as independent applicants, 69.6% (N=32) were principal applicants. The variable “family” is used to distinguish between independent and family class applicants, coded 1=family 0=independent.

Human Capital Resources

Human capital is that investment that individuals make in themselves in the form of education, occupational training and experience which later ostensibly translates into a resource upon which the individual can draw in order to make further occupational gains, and which is used world-wide as an indicator of an individual’s overall economic, and even social, potential. Economists and sociologist have long used human capital models to investigate the gender gap in earnings (Armstrong and Armstrong 1990; Boyd 1992), to do class analyses of labour market inequalities, and in the area of immigration, to determine the effects of immigrant populations on the economic success of native born populations (e.g. Borjas 1990; Model 1985; Porter 1965; Portes and Bach 1985; Reitz 1980; 1997).

---

assisted relatives: assisted relatives are not assessed by the same number of criteria during the application process, and are awarded bonus points for knowing someone in Canada (20-35 depending on the relationship to the person sponsoring them). Independent applicants must also accumulate a larger number of minimum points (50 out of 100, versus 20-35 out of 70 for assisted relatives) – hence, assisted relatives are less likely to have qualifications as high as those possessed by independent applicants, and may subsequently have the effect of lowering the economic performance of the independent immigrants in this sample. However, de Silva (1997) found that assisted relatives were able to eliminate a considerable proportion of their initial earnings disadvantage over time, indicating that they might not be all that different from independent applicants once they arrive in Canada. Preliminary analysis of variance tests conducted by separating the assisted relatives from independent immigrants indicate no significant differences in the mean values of variables by class of immigration – this will be explored further in Chapter Four.

18 Independent applicants also include a principal applicant’s family (spouse and dependent children under 18). This means that, while the principal applicant (usually a male) was screened through the points system for his human capital resources, his family was not, and these, too, count as independent class immigrants. This fact would seem to further question the validity of the points system as a true predictor of labour market (and general) integration success.
In this study, several questions relating to respondents’ human capital are used. Due to intercorrelations, a limited number of variables is included in each analysis. Information was collected on respondents’ levels of human capital at two time periods: at the time of immigration, and at the time of the interview. With variables measuring human capital at these two time periods, a test of the utility of pre-migration versus Canadian-earned qualifications can be conducted. These variables are described below.

Operationalization – Human Capital at Time 1

Held University Degree at Immigration

Respondents were asked “When you arrived in Canada, what was the highest level of education you had completed?” This 10-point ordinal variable (e.g. 1=None; 2=Some elementary; 3=Elementary, etc.) was subsequently translated into a dichotomous variable denoting whether the respondent held a University degree at immigration; 65.1% of the sample reported such a degree.19

Occupation Before Immigration

Respondents were asked to describe their main occupation before coming to Canada.20 Using Treiman (1977), these were re-coded into a 6-category occupation variable which is reflective of the Canadian and international labour markets. This occupation variable is coded 1=Professional/Technical, 2=Administrative/Management, 3=Clerical, 4=Sales, 5=Service and

19 The original ordinal variable was collapsed into this dummy variable because of the uncertainty of translating degrees and diplomas earned abroad into years of education, as they are understood in Canada.

20 The text of the full question is “What was your main occupation (where you worked the longest hours per week) before coming to Canada (Note to interviewer: Please get a complete and detailed description of this occupation, such as car mechanic in a garage, server in a restaurant, professor of physics...). This
6=Production/Labouring, with more than half of the sample reporting occupations in the Professional/Technical category before immigration (58.7%). Another 19.6% of respondents were employed in clerical jobs, and 12.0% in Administrative or Management occupations; 15.6% of respondents were not employed before coming to Canada.

Occupational Prestige Before Immigration

Again, using Treiman’s (1977) Standard Occupational Prestige Scale, the occupations listed by respondents were converted into prestige scores which have international recognition (Hagan et al. 1996). Due to the international nature of this analysis, and the fact that respondents are asked to describe employment experiences which took place in more than one country, it was essential to use an internationally standardized scale. Of course, prestige and occupation are correlated (in this case \( r = -0.38 \)); the categorical variable is used in preliminary examinations of integration in Chapter Four, while the continuous prestige variable is used in regression analyses in Chapter Six. This variable has a mean of 56.74 and a standard deviation of 11.20.

---

21 More recently, Ganzeboom and Treiman (1996) updated the Standard International Occupational Prestige Scale (SIOPS) developed by Treiman (1977). Major changes include better identification of computing and management careers, among others. Preliminary comparisons to the earlier version suggest that minor alterations might result if these were computed with the revised coding scheme. Future analyses using the prestige variable should account for the revised SIOPS, if only to ensure the currency of the classification.
Number of Years of Job-Specific Experience Before Migration

This continuous variable measures respondents' specific work experience doing their main occupation before immigrating (mean=8.72, standard deviation=8.92). Respondents were asked "How many years did you do this kind of work before coming to Canada?", and represents the years of experience that are used by employers to assess an applicant's suitability for a job. It is worth noting that age is highly correlated with years employed at main occupation (r=0.62), which will be taken into consideration in any analyses including age as a control variable.

Respondent's Self-Assessment of English Ability at Immigration

Four questions ask the respondent to rate their ability to understand, speak, read and write English at the time of immigration (e.g. "If you were asked to rate your ability to understand, speak, read and write English when you first arrived in Canada, would you say that you understood English...". To answer, respondents used a four-point scale ranking their abilities from 1=Very Well to 4=Not at All. Initial responses were reverse-coded to reflect the direction of the variable (so that a high value indicates more ability). These reverse-coded subjective indicators were then combined into a scale measuring overall English ability at the time of arrival in Canada: the scale ranges between nine and sixteen, with a mean of 14.25 and standard deviation of 2.10; half of the sample reported that they spoke, read, understood and wrote English "very well" (scale Cronbach’s alpha=0.92). This language variable is typically correlated with years of education, but is included separately from the other human capital
variables given the range in English abilities by country of birth (with those born in India particularly likely to have good English abilities).\textsuperscript{22}

*Operationalization – Human Capital at Time 2*

**Years of Education at Interview**

Respondents were asked “As of today, how many years of schooling have you completed in total?”. This continuous variable is a reflection of the respondent’s current human capital, including education acquired in Canada (mean=16.12 years, standard deviation=2.96).

**Attended School in Canada**

This dummy-coded variable measures whether respondents obtained any kind of Canadian educational qualifications after immigrating, including course upgrading, work-related courses, English language training, college and university.\textsuperscript{23} Some studies (e.g. Beach and Worswick 1993) have shown that immigrants’ pre-migration human capital has almost no effect on their occupational success in the host country. More than half of the sample (55%) reported some attendance at a Canadian educational institution after immigrating.

\textsuperscript{22} The Pearson’s correlation coefficient between English ability and years of education is not particularly high ($r=.24$) but it is statistically significant ($p<.012$). This correlation between education and language ability is expected, but due to the tremendous importance of linguistic ability to immigrant integration (e.g. McDade 1988), I decided to include this as a separate human capital measure.

\textsuperscript{23} Respondents were asked “Did you ever attend regular school or post-secondary education in Canada?”; responses were coded 1=Yes, 0=No.
Main Occupation in Canada

Respondents were asked to describe their main occupation in Canada with the question “Please describe your current main job.” The same procedure used to convert open-ended responses into the Occupation Before Immigration variable was followed with this variable. Again, this occupation variable is coded 1=Professional/Technical, 2=Administrative /Management, 3=Clerical, 4=Sales, 5=Service and 6=Production/Labouring, with less than one third reporting occupations in the Professional/Technical category (29.1%).

Occupational Prestige of Job in Canada

This variable is used in bivariate analyses of job equivalency in Chapter Four. Again using Treiman’s (1977) Standard Occupational Prestige Scale, the Canadian occupations listed by respondents were converted into prestige scores (Hagan et al. 1996). This variable has a mean of 43.92 and a standard deviation of 14.52.

Total Number of Full-Time Jobs Held Since Coming to Canada

This variable is used in the analysis of job equivalency as a control for experience in the Canadian labour market (or Canadian-earned human capital). Indeed, one of the questions explored in this study concerns the utility of foreign-earned versus domestically-earned human capital, to which this variable is applied. Respondents were asked “How many full-time jobs in total have you had since coming to Canada?” This variable has a mean of 1.3 and a standard deviation of 1.1.

---

24 This question was of course only asked following a positive response to the more general question, “Are you presently employed?”.
Total Number of Jobs Currently Held

In analyzing the determinants of employment income, it is important to control for the number of jobs held by the respondent. The majority of respondents employed at interview reported holding only one job (92.6%), while five respondents reported two jobs; this variable has a mean of 1.07 and a standard deviation of .26.

Financial Resources

Financial resources refer to the financial assets at the immigrant's disposal when she or he enters Canada, typically in the form of cash or a bank balance, but including investments (business and real estate). It is unusual to find measures of financial capital included in analyses, most likely due to their correlation with age, education and occupation. They have been separated out in this analysis in order to investigate the presence of such correlations in the context of immigrant integration, and to determine if financial resources have any independent effect on specific integration tasks. Independent immigrants are expected to possess larger initial financial assets than family class immigrants.

Operationalization

Amount of Money Respondent Brought to Canada

The questions about financial resources are asked mid-way through the interview, in an attempt to ensure respondent comfort with revealing such sensitive information. First, respondents were asked to select the income category from a 17-point ordinal scale which best represented the amount of money they brought into Canada when they arrived, in

\[ \text{Amount of Money Respondent Brought to Canada} \]

The question was asked as follows: “How many jobs do you have right now?”.
Canadian dollars. Mid-points were then assigned to each category, translating this ordinal variable into a continuous one. The mean amount of money brought into Canada is $15,858, the median is $3,500 and the standard deviation is 31,326.32.

Cultural Resources

Cultural resources are conceptualized as being those experiences or abilities possessed by the immigrant that are related to knowledge of Canadian customs, values, and socio-political-legal institutions. This is measured by the number of countries to which an immigrant has traveled. Those who have traveled abroad, particularly in more Westernized countries, are hypothesized to be more likely to find living in Canada less foreign than if they have never left their home town or city in South Asia. The measure used here does not distinguish between travel to Westernized countries, but rather examines the gross effects of greater amounts of travel; such a distinction is one that could be pursued in further research, as a refinement of the hypothesis. In keeping with policy assumptions and previous research, independent immigrants would be more likely to have greater cultural capital, which is also associated with higher human capital (e.g. education, occupational prestige).

26 The question asked "Using the card of income categories on page 14, please read me the number of the category that is the best estimate of the amount of money you (and your family, where applicable) brought into Canada when you arrived. Please give me the estimate in Canadian dollars." Response categories ranged from 1=None, 2=under $2,000, 3=$2,000 to $4,999 all the way to 17=$135,000 and above.

27 Of course, it is likely that being able to travel outside of one's country of birth is also correlated with human capital variables such as level of education. However, the Pearson's r between years of education and number of places traveled to is -.12 (p<.232), indicating that the correlation is not particularly strong (or in the expected direction). For this reason, this cultural capital variable is included in analyses with the confidence that it is measuring a distinct facet of the immigrant's resource base.
Operationalization

Number of Countries To Which Respondent Has Traveled

Respondents were asked if, where and for how long they had ever traveled outside of their country of birth; though a separate question referred to previous travel to Canada, this option is not included in the measurement of this particular variable. Each of these questions was open-ended, and subsequently dummy-coded for each country traveled reported. The continuous “number of countries traveled to” variable was created by counting across all of the dummy-coded travel destination variables, resulting in a cumulative measure for each respondent (low=0 high=9 mean=1.52, standard deviation=1.85).

Psychological Resources

It has often been said that immigrants are, by definition, a distinctive group in terms of their levels of autonomy, entrepreneurship, comfort level with risk, etc., by the very fact that they have immigrated: that is, they are distinctive from their compatriots that they have left behind, and possibly different from native born people in their countries of immigration.

Despite a tradition of research into the effects of personality on other domains — such as in the workplace (Kohn et al. 1983), educational setting (Miller et al. 1986; 1985), or on well-being (Jalajas 1994; Lin and Ensel 1989), fewer have applied psychological measures to the investigation of immigrant integration (e.g. Noh and Avison 1996). Based on findings of a

---

28 The question was asked as follows: “Before immigrating to Canada, did you ever travel outside of the country in which you were born, as a tourist or on business (besides any visits to Canada).

29 The following lists the different countries or geographic areas mentioned by respondents and included in this variable: Africa, Australia, East Asia, Europe, Middle East, South America, South Asia (other countries besides their own country of birth), United Kingdom, United States.
reciprocal, causal effect between levels of personal autonomy, mastery and self-esteem on economic success and well-being (Kohn et al. 1983; more recently, Jalajas 1994), immigrants with higher levels of self-esteem or autonomy may be more likely to be resourceful, economically successful, or satisfied with their experiences in Canada, because they may *feel* more in control of their situation, despite their objective reality, or because they are in fact more successful. This sense of self-control may result in a more positive presentation of self in interviews (again despite their objective situation), or may sustain the individual through long periods of underemployment to seek better work and actually achieve more success, where someone with lower autonomy might return to their country of origin, or give up and settle for poorly-paying, low-prestige employment.

*Operationalization*

**Internal Locus of Control**

I use a six-point likert scale in twelve questions to measure respondents’ levels of autonomy, mastery, perceptions of ability, responsibility and luck. These questions were adapted from those used in Wortley (1996), and have been shown to have high levels of validity and reliability. Each of the twelve statements was read in turn, and respondents were asked to select the number which best described how much they agreed or disagreed with each statement. I reverse-coded five of the questions so that agreement on all of the

---

30 However, previous uses of this scale developed by Rosenberg (1965) have largely been confined to non-immigrant populations. In this study, there were some problems with respondent comprehension, so some questions were eliminated following the pre-test. These problems are likely due to the language barrier and cultural differences, but may also be connected to level of education. Others conducting similar analyses would be well-advised to focus their efforts during the pre-test to developing more appropriate questions that better reflect their respondents’ backgrounds and experiences.

31 The opening statement to the series of psychological questions read as follows: “I am going to read you a series of statements that people might use to describe themselves. Please listen to each statement and tell
questions indicated high levels of mastery or autonomy, as opposed to lower levels which could indicate depression or anomie; those recoded are questions 57c to 57f and 57j in Section C (see Appendix D for the questionnaire).

A factor analysis was used to determine the relationships among the variables, from which four factors emerged. Two variables were eliminated from the analysis because of their low factor loadings, a reflection perhaps of the ambiguity of the questions when applied to this immigrant population – indeed, more than one respondent had difficulty with these two questions (Section C, questions 57g and 57l). Using the findings from the factor analysis, five variables were combined into a scale for “internal locus of control” which displays healthy reliability (alpha=0.71). Other variable combinations indicated by the factor analysis did not perform well in the reliability analysis, and so only one scale is used. The five variables which make up the scale are “Helpless” (“I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life”), “No Control” (“I have little control over the things that happen to me”), “No Solve” (“There is no way I can solve some of the problems I have”), “No Control Over Bad Things” (“I have little control over the bad things that happen to me”), and “Failure” (“All in all, I feel that I am a failure”). Again, because they were reverse-coded, a high value on each individual item indicates that, for example, the respondent does not feel like a failure, does feel in control of bad things, or does not feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life, which is why this variable represents internal locus of control as opposed to anomie. The scale ranges from 8 to 30, with a mean of 20.55 and a standard deviation of 4.66.

me the number that describes how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement”. Response choices ranged from 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Mildly Agree, to 6=Strongly Disagree.
Social Network Resources

This study applies a specific formulation of social capital, in the form of social network resources, to an understanding of the integration process. The connection between the structure of the network, and the types of resources that can be accessed through it – i.e. social support – is well-documented in the literature (e.g. House et al. 1988; Wellman and Wortley 1990). Several issues arise when investigating the relationship between network size, density, composition and support: some people have larger networks, also related to lower density or connectedness, which might provide them with a lot of support, simply because they have access to more people. Network size is of course also related to network composition: to the predominance of kin versus non-kin ties, and to the proportion of strong (or intimate) versus weak (non-intimate) ties. Strong ties are more likely to provide a lot of many different kinds of support, while weak ties are likely to provide less support, but often serve a crucial bridging role to more diverse set of opportunities (Granovetter 1973). Thus, the amount of support is also connected to the actual supportiveness of individual ties: in this way, people with smaller networks could also receive large amounts of support, if their networks contain a high proportion of strong ties. In this study, the relationship between network structure and the provision of different types of support is investigated, as these support measures relate to the accomplishment of specific integration tasks, in addition to reflecting dimensions determined to be important in previous research (Wellman and Wortley 1990).

Conventional wisdom would argue that because they are less likely to have family members in Canada, independent immigrants are more likely to have smaller, more loosely-structured networks comprised of a smaller proportion of kin compared to family class
immigrants, the latter having supposedly immigrated solely for the purpose of family reunification: in this way, the policy class under which an immigrant arrives should be highly correlated with the structure of their network. Given the established relationship between kinship and social support, the structural differences in immigrant networks therefore have implications for the types of support that will be accessible by independent versus family class immigrants (and by extension, for the types of formal settlement services that members of each immigrant class may require).

Social network resources were measured at immigration and at interview. The complexity of the variables measuring those at Time 2 means that each is discussed in somewhat more detail than have other resource variables. Because of the particularities of collecting social network data, a description of how the networks were defined precedes the definition and operationalization of the variables.

**Defining the Network: Name Generating Questions**

This study takes a relational approach to studying social networks (as opposed to a positional approach) (Burt 1980), in which one individual is defined as being at the centre of a set of dyadic relationships (called an egocentric network). Detailed information was collected on only those individuals who were actively involved in the respondent’s settlement experience: a relationship (or tie) with another individual constitutes a resource insofar as that relationship provides the immigrant with assistance or information – otherwise known as social support. In this way, it is the fact that the relationship acts as a means to integration-related social support that makes it a resource in this study, with the individual’s complex of helping relationships forming their social network. This concept of social resources therefore
reflects Coleman’s (1988) concept of social capital which points to the resources to which an individual has access as a result of their social connections. The network’s structure as it affects access to social support is the focus, rather than the content of the ties within the network; thus, while detailed tie information was collected, only aggregated measures are actually used in the analysis presented in later chapters.\textsuperscript{32}

The definition of the network used here is different from the traditional personal communities approach to measuring networks, which asks the respondent to name all of those people with whom s/he is close, including acquaintances. This traditional approach argues that the larger someone’s network (the more ties they have), the better off they are, the underlying assumption being that a greater number of ties provides access to a greater range of social support; in this way, it and the SANS approach are not that different. The difficulty in using the personal communities approach to understand the provision of task-specific support is that respondents will often include people (i.e. kin) in their personal networks out of a sense of obligation, not because the individual actually provides them with any type of emotional or other support. Though defining the networks of respondents in terms of their emotional attachment to intimate and significant people in their lives would likely result in the naming of many people who had helped with integration-specific tasks, it is also possible that more peripheral ties would be omitted. Thus, while the personal communities approach permits the investigation of very personal issues (from whom do we receive social support?\textsuperscript{32}

Mark Granovetter emphasizes the importance of weak ties in accessing scarce resources, in particular job contacts that facilitate job mobility (1973;1985). In fact, it may not even be the presence of a certain proportion of weak ties in the network that facilitates job mobility, but the presence of one tie in particular that has high prestige and can act as a bridge between the ego (person at the centre of the network) and a new occupational circle. While this theory is discussed in this study, a tie-level analysis is not undertaken because of space and time restrictions, but will be performed at a later time. This leaves a few questions unanswerable in the present context, specifically to do with the content of the networks and the impact of this on their utility.
Who can we really rely on in a crisis? How do these helping issues relate to general issues of emotional connectedness, identity formation, behaviour management?), it is not necessarily appropriate for an analysis of the achievement of specific goals as in the present study. It was to avoid a situation where a respondent named people they were “close to” but who were not living in Canada, with therefore no direct role in the fulfillment of integration tasks here, that the SANS study took a slightly different tack.

The definition and description of the network is often a separate section of the questionnaire. Generation questions used in the personal communities definition usually begin by asking “Who do you feel most close to”, followed by “Who do you feel next closest to” and so on. Wortley (1996) used this technique to elicit a network which included increasingly less intimate ties; this section of the questionnaire appeared following an entirely separate section on drug and alcohol use. He placed a cap on the total number of ties a respondent could mention at 20, which is considerably more than the 6 allowed by Wellman (1979) and many others. Wortley (1996) was especially concerned with the presence of alcohol or drug-using ties in the networks of his respondents, and so included an additional question which asked “Are there any people, besides the people that you have already listed, that you got together to drink alcohol or use drugs with on a regular basis in the past year”. This technique allowed him to expand the notion of a network as comprising only ties based on an affective or normative relationship, to include a third means of network membership: interdependence or exchange (Fisher 1982:287). Fisher argues that a network which includes relationships defined by relations of exchange or interdependence is “the most concrete and most comparable across respondents [and allows us] to use our implicit exchange theory of behaviour to identify the people who shape individuals’ attitudes, behaviours, and well-being”.
In effect, it is Fischer's (1982) emphasis on the individuals who affect the respondent's behaviours and well-being that led to this study's experimentation with a different method of generating network member names. As stated, this study is concerned with determining who it is that immigrants turn to for help when they first arrive in Canada and are confronted with a series of concrete settlement tasks, such as finding a place to live or employment, and when they are confronted with more generalized problem solving, such as overcoming loneliness, obtaining financial assistance in times of crisis, or resolving experiences with racism or prejudice. Rather than asking questions about immigration and integration, and following these with a series of questions about the respondent’s helping network, the network generation section is built in to the questions about specific integration tasks and experiences. It was more efficient and logical from the respondent's point of view to be asked about how they accomplished certain tasks as they were being asked about the general outcomes of each settlement task — that is, who if anyone helped them — instead of leaving the generation of the network until after the completion of the main questionnaire.

For example, in the section on integration dealing with employment, a series of questions was asked relating first to the respondent's current employment status, to the history of their employment, and about their current occupation — similar to the approach taken by Renaud et al. (1994). These are followed by the network generating question(s): "I would like to know how you found this job. Who did you ask for help?". Typical responses included “checked the newspaper”, “checked the employment agency”, and “Someone I know” — in which case, the interviewer would ask “what is their name”. These names (first names only) were recorded on the main questionnaire, and then transferred to the network information booklet which was used during the second half of the interview, during which the
detailed network information was collected. This strategy was the same for asking who it was that helped respondents with each integration task examined.

In each section, respondents for whom a particular question did not apply were asked a comparable hypothetical question; for example, if a respondent had not been employed since coming to Canada, they were still asked “If you needed to look for a job, how do you think you would find one?”. This question is intended to provide a measure of the respondent’s *perceived* network support, so that even if the first set of network generating questions based on specific integration tasks failed to elicit names because the respondent had not experienced those tasks, the names of individuals that the respondent is likely to rely on might still be obtained. In other words, it is important for the purposes of this study to understand the full complex of network resources that are, and could be, mobilized by respondents to fulfill integration goals.\(^{33}\)

Finally, two catch-all questions were added at the very start of the network portion of the interview that were intended to make up for any memory lapses on the part of respondent when being questioned about specific integration tasks, and to allow for the possibility that there are individuals who make an essential and important contribution to an immigrant’s integration that is unrelated to the specific integration tasks enumerated above. The first catch-all question employed was “Now, besides the people you have already mentioned, are there any others that you feel have significantly assisted your settlement in Toronto?”, which

---

\(^{33}\) Of course, naming someone who *could* help is not the same as naming someone who *has helped*: there is still the possibility that the named person will not provide the assistance being discussed. However, this approach is still considered to be a closer reflection of the helping networks of these immigrants than would have been generated had typical personal community network generating methods been used, because the questions concern helping tasks and not emotional bonds. Moreover, level of perceived support is an important determinant of well-being (e.g. Turner et al. 1983; Turner and Marino 1994), in that people who perceive themselves to be well-supported are healthier, and so more 'integrated'.
elicited 65 new ties. Network members can be sources of social support, but also sources of strain. To that end, a second catch-all question was included as follows: “Finally, besides these people, is there anyone who YOU have significantly assisted since coming to Toronto, such as lending money or providing temporary housing?” The inclusion of this question hoped to capture some indication of network strain on an individual immigrant, and the effect this might have on their integration experience; this element is not discussed in this presentation, again due to restrictions. This question generated an additional 60 ties, distributed across 31 networks. 

Operationalization – Social Network Resource Variables at Time 1

These three social network resource variables represent the basic fact of knowing someone in Canada prior to migration, followed by the specifics of the relationship between the respondent and person known. These are not standard social network measures (as are

---

Independent immigrants were slightly more likely to report such ties in their networks (30.4% versus 27.0% among family class respondents, \( \chi^2 = .156 \text{ d.f.}=1 \ p<.693 \)), and to have a slightly higher mean number in their networks – 2.14 compared to 1.76 among family class immigrants, \( F=1.04 \text{ d.f.}=1 \ p<.317 \). Because these ties enter the network as a result of a question asking not about help received by the respondent, but given, there is some question as to whether they should be considered part of the core helping network. An examination of the mean support provided by such ties revealed no significant differences compared to ties generated across the other questions. Breaking down the amount of support according to immigrant class showed that independent immigrants actually received slightly higher mean levels of total, emotional and financial support from the ties they claim to have assisted than from the ties generated by questions asking specifically about help the respondent had received (not statistically significant). By contrast, family class immigrants reported consistently lower levels of support from those ties that they named as having significantly helped (mean of 2.51 compared to 2.89, \( F=3.23 \text{ d.f.}=1 \ p<.077 \)). These potentially stressful ties were retained as part of the overall helping network because they do provide support – which is the prime criterion for inclusion in these immigrant networks – particularly among the independent class. Including these ties could underestimate the positive influence of family class networks; however, given that only 27.0% of the family class are concerned, with on average fewer than two such ties per network, any real distortion of network support levels is unlikely.
those collected at Time 2), but are intended to provide some indication of the potential for social resources prior to migration.35

**Knew Someone in Canada Before Migration**

Respondents were asked “Did you know anyone in Canada prior to migrating here?”. This variable is used to determine whether the fact of having contacts prior to migration helps (or hinders) an immigrant’s integration progress. This variable is a dichotomy coded 1=Yes, 0=No, and almost all respondents knew of someone in Canada prior to their own arrival (92.7%).

**Knew Immediate Family in Canada Before Migration**

Following a positive response to the initial question about knowing anyone in Canada at all prior to migration, respondents were asked “Who did you know?”. Open-ended responses were then re-coded into separate dichotomous variables for each response (only immediate and extended family members were noted). Thus, the “knew immediate family” variable is coded 1=Yes 0=No, with half of the sample reporting knowing immediate family in Canada (50.5%).

---

35 These variables were generated based on the types of individuals mentioned by respondents, which included only kinship relations. Another approach in the future would be to add a separate and specific question about whether respondents knew non-kin members in Canada prior to migration, because these could be a valuable form of “weak ties” that respondents do not consider important enough to mention, but which could have an effect on their integration experience.
Knew Extended Family in Canada Before Migration

As stated above, this variable was derived from a more general question about who the respondent knew in Canada. This is a dichotomous variable, with 49.5% of the sample reporting knowing an extended family member in Canada prior to migrating.

Operationalization – Social Network Resources at Time 2

The structure of the network section and the measures used follow Fischer (1982), Wortley (1996) and Wellman (1982), with minor changes appropriate to the topic of immigrant integration. Though other information was collected, the analysis reported in subsequent chapters deals with network size, composition and density, as well as with the social support which flows from the network to the respondent, leaving the analysis of tie-level information for another forum. All of the variables measured at Time 2 are aggregated values across each respondent’s network. As such, they are all counts, proportions or mean values. For example, for each network (N=109), I have calculated the proportion of network members that are kin; mean network density; and the mean amount of emotional support supplied by the network.

---

36 When social network data is collected in the manner used in this study, two data sets result: a respondent data set, in which information about individual respondents is stored, and a tie data set, in which information about each of the 109 respondents’ ties resides. In order to link the two types of information, I needed to create network level variables that are aggregated values across all of the ties for each respondent. That is, among the 109 respondents (and therefore networks), there are 545 ties, about which I have detailed information. To create network level (respondent level) measures, then, the values of the individual tie-level variables had to be either (1) summed or (2) averaged across the respondent’s network, resulting in mean values or proportions. The “AGGREGATE” command was used in SPSS, and the resulting new variables outputted to a new data set, which was then merged with the respondent information. All network level variables are therefore summary measures of the respondents’ ties, rather than measures relating to individual members of respondents’ networks.
Network Size

This variable is simply a count of the number of names generated throughout the questionnaire. Thus, network size in this study refers specifically to the size of the helping network, and may include, but is not defined as, individuals with whom the respondent feels some kind of emotional bond created either through friendship or kinship. Network size ranges between zero and fifteen ties, with the mean 5.00 and the standard deviation 2.57.

Network Composition

Once the name-generation was complete, with a full list of ties in hand the interviewer would then ask for detailed demographic and relational information about all of the ties. The first question asks how the ties are related to the respondent: "What is your relationship with each of the people you have named? Are they a friend, a sister or uncle, a co-worker, a neighbour, or something else?". The interviewer would then proceed down the list of names, noting the relationship of each tie to the respondent as defined by the respondent. Responses were then dummy coded, for example 1=friend 0=not friend, for each type of relationship. I have calculated network variables measuring the mean number and mean proportion of: kin versus non-kin, and in more detail, of immediate kin, extended kin, friends, acquaintances and formal ties. In this study only the mean proportions are used, largely

---

37 Rather than collecting information by tie – that is, asking all of the questions about tie number one, then returning to the beginning of the respondent booklet to ask the exact same questions about ties two through n – each substantive question is asked of each tie member, after which the interviewer moves to the next question. This enables the respondents to maintain a flow of ideas about a specific topic (where do their network members live), rather than about a specific individual (What is your relationship with Parminder? How old is Parminder? When did you first meet Parminder?, etc.).

38 Formal ties are those that have helped the respondent as a result of their organizational function, rather than as a result of a kinship or friendship bond, and include those between respondents and their lawyers, doctors, bank managers or other such professionals. It is particularly important to calculate the
because variables calculating the total number of kin, extended kin, etc. are confounded with network size: people with larger networks are indeed likely to have a larger number of every kind of tie, whereas using mean proportions concerns the specific question of network compositional differences by immigrant class. Thus, there are six separate network composition variables measuring mean proportions.

**Social Support**

Using factor analysis, Wellman and Wortley (1990:562-563) found that five distinct dimensions of support emerged based on eighteen questions about the support exchanged by network members. These included emotional aid, small services, large services, financial aid and companionship; intercorrelations among these five were found to be minimal (about \( r=0.20 \)). These authors also found that job information and job contacts made up a sixth dimension, while information on housing vacancies did not load neatly on any of the factors. They therefore omitted these two types of support from their analysis because of their low occurrence (Wellman and Wortley 1990:563).

In the SANS, time did not permit the inclusion of eighteen separate support questions. Based on this previous work, then, questions were asked about the provision of emotional and financial support, about the provision of information about possible job openings, support finding housing in Toronto, and with finding settlement services or organizations. Thus, the only innovation is the question about settlement support, which could qualify as both small proportion of a respondent’s network comprised of such ties because they are not expected to provide any support or assistance beyond that circumscribed by their organizational role. Though exceptions exist, professionals such as lawyers are not expected to provide emotional support, job information, or assistance finding affordable housing, while these types of support, and others, can be expected from an immediate family member.
and large services, and which was important to include given the study's original interest in determining settlement service use patterns and the means by which immigrants find out about them.

This study measures the mean amount of network support for each of five areas (emotional, financial, employment, accommodation and settlement). The respondent was asked to use a four point scale ranging from 1=Never, 2=Once or twice, 3=Several times, 4=Many times to answer questions like "Has (NAME) ever given you information on possible job openings?". These questions resulted in five variables measuring mean levels of network support, ranging between 1 and 4: mean emotional support, mean financial support, mean job information support, mean supporting finding housing and mean settlement support. In the interests of keeping variables to a minimum, a factor analysis of these five areas was conducted on the network-level data, and shows that these can conceptually be combined into

---

39 Alternatively, I could have measured the total amount of support provided by the ties in the network, as opposed to the mean amount of support provided. Larger networks could provide more support, even if each individual tie provides less support. However, when I investigated differences in immigrant class by the total amount of support provided, rather than by the mean amount, per network, I found no statistical differences. That is, on every measure of support, family and independent class immigrants appear to receive the same or similar total amounts of support from their networks (table not shown). This suggests that the larger networks of independent class immigrants in fact contain more ties that, overall, are less supportive per tie. Because the current investigation is concerned with resource differences by immigrant class, I decided to pursue the effects of having more supportive ties individually, as indicated by significant differences in the mean amounts of support received by immigrant class that are discussed in the Chapter Five, and which are displayed in Table 5.2. Preliminary regression analyses conducted in Chapter Six also indicated overall non-significance of the number of supportive ties versus the amount or support provided by each, or in the case of predicting employment income, less predictive power than the mean support variable. While future analysis of this data will examine the effects of the number of supportive ties on immigrant integration outcomes in greater detail, that presented in this dissertation concerns mean network support only.

40 The questions for the other four social support dimensions were worded as follows. "How often has (NAME) given you emotional support when you were discouraged or sad?"; "How often has (NAME) loaned you money?"; "Has (NAME) ever helped you to find services or organizations related to your settlement in Toronto?"; and "Has (NAME) ever helped you to find a place to live in Toronto?". Information about how much support the respondent gave to the tie was also collected at this time, though is not analyzed here.
one overall measure.\textsuperscript{41} As well, a reliability analysis of the scale indicates that the variables hang together well (alpha=0.79).\textsuperscript{42} The summary measure of mean total support is calculated by adding up the scores across the five areas of support, resulting in a scale ranging between 5 and 20 (mean=9.50, standard deviation=2.36).

Density

Each respondent was asked to define the extent to which the named ties also know one-another, from which measures of network density are calculated. A matrix similar to a correlation matrix is used to plot the ties’ relationships with one another (adapted from Wortley 1996). The network members’ names are transcribed to the x and y axes. Using the question “I would like to know if, and how well, these people know each other. Please select the number which best describes the relationship between each of the people we have

\textsuperscript{41} The proportion of variance explained by first factor=54.22; proportion of variance explained by second=15.35. Thus, the factor analysis indicates a one-factor solution.

\textsuperscript{42} The emergence of one type of support is contrary to the research discussed above (Wellman and Wortley 1990). Several factors may explain this difference. First, it may be related to the specific context of immigration and the support received by newcomers in the achievement of integration goals. Wellman and Wortley’s (1990) research concerned support related to day-to-day activities which were not tied to a disruptive major life event such as immigration, nor temporally specific as many integration activities are. The different types of support discussed in the SANS may not be that distinct in the context of early integration activities, during which time respondents must rely on geographically proximate others for all kinds of support, while in the context of everyday activities, people may be afforded the luxury of distinguishing between their network members and the types of support they choose to receive from them. Thus over time, it could be that the support exchanged in the personal networks of the SANS immigrants will come to resemble that of the East Yorkers. Second, this difference could be a result of the different ways in which networks were defined in the two studies. As stated by the authors, “our study provides information about the moderate to very strong ties that supply Canadians with most social support...and ignores the many weaker ties important for obtaining information and integrating social systems” (Wellman and Wortley 1990:562). In almost direct contrast, the SANS asks about the people who have helped with specific integration tasks which are largely concerned with information collection [a task typically relied upon from weak ties according to Granovetter (1973) and Wellman and Wortley (1990)]. In effect, the SANS network ties are essentially instrumental in nature, while the East Yorkers’ ties are emotionally based, in which case we are comparing apples and oranges.
discussed”, the grid is filled in using the response categories 1=Don’t know each other, 2=Just acquaintances, 3=Know each other well, and 4=Know each other very well.

Network density is calculated using the following equation:

\[ \text{Density} = \frac{\text{KNOWN} \times 2}{N \times (N-1)} \]

Scores on this index can range from 0% (none of the network members know one another) to 100% (all of the network members know one another). All density measures are calculated by excluding the tie between the respondent and network members, although density can also be calculated by including the network member. Total density is the variable used in subsequent analyses, and is the ratio of the total number of connections out of the total possible number (mean=0.68, standard deviation=0.30).

**Background Variables: Demographic Characteristics**

**Gender**

Gender was also used as a sample selection criterion, with the goal a sample comprised of roughly equivalent proportions of women and men. The integration of immigrants is expected to be very different depending on the individual’s gender. Gender roles in countries of origin and in Canada typically negatively affect the types of economic opportunities available to women, as well as the strategies that they employ to achieve their economic goals (e.g. Beach and Worswick 1993; Boyd 1992; Reitz and Sklar 1997). Other dimensions of integration are also expected to vary, due to differing expectations and obligations among men and women. Moreover, immigrants’ resources are expected to vary considerably by gender. For example, it is expected that men will have higher levels of human capital resources, while women are expected to have higher levels of social network resources...
The gender distribution of the sample is 44% (N=48) female. This variable is subsequently renamed "female" and dummy-coded 1=female 0=male.

Age

Age is a third variable used to screen respondents, in order to ensure a somewhat even distribution of respondents between the ages of 18 and 65 (although a very small number of respondents’ ages lie outside this boundary). Age is expected to affect a respondent’s integration insofar as it is related to other characteristics, such as years of schooling and employment experience; size of social network; and level of financial resources. The respondents interviewed range in age from a low of 20 to a high of 68, with a mean age of 36.8 years and standard deviation of 11.1; half the respondents interviewed are aged 34 or under. Two variables are used in these analyses: a continuous age variable (just described), and a categorical variable, coded as follows: 1=20-29, 2=30-39, 3=40-49, 4=50-68.

Marital Status

Likewise, age is related to life course events like marriage and childbearing, events which have implications for the types of opportunities available to an individual, and for the integration strategies employed; most significantly, being married likely buffers individuals from serious economic difficulty due to the presence of a second income (Renaud and Carpentier 1994). Respondents were asked if they were married, and if not, what was their marital status. The majority of the sample is married (77.1% N=84), with 20.2% (N=22) never married, 1.8% (N=2) widowed and 0.9% (N=1) divorced. The dummy variable
"married" (coded 1=married, 0=not married) is used as a background variable in most analyses.

Country of Birth

As previously stated, country of birth is one of the key sample selection variables. This variable was selected (1) to be able to better compare this sample to data on South Asians in the Census, which contains the country of birth variable; (2) to provide some means of restricting the pre-migration experiences of the respondents, so that for example Pakistanis born in the Middle East were not included in this study; (3) because country of birth is a component of ethnic identity\(^{43}\), and to some extent, South Asians, if not implicitly a group, are treated as one here in Canada; and (4) because it was one of the descriptive variables available in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration’s Landing Documents. Although all respondents were screened by the principal investigator prior to being interviewed, which included identifying their country of birth, respondents were asked again to identify “what country were you born in” as a simple check. Again, 5.5% (N=6) were born in Bangladesh, 22.9% (N=25) were born in Pakistan, 28.4% were born in Sri Lanka and the remaining 43.1% (N=47) were born in India. Two types of variables are used: the categorical country of birth

---

\(^{43}\) There are many ways of defining a person’s or ethnicity, though that is not the primary use of this variable here, as the ethnic make-up of South Asia is more complex than any one of these variables. These definitions can be ‘racially’ based, or based on linguistic or religious affiliation, as in the case of people who identify themselves as Jewish, or as Québécois. In the US and Canadian Censuses, country of birth is used to group people according to similar geographic background (and by implication, socio-economic and political sameness), though country of birth is also often used to indicate shared language, religion and culture, among other things. This method of defining ethnic identity reflects more of a social structural approach which sees these categories of attributes as fixed, involuntary, and based on some underlying “truth” which reveals something about the individuals possessing them (e.g. Gordon 1964; Isajiw 1974; Porter 1965). By contrast, other methods ask the respondent to ‘self-identify’ to which group or groups they feel like they most belong, which reflects the notion that ethnic identity is fluid and changes over time, and under different circumstances (e.g. Breton 1991; Gans 1979).
variable, coded 1=Bangladesh, 2=India, 3=Pakistan and 4=Sri Lanka, and four dummy variables for each country; India is the reference category in any multivariate analysis.

**Years in Canada**

Number of years in Canada is derived from the respondent’s year of immigration, another variable used to stratify the sample. As time passes, immigrants become more self-sufficient: in particular, knowledge and use of official languages improves, conditions in the country of reception become more familiar, and immigrants’ personal networks become larger (Renaud et al. 1993). It is essential to control for length of time in Canada, therefore, when examining outcomes such as occupational success.

Also used as a screening question, respondents were asked again during the interview “What year did you move to Canada?”. Except for two outliers collected in the pre-test (one arriving in 1989 and the other in 1991), all respondents arrived within a five-year time span beginning in 1992 and ending in early 1996: 20.2% (N=22) arrived in 1992, 24.8% (N=27) arrived in 1993 and 1994 respectively, 20.2% (N=22) came in 1995 and 8.3% (N=9) came in 1996. Year of immigration is subsequently recoded into a continuous variable Years in Canada, by taking the year the interview was conducted and subtracting the year of immigration. In order to facilitate the bivariate analysis, the two outliers are collapsed into the adjacent “five years” category (the two arriving before 1992), and respondents who had not been in Canada a full year are included in the one year category. Thus, the final variable used in all of the analyses is the truncated continuous number of years in Canada variable: 12.8% reported being in Canada one year, 18.3% two years, 22.9% three years, 26.9% four years and 19.3% five years (mean=3.21 years, median=3.00 years, standard deviation=1.31).
STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE STUDY

There are advantages and disadvantages to conducting a small study that focuses on the detailed processes involved in immigrant integration, and in particular immigrant social networks. The disadvantages are that the number of individuals sampled for the study does not permit statistical generalization beyond this sample, and so conclusions must be treated with more caution. The advantages of such a study, however, lie in the intimate details of the immigrants' lives, especially in obtaining their very personal reactions and assessments of the immigration and integration processes. This type of rich detail is very often missing in the larger scale, highly generalizable studies that rely on available data. The trade-off clearly involves sacrificing statistical significance and greater confidence in the applicability of the study's findings beyond those interviewed, for dense, detailed information about questions not ordinarily asked on the larger scale surveys or censuses. The following details some of the important strengths and weaknesses of this study's sample, and data collection methods.

Sample Strengths and Weaknesses

The opportunity to use the random sample provided by CIC is an extraordinary one. Unquestionably, it is one of this study's great strengths, but this sample was not gathered entirely using random techniques, nor is it large enough to generalize beyond this sample. There are small numbers of respondents in a few sub-categories, in particular Sri Lankan independent class immigrants of both sexes, and the Bangladeshi sub-sample is so small as to be inadequate to draw any real conclusions concerning respondents from this country of birth.

Of more importance are limitations to generalizability based on the quality of the CIC sampling frame itself. This sample was limited to those immigrants reporting 'English ability'
on their landing document, so this sample clearly does not address the integration difficulties of newcomers with little or no English ability; this study is therefore not concerned with those newcomers who typically have the most difficulty in integrating (e.g. Burnaby et al. 1987; McDade 1988).

Of course, there are also common sampling effects that may be at work, such as educational level of respondents, which may be related to the response rate. Educated individuals are more likely to agree to participate in the study, a fact which again would serve to make the findings less generalizable to immigrants who tend to have a harder time integrating. The higher level of education of this sample, relative to the Canadian 1991 Census, has already been demonstrated, though again this could be related to the slightly different age structures of the two samples.

Perhaps most importantly, the SANS sample is a sub-set of those entries that had telephone numbers, and so leaves out those who arrived, likely with no contacts here, and went to very temporary accommodations before seeking a more permanent place to live.\(^{44}\) This sub-sample therefore concerns immigrants, both independent and family, who had a telephone number (of an acquaintance, friend or family member) in Canada at the time of immigration; this similarity between independent and family class immigrants in previous contacts in Canada, however tenuous, may in fact blur differences between the immigrant classes that would be visible in a sample of all eligible immigrants (i.e. those with and without

---

\(^{44}\) This is not to say that all of the respondents interviewed actually knew people here in advance, as evidenced by other questions on the questionnaire. Some families sent one individual ahead to find a place to live – often the male head of the household, with the female head of the household and other dependents following later. The fact that some of the respondents reported telephone numbers on their landing documents as a result of such a scenario cannot be equated with those who were joining established families, relatives or friends, in terms of the social connections they had access to and the amount of immediate support potentially at their disposal.
valid telephone numbers). Immigrants omitted from the SANS sample are potentially individuals with the least amount of social support in Canada, but also may be a group with a large amount of independent financial support and human capital upon which to rely. Such self-reliance is likely more characteristic of the independent class, who are more likely to arrive without knowing anyone in Canada.

Correcting this sampling problem while using the CIC database would not be an easy task. Trying to match names and addresses (where available) with telephone numbers using the telephone directory is an extremely time-consuming and unrewarding task, largely because the names are common to many South Asian individuals. Even if this strategy resulted in successful matching of names with telephone numbers, immigrants that appear on the list, but who are not listed in the telephone book (for whatever reason) would still be left out. These omissions could include the youngest and oldest immigrants living with family members, newcomers who have joined another family and have not yet moved into their own accommodations, a larger proportion of females (in many households, it is the male’s name that is listed in the directory, a trend common to immigrants and non-immigrants), and finally immigrants who have subsequently moved to another country (such as the US), or returned home. This omitted group is potentially extremely heterogeneous in terms of their demographic characteristics, individual resources and integration experiences, making it very difficult to speculate as to how the SANS sample would differ with their inclusion.

Only one strategy could overcome these sampling difficulties, and that would be to involve the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in a study and have the sampling take place at the points of entry into Canada. This of course would require a large amount of funding and would entail many person-hours and the meticulous training of immigration
officials in a range of geographical locations; such reliance on individuals not trained in the
details of the research craft would undoubtedly introduce problems of its own. Thus, despite
the inaccuracies introduced by sampling from a portion of the entire list of immigrants to
Toronto, the strategy employed in the SANS is still considered to be superior to many of the
alternatives which have flaws of their own.

Moreover, given the comparison of the SANS dataset to the Canadian Census on a
variety of characteristics, as a case study the use of this sample is instrumental in illuminating
the integration experiences of South Asian immigrants to Metropolitan Toronto who arrived
in Canada between 1992 and 1996 as either family class or independent class immigrants. If
anything, the results from the SANS can be said to underestimate the difficulties of immigrants
from this population, something to keep in mind when the analysis chapters are presented.

*Strengths and Weaknesses of the Name-Generating Approach and Network Information*

The strength of the approach used here lies in the specificity of the questions used to
generate the network. Asking about very definite experiences — like who helped the
respondent find their current job — eliminates some of the ambiguity inherent in some other
approaches to network generation which rely heavily on feelings of support, love and
friendship, but which often get confused with obligation. The SANS strategy stems from the
argument that simply because you love someone does not mean that they are going to be able
to help you find a job, or information about English classes in Toronto, or about how to apply
for a health card: the presence of loved ones in a respondent’s personal community network
does not necessarily translate into practical assistance related to immigrant integration in
Toronto. In effect, it is the specific and foreign nature of so many of the tasks confronting immigrants when they first arrive in a country that necessitated innovation in the way in which this study measured their networks.

Despite the strengths of this approach, there are many opportunities for improvement. One concern is this method’s focus on the instrumentality of the network to the exclusion of the emotive or spiritual elements which make up an individual’s total support system. To be sure, adding more network generation questions was simply not possible given the length of the questionnaire, but the question remains as to how separate are these different elements of an individual’s network? Because information about the respondents’ intimate ties as such was not collected, it is unclear whether the people who helped these respondents with finding work are also the same people that the individual would identify as his or her intimates.45

Beyond interviewer errors, respondents themselves tended to omit certain types of individuals from their “active network”, particularly people who are very close to them, such as their spouses. This finding was also reported by Fisher (1982:289), who calls these omitted ties the “taken-for-granted associate”: that is, people who are so involved in the respondents’ lives that they fail to be noticed when it comes to a specific question about who provides help. It is also possible that respondents omitted important ties because they wanted to speed up the interview process, a source of error which can likewise be applied to interviewers who were

---

45 This may not be entirely true, because when we ask more detailed questions about the respondents’ ties, we do in fact get measures of tie strength. As well, when a respondent mentions the same name, for example their mother-in-law or sister, as having been instrumental in their early integration, it is possible to get a sense of the degree of emotional closeness between the respondent and tie. However, it would be ideal to design a method of network generation which would account for all elements in a network – instrumental and emotional. The problem of course is time.
ineffective at probing for additional names. Similar problems to those reported by Fisher (1982) were also experienced: respondents misinterpreting questions, failing to recall the correct name in relation to the task they were helped with, and in some cases possibly reacting to the negative stereotype of the needy immigrant, and therefore reporting that they had no help, from anyone, ever.

While the majority of the error associated with the network information is expected to have been incurred during the generation of names, respondents may also have had difficulty recalling the details surrounding their ties accurately – a tie’s age, level of education, or occupation, for example. Confusion over actual levels of support is also possible, wherein some respondents may have tended to under- or over-estimate their tie’s level of involvement; the same concern can be applied to the respondent’s recall of the frequency and locations of contact with each network member.

Yet, in his review of the literature on network data and measurement, Marsden (1990) indicates that while respondents have been shown to have difficulty reporting on transactions within highly specific time frames, their tendency is to accurately represent overall social network information (Marsden 1990:447). In effect, people tend to report on their ‘typical’ social relations, reducing fears of information being skewed by the recollection of a particularly atypical relation. Network generating questions relating to specific time frames

---

46 An examination of interviewer effects on the network sizes generated indicates that two interviewers tended to produce slightly smaller network sizes relative to the principal investigator, largely as a result of personal transcription errors and a failure to follow instructions (results not shown); these effects are, however, considered minimal.

47 Some of the potential weaknesses with this approach to network generation are also likely involved in the determination of settlement service use patterns. Respondents may have under-reported settlement use because of poor memory recollection, a desire to appear self-sufficient, or because the question was not properly asked by the interviewer.
are avoided (such as “Who did you confide in over the past six weeks”); rather, the generation of names is attached to specific, major integration tasks, which may assist respondent recall.

In terms of the information generated concerning network members, Marsden (1990:451) also reports high consistency on what he calls network members’ “observable features such as demographic characteristics”, although reporting on relational characteristics (such as the reciprocation of support, and emotional attachment or closeness) tends to be less accurate.

Thus, despite some weaknesses, confidence in the network material collected in this study is high.

General Methodological Strengths and Weaknesses

Having incorporated previously tested questions into the interview schedule, confidence in the validity of the interview information is high. In only a few instances was it determined that some questions were not clear or specific enough to elicit the desired information from respondents, and fortunately not in questions central to the investigation.

The fact that the questionnaire is highly structured ensures that, ultimately, standardization of information across interviewers is maintained, particularly compared to studies using open-ended and highly interpretive questionnaire formats.

The results of any study are only as reliable and valid as its tools and methods. Certainly the results from this study are somewhat interviewer/interviewee-specific, and if it was reproduced with different interviewers and respondents, it is likely that some variations in the findings could emerge. Nevertheless, I am confident that the results of this study were not manufactured through systemic biases in the questionnaire construction or administration of the interviews.
SUMMARY

Having discussed the methodological issues associated with this study, one final comment concerning the analysis of a small sample is warranted. The constraints imposed by the small sample size on the statistical techniques available, and particularly on the complexity of multiple regression models that can be constructed, certainly limit the power of this study to some extent. Numerous variables collected have been omitted from the analysis, largely as a result of this small sample size problem, but also due to space constraints. This thesis cannot and does not attempt to answer every question concerning immigrant integration.

It is easy to become obsessed with numbers and their meaning when conducting such an analysis, and perhaps the strength of working with a small sample is the constant reminder that the numbers are merely indicators of trends and patterns that need to be contextualized and theorized. Numbers do not speak for themselves. The power of the data collected in this study is in its rich detail, and especially in the quotes obtained from the 109 individuals who donated their time to the exploration of these issues. While there are methodological weaknesses in this study, the overall quality of the data is considered to be high; the consistency with which various issues were raised in general discussion by the immigrants themselves reinforces this investigator's belief that this data, while not representative of any immigrant population in the statistical sense, is at least so in its depiction of the experiences of many immigrants. It is the general description and discussion of the overall level of integration among respondents that is presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR:
A PRELIMINARY LOOK AT LEVELS OF INTEGRATION

INTRODUCTION

Three questions will be addressed in this chapter: (1) To what extent are the economic and well-being domains of integration related? (2) Which immigrant class is most successfully integrated in terms of each of the four dependent measures of integration? (3) Which sample sub-groups are most disadvantaged, according to the definition of integration in this study? In addition, due to the centrality of the economic dimension to subsequent stages in the integration model presented here, it is important to determine what factors, if not being employed or being in the labour force, are implicated in the integration of respondents not in the labour force. This preliminary analysis of integration will therefore be presented separately by labour force status.

This chapter first discusses intercorrelations between the integration indicators, and the reasons for presenting these separate indicators. This is followed by a presentation of bivariate relationships between the four dependent integration variables – being employed, employment income, and job equivalency reflecting the economic dimension of integration, and the subjective dimension represented by overall health and well-being – and class of immigration, and the five demographic variables: gender, marital status, age, country of birth, and number of years in Canada (these variables were all defined in Chapter Three). The analysis of the economic variables is confined to respondents in the labour force only or who were employed at interview (depending on the variable), as these do not apply to respondents not in the labour force. Levels of health and well-being are also analyzed separately for those
in the labour force, so that they can be compared to economic levels of integration among the same sub-sample. In all cases, group differences (chi-square tests) are statistically nonsignificant unless reported in the text, with the added caution that due to the small sample size, statistical significance is interpreted more liberally (see Chapter Three for the discussion of statistical significance and interpretation).

The last section presents a discussion of levels of integration among respondents not in the labour force. Due to the small number of cases and the predominance of females, comparisons are made by class of immigration and with females in the labour force, according to differences in household income levels, and levels of overall health and well-being.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN INDICATORS OF INTEGRATION

As depicted in Figure 2.1, two domains of integration are analyzed here: the economic domain, because of its centrality in achieving integration in the host country, and a subjective domain measured by overall health and well-being. The economic domain is represented by three separate variables, each of which is considered to signify a theoretically distinct part of the overall integration process: two objective indicators, being employed, and employment earnings, and one subjective indicator, perception of job equivalency. In terms of the overall relationship between the four indicators of integration, Table 4.1 shows very low Pearson correlations between each of these economic measures and overall health and well-being, regardless of the sub-sample being analyzed (all are between $r=.056$ and $r=.154$, and none are statistically significant). This suggests that contrary to previous research, the assumption that the economic dimension of integration effectively represents an immigrant’s integration
Table 4.1:
Inter-correlations Among Indicators of Integration, By Different Sub-Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Being</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Equivalency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents N=109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Income</td>
<td>.392***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Equivalency</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.268*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Health and Well-Being</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents In the Labour Force Only</td>
<td>N=84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Income</td>
<td>.513***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Equivalency</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Health and Well-Being</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents Employed at Interview Only N=68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Equivalency</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.269*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Health and Well-Being</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significant at p<0.01 level (two-tailed test)
**  Significant at p<0.05 level (two-tailed test)
*   Significant at p<0.10 level (two-tailed test)
experience is incorrect. That at least one of these economic measures of integration is not more highly correlated with well-being is nevertheless surprising, because of the established link between general poverty and health and well-being. The subjective indicator job equivalency is not highly correlated with being employed among respondents in the labour force ($r = .170$), which also indicates that these measures of integration indeed represent separate elements. Equivalency is however correlated with the earnings variable, hovering around .30 ($p < .05$ or better, depending on the sub-sample examined); whether this means that the two measures are separate but related, or that respondents with higher incomes are more likely to report equivalent jobs because they are just happier, is discussed below. Finally, as expected there is considerable intercorrelation between the earnings variable and being employed ($r = .513$, $p < .010$), which is one reason why the analysis of these two variables was conducted on separate sub-groups.

From previous chapters, it should be obvious that the selection of these four variables for analysis is not intended to represent the whole integration experience; this would require the analysis of the other domains of integration discussed previously. The purpose of analyzing more than one domain of integration in this thesis, and within these of examining both subjective and objective dimensions of integration, is to expand the accepted theorization of the integration experience. Other researchers may choose to develop this model differently. Based on the above discussion, however, the selection of these four variables provides an excellent starting place for such a reconceptualization. The following sections present a preliminary descriptive discussion of the ways in which the respondents vary in their achievement of integration along these two domains.
GETTING A JOB

In this study, respondents were asked if they were employed at the time of the interview, and if so, whether their job was full or part-time\(^1\), and how many full- and part-time jobs they have had in Canada in total (as described in Chapter Three). Certainly being employed part-time as opposed to full-time is associated with lower employment earnings, an important consideration when examining the determinants of immigrant earnings, while the number of full- and part-time jobs held since immigrating gives an indication of the respondent's occupational advancement. Table 4.2 gives the proportion of employed respondents by demographic variable categories, as well as chi-square tests to see if any apparent differences between variable categories are due to statistically significant differences in the sub-groups themselves. Table 4.3 presents the proportion of respondents employed at interview by the full- or part-time designation of their job by each of the background demographic variables; it is to these two summary tables that the majority of the discussion in this section will refer.

Within the entire sub-sample of individuals in the labour force (N=84), the employment rate is 81.0% (see Table 4.2). Of those employed at the time of the interview (N=68), 75.0% were employed full-time (see Table 4.3). Table 4.4 indicates that the majority (60.8%) of respondents employed full-time reported having had only one full-time job in Canada; therefore we know that in discussing their employment during the interview, these

---

\(^1\) Because this variable is not analyzed elsewhere it was not defined in Chapter Three. In reference to the job discussed as their main occupation in Canada, respondents were asked "Is it full-time or part-time". This variable is simply a dichotomous 1=Full-time 2=Part-time. Alternatively, respondents could have been asked to estimate the number of hours they work per week on average. Such a continuous measure would have permitted a finer distinction between the hours worked and employment earnings, a change that would be recommended in future research of this kind.
Table 4.2:  
Analysis of Variance in Being Employed,  
by Respondent Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Employed (%)</th>
<th>Chi-Square Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Population</strong></td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class of Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>$\chi^2=1.56$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>$\chi^2=0.566$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>p&lt;0.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>p&lt;0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>$\chi^2=5.236$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>d.f.=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>p&lt;0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and older</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>$\chi^2=8.746$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>d.f.=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>p&lt;0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or less</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>$\chi^2=7.394$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>d.f.=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>p&lt;0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to eight</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statistics are calculated based on the number of respondents who reported that they were in the labour force – that is, either employed or looking for work – at the time of the interview. Homemakers, full-time students and retirees are therefore excluded: N=84.
Table 4.3:
Proportion of Respondents Working Full or Part-Time,
by Respondent Demographic Characteristics, Employed Respondents Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Full-Time (%)</th>
<th>Part-Time (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Population</strong></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>68 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class of Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and older</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or less</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to eight</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individuals were discussing their first and only full-time job in Canada. Close to a quarter of full-time employed respondents reported having had two full-time jobs in Canada, while 15.7% reported holding three or more full-time jobs. Moreover, of those employed full-time at interview, a majority (64.7%) reported never having held a part-time job in Canada (see Table 4.4).

By contrast, of those employed part-time at interview, almost fifty percent (47.1%) have held only one such job in Canada, with 29.4% reporting having held two and 23.5% three part-time jobs since coming to Canada (please see Table 4.4). It is not surprising that a high proportion of respondents working part-time have held multiple part-time jobs, as this is a common strategy in order to fulfill economic obligations among native born and foreign born workers alike. However, it is also important to note that more than one third (35.3%) of respondents working part-time at interview have never held a full-time job in Canada. Even though half (52.9%) of part-time workers have held full-time work here, this seems to suggest that those who are skilled or lucky enough to find full-time work are likely to continue holding such work, while it may be more difficult to make the leap to full-time employment for a certain group of immigrants once part-time work has been established.

Immigrant Class

Turning to employment by immigrant class, as expected independent class respondents report a higher employment rate (86.8% compared to 76.1% of the family class, see Table 4.2). These rates are higher than those obtained by Renaud et al. (1993), for whom a higher proportion of independent versus family class immigrants were employed (60.8% compared to 53.1%) over the course of their first 140 weeks in Canada. It is not clear how comparable
Table 4.4:
Number and Proportion of Respondents Employed at Interview by Number of Full- and Part-Time Jobs Held in Canada, by Immigrant Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed Full-Time</th>
<th></th>
<th>Employed Part-Time</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Full-Time Jobs Held in Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (50.0)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 (70.4)</td>
<td>12 (50.0)</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>2 (33.3)</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 (18.5)</td>
<td>7 (29.2)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
<td>2 (8.3)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Part-Time Jobs Held in Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (74.1)</td>
<td>13 (54.2)</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (22.2)</td>
<td>2 (8.3)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4 (66.7)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
<td>5 (20.8)</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2 (33.3)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
these results are, given that the SANS includes individuals in Canada as long as five years, and is based on a cross-sectional as opposed to longitudinal analysis. Table 4.3 shows that of those employed at the time of the interview, the majority of independent and family class respondents were employed full-time (81.8% and 68.6% respectively); while the differences are not large, independent class respondents are more likely to be working full-time in Canada, which is typically related to more highly-skilled and better paying work. Finally, Table 4.4 shows that again, independent class immigrants are more likely to be in their first full-time job (70.4%), while a higher proportion of family class respondents have held two or more full-time jobs in Canada (50.0%); family class respondents working part-time are also more likely to have held multiple part-time jobs as well (63.7% compared to 33.3% of independent class respondents). This is of course related to the number of years a respondent has been in Canada, but may also be related to the sector in which the respondent is employed.

**Gender**

Also not surprising is the higher employment rate among males (83.1% versus 76.0% of females), though this difference is not statistically significant (see Table 4.2). A majority of both males and females employed at interview report working full-time, though this proportion is higher among the former (79.6% compared to 63.2%; see Table 4.3). A higher proportion of females is still in their first Canadian full-time job (66.7%), while a slightly smaller proportion of males report being so (59.0%) (table not shown). A much higher

---

2 However, when the employment rates are calculated on the entire sample and not simply those in the labour force, there is a significant difference. Males are much more likely to be employed, at 80.3% compared to only 39.6% of females – $\chi^2=19.004$, d.f.=1, $p<0.0001$. Thus, it is important to distinguish in the analysis between those who are actively engaged in either working or looking for work, which goes some distance to explaining gender effects and the increased likelihood for women to be at home with children.
proportion of females employed part-time at interview say that they have never held a full
time job in Canada (57.1% compared to 20.0% of males), and a higher proportion of females
working part-time also report having held multiple part-time jobs (57.1% versus 50.0% of
males); however, in each of these last two comparisons cell sizes are extremely small (table
not shown). Overall, however, the greater propensity for female than male respondents to
perform part-time work is not a surprising result, given that the same holds true in the general
labour market. What is perhaps more interesting is that a majority of females are in fact
working full-time. As far as obtaining employment, then, the female respondents in this
sample who are in the labour force appear to be at least as successful as their male
counterparts.

Breaking down the relationship between being employed part- or full-time by
immigrant class and gender is also instructive. Table 4.5 indicates that a majority of all
independent and family class respondents are employed full-time regardless of gender, though
female and male independent immigrants have slightly higher rates than either male or female
family class respondents; female family class respondents have the highest rate of part-time
employment, with half working part-time (50.0%). This fact will undoubtedly impact on other
elements of their economic integration, such as employment income, which is explored below.

Marital Status

Among respondents in the labour force, slightly higher employment rates were found
among married respondents (82.8% versus 75.0% among unmarried respondents), though this
Table 4.5:
Proportion of Respondents Employed Full- and Part-time at Interview,
by Immigrant Class and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>7 (77.8)</td>
<td>20 (83.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>2 (22.2)</td>
<td>4 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
difference is not statistically significant (see Table 4.2). This relationship is also broken down by gender. Though not shown in a table, males who are married are more likely to be employed than males who are not (86.0% versus 80.0%), while females who are married are also very slightly more likely to be employed than their non-married counterparts (76.2% compared to 75.0%). Further, unmarried females in the independent class are the most likely to be employed (100.0%) (these are likely professional women, and possibly dependents of independent principal applicants who have reached working age but are as yet unmarried), while unmarried females in the family class are the least likely to be employed (50.0%) (likely sponsored sisters or other relatives who have simply not yet been able to find employment). Among males, independent unmarried respondents are least likely to be employed (72.7%) (most likely recent arrivals), while those who are married and in the independent class, and unmarried and in the family class, are most likely to be employed (100.0%) (likely males supporting families).

From Table 4.3, it is evident that married respondents are also slightly more likely to hold full-time jobs than their unmarried counterparts (77.4% compared to 66.7%); this finding could be related to other factors such as age. Examining the number of jobs held in Canada by marital status is complicated by the low cell sizes, and so is not shown in table form here. It indicates that equivalent proportions of married and unmarried respondents working full-time report having held only one full-time job in Canada (61.0% compared to 60.0%)

---

3 Similar results occur when we look at employment rates by marital status for the whole sample, in which being married is also associated with slightly higher levels of employment (63.1% versus 60.0% of unmarried respondents, not statistically significant); these levels are lower due to the effects of including individuals in the analysis who are not involved in the labour force, particularly for life course reasons (such as being in school, or being at home with young children).
respectively), with higher proportions of married respondents reporting having held three or more full-time jobs. A slightly greater proportion of unmarried respondents working full-time have never held a part-time job (70.0% compared to 63.4%), which could be related to their greater independence and ability to ‘hold out’ for an acceptable full-time job, rather than feeling the economic pressure of supporting a family and the need to accept part-time work. Overall, however, there does not appear to be a great difference in the likelihood of working full- or part-time by marital status, or in the numbers of full- and part-time jobs held in Canada.

**Age Category**

Turning to the relationship between age and being employed, among those in the labour force, the highest employment rate is found among those aged 40 to 49 (90.9%), followed by the youngest group (87.0% of those aged 20 to 29) and 81.6% of those aged 30 to 39 (see Table 4.2). The lowest employment rate is found, not surprisingly, among those aged fifty and older, at 58.3%. Despite being more likely to have high levels of work experience (related to their age), this last group is most likely to have difficulty having credentials accepted, in part because employers typically want to hire younger individuals that they can train for the longer term. Among the other three groups, these employment rates generally reflect the higher human capital investments that accrue with age, particularly in the

---

4. It is important to remember that cell sizes at this point are small, and interpretation must be conducted with great care.

5. However, among the entire sample, being employed appears to be related to older age: beginning with 64.5% of those aged 20-29, the rate rises to a high of 71.4% of those aged 40 to 49, and then drops off among those aged 50 and older; this is consistent with expectations, given that 23.5% of those in this age category are
form of years of experience, while respondents in the youngest age group likely have some Canadian education or training, eliminating one of the most difficult barriers to finding employment faced by newcomers – accreditation problems. The slightly lower rate among those aged 30 to 39 is somewhat surprising, especially given that under the points system, applicants receive extra points for being between the ages of 20 and 40, reflecting a policy belief at least that those in this age group will have less difficulty adapting to the labour market in Canada. The difference is not statistically significant, however, so that what at first glance appears to be a statistical difference may in fact simply reflect other underlying factors (such as educational levels of the age categories). Multivariate analysis will assist in decomposing these relationships.

Turning to the proportion employed full- or part-time by age category (see Table 4.3), respondents in their thirties are the most likely to be working full-time (80.6%), compared to approximately 70.0% of those in each of the other age categories. Of those that are employed, then, there does not appear to be a great difference in disadvantage as measured by full-and part-time employment. Though not shown in a table, a majority of respondents in all age categories are still employed in their first full-time job, though respondents in their forties are more likely to report this than members of other age categories (85.7% compared to approximately 60.0% of other age groups). This may be related to the former group’s higher human capital levels, which may translate into more job security, but may also simply be a

---

over the age of sixty. This of course reflects the fact that some younger respondents are in school as opposed to being in the labour force.

---

6 Cross-tabulations not shown here indicate that there is some sample skewness in terms of the demographic composition of the age categories; however, these cannot explain all the variations found here, and in later bivariate analyses between age and the dependent variables. As stated, these differences will have to be investigated using multivariate analysis.
result of the lower number of respondents in this age category. Overall, respondents in the
two youngest categories appear to be more likely to have had multiple full- and part-time jobs
in Canada. Younger individuals are more likely to change jobs more frequently early on in
their employment histories, however, as they search for jobs that reflect their skills and goals
and as they accumulate job experience – indeed, as they build a career.

Country of Birth

As the more economically developed countries of the four, respondents from India and
Pakistan are expected to have higher employment rates and more prestigious jobs, all other
things being equal. Thus not surprisingly, respondents in the labour force who were born in
Pakistan have the highest employment rates (89.5%), followed by Indian respondents
(87.5%), Sri Lankan respondents (68.2%) and Bangladeshi respondents (33.3%) (see Table
4.2); this difference is statistically significant ($\chi^2=8.746$, d.f.=3, $p<0.033$).\(^7\) The distribution of
cases across these four groups is extremely uneven, so caution must be employed when
conducting analyses by country of origin.

Table 4.3 presents the proportion of respondents working, by whether that job is full-
or part-time, by country of birth. Excluding those from Bangladesh (N=2), respondents born
in India are most likely to be working in full-time jobs (88.6%), followed by 82.4% of
Pakistani respondents. In keeping with other indicators of economic integration, a minority of

---
\(^7\) There are only slight differences in the ordering of the countries when we examine employment rates
among the whole sample, and not just those in the labour force – India and Pakistan change places with Indian
respondents reporting the higher employment rate. This switching of places indicates that a higher proportion
of Pakistani respondents are not in the labour force, pointing to the necessity to conduct multivariate analysis
that can disentangle concomitant gender, age and marital status effects.
Sri Lankan respondents (33.3%) are employed full-time, indicating again that this group has specific difficulties gaining access to the Canadian job market.

A majority of respondents in all country of birth groups are in their first full-time jobs, though those born in India are most likely to report having held two or more full-time jobs in Canada; four out of five Sri Lankan respondents are in their first full-time job at the time of the interview (table not shown). A majority of Sri Lankans working part-time at interview reported having held a full-time job at some point in Canada (60.0%), while half (50.0%) of Indian respondents and two thirds (66.7%) of Pakistani respondents had never held a full-time job in Canada. The pattern of employment of Sri Lankan respondents therefore seems slightly different from that of other groups: despite a majority being employed part-time at interview, of these a majority have at least been employed full-time at some point. The employment histories of these respondents may therefore represent more varied types of employment than members of the other groups, who display more segregated employment in either full- or part-time jobs. Part of this may be connected to the fact that the Sri Lankan portion of the sample has been in Canada slightly longer than members of the other groups, giving them the opportunity to have experienced a wider variety of employment experiences.

**Number of Years in Canada**

Finally, employment rates by number of years in Canada (Table 4.2) reflect the particular difficulties associated with the first year of residence in Canada, followed by a sustained leveling out in subsequent years at eighty percent or higher; less than half (42.9%) of respondents who had been in Canada a year or less, who were in the labour market, reported being employed at the time of the interview ($\chi^2=7.394$, d.f.=4, $p<0.002$).
The likelihood of being employed full-time by number of years in Canada does not
display a linear relationship either (see Table 4.3). In the most recently and least recently
arrived groups, two thirds (66.7%) of respondents reported being employed full-time; among
those in Canada two years, 78.6% had full-time jobs, with a high of 84.6% reporting this type
of work among those in Canada three years. The rate drops down to less than three quarters
(73.9%) once again among those in Canada four years. These differences are not large and
may be a reflection of underlying sample characteristics (as discussed previously); the
observed drop in year four is possibly explained by the preponderance of family class
respondents in this group (72.4%), as family class respondents did have a lower rate of full-
time employment as discussed above.

Perhaps of more interest are the results of Table 4.6, which present the number of jobs
held by the number of years in Canada, among full-time and part-time employed respondents.
Of those employed full-time, it is interesting that among those in Canada the longest, a
majority are in their first full-time job in Canada (75.0%). The group reporting the most full-
time jobs are those who have been here four years: 41.2% are in their first, 29.4% in their
second, 11.8% are in their third and 17.6% are in their fourth full-time job, indicating that this
group either has the most difficulty keeping their full-time employment, or have chosen to
change jobs more often than others. Also interesting is that in the first two years in Canada, a
majority of respondents working full-time at the time of the interview report never having
worked part-time (81.8% of those in Canada two years, 75.0% among those in Canada one
year or less). This means that these individuals have entered the labour market as full-time
workers right away without having to work at (often) less skilled, lower paying jobs. By
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Full-Time Jobs Held in Canada</th>
<th>One or Less</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (75.0)</td>
<td>9 (81.8)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>6 (75.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
<td>2 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (25.0)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL N (100.0%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Part-Time Jobs Held in Canada</th>
<th>One or Less</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (75.0)</td>
<td>9 (81.8)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (25.0)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td>2 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (5.0)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL N (100.0%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contrast, a greater minority of respondents in Canada three years or more have worked part-time.

This may indicate that job transitions are more likely to occur after the first couple of years in Canada, at which time an immigrant initiates a move to a more skilled job, or an employer lays off the individual. In the former case, this transition period may coincide with an evaluation of goals and outcomes, a time when the immigrant takes stock of his or her progress in Canada. It is of course difficult to speculate as to what exactly is happening without a more detailed analysis and the examination of other indicators of integration. Suffice to say that the Canadian employment trajectories of these respondents are not simple linear effects of the number of years spent in Canada. Other factors are at work.

Summary

Despite the limitations of bivariate analysis, a few patterns concerning employment rates emerge. There is a relationship between immigration class and being employed that can be explained in some cases by the number of years respondents have been in Canada, and by the gender composition of the immigrant classes. Certainly, those having the greatest difficulty becoming employed have been in Canada the shortest amount of time (not surprising), are female respondents, and members of the family class. This analysis is based, of course, on those who are in the labour force: leaving out homemakers, people who are retired, and full-time students provides a more accurate picture of the groups having difficulties getting employment. If the same analysis were conducted on the entire sample, very different results would emerge.
EMPLOYMENT INCOME

The second dependent variable used to measure economic integration – respondent employment income – has been used in countless studies. Indeed, employment income can be considered the most widely used variable measuring the economic performance of any labour market sub-group. The sub-sample of respondents discussed in this section are those who were employed at interview. According to Table 4.7, the mean employment income reported across the entire sub-sample of respondents employed at interview was approximately $26,912; this table will be referred to throughout the following section.

Immigrant Class

The results from Table 4.7 present mean employment earnings by respondents’ class of immigration. As predicted, independent class respondents report higher mean employment incomes, approximately $31,061 versus $23,000 among members of the family class. This difference is statistically significant (F=4.757, d.f.=1, p<0.033). The independent class’ earnings are slightly higher than those found by de Silva (1997) in his analysis of the CIC longitudinal Immigrant Data Base (IMDB): he estimated independent immigrant incomes for those in Canada less than one year in 1984 to be $28,230, increasing over time from that point.8 However, breaking employment incomes down by full- and part-time work reveals that the SANS results are quite comparable to those found for independent immigrants by de Silva (1997). It is apparent in Table 4.8 that independent class respondents fair better whether they are employed part- or full-time: full-time employed independent immigrants report a

---

8 Recall that de Silva’s (1997) IMDB analysis did not include family class immigrants, and was conducted on a range of immigrant origin countries including, but not specific to, South Asia. These earnings
mean income of $33,981 compared to $27,708 among family class respondents, while independent class respondents working part-time reported mean earnings of $17,917 compared to $12,727 among the family class.

**Gender**

As expected, there is also a notable difference in male and female earnings (see Table 4.7). Females report a mean of approximately $21,184 compared to $29,133 among males ($F=3.672, d.f.=1, p<0.060$). As reported above, Renaud et al. (1993) also found a difference among male and female earnings. This difference is not surprising, and is likely associated with gender differences in human capital levels; however, it could also be explained by the segregated and gendered nature of the work performed by males and females (Boyd 1992).

Table 4.8 shows clearly that regardless of the full- or part-time designation of their jobs, males have consistently higher incomes. Yet, the gender difference in earnings is not that great among independent immigrants working full-time – about $3,000 – nor is the gender gap very wide among family class respondents working part-time – about $2,500. It is possible that respondents in these sub-categories are competing for similar occupations, or at least within the same employment sectors. The largest gender gap in earnings is found among independent class immigrants working part-time, with males earning more than double their female counterparts, though almost as large a gap exists between males and females from the family class working full-time ($9,105). Undoubtedly these differences are related to individual human capital levels and to the types of jobs occupied by these respondents.

---

are also calculated from multiple regressions, while those presented from the SANS are simple cross-tabulations based on actual reported earnings.
Marital Status

Continuing with the results reported in Table 4.7, there is almost no difference in earnings by marital status (approximately $27,028 among married versus $26,500 among unmarried respondents). Marital status is not expected to directly impact an individual's earnings, but is rather likely related to other individual characteristics such as age and gender. Indeed, Table 4.9 shows that married females report lower incomes than unmarried females, while married males report higher incomes than their unmarried counterparts. This difference in the effects of being married on employment incomes by gender, an interaction effect, is likely associated with married women's propensity to work both in the paid labour force and within the domestic sphere of the home, requiring that they do more part-time or flexible jobs which are less likely to pay well. These gender role pressures are certainly not specific to immigrant women, but it is also likely that these immigrant women are faced with a variety of additional barriers to "good employment" related to integration that their native born female counterparts do not confront.

Among females, when the relationship between marital status and earnings is broken down by whether the respondent was working full- or part-time, it is clear that there is almost no difference in earnings by marital status among those working full-time; rather, it is among those working part-time that the greatest difference lies ($16,667 among married females compared to $9,500 compared to unmarried females). It is likely that the females working part-time, who are also unmarried, are younger, perhaps in jobs which are financing studies (please see Table 4.9).

Among males, the simple bivariate relationship between marital status and earnings is also misleading. Examining Table 4.9 shows that the group of men considered to be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean Employment Income (approx. $)</th>
<th>Analysis of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Population</strong></td>
<td>26,912</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class of Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>31,061</td>
<td>F=4.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21,184</td>
<td>F=3.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29,133</td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>27,028</td>
<td>F=0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>26,125</td>
<td>F=0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28,952</td>
<td>d.f.=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>p&lt;0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and older</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>F=1.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>30,071</td>
<td>d.f.=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>25,294</td>
<td>p&lt;0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>21,667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or less</td>
<td>29,583</td>
<td>F=0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>26,429</td>
<td>d.f.=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>25,385</td>
<td>p&lt;0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>28,587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to eight</td>
<td>24,583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8:
Mean Respondent Employment Income by Whether Respondent was Employed Full- or Part-Time at Interview, by Immigrant Class and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Immigration</th>
<th>Employment Status at Interview</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time ($)</td>
<td>Part-Time ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Class</td>
<td>33,981</td>
<td>17,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>27,708</td>
<td>12,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>27,083</td>
<td>11,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,244</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immigrant Class by Gender

| Independent Class    | 31,786                         | 10,000          |
|                      | 34,750                         | 21,875          |
| Family Class         | 20,500                         | 11,500          |
|                      | 29,605                         | 13,750          |
Table 4.9:
Mean Respondent Employment Income by Whether Respondent was Employed Full- or Part-Time at Interview, by Marital Status by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employed Respondents</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time</td>
<td>$26,944</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Part-Time</td>
<td>$16,667</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'unmarried' is very heterogeneous, including males whose earnings are both the highest of any group ($38,214) and the lowest ($9,500, similar to unmarried females working part-time). That is, it is important to distinguish whether the work being performed is full or part-time, because the unmarried males making the higher wage are likely professionals in their late twenties or thirties, while the unmarried males in the part-time and lower earnings category likely comprise male students. By contrast, the mean earnings among males who are married are much more similar regardless of whether the work is full- or part-time, with a gap of about $5,500 only.

**Age Category**

Most research on age and income indicates a curvilinear relationship: initial incomes are lower when individuals first enter the labour market, grow as they gain job and skill experience, and then plateau as people enter and then pass middle age. Incomes of immigrants are less likely to fit this typical relationship, however, because of the additional difficulties of having their credentials recognized, language problems, and because these workers have to essentially start over again in terms of establishing themselves in the corporate hierarchy. Table 4.7 indicates that the mean employment incomes reported in this sample by age category indeed do not fit the typical curvilinear relationship, but rather highlight the difficulties associated with obtaining returns to human capital as age increases. The highest incomes are reported among respondents in their thirties ($28,952), followed by the youngest category ($26,125), respondents in the oldest category ($25,000) and finally those in their forties ($23,500).
These results are somewhat comparable to those obtained by Renaud et al. (1993), who found that respondents aged 18-25 had the lowest earnings relative to their older counterparts – earnings which did not really begin to improve until after week 100 in Canada. By comparison, respondents aged 26 to 40, and 41 and older showed remarkably similar salaries over time, though the younger group reported much higher mean earnings over the course of the first ten weeks or so (Renaud et al. 1993:39). The classification of ages is slightly different between the two studies, which may have something to do with these differences; in later analyses, age is used as a continuous variable, which may again produce slightly different results.

This relationship is somewhat less confusing when examining Table 4.10, which is also broken down by whether the respondent was employed full- or part-time. It is interesting that among full-time employed respondents, the differences in mean incomes between the age groups are not great, ranging from a high of $31,786 among those aged twenty to twenty-nine, to a low of $27,500 among respondents in their forties. The question is not so much why do incomes vary by age category among those employed full-time, but rather why are those aged 40-49 making the lowest wage? By contrast, among respondents employed part-time, those in their thirties report mean incomes that are almost twice those reported by respondents over the age of fifty ($17,917 compared to $10,000).

**Country of Birth**

Due to the uneven distribution of respondents across the four countries of origin, it is difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions from the information in Table 4.7 concerning mean employment earnings and country of birth. Nevertheless, the general trend is in the
Table 4.10: Mean Respondent Employment Income by Whether Respondent was Employed Full- or Part-Time at Interview, by Selected Respondent Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Employment Status at Interview</th>
<th>Full-Time ($)</th>
<th>Part-Time ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,786</td>
<td>$12,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,600</td>
<td>$17,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$13,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Employment Status at Interview</th>
<th>Full-Time ($)</th>
<th>Part-Time ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,774</td>
<td>$16,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,750</td>
<td>$9,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,500</td>
<td>$15,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years in Canada</th>
<th>Employment Status at Interview</th>
<th>Full-Time ($)</th>
<th>Part-Time ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One or Less</td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,750</td>
<td>$31,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,136</td>
<td>$9,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,273</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,235</td>
<td>$15,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to Eight</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$8,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
expected direction with Indian respondents reporting the highest mean employment incomes ($30,071), followed by Pakistani ($25,294), Bangladeshi ($22,500) and Sri Lankan ($21,667) respondents.

When we examine mean earnings among respondents employed full- or part-time at interview by their country of birth in Table 4.10, a different pattern emerges. Where Sri Lankan respondents overall report the lowest mean earnings, among those employed full-time these respondents report the highest ($34,500), followed by Indian ($31,774) and Pakistani ($28,750) immigrants. This indicates that the low mean earnings reported by Sri Lankans are largely because they are predominantly working part-time; when they do find full-time work, it is paying them well relative to their other country of birth counterparts. A majority of Indian respondents must be working full-time, as there is very little difference in the mean earnings for the full sub-sample and those working full-time from India; for the most part, the same can be said of respondents born in Pakistan. By contrast, among those employed part-time at the interview, Pakistani respondents report the lowest mean employment incomes ($9,167), almost half of that reported by Indian respondents, who reported the highest mean incomes ($16,875). As discussed in previous sections, this relationship is likely tempered by the gender, immigrant class and age distributions of the country of origin groups, among other factors.

Number of Years in Canada

Finally, we turn to the relationship between the number of years an immigrant has been in Canada and their employment earnings. As reported previously, immigrant earnings tend to be somewhat depressed during the early adjustment period (which lasts anywhere from one to
eight years), after which they typically equal, or surpass, those of native born Canadians (e.g. Breton et al. 1990; de Silva 1997; Renaud et al. 1993). This study is of course concerned with the initial adjustment period, during which immigrants in Canada a year or less are expected to report the lowest earnings, followed by gradual improvement.

Table 4.7 indicates that respondents in Canada a year or less do not in fact report the lowest earnings ($29,583), but rather those in Canada the longest do ($24,583). In fact, there is anything but a linear bivariate relationship between number of years in Canada and mean earnings according to Table 4.7. As above, fluctuations in the mean earnings presented in Table 4.7 most likely represent underlying respondent demographic characteristics rather than a true integration pattern.

In fact, when the earnings and number of years in Canada relationship is examined by whether the work is full- or part-time, the small differences persist but in different ways (see Table 4.10). There is only about a $4,000 difference in the mean earnings reported among those working full-time, with respondents in Canada three years reporting the lowest earnings ($27,273) and those in Canada four years the highest ($33,235). Similarly, the mean earnings reported among those working part-time are hard to explain, ranging from a high of $31,250 among those in Canada a year or less to a low mean of $8,750 among those in Canada five years or more. Clearly the types of jobs reported as part-time are a heterogeneous mix of typical 'filler' jobs unrelated to career development, and high-paying occupations that could qualify as full-time but for a shortage of a few hours per week. Of course, it could also be that there is something about these few individuals in Canada five years and working part-time that has marginalized them in the Canadian economy: they may be looking for full-time work,
but because of human capital deficits or discrimination, have been unable to obtain and maintain stable full-time employment since arriving in Canada.

Summary

The foregoing does not present any real surprises in terms of the earnings dimension of economic integration. Predicted outcomes are generally observed, with independent males reporting the highest employment incomes. Marital status appears to modify this relationship somewhat, so that unmarried males report the highest mean earnings; this may be related to higher pressure to support dependents on married males, which may lead them to accept less lucrative employment rather than remain unemployed for longer periods of time. Also interesting is the high level of mean earnings reported by full-time employed females regardless of marital status: this sample of female immigrants appears to report slightly higher earnings than those expected based on previous research — such as that conducted by Breton et al. (1990), Renaud et al. (1993) and Boyd (1992) — but it remains to be seen what factors are exactly at play in determining their apparent (and relative) economic success.

Clearly, the difference between full-and part-time employment earnings is an important determining factor in understanding an individual’s economic integration, though it is as yet unclear what factors, other than demographic ones, are related to whether an individual is working full- or part-time. Of course, it is expected that employment earnings will be strongly related to a respondent’s human capital, but not exclusively so: the effects of other resources, in particular social networks, are expected to modify the effects of human capital.
GETTING AN EQUIVALENT JOB

A third dependent variable used to measure economic integration is respondents’ perceptions of their jobs being equivalent to those held prior to migration, in terms of the skill and expertise required to do the job (see Chapter Three for variable operationalization).  

Before turning to the investigation of this question of job equivalency, and the relationships between obtaining equivalency and individual demographic background characteristics, a note on rates in the entire sample. Less than half of the overall sample reports an equivalent job (35.6%), 10.2% reported their Canadian jobs to be better than their previous employment, and 54.2% reported their Canadian jobs to be less skilled than their pre-migration jobs; collapsing the positive responses together, a total of 45.8% reported their jobs to be equivalent or better.  

This compares to the rate obtained by Renaud et al. (1992:47), who found that within the first year, about one third of their 1000 respondents rated their jobs to be equivalent to those held prior to migration, 22.0% found their jobs in Canada to be better, and 50.0% reported inferior employment in Canada (please see Table 4.11 for job equivalency rates by background characteristics for this section).

Comparing the occupational sector location of the jobs before and after immigration gives another perspective on the type of equivalency being reported by these respondents. Table 4.12 shows that the majority of respondents were concentrated in three sectors prior to

---

9 Recall that the question about job equivalency does not ask “Are you doing the same job as you were before”, but asks whether the Canadian job is equivalent in terms of the skills and abilities required to do the job. The question therefore allows for a respondent to report their job as equivalent even if they are doing different kinds of work: it is up to the respondent to determine whether they are using their skills and abilities in a general sense, rather than as they apply to one specific occupation.

10 Because of the small sample size, it is this collapsed rate – grouping those with comparable job, or jobs that were better together – that is used in the remainder of the analysis.
Table 4.11: Analysis of Variance in Job Being Equivalent, by Respondent Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Indicator of Economic Integration</th>
<th>Chi-Square Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job is Equivalent (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Population</strong></td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class of Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>$\chi^2=3.799$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>d.f.=1, p&lt;0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>$\chi^2=3.541$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>d.f.=1, p&lt;0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>$\chi^2=2.537$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>d.f.=1, p&lt;0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>$\chi^2=5.437$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>d.f.=3, p&lt;0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and older</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$\chi^2=2.648$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>d.f.=3, p&lt;0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or less</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>$\chi^2=5.561$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>d.f.=4, p&lt;0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to eight</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 These statistics are calculated based on the number of respondents who had a job at interview (N=68) and a valid response for the job equivalency question: final N=59.
Table 4.12:
Number and Proportion of Respondents Working in Various Job Sectors by Immigrant Class, Before\(^1\) and After Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Sector</th>
<th>Whole Sample Before Migration (%)</th>
<th>Whole Sample After Migration (%)</th>
<th>Independent Class Before Migration (%)</th>
<th>Independent Class After Migration (%)</th>
<th>Family Class Before Migration (%)</th>
<th>Family Class After Migration (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Management</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Labouring</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (%)</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>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) All of the percentages for occupational sector before migration are based on N=59 individuals who actually had a job before coming to Canada, whereas the percentages for occupational sector after migration are based on N=68 individuals employed at interview in Canada. It is because of these 9 missing individuals in the former variable that the job equivalency statistics are based on N=59, and not N=68, respondents.
migration (professional, administrative and clerical), whereas in Canada, respondents are much more evenly spread across five of the six categories (excluding the administrative), with the general trend being a shift into lower paid and prestige jobs in the sales, service and production sectors. This downgrading of job sectors therefore provides some objective confirmation of the frustration expressed by the respondents in interviews.

Three main reasons were given for respondents' inability of find equivalent work: lack of Canadian experience (84.4%), accreditation problems (59.4%) and lack of job opportunities in Canada (or, a poor economy) (34.4%), among the respondents with non-equivalent jobs (please see Table 4.13). These reasons have all been reported in previous studies, though it appears that very little has been done to rectify the problems from a systemic perspective (McDade 1988).

Immigrant Class

The only statistically significant relationship between the six control variables and job equivalency is with immigrant class, where over half (58.6%) of independent class respondents reported an equivalent job, compared to one third (33.3%) of family class respondents ($\chi^2=3.799$, d.f.=1, p<0.051 – please see Table 4.11). These results are again comparable to

---

11 As a follow-up question to job equivalency, respondents who reported non-equivalent jobs were asked "What do you think has prevented you from getting an equivalent job?". Responses are dummy variables coded 1 or 0.

12 Three other reasons were also given, but these were cited by less than ten percent of respondents: discrimination, lack of contacts, and poor English ability (in order of descending importance). The fact that a lack of English language skills was reported by a minority of respondents in the labour force is indicative of the high level of English proficiency in this sample – the ability to converse in English was a criterion for inclusion in the study, so this is not surprising. It is important to remember, though, that among many newcomers, poor English ability is the number one barrier preventing access to the labour market, not to mention preventing access to comparable jobs (Liu 1995; McDade 1988).
Table 4.13: Proportion of Respondents Reporting Different Barriers to Obtaining an Equivalent Job in Canada, by Respondent Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Barriers Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Canadian Experience (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Sample</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or Less</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to Eight</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Column percentages do not add up to 100% because respondents could report as many barriers as they felt applied in their particular experience. The number of valid cases being reported upon in this table is N=32.
those obtained in the ÉNI study, in which approximately 40.0% of family class, and 53.0% of independent class respondents reported an equivalent job – the differences likely reflecting that data was collected with different ethnic groups, in a different province and city and during a different part of the 1990 recession (Renaud et al. 1992:47).\footnote{Moreover, these percentages are only approximate because they are taken from a bar chart in the authors’ report that does not include the actual percentages for each bar.}

This immigrant class difference in reported job equivalency is in keeping with the higher labour market suitability of independent applicants, for which the points system is supposed to select; on the other hand, that leaves 39.4% of the SANS independent class sample that is very likely frustrated by their inability to find comparable work. In fact, this frustration was particularly acute among well-educated immigrants, and was heard time and again during the course of the interviews, in some cases to the point of outright hostility of the respondent toward the immigration system, and employers in Canada. In the words of one family class male respondent from India who trained and worked as a medical doctor there, life in Canada is “ruining my brain” due to the incredible stress of having to work in a gas station and trying to support his wife (who also worked) and their little girl. Asked about his participation in ethnic community and religious activities, he responded with the following:

“If you have a 10 to 20 kilogram load on your head, you cannot look around, only thing you can think about is where to put the weight. I cannot think of anything but how to find work, make money – whole other aspects of my life are totally forsaken.”(R64)

This man’s comments reflect the all-consuming importance of finding employment in Canada that not only pays the bills, but is also not soul-destroying in the process.

Table 4.12 shows that a slightly higher proportion of family class respondents in this sample held professional or technical jobs before immigration (58.6% versus 50.0%) of
independent class respondents). In Canada, however, a higher proportion of independent respondents are working in this sector (36.4% versus 22.9% among the family class). And, while members of the independent and family class were similarly concentrated in three sectors prior to migration (professional/technical, clerical and administration/management), family class respondents are spread out almost evenly across five of the six occupational sectors in Canada (excluding administration/management occupations), while independent respondents remain more highly concentrated, this time in professional/technical, sales and production and labouring jobs (75.8% of independent respondents). It would appear that there is something about the skill base, educational background, or other resources possessed by these independent applicants which is helping them to translate their human capital into better jobs here in Canada than their family class counterparts, despite the two groups having remarkably similar occupational backgrounds prior to migration. And, while a relatively high proportion of independent immigrants reports an equivalent job here in Canada, Table 4.12 points to a substantial number who are likely doing jobs which do not even remotely resemble their previous work experience, or their skill levels and abilities.

Among independent applicants whose jobs were not deemed equivalent, 91.7% of independent class immigrants and 80.0% of the family class reported a lack of Canadian experience (see Table 4.13). This was followed by a lack of recognition of skills and qualifications, at 41.7% of independent and 70.0% of family class respondents. Finally, the third most frequently cited reason was a poor Canadian economy, among 41.7% of independent respondents and 30.0% of family class respondents (none of these differences is statistically significant). This similarity in the barriers to equivalent employment reported by the members of the two classes is striking, because it indicates that while they are granted
admission to Canada for different reasons, they face comparable labour market difficulties once here.

**Gender**

Among males and females, surprisingly the latter were more likely to report equivalent jobs (66.7% compared to 38.6% among males – see Table 4.11). One interpretation would be that this is related to the increased likelihood that women will be engaged in lower-prestige work (like clerical work) regardless of the country they are working in, and that these types of jobs are less likely to have accreditation problems associated with them. What is apparent when we examine respondents’ job sectors by their gender before and after immigration is that by contrast, a higher proportion of women appear to be holding better jobs here in Canada than their male counterparts.\(^{14}\)

Indeed, as seen in Table 4.12, there is a clear movement throughout the sample from jobs in the more prestigious sectors to the more blue collar work in Canada. This process is seen particularly among the males in the sample (see Table 4.14), of which a lower proportion maintain occupations in the professional and administration sectors in Canada (30.4% of males compared to 67.1% of females). Females move into sales, service and production jobs in Canada, as do males, but for the latter this occurs in much greater proportions. The largest growth for males is seen in the production and labouring sector, from 9.1% before migration to 20.6% of these respondents after migration.

\(^{14}\) Recall that occupations reported by respondents prior to migration, and in Canada, were all recoded using the Treiman (1977) Standard International Prestige Scale; this was all explained in Chapter Three.
Table 4.14:
Proportion of Respondents Working in Various Job Sectors, Before and After Migration, By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Sector</th>
<th>Female Before Immigration (%)</th>
<th>Female After Immigration (%)</th>
<th>Male Before Immigration (%)</th>
<th>Male After Immigration (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Management</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Labouring</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What these trends say about competition for employment in Canada and the gendered division of labour is unclear from this table, because it does not include descriptions of specific jobs performed by members of each group. It may still be true that the female respondents are still doing more “female” types of work even in the high-prestige sector of professional/technical occupations, which as argued above would account for their greater ability to translate their skills to similar, less competitive and regulated jobs in Canada. By contrast, the types of skills and educational background possessed by the male respondents may be placing them in direct competition with similarly skilled and Canadian-trained native born males, and as such they may be suffering from accreditation problems and a lack of Canadian experience. More than one male respondent with a graduate degree or higher reported working as a labourer or in production, which indicates the degree to which these individuals are having difficulty applying their human capital to the job search process.

In fact, as among the immigrant classes, the most frequently reported barriers among females and males is a lack of Canadian experience (81.5% versus 100.0% respectively), followed by accreditation problems (63.0% of males and 40.0% of females – see Table 4.13). The lower rate of difficulty having credentials recognized reported by females is possible evidence of their tendency to work in lower-skilled “female” occupations where these would be less of a requirement (Boyd 1992; Lui 1995). Finally, one third of males (33.3%) and 40.0% of females reported a poor Canadian economy as preventing them from finding equivalent jobs. Again, given that the majority of this sample entered the country during Canada’s most recent recession, it is not surprising that this reason is reported consistently by respondents.
Regardless of the state of the economy, however, the story of one respondent’s wife reflects the importance of Canadian experience above all other job requirements, regardless of the job applied for. She reported applying for a job as a chambermaid in a hotel and being asked whether she had any Canadian experience, to which she replied she had been cleaning her own house for twenty years and did not think that her lack of Canadian experience would be a problem. This individual ended up being hired for the job, but her story reflects the ways in which job requirements can be used by employers in irrelevant ways to, in some cases, actively prevent individuals from obtaining employment.

Marital Status

The relationship between marital status and holding an equivalent job is somewhat difficult to interpret. As seen in Table 4.11, a majority of unmarried respondents (64.3%) compared to a minority of married respondents (40.0%) reported that their jobs were equivalent (though this relationship is not statistically significant: \( \chi^2 = 2.537, \text{d.f.}=1, p<0.111 \)). This may indicate that married individuals are so concerned about supporting a family that they accept employment that is below their expectations much more readily than those who may have the luxury of living at home, or at least supporting only themselves, and waiting for more attractive opportunities.

To investigate this possibility, a table reporting job equivalency by gender and marital status (not shown) was created, and indicates that indeed, among males who are married, only 30.3% report an equivalent job, compared to more than half of unmarried males (63.6%), while among females, equivalent proportions of married and unmarried respondents report an equivalent job – 66.7%. These findings do not support the Family Investment Strategy
discussed above, and are in fact in direct opposition to what would be expected if women were accepting the first available job so that their husbands could upgrade their skills (Worswick 1996).  

Age

The relationship between job equivalency and age of respondents is statistically non-significant, but there are some interesting variations. The group most successful at maintaining their job prestige is those aged forty to forty-nine, of which three quarters reported a comparable job (75.0%). The youngest age group (those aged twenty to twenty-nine) follows, with 56.3%, while the groups aged thirty to thirty-nine and fifty and older have the least amount of success, with 35.7% and 28.6% respectively reporting equivalent work in Canada (please see Table 4.11). As discussed in the section on age and employment above, these differences are likely related to human capital levels, labour market selectivity for younger workers, and accreditation problems. Moreover, individuals with job experience (older immigrants) may be more likely to have higher expectations in Canada than those younger, less experienced immigrants, and as such these older individuals may rate their Canadian jobs more strictly, and thereby find them wanting.

Table 4.15 shows the movement of the oldest respondents from a concentration in professional/technical and administrative/management occupations (57.2% of respondents) prior to migration to a concentration in lower prestige jobs in the clerical, and sales sectors in Canada (71.5%). Only respondents in their forties report an almost even distribution across

---

15 Cross-tabulations were also run on occupational sector by marital status. Both before and after immigration, married and unmarried respondents show very similar concentrations in the six labour market sectors; these are therefore not reported here.
Table 4.15:
Number and Proportion of Respondents Working in Various Job Sectors by Age Category, Before and After Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Sector</th>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before (%)</td>
<td>After (%)</td>
<td>Before (%)</td>
<td>After (%)</td>
<td>Before (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Management</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Labouring</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
all occupational sectors prior to migration; this group also reports the highest concentration in production and labouring jobs in Canada, at almost one third (30.0%). In every other age category, there is significant movement from higher prestige occupational sectors prior to migration to those that are less so within Canada.

An examination of the types and numbers of barriers reported by a majority of respondents in each age category, however, gives some indication of those facing the most difficulties. As presented in Table 4.13, among respondents in the oldest age category, a lack of Canadian experience was the most frequently reported barrier to obtaining an equivalent job (80.0%). This is followed by 60.0% in the same age group reporting accreditation problems, and equivalent proportions reporting a poor Canadian economy and discrimination as barriers (40.0%) (in this study, discrimination was taken to mean any kind of unfair treatment, and some respondents felt that they were treated unfairly based on their age).

Among respondents in their forties, all reported a lack of Canadian experience and of job opportunities as significant barriers to obtaining an equivalent job here (100.0%); this group also had the highest proportion reporting a lack of contacts (50.0%) as impeding their progress. This group may be more disadvantaged by their age in finding equivalent work, and may also have been in the labour force long enough to understand that contacts are in fact an important aspect of job mobility (unlike some of the younger respondents who may not yet have realized this; alternatively, the lower rates of this barrier reported by respondents in other age groups may indicate that this is simply not a problem for them).

Overall, among the other age groups similar barriers are reported; the youngest respondents appear to be somewhat less likely to report each barrier (as indicated by slightly lower proportions for each barrier cited). Certainly, the barriers to equivalent employment
reported by older respondents reinforce the favouring of younger immigrants within the independent class, precisely because of the better opportunities open to the younger groups within the Canadian labour market.

*Country of Birth*

Due to the sample skewness in terms of the frequency of respondents by country of birth, any analysis must be conducted very generally. In 4.11, a larger proportion of Indian respondents reported that their job in Canada was equivalent to their previous work before migrating (55.2%), with 40.0% Pakistani and 35.7% of Sri Lankan respondents reporting the same; none of the Bangladeshis in the sample reported an equivalent job. This country of birth difference is not surprising, as Indian respondents are expected to perform better in the labour market as a result of the relatively high level of economic development of the country, and India’s use of English as an official language.

As shown above in Table 4.16, the greatest change from higher prestige jobs to lower ones in Canada is seen among Pakistani respondents: 60.0% held jobs in the professional/technical sector prior to migration, with half of those holding jobs in the same sector in Canada (29.4%). Indian respondents display a slightly smaller gap in proportions reporting jobs in this sector before and after migration. However, Indian respondents show the greatest change in the proportion of respondents working in the production and labouring sector in Canada – from 3.6% before migration to 22.9% after – an indication of a poor ability to find equivalent work. By contrast, the greatest movement among Pakistani respondents is into the service sector in Canada (11.8%), where none had worked there prior to migration. Finally, Sri Lankan respondents also report much higher concentrations in the
Table 4.16:
Number and Proportion of Respondents Working in Various Job Sectors by Country of Birth, Before and After Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Sector</th>
<th>Bangladesh Before (%)</th>
<th>Bangladesh After (%)</th>
<th>India Before (%)</th>
<th>India After (%)</th>
<th>Pakistan Before (%)</th>
<th>Pakistan After (%)</th>
<th>Sri Lanka Before (%)</th>
<th>Sri Lanka After (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Management</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Labouring</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (%)</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>
</tbody>
</table>
sales, service and production sectors within Canada – 66.6% – compared to only 13.4% prior to migration. Thus, respondents from each country of origin are faced with working in sectors that very likely do not reflect their skills and abilities.

When asked about the barriers preventing their obtainment of equivalent work, the trends among the four countries of origin are generally consistent. Reasons reported by Indian respondents mirror the top three reported previously: a lack of Canadian experience (76.9%), accreditation problems (69.2%) and a poor Canadian economy (46.2%); the lowest proportion reporting problems because of a lack of contacts is also among Indians (7.7%) (see Table 4.13). While the same top three reasons hold for Pakistani and Sri Lankan respondents, a much higher proportion of Pakistani respondents blame their lack of Canadian experience (100.0%), while a much lower proportion report difficulty with accreditation (22.2% compared to a minimum of 70.0% in the three other country of birth categories); overall, slightly lower proportions of Pakistani respondents report the various barriers. Not surprisingly, Sri Lankan respondents reported difficulties because of poor English (22.2%); this group also has high proportions reporting a lack of Canadian experience and accreditation problems (77.8% each), with one third reporting the other three barriers. As a group, Sri Lankans clearly experience multiple barriers in achieving equivalent jobs.

*Number of Years in Canada*

Integration has been conceptualized to occur in stages, in that the first five to eight years are the most difficult, after which life satisfaction issues beyond the economic begin to take on greater importance (e.g. Goldlust and Richmond 1974; Breton et al. 1990; Renaud et al. 1993). This study examines those first hardest years to see whether there are more finely-
tuned distinctions that can be made in terms of immigrants' dominant concerns, and the barriers they face in achieving initial economic stability during this time. Thus, while it can be argued that in the long term, all of these respondents are at the same stage of integration and will face the same issues, this study treats this as an empirical question open to debate.

In terms of obtaining equivalent jobs, 4.11 does not provide any easy answers. As expected, a very small minority of respondents who had been in Canada a year or less reported an equivalent job (16.7%), which jumps to almost one third of those who had been here two years (61.5%). The trend ends here, however, with the proportions falling to 45.5% of those in Canada three years, climbing to 55.6% among those here for four years, and then dropping right back to less than a third of respondents in Canada the longest amount of time (27.3%).

A few things might be going on. The group that arrived earliest has a higher proportion of respondents born in Sri Lanka, has twice as many family class than independent class individuals, and a substantial proportion of respondents aged fifty and older – all of whom reported low job equivalency rates (table not shown). By contrast, the group that reports the best performance – those who had been in Canada four years – is almost entirely dominated by respondents born in India (58.6%) (who had high rates of job equivalency), is more than half male (62.1%, who had lower equivalency rates), is predominantly from the family class (also reporting lower rates of equivalency), and have a high proportion of young respondents (44.8%) aged twenty to twenty-nine (a group who had higher rates of job equivalency).

An examination of Table 4.17 complicates the picture further. Despite reporting one of the lowest rates of job equivalency, half of respondents in Canada the longest time reported
Table 4.17:
Proportion of Respondents Working in Various Job Sectors by Number of Years in Canada, Before and After Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Sector</th>
<th>One Year or Less</th>
<th>Two Years</th>
<th>Three Years</th>
<th>Four Years</th>
<th>Five Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before (%)</td>
<td>After (%)</td>
<td>Before (%)</td>
<td>After (%)</td>
<td>Before (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Management</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/Labouring</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
jobs in the professional/technical sector here in Canada (50.0%), compared to 58.3% who held jobs in the same sector prior to migration – which would seem to indicate success in obtaining comparable jobs. (However, comparing pre- and post-migration jobs by their sectoral location is a crude indicator of job equivalency, which this apparent discrepancy may be indicating). The group that appears to show the greatest movement into lower prestige occupations is comprised of people in Canada three years, with 30.8% reporting jobs in the production and labouring sector, 15.4% in service, and another 38.5% in the clerical sector; a mere 7.7% (one respondent) reported working in the professional and technical sector in Canada in this group, compared to 33.3% who had such occupations before migration. What is clear from this table is that perceptions of job equivalency and the objective sectoral location of the jobs being compared are not interchangeable measures.

Turning to the barriers cited as impeding access to equivalent jobs by the number of years in Canada, interesting results emerge (see Table 4.13). First, lack of Canadian experience dominates the barriers cited by each group, and follows an expected pattern of being cited most often by those who arrived most recently (100.0% of respondents in Canada one year or less), and least often by those in Canada the longest (62.5%). Basically, as time passes, immigrants have a higher probability of gaining at least some Canadian experience, even if this means working in poor-paying, low-skilled jobs (Liu 1995).

Second, it is interesting to note that while accreditation problems are cited most frequently by those who have arrived most recently (80.0%), this problem seems to persist throughout the five years, so that half (50.0%) of those in Canada the longest still report this as a significant barrier to their occupational progress.
Third, and oddly, the group in Canada the longest has the highest reported frequency of a lack of job contacts as impeding their job equivalency (50.0%), when it would be expected that, over time, these individuals would be able to make contacts. On the other hand, the fact that these individuals are reporting this despite having been in Canada five years probably indicates that they are limited by other factors as well – perhaps by their levels of human capital, language ability, or social networks.

Finally, the longer individuals are in Canada, the more likely they are to report barriers besides accreditation and Canadian experience, which indicates that while the reasons may change over time, the problem of finding an equivalent job does not disappear within the first five years, and in fact may intensify in importance as respondents begin to feel increasingly frustrated and disillusioned about their long-term prospects in Canada. What may change is the specific limiting factor perceived to be preventing the achievement of job equivalency.

Summary

Clearly, the relationship between obtaining an equivalent job and each of these demographic control variables is complicated, and remains somewhat obscured by the simplicity of the bivariate analysis. In a very general way, family class immigrants, married men, older immigrants, respondents born in Sri Lanka, and immigrants who have been in Canada both the longest and the shortest amounts of time all face difficulties finding equivalent work to that performed prior to migrating.

The preceding discussion certainly raises more questions than it answers. There is some question about the comparability of subjective reports of job equivalency and objective comparisons of the sectoral location of pre- and post-migration occupations, and while an
examination of the self-reported barriers to job equivalency is indicative of general trends, there are likely other factors also at work that are linked to the passage of time, changing aspirations, and the overall integration experience. It is possible that groups who are ‘down on their luck’ may be more likely to ‘blame’ external forces for their misfortunes. As pieces in the whole integration puzzle, however, these reports do seem to create a picture of greater difficulties among certain sub-groups consistent with other information. This type of investigation therefore remains important to understanding economic integration beyond that which is measured in dollar terms, precisely because it gives the added subjective dimension so often lacking in this type of research. Perhaps more importantly, how this more subjective dimension of economic integration is related to more objective dimensions (such as income) is as yet undefined.

HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

As stated previously, research into non-economic dimensions of integration comprises a small proportion of immigration research. As described and operationalized in Chapter Three, the overall health and well-being variable used in this study is a composite of the immigrant’s sense of physical health and overall well-being, and is intended to reflect the amount of stress experienced throughout the integration process (caused by poor performance in the economic sphere in particular), but also the relief experienced by many immigrants at living in a country that is free from the many forms of violence and persecution that instigated their immigration in the first place. Table 4.18 presents means levels of well-being across the
entire sub-sample of respondents in the labour force (N=84), which is 9.74 on a scale with a high of 12.00. Please refer to this table for all other bivariate relationships discussed below.

**Immigrant Class**

The difference in levels of well-being reported by family and independent class respondents is negligible – 9.80 compared to 9.66 respectively; this difference is not statistically significant. Based on the preceding paragraphs, the answer as to why their levels of well-being are so similar may reside in underlying demographic characteristics of the sample, or more likely, in the types of resources possessed and used by each class. If, after controlling for demographic characteristics, there are no real differences in levels of well-being by class of immigration, this might suggest that this subjective well-being measure of integration is less related to economic outcomes – in effect confirming the weak correlations between the three economic dimensions and well-being discussed at the beginning of the chapter.

**Gender**

The relationship between gender and well-being is also non-statistically significant, though the differences are somewhat larger. Males report higher mean levels of well-being than females – 9.88 compared to a mean of 9.40 among females. This may be a result of the types of stresses experienced by native born and foreign born women related to maintaining a family and working in the paid labour force, a likely explanation given that the majority of this sample is married.
Table 4.18:  
Mean Levels of Well-Being of Respondents in the Labour Force  
by Respondent Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean Levels of Well-Being</th>
<th>Analysis of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whole Sample</strong></td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>F=0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>p&lt;0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>F=0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>p&lt;0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>F=2.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>p&lt;0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>F=0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>d.f.=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>p&lt;0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>F=1.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>d.f.=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>p&lt;0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Years in Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>F=0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or less</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>d.f.=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>p&lt;0.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examining mean levels of well-being by gender and immigrant class points out some interesting differences unobservable with the individual cross-tabulations (table not shown). The highest mean levels of well-being are reported among family class females (10.20), followed closely by those reported by independent class males (10.18); female independent immigrants report the lowest levels of well-being – a mean of 8.20. Thus, there appears to be an interaction between gender and immigrant class, which may be related to the different expectations (for paid work, or domestic work, and economic prosperity) that individuals bring with them to Canada, and which must fundamentally shape their perceptions of the integration experience, and their well-being. That is to say, independent class females may have particular expectations for their integration that are related to their level of education, and to the lifestyle to which they were accustomed prior to migration, that end up negatively affecting their levels of well-being when these expectations are not met. It could also be that these independent class females enter Canada with few social contacts, and therefore with little social support on which to draw, relative to their family class counterparts.

*Marital Status*

Before investigating the presence of an interaction between gender and marital status, the mean levels of well-being reported in Table 4.18 indicate that unmarried respondents report higher levels of well-being – a mean of 10.35, compared to 9.55 among married respondents. Most likely, the economic stresses involved in maintaining a family, combined with role and value differences that may occur between those of the immigrant’s country of birth and those taught in Canada, combine to lower the subjective well-being of these married respondents.
As above, examining the relationship by gender as well indicates that female married respondents report the lowest mean levels of well-being (9.28), a finding which has been documented elsewhere, beginning with Durkheim's suicide studies (1897/1951) (table not shown). Unmarried males report the highest mean levels of well-being (10.44), not that much higher than their unmarried female counterparts (10.00). The female gender roles practiced in South Asia vary considerably depending on the religious background and geographic location of the individual, with some continuing to be more conservative by Canada's current standards. A high proportion of these married women enter the workforce in Canada - possibly more from economic necessity than from desire for economic independence - which could cause increased stress in the home, within the women themselves, or between spouses, as cultural values are challenged.

*Age Category*

The differences in mean levels of well-being are very similar by age category, as shown in Table 4.18. The youngest respondents report the lowest levels of well-being (possibly a reaction to difficulties in Canada in the face of typically youthful optimism), after which mean well-being levels rise slightly, peaking among respondents in their forties (mean=10.09). While not a statistically significant relationship, it is interesting to note that many of those reporting the lowest well-being are in their thirties, and reportedly had relative economic success (though they reported difficulties obtaining equivalent jobs, their employment incomes are among the highest). Possibly there are other demographic factors explaining this relationship, such as marital status and gender.
Country of Birth

The mean differences in well-being by country of birth presented in Table 4.18 appear to indicate a split between Bangladeshi and Sri Lankan respondents from their Indian and Pakistani counterparts (though again, the inconsistent distribution of respondents across these four categories must be kept in mind). Bangladeshi respondents report the highest mean levels of well-being (11.00), followed by Sri Lankans (10.09), compared to means of 9.78 and 9.05 among Indian and Pakistani respondents respectively. Perhaps most surprising is that the split in these levels is not reversed: respondents born in Pakistan and India report relative success on the economic dimension, while Sri Lankans and Bangladeshis are consistently at the lower end of employment and household incomes, employment rates, and rates of job equivalency.

Again, other demographic factors may be at work which may explain these differences by country of birth. On the other hand, these differences in levels of well-being may also be related to other factors mentioned from the outset, such as expectations and previous life experiences. Sri Lankan respondents are almost all in Canada as a result of the civil unrest in that country, and during interviews, almost all expressed a desire to return to their country of origin once that unrest has ceased. Moreover, the majority of Sri Lankan respondents arrived as family class immigrants, and so their elevated levels of well-being may be related to the social contexts into which they have inserted themselves – in effect, to their social network resources. As for the low levels of overall health and well-being among Pakistani respondents, these may be linked to the high level of education among this group, and therefore to high, unmet expectations. These other factors may be at work in explaining these country of birth differences.
Number of Years in Canada

Although not statistically significant, there are slight differences in the mean levels of well-being reported by length of residence in Canada (see Table 4.18). The levels do not seem to follow any observable pattern that can be linked to respondents’ economic integration. The highest level of well-being, observed among those in Canada one year or less, may be related to the optimism associated with immigrating to a new country that is full of possibilities: these respondents have had less time to experience failure, and to have their expectations for good employment stifled by accreditation and other problems. At the same time, the longer a respondent is in Canada, the greater the chance that their expectations are unfulfilled, perhaps indicated by the lower mean levels among those in Canada five years. Goldlust and Richmond (1974) reported a split between respondents in Canada five years or less, and those in Canada longer, with the former group reporting consistently lower levels of satisfaction. Thus, consistently low levels of well-being in the SANS sample would be expected – barring the initial optimism of the first year – which is in fact observed.

Summary

The differences in mean levels of well-being reported by the five demographic control variables are not statistically significant, so that the preceding discussion has perhaps exaggerated differences where in fact none exist. Nonetheless, when working with a small sample, statistical significance is somewhat rarer, so I have elected to discuss even slight variations.

What has emerged is in some cases a somewhat difference picture than that proposed in Chapter Two. As predicted, marital status interacts with gender resulting in lower levels of
well-being among married females, while gender also appears to interact with immigrant class, resulting in much lower levels of satisfaction among independent class females. Possible reasons for these differences include cultural and gender role conflicts, unmet education-related expectations of economic success, and the effects of social networks.

Contrary to expectations, Sri Lankan respondents report much higher mean levels of well-being than expected, while Pakistani respondents report lower levels. Based on Pakistani immigrants’ superior economic performance in Canada, there may be little association between the economic and well-being domains of integration (as suggested by correlations presented at the beginning of the chapter). Or, this may be related to pre-migration experiences and expectations, or to other sample characteristics that this bivariate analysis is unable to account for, such as the provision of social support by social networks, which serves to elevate Sri Lankans’ levels of well-being.\textsuperscript{16} Finally, the effects of length of residence seem to reflect previous findings that levels of well-being are fairly constant over the first five years in the host country. As with all of the integration indicators discussed in this chapter, the best way to untangle these complex interrelationships is to conduct logistic and ordinary least squares regressions, analyses that are presented in Chapter 6.

\textsuperscript{16} Wheaton (1990) has found that previous stressful events can in fact \textit{benefit} an individual when subsequent stressful events are encountered – either through the development of coping mechanisms, or because the subsequent events are contextualized differently and found to be non-stressful. It \textit{could} be that respondents who have suffered previous stress associated with living in a country at war may find that associated with finding a job in Canada to be comparatively non-stressful.
THE INTEGRATION OF RESPONDENTS NOT IN THE LABOUR FORCE: A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT DEFINITION

Within the sample of 109 South Asian respondents interviewed, 25 reported that they were not in the labour force at the time of the interview. While a proportion (56%) of these individuals had held jobs at some point in Canada, each was unemployed at the time of the interview, making it difficult to assess their levels of economic integration as was done for the proportion of the sample in the labour force at interview. The primary variable of interest describing their integration in Canada is therefore overall health and well-being. The analysis of this dimension of well-being is supplemented with a brief examination of household income as an indicator of economic integration, despite the difficulties in using a household measure to determine individual levels of immigration (these problems were discussed in Chapter Three).

The discussion presented below follows a slightly different format than that in the preceding sections. The small number of cases not in the labour force means that chi-square tests cannot be computed for the sub-groups of interest. The majority of respondents not in the labour force are also female, and so comparisons are made between the levels of integration of females by their labour force status, as well as by class within the non-labour force sample. A general discussion of the variations in levels of health and well-being will therefore present the trends by the demographic sub-groups, and highlight any particularly interesting differences between females in and out of the labour force.
General Demographic Characteristics of Respondents Not in the Labour Force

Before presenting variations in levels of well-being, sub-sample characteristics should be discussed. All of but two of the respondents not in the labour force are females (92.0%); the analysis of those not in the labour force is therefore restricted to females. Comparing the demographic characteristics of females in and out of the labour force, they are generally very similar (please see Table 4.19). Differences to highlight are that females in the labour force are distributed across the age categories more evenly, while among females not in the labour force, there are slightly more women in the youngest and oldest age categories; nevertheless, the mean age of females in (34.6) and out (35.6) of the labour force are comparable (mean not shown in Table 4.19). As well, a higher proportion of females in the labour force originate from India (56.0%), while a majority of females not in the labour force were born in Sri Lanka (39.1%). Finally, a majority of females not in the labour force have been in Canada three years (43.5%), though on average they have been in Canada slightly less than one year longer than females in the labour force (3.4 versus 3.1 years, mean not shown in Table 4.19).

The majority of females not in the labour force reported that they were homemakers (52.2%) and one woman was on maternity leave and returning to work within a month of the interview. Another 34.8% reported that they were students, and two individuals (8.7%) were retired (not shown in a table).

Both of the males not in the labour force are family class respondents from India; one is married. They are both over the age of fifty, and one has been in Canada four years, the other five years.
Table 4.19: Proportion of Respondents In and Out of the Labour Force by Demographic Characteristics, Females Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labour Force Status</th>
<th>In the Labour Force (%)</th>
<th>Not in the Labour Force (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Years in Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or less</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean Household Income Levels Among Respondents Not in the Labour Force

As stated, this variable is an imperfect representation of the economic well-being of respondents not in the labour force, but it provides a decent crude indicator of relative wealth and poverty levels. Among respondents not in the labour force at the time of the interview, the mean household income is approximately $41,087, compared to $42,342 among respondents in the labour force (see Table 4.20). Interestingly, the mean household income among those not in the labour force is slightly higher for family class respondents ($44,375) compared to independent class respondents ($33,571), while the reverse is true among respondents in the labour force ($46,689 among independent class respondent compared to $38,512 among the family class). Overall, however, mean household income levels do not differ greatly by labour force status.

The mean number of people contributing to the household income is approximately equal by class of immigration. When this relationship is broken down by labour force participation status within immigrant class groups, the independent respondents not in the labour force report slightly smaller mean numbers of contributors (1.17 compared to 1.79 among independent class respondents in the labour force). The opposite is true among family class members, where a slightly higher mean is reported among family class respondents not in the labour force (2.41) compared to those respondents in the labour force (2.24). Perhaps this indicates that family class respondents are able to choose to stay out of the labour market because there is a larger number of individuals contributing their (individually lower) wages to the household economic pool, whereas independent respondents are able to choose to stay out of the labour force because they have one primary contributor who is making a higher income. In each case, the household is economically successful enough that the respondent is not
Table 4.20:
Mean Household Income Levels Among Selected Sub-Samples, by Labour Force Status and Immigrant Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labour Force Status</th>
<th>In the Labour Force</th>
<th>Not in the Labour Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Sample</td>
<td>$46,689</td>
<td>$38,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$42,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females Only</td>
<td>$54,500</td>
<td>$36,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$39,773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
forced to enter the labour market out of economic necessity.

Given that the majority of those not in the labour force are female, it is appropriate to compare the household incomes of these women to those of females in the labour force. The mean household income among the latter group is $43,958 compared to $39,773 among females not in the labour force. The mean household income among independent females in the labour force is significantly higher than that of their family class counterparts ($54,500 compared to $36,429; F=3.80, d.f.=1 p<0.064; \eta^2=.147). By contrast, the gap is smaller and reversed among females not in the labour force, with family class respondents reporting slightly higher household incomes ($42,667 compared to $33,371). Clearly, the household incomes of female independent class immigrants in the labour force are positively influenced by the higher return to human capital investments observed in previous sections and chapters. As previously noted, the determinants of household income are beyond individual characteristics. The above indicates that while some differences do exist, on average females in and out of the labour force report similar household incomes.

*Overall Health and Well-Being Among Respondents Not in the Labour Force*

Among females not in the labour force, the mean level of well-being is 9.4, equivalent to that of females in the labour force (please see Table 4.21), and slightly lower than the mean for all respondents not in the labour force, which is 9.6 (this difference in two points on the scale is a result of the very high levels of well-being reported by the two retired males in the not in the labour force sub-sample, but who are not included in this table). Given the essentially equivalent levels of well-being among females regardless of labour force status, a
Table 4.21:
Mean Levels of Well-Being Among Females, by Labour Force Status and Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Levels of Overall Health and Well-Being</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Labour Force</td>
<td>Not in the Labour Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>9.40 (25)</td>
<td>9.39 (23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
glance at the distribution of these levels by other demographic characteristics is interesting. A general comment on the levels in Table 4.21 is the extreme variability within the two labour force status groups. In fact, the greatest similarity occurs by marital status, and also by immigrant class, where females who are married report consistently lower levels of well-being regardless of whether they are in the labour force, though there is greater variability among women not in the labour force (the levels ranging between 9.10 for married females and 10.75 for unmarried females not in the labour force).\(^1\) Comparing levels of well-being by immigrant class, it is evident that independent class females report the lowest levels of overall health and well-being (in the 8.20 to 8.50 range) regardless of labour force status, this time with women in the labour force reporting a higher range in levels (between 8.20 among independent and 10.20 among family class females).

Comparing Tables 4.18 and 4.21, the well-being of females in the labour force generally follows a similar pattern by demographic sub-groups to that among the whole sub-sample of respondents in the labour force, though the mean levels are somewhat lower among the female-only sub-sample. By contrast, the pattern among females not in the labour force by age category, country of birth and number of years in Canada appears to be somewhat different (see Table 4.21); this could indicate that there are separate determinants of well-being by an immigrant’s labour force status. For example, mean levels of well-being steadily decline from the youngest to the oldest among females not in the labour force (from a high of 10.50 as mentioned, to a low of 8.00); this compares to generally steady rates of well-being around 9.00 on the twelve-point scale among females in the labour force regardless of their

---

\(^1\) Examining the levels by age category and labour force status shows that the youngest group not in the labour force reports the highest levels of well-being (10.50); these women very likely contribute to the higher
age, except for those in their forties who report higher levels of well-being (10.50). The differences among females not in the labour force are likely related to their reasons for not seeking paid employment. As stated above, the high levels among the youngest group may be related to their lack of responsibilities, as many are likely to be students. By contrast, the lowest levels found among women over forty may be related to being of retirement age and other age-related health concerns (two are retired).

Comparing the levels of well-being by country of origin also uncovers differences by labour force status. Indian female respondents not in the labour force have much higher mean levels of well-being than their labour force counterparts – 11.20 compared to 9.64. This could be related to other factors, such as age or class of immigration. Females not in the labour force who have been in Canada four years (a small proportion of the sub-sample, see Table 4.19) have much higher levels of well-being compared to women in Canada the same number of years who are in the labour force (11.00 versus 9.57). Again, reasons for this difference can only be speculative without conducting multivariate analysis.

Probably the most interesting difference in levels of well-being between the two groups of females is by immigrant class. All other differences pointed out here may be somewhat related to underlying demographic characteristics, as the variability occurs within and between the two sub-samples of females; moreover, the differences within each labour force status sub-group occur among a small number of cases, and so cannot be treated as necessarily indicating real (or statistically significant) differences. By contrast, the consistency of the mean levels of well-being among females by their class of immigration, regardless of their labour force status, suggests that there might be something about being a member of
either class that affects an individual female's level of overall health and well-being. Of course, differences in levels of well-being among these respondents are likely related to their different resources — in particular, social network resources. Thus, this difference will be an important focus of the analysis of health and well-being in Chapter Six.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The relationships between four dependent variables representing two domains of integration were discussed. It was argued that three variables representing the economic domain, two objective indicators and one subjective indicator, are related, but that they do in fact articulate separate aspects of the economic integration process. A fourth subjective variable was argued to represent a second, separate domain of integration that, while related to the economic, provides a starting point for a reconceptualization of the integration process beyond the economic. While the preceding discussion of sample variation across each of these indicators has uncovered some similarities in sub-group levels of integration, differences have emerged which add credence to the argument that these four dependent variables do provide a fuller examination of the integration process than a unidimensional, one-variable discussion.

Table 4.22 summarizes the findings concerning the relative integration of independent versus family class immigrants, the primary bivariate relationship of interest. Though not all of the differences are statistically significant, independent class respondents do better on each of the economic indicators of immigration, while family class respondents appear to enjoy superior levels of well-being. Ignoring statistical significance for the moment, these immigrant worries and responsibilities.
Table 4.22:  
Summary of Immigrant Class Differences by Four Measures of Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Measure of Integration</th>
<th>Independent Class</th>
<th>Family Class</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (%)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>$\chi^2=1.56$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Employment Earnings ($)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>31,061</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>F=4.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Equivalency (%)</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>$\chi^2=3.799$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Well-Being Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Level of Well-Being&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>F=0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Level of Well-Being Females Not in the Labour Force</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>F=2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> This calculation is based on respondents in the labour force.

<sup>2</sup> The calculations for Mean Employment Earnings and Job Equivalency are conducted on respondents employed at interview.

<sup>3</sup> This calculation is conducted on all respondents in the labour force.
class differences appear to support hypotheses concerning their levels of success on these measures; only among respondents in the labour force are the class differences in levels of well-being so close as to question the existence of any real differences. That is, even with a larger sample, the levels of well-being among this sub-sample are so similar as to suggest no real differences in levels of well-being by class of immigration, though this must of course be left to speculation.

In terms of differences by demographic sub-groups, some appear to be having more difficulty integrating economically, though the patterns are far from perfect. Respondents from Sri Lanka, and respondents in Canada the least amount of time, have lower employment rates, lower mean earnings, and are less likely to report job equivalency, than other comparison groups. Females perform consistently poorly relative to the males in the sample, except in terms of job equivalency, where they have higher rates. Age affects achievement on each economic indicator differently: the youngest group has the most difficulty getting a job, as well as finding equivalent work, while those in their forties have lower incomes but higher job equivalency.

In terms of the subjective indicator of well-being, fewer sub-sample differences were noted in comparison to the economic indicators. While females continue to do poorly relative to males, there are interactions between being female and an independent immigrant, and being female and married, which appear to explain the lower levels of well-being among females overall. As well, Sri Lankan and Bangladeshi respondents have superior levels of health and well-being, despite their poor performance on all of the economic integration indicators.
Explanations offered for the differences in economic integration centre on individual levels of human capital, which are generally related to age and gender roles. And, while some measure of immigrant class differences can be explained as they pertain to background demographic characteristics of the classes, the full explanation most likely lies in terms of resource levels of individual immigrants. The observed class differences could be connected to the immigrant selection process (which would in fact confirm Canadian policy-makers’ efforts to encourage the flow of independent applicants). At the same time, I have indicated a concern with treating immigrant classes as if they were a naturally occurring phenomenon as opposed to a socially constructed one, and have raised questions about overlap in levels of human capital by immigrant class. Indeed, the reflections of respondents were introduced to demonstrate the stresses of finding comparable work, particularly for professionals, which exist regardless of the individual’s class of immigration.

Thus, it is likely that immigrant class differences in economic integration are related to individual resources, such as cultural capital and linguistic ability; financial resources brought into the country; and social network resources. In particular, regardless of the human capital levels possessed by members of the two immigrant classes, the ways in which individuals’ social networks modify the effectiveness of these resources may be key. That is, an individual is likely to mobilize her or his social networks to provide access to job information, with the ‘quality’ and ‘quantity’ of job information within that network ultimately determining the individual’s level of success. Moreover, social network utility is likely implicated in reported levels of well-being, in the form of social support, while levels of economic integration are also likely to affect respondents’ subjective perceptions of success in integration, and their subsequent well-being.
The next chapter's purpose is to determine how respondents' individual resources differ according to their background demographic characteristics, but in particular by immigrant class. Are there in fact differences by immigrant class in the resources possessed by these respondents, as assumed by immigration policies and the human capital model of integration? Are these differences reflective of the policy upon which their admission into Canada was based, or is the relationship more complex than that? Chapter Five addresses the descriptive aspect of resource differences.
CHAPTER FIVE:
COMPARING IMMIGRANT RESOURCES BY POLICY CLASS

INTRODUCTION

The major task of this chapter is to document the resources possessed by family and independent class immigrants, and thereby test conventional academic and policy assumptions about each. Figure 5.1 is a more simplified version of the integration model presented in Chapter Two, focusing on the first part of the process. Are there real differences in the resources possessed by these respondents by their class of immigration? Are these differences reflective of the policies upon which their admission into Canada was based, or is the relationship more complex than that? Chapters Two and Four have argued that immigration policies have over-emphasized the differences between family and independent class immigrants, and in particular over-valued the benefits of human capital resources at the expense of social network resources. This chapter does some preliminary work of describing the resources possessed by the two immigrant class groups to determine if the assumed connection between class and specifically human capital levels is empirically supported, though some of the more complex issues surrounding reasons for, and goals of immigration are left for another time. To this end, analysis of variance and difference of means tests were conducted (depending on the level of the variable). This descriptive analysis is followed by ordinary least squares regressions or logistic regressions (depending on the dependent variable type), which permit an examination of the effect of immigrant class on resource levels,
Figure 5.1:
Model of the Relationship Between Policy Class of Admission, Demographic Characteristics, and Immigrant Resources

Policy Class of Admission

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ➔ RESOURCES 1 ➔ RESOURCES 2
(At Immigration) (At Interview)

Gender
Age
Marital Status
Country of Birth

Human Capital 1 ➔ Financial Capital
Cultural Capital
Social Capital 1 ➔ Social Capital 2 ➔ Support

Psychological Resources 2
Human Capital 2

Number of Years in Canada ➔ Change Over Time
controlling for the four demographic variables and the passage of time in Canada (years in Canada).\(^1\)

**IMMIGRANT CLASS DIFFERENCES: A FIRST LOOK**

Before turning to an examination of immigrant class resource differences, it is instructive to examine the demographic make-up of the two groups. As discussed in Chapter Three, this sample does not conform to normal distributions across the four countries of origin, by class, by marital status, by number of years in Canada, by age or by gender. Table 5.1 presents the bivariate relationships between immigrant class and these five demographic, or background, variables.

Among both classes, females are a minority, although they make up close to half of the family class sample (47.6% versus 39.0%); this is partially due to the fact that the sample is 56% male overall.\(^2\) Among both classes, the majority are married, though again, a slightly larger majority of family class respondents are so (82.5% versus 69.6%). Approximately equivalent proportions of both groups (70%) are in the age range of 20 to 39, though the family class has both a larger proportion in the 20-29 age group (33.3% compared to 21.7%) and in the over 50 age category (19.1% versus 10.9%); half of independent applicants are between the ages of 30 and 39. This differing age structure reflects the criteria for admission in each category: family class immigrants may be sponsored siblings or parents (among other

---

\(^1\) Finally, I also needed to determine the effect of including the three assisted relatives as part of the independent class on overall statistical significance levels. I ran each regression twice – once on the whole sample, and then again leaving these three respondents out. While in some instances significance levels did improve, they never were dramatic enough to shift a result from non-significance to statistical significance: I therefore only report the results using the whole sample.
relations) of previous migrants, while independent applicants are favoured if they are between the ages of 21 and 44 (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 1993b). Nevertheless, the age structures of these two classes is not that different. Combined with the predominance of males, however, the independent class displays expected characteristics associated with labour market participation.

There is almost a statistically significant difference in the proportion of respondents originating from each of the four countries of origin by the two immigrant classes ($\chi^2=7.173$, $p<0.0666$): the largest proportion in each immigration class was born in India (45.6% of independents compared to 41.3% of family) – not surprising given that a majority of the sample is from India (43%). The proportion of respondents from Bangladesh in each class is negligible (there are only 6 respondents in the sample born in this country), with five of them arriving as family class respondents (these comprise 7.9% of the total family class). Where the two groups differ the most is in the proportion of respondents from Pakistan and Sri Lanka, with respondents from Pakistan comprising 32.6% of the independent versus only 15.9% of the family class, compared to Sri Lankan respondents who comprise about 19.6% of the independent versus 34.9% of the family class. In essence, the family class is dominated by respondents born in India and Sri Lanka, while the independent class is composed mainly of Indian-born and Pakistani-born respondents.

---

2 According to the 1991 Census of Canada, 46.4% of South Asian immigrants were female.
Table 5.1:
Analysis of Variance of Respondent Demographic Characteristics,
by Class of Immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Independent Class (%)</th>
<th>Family Class (%)</th>
<th>Chi-Square Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>$\chi^2=0.774$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=0.3780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>$\chi^2=2.532$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=0.1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2=4.552$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>d.f.=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>p=0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2=7.173$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>d.f.=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>p&lt;0.0666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2=9.512$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or Less</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>d.f.=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>p=0.0495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to Eight</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Indian community has a relatively longer history of immigration to Canada, which would explain the high proportion of sponsored immigrants. By contrast, the predominance of Sri Lankans in the family class is certainly a reflection of the particular history of war in Sri Lanka, and the tremendous flow of refugees in the 1970s and 1980s who, in turn, have sponsored many others to come to Canada. The high concentration of Sri Lankan respondents among the family class may have implications for the group’s overall integration outcomes, particularly as the networks of these respondents are likely to be composed of high proportions of foreign-born Sri Lankans who arrived as refugees, and who may still be struggling to achieve many goals of integration themselves as a result of their forced migration. Such networks may be less capital-rich, but may also contain settlement information specific to groups which have required, and used, more formal types of assistance consistent with the refugee experience.

Finally, turning to length of time in Canada, over half of the family class sample has been in Canada four or five years (55.5% compared to 32.6% of independent class respondents), while almost half (45.6%) of independent class respondents have been in Canada two years or less, compared to only 20.6% of family class respondents; this difference is statistically significant ($\chi^2=9.512$, $p<0.0495$). Certainly this sample skewness is important to acknowledge, because length of residence in the host country has been found by many researchers to be central to the successful integration of immigrants – albeit a more significant cusp would be if some of the sample had been in Canada eight or more years versus two or less, because it is after this much longer period of time that immigrants typically begin to match, or outdo, their native born counterparts in the labour market.
These demographic differences between the two immigrant classes are important to note. Though later regression analyses control for these differences, statistically significant effects may not always indicate a theoretically significant statistical finding, but may in fact simply be reflecting the sample composition itself.

**IMMIGRANT CLASS DIFFERENCES IN INDIVIDUAL RESOURCE LEVELS**

Table 5.2 presents statistical tests of differences in the resource levels of these respondents according to their class of immigration. Because the emphasis in the immigration literature has been on human capital resources, these are presented first, followed by financial, cultural, personal and finally social network resources. Variables which measure levels of resources at immigration always precede those measuring resources at interview (where applicable). These differences are calculated across the whole sample, as opposed to according to respondents' labour force status, in order to address the general question of whether there are any differences in resources by class.3

---

3 I could also calculate these class differences according to the sub-samples discussed in Chapter Four: among respondents in and out of the labour force, among females in and out of the labour force, among respondents employed at interview only. There could be something about the resources of respondents who enter the labour force that differs from those possessed by respondents not in the labour force. The same tests were in fact conducted in two other ways from that presented: looking for class differences among respondents in the labour force only; and looking for differences by labour force status, among the whole sample. The results from the first group of tests are remarkably similar to those conducted on the entire sample, with one notable exception: the difference in immigrant class mean occupational prestige levels before migration are significant among respondents in the labour force, with family class respondents reporting higher levels (mean=60.00 versus 55.17 among independent class respondents, F=3.65 d.f.=1 p<.060). In the second group of tests, looking for differences in resource levels by labour force status, there are two interesting deviations from the analysis presented: there are effectively no significant differences in financial, personal, social network, and even the majority of human capital resource levels. What is different between respondents in and out of the labour force are their levels of education, with 73.8% versus 36.9% of respondents not in the labour force reporting a University degree at immigration ($\chi^2=12.13$ d.f.=1 $p<.000$), and the mean number of years of education among those in the labour force 16.51 compared to 14.82 years for those not in the labour force ($F=6.57$ d.f.=1 $p<.012$). Therefore, it is very likely that an immigrant's level of education has a role in determining whether they enter the labour force.
Table 5.2:
Analysis of Variance and Chi-Square Tests of Differences in Levels of Resources
by Respondent’s Class of Immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant Resource Indicators</th>
<th>Independent Class</th>
<th>Family Class</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University Degree</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>$\chi^2=2.70$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige of Job Held Prior to Migration</td>
<td>54.90</td>
<td>58.28</td>
<td>F=2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years of Job-Specific Experience</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>F=0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessed English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>F=7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Capital – At Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years of Schooling</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>F=0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Some Schooling in Canada</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>$\chi^2=2.84$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Money Brought into Canada</td>
<td>30,641</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>F=21.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>F=38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Locus of Control</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>F=2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Someone in Canada</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>$\chi^2=3.81$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Immediate Family in Canada</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>$\chi^2=22.44$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Extended Family in Canada</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>$\chi^2=1.17$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.f.=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2 (continued):

Analysis of Variance and Chi-Square Tests of Differences in Levels of Resources
by Respondent’s Class of Immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant Resource Indicators</th>
<th>Independent Class</th>
<th>Family Class</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital – At Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mean Network Size             | 5.33              | 4.76         | F=1.28  
d.f.=1  
p<0.260 |
| Mean % Kin                    | 0.32              | 0.61         | F=24.01  
d.f.=1  
p<0.000 |
| Mean % Immediate Kin          | .09               | .34          | F=32.21  
d.f.=1  
p<0.000 |
| Mean % Extended Kin           | 0.23              | 0.27         | F=0.72  
d.f.=1  
p<0.397 |
| Mean % Friends                | 0.54              | 0.34         | F=11.52  
d.f.=1  
p<0.001 |
| Mean % Acquaintances          | 0.05              | 0.03         | F=0.55  
d.f.=1  
p<0.462 |
| Mean % Formal Ties            | 0.05              | 0.02         | F=4.65  
d.f.=1  
p<0.033 |
| Mean Total Support            | 8.59              | 9.94         | F=6.97  
d.f.=1  
p<0.010 |
| Mean Emotional Support        | 2.47              | 2.79         | F=4.43  
d.f.=1  
p<0.038 |
| Mean Financial Support        | 1.25              | 1.62         | F=10.20  
d.f.=1  
p<0.002 |
| Mean Job Information Support  | 1.65              | 1.94         | F=4.01  
d.f.=1  
p<0.048 |
| Mean Settlement Support       | 1.66              | 1.94         | F=3.55  
d.f.=1  
p<0.062 |
| Mean Housing Support          | 1.56              | 1.65         | F=0.43  
d.f.=1  
p<0.515 |
| Mean Network Density          | 0.58              | 0.75         | F=9.40  
d.f.=1  
p<0.003 |
**Human Capital Resources**

Several variables were used to collect information on the human capital resources of respondents, at the time of their immigration and at the time of the interview. It is important to examine both sets of variables, because past research indicates that previous work experience and educational experience are much less relevant, if not useless, in gaining employment in Canada relative to Canadian experience and Canadian-earned skills and education.

**Human Capital at Immigration**

**Held University Degree at Immigration**

Respondents were asked a series of questions about their education. The variable "held a university degree at immigration" is a measure of a respondent’s educational investment at the time of immigration. A chi-square test indicates that a higher proportion of independent class respondents held such a degree at immigration – 73.9% compared to 58.7% among family class respondents – though this difference is not statistically significant ($\chi^2=2.70$ d.f.$=1$, $p<.100$, please see Table 5.2). An inspection of the ten-point ordinal variable upon which this dichotomous one is based shows very comparable levels of education among the two classes, with higher proportions of independent class immigrants reporting graduate or professional education (34.8% versus 25.8% of the family class); almost four in ten (39.1%) of independent immigrants reporting a university degree versus 32.3% of family class immigrants; 13.0% of independent versus 8.1% of family class respondents reporting a college education; and significantly fewer independent class immigrants reporting a secondary school education (6.5% versus 21.0% of family class respondents – table not shown). This suggests
a real difference by class that is being masked by statistical tests of significance that are overly
stringent for such a small sample.

When demographic characteristics are controlled for in a logistic regression (excluding
years in Canada, because this variable measures an individual’s education at the time they
arrived, and so should be unaffected by the passage of time), family class has no statistically
significant effect on having a university degree at immigration, though family class
respondents are about half as likely to have such a degree (model not shown in table: b= -.71,
SE=.46 p<.122). That is, though there does not appear to be a significant statistical
relationship, given the difference in the odds of having such a degree, it is likely that the small
sample size is masking a real difference. Being born in Sri Lanka has the only close to
statistically significant effect, serving to lower the odds of having a university education by
about 60.0% compared to Indian respondents (b= -.90, SE=.52 p<.081).

To ensure that there was no time period effect (on the accuracy of respondents’ recall,
for example, or an effect from changing policy regulations), I re-ran the same multiple
regression, this time including years in Canada as an additional control (See Table 5.3: Chi-
square=17.29 d.f.=8 p<.027). The addition of this control variable improves the fit of the
model slightly, with each additional year in Canada reducing the odds of having a university
degree at immigration by .64 (b= -.44 SE=.18 p<.016). On the other hand, being married
increases the odds of having such a degree by almost three times (b=1.11 SE=.58 p<.056).5

---

4 -2 log Likelihood=129.96, χ²=11.00 d.f.=7 p<.139; Goodness of Fit=109.01.
5 Being born in Sri Lanka remains almost statistically significant, and retains its effect and power
relative to the model excluding the years in Canada control.
Table 5.3: Logistic Regressions on Held a University Degree at Immigration and Attended Some Schooling in Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Held a University Degree at Immigration</th>
<th>Attended Some Schooling in Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Odds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.11#</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-.90#</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University Degree at Immigration</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.87**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>123.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance level</td>
<td>p&lt;.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit</td>
<td>111.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at p < 0.01 level
* Significant at p < 0.05 level
# Significant at p< 0.10 level
What this seems to indicate is that the longer a respondent has been in Canada, the lower their level of education at immigration.

While the years in Canada variable is statistically significant, it is likely pointing to other demographic characteristics of the sample, rather than toward a trend of increasing educational qualifications of respondents over time\(^6\) – in effect, a sampling effect. The most common reason given for not participating in the study was lack of time, in particular by independent applicants. The longer an individual is in Canada, the more likely it is that they have begun to establish themselves here, and the less likely they are to have free time to indulge a Ph.D. student. Indeed, many reported working long hours, sometimes at multiple jobs. It is possible that individuals with a higher education, who had also been in Canada slightly longer and who had obtained decent or good jobs, were simply not able to participate because of time constraints imposed by these jobs. In contrast, earlier arrivals with an education, as yet unestablished in Canada, may have had more time to discuss their experiences in Canada, and in fact may have been motivated to participate in the study in the hope that we could assist them in the job-search process, or that they could at least use the opportunity to discuss their frustrations with an objective outsider who appeared to hold some legitimacy in terms of the immigration process. This whole discussion reinforces the difficulties of working with a small sample in which slight variations can be misinterpreted;

\(^6\) There is some debate as to the changing skill levels of immigrants to Canada, and a similar debate in the US. There were policy changes in the 1990s which tried to select for more educated independent applicants, but it is unlikely that the repercussions from this change would be felt as early as 1992 to 1996 due to the length of time required for such policy amendments to be approved and then implemented by government.
regardless of the reason, the years in Canada control will be used for each of the other resources at immigration variables.

**Occupational Prestige of Job Before Migration**

A second human capital measure is the prestige level of respondents’ main jobs before immigrating. Difference of means tests in Table 5.2 reveal no statistically significant difference between the occupational prestige of family and independent class immigrants (F=2.10 p<0.151); in fact, family class respondents reported slightly *higher* occupational prestige levels than their independent class counterparts (58.28 versus 54.90), something which goes quite contrary to expectations. Multiple regression results controlling for demographic characteristics are similarly non-significant (table not shown, F=0.79 p<0.611). Quite likely this is due to misspecification of the model, such as the omission of an education control variable. Indeed, when I control for holding a University degree at immigration, the model becomes significant, with both the family class variable (see Table 5.4: beta=0.23, t=2.15 p<0.034) and holding a University degree at immigration (beta=0.42, t=3.86 p<0.000) having positive effects on respondents’ previous occupational prestige before immigration. While it is certainly *not* surprising that individuals with higher education also held higher prestige jobs prior to migrating, the finding of superior occupational prestige levels before migration among family class respondents is totally contrary to predictions based on policy assumptions.

---

7 F=2.48, p<0.015, R²=0.214, adjusted R²=0.127.
Table 5.4: OLS Regressions Predicting Human Capital Resources at Immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Prestige of Main Job Before Immigration</th>
<th>Years of Main Job-Specific Work Experience Before Immigration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>5.13*</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.20#</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-6.53</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University Degree at Immigration</td>
<td>10.27**</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>39.65**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the p< 0.01 level  
* Significant at the p< 0.05 level  
# Approaching significance at the p<.10 level

¹ There are four dummy variables representing country of birth; in each analysis, India is the comparison group.
Years of Job Experience Before Migration

A third variable measuring work experience before migration was also collected. This variable asked respondents how long they had done the type of work described in their main occupation before migrating, a human capital investment important in determining an individual’s overall skill level. A means difference test reveals no statistically significant difference between the immigration classes (F=0.92 d.f.=1 p<0.341, see Table 5.2), though family class respondents reported a higher mean number of years of experience than independent class respondents (9.54 versus 7.75).

Of course, when considering the years of experience, it is important to control for certain individual characteristics, in particular age and gender: older males are more likely to have more work experience than other demographic groups. Indeed, the multiple regression model shown in Table 5.4 controlling for the same demographic characteristics is statistically significant, with several statistically significant predictors – not including the family class variable though (F=26.94 p<0.000, $R^2=0.75$, adjusted $R^2=0.72$). Being older has the strongest effect and increases the number of years of occupation-specific experience before migration (beta=0.81, $t=13.10$, p<0.000), while being female (beta=-0.14, $t=-2.37$ p<0.020), born in Sri Lanka relative to India (beta=-0.17, $t=-2.63$ p<0.010), and having spent more years in Canada (beta=-0.13, $t=-2.10$ p<0.039) all negatively affect previous occupation-specific work experience. All of these findings are in keeping with predictions.

Self-Assessed English Ability at Immigration

Table 5.2 shows that independent immigrants have slightly higher self-reported English abilities (a mean of 14.87 on the English ability scale compared to 13.79 among family class
respondents, $F=7.42, \text{ d.f.}=1, p<0.008$). Even when we hold the same demographic background variables constant, class of immigration remains a significant predictor of self-reported English proficiency ($F=3.48 \ p<0.001; R^2=0.22$, adjusted $R^2=0.16$). In fact, being in the family class reduces a respondent’s score on the English ability scale by almost one unit ($b=-0.96$) compared to independent class immigrants ($\beta=-0.23 \ t=-2.37 \ p<0.02$ — table not shown). When a control for having a University degree at immigration is introduced, the family class coefficient retains its significance and explanatory power (see Table 5.5: $\beta=-.21 \ t=-2.19 \ p<.03$). This is interesting given that English ability is usually subsumed under an individual’s human capital, and independent class respondents are supposedly selected based on their human capital levels: one would therefore expect the education control to explain away the differences in linguistic abilities based on class. The education coefficient has the opposite effect of the family class one, in that having a University degree increases an individual’s self-assessed English ability by $\beta=.21 \ (t=2.28 \ p<.02)$. Finally, as expected, all country of origin coefficients are significant and negative relative to the Indian comparison group.

---

8 It is important to note that the indicator for English ability is a subjective measure made by the respondents about their ability. Problems with this measure include over- or under-inflation by respondents. The difficulty is that rating one’s language ability tends to be a comparative exercise, to family members, and even to the interviewer. Generally, though, all respondents spoke English well enough to do the interview with no difficulty, rendering finer comparisons perhaps overambitious. It is possible that there is a personality effect here as well, with more self-assured respondents rating themselves more highly. This was investigated using a control for internal locus of control in the same regression model, but the effect of the family class variable remained significant.
Table 5.5: OLS Regressions Predicting Human Capital Resources at Immigration and Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>HUMAN CAPITAL AT IMMIGRATION</th>
<th>HUMAN CAPITAL AT INTERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Assessed English Ability at Interview</td>
<td>Years of Education At Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-.87*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-1.80*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-1.39**</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-1.38**</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University Degree at Immigration</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the p< 0.01 level
* Significant at the p< 0.05 level
# Approaching significance at the p<.10 level
From the preliminary analysis of these four variables emerges an inconsistent picture of the relationship between pre-migration human capital levels and immigration class. While independent class immigrants were expected to have higher levels of education, work experience and job prestige (indicating professional or a managerial job as opposed to semi- or unskilled employment) and English language abilities, the immigration class variable is either non-significant when basic demographic characteristics are controlled for, or in the case of occupational prestige before migration, statistically significant in the opposite to predicted direction (language ability is the exception). These findings may simply be an artifact of this sample, in that individuals with higher levels of education regardless of immigration class were more willing to participate in the interview, thereby effectively eliminating any real variation in human capital levels by immigration class. Or, the small sample size may be limiting the statistical power of any relationships.

Another possibility draws on the work by Borjas (1990) in the US. He argues that the types of immigrants one could expect from underdeveloped, or less-developed areas of the world, would be different depending on the opportunities for the educated and skilled stratum within those countries – that is, depending on the opportunity structures within those countries. Educated people with good opportunities for advancement would be less likely to immigrate than people whose mobility, and indeed life chances, were constricted due to an inegalitarian income distribution. Based on Borjas’ argument, then, the individuals in the SANS sample could reflect the attraction of people at the higher end of the low to moderately-skilled stratum, and of people at the lower end of the highly skilled stratum –
possibly explaining the fact that independent class respondents have lower levels of
occupational prestige at immigration than family class immigrants.\(^9\)

Borjas' (1990) argument of course presumes that Canada's policy classes actually
reflect a meaningful and real difference in the skills of these immigrants, rather than creating
this difference. This leads to yet another explanation: that these results may be pointing out a
growing similarity in the human capital levels of immigrants at arrival from South Asia
regardless of their immigration class, supporting the argument that immigration policy class
may be less an objective indicator of individual labour market suitability, and more an artifact
resulting from pragmatic decision-making of individuals who actively decide under which class
they should apply based on processing speed and convenience.\(^{10}\)

**Human Capital at Interview**

**Years of Education**

The variables used to measure human capital levels at the time of the interview are
very similar to those presented above, with minor alterations. Respondents were asked how
many years of education they had completed at the time of the interview, which includes

---

\(^9\) Contrary to this, evidence from Canada argues that the level of development of source countries is
irrelevant to the human capital levels of immigrants (Coulson and DeVoretz 1993). Instead, these researchers
point to declining numbers of independent class immigrants as a result of policy changes favouring other entry
classes. However, the data in their paper were not broken down by immigrant class, making it difficult to make
conclusive statements from their findings. Their explanation for the decline in human capital content of
immigrants to Canada in fact does not illuminate the question of human capital differences by class of
immigration raised by the results in this section.

\(^{10}\) Similar questions are raised by Lary et al. (1994) in their case study of Hong Kong immigrants to
Canada and Australia. These authors discuss the high skill levels of Hong Kong immigrants to Canada
regardless of their immigrant class, and point to the danger of assuming that the classification of immigrants
by policy class represents a real difference in their qualifications, rather than a decision based on personal
reasons to apply under a certain category.
educational qualifications earned since arriving in Canada. Not surprising, the bivariate relationship between years of education at interview and immigration class indicates no statistically significant differences in the mean levels reported – 16.24 among members of the independent class versus 16.03 among the family class (see Table 5.2, F=0.13 d.f.=1 p<0.720). Controlling for the same demographic characteristics above, the multiple regression model remains non-statistically significant (F=1.563 p<0.146; Table 5.5). Again, the educational levels of the members of the two immigrant classes are much more similar than expected.

**Attended Some Schooling in Canada**

Another indicator of Canadian-earned skills is whether respondents have gone to any kind of school in Canada – from university to language training classes. Analysis of variance tests in Table 5.2 indicate no statistically significant difference in the likelihood of attending school in Canada by immigration class, though higher proportions of family class members did report school attendance (61.9% versus 45.7% of independent class members).\(^{11}\) A logistic regression controlling for relevant variables shown in Table 5.3 reveals no statistically significant differences by immigrant class, although holding a University degree at immigration increases the odds of attending some school in Canada by a factor of three (odds=3.09, b=1.13, SE=.54, p<.036).\(^{12}\) Also not surprisingly, being in Canada longer increases the odds of attending classes here by a factor of 2.11 (b=.75, SE=.21, p<0.000), while being born in

---

\(^{11}\) \(\chi^2=2.84, \text{ d.f.}=1, \ p<0.092.\)

\(^{12}\) Running the same model, without the held University degree at immigration, produces similar results in the other predictors, though the model itself is a poorer fit.
Pakistan reduces a respondent's odds of attending classes by .34 (b=-1.08, SE=.59, p<0.07).\textsuperscript{13}

This last finding is likely related to high levels of Pakistani labour force participation: of the twenty-five individuals interviewed, 76.0\% (N=19) reported that they were in the labour force, of which 89.5\% were actually employed (N=17) – the highest rate among the four country of origin groups. Of those not in the labour force, two were retired and four were homemakers, while of those not in the labour force from each of the other countries, at least 20\% reported that they were currently in school. Pakistani respondents are therefore less likely to have attended some schooling in Canada because they are busy being employed.

These findings contradict predicted outcomes. Even when differences in human capital levels at interview occur in the expected direction, they are not even close to being statistically significant. Probably the measure for Canada-earned education does not distinguish enough between types of education which have an impact on occupational prestige (such as university education, or specific occupation-related qualifications). It is also possible that there is some sampling effect that has resulted in a higher proportion of well-educated respondents agreeing to be involved in the study, regardless of immigrant class; such an effect could mask actual human capital differences that exist in the South Asian immigrant population as a whole (this was discussed in Chapter Three).

\textsuperscript{13} Model $\chi^2=30.07$, d.f.=9, $p<0.000$. The age variable is verging on statistical significance, with increasing age only slightly reducing the odds of attending some kind of schooling in Canada ($\exp(B)=0.96$, $b=-.04$, SE=.02, $p<0.088$).
Financial Resources

Amount of Money Brought into Canada

Several income-related questions were asked, with the majority relating to financial well-being in Canada, and used as dependent variables (such as household and personal income). One other variable is used to measure financial resources, as the amount of money respondents brought to Canada (see Chapter Three for its operationalization). Possessing a certain amount of savings can provide an individual with self-employment capital, a cushion against prolonged unemployment or with the necessary funds to attend an educational institution in Canada and obtain necessary job-related Canadian qualifications.

Respondents were asked to report the amount of money they brought with them to Canada, money which could have an impact on the options available to a newcomer in their initial settlement in Canada – enabling educational and skills up-grading to self-employment, instead of accepting the first (usually low-paying) job offered. The difference of means test shown in Table 5.2 indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in the amount of money brought into Canada, with independent immigrants entering Canada with a mean of approximately $30,641, compared to a mean of approximately $5,063 among family class immigrants in this sample (F=21.01, d.f.=1, p<0.000).

Controlling for demographic characteristics in a multiple regression supports this finding (in Table 5.6, F=4.00, d.f.=8, p<0.000). Only the family class and number of years in Canada variables are statistically significant, with the class variable having the strongest effect (class beta=-0.47, t=-4.94 p<0.000; years in Canada beta=.20, t=2.19, p<.03). (Holding other

---

14 R²=0.24, adjusted R²=0.18.
Table 5.6:
OLS Regressions Predicting Financial Capital Resources at Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Amount of Money Brought into Canada at Immigration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-29442.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8972.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-2304.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>428.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-4513.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-3797.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-2851.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>4829.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the p< 0.01 level
* Significant at the p< 0.05 level
# Approaching significance at the p<.10 level
factors constant, each additional year a respondent has been in Canada increases the amount of money they brought into the country by $\beta = 0.20$; this is because the respondents who entered as entrepreneurs and investors all arrived earlier, and so reflects a sampling effect. Again, these findings are in keeping with expectations: independent immigrants are selected to come to Canada primarily based upon their human capital characteristics, and people with higher human capital are likely to also have more financial capital. Even when we leave out investors and entrepreneurs from the analysis, who brought significant amounts of financial capital with them (respectively $N=3$, mean of approximately $128,333$; and $N=4$, mean of $43,379$), family class still has a statistically significant effect on the amount of financial resources reported by the respondent ($\beta = -0.46$, $t = -4.54$, $p < 0.000$; table not shown).

**Cultural Resources**

**Number of Countries to which the Respondent has Traveled**

One variable was used to determine an immigrant’s level of cultural capital as it is measured in terms of contact with Canadian values and customs: the number of countries to which the respondent has traveled. Its operationalization was discussed in Chapter Three. Examining the second variable measuring cultural resources indicates similar results. The difference of means test shown in Table 5.2 shows that independent class immigrants have traveled to a mean of 2.63 countries versus less than one country (0.71) among family class immigrants ($F = 38.46$, $p < 0.000$, $\eta^2 = 0.2644$). In the regression analysis results in Table 5.7, controlling for the same demographic characteristics, this effect persists ($F = 5.73$, d.f. = 8 $p < 0.000$, $R^2 = 0.31$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.26$). Family class has the only statistically significant effect on “number of places traveled” ($t = -5.36$, $p < 0.000$), in that being in the family class reduces the
Table 5.7:
OLS Regressions Predicting Cultural and Psychological Resources at Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>CULTURAL CAPITAL AT INTERVIEW</th>
<th>PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL AT INTERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>Internal Locus of Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-1.79**</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0.75#</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the p< 0.01 level
* Significant at the p< 0.05 level
# Approaching significance at the p<.10 level
number of places traveled to by beta=-0.48. This result is in keeping with expected higher levels of human capital of independent immigrants which would afford members of this class more opportunities for (often) work-related travel, travel related to studies, and travel available to members of the upper-middle, educated classes typical of many countries.

The differences between independent and family class in levels of cultural resources are in keeping with predictions. People with higher levels of human capital, specifically education, also tend to have better linguistic abilities. Indeed, 69.6% of independent class respondents reported learning English as a child (before the age of 15) compared to 47.6% of family class respondents. As well, country of origin differences are consistent with their histories, specifically compared to the history of British colonialism in India.

*Psychological Resources*

**Internal Locus of Control**

Independent immigrants are expected to have higher levels of internal locus of control, associated with higher levels of human capital and the fact that, as economic immigrants, they are taking a greater risk in coming to Canada than their family class counterparts who are more likely to be settling in to pre-established support networks. The difference of means test for the psychological variable “internal locus of control” is presented in Table 5.2. Independent immigrants have a slightly higher mean level of internal locus of control (21.36 versus 19.97 on a 30-point scale), meaning that they perceive themselves to be slightly more in control of their lives than their family class counterparts, although the difference is not statistically significant (F=2.36, d.f.=1, p<0.127).
In order to test for possible class differences that might be masked by other demographic characteristics, a simple linear regression was run (see Table 5.7). The model was not statistically significant (F=1.08, d.f.=8 p<0.386). In this sample, controlling for age, gender, years in Canada, being married and country of birth, there are no immigrant class differences in the levels of psychological resources that may be used to accomplish their settlement and integration goals. There are perhaps other control variables which need to be applied which will illuminate the variation in this variable, such as level of education, but these will not be explored here.

Social Network Resources

As described in Chapter Three, social network variables collected include two types: aggregated network variables, and tie-specific variables relating to individual tie characteristics. For the purposes of this thesis, only aggregated, or summary, measures are presented for a selection of variables used in later analysis. Variables measuring the presence of social networks in Canada prior to migration are presented first, followed by immigrant class differences in classic social network analysis measures at interview.\(^{15}\) The utility of social networks as conduits of information and other resources being the focus, more time will be spent on presenting any class differences in the amounts of social support received.

\(^{15}\) Regression models were all run first controlling for demographic background models, and then with relevant social network controls. Due to the large number of tables involved, however, only the final models are presented, though reference will be made to interesting differences or changes between the difference models.
Social Networks at Immigration

Though not measured using any classic social network analysis technique, the presence of social contacts prior to migration was established by asking respondents if they knew anyone in Canada before immigrating, and if so, how did they know them (these measures were all described in Chapter Three). These social resource measures are different from those that follow in that they do not confirm a respondent’s activation or use of the contact to accomplish any integration tasks; rather, they serve merely as indicators of the potential for such activation. Given that family class respondents must be sponsored by someone in order to come to Canada, the presumption is that they will be more likely to know someone in Canada prior to migrating.

Knew Someone in Canada Prior to Migration

In fact, as shown in Table 5.2, this is indeed the case, though the difference is not as great as might be expected. Fully 96.8% of family class respondents knew someone in Canada prior to migration (leaving some question as to how 3.2% managed to enter the country without knowing someone), while 87.0% of independent class respondents knew someone here.\textsuperscript{16} Despite high levels in each class, this difference is statistically significant ($\chi^2=3.81, \text{d.f.}=1, p<0.051$). The high incidence of prior contacts in Canada among independent class immigrants is interesting in that it goes some way to contradicting conventional perceptions of their immigrant experience. Though knowing someone here

\textsuperscript{16} In fact, inspecting a crosstabulation of knowing someone in Canada by country of birth indicates that 100% of respondents from every country except India knew someone prior to migration, with 83% of Indian respondents doing so. It is therefore inadvisable to pursue further analysis of this variable in any multivariate sense, given the small sample size and such small variation in the variable.
certainly does not guarantee that these contacts will provide assistance, the vast majority of
independent class respondents in this sample are not migrating blindly to Canada either, as
some economic migration theorists would argue.

Yet, this fact is probably accounted for by the respondent selection process: recall that
only names with valid telephone numbers were eligible for inclusion in the sample. This
sampling process of course only applies to 74 of the 109 sample members, so that such a high
proportion of respondents knew someone is perhaps also indicative of the history of migration
from South Asia, which increases the likelihood of knowing someone than for countries with a
less-established connection to Canada.

**Knew Immediate Family in Canada Prior to Migration**

The second variable used is knew immediate family member; Table 5.2 shows that, of
those who knew someone in Canada prior to migration, a significantly higher proportion of
family class immigrants had immediate family in Canada (69.8% versus 23.9% of independent
class respondents) – again, this is not surprising ($\chi^2=22.44$, d.f.=1, $p<0.000$). A logistic
regression controlling for demographic characteristics shows that this class difference persists,
with being family class increasing the odds of knowing immediate family in Canada by almost
eight times (see Table 5.8: $b=2.07$, SE=.49, $p<.000$). Being female is the only other
significant predictor, reducing an individual’s odds of knowing immediate family a factor of
.32 ($b=-1.13$, SE=.49, $p<.02$).  

\[^{17}\] -2 log Likelihood=119.91; Model $\chi^2=31.18$, d.f.=7 $p<.000$. 

\[^{17}\]
Table 5.8
Logistic Regressions on Social Network Resources at Immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Knew Immediate Family in Canada</th>
<th>Knew Extended Family in Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>Odds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>2.07** (.49)</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-1.13* (.49)</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.27 (.58)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.00 (.02)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>.44 (.07)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-.22 (.59)</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>.68 (-1.12)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>119.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>31.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance level</td>
<td>p&lt;.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit</td>
<td>112.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at p < 0.01 level
* Significant at p < 0.05 level
# Significant at p < 0.10 level
Knew Extended Family Member in Canada Prior to Migration

Finally, Table 5.2 indicates that roughly equivalent proportion of family and independent class immigrants reported knowing an extended family member in Canada before migrating – 54.0% compared to 43.5%; this difference is not statistically significant ($\chi^2=1.17$, d.f.=1, p<0.279). Controlling for other demographic characteristics in the logistic regression in Table 5.8 shows that only age is a significant predictor, with each additional year reducing the odds of knowing an extended family member by a factor of 0.94 ($b=-.06$, SE=.02, p<.009). And, though not statistically significant, being a family as opposed to independent class respondent increases the odds of knowing extended family in Canada at migration by 1.65 times ($b=.50$, SE=.44 p<.258).

Thus, there are small class differences in the proportion of respondents knowing someone in Canada prior to migration, likely explained at least in part by the sampling process. This process, however, has little to do with the significant class difference in knowing immediate family in Canada, a difference which is very much consistent with immigration theory and policy.

Social Networks at Interview – Network Structure

The structure of a network has a lot to do with how it functions, and with the types of support that can flow through it. Networks can be big or small; they can be tightly-knit (dense) or loose, depending on how many, and how well, people within the network know one-another in addition to being connected to ego (here, the respondent). A network can be

---

18 -2 Log Likelihood=137.30; Model $\chi^2=13.80$, d.f.=7 p<.055.
composed of varying proportions of friends, family, neighbours and co-workers, and the individual at the centre of the network will have different expectations of the kinds of assistance and support that each tie can provide based on the definition of the relationship.\(^\text{19}\) Several network structure variables were collected. The following focuses on immigrant class differences in their size, density, and relational composition. Each of these was operationalized in Chapter Three.

**Network Size**

Network size is perhaps the crudest indicator of the potential for social support available to ego (the individual at the centre of the network). Recalling that the networks generated in this study are *helping networks*, the question becomes do respondents who name a larger number of people as having helped them with integration tasks in fact receive more support? Based on immigration policy assumptions and past immigration research, family class immigrants would be expected to have larger networks because they are joining an existing family and community structure in Canada, and so would have a larger number of individuals to whom they can turn for assistance.

In fact, independent immigrants have slightly larger average networks – 5.33 versus 4.76 ties – but this difference is not statistically significant (please see Table 5.2). Even controlling for relevant factors, the model is non-significant, though class of immigration

\(^{19}\) This example of course assumes that the boss is not a relative; that the neighbour is not a close friend; that the individual has a close relationship with immediate family members. These assumptions are not always met, which is why when examining the supportiveness of networks we not only describe their structure, but also the actual flow of resources within them. That is, knowing the structure of the network provides some insight into how it might function, and can help explain patterns of support provision.
coefficient verges on statistical significance (table not shown: $F=1.49$, d.f.=8, $p<.172$; family class $\beta=-.18$, $t=-1.73$ $p<.087$); the multiple linear regression model is statistically non-significant, even when controlling for proportion of kin in the network ($F=1.50$, d.f.=9, $p<.160$).

However, when the analysis is run with the full range of relational dummy variables instead of the dichotomous "mean percent kin versus mean percent non-kin", a different result emerges (Table 5.9). With mean percent immediate kin as the contrast group, and the same demographic controls, this more detailed model is statistically significant ($F=2.64$ $p<0.004$; $R^2=0.25$, adjusted $R^2=0.15$). Several of the relational dummy coefficients are significant predictors of network size (not including the one for family class), and they all have a positive effect on network size relative to the mean percent immediate kin contrast group. Having a network composed of a higher mean percent friends increases network size by $\beta=.35$ ($t=2.77$, $p<.007$), while higher mean percent helping ties increases the size by $\beta=.33$ ($t=3.56$ $p<.001$); a higher proportion of extended kin has somewhat less of an effect, increasing network size by $\beta=.24$ ($t=2.02$ $p<.046$). By not distinguishing between the type of non-kin ties, then, the first models mask the significant relationship between the different kinds of non-immediate kinship contacts and the size of the immigrant’s network. In particular, this highlights the need to decipher between different kinds of kin – extended and immediate.

The meaning of having a large helping network is not entirely clear. A person that names many different people as helpers may be having more difficulty integrating in Canada. Another explanation is that the size of the helping network is a reflection of the individual’s broader egocentric network, which includes not only people who have provided assistance,
Table 5.9:
OLS Regressions Predicting Mean Network Size and Mean Percent Kin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Capital at Interview</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Percent Kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>.94#</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.32#</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Extended Kin</td>
<td>2.34*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Friends</td>
<td>2.85**</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Acquaintances</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Helping</td>
<td>11.36**</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the p<0.01 level
* Significant at the p<0.05 level
# Approaching significance at the p<.10 level
but those with whom the respondent socializes, feels close, and works. Typically, people are
more likely to receive many different kinds of help from kin (including emotional, financial,
informational, etc.) (Wellman and Wortley 1990). Thus in this interpretation, individuals with
a larger helping network may not have access to, or do not feel comfortable relying on, a
small number of people for all of their needs – as appears to be the case for independent as
opposed to family class respondents. Therefore, this second explanation does not posit large
network size as an indicator of poor integration, but instead as a reflection of the composition
of the network.

Network Composition and Relational Variables

Percent kin has been shown by many to have important implications for levels and
types of social support (e.g. Fischer 1977; House et al. 1988; O’Connor 1994; Vega et al.
1991; Wellman and Wortley 1990). In distinguishing between kin and non-kin, researchers
have effectively differentiated between intimate versus non-intimate (or significant) ties; ties of
obligation and ties based on free choice; and ultimately between supportive and non-
supportive ties. Historically, this rough distinction might have held more truth. In modern
societies, however, where social roles and obligations have grown in complexity, it is much
more difficult to conceptualize the world in these very rigid terms (see Wellman 1979). The
purpose of mapping the composition of these respondents’ networks is to therefore leave
open the question as to what types of ties provide what types and amounts of integration
assistance.

As seen in Table 5.2, family class immigrants have a mean proportion of 0.61 kin in
their networks, compared to 0.32 among independent immigrants (F=24.01 d.f.=1 p<0.000) –
almost double. Even in a multiple regression controlling for demographic characteristics and
length of time in Canada, family class has a significant effect on the mean proportion of kin in
the network, raising it by beta=.44 (t=4.70, p<.000; R\(^2\)=0.28, adjusted R\(^2\)=0.21 – please see
Table 5.9). This is as expected, following from the terms under which family class
respondents are admitted to Canada, and is confirmed by previous research by Goldlust and
Richmond (1974), who also found that family class immigrant networks were composed of
more kin than the independent immigrants in their sample.

Other coefficients in this model behave contrary to past research (Wellman and
Wortley 1990): in this sample, being female reduces the percent kin in the network (beta=-.17,
t=-1.87 p<0.061), as does being married (beta=-.17, t=-1.82, p<.072). It is difficult to say
why being female is inversely related to proportion of network kin, except that the majority of
previous research focused on egocentric networks as personal communities and defined the
network in a very different way than does this study, which instead concentrates on ties which
help with specific tasks as the defining parameter for inclusion in the network. Thus, it could
be that being female in this sample is associated with lower concentrations of network kin
precisely because these immigrant women are not seeking assistance from relatives, but from
others. In fact, being female has a positive relationship with the proportion of friends in the
network, indicating one of the possible alternatives these immigrant women seek when dealing
with specific integration tasks. The women in this sample may also have relied heavily upon
husbands for the completion of tasks and problem solving, the balance of which they
completed themselves using their friendship networks (this may also explain the lower
proportions of kin among married individuals). It may be that a woman relies very heavily on
this one individual in her life – her husband, or a sister – so that the overall percent kin
measure is low, but that the amount of support provided by these key individuals is extremely high, leaving friendship ties to provide more transient types of assistance.\textsuperscript{20}

The kin versus non-kin distinction is broken down into five tie-types: two kinship and three others. While the above results indicated a class difference in the mean proportion of network kin, Table 5.2 reveals that the difference is in fact between the proportion of immediate\textsuperscript{21}, but not extended\textsuperscript{22}, kin. In effect, tests of immigrant class differences in the proportions of kin in their networks confirm academic and policy assumptions of kin-dominated family class networks, but contradict expectations that women would have higher proportions of kin as helpers.

If family class respondent’s networks are kin-dominated, independent class networks are dominated by friendship-based ties, with on average more than half of their network members comprised of friends (see Table 5.2: 0.54 compared to 0.34 among family class respondents; \(F=11.52, \text{d.f.}=1, p<0.001\)).\textsuperscript{23} Moreover, while the proportions are extremely small, independent immigrants have more than twice the proportion of formal ties in their networks (5.0\% versus 2.0\%, \(F=4.65, \text{d.f.}=1, p<0.033\)), and more than one and a half times

\textsuperscript{20} There is also a link between the structure of women’s networks, their immigrant class and their labour force status, which is discussed in the following sub-section.

\textsuperscript{21} Percent immediate kin in independent class respondent networks versus family class respondents’: 9.0\% versus 34.0\%, \(F=32.21, \text{d.f.}=1, p<0.000\).

\textsuperscript{22} The proportion of extended kin among independent respondents is 23.0\% versus 27.0 among family class respondents, a difference which is not statistically significant (\(F=0.72, \text{d.f.}=1, p<0.397\)).

\textsuperscript{23} This significant difference persists in the presence of demographic controls – regression results not shown.
the proportion of acquaintances as do family class immigrants (5.0% versus 3.0%), though this difference is not statistically significant (please see Table 5.2).²⁴

What are possible implications of network compositional differences? In combination with network size differences, the types of information and resources flowing through kin-dominated networks will tend to be redundant, or shared by the majority of network members, based on the principle of homophily, or that people in intimate relationships tend to be alike (Granovetter 1973). Family class immigrant networks may therefore tend toward the exchange of redundant information, as opposed to independent class networks which, because of their greater propensity to be comprised of social dissimilars (in the form of a greater proportion of formal ties and acquaintances), may tend to contain more varied and useful types of information.

In terms of the specific types of support that could be expected to flow through independent versus family class networks, this depends somewhat on the strength of the tie, and of the alter’s relationship to the respondent.²⁵ According to Wellman and Wortley (1990), strong ties tend to provide the most support of different kinds, but even this depends on whether the relationship is kinship-based, with parents tending to provide larger services and supplying financial aid, but less companionship, emotional support or small services. Non-intimate ties tend to supply less of all kinds of support, though when these non-intimate

²⁴ These slight differences in immigrant class network composition do not persist once other demographic variables and network size are taken into account.

²⁵ Strong ties have been defined as having three related elements: a sense of mutuality and trust, voluntariness, and frequent interactions that take place in multiple locations, over an extended period of time (Wellman and Wortley 1990:564). Wellman and Wortley distinguish between strong and significant ties – strong implying more intimacy, significant implying that the tie is important to the respondent, but is not a part of their innermost intimate circle.
ties are also immediate kin relations, they tend to provide more in the way of financial aid and large services.

In this analysis, I have not distinguished between intimate and significant, or strong and weak, ties, which makes predictions concerning the flow of support through these networks somewhat more tenuous. Nevertheless, the findings of Wellman and Wortley (1990) would translate into greater amounts of financial, housing and job information support among family class members, whose networks are dominated by immediate kin. 26 By contrast, these authors found emotional support to be the primary domain of intimate friends and siblings, which could mean that independent immigrants would receive comparable levels of this type of support; indeed, intimate friendship ties would tend to provide high levels of all but financial support. Finally, independent class immigrants are unlikely to receive much support beyond the fulfillment of role-related tasks from their formal ties (i.e. doctors, lawyers, bank managers, teachers), which would translate into low levels of settlement, housing and to a certain extent job information support from these ties.

Mean Total Network Density

A final variable affecting the provision of social support is total network density. There is no consistent evidence regarding the effect of density on social support, although the Durkheimian contention remains that social isolation reduces a person’s ability to cope with a variety of every day problems, as well as with more serious disturbances (Durkheim 1897). In

26 Wellman and Wortley (1990) were not able to analyze the provision support in the form of job information due to its low incidence in their East York sample, whereas the provision of job information is of central importance in this study.
terms of personal well-being, then, there is some merit to the argument that immigrants who are a part of a densely-knit network, or community, will be better able to cope with the challenges presented by the integration process, either because they perceive themselves to be well-supported in this endeavour (e.g. Turner et al. 1983; Turner and Marino 1994) or because they in fact do receive more support (Wellman and Wortley 1990). However, other research contradicts such an argument when other outcomes are analyzed (such as occupational mobility – Granovetter 1973). Wellman (1992) summarizes his own research as pointing to differing effects of density depending on the type of support analyzed: more dense networks are better for the provision of large services, but there are non-significant relationships between density and emotional support. Due to the composition of independent versus family class networks, the latter are expected to have more dense networks. In concert with the discussion of the effects of network composition on the provision of support, denser kin-dominated networks of the family class should again translate into greater amounts of support in the form of job and housing information and financial aid. By contrast, independent respondents should have less dense networks, which should reinforce the provision of emotional support through friendship ties.

As displayed in Table 5.2, a means difference test by immigrant class is statistically significant, with independent immigrants reporting lower total network densities (0.58) than family class immigrants (0.75: F=9.40, d.f.=1, p<0.003). This is not surprising, given the higher proportion of kin in family class networks, individuals who are more likely to know one-another by virtue of their more highly structured relationships. These networks are more dense than those collected by Wellman (1992:210), who found that active intimate network densities ranged between 0.3 and 0.5. Regardless of class of immigration, connections exist
between more than half of network members who could possibly be connected, such that even
the friendship-dominated helping networks of independent class respondents are well-
connected. This may suggest that even among immigrants who arrive with few kin in Canada,
they may gravitate to fellow-immigrants and somehow re-create a close-knit community, or
that within their larger networks, independent class immigrants have clusters, or pockets, of
densely-connected ties.  

Controlling first for respondent demographic characteristics, being in the family class
has a significantly positive effect on network density (beta=.29, t=2.94, p<.004 – table not
shown), while being female verges on significance, serving to reduce network density (beta=-
.17, t=-.78, p<.079).  

With the addition of network characteristic controls (mean percent kin
and size), these differences disappear, leaving only the mean proportion of kin as a significant
predictor: the higher network kin composition, the denser the network (beta=.45, t=4.59,
p<.000: see Table 5.10).  

The presence of a high proportion of kin in a network therefore
explains the immigrant class difference in network density.

\[\text{A more detailed analysis of the tie data would help resolve this question, but is not undertaken here.}\]
\[\text{F=2.48, p<0.017, R^2=0.16, adjusted R^2=0.10.}\]
\[\text{F=4.49, p<0.000, R^2=0.31, adjusted R^2=0.24.}\]
Table 5.10:
OLS Regressions Predicting Network Density and Total Network Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Mean Total Network Density</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Total Network Support</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-ratio</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Percent Kin</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the p< 0.01 level
* Significant at the p< 0.05 level
# Approaching significance at the p<.10 level
Social Networks at Interview – Social Support

The purpose of examining social networks in the context of immigrant integration research has been argued in previous chapters. As helping networks, they are included as resources based on the propensity for the individual ties to provide access to important integration-related information or assistance. The preceding sub-section discussed the potential implications of network structure in determining the flow of social support. This section discusses immigrant class differences in received support, controlling for specific network structure characteristics. While only the emotional support and total support variables are used in the analysis in Chapter Six (because the others were not correlated with the integration outcomes investigated), class differences in all six are explored below. Each of these variables was described in Chapter Three.

As discussed above, Wellman and Wortley’s (1990) in-depth analysis of social support and its predictors found that characteristics of the tie (or relationship, such as its strength) as opposed to characteristics of the alter (the individual at the end of the tie), such as their educational level, are what explain variations in network support (except in the provision of emotional support, where female alters supply more emotional support). This current analysis is confined to an examination of structural characteristics of the network. What follows explores the predictions concerning the effects of network structure differences on social support levels proposed above.

Total Support

Total support is not necessarily linked to either of the dependent integration variables directly, but respondents who receive higher levels of different types of support overall are
arguably going to feel well (even if they are not objectively doing well) – again, returning to the argument about support and well-being articulated above (e.g. Turner et al. 1983). There are statistically significant differences in the amounts of total network support received by immigrant class, with independent respondents reporting a mean of 8.59 versus 9.94 among family class respondents (F=6.97, d.f.=1, p<.010: see Table 5.2). This relationship persists when I control for demographic characteristics alone, with being in the family class increasing the amount of support received by beta=.30 (t=2.94 p<.004, table not shown), but is eliminated when I control for demographic and mean percent kin variables (please see Table 5.10). Only the mean percent kin is statistically significant, increasing the amount of total support received by beta=.41 (t=4.03, p<.000). Once again, the immigrant class difference is explained away by the difference in this network composition characteristic, mean percent kin.

### Emotional Support

Examining levels of emotional support by immigrant class also indicates a significant difference: independent class respondents report a mean level of 2.47 versus 2.79 among family class immigrants (F=4.43, d.f.=1, p<.038: see Table 5.2). Controlling for respondent demographic characteristics and network variables (mean percent kin and density), the multiple regression results show that only one aspect of the network – its density – is a significant and positive predictor of emotional support (please see Table 5.11: beta=0.40 t=3.94 p<0.000). Further, several respondent characteristics predict to emotional support:

---

30 When I include mean network size as a control variable, it does not affect the other coefficients in the model, is non-significant, and does not change the explanatory power of the model. Despite theoretical reasons for including it, I therefore present only the model controlling for mean percent kin: R²=.25, adjusted R²=.18.
being female, which increases reported levels of emotional support by beta=0.26 (t=2.97, 
p<0.004), each additional year of age, which increases support by beta=.18 (t=2.02 p<.046), 
and being married, which has a negative effect on the mean amount of emotional support 
received from the network, reducing it by beta=-.17 (t=-1.77, p<.080). This could be because 
respondents may tend to rely on their spouses exclusively for such support.\textsuperscript{31} Thus, in 
explaining differences in the mean amount of emotional support provided by the network, 
class differences persist until network characteristics are introduced – specifically, mean 
percent kin, and then in turn mean network density, the latter serving to explain away the 
family class difference by explaining the effect of mean percent kin.

Financial Support

The loaning and borrowing of money is a sensitive issue for many people. This variable 
underestimates the provision of this service between spouses, because many felt that their 
finances were co-owned and not subject to such definitions. As well, it may be hard for some 
to admit that they borrowed money, which might also serve to underestimate the importance 
of this service for respondents. I found a small, but statistically significant difference between 
the rates of support reported by immigrant class, with family class respondents reporting

\textsuperscript{31} R²=0.32, adjusted R²=0.26. A model excluding a control for network density is also significant, with 
the mean proportion kin variable a significant predictor of emotional support (beta=.29, t=2.78, p<.006), 
meaning that the density control in the full model presented in Table 5.11 explains away the mean percent kin 
effect. Finally, it is worth noting that, controlling for demographic characteristics alone, the family class 
coefficient is statistically significant, increasing emotional support by beta=.25 (t=2.49, p<.014).
Table 5.11:
OLS Regressions Predicting Mean Network Emotional and Financial Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Mean Emotional Support</th>
<th>Mean Financial Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-.31#</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Percent Kin</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Density</td>
<td>1.01**</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.28**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the p< 0.01 level
* Significant at the p< 0.05 level
# Approaching significance at the p<.10 level
slightly higher rates (see Table 5.2: 1.62 versus 1.25).\textsuperscript{32} The multiple linear regression model controlling for demographic characteristics indicates that the family class coefficient still has positive effect on the amount of financial support received (beta=.25, t=2.50, p<.014 –table not shown). Adding the percent kin control yields a model in which it is the only significant indicator, with networks with a higher proportion of kin also having more financial support (beta=.36, t=3.53 p<0.001); being in Canada longer verges on statistical significance, increasing the amount of support by beta=.18 (t=1.90, p<.06 – see Table 5.11).\textsuperscript{33}

This analysis was also conducted using the detailed alter relationship dummy variables, with percent immediate kin used as the contrast group. This model (table not shown) has lower explained variance (R\textsuperscript{2}=0.18, adjusted R\textsuperscript{2}=0.08), but is interesting in that it shows that it is the presence of higher proportions of friends (beta=-.23, t=-1.74, p<0.09) relative to immediate kin which result in lower levels of financial support – in fact, each of the four relational dummy variables has a negative effect on the amount of financial support received relative to that provided by immediate kin.\textsuperscript{34} Thus, it would appear that networks dominated by kin, and specifically immediate kin, also provide more financial support, and explain the initial significant difference in the support received by immigrant class.

\textsuperscript{32} F=10.20, d.f.=1, p<0.002.

\textsuperscript{33} R\textsuperscript{2}=.24, adjusted R\textsuperscript{2}=.17. This result is essentially maintained with the introduction of a network size control, which itself is non-significant; it is therefore left out of the model.

\textsuperscript{34} This model suffers somewhat from collinearity, however. The tolerance on the mean percent friends coefficient reaches a low of .483. This is not as much of a problem if, following John Fox’s (1991) recommendation, I examine square root of the VIF instead of the VIF itself: when I do this, none of the estimates is degraded seriously by collinearity, indicating that, as Fox (1991:10) argues, these estimates suffer more from small sample size and large error variances.
Job Information Support

Turning to mean network support in the form of information about job opportunities, there is a significant difference by immigrant class (see Table 5.2: 1.65 among independent versus 1.94 among family class respondents).\(^{35}\) This finding is in keeping with general expectations of higher levels of support among family class immigrants. When I control for demographic characteristics alone, this difference persists, with the family class coefficient increasing the amount of job information support by beta=.24 (t=2.42, p<.017 - table not shown).\(^{36}\) In the presence of controls for mean percent kin and network size, however, this effect disappears, explained away by the mean proportion of kin coefficient (please see Table 5.12).

As in previous models, the mean percent kin coefficient is the most powerful determinant of the amount of job information provided by the network, serving to increase it by beta=.30 (t=2.86, p<.005). Not surprisingly, age is significantly and negatively associated with obtaining job information (beta=-.21, t=-2.14 p<0.035), reflecting changing labour market status over the life course; that is, as people age, they are less likely to be seeking employment, because they have established themselves in an occupation or have left the labour force. Interestingly, while the network size coefficient is not statistically significant, its effect is negative: larger networks result in less job information flowing to the respondent (beta=-.11, t=-1.20 p<0.232). This finding reflects the basic difference in the amount of support received through kinship dominated networks (which, in this sample, are smaller, and

\(^{35}\) F=4.01, d.f.=1,p<.048.

\(^{36}\) R\(^2\)=.23, adjusted R\(^2\)=.16.
Table 5.12:
OLS Regressions Predicting Mean Network Information and Settlement Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Mean Job Information Support</th>
<th>Mean Settlement Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Percent Kin</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the p< 0.01 level
* Significant at the p< 0.05 level
# Approaching significance at the p<.10 level
belong to family class immigrants), such that family class immigrants receive greater *amounts* of job information. It does *not* address Granovetter's weak ties argument that larger, more loosely-structured networks provide access to a more heterogeneous pool of information through diverse ties – information which has been found to be crucial to job mobility (1973). It is their greater access to such *quality* ties that independent class respondents would be at an advantage. This in fact might be happening, a question that will be investigated in the following chapter.

**Settlement Support**

The types of support captured by this variable are much more open to the discretion of the respondent: unlike those questions relating to job information or help finding housing, this question asked in a much broader sense how much network members have helped with settlement issues. Independent class immigrants report slightly lower levels of mean settlement support than family class respondents – 1.66 versus 1.94 (please see Table 5.2: F=3.55, d.f.=1, p<0.062). While support in the form of job information could be expected to increase an individual's chances of finding work, and higher levels of emotional support increase levels of well-being, the relationship between general settlement support and these two outcomes is not known; however, it is likely that someone who is receiving more generalized settlement support may be more likely to report higher levels of well-being (a sort of rub-off effect related more to being well-integrated into some kind of a community than anything else). By contrast, an individual receiving more settlement support may also be more disadvantaged and *need* such support, and so higher levels of settlement support could be
negatively associated with integration outcomes (though this is a question for the next chapter).

A multiple regression controlling for the same set of demographic factors as above reveals several significant predictors of support (table not shown): notably, support increases among family class respondents (beta=.26, t=2.63, p<0.010) and among older respondents (beta=.24, t=2.36 p<0.020), while Bangladeshi respondents report lower levels of overall settlement support relative to Indian respondents (beta=-.22, t=-2.25, p<0.027). Though only verging on significance, the coefficient for being born in Pakistan relative to India has a positive effect on the amount of settlement support received (beta=.19, t=1.89, p<0.062).\(^{37}\)

Not surprising, once a control for mean percent kin is introduced, the family class coefficient disappears from significance, explained by the former (beta=.22, t=2.13, p<.036) (the network size variable has no effect: see Table 5.12). The effects of the other three respondent characteristic variables – age, being born in Bangladesh or Pakistan – are similar to those in the previous model\(^{38}\). At this point, however, it is not known whether obtaining more settlement support indicates better or poorer integration.

**Housing Support**

Finding a place to live is an important step in becoming an autonomous, active member of society. Not all of the respondents had moved from their first “temporary” housing at the time of the interview; that is, some who had come to Canada to join an immediate family member (a spouse, child, sibling) simply went to live with that individual.

\(^{37}\) \(R^2=0.17,\) adjusted \(R^2=0.10.\)
As this variable is an indicator of frequency of help with finding a home, assistance in the form of actually providing a home is not captured, and thereby underestimates the assistance received. Moreover, if someone has moved only once, then they are also likely to have lower levels of reported support, as opposed to someone who has had to look for accommodation on more than one occasion. Thus, this measure may be more representative of contextual events in a respondent’s life than of network support.

In fact, there is no significant bivariate relationship between immigrant class and the amount of housing support reported, with independent immigrants reporting on average 1.56 versus a mean of 1.65 among family class respondents on the support scale (\(F=0.43\), d.f.=1, \(p<0.515\): see Table 5.2). Only when network characteristics (mean percent kin an network size) are included in a model with demographic controls does the model become statistically significant (\(F=1.96\), d.f.=10, \(p<0.046\)), though the explained variance is still small (\(R^2=0.17\), adjusted \(R^2=0.08\) – please see Table 5.13).

Among respondent characteristics, only the female coefficient is statistically significant, serving to increase the amount of housing support received by \(\beta=0.22\) (\(t=2.22\), \(p<0.029\)). The two network controls are also significant predictors, with higher percent kin increasing housing support (\(\beta=0.32\), \(t=2.93\) \(p<0.004\)) and larger networks reducing support (\(\beta=-0.20\), \(t=-2.00\), \(p<0.049\)). The effect of network size is likely explained by the relationship between size and proportion of non-kin ties – simply reflecting the opposite of the mean percent kin variable. That is, finding a place to live could be an activity that is either conducted in a formal manner – for example, with the assistance of a real estate agent, or alone using the newspaper or by investigating apartment buildings on foot – or with the

\[R^2=0.20, \text{ adjusted } R^2=0.13.\]
Table 5.13:
OLS Regressions Predicting Mean Network Housing Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Mean Housing Support</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Percent Kin</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the p< 0.01 level
* Significant at the p< 0.05 level
# Approaching significance at the p<.10 level
assistance and recommendation of family members already living in the area. Respondents with larger networks tend to be independent class respondents who, because of the lower proportion of kin in their networks, may rely less on the assistance of others and more on a formalized method of house-hunting.

The question that persists in examining the relationship between the mean percent kin variable and levels of support concerns the relationship of supportive ties to the respondent: though immediate kin may dominate a network, are they in fact the ones providing the support? A glance at the tie-level data indicates that indeed, immediate kin and extended kin together provide the greatest proportion of support of all types, while immediate kin provide the greatest mean level of all types of support per tie – particularly emotional and financial support (Table 5.14). The fact that extended kin provide such a high proportion of all kinds of support is contrary to the results presented by Wellman and Wortley (1990), and likely reflects the continued importance of extended kinship within these South Asian communities. Indeed, the concept of kinship used by respondents was one that drew far fewer distinctions between what dominant North American culture refers to as ‘immediate family’ (parent/child/sibling), encompassing distant relations that we would typically refer to as second or third cousins as ‘cousin-brother’ or ‘cousin-sister’. These terms illustrate the extent to which such individuals are considered family in the most intimate sense of the word, and point to the expectations for relations of mutuality and reciprocity that emerged from the interviews. Though ideally it would be interesting to analyze the individual effects of each tie type in later analyses, the foregoing supports the decision to use the mean percent kin variable only.
Table 5.14: Proportion and Mean Level of Support Given by Tie Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Family</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Tie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not all percentages add to 100 because of rounding.
N=545
A Glance at the Networks of Females in and Out of the Labour Force

Finally, it is important to examine the network differences of two specific sub-groups of the sample that will become important when the full integration model is discussed in Chapter Six. Specifically, due to the small sample of individuals not in the labour force that is dominated by women (N=23), a brief comparison of the networks of women in the labour force with those of women not in the labour force is warranted.39

Without going into too much detail, some major differences in these networks should be pointed out. The immigrant class differences in the networks of women in the labour force do not differ greatly from those of the general labour force population (see Table 5.15 compared to Table 5.2). Independent female labour force respondents' networks are dominated by friendship ties (mean of 0.68 compared to a mean of 0.35 among family class immigrants), and this difference is statistically significant ($F=7.25$ d.f.=1 $p<0.013$). Conversely, family class female labour force participants' networks are kin dominated – 60.0% compared to 20.0% among independent class immigrants; this difference is also significant ($F=10.25$ d.f.=1 $p<0.004$). Finally, the size of the networks of females in the labour force also varies by immigrant class, with female independent immigrants reporting mean sizes of 6.5 compared to 5.2 among family class females in the labour force; this difference is not statistically significant. A related measure, total network density, also indicates significant differences by immigrant class among females in the labour force. Independent class respondents report mean density levels of sixty percent compared to 78% among the family class, which indicates that a significantly higher proportion of family class network members

39 Of course I am unable to conduct the same types of multivariate analysis on these two small subsamples, and so will simply present some basic descriptive differences between their networks.
Table 5.15:  
Mean Network Characteristics Among Females, by Labour Force Status, By Immigrant Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Class</td>
<td>Family Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Kin</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Immediate Kin</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Extended Kin</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Friends</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Acquaintances</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Formal Ties</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Support</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>10.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Emotional Support</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Financial Support</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Job Information Support</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Settlement Support</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Housing Support</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Density</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
know one another \((F=4.08 \text{ d.f.}=1 \ p<0.055)\). This type of interconnectivity is typically associated with higher levels of certain types of support, as discussed above.

Compared to the clear network composition differences by immigrant class among females in the labour force, the networks of females not in the labour force vary only slightly by class. While the networks of independent females not in the labour force are still dominated by friends – a mean of 57% – so are those of family class females – 52%. Similar proportions of kin are also found by immigrant class among women not in the labour force; specifically, family class females still report a higher proportion of kin, but the difference is much smaller and not statistically significant (43% compared to 33%). The mean network sizes of independent females not in the labour force are actually smaller than those of their family class counterparts (mean of 5.0 network members compared to 5.3 among family class females), which is a departure from the trend of larger size among independent immigrants in the whole sample, and indeed in the whole labour force sample. Related to the size of a network is its density. Independent females not in the labour force report lower mean densities (.39 compared to .61), meaning that about forty percent of their network members know one another compared to sixty percent of their family class counterparts. While not statistically significant, this low density among independent females could have implications for the types of support that flow through their networks: specifically, for the amount of emotional support, as was found above.

There is some question as to why the proportion of kin is different depending on the respondent’s labour force status. An explanation for this difference in composition lies perhaps in the types of opportunities for contact and interaction afforded respondents who are not in the labour force. It is likely that they make friends at school or in their neighbourhoods
and through their children through frequent contact in these milieux, and eventually cement friendships and helping networks that come to take precedence over established kinship contacts. The types of situations in which women not in the labour force find themselves thus may provide opportunities to share with non-kin members in the intimate details of their lives. By contrast, a woman who works outside of the home is also likely to be balancing this with domestic duties, particularly when children are present. Such time pressures, experienced by immigrant and non-immigrant women alike, may make it more difficult for these women to make as many non-kinship based connections that provide them with support.

To explain the much larger difference in the composition of labour force female respondents by immigrant class, Table 5.16 presents the compositional differences by country of birth, and shows that the key difference occurs between Indian independent and family class immigrant women. Independent Indian women report a mean proportion of kin of 21% compared to 75% among their family class counterparts – the largest difference by country of birth noted. Table 5.17 then shows whether these female respondents knew anyone in Canada prior to migration, and if so, whether these were family members, all by immigrant class and country of birth. This table indicates that a much larger proportion of Indian independent class respondents arrived knowing no one in Canada – in effect, illustrating the classic economic immigrant upon which immigration policy is based. In fact, half (50.0%) of Indian independent females arrived knowing no one in Canada, compared to only 12.5% of their family class counterparts. When respondents are asked more specifically about whether they knew family in Canada before migrating, again half of Indian independent females report knowing no one, compared to only 25% of family class Indian female respondents.
Table 5.16:
Mean Network Characteristics Among Females in the Labour Force, by Immigrant and Country of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Network Size (N)</th>
<th>Mean Network Density (N)</th>
<th>Mean % Kin (N)</th>
<th>Mean Total Support (N)</th>
<th>Mean Emotional Support (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>6.67 (6)</td>
<td>.66 (6)</td>
<td>.21 (6)</td>
<td>9.61 (6)</td>
<td>2.88 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>6.25 (4)</td>
<td>.52 (4)</td>
<td>.20 (4)</td>
<td>9.00 (4)</td>
<td>3.11 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.50 (10)</td>
<td>.60 (10)</td>
<td>.20 (10)</td>
<td>9.34 (10)</td>
<td>2.97 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>5.50 (8)</td>
<td>.81 (8)</td>
<td>.75 (8)</td>
<td>10.22 (8)</td>
<td>3.00 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>4.00 (1)</td>
<td>.67 (1)</td>
<td>.00 (1)</td>
<td>11.25 (1)</td>
<td>3.50 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>5.00 (6)</td>
<td>.77 (6)</td>
<td>.51 (6)</td>
<td>9.72 (6)</td>
<td>2.77 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.20 (15)</td>
<td>.78 (15)</td>
<td>.60 (15)</td>
<td>10.09 (15)</td>
<td>2.94 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>6.00 (14)</td>
<td>.75 (14)</td>
<td>.52 (14)</td>
<td>9.96 (14)</td>
<td>2.95 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>5.80 (5)</td>
<td>.55 (5)</td>
<td>.16 (5)</td>
<td>9.41 (5)</td>
<td>3.19 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>5.00 (6)</td>
<td>.77 (6)</td>
<td>.51 (6)</td>
<td>9.72 (6)</td>
<td>2.77 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.17:
Proportion of Female Respondents in the Labour Force Who Knew Someone in Canada Prior to Migration, by Immigrant Class and Country of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Immigrant Class</th>
<th>Knew Someone in Canada % (N)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Knew Family in Canada % (N)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>50.0 (3)</td>
<td>50.0 (3)</td>
<td>6 (100.0)</td>
<td>6 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>87.5 (7)</td>
<td>12.5 (1)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
<td>8 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0 (3)</td>
<td>75.0 (6)</td>
<td>50.0 (3)</td>
<td>25.0 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (5)</td>
<td>100.0 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>100.0 (4)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>100.0 (4)</td>
<td>75.0 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>100.0 (1)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>100.0 (1)</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (4)</td>
<td>100.0 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>100.0 (6)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>100.0 (6)</td>
<td>83.3 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, the respondents from India display the classic split in social network resources espoused by Canadian immigration policy, in that family class immigrants to Canada insert themselves into pre-established family-based networks and thereby achieve a certain measure of automatic integration, while independent class immigrants are in a sense pioneers in Canada and are effectively starting from nothing, from the perspective of accessing economic and social support. In contrast to the class differences among Indian respondents, all of Pakistani and Sri Lankan females in the labour force knew someone in Canada prior to migration regardless of immigrant class. Further, 75% of Pakistani independent immigrants had family in Canada compared to 100% of family class respondents from Pakistan, while 83% of Sri Lankan females in the labour force, all of whom arrived as family class respondents, knew family in Canada. It therefore appears that the significant large class difference in network composition among female respondents in the labour force is largely attributable to that within the Indian sub-sample.

When the types of support received by women in and out of the labour force are examined, again immigrant class differences exist, but they are often in different directions (see Table 5.15). For example, independent females not in the labour force report slightly higher mean total levels of support (9.4 compared to 9.1 among their family class

---

40 In contrast to the marked differences in network composition by immigrant class and country of birth among females in the labour force, females not in the labour force vary slightly more by country of birth, though little overall by class (as discussed in the text). Moreover, I found no differences by class and country of birth in whether they knew people in Canada prior to migration: 100% of all female respondents not in the labour force knew someone in Canada before arrival. When this question was narrowed to whether they knew family in Canada prior to migration, a majority of all respondents by class and country of origin did, with the exception of the lone Bangladeshi independent respondent who did not. Thus, while slight variations do exist in network composition by class and country of origin among those not in the labour force, the overwhelming similarities are in keeping with other commonalities in their social network resources at arrival. This comparability in social networks at immigration by immigrant class appears to be one of the greatest
counterparts), while among females in the labour force the opposite is true: family class respondents report a mean total support level of 10.1 relative to 9.4 among the independent females in the labour force. The difference observed here is therefore not so much among females in and out of the labour force, because the reported support levels do not differ that much between the two independent class female samples. Rather, the difference is by class, with family class females in the labour force receiving more support than their counterparts not in the labour force. Another interesting support difference is in the amount of emotional support received by women in and out of the labour force. Women in the labour force report higher mean levels (3.0 among independent class and 2.9 among family class women), compared to 2.4 among independent class and 2.6 among family class women not in the labour force. This is curious: except for family class females in the labour force, the networks of all of these females are friendship-dominated, which was found to be related to higher levels of emotional support above. There may be underlying demographic differences affecting these levels of emotional support.

From this very brief discussion, then, it is possible to make some very basic statements about the networks of these two sub-samples of females. One the one hand, the networks of women not in the labour force do not appear to differ that greatly by immigrant class; in fact, there are no statistically significant differences. On the whole, it appears that these women report slightly lower levels of support overall compared to their labour force counterparts, have smaller average networks, and networks of lower density. Recalling that these are helping networks, this means that women not in the labour force rely on a smaller number of differences distinguishing the labour force and non-labour force female respondent networks, particularly among the Indian respondents in the labour force.
individuals for assistance, and while one might expect the networks of homemakers in particular to be dominated by kin, this is not the case. In fact, family class women in the labour force report higher proportions of kin in their networks than do either independent or family class women not in the labour force. It could be that these women who are not in the labour force are somewhat more isolated than those in the labour force, as denoted by the somewhat lower overall levels of support and lower mean network densities, but the differences are so small as to make such a prediction extremely tenuous. What this could mean for their sense of overall well-being is a question addressed in Chapter Six.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter was to determine the resource levels of the sample of South Asian immigrants interviewed in this study, and whether these differ according to their policy class. Several hypotheses were proposed at the beginning of the chapter, with independent immigrants predicted to have higher levels of human capital and other related types of capital, including psychological resources, while family class respondents were expected to have higher levels of social capital. In the main, these predictions have been found to be supported by the data in this study, although some exceptions are notable.

Contrary to predictions, superior human capital levels among independent immigrants at immigration are not realized, except in the case of language ability, particularly once demographic characteristics are controlled for (Table 5.3 and 5.4). When differences do persist, they are often not in the direction predicted: for example, family class immigrants report higher levels of occupational prestige before immigration. To be sure, the regressions conducted here are limited, controlling in most cases only for demographic characteristics, or
in a few cases for obvious preceding variables (like controlling for education when examining immigration class differences in occupational prestige before immigration). Levels of human capital at interview (Table 5.3 and 5.5), indicate even smaller class differences.

Instead, what appears to be significant is how long a respondent has been in Canada, even predicting to education before immigration and years of occupational experience before immigration. The most plausible reason proposed for this variation is a sampling effect created by the small sample size and the length of the interview. Age and being female are also associated with human capital: older respondents are more likely to report higher occupational prestige in their jobs, and more job experience, before migrating, supported by research by de Silva (1997). Conversely, females are less likely to have as many years of job experience, even controlling for education before immigration – certainly not surprising given the different labour market trajectories of men and women around the world related to their gender roles. Also not surprising is the importance of education in predicting to occupational prestige, although of interest is that holding a University degree at immigration, and not years of education at interview, is significant. Finally, (see Table 5.3) females are more likely to have attended some schooling in Canada, although this drops out controlling for years in Canada and level of education at immigration, which instead become the significant predictors, both increasing the probability of attending school in Canada.

Comparisons of financial resources also elicit expected outcomes, with and without controls: independent immigrants are more likely to bring more money when they first arrive, while the significance of the years in Canada variable was explained as a sampling effect (the seven entrepreneurs and investors in the sample arrived earlier, and also brought larger amounts of money with them).
Turning to cultural resources, class differences persist, and in the direction expected, even when controlling for other factors (Table 5.7); this is true both for the number of countries to which the respondent has traveled, and for self-reported English ability at immigration. As well, level of education at immigration is a significant predictor of English ability, a finding which is definitely expected. Also predicted is the effect of country of birth on English ability: compared to the contrast group – born in India – all other country of birth variables negatively effect English ability, reflecting most likely the history of British rule in India.

Also of note is the persistent non-significance of the model predicting to ‘locus of control’, despite the introduction of demographic control variables (Table 5.7). It is possible that the causality of the variables is not as thought, and so controlling for human capital, or social network resources, for example, could produce differences. For example, in her work on the interrelationships between structure and individual action and identity, Coser (1975:246) found that nurses who work in more complex structures, so that they are forced to continually negotiate individualized relationships with the many other professionals with whom they interact – in effect, those with larger and more diffuse networks – tend to have higher levels of what she calls innovation, flexibility, reflection and self-direction. She combines this work with that of Kohn et al. (1983) to discuss the ways in which social structure can actually affect an individual’s cognitive functioning, precisely as a result of the different demands made on the individual’s capacity to interact with many or few, similar or different others. This would argue for higher levels of autonomy among the independent class respondents, whose networks are more diverse and comprised of a larger proportion of non-intimate kinship ties. In fact, the direction of the family class coefficient supports this (see
Table 5.7; it is simply a non-statistically significant effect, which is perhaps not surprising with such a small sample.

In terms of the relationship between human capital and personality, research supports the view that people with higher autonomy are more likely to be successful in their studies, while the reverse is also true. For example, Miller et al. (1986;1985) found support for reciprocal effects between cognitive and non-cognitive aspects of personality on educational outcomes. That is, in their earlier study, the authors found that more self-directed students had higher cognitive functioning, while their cognitive functioning impacted on their level of self-direction in their schoolwork (1985). In their later study (Miller et al. 1986), they found that educational self-direction affects elements of personality as well: higher levels of the former increases the self-directedness of the student’s general orientation and reduced levels of distress, while more distressed students exercised less self-direction in their schoolwork (there was no reciprocal effect for the general orientation on self-direction in schoolwork). These findings suggest that to understand the differences in levels of psychological resources measured here, differences in levels of education need to be accounted for; however, such an increase in the complexity of the current integration model is beyond the scope of this presentation.

More specifically, it is difficult to hypothesize the direction of the relationship between internal locus of control and the dependent variables measuring integration in the next chapter, which are also likely characterized by various reciprocal effects. As reported by Kohn et al. (1983) and others (e.g. Jalajas 1994) in occupational contexts, there is a feedback loop whereby a highly self-directed person is more likely to achieve occupational self-direction (and so become successful), precisely as a result of greater ideational flexibility and self-direction
Both studies show direct implications for the level of well-being experienced by the individual as well. If independent class immigrants have greater levels of this psychological resource, then they will be more likely to report economic success and well-being. However, as discussed by Jalajas (1994) and Kohn et al. (1983), those whose self-esteem has been undermined by being forced to do labouring jobs, or work that is below their level of cognitive functioning, or who have experienced repeated job search failures, will experience more distress and lower levels of well-being overall. Depending on the nature of the ‘assault’ on their self-esteem, and of the duration of their difficulties, immigrants could suffer long-term negative effects to their well-being (e.g. Turner et al. 1983; Noh and Avison 1996). Because the models used in this study are limited in their complexity by the sample size, reciprocal effects cannot be estimated. As a predictor of integration outcomes, therefore, this indicator for personality resources may therefore not be very useful, though it might be extremely useful in more focused analysis of the stress process that could allow for reciprocal effects among variables.

The analysis of social network resources also confirmed general predictions. When we look at the relationship of the alter to the respondent, family class persists as a significant predictor of mean percent kin, controlling for relevant network and demographic characteristics (Table 5.9). Moreover, though not shown in a table, there is a persistent class difference in the specific network proportions of immediate kin and friends. This was linked to initial differences in networks at immigration, with a significantly higher proportion of family class respondents reporting knowing immediate family in Canada (particularly in explaining the network differences of females by their labour force status and immigrant class – see Tables 5.8, 5.15 and 5.17).
Table 5.14 gives evidence of the importance of kinship in the provision of support: though the proportions of each type of support supplied by immediate kin, extended kin and friends display considerably more similarity than those reported by Wellman and Wortley (1990:567), kinship in general provides the greatest proportion of support. Further, the mean amount of support supplied by immediate kin is higher than for extended kin and friends for each type of support, which confirms the finding by Wellman and Wortley (1990) that intimate kin in particular are typically providers of greater amounts of many different kinds of support. Thus, the fundamental difference in the network composition of family class and independent class immigrants – as defined by the mean percent kin variable – effectively explains other class differences in network structure (such as network size, density and amount of support) among the whole sample.

Examining all of the support results together, what emerges is a relationship between network size, network composition, and support. As these respondents' networks get larger, they are more likely to contain ties that are known to the respondent as a result of the institutionally-defined function that the individual plays in the respondent's life: as a lawyer, doctor, accountant, or settlement worker. These few ties tend to provide considerably lower levels of emotional support and financial support because of their institutional nature: unlike a social intimate, who is more likely to provide all kinds of different types of support (as argued by Wellman 1979, and Wellman and Wortley 1990), structurally defined ties are more bounded in the content of the interaction, and so the support they provide is likely restricted to the activities associated with their specific role (such as employment agency worker, settlement worker, real estate agent, lawyer).
The consistent significance of the mean percent kin variable in explaining immigrant class differences in social support is interesting. All of the above analyses were conducted with the full range of relationship dummy variables in place of the "mean percent kin" variable (e.g. mean percent immediate kin, extended kin, friends, acquaintances and formal ties, with mean percent immediate kin serving as the contrast group). Significant differences in these four dummy variables emerged only when estimating the variation in levels of financial support (reported above); in all of the other models, the explanatory power of the models was reduced and the coefficients were non-significant. However, the direction of the coefficients was consistent, with differences emerging in terms of the effects of immediate versus extended kin: in effect, it is not the presence of any type of kin in the network that is related to greater amounts of social support, but rather the presence of immediate kin; this is largely supported by the mean levels of emotional and financial support provided by kin type in Table 5.15. Due to sample constraints, subsequent analyses use the mean percent kin dummy variable only. Though per tie, immediate kin provide more support of all kinds, extended kinship ties provide more than those based on friendship, and so I am confident that using the more general dichotomous percent kin variable does not misrepresent the kin versus non-kin distinction.

The implications of these differences in network composition by class of immigration are not self-evident. The link made in policy circles is of course between being family class, having access to a larger number of close kin, and (supposedly) greater amounts of social support of all kinds, this latter point being the key to family class immigrants' level of integration success. This presumption ignores sociological research pointing to the importance of 'bridging' ties in a network, or ties that provide an individual with access to a
larger set of opportunities: the 'weak ties’ discussed by Granovetter (1973), and which apparently comprise a greater proportion of independent class respondents’ networks. Thus, independent immigrants would be expected to access a more varied array of resources through their helping networks, resources which might be of greater utility in achieving the economic goals of integration in particular, while family class immigrants, with their access to a more limited range of resources, may not end up benefiting from the greater amount of support that they receive through these kin-based ties. The 'weak tie’ argument effectively argues that not all support is created equally: in finding a job, for example, it is the quality of information that is passed on to the respondent, rather than the actual number of job referrals made. Often, this quality is related to the alter’s own prestige levels, with individuals who are able to use contacts from alters with a higher social position than themselves at a greater advantage.

Thus overall, family class immigrants seem to be receiving more support – job information and emotional – which confirms predictions. However, the second half of the prediction – that despite lower levels of support, especially job support, independent immigrants would be able to use their social networks to greater advantage in actually securing employment – has yet to be presented. Indeed, what does any of this mean for the actual tasks of integration: for getting a job, a decent income, and overall health and well-being? Does the fact that family class immigrants get more job information actually translate into more jobs for them? And are their jobs of better quality? Does receiving more support result in higher rates of overall life satisfaction, or health, here in Canada among family class immigrants?
From the analysis in Chapter Four, it is likely that the answers to these questions will not be simple: indeed, as discussed, independent class respondents appear to outperform family class immigrants on many of the economic indicators, which would certainly lead to the conclusion that their greater job information support is not an asset to family class economic integration (though without a multivariate analysis it is impossible to know exactly what mechanisms are at work). On the other hand, Chapter Four demonstrated that family class immigrants are more likely to report higher levels of well-being and health; this could be associated with their superior support networks, and indeed would confirm past research concerning the fundamental importance of social support from networks in “buffering” an individual from otherwise stressful situations (though this research does not undertake a specific testing of the buffering effects of social support in its strictest sense). Ultimately, the question to be answered in this study is can differences by immigrant class in their levels of human, cultural, personal, financial and social network capital explain the observed differences in levels of integration? Or is there some other explanation, which possibly combines the effects of immigration policy, individual resource levels and immigrant decision-making, to explain the observed differences in integration? These are the questions analyzed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER SIX: IMMIGRANT RESOURCES AS DETERMINANTS OF INTEGRATION

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is concerned with analyzing the full integration model as presented in Figure 6.1, and so is a culmination of the analysis presented in Chapters Four and Five. Chapter Four asked the basic questions, What is integration? How are the different dimensions related?, and Who is integrated?, and established to what extent demographic sub-groups vary in their achievement of the integration goals of interest: being employed, employment income, job equivalency and overall health and well-being. Chapter Five asked the question Who possesses what types of resources?, and presented differences in resource levels according to immigrant class. This final results chapter will now focus on the question Why are some people more integrated than others?, and will therefore establish the explanatory importance of the different resources as predictors of the four integration goals. Primarily, this chapter concerns the importance of the financial, cultural, psychological and social network resources compared to human capital resources. Secondarily, this chapter asks to what extent success in economic integration affects levels of well-being, in the presence of these individual resources. In answering these questions, some of the differences in levels of integration among the demographic sub-groups presented in Chapter Four will be explained.
Figure 6.1:
Model of the Role of Immigrant Resources in the Integration Process
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This analysis and its presentation essentially mirror the process of integration presented throughout this thesis, and depicted in Figure 6.1. Four dependent variables represent the integration process, three of which are related to the economic domain, and one of which relates to overall health and well-being. There is an intended logic in the selection of these variables, in that they represent one possible progression through the process of integration.

For immigrants destined for the labour market, the first step in this process is to find a job. Being employed is an objective measure of economic success, and is the first dependent variable examined. Two related issues then arise in determining a labour market immigrant’s economic success: the level of income generated by this job, which is an objective measure of economic well-being; and the extent to which this job is equivalent to previous employment in terms of the skills required to perform it, a subjective measure of economic well-being. Finally, having established some degree of economic self-sufficiency (and this can vary from needing social support services or welfare, to complete economic independence and even affluence), the final step investigated in this model is an immigrant’s level of subjectively defined overall health and well-being. This level of well-being is expected to be impacted by previous economic successes or failures, but other factors are also postulated to be at work – factors which are not included in the analysis at this time.

For immigrants who are not entering the labour market, which are a minority in this sample, the process is conceptualized slightly differently. The primary dependent integration

---
1 I repeat here that this model is not intended to serve as a complete representation of the integration experience as a whole, as it leaves out many dimensions of integration (such as other economic aspects of integration, searching for a home and neighbourhood belonging, ethnic identity and ethnic group involvement, participation in Canada’s political and social structures, etc.). This model is intended to serve as an extension of the typical economic model, and as a means to investigate the relationship between basic economic integration and a subjective dimension of integration – overall health and well-being.
variable of interest is overall health and well-being. Consideration is given to household income levels among these respondents, in order to obtain a rough measure of their economic status in Canada; however, as described elsewhere and further articulated below, household income is an imperfect measure of individual economic integration, which is the focus in this study, and so is only given a cursory examination.

One of the ways the integration process varies is according to the goals of the immigrant. The analysis examining the economic dimension as it is defined by labour market activity and success does not address the integration of immigrants who arrive in Canada and choose not to enter the labour force (or who are not in the labour force at the time of the interview). This primarily concerns seniors, youth and full-time homemakers, who by virtue of their stage in the life course are typically involved in others activities (retirement, education and parenting-related, respectively). It is precisely to address such omissions that this thesis takes a second dimension of integration as its focus, one that concerns all immigrants – overall health and well-being.

These substantive issues have implications for the sample size used in each analysis, varying according to the dependent variable being analyzed. Only respondents who are in the labour force – that is, looking for work, or currently employed – are of interest in the odds of being employed analysis. As an indicator of integration, being employed has no relevance for those who are not seeking employment; to classify a female immigrant who is at home with her children by choice as 'poorly integrated' misrepresents her situation. She may very well be poorly integrated – but the measurement of her integration must take into consideration areas such as personal well-being, community and neighbourhood involvement, areas which are relevant to her daily experience, as opposed to whether she is
employed, which is not. Moreover, including non-labour force migrants in the analysis would misrepresent the factors affecting employment, because of the predominance of females (92% of those not in the labour force are female, of which close to half are homemakers), and people at the extremes of the age distribution (students and retirees).

The same logic applies when investigating the determinants of employment income and job equivalency, but in this case, the sample is further reduced to individuals who are currently employed. The earnings analysis could have been conducted on the whole sample (an individual with no employment earnings circled “None”, whether they were in the labour force or not), but it again does not make sense to label someone as poorly integrated for having no employment income when they are not even attempting to acquire one. Even when the dependent variable at Time 2 – health and well-being – is analyzed, the multivariate analysis is first done on the whole sample; having determined which individual resources affect well-being among all respondents, I then take the non-labour force sample and conduct some brief bivariate analyses to clarify the extent to which these resources predicting well-being are also common to respondents out of the labour force.

The analysis in this chapter follows essentially the same pattern for each dependent variable (excluding the bivariate analysis done on respondents not in the labour force). Correlations between independent resource and dependent variables are first discussed. I then present regression models that build in complexity from the inclusion of background

---

2 I also collected job equivalency and earnings information from individuals who were unemployed at interview, but who had previously held a job in Canada. I decided that there were potential difficulties in comparing these values for people currently employed versus individuals no longer in the labour force, or currently unemployed – potentially different job trajectories, increased effects of distorted information as a result of memory recall problems – that warranted confining the sample to individuals currently employed only.

3 Moreover, an earnings analysis conducted on the labour force sample was also ruled out, because of the coincidence of being employed and having an income: in essence I would be duplicating the analysis of the odds of being employed.
variables, to the addition of human capital, financial capital, cultural capital, psychological and finally social network resource variables, where measures of these resources have been shown to be correlated with the dependent variable of interest, or where there is a theoretical basis for their inclusion. In some cases, there are zero-order correlations between independent and dependent variables, but these disappear in a model including demographic background variables. In other cases, zero-order correlations are absent, but the variable has a significant effect when introduced into a regression including demographic controls.

As stated elsewhere, the sample size is too small to permit the inclusion of all resource variables simultaneously. Therefore, having determined the absence of an effect within a regression, some resource variables are omitted from further analysis with that specific dependent variable. This process is imperfect, because it risks excluding variables whose effects may change depending on the introduction of other resource variables. Another approach would be to select a small number of resource variables based on theory alone, and test their effects, keeping consistent the independent variables included in the models for the different measures of integration. It was decided to adopt the former approach, which allows different predictor variables according to the dependent variable in question.

In each case, the discussion will examine to what extent non-human capital versus human capital resource variables are predictors of the dependent variables. The determinants of being employed will be discussed first. This will be followed by the earnings analysis, the factors affecting the odds of obtaining an equivalent job, and finally the resources determining overall health and well-being.
BEING EMPLOYED

Introduction

For the majority of immigrants, achieving economic success in the host country is a primary goal. Even if the ultimate intention is to return to the country of origin, this is usually only after economic success has been reached (though in a few circumstances, return to the home country is more closely linked to political instability in the area, such as for immigrants from Sri Lanka) (e.g. Piore 1979). As the cornerstone to establishing a life in Canada, becoming employed is arguably the greatest source of anxiety and stress for a new immigrant whose intention is to enter the labour market. Even those who have not come to Canada to work - such as seniors, children or youth of school age, people with a disability, or women with very young families intending to remain at home - are not spared the stress related to economic integration, as they must watch their family members search for work in order to support the household. Some in this situation of dependency may suffer even greater anxiety as a result of their own powerlessness in the face of economic difficulties.

Determinants of Being Employed Among Respondents in the Labour Force

The following analysis is conducted on the labour force sample only, which is N=84 respondents, of which the majority (70.2%) are males and from the independent class (54.8%). The labour force sample is predominantly employed (81.0%). The results of the bivariate analysis in Chapter Four indicated that females, family class and most recently arrived immigrants are the most disadvantaged in terms of finding a job. This analysis investigates what individual resources explain the difference in the odds of employment among these demographic sub-groups.
After inspecting and discussing zero-order correlations between all resource variables and the dependent variable, variables are introduced into logistic regressions estimating the odds that a respondent will be employed. These correlations appear in Table 6.1.\textsuperscript{4} The analysis then proceeds to the results of the logistic regressions. For the reader's information, the effects of all background variables are estimated first and presented as Model 1, though this model is not discussed. To this basic model are added human capital variables, followed by applicable variables representing the other four resource types. This permits a determination of the relative importance of each type of resource in estimating variations in the dependent variables, after which the full model is presented.

**Results of Zero-order Correlations**

Column 1 of Table 6.1 shows the zero-order Pearson correlation coefficients between the resource variables and being employed. Three points should be highlighted: overall, human capital variables are not highly correlated with employment, and when they are, they are in the opposite direction to policy and many research expectations; second, there is no consistent pattern whereby human capital earned prior to migration affects earnings negatively, while that earned after immigration affects it positively, as some research would suggest (e.g. Beach and Worswick 1993); third, social network resources characteristic of family class respondents are exclusively negatively associated with employment, pointing to potentially serious limitations of such (so-called) resources.

\textsuperscript{4} Even in the absence of significant Pearson correlations coefficients, some variables are included in the analysis out of theoretical necessity, or under the suspicion that a true relationship is being masked by other characteristics.
Table 6.1:
Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Immigrant Resource Indicators and Measures of Integration Outcomes, Among Respondents in the Labour Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant Resource Indicators</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient Employed</th>
<th>Annual Employment Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University Degree</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige of Job Held Prior to Migration</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years of Job-Specific Experience</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessed English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Capital – At Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years of Education</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Some Schooling in Canada</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Money Brought into Canada</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Locus of Control</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Someone in Canada</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Immediate Family in Canada</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Extended Family in Canada</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital – At Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Kin</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Immediate Kin</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Extended Kin</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Friends</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Acquaintances</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Formal Ties</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Support</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Emotional Support</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Financial Support</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Job Information Support</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Settlement Support</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Housing Support</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Density</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at p<0.10 level (two-tailed test)
** Significant at p<0.05 level (two-tailed test)
*** Significant at p<0.01 level (two-tailed test)
The strongest correlation among all of the human capital variables is with occupational prestige of job prior to migration \((r=-.22, p<.062)\); it is also the only correlation close to statistical significance. Number of years of previous job experience is not as highly correlated \((r=-.16)\), but also has a negative effect on being employed. The correlation between being employed and the continuous total years of education variable measured at interview is also negative, though weak \((r=-.08)\).

Conversely, having a university degree, self-assessed English language ability at immigration and completed some schooling in Canada are all weakly and positively correlated with being employed at \(r=.06\). These relationships are contrary to expectations based on previous research, which has shown that language competence is the number one determinant of economic success in the host country (e.g. Burnaby et al. 1987), while in general, human capital earned in Canada should have a stronger and more positive effect on obtaining employment (e.g. Beach and Worswick 1993). This appears to suggest that, as finer distinctions are made in the actual number of years of education an individual has, those with university degrees, particularly professional degrees which usually require lengthy periods of education, are least likely to be employed. Combined with the negative impact of higher human capital earned prior to migration, this suggests considerable disadvantage to independent class, professional immigrants – the group most targeted by Canadian immigration policy.

Variables measuring financial \((r=.19)\), cultural \((r=.14)\) and psychological resources \((r=.04)\) are all positively correlated with being employed, as predicted. This could be related to their connection with higher human capital levels which were predicted to be positively related to being employed. Having more financial capital at immigration appears to be
strongly related to employment, perhaps because these individuals are more likely to become self-employed, or because those bringing much higher amounts of money into Canada have been considerably more successful in their countries of origin, and may have highly transferable skills (as denoted by the correlation between cultural capital and being employed). Whether these are distinctive resources from human capital remains to be seen below.

The correlations between social network resources and being employed are very interesting, as they appear to suggest that those networks most characteristic of the family class – kin-dominated, dense and supportive – are also least correlated with being employed. This holds for almost every variable measured, from knowing someone prior to migration (social capital at immigration) to the structure of the network defined at interview. In particular, knowing immediate family at immigration \( (r = -.18, p < .10) \) and mean proportion of kin \( (r = -.21, p < .05) \) are very negatively associated with being employed; when a finer distinction regarding the network members' relationship to the respondent is made, having a higher proportion of extended kin in particular (that is, joining a well-established family group in Canada, characteristic of the family class) is very negatively correlated with employment \( (r = -.18, p < .10) \), while having a high proportion of friends in the network (characteristic of independent class immigrants) is positively related to being employed \( (r = .19, p < .10) \). The correlations between these social network resource variables and being employed therefore seem to indicate that the networks characteristic of the family class have a negative impact on their employment. Finally, network size and density are weakly correlated with being employed (as they are with every other dependent variable measured).
This points to a distinction between the quantity of alters in a network versus their ‘quality’ in providing support, with the former appearing to have little relationship to finding a job.

Results of Logistic Regressions

Table 6.2 presents a series of logistic regressions concerning the odds of being employed. Model 1 is included for the reader’s information, confirming the bivariate relationships examined in Chapter Four.

Model 2 introduces the first human capital resource variable, had a university degree at immigration; this is a measure of a respondent’s human capital at Time 1. Though not statistically significant, holding such a degree and controlling for other demographic

5 While the linear regression model places no restrictions on the values of the dependent variable — that is, it is assumed to be continuous and linear — the logistic model is used to estimate the non-linear effects of independent variables on a dichotomous dependent variable that is restricted to two values: here, one or zero, or being employed versus not being employed. The regression method estimates the probability (Pr) of observing that the outcome measured in the dependent variable occurs, or that Y=1. That is, this method assumes the effect of changes in X on the Pr(Y) are small as values of Y approach zero and one, but that there is a critical region over which X has a stronger and substantial effect (Aldrich and Nelson 1984). In order to be able to apply the mathematically simpler linear model to this non-linear dependent variable, the logistic model assigns continuous values to Y by first, examining the ratio of Pr/(1-Pr), and then taking the natural logarithm, log(Pr/(1-Pr)). This enables the assumption that the transformed variable is a linear function of X: \( \log \left( \frac{P}{1-P} \right) \). Using antilogarithms, the logistic function can be rewritten to obtain an expression for \( P = \frac{e^Z}{1 + e^Z} \). Thus, in the tables of logistic results, the estimated b coefficients refer to the “log odds” of Y=1 (or, log [P/(1-P)]), while the odds are calculated as \( e^Z \). Further, while the logistic regression tables presented in this thesis show the “log odds” and the “odds”, the latter are discussed because they make more intuitive sense.

6 The variable years of education at interview (Time 2) was tested in the model, and found to be extremely non-statistically significant, with little change in the odds of being employed according to each year of additional education (b=-.05, Odds=.95, p<.63). It must be, then, that it is the distinction of having a University degree versus not having one that is an asset to obtaining employment among this sample. Due to the significant zero-order correlations between financial capital brought at immigration and being employed, I ran a regression with the demographic control variables which indicated a very weak, non-significant relationship between the amount of money brought and being employed (b=.74E-.05, SE=4.50E-.05, p<.1465, e=.10) — that is, there is no change in the odds of being employed by the amount of money brought into Canada. Even controlling for level of education, a very similar result was obtained. As well, variables representing each of the resource variables were tested in the model: first, with only the control variables, then, in the event that a relationship was being masked by educational differences, I ran the model with background control variables and the dichotomous education variable. In each case, I found no relationship between the other resource variables and being employed. It appears that in this sample, then, differences in being employed are only related to the two human capital and social network resource variables discussed below.
Table 6.2:
Logistic Regression on Being Employed at Interview Among Respondents in the Labour Force Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Employed at Interview</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>Odds‡</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>Odds</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University Degree at Immigration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.10 (.85)</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.26 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige Before Migration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.08†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Kin</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Social Support</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-1.47†</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-1.72‡</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.06†</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-0.07‡</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-2.88†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.51)</td>
<td>(1.61)</td>
<td>(1.61)</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.08)</td>
<td>(1.08)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.92***</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.06***</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.32)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>4.80†</td>
<td>10.55**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>58.67</td>
<td>56.24</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>39.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>34.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance level</td>
<td>p&lt;.0032</td>
<td>p&lt;.0031</td>
<td>p&lt;.0021</td>
<td>p&lt;.0005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit</td>
<td>78.58</td>
<td>86.24</td>
<td>68.97</td>
<td>74.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significant at p<0.01 level  
** Significant at p<0.05 level  
* Significant at p<0.06  
† Significant at p<0.10 level  
‡ Odds = e^b  
1 This model loses 10 cases who did not have jobs before coming to Canada; N=74.
characteristics increases the odds of being employed by three times ($b=1.10$, $SE=.85$ $p<.1947$).\(^7\) Controlling for this human capital resource increases the explanatory power of the years in Canada coefficient, so that each additional year in Canada increases the odds of employment by a factor of 2.9 ($b=1.06$ SE=.36 $p<.0032$). Similarly, controlling for having a University degree at immigration increases the negative effect of being a family class immigrant, which reduces the odds of being employed by a factor of .18 ($b=-1.72$, SE=.95 $p<.0717$). This is likely because of the relatively high proportion of family class respondents holding University degrees at immigration, as discussed in Chapter Five. Controlling for having a university education also decreases the odds that females will be employed to .32 those for males ($b=-1.15$, SE=.80 $p<.1503$). This model does not fit quite as well as the previous one, but it is still acceptable ($-2$ Log Likelihood=56.95; $\chi^2=24.85$, d.f.=9 $p<.0031$).\(^8\)

An additional human capital at Time 1 variable is added to the equation in Model 3, occupational prestige of job before migration. Occupying a more prestigious job before

---

\(^7\) The lack of significance of this education variable, despite an apparently powerful effect, is not an isolated occurrence in dealing with this sample. In the logistic regressions predicting the odds of employment and obtaining an equivalent job (below), on more than one occasion effects which look powerful are not statistically significant. This is likely a result of the sample size, and its role in the calculation of the Wald statistic which is used to test hypotheses about the coefficients. The problem with the Wald statistic is that, as the regression coefficient's absolute value increases, the estimated standard error is too large. Because the standard error forms the denominator in the formula, the resultant Wald statistic is too small, and the null hypothesis that the coefficient is zero is not rejected when in fact it should be. Hauck and Donner (1977) suggest abandoning the Wald statistic in such cases, and instead re-estimating the model with, and without, the variable in question, basing the hypothesis test instead on the difference between the two likelihood-ratio chi-squares (Norušis 1990b:B-42). Due to the large number of models and coefficients that are potentially involved in this research, I have chosen to simply discuss those which appear to have a substantial effect and disregard the fact that they are not necessarily statistically significant.

\(^8\) There are different ways of assessing how well the estimated model fits the data. One way is to examine the classification table, which compares predictions to observed outcomes, and gives an overall proportion of correctly classified cases; this method gives a rough estimate of how well the model fits the data. Another way is to examine the $-2$ log likelihood statistic, where a good model is one that results in a high likelihood of observed results, or a low value for the $-2$ log likelihood statistic. The goodness-of-fit statistic also compares the observed probabilities to those predicted by the model, and leads to the same conclusions as the $-2$ log likelihood statistic. Finally, the model chi-square tests the null-hypothesis that the coefficients for all of the terms in the current model, except the constant, are 0, and is comparable to the overall $F$ test for ordinary least squares regression.
coming to Canada has the effect of decreasing the odds of being employed by .93 times (b=-.08, SE=.04 p<.925). Controlling for occupational prestige increases the effect of having a University education on being employed to 3.53 times those without a degree, meaning that respondents with higher occupational prestige prior to migration must be having more difficulty obtaining employment (b=1.26, SE=1.08, p<.242).

In this model, the each additional year in Canada increases the odds of employment in a slightly less dramatic way, but its effect is largely consistent: the longer an immigrant is in Canada, the more likely they are to be employed. This is likely a sampling effect, in that a larger proportion of the sample that arrived earlier in Canada is born in Sri Lanka, a group that is less likely to have high levels of human capital, and of high occupational prestige before migration. The negative effect of being female on the odds of being employed continue to grow, so that controlling for these two human capital variables, females are .35 times as less likely to be employed as males (b=-1.04, SE=.88 p<.235).

By contrast, the effect of the family class coefficient is less negative when controlling for previous occupational prestige (b=-1.25 SE=1.03 p<.226; odds=.28): this is likely related to these respondents' having held more prestigious jobs prior to migration relative to independent class respondents in the labour force (-2 Log Likelihood=47.00, $\chi^2=27.62$, d.f.=10, p<.0021). Indeed, Chapter Five demonstrated that the family class respondents in this sample actually have higher mean levels of prestige prior to migration (See Table 5.2). Once again, this results points to a discrepancy between the expected resource levels of the different admissions classes, and their expected labour market integration trajectories.

The negative effect of higher occupational prestige may be reflecting the difficulties experienced by professionals when they try to practice their professions in the host country.
The majority must re-train or re-certify with Canadian educational or professional qualification, while others are prevented from practicing altogether. In this way, higher human capital can be seen as a liability for some who are effectively barred from practicing due to the requirement for Canadian educational equivalencies, Canadian professional certification and/or Canadian experience. Such a finding goes explicitly against the goals of Canadian immigration policy, but is supported by anecdotal references to the numbers of immigrant taxi drivers, gas station attendants and labourers with PhDs. As will be discussed further below, these immigrants place considerable importance on the prestige of their jobs and actively compare their situation in Canada to that before migrating. One Pakistani independent male respondent in Canada since 1992 worked in banking before coming to Canada. Unable to find work in this area, he was forced to re-train and at the time of the interview was doing a Teller’s course at College. Of his life here, he said “I [have] lost weight. I was a manager in Pakistan, here I am nothing, a financial loss” (R67).

Model 4 presents the final, full equation which includes a control for social capital resources in addition to the two human capital ones.9 Introducing the controls for social capital resources in the form of mean percent kin and mean total support seems to increase the effects of the human capital variables, in particular the effects of education. Controlling for all four resources simultaneously, having a University degree increases the odds of being employed by about 7.4 times (b=2.00, SE=1.31, p<.066). The effect of higher occupational prestige prior to immigration is also slightly intensified, reducing the odds of employment by .88 times – though a comparatively much smaller effect (b=-.13, SE=.06, p<.023). The effect of mean proportion of kin is extremely negative, reducing the odds of being employed among

9 Model 4: -2 Log Likelihood=39.83; χ²=34.78, d.f.=12 p<.0005.
those with a higher proportion of kin by .15 times ($b=-1.92$, $SE=1.95$ $p<.325$), while those who received more mean total support were .65 times as likely to be employed ($b=-.43$, $SE=.22$ $p<.049$).

Perhaps most strikingly, holding constant the negative effects of these social network measures, the family class coefficient becomes a positive predictor of being employed, increasing the odds compared to independent class respondents by 3.11 times that for independent class respondents ($b=1.13$, $SE=1.71$ $p<.509$). Likewise, holding other factors constant, the number of years in Canada coefficient indicates that over time, immigrants are more likely to be employed, just as they are expected to be; this suggests that respondents in Canada longer may be held back by their kin-dominated networks in obtaining employment ($b=1.32$, $SE=.44$ $p<.003$). Finally, in the presence of human capital and social capital resource controls, the female coefficient is an even more strongly negative predictor of employment, reducing the odds by .16 times compared to males ($b=-1.86$, $SE=1.12$, $p<.096$).

There are several possible explanations for the negative impact of these two measures of social network resources that need not be seen as mutually exclusive. First, it could be that respondents who received larger amounts of support are individuals who were more disadvantaged, and therefore needed more assistance, but that the assistance received was not of the sort that had direct implications for finding work. A second, and related explanation, is that individuals who have a higher proportion of kin in their networks, and who by extension tend to receive higher levels of overall support, may be less likely to seek assistance in searching for employment outside of their closed familial networks. In the words of one female family class respondent from India, aged twenty-five, "Generally most of us do not go to a particular agency – mostly you talk with friends" – friends here taken to
include family, given that of her five network members, four are kin (R37). This explanation may help understand the relationship between these social network resources and the family class coefficient, as indicated by the change in the sign of the family class coefficient in the final model from negative to positive: controlling for the negative impact of a closed, family-based network, family class respondents are in fact more likely to be employed. But the reality of course is that they are more likely to function within these types of closed networks, which as argued previously by Granovetter (1973) leaves these immigrants with a shortage of weak ties providing access to scarce information – in this case, job search techniques, job openings, etc. It is therefore possible that the negative relationship between being employed, and having a supportive and kin-dominated network, could be illustrating this “weak tie” theory (1973).

Yet another explanation could be that respondents with a high proportion of kin in their networks may be sufficiently supported so that they may be more selective in finding a job, take more time, pursue job re-training in the event of work search failures, or not look for work with quite the same intensity as an individual who is relying on their own meager resources to survive. This would argue that a high proportion of kin or supportive network does not necessarily contain poor information, but that the individual immigrant in such a milieu is simply permitted some discretionary space when seeking employment.

This third explanation is reflected in different ways in the interviews of some of the respondents who considered themselves to be in the labour force, but who were unemployed at the time of the interview. Of the eleven unemployed family class respondents in the labour force, four are between fifty-five and sixty-seven years of age. Among these individuals, it is likely that their age is an important factor in determining their employment
status. In a competitive labour market where youth is certainly highly valued, even their
greater occupational experience and skill is unlikely to assist them in finding work in
Canada, when they are also facing those barriers typically named by immigrants: in
particular, a lack of Canadian experience, skills or qualifications. The oldest respondent, a
male aged 67 from Bangladesh, in Canada for five years, reported that “racial discrimination
in job is much more common here. I was refused a job because of my accent … When I go
for a job, they always ask if I have Canadian experience” (R22). While the fact of ethnic
discrimination is real, it is also possible that this respondent was being refused employment
because of his age, and that it is easier for an employer to exclude on the basis of a lack of
experience when in fact the other factor was more important in their decision. Each of these
older respondents was being supported by another family member (a son or daughter), which
is in fact anticipated by immigration policy of the family class stream. Other family class
respondents unemployed at the time of the interview had not been looking for work that long:
though they may have been in Canada more than a couple of years, a few had decided to
return to school to re-train, in the hope that these Canadian qualifications would provide the
bridge to their desired labour market position, while two others had been on maternity leave
and only just begun to look for work. These respondents also had other kinds of support that
enabled them to do these non-labour market activities: other family members.

Thus, it is likely that several scenarios combine to understand the negative
relationship between family class respondents, these social network resources and the odds of
being employed. For some, their networks are probably poor repositories of useful
information that leads to employment; for others, other limiting factors (such as their age or
human capital) create barriers to their employment, and the strength of their social networks
is what keeps them from becoming totally destitute, or even returning home. Though it is not possible to reach a definitive conclusion from this analysis, it has provided some insight into the potential ways in which family and independent class respondents’ experiences in looking and finding work differ.

Turning to the implications of the female coefficient, crosstabulations of being employed by female and family class show that independent class females are not those having difficulty finding work: of the ten that are in the labour force, nine are employed at the time of the interview (table not shown). By contrast, five out of the fifteen family class females in the labour force were not employed. A further comparison of the mean educational levels of females by employment status by immigrant class reveals that the five family class respondents who were not employed had the highest mean level of the four groups (17 years). One explanation for this group’s apparent difficulty in becoming employed is that, as a result of their higher levels of education, these women are competing for professional occupations that are more difficult to access. In this way, they are likely encountering the barriers to employment most typically associated with being male, and competing with highly skilled native born workers in a more restricted, exacting labour market. It is worth repeating a theme from Chapter Five that these findings, and the fact that there is only a half a year’s difference in the overall mean years of education between family and independent class females, illustrates the false assumptions about the human capital content of members of the two policy classes.
Discussion

When the results of the bivariate and multivariate analyses are compared, controlling for individual immigrant resources explains the differences observed between the two immigrant classes and among the different age groups. Having a university degree upon arrival is a definite asset in becoming employed, but immigrants with higher levels of job prestige prior to migration are likely to find greater difficulty getting work in Canada. The contradictory findings of human capital as both an asset and liability is an important contribution to the understanding of the immigrant employment process. Certainly, it undermines many accepted beliefs about the importance of human capital to economic success in Canada, and by extension, about the relative abilities of independent and family class respondents to achieve economic independence here. Further, the finding that respondents with kin-dominated or supportive networks are less likely to be employed draws attention to the distinctive network contexts in which members of the two immigrant classes live, and the effects of these on the odds of being employed. As discussed above, it is probable that there are different interpretations for this negative relationship between social network resources and being employed, some of which point to the limiting effects of these networks, others which point to the importance of social network resources in supporting disadvantaged individuals in their continued search for employment, individuals that might otherwise face serious poverty, or be faced with only the choice of underpaid and demeaning work.

There are of course several resources absent from this discussion. Financial, cultural and psychological resources are all poor predictors of being employed, despite their theoretical importance, or even the presence of a bivariate correlation as in the case of
financial capital at immigration (see discussion above). The absence of these relationships might have real substantive meaning – that in fact, having cultural capital as defined by the number of countries to which the respondent has traveled does not improve an immigrant’s odds of being employed. Or, the nature of this sample, which is relatively well-educated, with good English language skills, may simply underestimate the importance of these other resources to obtaining employment among a more disadvantaged population.

In particular, the absence of education variables at Time 2 in this model (having done some schooling in Canada and number of years of education at interview) goes contrary to expectations. As stated above, it could be that the real determining factor in being employed is the sharp distinction between having a university degree and not having one, with much greater years of education or professional qualifications actually serving as liabilities (as indicated by the negative effect of the occupational prestige before migration coefficients). The fact that the dichotomous variable measuring schooling in Canada has no effect is very likely related to problems with its measurement. As described in Chapter Three, any type of Canadian-earned educational qualifications are grouped together: there is no distinction between a respondent who has completed an entire undergraduate or graduate degree here, versus someone who did an English as a Second Language course, or a college diploma. However, the purpose of the variable was in fact to determine whether the acquisition of ‘any’ Canadian qualification would make a difference in obtaining employment, which it clearly does not in this sample. It could be that the majority of those enrolling in some kind of Canadian education or re-training courses are precisely those who have had difficulty finding work, such as professionals (people with higher prestige job before migrating), or people with kin-dominated or supportive networks. Lastly, one more reason for the non-
significance of this variable could be the narrow time span of this study. The effects of this investment may not necessarily be visible within the first couple of years of the completion of the course, particularly among those who were enrolled at the time of the interview. In a study spanning a longer period of time, then, education completed in Canada might emerge as a positive predictor of economic outcomes.

Finally, the fact that human capital variables do not comprise the only relevant predictors of employment, and that in fact some (such as English language ability, or years of education at interview) have no relationship in this analysis, clearly supports the inclusion of other resource types in understanding the integration process. In particular, I have found empirical support for the theoretical application of social network analysis within the field of immigration research.

EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS

Introduction

The second dependent variable measuring economic integration in this study is employment income. The most commonly used indicator of economic success among immigrant and non-immigrant populations alike, an individual’s level of income derived from employment serves as an objective indicator of their general labour market success in the host country. The analysis of this income variable will permit a general understanding of the role of an immigrant’s different types of resources in their quest for financial well-being. General assumptions are that human capital resource variables will be most effective in predicting the variation in levels of earnings among this sample of immigrants.
Determinants of Employment Income Among Respondents in the Labour Force

The purpose of the following models is to first present the effects of traditional human capital variables on respondents’ employment incomes, followed by the effects of the other four types of resources discussed in previous chapters in the presence of these human capital effects. This procedure is followed in order to determine the additional explanatory value of these other resource types. This portion of the analysis is conducted on respondents who were employed at the time of the interview, N=68.

Variables are introduced into the regression models based in part on their initial Pearson correlation coefficients with the dependent variable. Again, some variables were tested in analyses even in light of weak or absent correlations in the event that a predicted relationship was masked by other background variables. A table of these correlation coefficients in presented in Table 6.1. As discussed in Chapter Four, differences in earnings were found between female and male respondents, as well as between some immigrant class sub-groups. In this chapter, multivariate controls are introduced through the use of ordinary least squares regression analysis in order to determine which individual immigrant resources best predict employment income levels in this sample, and so explain these bivariate differences.

10 Thus, while the full integration model presented in Figure 6.1 includes effects for several variables in each of the five resource types, not every resource type is represented in each regression model, for each dependent variable. For example, in the regression models for employment income, there are no controls for cultural resources, financial resources or psychological resources, because these were either uncorrelated with the dependent variable as indicated by their Pearson correlation coefficients, or because once introduced into the model they remained statistically insignificant predictors and added little or nothing to the model’s explanatory value.
Results of Zero-order Correlations

The bivariate relationships between each resource type and employment income presented in the table of correlation coefficients above (see Table 6.1) are generally consistent with the direction of those between the independent variables measuring resources and being employed, though the strength of some of the correlations is very different. Having a university degree at immigration is again positively related to earnings, in contrast to the negative relationships between the other two variables measuring human capital at immigration. This is consistent with the difficulties faced by professionals in having their credentials recognized discussed earlier, though it appears that these variables are less strongly correlated with earnings. Perhaps, then, greater experience and occupational prestige prior to migration is a barrier to becoming employed, but that once employed, this negative effect is somewhat less.

Similarly weak correlations between human capital at interview variables are observed between independent variables, and being employed and earnings dependent variables (though the sign of the years of education variable becomes positive in its correlation with earnings); the greatest difference is in the correlation between self-assessed English language ability and earnings, which is strong and positive (r=.29 p<.01). Perhaps this is because immigrants with higher English language abilities are able to access higher prestige, and thus better paying jobs in Canada.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{11} Indeed, though not shown, the correlation between earnings and occupational prestige is high – r=.34, p<.004, so it is likely that language competence is affecting earnings through the occupational sector and/or prestige of the job obtained.
Measures of financial capital ($r = .20 \ p < .10$) and psychological resources ($r = .18 \ p < .10$) are both positively and significantly correlated with earnings, and the number of countries to which the individual has traveled – measuring cultural capital – is also positively correlated ($r = .12$). Bringing more money into the country could be a reflection of higher levels of human capital, and so affect earnings in this way; there could also be a relationship between high levels of financial capital at immigration and being a successful entrepreneur in Canada, which could also affect earnings positively. Immigrants with higher levels of autonomy or sense of control may be more successful in finding ways to mobilize their human capital to getting better-paying jobs. Finally, the type of human capital may be the key to higher earnings, which may be reflected in having traveled to a larger number of countries: respondents who have done so may have internationally recognized qualifications and a high transferability of skills, which may be distinct from simply having a high level of human capital, and so increase the chances that an immigrant will find a well-paying job in Canada.

Lastly, the strength of the correlations between the social network resource variables and earnings are slightly different. Knowing immediate family prior to migration, and a kin-dominated network, are again negatively associated with earnings ($r = -.24 \ p < .05$; $r = -.15$ respectively), but it specifically a high proportion of immediate kin that is most strongly correlated ($r = -.25 \ p < .05$); other dichotomous measures of network composition are weakly, and overall positively correlated with earnings (except having a high proportion of formal ties). This likely reflects the same kind of distinction observed in predicting the odds of being employed: people with kin-dominated networks have lower earnings, and these people tend to be family class respondents. Interestingly, highly supportive networks are very negatively correlated with earnings on all measures, the weakest being between high amounts
of support finding a house and earnings. This is likely a reflection of the power of the immediate kin and earnings correlation: immediate kin are likely to provide all kinds of support as opposed to just one type. Finally, once again network size and density are only somewhat correlated with the dependent variable. What seems to be important is not the actual number of “helpers” a respondent had access to, or whether these people are well-connected with each-other, but rather the relationship of the helper to the respondent and the types of support that are then likely to flow from that individual. The purpose of the following multiple regression models is to impute some meaning to these negative and positive bivariate correlations in order to determine, in part, whether in fact these social network resources are a net ‘drag’ on the earnings of family class immigrants, and whether different kinds of human capital indeed have differing effects on the earnings of these immigrants.

**Results of Ordinary Least Squares Regressions**

Table 6.3 presents the results of OLS regressions of earnings on first, demographic control variables, and then these background controls with variables measuring individual resources. Only variables that emerged as predictors of earnings are displayed in the tables, and so despite significant Pearson correlations, financial capital, psychological and social capital resources at immigration are omitted. As above, Model 1 is included for the reader’s information, and is not discussed.\(^\text{12}\)

---

\(^{12}\) Model 1 is not statistically significant: F=1.56, d.f.=8 p<.157.
Table 6.3:
OLS Regression Predicting Employment Income Among Respondents Employed at Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Employment Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-ratio</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University at Immigration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8562.93</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree at Immigration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-9275.82</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>-9236.59</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-8249.40</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>-9326.81</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-115.26</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-193.19</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3797.71</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2981.70</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-5753.39</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-7152.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-667.72</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-5360.26</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-6462.25</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>-5012.50</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>708.49</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>964.91</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>35985.71***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31790.37***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employment Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-ratio</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University at Immigration</td>
<td>6454.44</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>5942.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree at Immigration</td>
<td>2165.66*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2102.13*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Immediate Kin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-16902.90**</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1018.90</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-6460.93</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>865.38</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-10132.10***</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
<td>-10027.90***</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-272.69</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-265.53</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4883.86</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>4662.88</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-10441.30</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-12676.90</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-2320.32</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-3771.52</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-3668.91</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>-8433.64†</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>700.72</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>914.62</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1673.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13242.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significant at p<0.01 level       * Significant at p<.06 level
** Significant at p<0.05 level        † Significant at p<.10 level
In Model 2, the first of two human capital variables is introduced to the model. Having a university education at immigration represents human capital resources at immigration, or Time 1, and has a positive effect on employment earnings, raising them by approximately eight and a half thousand dollars ($beta=0.24, t=1.93, p<0.058$). Family class and female coefficients retain their statistical significance, with the coefficient for being family class maintaining its explanatory power: this indicates that, assuming equivalent levels of education at immigration among family and independent class immigrants makes no real difference in the negative effect of being a family class immigrant on earnings ($beta=-0.30, t=-2.23 p<0.05$). Further, controlling for having a university degree increases the power of the female beta coefficient (though slightly) to $beta=-0.27 (t=-2.28 p<.05)$, indicating that females make approximately $9326.81 less than their male counterparts when having a university degree is held constant. The increased power of the coefficient controlling for education at immigration is likely due to the high level of education among employed females in this sample.  

A second control for human capital at immigration, in the form of self-assessed English ability is included in Model 3 along with the dichotomous education at immigration variable. The unstandardized coefficient for the English ability variable indicates that high self-assessed ability increases earnings by about two thousand dollars, holding constant having a university degree at immigration ($b=2,165.56; \text{beta}=.26 \ t=1.91 \ p<.06$). Overall, the fit of the model is improved to $R^2 = .27$, or by about four percent (Adjusted $R^2 = .14$). 

---

13 $R^2 = .23$, Adjusted $R^2 = .10$; $F=1.87 \ d.f.=9 \ p<.075$.  
14 Model 3: $F=2.12 \ d.f.=10 \ p<.037$.  

Including this control variable seems to decrease the differences in earnings between the classes of admission (beta=-.21 t=-1.50 p<.14), and increase those between males and females (beta=-.29 t=-2.53 p<.01). Family class respondents must therefore have lower levels of self-assessed English ability, and females higher levels than their male counterparts, controlling for level of education and other demographic characteristics. The female coefficient is in fact the strongest predictor of earnings, reducing females' incomes by more than one thousand dollars compared to males when having a university degree and language ability are held constant (b=-10132).

In Model 4, social network resources at interview are entered into the model with human capital controls. This allows me to determine the contribution of these variables to the model's overall explanatory power compared to that of the human capital variables. The improvement is dramatic, as indicated by a significant R squared change value, pointing to the importance of these variables in understanding the variations in earnings among this sample of immigrants.

Essentially, the sign of both social capital coefficients is negative, in that kin-dominated and supportive networks are negatively associated with employment income, holding level of education, English ability and demographic characteristics constant. That is,

---

15 Model 4: R^2 = .38, Adjusted R^2 = .24; F=2.77, d.f.=12, p<.005.

16 Social network resources at immigration were also included in a model with the two human capital control variables, and were found to have much weaker effect than social network resources at interview. For reasons of model stability it was necessary to choose between these social network measures, and so those at Time 2 have been reported in full. The effect of knowing an immediate family member in Canada prior to migration is also negative, reducing earnings by b=-5356 when other demographic and human capital variables are held constant (beta=-.17 t=-1.27 p<.21). With this variable in the model, the family class coefficient's power is somewhat weaker (b=-.15 t=-1.00 p<.32), suggesting that the inclusion of this social network control helps to explain the differences in earnings by class through the structure of respondents' networks. These results can be compared to Model 3, which includes just human capital controls, and to Model 4, to see the difference in the effects of social network measures at Time 1 and 2 (R^2 = .29, Adjusted R^2 = .15).

17 R^2 change=.105, F Change=4.629, d.f.1=2 d.f.2=55, p<.014.
having a higher percent immediate kin in the network effectively is associated with a reduction in an immigrant’s earnings by $16,902.90 (beta=−.30 t=−2.10 p<.04), while receiving a higher mean amount of total support reduces earnings by b=1019, holding other resources constant (beta=−.18, t=−1.36 p<.18). Interestingly, the network composition resource variable emerges as the strongest predictor of earnings in this sample, followed by one human capital variable (English ability at immigration beta=.26); the variables measuring total support and having a university degree are comparable in their power. From this, the inclusion of these two social network resource variables is an important addition to traditional analyses of employment earnings outcomes among immigrants.

Controlling for the negative effects of social network resources causes the dummy variable for being born in Sri Lanka to emerge as a stronger predictor of employment earnings relative to their Indian counterparts (beta=−.23, t=−1.80 p<.08), probably because they tend to receive slightly lower levels of total support than their Indian counterparts (see Chapter Five). Thus, controlling for the negative effect of social support, Sri Lankan respondents earn even lower incomes compared to Indian respondents, who tend to have more supportive networks (see Chapter Five). The coefficient for being female remains largely unchanged (beta=−.29 t=−2.59 p<0.01). Most strikingly, the coefficient for family class appears to have been essentially explained away by the social network controls, as indicated by the extremely weak beta coefficient (beta=.03, t=.18 p<.86). Moreover, controlling for the negative impact of kin-dominated networks and social support changes the sign of the family class coefficient, which now has a positive effect on earnings (b=865), meaning that if we were able to take away the negative effects of these network resources, family class immigrants would in fact have higher earnings than their independent class
counterparts (controlling for human capital and demographic characteristics). From Model 4, then, even the positive effect of human capital in the form of a university degree and high self-assessed English ability at immigration cannot overcome the negative effects of kin-dominated and supportive networks in determining the earnings of family class compared to independent class immigrants.

Three demographic background variables have not been discussed for each model because their effects are largely consistent: age, being married and number of years in Canada. Holding other factors constant, each additional year of age lowers the incomes of respondents by between $115 and $270 across the four models, which is largely consistent with predictions that older respondents will have a harder time finding work, and so in achieving a higher income. Controlling for the two human capital variables (in Model 3), the beta coefficient increases to beta=-.16 (t=-1.19 p<.24) indicating that older respondents are more likely to have a university education at immigration, as well as higher levels of self-assessed English ability; controlling for social network resources, the effect of the age coefficient is maintained, indicating that these resources do not vary greatly across the age categories of this sample (controlling for other demographic factors that is).

Being married has a positive effect on earnings relative to unmarried respondents in each model. Holding level of education constant, the coefficient for being married decreases slightly (b=2982 beta=.08, t=.59 p<.56), meaning that married respondents are slightly less likely to have a university education at immigration. The same effect is observed in Model 3 when language ability is held constant as well, with the beta coefficient for being married rising to beta=.13 (t=.97 p<.34): being married increases the earnings of an immigrant by $4884 in this model. The increased power of the marital status variable when human capital
is held constant could be related indirectly to the fact that single respondents tended to be much younger and undergoing their university education in Canada. Finally, controlling for social network resources changes the marital status coefficient only slightly ($\beta=.12 \ t=.91 \ p<.36$), indicating that married respondents have a lower proportion of kin and less supportive networks (this is confirmed by analysis of variance tables not shown). Though counter-intuitive, this entire analysis is conducted on employed respondents only, and so may be illustrating the closed support system of husband and wife that develops, as opposed to unmarried respondents who rely on a variety of family members for assistance.

Finally, the coefficient for number of years in Canada is a consistently positive predictor of earnings, as expected: the longer an individual is in Canada, the more likely it is that they will acquire experience and contacts that assist in achieving a higher income. It is also interesting to note that in Model 4, controlling for social network and human capital resources, each additional year in Canada increases the earnings of respondents by about $200 (\beta=.07 \ t=.61 \ p<.54)$. This would seem to suggest that people who have been in Canada longer have more kin-dominated and/or more supportive networks, which negatively affect earnings. Examining the analysis of variance and crosstabulations of these network and demographic background variables shows that there is a marked difference in the mean proportion of kin and support provided to respondents in Canada two years or less, and those in Canada longer: levels of support and proportion of kin peak among respondents who have been in Canada three and four years – years in which the proportion of Indian respondents is also extremely high. I expect that what explains this negative effect of social network resources among respondents in Canada is therefore more related to sample characteristics.
than an actual causal effect between years spent in Canada, network characteristics and earnings.

Discussion

Perhaps what is most striking in this analysis is the overall strength of social network compared to human capital variables as predictors of immigrant earnings. Predictably, English language ability is strongly associated with higher earnings, even more so than having a university degree at immigration, though such qualifications also have an important and positive effect on employment income. As with the analysis of being employed, it is the distinction between having a university degree that appears to matter, given that the continuous years of education at interview variable is largely uncorrelated with earnings. This lack of relationship may reflect the barriers experienced by many professionals in having their credentials recognized. Yet, this difficulty is not universal, because some respondents with computing and accounting skills did not seem to experience the same difficulties. Indeed, some had access to numerous job opportunities, though such respondents typically had obtained their university education at a Canadian or American institution, a factor that has not been explored in this study but which is worthy of further investigation. Thus, these two human capital variables likely function to gain respondents access to high prestige jobs – particularly among those with superior linguistic skills, who are competing in specific job sectors where skill transferability is high regardless of their specific

\[18\] When this variable is placed in a regression including demographic controls, not only is the overall model not statistically significant \((F=1.40 \ p<.21)\), but the education coefficient is an extremely weak predictor \((\beta=.07, \ t=.55 \ p<.58 – \text{table not shown})\).
educational background, and where Canadian professional associations do not impede immigrants' abilities to practice in Canada.

It appears that the effects of other kinds of resources, such as financial, cultural and psychological capital, are largely accounted for once they are included with demographic controls and where levels of education and English ability are held constant. Whether these would emerge as more important predictors of earnings in a larger sample is still open to question; their lack of importance in this analysis is not a convincing argument for their exclusion from future research. The amount of money brought to Canada at immigration variable in particular is one that might emerge as a more important predictor of earnings within a larger sample. In a model holding constant the dichotomous education variable and English ability, the effect of financial resources is not much different (table not shown: beta=.11 t=.82 p<.42), while the family class coefficient appears further reduced in its power to beta=-.16 (t=-1.09 p<.28); this model could be compared to Model 3 (R^2=.28, Adjusted R^2=.14).\textsuperscript{19} The fact that holding financial resources at interview constant modifies the effect of the family class variable likely reflects the fact that independent class immigrants bring higher amounts of money in to the country; that this money has only a marginal effect on earnings itself is something to be investigated with a larger sample.

What does this negative association with social network resources and earnings mean, however? Having a lot of kin in the network does not cause an individual to have a lower employment income. Rather, when it comes to the quest for socially valued goods (such as well-paying jobs), social networks as a resource are only ever as good as the type of

\textsuperscript{19} Included in a model with demographic controls alone, financial resources have a small, positive effect on earnings (beta=.11 t=.76 p<.45), increasing these by about $46 for every dollar brought into Canada. More importantly, its inclusion modifies the effect of the family class coefficient, reducing it to beta=.25 (t=-1.66 p<.10), and closing the earnings gap as a result of class of admission to \( b \approx -7782 \).
information that they contain. As argued elsewhere (Fischer 1982; Granovetter 1973), networks based on kinship are more typically closed, in that information circulates within them as if they were a closed system. This is characteristic of the family class immigrants interviewed in this study, who often referred to a small number of individuals as their primary source of information on all aspects of immigration. Certainly, those individuals accessed by these respondents also in many cases had individuals that they, too, access when seeking assistance with such tasks as job searches – but the point is that in these kin-dominated networks, it is likely that even these other more distant network members possess the same types of information as those actually mentioned by the respondents.

By contrast, the independent immigrants in this sample report a greater presence of non-kin (friends and formal ties such as bank managers and lawyers) – individuals who assisted these respondents in finding jobs, places to live, and with other integration tasks. Thus these independent immigrants are accessing many different types of information through their ties, and their networks can be seen as less circumscribed than those of their family class networks. Indeed, the networks of these independent immigrants are likely to have a higher presence of what Granovetter (1973) calls weak ties, and it is likely that it is these weak ties that end up providing independent immigrants with crucial job information tips, among other types of information.20

As discussed in the analysis of the odds of being employed, the fact that some people are receiving more support from their network members may be an indicator of more than network members’ generosity: highly supported respondents may be more disadvantaged individuals who end up asking for more help; they may be people with lower self-esteem or

---

20 Tie strength was in fact measured in the study but was not developed for this presentation of results, and so is a network element that will be examined in other contexts.
locus of control, who as a result end up asking for assistance when in fact they are not objectively any worse off than others; high levels of social support may also be a function of network composition, with intimate ties providing more of many types of support simply based on the closeness of the relationship.\textsuperscript{21}

The effect of strong versus weak ties on earnings, and possibility of real disadvantage among those receiving more support, was supplemented in the odds of employment analysis by a third explanation which applies to the earnings analysis as well. Among respondents who have supportive networks and a high proportion of kin, it could be that their earnings are low because they are economically supported by others, and so may be working part-time (while also attending some education classes, for example), or may change jobs more often (because they are working in an unstable job sector with high turnover rates, for example). These two possibilities may also be linked to lower levels of human capital and language ability. It is impossible to determine from this analysis the exact reasons for this negative relationship between these two measures of social networks, but it is clear that their inclusion in the earnings analysis is an important contribution from statistical and theoretical perspectives.

\section*{GETTING AN EQUIVALENT JOB}

\textit{Introduction}

The third dimension of economic integration investigated here is the probability of obtaining an equivalent job to the one held prior to migration. This indicator of economic integration adds a subjective dimension to the analysis that is generally missing in most

\footnote{All of these possibilities can be investigated using the detailed network analysis information collected in this study, but for reasons of clarity and focus, this has been left to another forum.}
studies of immigrant economic success – one that reflects concerns voiced by many respondents about the fundamental link between the type of job performed, self-esteem and human potential. For many respondents, their satisfaction with their Canadian lives reaches beyond a desire for financial stability, to being given the opportunity to practice the skills and abilities for which they have been trained and in which they have spent time and money developing and investing. For immigrants to Canada, just as for native born Canadians, the desire to reach one’s potential is an important part of self-esteem and self-respect. Furthermore, the extent to which predictors of being employed and earnings are also found in the analysis of the determinants of job equivalency is of great interest in order to understand the extent to which these dimensions of economic integration are affected by distinctive factors.

**Determinants of Obtaining an Equivalent Job Among Respondents Employed at the Time of the Interview Only**

The following logistic regression models present effects of human capital variables on the odds of obtaining an equivalent job, followed by the effects of variables measuring other resource types in the presence of these human capital measures. This section is concerned with the factors affecting job equivalency in Canada, and so concerns the N=68 individuals employed at interview.22

Bivariate analyses of Chapter Four showed that females were more likely to obtain equivalent employment, while there did not appear to be any relationship between number of

---

22 There are 68 respondents employed at interview, but I have only 59 valid responses on the job equivalency variable (mostly due to the presence of individuals who had never had a job prior to migration, but also as a result of respondents who could not decide whether their job was equivalent). No satisfactory method of substitution was devised, and so the sample size on this question is further reduced, restricting the number of independent variables included in the analysis.
years in Canada and obtaining an equivalent job. In this section, multivariate analysis will introduce controls for demographic characteristics and individual resource variables in order to try to understand the factors at work behind these general trends. The correlations between the resource variables are first inspected (please see Table 6.4) to determine which variable combinations should be included in the logistic regressions, though even some that show non-significant correlations were included for theoretical reasons. As in the preceding sections, not all resource variables are significant predictors of job equivalency, even where strong Pearson correlations indicated a relationship. The meaning behind this non-significance is discussed below.

**Results of Zero-order Correlations**

Variables were selected for inclusion in the analysis based upon the Pearson correlation coefficients presented in Table 6.4. All human capital measures at immigration are negatively associated with job equivalency, except for self-assessed English ability at immigration which has a positive relationship with job equivalency ($r=.24 \ p<.07$). Similarly, just one human capital variable at Time 2 is strongly correlated with the dependent variable, years of education ($r=-.29 \ p<.03$); though weak, having done some schooling in Canada is positively related with job equivalency. These negative human capital effects mirrors the negative effects of higher levels of education reported on being employed, perhaps again illustrating the difficulties associated with translating skills into positive economic outcomes among the very highly educated in this sample.
### Table 6.4: Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Immigrant Resource Indicators and Measures of Integration Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant Resource Indicators</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University Degree</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige of Job Held Prior to Migration</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years of Job-Specific Experience</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessed English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Capital – At Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years of Education</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Some Schooling in Canada</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Money Brought into Canada</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Locus of Control</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Someone in Canada</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Immediate Family in Canada</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Extended Family in Canada</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital – At Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Kin</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Immediate Kin</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Extended Kin</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Friends</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Acquaintances</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Formal Ties</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Support</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Emotional Support</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Financial Support</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Job Information Support</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Settlement Support</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Housing Support</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Density</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Domains of Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Labour Force</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Income</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job is Equivalent</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p<0.01 level  
**Significant at p<0.05 level  
*Significant at p<0.06  
Significant at p<0.10 level

* This analysis is conducted on employed respondents  
† This analysis is conducted on the whole sample
The number of countries to which a respondent has traveled, measuring cultural capital, is also positively related to obtaining an equivalent job \( (r=.32 \ p<.02) \) – as is the psychological resource variable internal locus of control \( (r=.26 \ p<.04) \). These two variables could be indicating the importance of international work or educational experience in mobilizing human capital in Canada, while a higher sense of autonomy and control would be more expected of someone who has already spent some time traveling and adjusting to different cultures (e.g. Coser 1975; Kohn et al. 1983). By contrast, financial capital does not seem to be very strongly related to obtaining an equivalent job in Canada. Among variables measuring social network resources, theory and Pearson correlations point to the importance of controlling for knowing someone at arrival (at Time 1), as those people could serve as important conduits to jobs \( (r=-.29 \ p<.02) \); for network composition (mean percent kin, \( r=-.06 \ p<.63 \)); and for the amount of support provided by the network (total support \( r=-.11 \ p<.42 \); financial support \( r=-.24 \ p<.07 \); and specific job support \( r=-.08 \ p<.53 \)). The continued negative correlations between social network resource variables and the dependent variable measuring economic integration indicates that similar scenarios as described above are likely at work, with social networks somehow limiting the abilities of respondents to achieve economic success. The following logistic regression models go some distance to understanding some of the dynamics indicated by these Pearson correlations.

**Results of Logistic Regressions**

Table 6.5 displays the results of the logistic regressions of having an equivalent job on demographic and individual resource variables, beginning with the introduction of human capital controls, followed by other resources, in order to determine their relative importance.
### Table 6.5:
Logistic Regression on Having an Equivalent Job Among Respondents Employed at Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>Odds‡</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>Odds‡</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>Odds‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Education at Interview</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-38**</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-46**</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-1.32†</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-1.38†</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.30†</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.46†</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.40†</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>- .86</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>- .09†</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-6.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-4.83</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(36.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(36.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-1.25†</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-1.70**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-3.06***</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>- .64</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.10**</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.65**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-2 Log Likelihood</strong></td>
<td>67.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance level</td>
<td>p&lt;.0925</td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.0120</td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.0012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit</td>
<td>58.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *** Significant at p<0.01 level  
** ** Significant at p<0.05 level  
* † Significant at p<0.06  
† †† Significant at p<0.10 level  
‡ ‡‡ Odds = e^b
Table 6.5:
Logistic Regression on Having an Equivalent Job Among Respondents Employed at Interview (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>Odds‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Education at Interview</td>
<td>-.45*** (.17)</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Immediate Kin</td>
<td>.62 (.18)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Financial Support</td>
<td>-1.29† (.73)</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-1.13 (1.87)</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.44 (.84)†</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-1.49 (.99)</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.04 (.05)</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-3.53 (36.68)</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-1.67** (.85)</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-1.35 (.98)</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.64† (.35)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>10.22***</td>
<td>13.87***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>56.61</td>
<td>46.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>34.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance level</td>
<td>p&lt;.0099</td>
<td>p&lt;.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>72.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significant at p<0.01 level
** Significant at p<0.05 level
* Significant at p<0.06
† Significant at p<0.10 level
‡ Odds = e^b
to the overall fit of the models. Model 1 includes only demographic controls and is included for the reader’s interest.

In Model 2, the years of education at Time 2 variable is introduced, which has the effect of increasing the overall significance of the model considerably ($\chi^2 = 21.15$ d.f.=9 p<.012; $-2 \text{ Log Likelihood} = 60.22$; Goodness of Fit = 61.48). The negative effects of education on being employed and earnings are repeated here, reducing the odds of having an equivalent job by a factor of .68 ($b=-.38 \text{ SE}=.16 \text{ p}<.02$), other things being equal. As proposed above, this could be because professionals have more difficulty finding comparable work here in Canada, just as respondents with higher occupational prestige before migration have lower odds of being employed. As a measure of their subjective comparison of the two jobs, professionals are also more likely to be rating their Canadian jobs with ones that were at a very high standard, which could intensify their negative evaluation of their jobs.

Controlling for years of education does little to change the effect of being a family class immigrant, which continues to have a negative effect on the odds of being employed, reducing them to .25 those for independent class immigrants ($b=-1.38 \text{ SE}=.77 \text{ p}<.07$). Controlling for education, though, increases the effect of being female on the odds of obtaining an equivalent job to 4.30 times those for males ($b=1.46, \text{ SE}=.80 \text{ p}<.07$); this is likely because this female sample is highly educated, and removing the negative effect of education would increase their odds of finding an equivalent job. Controlling for years of education and other demographic factors increases the negative effect of being Pakistani on

---

23 A model with demographic controls and the dichotomous education at Time 1 variable was also estimated and found to be a much poorer fit than that reported in the text ($\chi^2 = 18.22$ d.f.=9 p<.0327; $-2 \text{ Log Likelihood} = 63.15$; Goodness of Fit = 56.91). Moreover, the intention of the logistic model is to allow for non-linear continuous independent variables with a categorical dependent variable. In this case it is therefore useful to use the continuous education variable, even though the categorical “held university degree at immigration” variable is a predictor of job equivalency ($b=-1.68 \text{ SE}=.83 \text{ p}<.04$ – table not shown).
the odds of working in an equivalent job, down to .18 times those for Indian respondents (b=-1.70 SE=.84 p<.04). As with females, this is likely due to the high level of education and proportion of professionals among this sub-sample. As expected, each additional year in Canada increases the odds of finding an equivalent job by about 1.5 times, probably because an individual is able to acquire some Canadian experience or other qualifications that break down some of the barriers to obtaining equivalent jobs discussed in Chapter Four (b=.42, SE=.30 p<.15).

Model 3 presents an additional control for cultural capital as defined by the number of countries to which the respondent has traveled. This variable did not predict either of the two types of economic integration discussed above, and so introduces a unique dimension to this analysis. With each additional country, the odds of finding an equivalent job in Canada among respondents with equivalent years of education are increased 1.90 times – they are therefore almost twice as likely to do so (b=.64, SE=.26 p<.02). This could be because respondents who have traveled more are also more likely to have acquired educational or occupational qualifications and skills abroad that are internationally recognized. Particularly in the case of occupational qualifications, if an individual has done international work, they have proven that they are able to find jobs outside of their country of origin, and so it is not surprising that these individuals are also better able to find equivalent work here in Canada (though it is interesting that this same variable did not predict to the odds of obtaining a job). It could also be that having traveled seasons the individual to the differences in labour markets and cultures around the world so that they are better able to translate their skills in the Canadian context. Moreover, international travel is also likely associated with superior

\[ \chi^2 = 29.07 \text{ d.f.}=10 \ p<0.012; \ -2 \text{ Log Likelihood} = 52.29; \ Goodness \ of \ Fit = 59.94. \]
English language skills – a variable which did not predict to finding equivalent employment, but perhaps because of the overwhelming importance of years of education.\(^{25}\)

The addition of the cultural capital variable to the model affects both the family and female coefficients: in the case of the first, the odds of having an equivalent job are increased among family relative to half the odds among independent class respondents, indicating that family class respondents actually arrive with less cultural capital ($b=-.68$ SE=.87 $p<.43$). In the case of the second coefficient, the odds of having an equivalent job are slightly reduced to just four times those for females than males, indicating that these women arrive with more such cultural capital ($b=1.40$ SE=.86 $p<.11$). Controlling for these two types of resources, all country of origin groups have lower odds of having an equivalent job relative to their Indian counterparts. In particular, Pakistani respondents have much lower odds of finding such work, down to .05 times those for Indian respondents ($b=-3.06$ SE=1.13 $p<.007$). As discussed in Chapter Four (see Table 4.21), Pakistani immigrants were concentrated in the professional sector prior to migration (60.0%), the highest concentration reported among the four country of origin groups. Thus, the preceding discussion about difficulties of professionals in finding work more than likely applies to many Pakistani respondents.

Finally, as predicted, the longer an individual lives in Canada, the more likely they are to report having an equivalent job: in fact, each additional year raises the odds by a factor of

\^{25} In fact, when the model is estimated with years of schooling and English ability at immigration only, the latter has a small positive effect on the odds of finding equivalent employment, increasing them by about 1.4 times ($b=.34$, SE=.22 $p<.12$). I say a ‘small’ effect, because when the partial correlation between having an equivalent job and English ability is examined, this human capital variable explains about 7% of the variation in the dependent variable. By contrast, in a model with years of schooling, number of countries traveled to and English ability, the partial correlation for English language ability is 0.0000 ($b=.27$ SE=.23 $p<.24$, while that for the cultural capital variable is .21 ($b=.60$ SE=.26 $p<.02$). Effectively, then, the cultural capital variable appears to explain the effect of English language ability. Perhaps in a larger sample, both variables would emerge as significant predictors, because though related, they do seem to tap different resource dimensions ($r=.22$ $p<.07$). The partial correlation statistic can range between -1 and +1; small values indicate a small partial contribution to the model (models not shown).
1.87 (b=.63 SE=.34 p<.06). The acquisition of Canadian skills and experience are probably involved in this process, though it is unclear from this analysis whether it is years of experience working in Canada, specific qualifications, the number of jobs held in Canada, or some other occupation-related characteristic that is a determining factor.

Model 4 displays the effects of controls for social networks at Time 2 – mean percent immediate kin and mean financial support – in the model with demographic and years of education; leaving out the control for cultural capital shows the additional explanatory value offered by the social network as opposed to the human capital resource variables. Because the direction and essential magnitude of the effects of these resources are similar to those in Model 5, and to avoid excessive repetition, the discussion of Model 4 focuses on this additional explanatory value. The introduction of the social network variables has very little effect on the years of education coefficient: thus, controlling for these two network structure characteristics, each year of education still reduces the odds of finding an equivalent job by a factor of .63 (b=-.45 SE=.17 p<.009). Holding the negative effects of education constant, each unit increase in the proportion of immediate kin increases the odds of having an equivalent job by close to two times (b=.62 SE=1.18 p<.60), while receiving a higher amount of financial support has the opposite effect. In fact, each unit increase in the amount of support received reduces the odds of having an equivalent job by a factor of .28 (b=-1.29 SE=.73 p<.08). Controlling for these resources means that the odds of having an equivalent job among family class respondents are somewhat ‘less negative’, rising to .32 times those for independent class immigrants (b=-1.13 SE=.87 p<.19). Thus, family class respondents are somewhat disadvantaged by the structure of their networks in finding equivalent jobs. Conversely, female respondents have networks that are largely comprised of friends, which
explains why the coefficient for being female is slightly less positive controlling for social network resources \( (b=1.44 \ SE=.84 \ p<.08) \).

It is difficult to compare the relative effects of the different resource types, unlike in a linear regression model where the comparison of the beta coefficients is very instructive. A rough estimate of the power of the different resources in predicting the odds of employment can be found by examining the change in the -2 log likelihood statistics for models 2 and 4 and 2 and 3. This shows that the addition of social network resources improves the fit by a smaller margin than the addition of the control for cultural resources \( (60.22 - 52.29 \ versus \ 60.22 - 56.61) \). Yet, the inclusion of both resource types improves the fit of the model over that with the simple human capital control, which supports the expansion of the immigrant integration conceptual framework as argued in this thesis.

The final model (5) presented in Table 6.5 includes controls for social network, cultural capital and human capital resources simultaneously.\(^{26}\) The negative effects of networks on other components of economic integration noted above (particularly in finding employment) are repeated here, but with a slight variation. The mean percent immediate kin variable has a positive (though very non-significant) effect on the odds of finding employment \( (b=.98 \ SE=1.69 \ p<.56) \), increasing the odds by a factor of 2.65, while receiving higher amounts of financial assistance from the network has the opposite effect, serving to

\(^{26}\) Other social network variables were added to the model to determine their effectiveness in predicting job equivalency. Social network resources at Time 1 were consistently poor predictors, though their relationship was in keeping with the negative effects observed among the majority of these variables. Instead of mean percent immediate kin, mean percent kin in general was also used in the model. While itself non-statistically significant, as is the mean percent immediate kin variable reported, the estimate of the mean percent kin coefficient was less stable (as evidenced by a very large confidence interval); it was therefore decided to use the immediate kinship variable, which also has a much higher Pearson correlation coefficient with job equivalency (see Table 6.4 above). Finally, the decision to use mean financial support as opposed to total support rests in part on the stronger Pearson correlation between the former and job, as well as on the superior fit of the model using the financial support variable (with total support, -2 Log Likelihood = 50.30; Goodness of Fit = 60.87; Chi-Square = 31.07 d.f.=12 p<.0019 – model not shown).
reduce the odds of having an equivalent job by .16 (b=-1.86 SE=.90 p<.04).\(^{27}\) Just as in the explanation for the factors affecting being employed, the use of helping networks is related to lower odds of having an equivalent job, which is again more characteristic of family class respondents. The fact that having a high proportion of immediate kin actually increases the odds of having an equivalent job is puzzling, but the direction of the effect is repeated when mean percent kin and mean percent extended kin variables are substituted. This suggests that these two network resource measures do in fact function independently, and that the mere presence of a network dominated by immediate kin does not automatically seal an individual’s fate. One explanation of the direction of this effect reinforces the notion that the job equivalency variable measures the respondents’ subjective perceptions, which again, are rooted in comparison. These respondents likely compare themselves, and their jobs, to others like them in their own current jobs. It could be that respondents with closed, kin-dominated networks do in fact get worse jobs, but that those around them are in the same situation; relatively speaking, then, they may rate their jobs, and their economic success, as superior.

The experiences of one respondent are illustrative of the interplay between demographic characteristics, human and cultural capital resources, and social networks described above. One Sri Lankan family class male in his fifties tells of thirty years as an engineer and disaster relief coordinator in Sri Lanka and being unable to find work in Canada, causing intense economic distress for his family. This respondent entered Canada in 1994, joining an extended family circle of more than one hundred people already in Canada.

\(^{27}\) In fact, though not shown here, a model without the mean percent immediate kin control is an equally good fit to the data and has very little effect on the coefficients of the other variables, suggesting that its inclusion is perhaps extraneous to the prediction of the odds of obtaining an equivalent job. Nevertheless, this control is maintained for theoretical reasons, and given that the link between the nature of the ties in the network, the types of support provided and class of immigration has been established in previous chapters.
His apartment was poorly furnished: cardboard boxes were being used for shelving, furniture was threadbare and sparse, though the apartment was spotless. He comments on the effects of doing work which is far below one’s qualifications:

"The picture painted [of job opportunities in Canada] is very different from that presented in Sri Lanka; I was told there would be opportunities, while there are none. Job satisfaction is very important for people: if they are forced to take jobs which lower self-esteem, it really puts them out", as he witnessed in his previous work with the economically deprived (R1).

This is a respondent who has been supported economically by his immediate family while he has continued to search for work, and specifically work related to his expertise, since entering the country. Though he reported having at least one job since arriving (one as a telemarketer, which he found extremely degrading), his actual participation in the labour market was sporadic. He is an example of someone whose networks are not causing a poor level of economic integration, but rather are supporting him in his disadvantaged state. More than likely, his ‘advanced age’ and lack of Canadian qualifications or other easily recognizable skills are the keys to his exclusion from employment. His remarks highlight the importance placed on finding equivalent work, or at least work that is not demeaning, to many respondents, particularly among those with previously well-paying or prestigious jobs, and subsequently higher expectations for their lives in Canada.

The effect of controlling for all of these resources simultaneously is to once again reduce the gap between the odds of equivalent employment between the two classes of admission: in this final model, family class respondents are only .64 times as likely to have such jobs (b=.45 SE=1.04 p<.66). The coefficient for females indicates that the odds of equivalent employment are further decreased over those for males when the negative impact of financial support and years of education are held constant. Pakistani respondents appear
to be most disadvantaged when these three types of resources are held constant: in this model, they have 96% lower odds of being employed in an equivalent job compared to Indian respondents.28

In this final model, each year in Canada increases the odds of equivalent employment 3.05 times (b=1.11, SE=.45 p<.01). The importance of time spent in Canada is encouraging on the one hand, though for those in the early stages of their integration probably not much of a comfort. Though these variables do not appear in the analysis, it is likely that there is a link between the passage of time and the acquisition of Canadian educational and professional qualifications: many of the respondents referred to evening classes in which they were currently enrolled, and intentions to re-train in the near future, in order to be eligible for promotions, or considered for occupations for which they had been previously trained. Indeed, the specific meaning behind the years in Canada variable remains unclear: does it reflect an increase in generalized knowledge that helps people in the labour market, or is there a specific pattern of job transitions representing a career-building process typical of new entrants to the labour market (non-immigrants included), who must build up their job contacts and work experience in order to advance into more highly-skilled, better paying jobs? This is something that could be explored with a larger sample in which specific job transitions were observed over a longer period of time, similar to the study by Renaud et al. (1993).

Some demographic control variables were not discussed in previous models for reasons of brevity or because their contribution to the model was marginal. The first, being

---

28 This serious disadvantage when controlling for these individual resources indicates that Pakistani immigrants must have high levels of human capital and not be overly encumbered by negative social resource networks in reality.
married, is associated with much lower odds of holding an equivalent job in every model but
in particular when these three types of resources are held constant (b=−2.22, SE=1.15 p<.05).
This indicates that they must have lower levels of education, have traveled to a larger number
of countries, and receive lower amounts of financial support than their non-married
counterparts. As well, the age coefficient varies little across the five models. In general,
there appears to be a minor negative relationship between age and obtaining equivalent
employment (given the stability of the odds of having such a job in each model as a result of
each additional year of age). The absence of change in the odds of finding equivalent work
between models 2 and 4 indicate that older respondents are not necessarily receiving higher
amounts of financial support, while the reduction in the odds with each year of age between
models 2 and 3 indicates that older respondents are also more likely to have traveled and
acquired cultural capital. Thus, in the final model, the 9% reduction in the odds of obtaining
equivalent employment with each year of age is likely a reflection of controlling for their
higher cultural capital, and as proposed above, the possibility that international travel is
associated with the acquisition of skills that are readily applied to, or recognized by, the
Canadian labour market (b=−.09 SE=.06 p<.12).

Discussion

One of the questions asked at the beginning of this chapter concerned whether the
predictors of this subjective dimension of economic integration would be the same as for the
other two objective measures. The answer appears to be that while the identical variables
have not been shown to predict job equivalency, there is certainly a similar pattern. The two
most striking differences between this analysis and the preceding two is the significance of
the cultural capital resource measure, and the direction of the effect of the mean percent immediate kin variable. The findings concerning the first variable are in keeping with theoretical expectations and seem to make sense within the overall economic integration process. What is more surprising is the reversal in the sign of the network composition variable that has a negative zero-order Pearson correlation coefficient, but in the model including controls for human capital controls, cultural capital, and financial support, it becomes a positive predictor of job equivalency. This seems to indicate that in this case, it is not the very fact of having a high proportion of immediate kin in the network that has a negative effect on finding equivalent employment, but rather that of receiving financial support: controlling for this network structure characteristic distinguishes between network composition – who an immigrant relies upon for assistance in this case – and the actual provision of such assistance. In the previous two analyses, these two network characteristics have been indistinguishable, both retaining their negative influence on being employed and on employment earnings. Why there is a difference in the investigation of the odds of finding an equivalent job is unclear.

This analysis also confirms many of the conclusions reached above about the importance of the different types of resources which facilitate economic success versus those which seem to impede such progress. The glaring negative impact of higher educational levels in obtaining equivalent employment is contrary to expectations based on previous research, and created by the immigration selection system, and supports a refrain that settlement workers, researchers and immigrants have been communicating to government and policy-makers for some time: that the points system selects for individuals whom the
"system" is then powerless (or unwilling) to assist in actually carrying out and using the skills for which they were selected.

What is interesting about the analysis of job equivalency is the addition of the predictive power of the variable measuring cultural capital. As argued above, there must be some advantage associated with having traveled more, and this is likely related to obtaining a better job either through the development of actual skills and qualifications that are internationally recognized by the Canadian labour market – a concrete product of such travel – or by changes in attitude or generalized knowledge that the immigrant is able to apply to their job search in Canada that increases their success. That independent class immigrants are more likely to have traveled could make a difference in overcoming the negative effects of human capital among the highly educated; that is, there could be an interaction effect between immigrants' human capital, the sector in which they are seeking work, the specific occupation for which they are qualified, and the fact of having traveled abroad and earned international experience (in either the concrete or generalized senses described above). Such a process might explain why a medical doctor from India or a pharmacist from Pakistan are both unable to practice their professions in Canada, while a computer systems analyst, an accountant or banking professional have all found lucrative positions in Canada.

In fact, questions remain as to what it is about having higher cultural capital that is in fact assisting successful respondents to find equivalent jobs. Does it have something to do with the occupational sector in which the respondent is competing, as suggested? Are respondents more likely to report job equivalency if their job in Canada is high prestige, thus reflecting general satisfaction with their employment situation, or, even when employed in lower prestige jobs such as those often occupied by females, do respondents accurately
compare their job experiences before and after migration? With a larger sample, analyses by occupational sector might offer some answers to these questions.

As proposed with the other two economic analyses, the consistently negative effect of supportive networks in achieving economic success along each of the three dependent variables likely reflects a variety of scenarios. The fact that receiving financial support is the most powerful support variable predicting to job equivalency suggests that the disadvantage associated with social networks might in fact be more closely related to the individual characteristics of respondents with such networks, than with the characteristics of the networks themselves. That is, rather than imputing a causal relationship between more supportive networks and poor economic integration outcomes, it could be that respondents who receive more support – here financial support, indicating more clearly the kind of disadvantage they are experiencing – do so because they actually need it. Given that level of education and level of cultural capital are held constant, there must be something else associated with these individuals that forces them to be recipients of financial assistance from network members. Whether this is an excessive reliance on information which does not translate into economic success (à la Granovetter 1973), or a dependency on conveniently available support that translates into less effort by the respondent in finding an equivalent job, or into the exploration of other avenues of economic integration (such as part-time education) and so uneven entry into the labour market, all are possible explanations for the consistently negative impact of social networks on economic integration.

Finally, the fact that females are so much more likely to obtain equivalent employment is not exactly cause for celebration. Canadian jobs equivalent to what? is the question that must next be asked. The accomplishment of achieving job equivalency is
mitigated by the fact that immigrant women are not moving from one boardroom in India to another in Toronto, as evidenced by the far lower earnings compared to men presented above. As discussed in Chapter Four, these immigrant women are likely competing in a different labour market from their male counterparts, one which is less competitive and in which they are concentrated in female-dominated jobs doing ‘female’ types of work – even if they are employed in occupation sectors that are typically associated with higher prestige jobs. In other words, in comparing their jobs in Canada to those held previously, women have a lower past standard to compare to.

In terms of the impact of the inability to reach this important goal on immigrants’ psyches and levels of determination, the strain and defeat of the spirit was evident and unsettling in many respondents. The impact of economic success on overall health and well-being is investigated in the next section.

OVERALL HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

Introduction

This study has argued that immigrant integration involves more than the economic dimension traditionally researched, though it by no means excludes this essential dimension. The questions being asked in this section are, in general, what are the determinants of overall health and well-being among immigrants? More specifically, of their resources, which are the most effective at improving immigrant levels of well-being? Which have negative effects? How important to overall well-being is an immigrant’s experience of economic integration, and is this different for women and men, and by immigrant class?
Figure 6.1, presented at the start of this chapter, posits subjective health and well-being as a dimension of integration occurring temporally and sequentially after economic components of integration: that is, this model argues that health and well-being is going to be affected by the economic well-being of the individual. The reverse may also be true, but is not investigated here. More specifically, an individual’s level of economic integration is expected to be positively related to their overall health and well-being: individuals who have had a better economic experience, by obtaining well-paying jobs in a timely manner, equivalent employment, or who live in a household where financial stability exists, will have higher levels of overall health and well-being. The effects of economic well-being are posited as intervening variables between immigrants’ resources and the dependent variable, such that in addition to having direct effects, their resources act through one or more economic integration outcomes to affect well-being.

In order to investigate these possibilities, this section presents the results of several ordinary least squares regression models, and is organized in a slightly different way from the preceding three because this dependent variable applies to the whole sample. In order to maintain some comparability with the analyses of labour force immigrants, though, this analysis will also be reported separately for respondents out of the labour force. This is described in more detail below.

---

29 In effect, this subjective dimension of integration is posited as merely one of various elements of integration (such as the maintenance of ethnic identity, feelings of belonging in Canada) which occur following the very practical tasks of acquiring the necessities of life (such as including finding employment, a place to live, schooling for dependents).
Determinants of Health and Well-Being: Testing Immigrant Resources

The purpose of the following ordinary least squares regression models is to determine first, what individual immigrant resources predict overall health and well-being, and second, to determine whether the economic dimensions of integration analyzed above have any effect on levels of well-being. In answering the first question, human capital resources are first added to a model containing only demographic controls, as done for the previous three dependent variables. Successive resource types are then added to the model containing the human capital controls, after which a full model regressing well-being on demographic controls and resource variables is presented. To then answer the second question, the intervening economic outcomes analyzed above are added to the model to determine whether the resources are affecting well-being directly, or through economic integration outcomes.

The sample size for this analysis is N=109.

As above, variables were selected for inclusion based on theory and on the table of Pearson correlation coefficients between independent resources the dependent variable (please see Table 6.4). As discussed in Chapter Four, the most interesting differences in levels of well-being were found between members of family and independent classes (in the whole sample there are none, and the question is why not, given the large differences in their levels of economic integration); between being Bangladeshi and Sri Lankan versus Pakistani and Indian respondents (migrants from the former two countries having higher levels of well-being again despite lower levels of economic success in Canada); and between independent and family class females (where the gap in levels of well-being regardless of labour force status suggests something about being an independent class female immigrant that is associated with lower levels of overall well-being). The application of ordinary least squares
regression analysis is intended to assist in determining the interplay between immigrant resources and levels of economic integration that might explain these variations.

**Results of Zero-order Correlations**

A glance at Table 6.4 suggests that there are different determinants of health and well-being than those identified for the three variables measuring economic integration among the whole sample. But for a negative correlation between having a university at immigration and well-being, human capital variables are all positively correlated with well-being, though these are extremely weak. One exception is the variable measuring English ability at immigration ($r=.18 \ p<.06$), which might suggest that those with better language skills are better able to conduct their daily activities and so feel less isolated in their host country. Correlations with financial and cultural capital are equally weak as those with human capital variables, with financial capital being negatively associated with well-being in Canada; this may point to unfulfilled expectations of more highly educated and experienced professionals who have difficulties with accreditation, and so with finding employment (though the correlation is so weak as to make such a speculation quite hypothetical).

The variable measuring internal locus of control is moderately and positively correlated with well-being ($r=.23 \ p<.02$) — that is, respondents with a higher sense of control also report higher levels of overall health and well-being. This is in keeping with previous findings which show that personal autonomy is indeed a predictor of job success, and of

---

30 The zero-order correlations for those in the labour force only deviate only slightly from those presented for the whole sample. All trends noted in the text apply to those in the labour force, and there are not notable changes in the strength of the correlations observed, though there are slight variations in the direction of some of the variables (for example, among respondents in the labour force, the correlation between previous job experience before migration and well-being is $r=-.027$, while in the whole sample it is $.01$; likewise, years of education at interview is correlated $r=-.02$ among those in the labour force and $r=.00$ among the whole sample. These differences are not considered worthy of a separate discussion).
well-being, and that these effects are reciprocal (Jalajas 1994). For several reasons this variable is not included in the multiple regressions below: because the causal relationship is likely reciprocal (as found by Kohn et al. 1983; Jalajas 1994), causal models should be used to adequately represent its role in the determination of well-being, which is not possible given the present focus of the analysis. In a larger sample, the presence of a non-recursive relationship (where having a high sense of locus of control affects one or all of the measures of integration, and success in all or some of these domains of integration affects an individual’s sense of control) could be tested using structural equations analysis.

Finally, social network resources at immigration are all weakly and negatively associated with well-being, as are the majority of network composition variables measuring kinship in networks, while network size emerges as significantly, and negatively, correlated with well-being (r=-2.0 p<.04).31 This is puzzling and does not fit the neater pattern of family class versus independent class network effects on integration discussed previously, given that independent class networks tend to be larger and composed of friends, which have the opposite effects on well-being. By contrast, density and all support measures are positive correlates of well-being, in particular emotional (r=.20 p<.04) and job information (r=.18 p<.06) support. The importance of social network structural characteristics appears to be greater in predicting this domain of integration, which is assessed in the multivariate regression analysis below.

31 Given the low occurrence of formal ties across all networks in this small sample, the fact that a high proportion is highly correlated with well-being is not emphasized (r=-.34 p<.00), though like the mean percent kin variable, it is a negative and significant predictor of well-being in regression models (though with a poorer fit to the data. It does indicate however that respondents with these ties in their networks may be feeling more isolated and be receiving less support from the rest of their networks which, though shown to be positively related to economic integration, may have the opposite effect on overall well-being.
For this dependent variable only, correlations between the economic dimensions of integration analyzed above are also presented. Among members of the whole sample, these are surprisingly weak, though positive, with employment income having the greatest relationship with overall well-being ($r=.12 \ p<.20$). These measures of economic integration may nevertheless emerge as significant predictors of overall well-being when the full integration models are computed.\footnote{Because of sample size limitations, the inclusion of more than one of these intervening economic variables in the full model must be done with caution, particularly the job equivalency variable which automatically drops the sample size to N=59 due to missing cases. This is discussed in more detail below. Deviations in zero-order correlations computed and presented for the whole sample in Table 6.6 are comparable to those computed for sub-samples based on labour force status and employment status.}

**Results of Ordinary Least Squares Regressions**

Table 6.6 presents a series of ordinary least squares regressions of health and well-being that begin by including only demographic background variables; this is Model 1, which is presented for the reader’s interest only and is not discussed.\footnote{Model 1: F=1.28, d.f.=8, p<.262.} Human capital variables are then introduced to the model, after which theoretically important or highly correlated variables representing the four other resource types are added to the model with human capital controls: first, individually, in order to determine their relative effect to human capital predictors, and then in a full model of resources as they predict to well-being. This is the same method followed for the other dependent variables.

Deviating from the presentation above, though, models including the intervening economic outcomes of integration are then presented, building on the best model regressing well-being on immigrant resources. This allows the assessment of whether these resources affect health and well-being differently depending on their level of economic integration.
Table 6.6:
OLS Regression Predicting Well-Being, All Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Overall Health and Well-Being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessed English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-1.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>10.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significant at p<0.01 level
** Significant at p<0.05 level
* Significant at p<0.06
† Significant at p<0.10 level
Table 6.6:
OLS Regression Predicting Well-Being,
All Respondents (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Overall Health and Well-Being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessed English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>.19†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion of Kin</td>
<td>-1.92***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Emotional Support</td>
<td>.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>-1.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.88†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.69†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-1.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significant at p<0.01 level
**  Significant at p<0.05 level
*   Significant at p<0.06
† Significant at p<0.10 level
answering the question about the relative importance of different resources, the analysis is conducted on the whole sample. When controls are added for economic integration, in each case the largest possible sample size is used based on the applicability of the economic control: the whole same is therefore used when I control for being in the labour force, the labour force sample is used when controlling for being employed, and the employed sample is used when controlling for the effects of employment income and job equivalency. These sample sizes reflect those used in conducting the economic analyses of integration above.

Model 2 introduces a control for English ability at immigration – human capital resources. Despite this poor fit, the English ability at immigration coefficient is a strong, positive predictor of well-being: with each unit increase in self-assessed language ability, well-being increases by beta=.19 (b=.19 t=1.79 p<.076). From Model 2, it is evident that human capital resources are not strong predictors of overall health and well-being, unlike their central role in predicting economic outcomes of integration. This reinforces the argument that integration cannot be reduced to one domain only, and each domain must be conceptualized differently in order to understand the various challenges facing newcomers when they first arrive.

Despite a low, positive zero-order correlation with well-being, Model 3 tests to see if cultural resources, measured by the number of countries to which a respondent has traveled,

34 Despite the low zero-order correlation between both education variables and well-being, I decided to examine a model containing the best of the two education predictors to verify that there was indeed no correlation (models not shown). The dichotomous education variable is a slightly better predictor than the continuous years of education measure, but even the former appears to have very little to do with an immigrant's sense of well-being (F=1.37 d.f.=10 p<.206). I verified the impact of having a university degree controlling for language ability as well, and it remains essentially unrelated to levels of well-being. None of the models controlling for university education are shown: language ability is the only measure of human capital that appears related to this dependent variable.

35 F=1.52, d.f.=9 p<.151.
make a difference in their well-being. Theoretically, those who have traveled more are expected to have an easier time adjusting to cultural and other differences in Canada, simply because these individuals have had to adjust to differences in other countries previously. Indeed, this variable does have a significant and positive effect on well-being holding other variables constant, each additional country increasing the level of well-being by \( \beta = .24 \) \( (t=2.08 \ p<.04) \); the overall model is verging on significance \( (F=1.84 \ d.f.=10 \ p<.063) \).\(^{36}\) Controlling for cultural capital, the power of the English language coefficient decreases \( (\beta = .16 \ t=1.46 \ p<.147) \), suggesting that those who have traveled more also have superior language skills. This is also likely related to level of education, given the even weaker relationship between having a university degree and well-being.

The introduction of the cultural resource control increases the power of the family class coefficient to explain levels of well-being, likely because these respondents are much less likely to have traveled relative to their independent class counterparts \( (\beta = .28 \ t=2.41 \ p<.02) \): being family class increases a respondent’s level of well-being by \( b = 1.19 \). A smaller effect is noted in the female coefficient which becomes more negative, indicating that controlling for the beneficial effects of travel on well-being decrease females’ levels of well-being by \( b = - .45 \) \( (\beta = -.11 \ t=-1.09 \ p<.276) \). Pakistani respondents also benefit from having traveled more than their Indian counterparts, given the similar reduction in their levels of well-being controlling for cultural resources \( (\beta = -.15 \ t=-1.34 \ p<.18) \). The number of years a respondent is in Canada is largely unrelated to their well-being across \( all \) of the models: this is puzzling, given assumptions about the positive effects of accumulation of experience in Canada in helping an immigrant feel integrated. However, research by Goldlust and

\(^{36}\) \( R^2 = .16, \text{ Adjusted } R^2 = .07. \)
Richmond (1974) found that levels of well-being were essentially unchanged among respondents in Canada five years or less, which would indicate that the time elapsed for the SANS respondents is as yet insufficient to affect their well-being. Finally, being married has a consistently negative effect on well-being that appears essentially unrelated to the resources included in the various models, the beta coefficient hovering around $b=-.20$. This suggests that there might be something about the stresses imposed on the spousal relationship by the immigration process that negatively affects levels of well-being.\(^{37}\) Thus, cultural resources are better predictors of well-being than human capital resources, which again suggests that a reliance upon human capital variables as predictors of immigrant integration that is not economically defined is inadequate.\(^{38}\)

The purpose of Model 4 is to show the additional explanatory value accrued through the addition of social network resource variables compared to that provided by the human capital variables in Model 2.\(^{39}\) Indeed, the addition of social network resource controls produces a substantial improvement in the explanatory power of Model 4 ($F=2.56$, d.f.=12 $p<.005$), again as measured by the significance of the $R^2$ squared change ($R^2$ change=.121, $F$ Change=5.13 d.f.1=3 d.f.2=96, $p<.002$). Comparing the size of the beta coefficients for social resources compared to that for travel experience in Model 3, the former are almost all

---

\(^{37}\) In fact, it is likely that there is an interaction between being female and married which reduces a respondent's level of well-being more than if one is male and married, despite its non-significance in the regression model, given this well-documented relationship in other areas of social research.

\(^{38}\) By comparing the significance of the $R^2$ change, it is apparent that the addition of the cultural resource measure improves the model in a statistically significant way: $R^2$ change=.037, $F$ Change=4.31 d.f.1=1 d.f.2=98, $p<.04$.

\(^{39}\) Social network resources at immigration continue to be poor predictors of well-being in the regression model, suggesting that it is the activation of social network resources once in Canada that affects well-being, not the simple presence of individuals known to the respondent. This essentially mirrors the emphasis on helping networks as opposed to the generalized egocentric network throughout this study.
superior predictors of levels of well-being relative to both human capital and cultural resources.

Holding language ability constant, a kin-dominated network reduces the level of well-being (each unit increase reducing it by beta=-.30, t=-2.78 p<.01), each unit increase in emotional support increases levels of well-being by beta=.28 (t=2.76 p<.01), while each additional network member reduces well-being by beta=-.20 (t=-2.12 p<.04). That holding constant mean percent kin and emotional support, network size has a strong, negative effect on well-being is again related to the compositional differences in independent and family class networks. Networks of the independent class are composed of a higher proportion of formal ties (people like bank managers and lawyers), from whom they are not likely to receive emotional support, and of a higher proportion of friends, who are likely to provide different types of support in the absence of kin. The negative relationship between network size and overall health and well-being is not necessarily an indication of integration difficulties, nor does having a larger network cause someone to have a lower subjective sense of integration. Rather, this correlation may be an artifact of the emotional well-being of independent versus family class immigrants that exists due to other factors associated with being in one immigrant class over another, beyond social network resources – factors possibly related to their level of economic success in Canada, or to the extent to which expectations of economic success have been met.

The effects of social network resources are therefore not uniform: it is in fact the provision of emotional support that makes the difference in an immigrant’s sense of well-being in Canada, not the mere presence of kin, or access to a large network. This finding is corroborated by previous research on well-being, and makes intuitive sense. The negative
impact of a kin-dominated network controlling for emotional support may be less an
indication of kin causing lower levels of well-being than of the correlation between
respondents with kin-dominated networks and poor economic outcomes discussed above —
that is, family class respondents. It could be then that the provision of emotional support is
able to off-set the negative impact of poor levels of economic integration.

Moreover, the distinction between network composition and support was reflected in
the discussions with respondents. While it is expected that immigrants will experience some
type of homesickness or sadness, reflected in lower levels of well-being, it is also likely that
those who receive emotional support will be far less likely to report such feelings; indeed,
one respondent remarked that her sense of sadness was very acute while she waited in
Australia for two years to join her family in Canada, and was essentially non-existent in
Canada once she was reunited with them. Another older respondent experienced the opposite
in Canada: she talked about how her son’s Canadian-born wife had effectively cut her and
her husband off from their son’s life here in Canada. This was particularly
painful to this respondent given the expectation of many parents of older male children that they will live
with their son and his family. This respondent wept a few times during the interview in
describing her distress, which was further complicated by her poor health here in Canada as a
result of the large temperature swings. Though an active volunteer in her community, this
respondent’s well-being was largely determined by her relationship with her son and his family.

It therefore makes sense that receiving more emotional support is distinct from having
a kin-dominated network, despite the assumption that being around kin automatically leads to
the former. In fact, the mean percent kin variable does not differentiate between someone
who is surrounded by immediate family, and someone who has left her South Asian country to come to Canada as part of an arranged married, leaving all of her own family behind (there are several respondents in both situations). The types of support available to each of these respondents is quite different, as indicated by the interviews.

The effect of the language coefficient compares to that in Model 2 even when controlling for the effects of social network resources: that is, each unit increase in English ability improves an immigrant's level of well-being by beta=.19 (t=1.84 p<.07). When human capital and the negative effects of kin-dominated networks are held constant, family class respondents have even higher levels of well-being relative to their independent class counterparts (beta=.21 t=1.84 p<.07), while holding constant other resources, in particular the positive effects of emotional support, females have even lower levels of well-being relative to males (beta=-.16 t=-1.65 p<.10). Controlling for human capital and network composition, size and level of emotional support have little effect on the coefficients for other demographic groups, though the coefficient for being born in Sri Lanka as opposed to India becomes positive (beta=.04 t=.35 p<.347); this is likely because Sri Lankans report less emotional support and slightly larger social networks than Indian respondents, network characteristics which serve to lower their levels of well-being.

Model 5 combines the effects of all three types of resources as they predict levels of well-being in the whole sample. In the presence of controls for cultural capital and social network resources, the variable measuring human capital loses its importance in predicting well-being, such that each unit increase in the self-assessed English ability scale increases
levels of well-being by $b=0.15$ ($\text{beta}=0.15$, $t=1.48$ $p<0.14$). Controlling for social network and human capital resources, the coefficient for travel experience essentially maintains its importance, each additional country improving a respondent’s level of well-being by $b=0.25$ ($\text{beta}=0.22$, $t=1.98$ $p<0.05$).

By far the strongest predictors of well-being, however, are the social network variables. The coefficients for mean emotional support and mean network size are essentially unchanged, the former serving to increase well-being ($\text{beta}=0.29$, $t=2.93$, $p<0.00$), the latter to decrease it ($\text{beta}=-0.20$, $t=-2.18$, $p<0.03$), while in the presence of a control for travel experience, the importance of the mean percent kin variable decreases in predictive importance ($\text{beta}=-0.25$, $t=-2.27$, $p<0.03$). Combined with the change in the coefficient for being a family as opposed to independent class immigrant, with members of the family class having higher levels of well-being controlling for cultural capital in addition to human capital and social network resources ($\text{beta}=0.28$, $t=2.38$, $p<0.02$), this suggests that cultural capital helps to mitigate the negative impact of a kin-dominated network on levels of well-being. As proposed above, this could be because those who have traveled previously are more experienced at adapting to foreign ways of life, and may also have acquired more transferable skills through their international work experience.

In terms of the effects of these resource controls on the coefficients of other demographic background variables, the majority remain unchanged from the previous model. Of note, being married has a less negative effect when the control for cultural resources is added to Model 4 ($b=-0.97$, $\text{beta}=-0.19$, $t=-1.89$, $p<0.06$), indicating that married respondents are

---

40 $F=2.74$, d.f.=13 $p<0.002$; $R^2=.27$, Adjusted $R^2=.17$. Again, adding the social network measures to human and cultural capital measures increases the fit of the model significantly: $R^2$ change$=.114$, $F$ Change$=4.97$, d.f.1=3 d.f.2=95 $p<.003$. 
less likely to have traveled, a factor which is lowering their overall levels of well-being. By contrast, being Pakistani—relative to Indian-born has a greater negative effect on levels of well-being controlling for cultural resources as well as human capital and social network resources; this as also observed in Model 3 when the control for cultural capital was included, again because Pakistani respondents have had more international experience than other respondents. Being born in Pakistan lowers a respondent’s level of well-being by \( b = -0.76 \) (\( \beta = -0.15 \) \( t = -1.42 \) \( p < 0.16 \)) relative to levels of well-being among Indian respondents.

Given the finding in Chapter Four that independent class females have lower levels of well-being, regardless of their labour force status, a control for the effect of being female on well-being by class of immigration is added to Model 5 (table not shown). The results of this model indicate that, even controlling for human capital, cultural capital and social network resources, being a female family class immigrant increases a respondent’s well-being by \( b = 0.45 \) relative to her independent class counterparts (\( \beta = 0.21 \) \( t = 2.23 \) \( p < 0.03 \)). The effects of other resource coefficients are consistent with those shown in Model 5, with only slight variations.\(^{41}\) Controlling for the positive effects of superior language ability and cultural capital, independent class females’ levels of well-being are further reduced relative to female family class respondents’. Moreover, once the positive effects of their slightly smaller networks, and the negative effects of their kin-dominated networks, are held constant, female family class immigrants’ superior levels of well-being relative to their independent class counterparts, are increased; the strong, positive effects of emotional support do not explain much of the variation in their levels of well-being, given the comparable levels reported in

\(^{41}\) F=3.00 d.f.=14 p<.001; R\(^2\)=.31, Adjusted R\(^2\)=.21. One should not interpret the standardized coefficients in a model with interactions, because the estimate for the interaction term is incorrect. To correct for this, standardized independent variables were inputted into the model, and are reported in the text.
Chapter Five. Despite the explanatory value of these individual resources, the difference in levels of well-being between among females according to their class of immigration persists—that is, there is still a relationship, indicating some exogenous factors as yet undetermined that explain this difference.\(^{42}\)

In trying to understand these class differences in females' overall well-being, the comments of women in and out of the labour force become instructive. A sense of belonging to one's ethnic group may not simply involve the common expression of language (as expressed by many respondents); for some, there may be an economic (as opposed to immigration class) class difference at work in conjunction with higher expectations for success in Canada, which result in lower levels of well-being among independent females regardless of their labour force status. One Pakistani woman, aged 44, married with two children, reported an overall health and well-being level of six out of twelve (R35). An independent immigrant in Canada three years, she reported that she was very wealthy in Pakistan, but came to Canada for the education of her children. Her intention was to find employment, having been a teacher before her migration; having failed to do so, she decided to take some time away from the arduous process of looking for work, and so was not in the labour force at the time of the interview. Her husband does a lot of traveling back to Pakistan to sell their property because he has been unable to find work in Canada, and she reported no other family in Canada. She seemed extremely lonely as a result, and that she is "isolated in Canada because her ethnic community is 'low brow'".

\(^{42}\) The addition of the interaction effect between being female and family class has the effect of introducing instability into the model due to the collinearity between the component variables and the interaction itself. While unavoidable, given the constraints imposed by this small sample already, further models testing for the importance of levels of economic integration as predictors of health and well-being are estimated without the interaction effect.
A similar expression of isolation within the ethnic group because of internal
differences is made by an independent class female immigrant who arrived from India (R90).
Aged 32, she lives with her husband and one child, and while in the labour force, has yet to
have found a job in Canada, despite possessing a Bachelors of Science and a Bachelors of
Education; she had been in Canada just one year at the time of the interview. Her reported
level of health and wellbeing was also six, and their household income $22,500. Their
reason for migration was also to obtain a good education for their children, to save some
money and then return to India. In reference to her sense of belonging to her ethnic group in
Canada, she states that the “people who are here in Canada, 85% of them are labour and
lower class and so I’m not interested in associating. I would rather have a higher standard of
'class' of people in greater numbers to choose from”.

Finally, the stress associated with the transition from wealth in their home countries
to essentially working class people in Canada plays out in very practical ways. Two other
independent females in the labour force commented on the differences between life in
Canada and, in both their cases, Pakistan. The first, a 38-year-old PhD in Anthropology from
the United States with one child, working as a researcher for Queens University, summed up
the stress in her Canadian life this way (R89):

“Work here is overwhelming. In Pakistan we did not cook, clean or drive ourselves.
Here we work and do all the domestic duties. Getting used to smaller closed-in space
in apartment living. Although I had lived for a few years in a North American city
(New York), the adjustment has been difficult. The loss of family support is what I
miss the most”.

(This respondent reported having no other family in Canada). Thus, despite a household
income of $90,000, she has found the transition so difficult that she has decided not to have a
second child as previously planned.
Similarly, another female independent respondent, whose father entered Canada as an entrepreneur, reported that "not having servants is a big deal. What you gain in security, you lose in luxuries" (R105). Aged twenty-five and living at home, this woman’s $40,000/year income from her banking job supports her parents and sister while her father sets up his business in Canada. Despite reporting an equivalent job and personal economic success, the stress of worrying for her parents’ well-being has resulted in her being unable to pursue activities within her own ethnic group, and in an erosion of her own sense of well-being (six on the overall scale). This respondent also reported no other family in Canada.

From the comments of these four independent class women, three main issues emerge which may explain the lower levels of health and well-being among independent class women on the whole. First, none of these respondents reported other family in Canada, which may be associated with feelings of isolation, homesickness, and the strain of leaving one’s country. Second, two report feeling isolated within their ethnic communities due to educational and other economic class-related factors that affect their desire to make friends with these other people. Third, two respondents indicate a real difference in the practicalities of Canadian life that impose new stresses in addition to those associated with finding employment and adjusting to a new climate and culture. Coming from a lifestyle of luxury, where for many of these people the presence of servants to do domestic work was the norm, these women are perhaps faced with the double burden of paid work and domestic work for the first time.

Thus, Model 5 is a clear indication of the distinctiveness of the different domains of integration in terms of the utility of respondents’ resources to explain variations in their levels of well-being. Human capital resources as defined here have little to do with
explaining levels of well-being relative to the importance of cultural resources, and most significantly, social network resources. This model leaves open the question, however, as to how success in economic integration affects levels of well-being, and in fact, what dimensions of economic integration appear to be the most important to an immigrant's sense of overall health in Canada. To test these questions, four additional models were computed and are presented in Table 6.7: the first (Model 1) examines the impact of being in the labour force on well-being levels in the whole sample; Model 2 narrows the examination to respondents in the labour force, to determine the effect of being employed on well-being; while Models 3 and 4 specify the sample even further to determine the effects of employment income and job equivalency on the levels of well-being among respondents employed at interview.43

Determinants of Health and Well-Being: Testing the Effects of Immigrant Resources and Levels of Economic Integration

Model 1 in Table 6.7 shows the effects of immigrant resources on levels of well-being, controlling for the respondent's labour force status.44 The Pearson correlation coefficient in Table 6.4 indicates a very weak, positive relationship between being in the

43 As discussed previously, the findings reported from Models 1 to 4 become increasingly unreliable as the sample size is reduced and the number of variables maintained at essentially the same level. Variables are retained in the models so as to try and answer the questions about the impact of each dimension of economic integration on well-being, but in reality the number of cases is far too small to. What is presented, therefore, are merely indications of the impacts of these variables, though Pearson correlations and models run with fewer background control variables do indicate that the direction and size of the coefficients even in these later models are likely representative of real processes affecting these immigrants.

44 F=3.01 d.f.=12 p<.001; R^2=.27, Adjusted R^2=.18. Though inspection of Tolerance and VIF statistics indicates collinearity between independent variables is at acceptable levels, this model is re-estimated after removing age and number of years in Canada from the equation because of their extremely low beta coefficients (F=3.01 d.f.=12 p<.001; R^2=.27, Adjusted R^2=.18). This is done in order to determine whether the relationships observed, and specifically the effect of labour force status, are the product of instability in the model and small sample size. In fact, essentially the same effects are observed, suggesting that though violations of assumptions of the ordinary least squares regression model occur, confidence in the results is maintained.
Table 6.7:
OLS Regression Predicting Well-Being, Controlling for Individual Resources and Levels of Economic Integration Among All Respondents\(^1\) and Respondents in the Labour Force\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Overall Health and Well-Being</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Health and Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-ratio</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessed English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.22(^\dagger)</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>.26(^**)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.28(^\dagger)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion of Kin</td>
<td>-1.53(^**)</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Emotional Support</td>
<td>.82(^***)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.77(^**)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>-.16(^**)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervening Economic Integration Variables</td>
<td>In the Labour Force</td>
<td>- .48</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>- .83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.14(^\dagger)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.17(^**)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.26(^*)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.17(^**)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.96(^*)</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-.89(^\dagger)</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>-1.07(^\dagger)</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.17(^**)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>-.96(^*)</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.50(^***)</td>
<td>4.40(^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(^2)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R(^2)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\) Significant at p<0.01 level
\(^**\) Significant at p<0.05 level
\(^\dagger\) Significant at p<0.06
\(^\dagger\) Significant at p<0.10 level

\(^1\) The analysis in Model 1 is conducted on all respondents.

\(^2\) The analysis in Model 2 is conducted on those in the labour force only.
Table 6.7:
OLS Regression Predicting Well-Being, Controlling for Individual Resources and Levels of Economic Integration Among All Respondents and Respondents in the Labour Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Overall Health and Well-Being</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-ratio</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessed English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion of Kin</td>
<td>-1.71**</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>-2.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Emotional Support</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Size</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervening Economic Integration Variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Income</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Equivalency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Distress</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant Class</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1.31**</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-1.43**</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Intercept                                           | 5.93**    | 8.04***   | 7.95***   |
| R²                                                  | .33       | .42       | .39       |
| Adjusted R²                                         | .17       | .26       | .30       |

*** Significant at p<0.01 level
** Significant at p<0.05 level
* Significant at p<0.06
† Significant at p<0.10 level

1 The analysis in Model 1 is conducted on all respondents.
2 The analysis in Model 2 is conducted on those in the labour force only.
labour force and levels of well-being ($r=.04$ $p<.72$). By contrast, holding other resources constant, being in the labour force has a weak and negative impact on levels of well-being, serving to reduce them by $b=-.48$ ($\beta=-.10$ $t=-.83$ $p<.41$). This negative effect is likely related to the lower levels of well-being among respondents in the labour force, but as yet unemployed, the overall weak relationship indicating that this very basic decision to enter the labour market does not greatly affect levels of well-being in the presence of controls for individual resources. There are very few changes in the effects of the individual resource coefficients on levels of well-being: not surprisingly, holding labour force status constant, human capital becomes a slightly more important predictor of well-being (compared to Model 5 in Table 6.6), with superior language ability increasing well-being by $b=.17$ ($\beta=.17$ $t=1.63$ $p<.11$).

By contrast, holding labour force participation constant causes the female coefficient to have an even stronger negative effect (than in Model 5, Table 6.6), such that being female reduces overall well-being levels by $b=-.96$ ($\beta=-.22$ $t=-1.94$ $p<.06$) relative to being male.

From Chapter Four, the equivalence of levels of well-being between females in (mean=9.40) and out (mean=9.39) of the labour force is likely a factor in producing this weak labour force coefficient, though it is interesting that this weak relationship persists controlling for individual resources.45

The impact of being employed on levels of well-being, holding resources constant, is estimated in Model 2; this model is estimated with those in the labour force only, and excludes a control for network size because of the lack of relationship of this variable in

---

45 When a control for being in the labour force is added to the model including the interaction effect for being female and family class, there is no real change in the size of the interaction beta coefficient ($\beta=.38$ $t=2.22$ $p<.03$ – table not shown). This further confirms the apparent absence of a statistical relationship between immigrant class and levels of well-being by labour force status among females.
predicting levels of well-being within this sub-sample. From Table 6.4, being employed is weakly correlated with levels of well-being among the whole sample ($r=.09 p<.33$); among respondents in the labour force, it is only slightly higher ($r=.12 p<.31$, not shown in a table). Holding other variables constant in the multiple regression, however, being employed has a stronger effect on overall levels of well-being, increasing these by $b=1.14$ ($\beta=.21 \ t=1.75 \ p<.08$). Certainly the importance of employment to well-being was reflected often in the interviews, and makes intuitive sense. Compared to the strength of individual resources as predictors of well-being, this dimension of economic integration is comparable, but still less important than social network resources, whose strength as predictors.

In the presence of the control for employment status, the negative effect of a kin-dominated network also takes on new meaning: such networks have negative effects on well-being, not necessarily because they restrict someone’s access to the labour market, which in turn negatively affects well-being, but because there are relational stresses associated with kinship ties. Examples of strained relationships occurred as a result of arranged marriages between South Asians born in Canada and those born in South Asian, of which there were several in this sample. Respondents affected by such marriages — either as a spouse or parent to a child in such a marriage — reported role conflicts and a confusion of Canadian and South Asian values. Others spoke of the effects of their own presence in causing financial strain on their families, indicating that stress is produced not only in those providing financial assistance, but also in those being supported. Finally, though more uncommon, another PhD-educated Indian family class male reported being exploited by the extended family members

---

46 When included in the multiple regression equation, the network size variable was consistently non-significant with lower beta coefficients; while in a larger sample this variable might continue to be a significant predictor of well-being, the need for economy of predictors in the equation required its omission.
by whom he was sponsored: after three months without work, they began to ration his food, forced him to pay excessive rent for his room, and to subsequently work illegally as a labourer in order to meet these payments. This respondent suffered a nervous breakdown as a result, and after being hospitalized in Canada and a brief recovery in India, returned to Canada to pursue a career here. The kinship relationship is therefore not ideal or uncomplicated: while equipped to provide multidimensional types of support, these role-bound relationships can also be fraught with extraordinary obligations that can have adverse effects on the well-being of respondents.

The effect of holding employment status constant is most evident in changes in the human and cultural capital resource coefficients; for the most part, the effects of social network resources remain independent from this economic control. In Model 2, the coefficient for English ability increases levels of well-being by \( b = 0.22 \) (\( \text{beta} = 0.20 \ t = 1.73 \ p < 0.09 \)), suggesting that respondents with superior levels of language ability are having difficulty becoming employed, which is negatively affecting their levels of well-being. The increased importance of cultural capital, controlling for being employed, also likely indicates that the levels of well-being of respondents who have traveled more are being suppressed by difficulties finding employment – again, most likely among professionals. The increased importance of the human capital variable in particular is also not surprising given that this model is estimated on respondents in the labour force, where such a resource is likely to have even greater importance.

The effect of controlling for employment is to further increase the importance of being family class in increasing levels of well-being, by \( b = 1.26 \) (\( \text{beta} = 0.30 \ t = 2.00 \ p < 0.05 \)) relative to their independent counterparts; this, because family class respondents are more
likely to be unemployed than independent class respondents. Lastly, controlling for employment status alters the coefficient for being female slightly: compared to males, being female reduces levels of well-being by $b=-.88$ ($\beta=-.19$, $t=-1.63$, $p<.11$). The change in the female coefficient from Model 5 in Table 6.6 to Model 2 in Table 6.7 reflects the relatively high employment rate of the females in this sample, holding other variables constant.\footnote{As with Model 1, Model 2 was also re-estimated excluding the age and number of years in Canada variables which retain their lack of relationship to levels of well-being throughout the analysis. Not surprisingly, the model with fewer variables is a better fit ($F=2.33$, d.f.=$11$, $p<.016$; $R^2=.26$, Adjusted $R^2=.15$), but estimated coefficients for resources and for being employed are essentially consistent between the two models. Comparing these statistical results to the information gleaned from the interviews, I am therefore confident that the regression analysis results reflect the experiences of these respondents.}

A control for employment income is included in the equation predicting levels of health and well-being in Model 3 (Table 6.7). Table 6.4 shows a relatively weak Pearson correlation between earnings and well-being in the whole sample ($r=.12$, $p<.20$); among employed respondents, this correlation is lower ($r=.06$, $p<.65$; not shown in a table). These multiple regression results should be treated with caution because of the small sample size: they are used to provide an indication of the relationship between income and well-being, though the relative size of the coefficients may be distorted because of model instability; the effects of individual variables are therefore not discussed in detail.\footnote{The difference between the $R^2=.33$ and the Adjusted $R^2=.17$ is one indication of the presence of too many variables for the sample size, but there does not appear to be extreme instability in the individual coefficients, whose Tolerance and $\sqrt{VIF}$ statistics are all within acceptable ranges. The model is re-estimated with only the four resource variables, the control for earnings, and controls for being family class, female and married, and while the size of the beta coefficients do change, that for employment income remains a very poor predictor of health and well-being ($\beta=.06$, $t=.48$, $p<.64$; $F=2.18$, d.f.=$8$, $p<.04$; $R^2=.23$ and the Adjusted $R^2=.12$).}

Overall, this model confirms the zero-order correlations that earnings are \textit{not} important predictors of overall well-being among respondents who are employed, though a weak and positive relationship does exist ($\beta=.09$, $t=.69$, $p<.49$). Social network and cultural capital resources continue to be better predictors of well-being than human capital resources,
in particular the former. In general, the effects of other variables on levels of well-being are consistent with previous models. Most notably, controlling for earnings and individual resources, being family class has an even larger effect of increasing levels of well-being (beta=.33 t=2.06 p<.04), which reflects the superior earnings of members of the independent class. As well, the increased negative effect of being born in Pakistan on well-being reflects Pakistanis’ earnings success relative to those born in India, holding other factors constant.

The fourth model presented in Table 6.7 includes a control for job equivalency in predicting levels of well-being among respondents employed at interview; as with the previous model controlling for earnings, Model 4 is discussed only briefly and should be treated with caution. The correlation between job equivalency and health and well-being in the whole sample (N=70) is r=.12 (see Table 6.4); among respondent employed at interview, it is only r=.10 (p<.45). This absence of a relationship is confirmed by the multiple regression results, where job equivalency actually has a negative effect on levels of well-being (beta=-.01 t=-.04 p>.97) when other resources and demographic characteristics are held constant. It is unclear whether this negative relationship is the effect of poor model fit, or the result of holding other variables constant; what is curious, however, is the absence of a relationship given the importance of job equivalency in the discussions with respondents. It is entirely possible that a statistical relationship would emerge in an analysis with a larger sample, though even when variables are removed and the equation re-estimated including the four resource variables and controls for being family class, female and married, job equivalency still does not predict levels of well-being in this sample of employed respondents (Table not shown: beta=.08 t=.56 p<.58).49 Instead, individual resources persist

49 F=2.39 d.f.=8 p<.03; R^2=.28 and the Adjusted R^2=.16.
as the best predictors of levels of well-being in much the same relationship as in Model 5 in Table 6.6, with cultural capital and social network resources having the strongest effects.

Explaining this lack of relationship is difficult given discussions with respondents that reflected the exact opposite. Indeed, the amount of stress caused by the inability to find equivalent work was overwhelming in some cases. It is possible that it is not the attainment of job equivalency per se that affects levels of well-being, but rather some other unmeasured and generalized economically-induced stress variable. It is also entirely possible that the absence of a relationship is a direct outcome of the sample size problems associated with this analysis; however, the consistency of the weak relationship across Pearson correlations and regression equations of differing complexity, suggests that this particular measure in fact is not an important determinant of well-being, even when other resources are held constant.

In order to understand the absence of a statistical relationship when qualitative information from the interviews suggested one, I briefly investigated the effects of having experienced economic distress in Canada on levels of well-being. This variable is in fact a significant and strong predictor of well-being, rivalrying the predictive power of social network resources: holding other factors constant, experiencing economic distress reduces levels of well-being by $b=-1.54$ (beta=$-0.36$, $t=-4.23$ $p<0.000$ – see Table 6.7, Model 5).

---

50 The actual wording of the question is as follows: “Since coming to Toronto, has your household experienced economic distress as a result of periods of unemployment of one or more household members?” If necessary, interviewers probed with further questions such as “For example, have you had to borrow money? Stop buying certain items? Apply for social assistance?” If so, respondents were asked to describe how these financial problems have affected their lives, and how they dealt with these problems. This variable is dummy coded 1=Yes 0=No; close to half of the sample (47.7%) reported such distress.

51 Relative to Model 5 in Table 6.6, the resource coefficients show similar (though not identical) predictive powers in the presence of this control for economic distress. These are presented in Table 6.7 for the reader’s interest, but are not discussed in detail here because the economic distress variable is not a central part of the integration model discussed to this point. These results suggest that future work should take this type of measure of economic integration experience into account.
The large effect of the economic distress variable, compared to a general absence of other economic effects, is perhaps because it is the experience of economic distress that has a long-lasting effect on an immigrant’s outlook on Canadian life. Even a state of ‘current’ employment does not erase an earlier experience of economic deprivation as measured by the economic distress variable (model not shown). In fact, this experience of distress persists in the minds of respondents and seems to shape their perceptions of well-being in Canada, as it is likely related to issues of self-esteem and self-respect, honour (both within Canada, and perceptions of success among friends and relations in the home country), and ongoing economic security and the fear of losing employment once it is obtained. This finding is consistent with a study of Korean immigrants to Toronto, that found the effects of chronic strain on mental well-being to persist over time (Noh and Avison 1996), and with other studies of the stress process (e.g. Turner and Lloyd 1995). Moreover, the study of Koreans found that ethnic social support suppresses the effects of stress, while psychological resources (measured as mastery and self-esteem) also have the effect of reducing stress (Noh and Avison 1996). Though the SANS model does not conceptualize the stress process in the same way or with the same variables, the fact that the same trend emerges supports the findings of this study, and suggests an area of study that should be explored in greater detail.

Determinants of Health and Well-Being Among Respondents not in the Labour Force: Are they Similar?

There is some question as to whether the resources determining levels of well-being among respondents in and out of the labour force are the same. There are different ways of investigating whether the experience of the (predominantly female) respondents not in the labour force are being captured by these regression models. One way is to apply the same
regression model in Model 5 to the labour force sample only, and see if the predictors of well-being alter significantly. This was done, with the only difference being in the size and significance of the human capital and cultural capital variables, which emerged as stronger predictors of well-being (table not shown). For the most part, the size of all other coefficients remained consistent with the model run on the whole sample, pointing to the applicability of this model to an understanding of the well-being of non-labour market respondents.

A second way is to examine Pearson correlation coefficients between individual resources and levels of well-being for the labour force and non-labour force populations separately. Given the preponderance of females in the latter group, it makes sense to compare the correlation coefficients between females in and out of the labour force. These are presented in Table 6.8.

Perhaps most striking is the comparability of the correlations presented for respondents not in the labour force with those presented in Table 6.4 for the entire sample. Some differences are evident in the correlates of well-being among females depending on their labour force status, most notably among human capital resource variables, with those of females in the labour force being more highly correlated with their well-being than human capital resources of females not in the labour force. This makes sense, given that their level of occupational success, and their labour force experience in general, very likely impacts on levels of well-being among this group. Among females in the labour force, previous years of

---

52 The beta coefficient for English ability increased to .22 (t=1.85 p<.07), while that for travel experience increased to .27 (t=1.95 p<.06).

53 The model run on the labour force sample is, of course, a poorer fit, due to the smaller number of cases: F=1.87 d.f.=13 p<.05; R²=.26, Adjusted R²=.12. The consistency of the beta coefficients however supports the argument that the underlying relationships between these resources and well-being are correctly represented.
job experience ($r=.36 \, p<.11$), self-assessed language ability ($r=.24 \, p<.24$) and having completed some schooling in Canada ($r=.34 \, p<.10$) are all positively correlated to well-being, while previous occupational prestige and the two education variables are weaker, and negative, correlates. Among females not in the labour force, all human capital variables are weakly correlated with well-being, with all but two (the dichotomous education variable and years of experience before migration) positive correlates. These differences likely reflect the different social contexts in which these two groups of women were functioning at the time of the interview.

Financial ($r=-.10 \, p<.62$) and cultural capital ($r=-.22 \, p<.30$) are both negative predictors of well-being among females in the labour force, while the same variables are extremely weak predictors of well-being among respondents not in the labour force ($r=-.00 \, p<1.00$ and $r=.04 \, p<.87$ respectively). Though less strongly than among the whole sample, internal locus of control is also positively correlated with well-being among females in ($r=.15 \, p<.48$) and out of the labour force ($r=.30 \, p<.17$). As discussed above, this relationship is very likely the product of some kind of feedback loop whereby respondents with a greater sense of autonomy are objectively more successful, which reinforces their sense of control, or to at least subjectively define themselves as having high levels of well-being.

The fact that financial and cultural capital are negatively correlated with well-being is puzzling, because of their relationship to higher levels of human capital, and so to independent class immigrants, among the whole sample. Even though they are weak, the difference in the sign of these two correlations suggests that female and male respondents' levels of well-being are affected in different ways by these resources – most likely because of some underlying, unmeasured factor which modifies the positive impacts of having traveled
Table 6.8:
Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Independent Resource Variables and Well-Being Among Females In and Out of the Labour Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant Resource Indicators</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>In the Labour Force</th>
<th>Not in the Labour Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University Degree</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige of Job Held Prior to Migration</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years of Job-Specific Experience</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessed English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Capital – At Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years of Education</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Some Schooling in Canada</td>
<td>.34†</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Money Brought into Canada</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Locus of Control</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital – At Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Someone in Canada</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Immediate Family in Canada</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew Extended Family in Canada</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital – At Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Size</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Kin</td>
<td>.34†</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Immediate Kin</td>
<td>.29†</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Extended Kin</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Friends</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Acquaintances</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion Formal Ties</td>
<td>-.41***</td>
<td>-.59***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Support</td>
<td>.51****</td>
<td>.39†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Emotional Support</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Financial Support</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Job Information Support</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Settlement Support</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Housing Support</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Network Density</td>
<td>.35†</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Domains of Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significant at p<0.01 level
** Significant at p<0.05 level
* Significant at p<0.06
† Significant at p<0.10 level
internationally and brought larger amounts of financial capital to produce these negative correlations. One possibility is that females and males have different expectations for their integration in Canada; another explanation is that male gender roles function to make raise the importance of males' economic experience of immigration (in which high levels of cultural and financial capital play an important role), while female gender roles emphasize some non-economic domain of integration which is more closely tied to levels of well-being, and in which higher levels of cultural and financial capital play an opposite role. Indeed, an interaction effect in the experiences of males and females according to their class of immigration, which affects their levels of well-being, is suggested by the much lower levels of well-being among female independent class immigrants relative to their family class counterparts (as discussed in Chapter Five, independent class mean=8.33, family class mean=10.03).

For the most part, the relationship between social network resources and well-being is very similar to that described for the whole sample above. One measure on which these correlations differ is among the network composition variables, which reflect the fact that the networks of women in the labour force are kin-dominated, while those of women not in the labour force are dominated by friends (see Chapter Five). The effects of social networks at immigration are very similar, except for the (weak) negative correlation between having immediate family in Canada and well-being ($r=-.13 \ p<.53$). This difference likely reflects an underlying sample composition difference: as discussed in Chapter Five, the majority of Indian independent class respondents entered Canada knowing no one, which likely explains this negative correlation.
Another difference is in the interpretation of the negative relationship between network size and well-being common to women in \( r = -0.24 \) \( (p<0.25) \) and out \( r = -0.44 \) \( (p<0.04) \) of the labour force. The stronger negative correlation among the latter group reflects their network composition, which is friend-dominated, but unlike the explanation offered above for the negative effect of network size on well-being, it is less likely that this reflects underlying, class-related satisfaction with economic success in Canada given their absence from the labour market.\(^{54}\) Though unclear, the point, as above, is that larger networks do not cause lower levels of well-being, but that they reflect other, immigrant class-related contextual factors negatively affecting the well-being of these respondents.

In both sub-samples of females, mean levels of social support are positively correlated with overall health and well-being, which is in keeping with existing literature, and fluctuations in the strength of these correlations likely reflects differences in the actual amounts received by members of each class.\(^{55}\) For the most part, then, social network resources appear to be similarly correlated with levels of well-being within the two female sub-samples, and within the whole sample.

One correlate of well-being not included in the multiple regressions for the whole sample is household income. As stated above, as the only indicator of economic integration available for the non-labour force sample, it is included in Table 6.8. Not surprisingly, household income levels are much stronger predictors of well-being among this non-labour force sample: \( r = 0.49 \) \( (p<0.02) \) versus \( r = -0.13 \) \( (p<0.55) \) among females in the labour force. Among

\(^{54}\) Of course, this could still be a factor, given that many of these women had had one job in Canada, and because their sense of success could be an extension of their spouse's or family's overall economic success.

\(^{55}\) While family class female immigrants tend to report slightly higher levels of most kinds of support, regardless of labour force status, there are no statistically significant differences by class in received support (again, please see Table 5.14).
women not in the labour force, independent class respondents report lower levels of household income than their family class counterparts ($33,571 compared to $42,667; F=.41, d.f.=1 p<.53). This economic factor may be related to their lower reported sense of health and well-being, though it could also be that, though not in the labour force themselves, the well-being of these women is affected by the economic experience of their spouses or other family members. Several respondents expressed terrific disgust with the barriers to employment faced by professional immigrants to Canada, particularly in the form of the requirement for Canadian experience, barriers more often affecting members of the independent class.

Thus, though the correlates of well-being for respondents not in the labour force are not identical to those presented for the entire sample in Table 6.4, nor with those among females in the labour force in Table 6.8, the similarities are considerable, particularly in terms of the relationship between social network resources and levels of well-being. The fact that only minor changes in the coefficients included in Model 5 were noted when the model was re-estimated on the labour force sample only also suggests that while the determinants of their levels of well-being may not be perfectly captured by this model, neither are they being completely misrepresented by it. Certainly the ideal would be to conduct separate analyses with a much larger sample, in which case different predictors of well-being might emerge, differences related to the distinctive contexts in which immigrants not in the labour force conduct their daily lives. Given the restrictions on the current analysis, though, Model 5 is considered an adequate representation of the levels of well-being of all sample members.
Discussion

The aims of the preceding analysis were to first, identify which immigrant resources best predict levels of well-being and second, to ascertain what role, if any, an immigrant’s level of economic integration plays in determining levels of well-being in the presence of these resources. In answer to the first question, the determinants of health and well-being are different than for the three dimensions of economic integration analyzed above, in terms the relevance, predictive power and direction of their effects. Human capital variables are only marginal in their contribution to understanding variations in levels of well-being, with only one variable, self-assessed English language ability at immigration, emerging as a consistent predictor. Cultural resources, on the other hand, are strongly and positively related to levels of well-being. Explanations offered above centre on generalized and specific advantages of international travel that may contribute to an increase in an individual’s well-being, though with the absence of a relationship between job equivalency and well-being, it is unclear whether such travel in fact affects well-being by providing a respondent with access to better jobs as proposed. Rather, it might be more in the sense of a generalized comfort with having adapted to cultural differences previously, or in modified expectations for initial economic success based on previous experiences, that improves an immigrant’s well-being. Whatever the specific mechanism, the emergence of this variable is an interesting addition to current understanding of immigrant integration, one that is not typically investigated.

The most important determinant of levels of well-being, however, are social network resources, as they are measured by network composition, level of support and network size. Specifically, kin-dominated and larger networks affect well-being negatively, while networks that provide more emotional support serve to strongly increase overall health. Explanations
for this bifurcation in the effects of social networks highlight the distinctiveness of network composition and the provision of social support. While the positive effects of emotional support on well-being discussed in other areas of sociology are confirmed (e.g. House et al 1988; Wellman and Wortley 1990), there is also a danger of making assumptions about social support based on a network member’s relationship to the respondent. In the integration context, what appears as an important negative effect of kinship relations on levels of well-being are the stresses on these relations resulting from Canadian versus South Asian role expectations, and from financial stresses imposed by one or more family members’ inability to find employment, among others. The negative effect of network size on well-being, controlling for the provision of emotional support, suggests that these networks are associated with other integration difficulties that are negatively affecting well-being. Indeed, the fact that network size ceases to be a predictor of well-being when the analysis includes controls for economic integration may be less a product of small sample size and estimation problems, and more related to difficulties associated with finding employment among respondents with larger helping networks, such as professionals. Again, this could be best tested with a larger sample size.

Two types of resources are excluded from the analysis. Financial capital resources remain unrelated to levels of well-being throughout, indicating that though bringing larger amounts of money into Canada may serve as a buffer against poverty, or provide a respondent with additional options if they are unable to find work, these resources per se are not implicated in explaining levels of well-being when other resources are held constant, and in particular, with this sample size. It might also be that cultural resources and human capital are underlying determinants of financial capital, which would explain the significance of the
first two over the third. The second resource not included in this analysis is level of internal locus of control. Though a strong predictor of well-being, I decided to exclude it from this analysis based on the complexity of the reciprocal relationship that has been found to exist between well-being and psychological resources (Jalajas 1994; Kohn et al. 1983; Miller et al. 1986; 1985). That immigrant's with a higher sense of control and autonomy do experience higher levels of integration as defined by the well-being variable suggests that previous methods specifying this reciprocal relationship could be successfully applied to the immigrant integration experience. Further study could illuminate the exact nature of this relationship.

The second aim of this section was to determine the relationship between levels of well-being and economic dimensions of integration. In addressing this, the results are more ambiguous, in particular due to the small sample size. Statistically, the effects of resource coefficients and economic integration controls were generally consistent with Pearson correlation coefficients and with models that were re-estimated with fewer background variables (though some obvious differences occurred because of this). Ambiguities occur more between the statistical data and the qualitative information gleaned from interviews, but as discussed below, these may be the effect again of sample size.

Indeed, based on respondent interviews, a stronger relationship between level of economic integration was expected. It could be, of course, that it is not the experience of finally obtaining a job, a well-paying job, or an equivalent job that makes a difference in levels of well-being, but the previous experience working in jobs that were distinctly below the respondents' level of education and training, or the experience of being without work at all for an extended period of time – in a sense, experiences which might be reflected by the
economic distress variable briefly discussed above. Indeed, the theme of persistent economic stress even in the face of current employment, and even employment equivalent to previous jobs, was present in many interviews with individuals who appeared to have progressed to the point of actual economic security (as evidenced by home ownership and the overall character of their belongings). In the words of one female independent class respondent from Pakistan in Canada since 1992,

"People need to be informed regarding the job situation [in Canada]. The biggest frustration for professionals is having to recertify. We had a huge emotional turmoil never experienced before – self esteem really low, feel worthless... People will just end up on social assistance... [There is a huge] stigma of being ‘losers’, [people] can’t go home until [they are] successful [here in Canada]” (R52).

This, from a highly educated woman who was running her own Montessori school, living in a beautiful, well-furnished home in Erindale (a suburb of Toronto), who experienced serious economic problems for the first six months during which her husband, a computer engineer, was unable to find work despite much international experience.

Similarly, a male family class respondent from India who arrived in 1995 spoke of initial economic deprivation, and the current fear of losing his job because he was ineligible for Employment Insurance. This stress was exacerbated by tremendous expectations for his life in Canada, in conjunction with having left a high prestige position and wealthy lifestyle in India. Asked his reasons for leaving such a position, he answered that they left so that their daughter could benefit from the educational system and economic opportunities in Canada, another familiar theme that crossed the respondents’ countries of origin and classes of immigration (R77). In effect, the relationship between economic integration and well-being may be even more complicated than proposed, not merely falling into a linear pattern of finding work, finding good-paying work, finding equivalent work, and therefore feeling well.
Rather, there may be some integration experiences that override those identified and which have long-lasting effects on an individual’s perception of their well-being in Canada – perceptions that may not be reflective of their objective situation at the time of the interview, but which might be an accumulation of economic hardship, occupational uncertainty, cultural estrangement, and unmet expectations for life in Canada, among many others.

In fact, though it does not appear in the analysis, tied to economic deprivation and its effects on overall health and well-being is the time taken by respondents to find their first jobs, and to reach a basic level of economic security. For their part, the necessity for the majority of professionals to retrain in Canada, despite in some cases international experience, effectively undermines the very foundation of highly skilled immigrant integration strategies. Without instituting a parallel system to facilitate the employment of these skilled immigrants, Canadian policy makers are effectively setting them up for economic failure – certainly in the short term, but as shown by this analysis, potentially in the long term as well, as the effects of initial economic deprivation continue to shape the individual’s perceptions of their stability and place in Canada.

A third and final aim of this section was to explain the class differences in levels of well-being among females that are unrelated to their labour force status. The presence of a significant interaction effect highlighted the fact that, even controlling for human capital, cultural capital and social network resources, the difference in these levels between independent and family class respondents persists. Explanations based on themes drawn from interviews pointed to the possible influence of economic class distinctions in the attitudes and expectations of independent versus family class immigrants that are likely related to levels of human, cultural and financial capital. Moreover, though discussed as they
relate to class of admission, the effects of these attitudinal differences suggest that another
domain of integration, level of ethnic group belonging, affects the levels of well-being
among female respondents, regardless of their labour force status.

This would also help to explain why human and cultural capital are negatively related
to levels of well-being among females in the sample, while the opposite is true among males.
It is possible that economic class issues shape the attitudes and levels of well-being among
females more than males, although it is unclear why this would be so, except to say that such
a difference could be associated with gender and cultural roles among these South Asian
groups.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this chapter was to determine the relative importance of four
types of individual resources, in the presence of human capital resources, as predictors of
immigrant integration. The second goal of the chapter was to determine the relative
importance of each dimension of economic integration on levels of overall health and well-
being, in the presence of these individual resources. Two general findings suggest a need to
reconceptualize the importance given to other domains of integration by immigration
researchers, and to re-think the assumptions behind immigration policies which rest heavily
on the human capital model of integration which is not borne out by this research.

First, the determinants of integration are different depending on the domain being
analyzed, which supports the argument made in this thesis that immigrant integration cannot
and should not be reduced to the economic domain alone. Second, integration as defined
here is not determined solely by the human capital characteristics of individual immigrants,
as presumed by immigration policy. In fact, human capital resources are important
predictors of economic dimensions of integration, but the effects of the separate variables
vary depending on the dimension being analyzed, and do not always affect integration in the
expected direction. Competing predictors of economic integration and levels of well-being
emerge in the form of cultural capital, and most significantly, social network resources, their
explanatory power often equaling or exceeding that of standard human capital variables. The
following Table 6.9 assesses the relative importance of the five types of resources as
determinants of the four dimensions of integration emerging from this analysis.

The relative contribution of each resource type to the explanatory power of each
model can be summarized in a very crude way, based on logistic regression partial
correlations and linear regression beta coefficients. From this information, **human capital
variables** emerge as the most important predictors in only one analysis, that of the odds of
being employed. Though these variables figure in earnings and job equivalency analyses, in
each case they are equivalent to social network and cultural capital variables respectively. In
the analysis of levels of well-being, human capital variables play the smallest role. **Cultural
capital variables** emerge as strong predictors of job equivalency and levels of well-being, in
the first case equaling the role of human capital, in the second exceeded in importance by
social network variables, but exceeding that of human capital. **Social network resource
variables** are important in predicting the odds of employment and of job equivalency, but are
second to human capital, and human capital and cultural capital. By contrast, social network
variables are equally as important as human capital variables in explaining the variations in
earnings, and are by far the strongest predictors of levels of well-being.
Table 6.9:
Summary of the Relative Importance of Immigrant Resource in Predicting Immigrant Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIMENSION OF INTEGRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held University Degree at Immigration</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige Before Immigration</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Ability at Immigration</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Education</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Countries Traveled To</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Network Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Percent Kin</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Percent Immediate Kin</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total Social Support</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Financial Support</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Emotional Support</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Size</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dark Shading = Greatest importance
Light Shading = Equivalent importance
No Shading = Least importance
In terms of the impacts of each resource on the different integration outcomes, human capital variables are not a consistently positive influence, contrary to expectations, and to most past research which shows such characteristics to be important determinants of economic well-being among immigrants. Specifically, having a university education at immigration positively affects both the odds of employment and employment income, though the years of education at interview variable has a negative effect on the odds of obtaining an equivalent job. Two points were discussed in the economic analyses above concerning the effects of these measures of education: that having a university education predicts to employment and earnings, rather than the continuous measure of education, confirms that human capital investment in the form of a university education is in fact important to the job search process, as well as in obtaining subsequent financial rewards commensurate with such investment. An alternative explanation suggests a possible non-linear effect of education which actually reduces an immigrant’s economic success at extremes of the education distribution. This may be supported by the importance of the years of education variable in the logistic regression predicting job equivalency – a method which is designed to deal with the non-linear effects of independent variables on dichotomous dependent variables. Such a non-linear relationship would support the arguments made above that professional immigrants to Canada actually suffer as a result of their much higher and specific education, arguments which call into question the fundamentals of Canadian immigration policy that currently emphasizes the admission of such highly qualified individuals. Furthermore, the negative effects of previous occupational prestige on finding employment reinforce the argument of professional disadvantage in Canada, as well as the possible non-linear effects of education. The presence and persistence of significant barriers to the employment of
professional immigrants to Canada was discussed at length above, and was a recurring theme throughout the interviews.

By contrast, self-assessed English ability at immigration is a consistently positive predictor of earnings, and of personal well-being. This finding confirms previous research showing linguistic competence to be the most important skill an immigrant can bring to Canada, as well as policy initiatives that both select for such qualifications among independent applicants, and provide instructional support to those lacking in English language skills. Given the elevated level of language competence within this sample, however, it is perhaps somewhat surprising that this measure of human capital still emerges as an important factor in determining integration. As a determinant of earnings, it is possible that language competency opens the door to more prestigious jobs in Canada, from which an equally skilled immigrant would be otherwise barred. Another possibility not investigated concerns the impact of accent on earnings: while actual language competence may be high across this sample, the type of English spoken may be the key to economic success, particularly among those respondents speaking a more British-sounding English, which, given Canada’s own history, might prove to be a great asset.

For their part, only cultural resources as measured by international travel experience have a consistently positive effect on both job equivalency and levels of well-being. Explanations offered above centre on objective outcomes of such travel — such as practical knowledge concerning job search strategies abroad, and internationally-recognized qualifications and experience — as well as on generalized outcomes — such as greater comfort with the uncertainties of the integration process, and modified expectations for the economic integration process in Canada — which may serve as a bridge to equivalent employment, and
to higher levels of well-being. Evidence of the former was found in the interviews with respondents: a couple obtained in-company transfers from an office abroad to that in Canada, while others cited considerable international travel as business people, or as students studying abroad. Certainly, educational credentials earned in the US or UK appear to face fewer challenges than those obtained in a South Asian country, regardless of the degree being assessed; more than one individual had their PhD re-assessed as Masters level or below. Moreover, if international experience in fact equips an individual with a generalized set of survival skills that improve well-being in Canada as proposed, then this finding empirically supports a dynamic that was only theorized to be present at the study’s outset, and which expands the notion of what types of personal resources facilitate the integration process.

Lastly, the consistent and strong presence of social network variables as determinants of economic and health dimensions of integration adds empirical support to theoretical claims of their importance, as well as methodological vigour in analyzing their role in a process in which they have previously figured, but only as ambiguous measures. As predictors of economic integration, the social network variables as measured produce noteworthy effects.\textsuperscript{56} Explanations proposed above for the negative impacts of kin-dominated and supported networks were careful to distinguish between causality and the presence of a relationship between social network variables and integration: it is very unlikely that kin-dominated networks, which are tend to provide greater amounts of generalized support, actually serve to cause unemployment or low earnings. Rather, I have

\textsuperscript{56} The composition variable (mean percent immediate kin) has a positive effect on job equivalency, which as discussed above may be related to the choice of the support control variable (other support controls produce a negative effect in the composition variable); it may also be related to the context of comparison in which the respondents find themselves, rating their own jobs as superior to those of their bounded network members. Moreover, this effect should be treated with caution, given that mean percent kin is highly non-statistically significant, and the sample size extremely small (N=59).
emphasized the confluence of network compositional and structural characteristics with policy class-related factors which appear to explain the lower levels of economic integration found among family class immigrants in this sample. Three possible explanations were offered: that respondents receiving more support do so because they are disadvantaged, but that the support received is not of a type to counter their disadvantage. Related to this, it was proposed that respondents with kin-dominated and supportive networks end up relying on these individuals for the bulk of their information, which ultimately may leave them with a shortage of useful “weak ties” that have been shown to provide access to scarce resources and information particularly useful to occupational mobility (Granovetter 1973). Finally, I also speculated that disadvantaged individuals may be supported in their poor economic integration by kinship obligations and social support, in the sense that they are perhaps afforded more time to investigate better job opportunities, to attend school part-time, or be otherwise less intensive in their search for employment or well-paying jobs. This explanation evokes images of a dependency relationship between such respondents and their networks; in combination with the other two explanations, it is possible to see how the networks characteristic of family class respondents might actually function to limit their levels of economic integration in Canada relative to independent class respondents.

The role of network variables in predicting well-being is not uniform, but is considered to be positive overall. The network size variable emerges as a weak and negative predictor of well-being for the whole sample. This was shown to be related to network composition, in that respondents with larger networks are also more likely to have a higher proportion of formal ties and acquaintances in them; this is more characteristic of independent class networks, and so helps to explain their lower levels of well-being. By
contrast, the overwhelming strength of emotional support in explaining well-being confirms previous findings that networks can serve as buffers between negative events, to positively affect an individual’s overall health. Concomitantly, the stresses imposed by relations of obligation most often associated with kinship were proposed as explanations for the negative effect of a high proportion of kin on well-being. The effects of these three variables were shown to help explain greater levels of well-being among family class respondents, who may suffer from the strains of kinship relations, but who ultimately benefit from emotionally supportive, and smaller, helping networks.

Generalized conclusions emerging from this chapter help explain immigrant class differences in levels of integration. Independent immigrants’ superior economic integration on every dimension appears to be explained in part by their levels of education, but more importantly by the structural characteristics of their networks. In fact, the greater education and skill characteristic of independent immigrant professionals act as liabilities rather than resources when it comes to becoming employed, and specifically to finding equivalent work. By contrast, family immigrants’ poorer economic experiences do not appear to be tied so much to differences in levels of human capital, but to the negative effects of their own network structures which are somehow limiting their economic success.

By contrast, the very network characteristics that seem to limit family class respondents’ economic success appear to be instrumental in promoting their sense of well-being in Canada — indeed, possibly buffering them from their negative economic experiences. Unfortunately for them, professionals who appear to be faced with serious labour market difficulties do not benefit from the same positive network effects: overall economically better
off, the overall health and well-being of independent immigrants seems to be undermined by their labour market difficulties, even once these have been resolved.

And yet, based on the statistical analysis of the impacts of economic outcomes on levels of well-being, it is not possible to make a direct connection between levels of well-being and each dimension of integration: only being employed has any discernible effect. This does not fit with the qualitative information gathered from respondents’ interviews, where difficulties being employed, and in having credentials recognized, were repeated again and again. One possibility is that some more generalized economic experience – such as in the form of experiencing serious economic difficulty – has a greater impact on levels of well-being. This was explored briefly with a measure for having experienced economic distress, and which was a significant and strong negative predictor of well-being, even in the presence of controls for the buffering effects of emotional support. That such long-lasting effects of initial economic uncertainty (and that may not be reflective of a respondent’s objective economic situation at interview) continue to affect their levels of well-being suggests that wherever possible, immigrants need to be supported in achieving financial independence as early as possible in their integration experience. In particular, immigrants for whom economic success in Canada has been implied by the manner in which they were selected need to be supported in achieving these goals; this would entail a fundamental change in the way that information concerning economic opportunities is communicated to independent immigrants in particular, in the emphasis placed on specific qualifications that might lead an individual to believe that their economic prospects in Canada are better than they are, and in the role that governments currently plays in shaping and monitoring the accreditation of educational and professional qualifications.
CHAPTER SEVEN:
CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

Using data collected through the South Asian Newcomer Study (SANS) with independent and family class immigrants to Toronto, the research presented in this dissertation examined three questions relating to immigrant integration. Each of these was addressed in a separate chapter: (1) Which class of immigration is most successful in terms of each of the four dimensions of integration? (Chapter Four) (2) How do the individual resources possessed by independent and family class immigrants differ? (Chapter Five) (3) Which resources are most important in predicting an individual’s success in achieving the goals of integration as defined in this study? (Chapter Six). The hypotheses and findings for each chapter are presented in Table 7.1, and are discussed separately.

Because Chapter Six synthesizes the major research findings of the preceding two, and thus the central ideas presented throughout this dissertation, it is from this chapter that I will focus a discussion of how these findings affect current theorization of the immigrant integration process. First, I will argue that this study provides empirical support for a broader conceptualization of what researchers mean by integration, and of the resources possessed by individual immigrants that impact on this multidimensional process. Further, I will argue that the findings of this study call into question the human capital model of integration that pervades academic and social policy research. Specifically, implications of these findings for policy analysis, the formulation of the current immigrant selection process, and for the structure of settlement and integration programs will be presented. Lastly, I will discuss future research extending from this study, in terms of improvements to some of the SANS weaknesses, and of further specifications of persistent and original research questions.
Table 7.1:  
Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYPOTHESIS</th>
<th>FINDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levels of Integration by Class of Immigration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1  Higher employment rate among independent migrants</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2  Higher earnings among independent migrants</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3  Difficulties finding equivalent jobs among independent immigrants who are professionals</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjective Perceptions of Overall Health and Well-Being</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4  Higher levels of well-being among family class overall</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant Class Resource Differences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5  Higher levels of human capital at immigration among independent immigrants</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6  Higher levels of cultural, financial, personal capital among independent immigrants</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7a Higher proportion of family class with contacts in Canada prior to migration</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7b Larger networks among family class</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7c Kin-based networks among family class</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7d Greater total network support among family class</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility of Resources in Achieving Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8a Human capital variables strongest, positive and exclusive predictors of being employed and earnings</td>
<td>MIXED (not exclusive, not in direction predicted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8b Human capital variables positive, but weak predictors of job equivalency</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9  Cultural, financial, psychological resources all positive predictors of economic outcomes</td>
<td>MIXED (CC only significant ones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10 Networks at immigration negative predictors of economic integration because of strong tie bias</td>
<td>NO – n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11 Kin-dominated networks negative predictors of job equivalency</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12 Larger networks positive predictors of all economic outcomes – effect of 'weak ties'</td>
<td>NO – n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13 More supportive networks negative predictors of economic outcomes – indication of disadvantage if need more help</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjective Perceptions of Overall Health and Well-Being</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14 Higher human capital levels expected to improve well-being through superior economic outcomes</td>
<td>MIXED (weak relationship among employed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15 Higher cultural, financial, psychological resources positive predictors of well-being through superior economic well-being</td>
<td>YES for CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16 Networks at immigration positive predictors of well-being because of strong-tie bias</td>
<td>NO – n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H17 Kin-based networks expected to have positive effect on well-being</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18 Larger networks negative predictors of well-being – fewer 'strong ties'</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H19 Support, especially emotional support, positive predictor of well-being</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

Research Findings for Question #1: Which class of immigration is most successful in terms of each of the four measures of integration?

One of the first tasks of this research was to describe the relative integration of respondents along the four dimensions, according to their class of immigration; this was the primary task of Chapter Four. Another goal of the chapter was to determine how inter-related are the four dimensions of integration. Based on inter-correlations among the four measures, it was determined that indeed each dependent variable measures a distinctive aspect of the integration process. It was suggested that this supports the argument that integration cannot be reduced to a unidimensional process, though it is in the final results chapter (Six) that this becomes especially clear.

In response to the first question, Chapter Four presented integration levels by class of immigration, in addition to differences according to the other five background variables of interest, as a backdrop to the full integration model analyzed in Chapter Six. Based on Table 7.1, the results support three of the four hypotheses concerning the relative integration of independent and family class respondents, though with some modifications.

Independent immigrants are better integrated on each of the three economic dimensions, but differences are not always statistically significant. In fact, members of the two classes show remarkable similarity in employment rates, rates which appear to exceed those found in previous research by Renaud et al. (1993), though methodological differences make a direct comparison difficult. Class differences in being employed appear to be modified by other demographic characteristics of the sample, with females, respondents born in Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, and most recent arrivals to Canada reporting lower rates of employment.
In terms of employment income, again independent class immigrants report superior levels relative to their family class counterparts, regardless of whether respondents were working full-time or part-time. The mean employment incomes calculated for the SANS sample exceed those calculated from the Canadian Census as well as those derived for independent class immigrants by de Silva (1997), though in each case the comparison is complicated by differences in sample definition or in calculation methods; calculating earnings by full- and part-time employment show the SANS results to be very comparable to those calculated by de Silva (1997). Being female and married are two background characteristics that explain some of the class differences, with unmarried independent class males reporting the highest incomes. Working full- or part-time also explains differences in the incomes reported among other demographic sub-groups: Indian and Pakistani respondents are much more likely to be working full-time, which helps to explain their higher income levels, while Sri Lankans working full-time, though few in number, report the highest mean earnings of any country of origin group. The same distinction appears to explain greater gaps in levels of earnings by age group, and by the number of years a respondent has been in Canada: once full- and part-time work is distinguished, earnings are much more similar across the age and number of years in Canada categories.

In keeping with previous research by Renaud et al. (1993), job equivalency was reported by a higher proportion of independent class immigrants, which confirmed the hypothesis predicting higher job equivalency rates assumed to derive from associated human capital investments. Part of this class difference appears related to country of origin (with Sri Lankan respondents reporting the lowest levels of job equivalency). Yet, comparing occupational prestige levels prior to migration with those of jobs in Canada, family class
immigrants are in fact more highly concentrated in professional jobs than their independent class counterparts prior to migration. This is surprising: while the hypothesis is confirmed, the basis for the prediction is not supported. Family class respondents cite accreditation problems at a much higher rate than those in the independent class, which could indicate a difference in the types of qualifications possessed by each; regardless, lower rates of job equivalency among the family class do not appear to be directly connected to lower levels of human capital as expected, but must be related to some other demographic or resource characteristic.

In fact, the discussion of the determinants of job equivalency raise questions about the meaning of this subjective definition of integration, because of discrepancies between pre- and post-migration occupational prestige levels. Moreover, it was found that females reported higher job equivalency than males which did not appear to be a direct result of their segregation into lower status jobs internationally, based on high pre-migration concentrations of females in the professional sector. However, based on the earnings gap between males and females, even within more prestigious occupational sectors, females may be doing more “gender-typed” work. Thus, the hypothesis that independent class professionals would experience the most difficulty finding work was over-specified: regardless of class of immigration, professionals have difficulties, though overall this translates into a confirmation of the general hypothesis of greater economic success among independent class members.

The second domain of integration was analyzed separately for respondents in and out of the labour force. Overall, results indicate similarities in levels of well-being by labour force status, confirming results by Goldlust and Richmond (1974) of only minor variations in levels of well-being among respondents within the first five years of the integration process.
In describing levels of well-being, the analysis confirms predictions of superior integration among family class respondents based on the hypothesized benefits of social network resources (explaining high levels of well-being among Sri Lankan respondents), and refutes predictions of superior well-being among independent class respondents resulting from economic success. This was also seen as supporting the notion of distinctive domains of integration, as indicated by the correlations at the beginning of the chapter, and the argument made throughout this dissertation for a multidimensional definition of integration extending beyond the economic.

Most importantly, an implied interaction effect of being female on levels of well-being, by class of immigration, was uncovered, *unrelated to the respondent’s labour force status*, with independent class females reporting much lower levels of overall health and well-being. Explanations for this difference centre on expectations for economic success in Canada deriving from the respondent’s previous standard of living, and level of education, which might help explain why independent class immigrant women are more likely to report lower levels of well-being in Canada. As well, differences in amounts of social support received from network members may explain this class difference.

Thus, while the majority of hypotheses concerning levels of integration according to immigrant class were confirmed by the bivariate analysis in Chapter Four, competing explanations for these results call into question predictions based solely on the human capital model of integration. Underlying demographic characteristics of the sample appear to explain some of the variations, but overall, the answer as to why the levels of integration differ as much as they do cannot be reduced to such personal characteristics.
Research Findings for Question #2: Are there differences in the levels of individual resources possessed by independent and family class immigrants?

The findings from Chapter Five addressed the question of differences in resources by immigrant class (hypotheses H5 to H7d in Table 7.1). Probably the most significant observation from this chapter is that individual resources are not directly correlated with immigrant class: in fact, it may be that class of immigration is as much a social construction as it is an objective indicator of the resources at an individual immigrant’s disposal, a finding which calls into question the meaningfulness of the policy class designations as indicators of an immigrant’s ability to migrate.

Specifically, the independent immigrants in this sample do not report consistently higher levels of human capital across all measures. Though a higher proportion report a university degree at immigration and higher levels of self-assessed English ability, independent class immigrants have lower levels of occupational prestige and of job experience prior to migration, even controlling for demographic background characteristics, and only slightly higher (non-statistically significant) years of education at interview. This finding is most puzzling, and could be the result of a few factors. First, this could be the result of sample self-selection: family class immigrants who agreed to participate in the study could simply be those who are better educated; being more highly educated themselves, they may have been more willing to assist in this research because they value education intrinsically. While the same rationale should apply to independent class immigrants, they are pre-selected by admissions criteria for higher levels of education, and so intra-class differences might be fewer and less likely to affect their participation. A related explanation also concerns sample selection. Only respondents who could speak English well-enough to do the interview were included in the sample. Because English ability is also one of the
selection criteria applied to independent immigrants, they have in effect already been screened for this ability prior to being contacted for the study. By contrast, it is possible that family class immigrants whose English was not as good declined to participate because they did not feel comfortable, or because they did not understand the screening questions.¹

A second reason discussed in Chapter Five draws on economic research by Borjas (1990), who argues that the type of individual willing to leave their country is affected by ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors: people living in places with flatter opportunity structures would therefore be more likely to immigrate if they had fewer chances for real success in their countries, which would include those at the lower end of the highly skilled stratum, and those at the higher end of the lower-to-moderately skilled stratum. Members of these two groups, according to Borjas (1990), would be more likely to have the means to leave their own countries, and to benefit from the more complex opportunity structures in North America. The similarity in human capital levels between the independent and family class could be the result of the desire to migrate stimulated by the penetration of capital from more developed countries, causing increased awareness in less developed areas of values and opportunities in the former (Portes 1995). Recent research by Cheng and Yang (1998) supports these reasons in explaining the movement of professionals – “the highly trained” – to the United States.

And yet, this reason developed by Borjas (1990) has little to do with class of immigration per se, and more to do with the occupational skill levels of immigrants in general; his argument still takes for granted that policy class reflects real differences in immigrants’ resources. Stripping away this assumption gives rise to the third possible reason for the unpredicted differences in human capital by immigration class: that class of

¹ This possibility is not really supported by the data reported in Table 3.1, which shows very similar refusal rates by class of immigration across the four countries.
immigration may indeed be related to an individual’s educational and occupational skill set, but that it may also reflect personal decisions made by individuals who rationally choose the most efficient method of entering the country.

For example, for some professionals, the presence of kinship networks may represent a significant lowering of the cost of migration when it comes to the application process, and so they may choose to come as sponsored immigrants when in fact they could also have qualified under the independent class. By the same token, it is possible that an independent class immigrant with family in Canada applies under the points system because their information channels suggest that this stream would provide them with the most efficient entry into Canada. Certainly, it cannot be argued that immigration policy creates resources, in whatever form: individuals develop a certain level of human capital, they have friends or family who have migrated previously – in effect they lead lives before and outside of applying for immigration to Canada. And yet, immigration policy influences the types of people who are able or willing to immigrate to Canada, by valuing certain types of resources that are believed to assist in the integration process: specifically, in the form of a minimum level of human capital which is assumed to help (independent class) individuals enter the labour market and develop economic independence, and in the form of social networks among the family class, which, in the absence of a baseline of human capital, are expected to provide financial and other support to the individual regardless of whether they find work. As such, policy does constrain an individual’s choices: individuals with neither human capital or social networks are effectively prevented from entering Canada (excluding the refugee stream of course).
The analysis in Chapter Five suggests that for the most part, people with a lot of human capital apply as independent immigrants, while those with less human capital or other less 'desirable' characteristics apply through the sponsorship system. Thus, in the main, resource levels reflect expectations based on class of immigration. The inconsistencies noted (particularly in levels of human capital) may point to the effects of individual action within the context of broad structural constraints imposed by immigration policy – as noted above, the ability of some with high levels of human capital and social networks to choose their path of entry. In this light, these results present a challenge to immigration researchers and policy makers to undertake larger-scale empirical analyses to determine more precisely whether these similarities in human capital resources occur in other country of origin groups and immigrant cohorts, or whether they are specific to the sample of South Asian newcomers used in this study.

Hypothesis six in Table 7.1 predicted higher levels of cultural, financial and psychological resources among independent class immigrants, all related to, though not commensurate with, human capital levels. Support was found for all three hypotheses, though differences in psychological resources were not statistically significant. The fact that differences by class were found among these resources, and not as clearly in levels of human capital, supports the argument that these resources all tap slightly different characteristics of an individual's overall skill set; though expected to be related, they represent distinctive measures. In effect, despite inconsistent human capital differences, the higher levels of financial and cultural capital reported by independent class respondents reflect expectations based on policy admissions criteria. Indeed, the superior language ability and greater likelihood of holding a university education at immigration among independent class
respondents help explain why independent respondents report bringing more money into Canada, and having more travel experience.

Perhaps what is more puzzling is the lack of significant class differences in respondents’ psychological resources: based on the research by Kohn et al. (1983) and Miller et al. (1986; 1985) showing a reciprocal causal link between higher levels of mastery and autonomy and occupational success and educational, independent class immigrants should have higher psychological resources. However, as discussed previously, it could be that the general migration process has pre-selected for individuals with high autonomy and mastery, resulting in small, insignificant differences by class of immigration. Yet, there is variation across the sample, just not by class of immigration. Another explanation could be similarities in respondents’ levels of human capital: inconsistent human capital differences by class could result in minor variations in reported psychological resources. Of course, a final explanation is in the relative success of respondents as measured by the three dependent variables of economic integration, with the most highly skilled (professional) immigrants experiencing the most difficulty finding well-paid, comparable work, which in turn lowers their reported levels of autonomy and mastery; yet, this feedback loop could be at work, and still be unrelated to immigrant class, which leaves a reconsideration of the meaning of the class designations as a logical outcome of these results.

The final four hypotheses examined in Chapter Five relate to the specific social network resource levels expected among family and independent class respondents. The former were expected to be more likely to know someone in Canada before migrating, and to have larger, kin-dominated, more supportive networks. Confirmation for the first, third and fourth (overall) hypotheses was found, while independent respondents were found to have
larger helping networks. Chapter Five discussed the interrelationships between these characteristics, with the defining factor relating to the overwhelming predominance of kin in the networks of family class respondents.

Indeed, though the overwhelming majority of the sample reported contacts prior to migration regardless of class of immigration, family class respondents were found to be significantly more likely to know immediate, but not extended, kin in Canada. This illustrates a real difference in the contexts of arrival, and in the types of people to which members of each class had access when they first arrived. The overwhelming presence of kin in the helping networks of the family class seems to be directly related to this contextual difference, and is in keeping with policy assumptions as well. Contrary to expectations, their greater likelihood of having immediate and extended family in Canada does not translate into larger helping networks among the family class. This finding points to the distinction between helping network versus personal community definitions of networks: as discussed in Chapter Five, larger network size among the independent class respondents appears to be linked to the greater presence of non-kin in their networks, and though strength of ties is not analyzed, it is likely that the networks of independent respondents contain a higher proportion of ‘weak’ ties. In effect, because their networks contain a smaller proportion of kin, and kin typically provide more of many types of support (Wellman and Wortley 1990), independent class immigrants are forced seek assistance from a larger number of individuals to achieve their settlement goals. This relationship between kinship and support is also confirmed: though independent class respondents have larger networks, those of the family class are more supportive overall, precisely because of the greater mean supportiveness of kinship ties.
Thus, the findings from Chapter Five both support and contradict predictions of resource levels by class of immigration – predictions that are rooted in the human capital model of immigration, and reflected in current immigration policy assumptions about the relative adaptability of independent versus family class immigrants. As measures that have received the most attention in the literature, it is worth repeating that human capital levels vary considerably less by immigrant class than predicted, though in the main other resource levels confirmed predictions. A primary conclusion from this chapter, then, is that there could be real differences in individual resources by class of immigration that affect an immigrant's integration, but these differences may not be as directly embedded in human capital levels as argued by previous researchers and policy-makers. It is toward the understanding of what resources do affect integration trajectories that the analyses in Chapter Six were undertaken.

*Research Findings for Question #3: Which resources are most effective in facilitating an individual's ability to access the goals of integration as defined in this study?*

The purpose of Chapter Six was to combine the bivariate, descriptive information from Chapters Four and Five and undertake the task of determining why independent and family class respondents' levels of economic integration and well-being are different (hypotheses H8a to H18 in Table 7.1). This question was posed for both theoretical and technical reasons: to synthesize various theories explaining differences in levels of integration according to variations in resource levels, and also to determine whether any of these resources offered competing explanations to those traditionally provided by human capital analyses.
In answer to the technical question of the relative importance of different resource measures, Table 6.9 summarized the findings of this chapter and indicated that indeed, cultural capital and social network resource variables make important contributions to the analysis, in some cases exceeding the explanatory role of the human capital measures. Social network variables provide the greatest alternative and competing explanation to human capital variables, which substantiates arguments for their inclusion in immigration research as standard variables. Moreover, despite their omission from the regression analyses conducted here, psychological resources also emerged as important predictors of well-being in the presence of other resource measures, and were significantly correlated with measures of economic integration (though these disappeared in the presence of other resource measures). Whether their lack of significance means that they are not important predictors, or is related to the small sample size, remains to be investigated, though their importance in the occupational and health literatures, and presence as zero-order correlates, suggests that these variables should not be dismissed in future studies. Finally, while the amount of financial capital brought into Canada was highly correlated with some aspects of economic integration, this measure never persisted as a significant predictor once demographic and human capital variables were included in the regression analyses. Though financial resources are likely essential in predicting other dimensions of economic integration – such as entrepreneurial activity – their role in the integration outcomes analyzed here appears to be explained by differences in the human capital levels of respondents.

From this research it is clear that the classic human capital theory of integration is inadequate to the task of explaining differences in integration levels. Moreover, this study challenges researchers to not only expand the definition of useful resources in the integration
process, but to additionally conceptualize the process itself in terms which include, but are not limited to, the objective economic domain. The findings presented in Table 6.9 provide clear empirical evidence that the predictors of immigrant resources vary depending on which integration outcome is being analyzed. And, while human capital and social network resources appear in each of the four analyses, their relative importance varies substantially depending on the outcome being examined.

Beyond these more technical considerations, the interpretation of the substantive findings of Chapter Six also pointed to a reconsideration of the effects of immigrants’ resources in achieving integration goals – in the ways in which resources appear to be shaped by the structural framework in which each applies for admission, and their utility is modified by the structural context in which immigrants actually live once in Canada. As discussed above, immigrants arrive with a bundle of individual resources which together reflect, to some extent, different strategies of integration: one stream is expected to use their human capital levels to achieve economic independence, the other stream is expected to use their social networks to become economically independent, or is assumed to be incorporated into a financially independent family unit. In achieving economic independence, then, human capital, financial, cultural and psychological resources were all expected to be positive correlates of being employed, earnings and job equivalency; by contrast, characteristics associated with dense kin-dominated networks were expected to be negative predictors of these economic outcomes, but positive predictors of well-being.

In fact, the results of regressions analyzing the relative effects of these resources on integration provide mixed support for the implied association between, in effect, policy class and an immigrant’s ability to integrate. This, because of the contradictory effects of both
human capital and social network resources in predicting levels of economic success and overall well-being, which in some cases appear to act as handicaps instead of assets.

On every dimension of economic integration, bivariate analyses in Chapter Four showed independent immigrants to be more successful. Yet, in trying to explain these differences, two measures of human capital — occupational prestige prior to migration and years of education at interview — were found to be negatively related to, respectively, being employed and job equivalency, though having a university degree at immigration was a positive predictor of being employed (hypotheses H8a and H8b). In both cases, these negative effects seem to suggest the particular difficulties experienced by professionals (those at the higher end of the prestige and educational ranges). Contrary to the majority of writing on this topic, then, human capital at a certain level and of a certain type can act as a liability in predicting economic integration outcomes, a finding which, as argued in Chapter Six, goes explicitly against the goals of Canadian immigration policy, and has far-reaching implications for the health and well-being of these individuals.

In analyzing the effects of financial, cultural and psychological resources on economic outcomes (hypothesis H9), only travel experience emerged as a significant predictor, of job equivalency alone. Several possible reasons for this relationship were discussed, including the acquisition of tangible credentials which are more easily recognized in Canada, and the development of more abstract coping mechanisms and integration strategies through previous experience in adapting to different cultures and foreign situations. Evidence has been found supporting both explanations: Findlay and Li (1998:691) recently reported results from a study examining the employment strategies of expatriate professional engineers, in which many of those experiencing multiple relocations did so through internal
company transfers, professional journals and the media. Similar strategies were found to work among some of the SANS respondents, though more frequently within financial sector jobs. Further, as discussed by Coser (1975) and Kohn et al. (1983), intellectual flexibility, psychological resources – skills earned and developed through more frequent travel – and positive occupational outcomes are all interrelated. Though these results may appear to contradict evidence pointing to the employment difficulties of professionals, it is more than likely that these problems are contingent upon the occupational sector in which the individual is located, and the types of regulatory barriers that exist within Canada. That is, computing engineers, for whom there is considerable demand at present, likely face fewer barriers to their accreditation, while health professionals entering from abroad are likely faced with the prospect of educational upgrading and re-certification, as if they had never practiced medicine before. This finding is echoed in research conducted by Ewins, who interviewed fourteen Eastern European immigrants three times over the course of a year and a half, and found that computing engineers typically found jobs within the first couple of weeks, while others faced barriers associated with accreditation and requirements for Canadian experience common to the majority of newcomers (personal communication).\footnote{Captain Johanna Ewins conducted field research during 1995 and 1996 in Toronto as part of course requirements for her Master of Arts at the University of Toronto, Department of Sociology. The personal}

Finally, in predicting economic integration outcomes, the effects of social networks are as mixed as those of human capital variables (hypotheses H10 to H13). Two measures emerge as important predictors: network composition variables (mean percent kin, mean percent immediate kin) and measures of mean network support (total support, financial support). Except in one instance (discussed in Chapter Six), these variables are all strongly and negatively related to economic outcomes. In fact, when compared to the effects of the
other resource control variables, the poor economic performance of family relative to independent class immigrants appears to be largely related to their network structure – kin-dominated and highly supportive – as opposed to their human capital levels: ironically, the "resource" for which they are selected appears to be negatively associated with their economic integration goals, a liability in the same sense as is human capital for certain groups of highly skilled professionals. Another way of expressing this is that independent immigrants on the whole benefit from human capital, cultural capital and the specific structure of their social networks, except in the case of highly skilled professionals who appear to be limited by the very qualifications for which they were admitted to Canada.

Restating the relationship between individual choice and social structure, then, the types of resources with which an individual arrives are not simply applied to the business of integration in isolation. Rather, successful mobilization of resources is affected by the social structural context in which the individual finds themselves: human capital is useful, as long as the individual is not competing in an occupational sector which is highly regulated by professional organizations who have a vested interest in controlling who is licensed to practice; human capital is also useful as long as the individual is not encumbered by an excess of strong ties found in densely-knit, kin-dominated networks that, as discussed previously, very likely restrict the types of contacts to which an individual has access to those providing redundant information (Granovetter 1973).

The importance of contextualizing resources and their mobilization is reaffirmed in the analysis of levels of well-being. Not only does it show that economic success (as measured by being employed, earnings and job equivalency) is only weakly, and in some cases negatively, associated with levels of well-being; kin-dominated networks appear to
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serve as both a cushion against the pressures of integration, and as a source of such stress and strain. A few points need to be highlighted.

First, there are substantial differences in the relative importance of resource types in analyzing family class members’ superior levels of health and well-being, which supports the recommendation of a multidimensional definition of integration. The analysis pointed to important, positive effects of English language ability and travel experience (resources more characteristic of the independent class), though these paled in comparison to the overwhelmingly positive effects of emotional support (of which family class respondents receive more); the effects of these variables were offset by the negative impact of larger network size (most likely among independent class respondents) and kin-dominated networks (characteristic of the family class).

Significantly, all but one measure of human capital failed to appear as significant predictors of this subjectively-defined, non-economic domain of integration (hypotheses H14). Only level of English ability positively affects well-being (though even this measure dropped out of statistical significance in the full model). As with the positive and significant effects of cultural resources on well-being (hypothesis H15), superior linguistic ability is likely related to a reduced sense of isolation: people who speak English well and who have experience traveling are more likely to have better coping mechanisms and to be able to insert themselves into occupational, community and neighbourhood structures with greater ease. By contrast, limited English ability in particular excludes an individual from basic communication and information exchanges, in daily interactions and through various media (though there are newspapers, radio and television programs that communicate in various
South Asian languages): such isolation, even in a supportive family context, could negatively impact on an individual’s well-being.

Second, as the strongest predictors of well-being, the effects of social network measures are somewhat contrary to predictions, just as are those of human capital variables in predicting economic integration outcomes. Greater network size, a characteristic of independent class networks, confirmed hypotheses as a negative predictor of well-being (hypothesis H18): larger networks are related to a higher incidence of ‘weak’ ties, which are not expected to provide much in the form of social support. In contrast, findings pointed to the need to distinguish the effects of emotional support and networks primarily composed of kin on well-being, though these can coincide (Koser 1997; Vega et al. 1991; Wellman and Wortley 1990): the first are strong and positive, while the second are comparably strong and negative. In this sample, support cannot be equated with the presence of kin, even in the form of emotional support (Wellman 1992); this resulted in the confirmation of hypothesis H19, and the rejection of hypothesis H17.

Moreover, the negative effect of having a kin-dominated network was also taken to suggest that, aside from positive network outcomes in the form of emotional support, close kinship ties can also be sources of stress and strain, reflected in the comments of several respondents. For the most part, the respondents interviewed in this study demonstrated an orientation to ‘family’ that exceeds that displayed by the average North American. This embracing of extended kinship relations appears to be both the source of much strength and instrumental support in the lives of immigrants, but at an emotional level, there seems to be a concomitant difference in the sense of well-being derived from relations acquired through marriage and that from immediate, blood relations. In many cases, respondents reported the
presence of extended relations belonging to either their spouse or themselves; rarely had members of both sides of the family established themselves in Canada. It is partially in negotiating intimate relationships with these extended kin, who are effectively treated as immediate family members, as well as with blood relations, that substantial amounts of stress appeared to be generated.

The final goal of the analysis in Chapter Six was to determine if prior economic experiences affected levels of health and well-being, such that successful independent immigrants would be more likely to report higher levels of well-being. For all but one economic intervening variable, levels of economic integration as measured appeared to be only weakly related to levels of well-being. Only being employed emerged as a (positive) predictor of well-being, indicating that without some measure of economic success, independent class immigrants would have even lower levels of well-being, largely because their social networks do not provide vast amounts of emotional support. Thus, while the independent class immigrants in this sample appear to be faring better economically than their family class counterparts, partially as a result of the more diffuse structure of their helping networks, their well-being suffers for exactly the same reason. Likewise, despite poorer economic integration outcomes, members of the family class report consistently higher levels of well-being, and indeed this was found regardless of labour force status.

And yet, the results of the statistical analysis in Chapter Six did not entirely reflect the overwhelming importance assigned to economic aspects of integration, as represented in the comments of respondents: during the interviews, economic difficulties were reported to not only affect their sense of financial security, but their sense of self-esteem, self-worth, and ability to participate in their neighbourhoods and ethnic communities – even for those who
had achieved a measure of economic success. Though not analyzed fully, the possibility that having experienced economic distress *at some point in the integration process* – in conjunction with the general stresses of finding employment, meeting financial needs, and obtaining work reflective of the individual's human capital investment – has long-term and lasting effects on levels of well-being was introduced. The negative effects of such stressors on well-being were argued to exist for individuals in and out of the labour force, as illustrated by the especially low levels of well-being among female independent respondents regardless of their labour force status.

In effect, the chronic financial strain represented by economic distress, and by the stress of finding employment in Canada, appears to be such that even after the stressors have been removed, persistent negative effects on well-being are observed. Research by Noh and Avison (1996) into the stress process among Koreans in Toronto demonstrates that psychological and social resources (in the form of support from co-ethnics) both help to mitigate these negative effects, but they also find evidence of direct, negative effects of chronic strains over time on distress. Moreover, they report that neither resource type modifies the effects of concurrent stressors, suggesting that the economic distress experienced by respondents at the time of the interview predicts more strongly to lower levels of well-being *even in the presence of the positive effects of emotional support.*

Evidence shows that stress can have positive or negative effects on self-esteem: in the first instance, the argument is that the individual's self-esteem may actually improve following a stressful event as a result of the development of superior coping mechanisms (e.g. Lin and Ensel 1989); in the second, under certain circumstances stress has the opposite effect, and serves to lower levels of self-esteem (Jalajas 1994). From the SANS interviews,
there was no question that for many, their sense of self had been fundamentally, negatively altered by their financial difficulties, and in ways that are not likely to be easily remedied. Though not tested empirically, for many the chronic financial hardships associated with the first years of integration seemed to place a toll on their sense of self-worth; more than one respondent spoke about their financial ruin in Canada, or of their loss of self-esteem because of the type of work they were forced to do, while others manifested their sense of loss in their body language, which spoke of humiliation. In particular, such effects were noted among respondents who occupied positions of prestige and authority prior to migrating, and seemed unrelated to class of immigration specifically.

That self-esteem also affects occupational success (Kohn et al. 1983) and well-being (Jalajas 1994; Noh and Avison 1996), suggests that under certain circumstances, immigrants experiencing severe economic hardships, persistent employment difficulties, or who are forced to accept work that is demeaning to their sense of self, are at serious risk for depression in Canada. Moreover, in analyzing the determinants of well-being among females, low levels of self-esteem are not confined to respondents who experience labour market difficulties personally: female independent respondents in and out of the labour force report the lowest levels of well-being. Several reasons were suggested for these differences: experiencing economic hardships as a result of their own, or their spouse’s or other family members’ difficulties finding work; loneliness and isolation from immediate family members; economic class and educational differences that translate into low levels of ethnic community belonging, because of perceptions of superiority in relation to co-ethnics; and a significant lifestyle gap for women who left relatively luxurious and wealthy situations to come to Canada, where the subsequent domestic burden has more than likely been placed on
them. Though somewhat distinct, the themes emerging from conversations with many of these women parallel those discussed for the whole sample: a loss of self-esteem, prestige or authority accompanying a concomitant decrease in material well-being in Canada.

In her research with impoverished ghetto women, Fernández Kelly (1995) examines the relationship between social and cultural capital, and the ways in which these are defined and shaped by the social structural context in which an individual lives. Her research findings extend to the present immigration context, in their analysis of the potential long-term effects of closed social networks which reinforce socio-economic marginalization. For the women in the ghetto, the resources that can be accessed through their social networks do not provide any means to transcend their socio-economic position, because these are effectively “truncated” (Fernández Kelly 1995:220) by their closed structure: the women know few people who are either educated or employed, and so have no means of accessing the world outside of the ghetto. This crucial lack of Granovetter’s bridging ‘weak ties’ translates into a high rate of early motherhood among women in this ‘underclass’, which represents a reinterpretation of prestige and status symbols to reflect the opportunity structure within which they are embedded. Indeed, displays of female power and prestige are effected through hair sculpting, as well as through the transition into adulthood, motherhood, and so into the authority accompanying these roles.

In the context of immigrant integration discussed here, the potential exists for the creation of a displaced and marginalized underclass through a combination of closed, dense, kin-dominated networks and occupational barriers which force otherwise highly competent individuals into jobs for which they are entirely overqualified. Fernández Kelly (1995:240) points out that in the US, the difference between immigrants’ continued valuing of education
and attempts to find acceptable work, and the creation of an alternative set of goals and
time values within the American underclass, is time: the former cannot yet point to a history of
marginalization as can the latter. However, to the extent that recent immigrants face
sustained impoverishment or barriers to economic advancement similar to those which have
affected African Americans, she argues that they too could develop alternative coping
mechanisms.

There is of course some question as to how comparable the experiences of African
Americans and immigrants to the United States are to the Canadian context. Certainly,
Canada is not without an underclass: we need only look to the effects of the geographic,
socio-political and economic marginalization on the current position of First Nations People.
However, to the extent that the Canadian opportunity structure is comparatively less
polarized than the American; that our tradition of social welfare policies is more generous;
and that the composition of immigration to Canada differs from that to the US (the US
having a considerably higher incidence of illegal immigration from countries to the South), it
is perhaps irresponsible to imply that such a negative outcome as postulated by Fernández
Kelly (1995) is a real possibility in Canada. Nonetheless, the parallels suggest that
researchers in Canada not ignore the importance of social networks, in mediating the utility
of individual resources in the process of individual integration, and in shaping the
characteristics of ethnic community structures that are developed by successive waves of
immigrants.
POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The findings from this analysis provoke conclusions of primary interest to policy makers. The first point relates to the relatively weak presence of human capital variables as an explanatory tool, and conversely, the emergence of social network resources, cultural capital, and to a lesser extent, psychological resources as important explanatory variables. While the indicators of human capital investment all have a positive effect on earnings in Canada, the power of these variables to explain the variations in earnings in this sample is much lower than one would expect, given the enormous emphasis placed on the importance of human capital qualifications through the points system. The same can be said for the analyses of the odds of being employed and of having an equivalent job, in which social network variables emerge as important predictors, and the presence of cultural capital adds a new dimension to the understanding of the integration process, beyond the traditional human capital model.

The significance of this research lies therefore in the alternative explanations offered for the immigrant class differences in levels of economic integration and levels of health and well-being. Undoubtedly, from the perspective of the Canadian Government, attracting immigrants who have the fewest difficulties becoming, in particular, economically self-sufficient, is of primary importance; depending on the explanations offered for the differences, information regarding the relative success of the immigration classes invokes the manipulation of different policy levers. That independent class immigrants seem to have greater economic success (albeit in the short time span analyzed here) could lead some to advocate an increased focus on screening potential entrants for higher levels of human capital, in keeping with the belief that human capital variables are the most important
determinants of an individual’s economic success in Canada; indeed, this recommendation was made in recent months (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 1998).

Yet, the findings here point to the possible detrimental effects of ‘too much’ human capital that seem to limit, in particular, members of certain professions (regardless of immigrant class). That is, while some kinds of human capital are consistently useful (having a university degree and superior English language levels), others have the opposite effect (high occupational prestige before immigration and high number of years of education). As such, this research would in fact recommend against manipulating human capital levels of the independent stream in isolation in order to improve the contribution of immigrants to the Canadian economy. Instead, that cultural capital appears to improve both the odds of finding an equivalent job and levels of well-being suggests the need to investigate further the meaning behind this variable. Is it the effect of foreign-earned experience or qualifications that assists in obtaining an equivalent job, or is it a generalized knowledge concerning job search techniques? Does traveling abroad make it easier for someone to adapt in a generalized sense, which means that they end up being happier in Canada as a result of coping mechanisms developed previously, or are higher levels of well-being among those who have traveled attributable to other unmeasured effects? A more detailed understanding of the meaning of the cultural capital variable might in fact offer a different, and more useful, means by which to screen immigrants that would positively influence both economic and well-being aspects of their integration experience.

If travel experience is actually an indicator of internationally-recognized credentials that are more quickly recognized in Canada, the findings from the SANS suggest that concrete actions be taken to streamline the accreditation process: this would ostensibly
remove the negative impact that some kinds of human capital appear to have on economic integration. This could occur either through the direct involvement of government in the activities of professional organizations, but more plausibly through the establishment of explicit practices that demystify and standardize the process, perhaps through a central organization to which immigrants would apply directly, even in advance of their actual arrival. Such an organization could develop equivalency ratings for university and college courses, professional credentials and certification, and establish explicit upgrading guidelines and procedures. Ideally, such an organization would take advantage of current information technology and would therefore be available on-line, and so be accessible to potential applicants, immigration lawyers and counselors around the world. That such an organization does not currently exist, given the volume of international migration, is in fact astounding; a cynical observer might argue that its absence points to the dominance of First World nations in structuring such processes, and the benefits they accrue in the form of a cheap supply of labour due to the inability of immigrants to have their qualifications fairly recognized.

Furthermore, despite the weak statistical relationships between the three measures of economic integration in Canada and levels of well-being, I have also suggested that economic success in Canada in fact is a fundamental determinant of well-being, based on interviews and on a brief investigation of the effects of a measure of economic distress. While the lower levels of well-being among the independent class are certainly a function of less supportive networks, it is also very likely that removing some of the economic stress, through the facilitation of the accreditation process and of the employment process in

3 Knowledge of barriers to the accreditation process is not new, and such recommendations have of course been made in the past (e.g. Citizenship and Immigration 1994c; McDade 1988). The fact that nothing concrete has emerged may indicate the power of professional organizations to resist government intervention, as well as a lack of political will on the part of the federal government.
general, would alleviate some of their risk for depression and poorer overall health and well-being. Finally, understanding that independent class immigrants are at a higher risk for lower levels of well-being is important information for settlement service providers and other health care professionals. Such knowledge could form the basis for specific outreach programs that promote networking and information exchange among community members who have arrived in the same stream; this could also be organized within ethnic communities, which would serve the dual purpose of providing immigrants with few co-ethnic contacts the possibility of encountering others who have had similar pre- and post-migration experiences. This second option might prove most useful, given Noh and Avison’s (1996) finding that it is particularly co-ethnic social support that mediates the effects of stress on depression levels among Koreans in Toronto.

A second major point that emerges from this analysis concerns the importance of social network resource variables in this analysis. The negative influence of what appear to be closed systems of social support on employment earnings indicates the need for some type of outreach to all classes of immigrants in terms of job search information, not only to those whom the government ‘selects’ as economic immigrants. The educational levels observed in this sample are not that different by immigrant class, as evidenced by the analysis conducted in Chapter Five. And yet, there are clear differences in the outcomes by class when it comes to analyzing economic integration, with family class immigrants typically achieving lower levels on all indicators. This analysis suggests that an exclusive reliance upon immediate kinship networks places an individual at a distinct disadvantage when it comes to achieving economic integration. On more than one occasion, respondents (in particular family class, but not only) who had a large, pre-established family network in Canada reported not seeking
assistance from settlement services or employment agencies because of the presence of, ease of accessibility to, and reliance upon their kinship contacts. Furthermore, many respondents with such family connections in Canada reported that had they been aware of programs in Canada, they would have tried to use them.

This presents a challenge to organizations serving immigrants, and to government policy-makers. Reaching out to a population that, by default, relies on pre-existing, closed information channels that are largely unconnected to formal channels, is difficult. All immigrants receive a welcome package, though very few of the respondents reported having received any literature on settlement services. Yet, having reminded them of it, the majority did remember having glanced at it upon arrival, and then discarding it. From the interviews, it became clear that an individual arriving with no previous contacts was more likely to take the time to read the material, because they had to rely on many more formal channels of information; more often than not, these were independent class immigrants.

This reliance on pre-existing networks exacerbates a problem articulated by immigrants and policy and settlement workers alike, though from opposite sides. This problem is the perception by immigrants of false advertising on the part of the Canadian government concerning the actual economic opportunities in Canada, and on the part of policy-makers, the perception that immigrants do not want to know the truth, and disregard their best attempts to alert prospective newcomers to the hurdles they will encounter once in Canada. This difference in perception is very likely a result of immigrant reliance on anecdotal evidence from previous migrants, and human tendency to evaluate the unknown in a highly positive fashion (the grass is always greener syndrome), so that even accurate information provided by the government may fall on deaf ears. However, responsibility also
lies with the government to investigate alternative ways of transmitting this information that might actually reach, and be accepted by, prospective newcomers.

What is needed, then, is some way of contacting and supporting even recent newcomers (perhaps targeting the family class in particular) with information about settlement, such that the existing networks into which subsequent immigrants integrate are infused with the necessary information to make the most of their human capital potential in Canada. Such would be the type of strategy advocated by Fernández Kelly (1995), who argues that to effectively alter the situation of the American underclass, their networks need to be infused with resources that can be applied within the larger American opportunity structure. By comparison, the closed networks of family class immigrants discussed in this dissertation are resource-rich, as demonstrated by the large amounts of support flowing through them. However, the point is that the resources contained within their networks do not appear to be the same ones that facilitate employment or other economic dimensions of integration - though they do foster overall health and well-being, which is an important aspect of integration.

Thus, family class immigrants do not need "more" social networks, they need more 'weak ties' that bridge to effective information. The challenge is to find a way of tapping into these networks, particularly given that SANS interviews and past research indicate that immigrants more readily adopt integration strategies based on information from informal rather than formal channels (e.g. Koser 1997). Suggestions made by respondents themselves include the development of a mentoring or buddy system that would connect 'successful', or at least established immigrants with newcomers in order to effect a transfer of information. This suggestion of course does not address the problem of how to create these bridges to
larger structures of opportunity. The problem of an excess of strong ties becomes self-fulfilling: without the knowledge that other types of community contacts ('weak ties') would likely assist in the integration process, an individual is unlikely to make the effort to develop ties with individuals outside of their close kinship group, if they feel that their interests are being well-served by the support they receive from this group.

It would therefore make sense to determine at what point in the integration process immigrants are most receptive to information about Canada, and in what format. Past Citizenship and Immigration strategies have included providing literature at the point of filing in the sending countries, though this has apparently met with little success. Like in many instances where individuals are sent information in a written form, it simply gets ignored. The format and medium chosen for information dissemination is likely crucial to its impact on those for whom it is intended. It could be that videos, provided through religious or other ethnic community organizations, would be more effective in transmitting some basic information about the Canadian occupational structure, processes of occupational accreditation and educational upgrading, and even of finding employment in Canada. Or, community meetings in Canada might serve people's interests better, in which the same types of information could be transmitted. Moreover, many ethnic communities publish their own newspapers, which could serve as a forum for community announcements.

The suggestions of respondents themselves are instructive. Many asserted that they would attend an orientation session or employment workshops, but for them these had to be 'useful': for the majority, this meant that time spent creating a résumé that was nevertheless ignored by a potential employer because of a lack of Canadian experience, or Canadian qualifications, was considered useless. Respondents also suggested the development of
occupational mentorship programs similar to the co-operative programs that currently exist to serve other populations; almost every individual expressed a willingness to volunteer and work without pay for a matter of months, if only they were guaranteed a position at the end of the placement.

In effect, the practicalities of finding employment in Canada as described by these respondents, and the severe gap between these issues and the assistance provided by settlement and employment agencies, points to the need for an evaluation of settlement issues, and of the system currently operating. Past and current practice in this area has been to create a formal, separate structure that is supposed to serve the various ‘needs’ of newcomers. What emerges from the SANS research is that immigrants to Canada have many ‘resources’ at their disposal. To conceptualize this population as being only ‘needy’ misses the point that the majority experience the integration process without ever using any of the formal services available – largely because information from others indicates that this formal assistance is useless in addressing the real issues of integration, and of finding employment in particular; partially because of a need for self-reliance; and also because of a total lack of awareness that such programs exist. By recasting immigrants as skilled, resourceful individuals, policy-makers and service providers can then start to determine in what ways they can facilitate the process with which the individual immigrant is already fully engaged. It is possible that by understanding the types of information channels used by immigrants to mobilize their resources, policy makers and settlement service workers would be able to tap into and support these, and so reach a target population with the types of information that can potentially make a difference in the transition from unemployment to employment, and from financial insecurity to stability.
FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN IMMIGRATION STUDIES

The results from this study confirm that immigration research should pursue analyses by class of immigration in a more rigorous fashion. The differences and similarities in the resources of the independent and family class immigrants in this sample prompt more questions: are there clear class differences in the social network structures of all country of origin groups to Canada? Are there other groups who display greater, or smaller, gaps in human capital, financial, cultural and psychological resources? What factors determine the resource levels of members of the two streams of immigration from various countries? The SANS findings indicate gender differences in integration outcomes, as well as differences in outcomes for women and men by class of immigration; yet, the findings do not provide much insight into exactly how the resources of men and women shape their integration experiences, particularly into why similar resource levels have opposite effects. Indeed, how do the resources possessed by men and women shape their integration strategies and outcomes? An important element of future research should therefore include an investigation of the generalizability of these findings to other countries of origin, and by gender.

In her article examining the effects of migration type on the establishment of ethnic communities, Grieco (1998) discusses the ways in which the historical, economic, social and political contexts framing a population movement – called the “auspices of migration” – impact on the type of ethnic community that results in the host country. She argues that contexts which foster the movement of individuals, such as refugee movements or labour migration, as opposed to those which foster the movement of groups, as in family or chain migration, result in communities whose social networks are predominantly “weak” or “strong” in the sense articulated by Granovetter (1973). The predominance of one type of
network structure over another within a community can then have implications for the flow of resources within that community, and thus for the integration strategies adopted by its members. The social structural contexts, or auspices, under which an immigrant leaves and arrives are therefore important elements in understanding the choices that individual immigrants make, from their choice of application stream, to their selection of a destination city (Koser 1997).

As discussed earlier, the primary impediment to research according to immigrant class has been a lack of available data. In Canada, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration is currently developing new projects that will be capable of addressing this information gap, the most promising of which is the International Migration Database (IMDB). The IMDB would provide researchers with the ability to conduct analyses over time, by cohort, country of origin, gender and other demographic sub-groups, concerning the (primarily economic) integration of immigrants according to class of immigration, and using a large sample – indeed, it would permit an investigation of some of the questions raised in this study, particularly those concerning the generalizability of some of these findings beyond South Asian immigrants. Though the findings of this study have indicated that an exclusive focus on the economic dimension is insufficient, the IMDB nevertheless constitutes a significant resource to academic and policy analysts alike. It is hoped that increased demands on government accountability will encourage the Department to develop this, and other databases, to their fullest potential.

Another, albeit smaller, gap in the immigration literature concerns the experiences of female immigrants – experiences that were largely uninvestigated until the mid-1980s (Boyd 1992). The SANS analysis clearly shows that even controlling for differences in human
capital and cultural capital, females consistently make approximately ten thousand dollars less than their male counterparts, confirming the ongoing and persistent economic disadvantage experienced by females in the labour force, and according to Boyd (1992), immigrant females in particular. Part of this is related to job segregation, as discussed previously. Even when women work in a 'professional' job, they are more likely to be performing tasks which are associated with 'women's work', and so devalued and underpaid. As disadvantaged as new immigrants in general are by discrimination in the workplace, barriers to accreditation and requirements for Canadian experience, it is female immigrants that are suffering the most. Furthermore, independent class women in this sample also reported the lowest levels of well-being of any group, indicating that it is not only in the domain of economic integration that women face difficulties. That some are also more likely to experience difficulties with other aspects of the integration process, as a result of cultural, gender or economic class roles and expectations, suggests a need for focused research by gender, in order to determine in what ways men and women experience the integration process differently. As stated, the IMDB would be an asset in addressing some of these questions as well, though arguably all immigration research should include a gender component.

A second implication of this study’s results concerns the application of the social network perspective to other areas of immigration research. Indeed, the significance of other resources, in particular social network resources, in expanding explanations of the integration process beyond the human capital model presents a significant challenge to researchers who wish to incorporate this perspective into their own work. This, because of the methodological requirements of collecting network information, which tend to exceed both
the duration and financial capacity of most projects. The majority of immigration research is conducted with secondary data, which for the most part does not include measures of non-human capital resources, much less measures of social resources using social network analysis concepts and data collection methods. But, as discussed previously, the application of a standardized set of social network variables is essential if researchers are going to be able to make rigorous conclusions and comparisons to other findings.

One way in which social network measures could be incorporated into immigration research is through case study analysis such as that presented in this dissertation research, from which trends can be gleaned, and then inferred to larger populations. One of the strengths of the SANS study is its incorporation of quantitative statistical techniques with qualitative, in-depth interview information, which permits the investigation of small-scale processes within a broader, social-structural perspective. At the same time, the results from the SANS would be more generalizable had the sample size been larger. Thus, a balancing of small-scale, in-depth studies with large scale, ideally longitudinal projects (such as that proposed by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and as yet not undertaken) would serve to best expand the current state of knowledge surrounding the impact of social network and other resources on immigration and integration processes. As suggested by the findings presented here, incorporating social network analysis into a model of immigrant integration does not have to entail a full-scale analysis of every level of data: though focusing on network level measures alone in the SANS leaves many questions unanswered regarding the specific effects of the content of individual networks on the economic and well-being domains, the analyses presented here have certainly extended the level of understanding of
the integration process. It is hoped that others will pursue the development of these social resource measures in future work.

The results of the SANS support past recommendations for the development of a multidimensional set of integration indicators – measures that could be implemented by researchers internationally in order to address what is a global phenomenon. In effect, this type of a project is no different than those which have been undertaken to design standardized indicators of economic development used by international research organizations such as the United Nations or the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), or which have been proposed in the area of immigrant integration (e.g. Breton 1992; Neuwirth 1986; Neuwirth et al. 1988). What has not been discussed previously is the concomitant formulation of a set of individual resource indicators extending beyond the human capital variables routinely used. The proposal to develop standardized measures of immigration resources and integration outcomes would indeed be a large undertaking, and yet, under the auspices of the Canadian Centres for Excellence for Research on Immigration and Settlement, not entirely impossible. Regardless of under whose direction such a research plan was carried out, however, it would necessitate substantial amounts of funding and the co-operation of an interdisciplinary team of academic researchers, policy analysts, settlement service providers and other professionals.

A FINAL COMMENT

It is easy to forget that the numbers in the myriad tables presented herein are a reflection of the lives of real individuals. That many sociologists routinely manipulate such abstract numbers in the quest for a greater understanding of what is in effect individual
behaviour has puzzled many a student of sociology, not to mention the general public. It is in an effort to understand the patterned nature of these individual human decisions that researchers categorize and classify individuals, for without such classification the larger analysis would in effect be impossible. And yet, the very methods used to accomplish this quest for understanding inevitably remove the researcher so far from the origin of the information that it is sometimes difficult to remember that numbers are only ever indicators of underlying processes, a window on individual action, which need to contextualized and interpreted.

Throughout this study, I have struggled to maintain the presence of the individuals that I encountered within the overall analysis. To inhabit the space between the effects of social structure and human agency is at times an ambiguous and unsettling position, but one that I think presents an interesting and refreshing perspective on a social phenomenon that has been investigated for decades by countless others. The strength of the social network approach in facilitating the conceptualization and measurement of this movement between macro and micro domains – between individual resources and outcomes, which in turn operate within and are mediated by political, economic, historical and social structural contexts – offers a fruitful avenue of exploration for the area of immigration research. I therefore submit that applying this approach in a formalized and consistent manner to immigration studies should not be impeded by the potential complexity and capital and labour intensity of social network analysis methods; rather, these should be adapted in such a way as to permit the more routine inclusion of this approach.
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APPENDIX A:

Legal Definition of Immigration Classes
APPENDIX A

The family class of immigrants is made up of close relatives of a sponsor in Canada. Relatives eligible for sponsorship include the sponsor's spouse; fiancé(e); dependent son or daughter under the age of 19 and unmarried; parents and grandparents, brothers, sisters, nephews, nieces, grandchildren, who are orphans, unmarried and under 19; children under 19 the sponsor plans to adopt; or any other relative, if the sponsor does not have any of the above family in Canada (Canada 1993a). The family class applicants are not assessed under the points system, but must be of good character and health.

The independent class includes assisted relatives, skilled workers, entrepreneurs, investors and self-employed persons applying on their own initiative. Applicants are assessed against specific criteria, "called the points system":

assisted relatives: are independent applicants who have a relative in Canada able and willing to help them become established here; selection points are awarded for this potential assistance. These include the sons, daughters, grandchildren, grandparents, nieces, and nephews who do not qualify under the family class. These applicants must meet the requirements under the Immigration Act and Regulations.

entrepreneurs*: these applicants must provide evidence to an immigration official that they intend to purchase, establish or invest substantially in a business in Canada that will contribute significantly to the economy – that is, create or continue at least one job in Canada for a Canadian citizen or permanent resident other than the entrepreneur and dependants. The applicant must intend and be able to have ongoing and active involvement in the management of the business.

investors*: applicants must have a proven record in business and have accumulated a personal net worth of $500,000 or more. Investors can subscribe to any one of three investment levels:

- Tier I, provinces with less than 10% of landed business immigrants, require a minimum investment of $250,000 for a minimum holding period of five years;
- Tier II, provinces with 10% or greater of landed business immigrants require an investor to have a net worth of $500,000 and make a minimum investment of $350,000 for a minimum holding period of five years;
- Tier III, all provinces require a net worth of $700,000 and an investment of $500,000 for a minimum period of five years.

All projects must be approved and demonstrate a significant benefit to the economy of that province, and must contribute to the maintenance of employment opportunities for Canadian citizens of permanent residents. Real estate ventures are excluded. (Canada 1993a).

---

1 This information is taken from Immigration Canada (1993), Canada's Immigration Law, Minister of Supply and Services: Ottawa.
self-employed*: applicants in this category intend and have the ability to establish or buy a business in Canada that will create employment for that person, and will make a significant contribution to the economy, or the cultural or artistic life of the country.

*These three categories are part of the Business Immigration Program, which provides information and specific services to those interested in applying.

Finally, the refugee class is defined in the Immigration Act based on the definition in the United Nations Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. A Convention Refugee is someone who:

(a) by reason of a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion,  
   (i) is outside the country of her nationality and unable or, by reason of that fear, is unwilling to avail herself of the protection of that country  
   or
   (ii) not having a country of nationality, is outside the country of his former habitual residence and is unable or, by reason of that fear, is unwilling to return to that country; and

(b) has not ceased to be a Convention refugee by such reasons as voluntary repatriation (Canada 1993a).

Two other opportunities exist for applicants in the refugee category even if they do not meet the strict Convention definition.

(1) Members of designated classes, who are people who are in refugee-like situations in need of resettlement, will also be accepted. Applicants are currently accepted under one of two designated class: Indochinese and Political Prisoners and Oppressed Persons.

(2) Special humanitarian measures can be taken for persons from special countries who are in need of resettlement because they are victims of natural or human-caused disasters, but who are not Convention refugees or members of a designated class. These measures normally apply to applicants with close relatives in Canada (Canada 1993a).
APPENDIX B

Recruitment Procedures, Random Sample

- Statement of Introduction and Telephone Screening Questions
  - Eligibility Screen and Tracking Record Sheet
APPENDIX B
Statement of Introduction and Telephone Screening Questions

Having reached the intended individual on the telephone, the principal investigator used the following statement to introduce the study, and determine the potential respondent’s eligibility:

“My name is Stephanie Potter and I am calling from the University of Toronto. I am a (doctoral) student and I am doing a study for my degree on the experiences of newcomers to Toronto. I am wondering if you might be interested in being a part of the study?” If the response was favourable, the introduction would continue, providing more information about the study: “I am talking to people who have come to Canada in since 1992 about their experiences here – how people find a job, a place to live, any problems they may have had since coming here. I meet people whenever it is convenient for them, so it could be during the evening, the weekend or during the week. I meet people where they feel comfortable, often in their home, but sometimes I meet people in a coffee shop or at the University – whatever is best for you. The interview takes between one and a half hours and two hours. Are you interested?” [The following screening questions were asked and recorded on the Tracking Sheet that follows].

**IF YES:**
First of all, I need to ask you a couple of questions to make sure I can interview you.

1. In what year were you born? OR How old are you?
2. Record Sex from Voice on Phone
3. When you came to Canada, what class did you immigrate as? Did you come as an independent immigrant, or were you sponsored by someone? (If say refugee, terminate)
4. What country were you born in?
5. What year did you immigrate to Canada? [Calculate number of years in Canada, and confirm; if years in Canada exceed 5, regardless of year of immigration, terminate].

**IF QUALIFY:**
I would like to set up a time to interview you now. When is a good time for you.... (etc.)

**IF DON’T QUALIFY:** Explain that can’t interview them, thank them for their time, have a good day.
SOUTH ASIAN NEWCOMER STUDY
ELIGIBILITY SCREEN AND TRACKING RECORD SHEET

Respondent Name: ____________________________  ID# ______________

Address (Initial) __________________________________ PHONE: ________

Address (Second) __________________________________ PHONE: ________

Address (Third) __________________________________ PHONE: ________

CALLS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

READ SCREENING QUESTIONS: RECORD ANSWERS HERE

1. **AGE:** ______

2. **SEX:** 1. FEMALE  2. MALE

3. **IMMIGRANT CLASS**
   1. Independent
   2. Family
   3. Other

4. **COUNTRY OF ORIGIN**
   1. Bangladesh
   2. India
   3. Pakistan
   4. Sri Lanka

5. **YEAR OF IMMIGRATION:** ____________ (cannot be here longer than 5 years)
APPENDIX C

Recruitment Procedures, Non-Random Portion of the Sample

- Recruitment Flyer/Newspaper Ad
- Letter to South Asian Community or Settlement Agencies
- Information Pamphlet (Cover and Inside)
VOLUNTEERS NEEDED!!!!
for Study of Newcomers
Win $100.00!!

ARE YOU:
- South Asian (born in Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan)?
- Living in Canada a MAXIMUM of 4 years?
- A landed immigrant, in the family or independent class?

At the University of Toronto, we are doing a study of immigrant integration. We are interested in how newcomers to Toronto get jobs, find a place to live, and generally make their new life in Canada. The information will be shared with organizations which serve immigrants, in order to improve the experience of newcomers to Toronto.

**Participation** includes one in-person interview, approximately 2 hours in length, *at a time and place convenient to you* (we often meet people in their homes, on weekends, during the day, in the evening).

**Participants must be able to understand and speak English well enough to do the interview - there will be no translation available.**

To show our appreciation for your time, all participants in the study (about 100 people) will be eligible to win $100.00 – **one** name will be drawn once all of the interviews have been completed.

If you are interested in participating, or would like additional information on the project, please call **Stephanie Potter** at the number below weekdays and weekends. All messages will be returned as soon as possible.

Phone number: **Mississauga: (905) 876-3925**

WE WANT TO HEAR YOUR STORY!!!
Letter to South Asian Community or Settlement Agencies

May 9th, 1996

To the Director:

I am writing to inform you of a study of immigrant integration that I am currently conducting at the University of Toronto, Department of Sociology, and to ask you for your assistance. I am a doctoral student interested in how South Asian newcomers to Toronto get jobs, find a place to live, and generally adapt to their new life in Canada. The information gathered will be analyzed for my doctoral dissertation, and so will be published and presented in academic journals and conferences. The information will also be shared with organizations serving South Asians like yourself, in the hopes of improving the initial settlement experience of South Asian newcomers to Toronto.

Participation in the study is completely voluntary – I am simply looking for people who are interested and willing to share their experience of migrating to Canada with us in an in-person interview, at the respondent’s convenience. All of the interviews will be kept strictly confidential. In the published reports, no names will be used, so there is no way that anyone will be able to identify the participants of the study. During the interviews, respondents can decline to answer any questions they don’t feel comfortable with, and may stop the interview at any time, for any reason: I am dependent upon people’s goodwill to collect this information, and so appreciate and respect the privacy of the individuals being interviewed.

Because this is research for a dissertation, there is no funding to pay the people who generously give up their time to speak with me. However, I will hold a draw for $100.00 after all of the interviews have been completed; I am expecting to interview about 125 people.

I am writing to you to ask for your assistance in recruiting respondents for this project. I am looking for South Asian newcomers, that is, people from Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, who have been in Toronto a maximum of three to four years, who speak English well enough to answer questions in the interview (they do not need to be fluent), and who entered Canada as landed immigrants in the family or independent classes (I cannot interview any refugees). In essence, I am hoping that you may be able to post copies of the flyer enclosed in prominent places, and/or encourage individual clients who you think might qualify for the flyer to give us a call.

Enclosed is the flyer that can be copied and posted around your organization. If you have any additional questions, I can be reached at the University most weekdays at (416) 978-6251; if I am not in, I will return a message as soon as possible. I will be pleased to respond to any questions, concerns or suggestions you might have about the project.

I appreciate you taking the time to read this letter, and hope that you will consider my request favourably. If you have any outstanding concerns about the legitimacy of the project, I encourage you to call Professor Jeffrey Reitz here at the University, as he is supervising my research. He can be contacted at (416) 978-5692.

Yours sincerely,

Stephanie M. Potter
Ph.D. candidate
Department of Sociology
University of Toronto
Your participation is crucial to the success of this study, because you will represent South Asian newcomers just like yourself. We hope that you will participate in this very important study.

For more information, or to volunteer for the study, please write or call:

South Asian Newcomer Study
Department of Sociology &
Centre for Urban and Community Studies
University of Toronto
455 Spadina Avenue
Suite 426
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 2G8

Tel: (416) 978-0350
What is the South Asian Newcomer Study?

We at the University of Toronto are interested in how South Asian newcomers to Toronto adapt to their new life here, including how they get jobs, a place to live, and generally adjust to their new communities. There is no doubt that it is important for agencies and governments serving immigrants to understand the problems facing newcomers to Canada, so that they can make better programs to help in the transition to a fulfilling life in Canada.

The South Asian Newcomer Study is supported by an Ethnic Studies Fellowship from the Department of Heritage.

Who will use the information collected?

The information is being collected by the Department of Sociology, University of Toronto. The information will be used for academic publications; as well, it is hoped that government and settlement agencies involved in the area of immigrant integration will use this information to improve the services available to newcomers.

How secure is the information collected?

All of the information related to respondents' identities will be deleted from these reports - your identity will be kept completely anonymous and confidential. That means that the identity of participants will be kept private, and completed questionnaires will be stored in a locked area at the University. We will be conforming to the strict confidentiality rules established and supervised by the University of Toronto.

Who can participate?

South Asian newcomers from Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, who have been in Canada a maximum of 4 years, and who arrived as independent or family class immigrants (not as refugees) can participate.

Why should I participate?

This is a chance for you to make a difference for newcomers who come after you. We are hoping to tell agencies that service newcomers the problems that you report to us; we need your stories and suggestions so that we can make Canada a better place for newcomers.

If I want to participate, what do I do?

If you wish to participate, all you need to do is telephone the number on the back of this pamphlet and leave a message with your name and phone number. An interviewer will call you to set up an interview, at a place and time convenient to you. The interview takes approximately one and a half to two hours to complete.

Do I have to participate?

NO - this is a completely voluntary project. If you do not wish to participate, or if at any time during the interview you do not wish to answer any questions, you do not have to. This project has nothing to do with obtaining citizenship or any other type of settlement service; it is totally separate from any government programs. We hope that you will participate, however, because this is an important opportunity for you to contribute to our understanding of the problems facing newcomers, and to help improve the situation for future immigrants.

What kinds of questions will I be asked?

We will ask you questions about your life in your home country, your immigration experience, and about the problems or difficulties you may have had since coming to Canada. We want to know about people or agencies who have helped you overcome these problems, as well as about services which have disappointed you.

Will I be paid to participate?

The funding for this study is too small to pay each respondent for the generous donation of their time and energy. To thank respondents, we will have a lottery for a prize of $100.00 at the end of the study, that one of the 100 respondents will win.
APPENDIX D:

Respondent Questionnaire, South Asian Newcomer Study

- Letter of Consent
- Respondent Questionnaire
- Network Information Response Booklet
CONSENT FORM

THE SOUTH ASIAN NEWCOMER STUDY

I, ________________________________, hereby consent to participate in the research project entitled "The South Asian Newcomer Study" which is taking place under the direction of Professor Jeffrey Reitz, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto. The purpose of the project has been explained to me by ________________________________, In consenting to participate, I understand that:

1. The purpose of the study is to learn more about how immigrants get jobs, places to live, and generally adapt to life in Canada when they first arrive. I will be asked questions about the social connections which have affected my integration experience, and about specific social services I have used since coming to Canada.

2. I will be asked to answer questions by an interviewer. These questions will last about one and a half to two hours. I may also ask the interviewer questions at any time.

3. All of my answers will be kept strictly confidential. Neither I nor any person I mention will be identifiable in reports or analyses.

4. During the study, I may decline to answer any question asked me.

5. I may withdraw from the study at any time, and for any reason.

6. My participation in this study is completely voluntary, and is not connected in any way to obtaining Canadian citizenship, or getting access to settlement services.

I, ________________________________, have read the consent form, been given the opportunity to ask questions, and any questions which I did ask have been answered to my satisfaction.

Dated this ________ day of ________________, 1996.

Signed: ________________________________

Address: ________________________________

This consent form has been read in my presence by (name of client)

______________________________ who has informed me that he/she carefully considered and understood each point above.

Printed name of staff ________________________________

Signature ________________________________
CASE NUMBER: _______________________

INTERVIEWER #: ____________________

DATE OF INTERVIEW: ___________________

TIME OF INTERVIEW: BEGIN: ______ END: ______

LOCATION OF INTERVIEW: ___________________
Section A: RESPONDENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This first set of questions ask about you and your background before coming to Canada.

1. (Interviewer code without asking; circle one)
   1. Female
   2. Male

2. What year were you born in? 19______ \( \rightarrow \) Interviewer calculate AGE ______

3. What country were you born in?
   1. Bangladesh
   2. India
   3. Pakistan
   4. Sri Lanka
   5. Other (specify) ________________________________ \( \rightarrow \) Terminate interview

4. What year did you move to Canada? ______

5. Which ethnic or cultural group(s) did your ancestors belong to? **Probe:** What groups did your parents or grandparents belong to? ________________________________

6. If you were asked which ethnic or cultural group you identify *most* with, what would you say? **Probe:** for example, a regional linguistic or religious group...

   ________________________________

7. Are you currently married?
   1. YES \( \rightarrow \) Go to 1i)
      i) If YES, when did you get married? In what year? ______
   2. NO \( \rightarrow \) Go to 2i)
      i) If you are NOT married, then what is your marital status? Are you
         (1) Separated \( \rightarrow \) Go to 2ii)
         (2) Divorced \( \rightarrow \) Go to 2ii)
         (3) Widowed \( \rightarrow \) Go to 2ii)
         (4) Never Married \( \rightarrow \) Go to 11
      ii) If you are not presently married, were you married when you immigrated to Canada?
         (1) YES \( \rightarrow \) Go to 8
         (2) NO \( \rightarrow \) Go to 11
8 What is (was) your spouse's citizenship status? Was s/he born in Canada, is s/he a landed immigrant or new citizen, or other?
   1. Born in Canada ➔ Go to 11
   2. Landed Immigrant/New Citizen ➔ Go to 9
   3. Other (specify) ___________________ ➔ Go to 9

9 In what country was your spouse born? ___________________________________________

10 Did your spouse immigrate at the same time as you?
   1. YES ➔ Go to 11
   2. NO ➔ Go to 10b

10b) IF NO, When did s/he immigrate to Canada? _____/_____/____
    day/month/year

11 Do you have any children?
   1. YES ➔ Go to 12
   2. NO ➔ Go to Question 13

12 I would like to know more about each of your children, starting with the oldest. Please tell me their age, their sex, and where the child was born.

   Child #   Age   Sex   Country of Birth
   ___________________________
Please list all of the people who live in your household now using their first name, and tell me how they are related to you — are they an immediate family member, an aunt or niece or grandparent, or are they a friend? [IF NONE, code 00; NR code 99]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If your spouse does not live with you, where does s/he live? — Is it somewhere else in Canada, in your home country, or in another country?

1. Elsewhere in Canada
2. Home Country
3. Another Country (specify) ______________________

Where are your children who are not living in the household living? [Check all that apply if there are multiple children not living with the respondent.]

1. Elsewhere in Canada
2. Home Country
3. Another Country (specify) ______________________

How many of your immediate and extended family members have now immigrated to Canada? _____
Now I have some questions about your immigration experience, such as your decision to come to Canada, and the expectations you had before coming here.

Reasons for leaving country of origin

1  I'd like to know why you decided to leave (Country of Origin). What made you decide to leave?

2  Did you encounter any problems leaving your country of origin, such as obtaining necessary documents, getting the money to come to Canada, or actually leaving the country because of violence or social unrest?

   1. YES  → Go to 2b
   2. NO  → Go to 4

   2b) If YES, please describe the problems you had below.

   2c) Did anyone in Canada help you to deal with these problems?

      1. NO  → Go to 4
      2. YES
         i) Who helped you?
            (1) someone I know - What is their name? ___________________________
            (2) immigration lawyer
            (3) settlement agency
            (4) other (specify) ___________________________

3  Please turn to the first card. In general, how satisfied were you with the help you received from the above individuals? Would you say...

   1. Very Satisfied
   2. Satisfied
   3. Somewhat Satisfied
   4. Somewhat Dissatisfied
   5. Dissatisfied
   6. Very Dissatisfied
Purpose of Migration to Canada

4. Before applying to Canada, did you apply to immigrate to any other country?

   1. NO ➔ Go to Question 6
   2. YES
      i) If so, Where? ____________________________
      ii) Were you accepted?
          (1) YES ➔ Go to Question 5
          (2) NO ➔ Go to Question 5

5. Did your acceptance or rejection by other countries affect your decision to apply to Canada?

   1. NO ➔ Go to Question 6
   2. YES
      i) How did this affect your decision? Please explain.

6. Please turn to page 2 in your booklet. I'm interested in the main reasons why you chose Canada as your destination. Why did you come here, instead of going to another country? [Check all that apply.]

   1. to improve my economic position
   2. to be near relatives or close friends
   3. to get married
   4. to undertake studies
   5. to secure a better future for family in Canada
   6. desire for adventure, travel, to see the world
   7. lack of employment in former country
   8. dislike economic conditions in former country
   9. dislike social conditions in former country
   10. escape war or political situation
   11. applications to immigrate to other countries turned down
   12. Other, specify ________________________________

7. In coming to Canada, how long do you expect to stay here? Do you expect...

   1. to settle permanently in Canada
   2. to return home later ➔ Go to 2i)
      i) How long do you plan to live in Canada? ________
   3. to move to another country? ➔ Go to 3i)
      i) Which country? __________________

8. Prior to this, have you ever been to Canada, for example as a tourist or on business?

   1. YES ➔ Go to 8b
   2. NO ➔ Go to 9
8b) If YES, Can you describe any previous visits you have had to Canada: why were you here, how long did you stay, and why did you leave?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Purpose of Stay</th>
<th>Reason Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9 Before coming to Canada, did you ever travel outside of the country in which you were born, as a tourist or on business (besides any visits to Canada if applicable)?

1. YES
   i) Where did you travel to? ________________________________
2. NO  ➔ Go to 10

10 Before immigrating to Canada, did you ever live in any other country for a year or more?

1. NO  ➔ Go to 11
2. YES  ➔ Go to 2i)
   i) Which country(ies)? ________________________________

11 In the 6 months before migrating to Canada, where did you live?

______________________________

12 Thinking of the (country from Question 11), were you living in a city, a town, or in a rural area?

1. City  ➔ Go to 1i)
   i) About how many people lived in the city? __________________
2. In a town  ➔ Go to 2i)
   i) About how many people lived in the town? __________________
3. In a rural area?

13 Did you know anyone in Canada prior to migrating here?

1. NO  ➔ Go to 14
2. YES  ➔ Go to 13b

13b) Who did you know? Was it.... [Please check all that apply.]

1. an immediate family member (specify relation) __________________
2. an extended family member (specify relation) __________________
3. a co-worker
4. other (specify) __________________
I want to make sure that I have your correct immigration status. Did you arrive as an independent or a family class immigrant?

1. Family → Go to 15
2. Independent → Go to 1i)
   i) Did you arrive as a principal applicant, or as a dependent of a principal applicant?
      (1) Principal Applicant
      (2) Dependent of Principal Applicant
   ii) Please specify your class of entry in detail if possible, for example, if you are an independent immigrant who arrived under the business subclass. → Go to 17

Were you sponsored by anyone?

1. YES → Go to 15b
2. NO → Go to 16

15b) If YES, please tell me who sponsored you. What is their name? ________________________

15c) How did you know your sponsor? Was it a friend, a family member, an employer, or someone else?

1. Immediate Family member
2. Extended Family member
3. Employer
4. Friend
5. Other (specify) ________________________

Before coming to Canada, did you arrange for employment here?

1. NO → Go to 19
2. YES

How did you arrange for this job? Who did you ask for help? [Please circle as many as apply. INTERVIEWER: Probe “Anyone else” if #1 is circled.]

1. someone I know - What is their name? ________________________
2. no one - didn’t ask for help → Go to 19
3. settlement agency
4. other (specify) ________________________

Please turn to page 3 in your booklet. In general, how satisfied were you with the help you received from the above individual(s)? Would you say...

1. Very Satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat Satisfied
4. Somewhat Dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very Dissatisfied
19 Did anyone help you complete the documents or the application to come to Canada?

1. NO
2. YES
   i) Who helped you? ______________________
   ii) What country were they in? ____________

20 Using the same card (page 3), how satisfied were you with the application process overall?

1. Very Satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat Satisfied
4. Somewhat Dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very Dissatisfied

21 Do you have any suggestions to improve the immigration process to Canada? How could the application process have been changed to improve your experience?

22 Before coming to Canada, what problems did you think you would have when you first got here? [Interviewer: Circle all that apply.]

1. finding a job
2. finding a home
3. learning English
4. other (specify) ______________________

23 What problems did you actually have when you first arrived? [Interviewer: Circle all that apply.]

1. finding a job
2. finding a home
3. learning English
4. other (specify) ______________________

24 Since coming to Canada, have you returned to your country of origin for any reason?

1. NO ➔ Go to Next Section
2. YES
   i) If YES, Please explain why you went, and for how long.
SECTION C: IMMIGRANT RESOURCES AND INTEGRATION

HUMAN CAPITAL RESOURCES - RESPONDENT

Respondent’s Education

Now I would like to ask a few questions about the education you have completed.

1. As of today, how many years of schooling have you completed in total? __________

2. In what country did you obtain the majority of your education? ______________

3. Turn to page 4. When you arrived in Canada, what was the highest level of education you had completed?

   1. None
   2. Some elementary
   3. Completed elementary
   4. Some secondary
   5. Completed secondary
   6. Some community college, technical college, or nurse’s training
   7. Completed community college, technical college, or nurse’s training
   8. Some university or teacher’s college
   9. Completed university or teacher’s college
   10. Completed graduate or professional degree
   11. Completed other education (specify)

INTERVIEWER: If Respondent has completed any degree or diploma, Go to 3b; ELSE SKIP to 4.

3b) If possible, please specify the name of the degree or diploma you received, including the field of study. ____________________________

3c) In what country did you obtain your (highest level of schooling)? ______________

4. Besides this (highest level of education), have you completed any other education, such as at colleges, technical institutes, trade schools (etc.: private business colleges, diploma schools of nursing)?

   1. YES → Go to 1i)
      i) What qualification? ____________________________

   2. NO

5. Did you ever attend regular school or post-secondary education in Canada?

   1. YES → Go to 5b
   2. NO → Go to 6
5b) Please turn to page 5 of your booklet. What is the highest grade or year of school or post-secondary education you ever completed in Canada?

1. Some schooling in Canada but didn’t complete a year
2. Kindergarten
3. Some Elementary
4. Elementary
5. Some High School
6. High School
7. Some University
8. Undergraduate University Degree
9. Some College or Trades
10. College or Trades Diploma
11. Professional Degree
12. Graduate Degree (M.Sc., M.A.)
13. Doctoral Degree (Ph.D.)

5c) How many years of schooling did you complete in Canada? ________________

5d) Are you still in school now?

1. YES  → MAKE SURE QUESTIONS 32-37 GET ASKED
2. NO

6 Before your arrival to Canada, did you ever go to school in....

6a) English?

1. YES
2. NO

Respondent’s Previous Employment

7 Before coming to Canada, were you ever employed for pay?

1. YES  → Go to 8
2. NO  → Go to 13

8 What was your main occupation (where you worked the longest hours per week) before coming to Canada? (Please get a complete and detailed description of this occupation, such as car mechanic in garage, server in a restaurant, professor of physics....)

9 In what country did you hold this job? ________________

10 How many years did you do this kind of work before coming to Canada? ______

11 How many years did you work for pay before coming to Canada? ______
Before your arrival to Canada, did you ever work in an organization where you had to use English?

12a) English
   1. YES
   2. NO

ECONOMIC INTEGRATION IN CANADA

We have been speaking about your work experience before coming to Canada. Now, I would like to ask you some questions about your employment experiences since coming to Canada.

Are you presently employed?

13

1. YES \(\rightarrow\) Go to 14
2. NO \(\rightarrow\) Go to 2i)
   i) Since coming to Canada, have you had at least one paid job?
      (1) YES \(\rightarrow\) Go to 15
      (2) NO
      (a) If you needed to look for a job, how do you think you would find one?
         (i) someone I know - What is their name?
         (ii) checked the newspaper
         (iii) settlement agency
         (iv) immigration official
         (v) other (specify)

   \(\rightarrow\) NOW Go to 30

Since coming to Canada, have you experienced periods of unemployment?

14

1. NO \(\rightarrow\) Go to 16
2. YES \(\rightarrow\) Go to 15

In the past year, approximately how many weeks have you been unemployed? ___________

Please describe your current (last) main job. (Please get a full description of this job. Main job refers to the job you do most of the time).


16a) Is (was) it full or part-time?

1. full-time
2. part-time

16b) Is (was) it unionized?

1. YES
2. NO
16c) How long did it take you to find this job? ____________ (days/weeks/months)

16d) Are (were) you self-employed in this job?

1. NO
2. YES ➔ Go to 2i)
   i) Being self-employed, do you have any co-workers?
      (1) YES
      (2) NO ➔ Skip to 21

17 Please turn to page 6. In this job, would you say that your co-workers are:

1. Mostly people from your ethnic group
2. Mostly people from a variety of ethnic backgrounds
3. Mostly people of “white European” ethnic origin
4. Other (specify)

18 Using the same card (page 6), would you say that most of your supervisors or managers are:

1. Mostly people from your ethnic group
2. Mostly people from a variety of ethnic backgrounds
3. Mostly people of “white European” ethnic origin
4. Other (specify)

19 What language or languages do (did) the majority of your co-workers speak in this job?

20 What language or languages do (did) the majority of your supervisors or managers speak on this job?

21 What language or languages do (did) you speak in this job? Please list them with the one you speak the most first.

22 I would like to know how you found this job. Who did you ask for help? [Please circle as many as apply. INTERVIEWER: Probe “Anyone else” if respondent circles #1.]

1. someone I know - What is their name? ____________________________
2. checked the newspaper
3. settlement agency
4. immigration official
5. other (specify) ____________________________
23 Turn to page 7. How satisfied were you with the help you received? Would you say...

1. Very Satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat Satisfied
4. Somewhat Dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very Dissatisfied

INTERVIEWER: IF 22 #3 is circled (settlement agency), Proceed;
ELSE, Skip to 25.

24 What type of settlement agency was it that helped you? Please describe it in detail.

24a) What type of service did this agency provide to you?

24b) Using the same card (page 7), how satisfied were you with this service?

1. Very Satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat Satisfied
4. Somewhat Dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very Dissatisfied

IF R has mentioned more than 1 source of help in Q. 22, Proceed;
ELSE, Skip to Q. 26

25 Of the organizations or people that helped you find this job, which one do you think provided the most useful assistance? Please explain your answer.

26 In your opinion, is (was) this current (last) job equivalent to the last job you had before coming to Canada, in terms of the skill and expertise required to do the job?

1. YES ➔ Go to 27
2. NO ➔ Go to 26b
3. DK ➔ Go to 27
26b) If NOT, what do you think has prevented you from getting an equivalent job?

1. poor Canadian economy - no employment opportunities
2. poor English skills
3. lack of recognition of skills and previous education or professional experience
4. lack of contacts
5. lack of Canadian work experience
6. unfair treatment by employers (discrimination/prejudice)
7. other (specify) ____________________________

27 How many jobs do you have right now? Please name them for me. #________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

28 How many full-time jobs in total have you had since coming to Canada? #____________

29 How many part-time jobs in total have you had since coming to Canada? #____________

INTERVIEWER: IF Respondent has a SPOUSE, proceed; ELSE, Go to Question 31.

30 Is your spouse currently employed?

1. NO
   i) What is s/he doing?
      (1) student (language classes, skills training included)
      (2) retired
      (3) homemaker
      (4) disability leave
      (5) looking for work
      (6) other (specify)

2. YES
   i) How many jobs does s/he have? #__________________________
   ii) Is s/he working full-time or part-time?
       (1) full-time
       (2) part-time
   iii) What is his/her main job? Please describe it. ____________________________
IF R is NOT employed NOW, Go to 31;  
IF R is IN school NOW, Go to 32;  
ELSE, SKIP TO Question 42, Parental Employment

FOR RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT WORKING NOW, PROCEED

31 If you are not working, what are you doing? Are you a student, a homemaker, retired, looking for work... what? [Circle all that apply.]

1. looking for work → Go to 39
2. student (language classes, skills training included) → Go to 32
3. retired → Go to 42
4. homemaker → Go to 38
5. disability leave → Go to 38
6. other (specify) → Go to 38

32 What level of education are you currently registered in, for example, are you in College, University, High School, language courses, job re-training...what?

1. High school
2. University
3. College or Technical Training
4. Language Classes
5. Job Re-training
6. Other (specify)

33 I would like to know how you found out about these classes. Who did you ask for help? [Please circle as many as apply. INTERVIEWER: Probe “Anyone else” if #1 is circled.]

1. someone I know - What is their name? 
2. newspaper
3. settlement agency
4. immigration official
5. other (specify) 

34 Using the satisfaction scale (page 7), how satisfied were you with the help you received? Would you say...

1. Very Satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat Satisfied
4. Somewhat Dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very Dissatisfied
INTERVIEWER: IF 33#3 is circled (settlement agency), Proceed; ELSE, Skip to Q. 36

35 What type of settlement agency was it that helped you? Please describe it in detail.

35a) What type of service did this agency provide to you?

35b) Using the same response card (page 7), how satisfied were you with this service?

1. Very Satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat Satisfied
4. Somewhat Dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very Dissatisfied

IF R has mentioned more than 1 source of help in Q. 33, Proceed; ELSE, Skip to Q. 37

36 Of the organizations or people that helped you find the educational classes you are taking, which one do you think provided the most useful assistance? Please explain your answer.

37 Before coming here, did you plan to pursue your education or language courses, or is there another reason why you are in classes and not working? Please explain.

1. planned to pursue education
2. couldn't find work
3. had to re-certify in Canada despite previous education
4. needed to improve language skills
5. other (specify) ________________________________

38 Do you plan to enter the job market in the future?

1. YES → Go to 38b
2. NO → Go to 42

38b) If YES, when do you plan to enter the labour market? ________________________________
Have you been looking for work during the past 4 weeks?

1. YES  → Go to 39b
2. NO   → Go to 40

39b) What have you been doing in the past 4 weeks to find work? (PROBE: Anything else?)  
[Interviewer: Check all that apply.]

1. Nothing
2. Checked with public employment agency
3. Checked with private employment agency
4. Checked with employer(s) directly
5. Checked with friends and relatives
6. Placed or answered ads
7. Did volunteer work
8. Other (specify) ______________________________

How many weeks have you been looking for work in total? # of weeks: __________

Are you collecting unemployment compensation now?

1. YES
2. NO
PARENTAL EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION

42 Please turn to page 8. What is the highest educational degree your parents (or guardian) ever completed, beginning with your mother?

1. None
2. Some elementary
3. Completed elementary
4. Some secondary
5. Completed secondary
6. Some community college, technical college, or nurse’s training
7. Completed community college, technical college, or nurse’s training
8. Some university or teacher’s college
9. Completed university or teacher’s college
10. Completed graduate or professional degree
11. Completed other education (specify)

42b) Mother? ________________________________

42c) Father? ________________________________

43 In what country was this highest degree obtained for each of the above parents?

43a) Mother? ________________________________

43b) Father? ________________________________

44 What was the principal occupation of your parents (or your guardian), the year you turned 16? (If retired, deceased or unemployed, enter last occupation; if had more than one occupation, list the one considered to be their main source of income – get a complete and detailed description of this occupation)

44a) Mother? ________________________________

44b) Father? ________________________________
CULTURAL (LINGUISTIC) RESOURCES AND INTEGRATION

I would now like to ask you some questions about the languages you know and use.

45 What language or languages did you first learn as a child and still understand? Probe: Are there any others? [Please list them all.]

46 Please use the response card on page 9 for the following four questions. If you were asked to rate your ability to understand, speak, read and write English when you first arrived in Canada, would you say that you:

46a) Understood English:
    1. Very Well
    2. Well
    3. A Little
    4. Not at All

46b) Read English:
    1. Very Well
    2. Well
    3. A Little
    4. Not at All

46c) Spoke English:
    1. Very Well
    2. Well
    3. A Little
    4. Not at All

46d) Wrote English
    1. Very Well
    2. Well
    3. A Little
    4. Not at All

47 In what country did you learn to speak English? ____________________________

47a) How did you learn English there?
    1. in school
    2. in the workplace
    3. at home
    4. other (specify) ____________________________
Approximately how old were you when you learned to speak English well enough to have a conversation with someone, without too many problems? Were you ...

1. Less than 5 years old
2. Between 5 and 15 years old
3. Between 16 and 25 years old
4. Between 26 and 35 years old
5. Between 36 and 45 years old
6. Between 46 and 55 years old
7. Over 55 years old

Now, I would like to ask you a few questions about your use of English after coming to Canada.

Have you taken any language courses since coming to Canada?

1. YES  ➔ Go to 1i)
   i) If YES, was this program offered under the LINC system, Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada?
      (1) YES
      (2) NO

2. NO  ➔ Go to 2i)
   i) IF NO, Why have you NOT taken any of these courses?

Using the next card (page 10), answer the following four questions. How would you rate your ability to understand, speak, read and write in English at the present time?

50a) Understand English:
1. Better than when you arrived
2. About the same as when you arrived
3. Worse than when you arrived

50b) Read English:
1. Better than when you arrived
2. About the same as when you arrived
3. Worse than when you arrived

50c) Speak English:
1. Better than when you arrived
2. About the same as when you arrived
3. Worse than when you arrived
50d) Write English
1. Better than when you arrived
2. About the same as when you arrived
3. Worse than when you arrived

51 How important has it been/is it for you to learn English in your life? Would you say it is...
1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Not at all important

Sometimes people have difficulties because of their accent, or because they do not speak English well. I want to ask you about difficulties you may have had in certain situations.

52 Please use the next card (page 11) for the next three questions. Have you had any difficulty with your daily shopping, such as purchasing food?
1. considerable difficulty
2. some difficulty
3. little or no difficulty

53 Have you had difficulty getting a job because of your accent, or because you couldn’t speak English well enough?
1. considerable difficulty
2. some difficulty
3. little or no difficulty

54 Have you had difficulty reading and completing forms for the government or for other purposes?
1. considerable difficulty ➔ Go to 54b
2. some difficulty ➔ Go to 54b
3. little or no difficulty ➔ Go to 55

54b) When you need help in understanding and completing a form, what do you do? Who do you ask for help?
Religious Practices

55 If you were to describe your religion, what would you say?

1. No religion  ➔ Go to 57
2. Hindu (temple)
3. Sikh (gurdwara)
4. Islamic (mosque)
5. Buddhist (temple)
6. Catholic (church)
7. Christian (church)
8. Other (specify) ________________________

56 Turn to the next response card (page 12). Since coming to Canada, how often do you go to the temple, gurdwara, mosque or church on average? Would you say....

1. more than once a week?
2. at least once a week?
3. 2 or 3 times a month?
4. once a month?
5. a few times a year?
6. about once a year?
7. never?
PERSONALITY RESOURCES

Please turn to page 13 and use the scale to answer the following questions. I am going to read you a series of statements that people might use to describe themselves. Please listen to each statement and tell me the number that describes how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement.

57a) I believe that I have a number of good qualities

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Mildly Agree
4. Mildly Disagree
5. Disagree
6. Strongly Disagree

57b) I am able to do things as well as most other people

57c) All in all, I feel that I am a failure

57d) I have little control over the things that happen to me

57e) There is no way I can solve some of the problems I have

57f) I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life

57g) What happens to me mostly depends on me

57h) I can do just about anything I want to do

57i) When I get what I want, it is usually because I work hard for it

57j) I have little control over the bad things that happen to me

57k) I am responsible for my own success

57l) My misfortunes are the result of mistakes that I have made
FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND INTEGRATION

Now I would like to ask you some questions about the financial resources with which you and your family arrived in Canada. I would like to remind you that all of your answers are confidential and private.

58 Using the card of income categories on page 14, please read me the number of the category which is the best estimate of the amount of money you (and your family where applicable) brought into Canada when you arrived. Please give me the estimate in Canadian dollars.

1. No income
2. under $2,000
3. $2,000 to $4,999
4. $5,000 to $9,999
5. $10,000 to $14,999
6. $15,000 to $19,999
7. $20,000 to $24,999
8. $25,000 to $34,999
9. $35,000 to $44,999
10. $45,000 to $54,999
11. $55,000 to $64,999
12. $65,000 to $74,999
13. $75,000 to $84,999
14. $85,000 to $94,999
15. $95,000 to $114,999
16. $115,000 to $134,999
17. $135,000 and above

59 Did your country’s regulations restrict the amount of money you could bring with you to Canada?

1. NO
2. YES
   i) How much were you allowed to bring into Canada (in $Cnd)? _________

60 When you first arrived, did you have any other financial support, other than the money which you brought with you to Canada?

1. YES  → Go to 60b
2. NO  → Go to 61

60b) What other financial support did you have? Please describe it. [INTERVIEWER: Probe “Anyone else” if #1 is circled.]

1. financial help from someone I know - What is their name? __________________
2. a loan from a financial institution in Canada
3. other (specify) __________________
Financial Integration in Canada

Now I would like to ask you some questions relating to your financial well-being in Canada.

61 Please turn to the next card (page 15). Please read me the number of the category which is the best estimate of your ANNUAL personal employment income before taxes in Canada.

[INTERVIEWER: If respondent does not know their annual income, ask for their monthly or weekly income and write in the margin.]

1. No income
2. under $5,000
3. $5,000 to $9,999
4. $10,000 to $14,999
5. $15,000 to $19,999
6. $20,000 to $24,999
7. $25,000 to $34,999
8. $35,000 to $44,999
9. $45,000 to $54,999
10. $55,000 to $64,999
11. $65,000 to $74,999
12. $75,000 to $84,999
13. $85,000 to $94,999
14. $95,000 to $114,999
15. $115,000 to $134,999
16. $135,000 and above

62 Using the same card (page 15), please read me the number of the category which is the best estimate of your total ANNUAL household income before taxes in Canada.

[INTERVIEWER: As Above If respondent does not know their annual income.]

1. No income ➔ Go to 65
2. under $5,000
3. $5,000 to $9,999
4. $10,000 to $14,999
5. $15,000 to $19,999
6. $20,000 to $24,999
7. $25,000 to $34,999
8. $35,000 to $44,999
9. $45,000 to $54,999
10. $55,000 to $64,999
11. $65,000 to $74,999
12. $75,000 to $84,999
13. $85,000 to $94,999
14. $95,000 to $114,999
15. $115,000 to $134,999
16. $135,000 and above

63 How many people contribute to the total household income? #__________
64 Who is the main source of income in your household?

1. Respondent
2. Spouse/Partner
3. Both Respondent and Spouse/Partner
4. Father
5. Mother
6. Other Relative (specify) __________________________
7. Other (specify) __________________________

65 Since coming to Toronto, has your household experienced economic problems as a result of periods of unemployment of one or more household members?

1. NO → Go to 66
2. YES
   i) How have your financial problems affected your life? [INTERVIEWER: Probe: For example, have you had to borrow money? From whom? Stop buying certain items - which ones?]

   ii) What did you do? How did you deal with this problem? Who did you ask for help? [Please circle as many as apply. INTERVIEWER: Probe “Anyone else” if #1 is circled.]

   (1) someone I know - What is their name? __________________________
   (2) no one - didn’t ask for help → Go to Question 66
   (3) settlement agency
   (4) bank
   (5) other (specify) __________________________

66 Turn to page 16. Since your arrival to Toronto, has one or more adults in your household drawn any income from any of the following sources? [Please check all that apply.]

1. personal savings
2. help from family in Canada
3. help from family outside Canada
4. revenue from investments
5. Unemployment insurance
6. Scholarship (specify)
7. Welfare/Social Assistance
8. Family Allowance
9. pension
10. other (specify)
Turn to the next card (page 17). In terms of your material well-being, would you consider yourself and or your family to be better off, the same, or worse off than before you came to Canada?
[INTERVIEWER: This refers to the ‘things’ they have - car, home, disposable $]

1. Better off
2. About the same
3. Worse off

In terms of your quality of life, would you consider yourself and or your family to be better off, the same, or worse off than before you came to Canada? Please use the same card as above (page 17).
[INTERVIEWER: This refers to safety, freedom - more general than $]

1. Better off
2. About the same
3. Worse off
SPATIAL INTEGRATION

69  Who did you live with when you first arrived in Canada?

1. sponsor
2. immediate family member
3. extended family member
4. friend
5. own apartment or house
6. hotel
7. other temporary housing
8. other (specify) ____________

70  Have you moved since your first temporary lodgings?

1. YES  ➔ Go to 71
2. NO  ➔ Go to 70i)
   i) If you were looking for a place to live, how would you find one? Who would you ask for help?

   (1) no one - wouldn’t ask for help
   (2) someone I know - What is their name? ______________
   (3) religious leader at mosque, temple or church
   (4) newspaper or magazine
   (5) settlement agency
   (6) other (specify)

   ➔  NOW GO to 73

71  About how long did you live in this initial accommodation? _____________(days/weeks/months)

Now I would like to ask you about where you live now.

72  How long did it take you to find your present accommodation? ____________

73  What type of housing is it? (Apartment, single family dwelling, townhouse...)

1. apartment
2. single family dwelling
3. townhouse
4. condominium
5. other (specify)
74 How did you find this housing? Who did you ask for help? [Please circle as many as apply.]
INTERVIEWER: Probe “Anyone else” if #1 is circled.]

1. someone I know - What is their name? ____________________________
2. no one - did not ask for help → Go to Question 78
3. real estate agent
4. checked the newspaper
5. settlement agency
6. other (specify) ____________________________

75 Turn to page 18. How satisfied were you with the help you received?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat satisfied
4. Somewhat dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very dissatisfied

[INTERVIEWER: IF 74#5 is circled (settlement agency), Proceed; ELSE, Skip to 77.]

76 What type of settlement agency was it that helped you? Please describe it in detail.

76a) What type of service did this agency provide to you?

76b) Using the same response card (page 18), how satisfied were you with the help you received?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat satisfied
4. Somewhat dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very dissatisfied

[IF Respondent circled more than one source of help in 74, Proceed; ELSE, Skip to 78.]
77 Of the organizations or people that helped you find this housing, which one do you think provided the most useful assistance? Please explain your answer.

SOCIAL/POLITICAL INTEGRATION

78 Please turn to the next response card (page 19). Generally speaking, do the people living on your street and on neighbouring streets, talk mainly in.... Please circle one answer.

1. English
2. the same language as you
3. English and your language
4. the same language as you and another language other than English
5. English and a language other than yours
6. One or more languages, other than English

79 Turn to page 20. How friendly would you say that people in your neighbourhood are?

1. Very friendly to you
2. Fairly friendly to you
3. Neither friendly nor unfriendly
4. Fairly unfriendly to you
5. Very unfriendly to you

80 Since coming to Canada, have you found new friends to spend time with?

1. NO
2. YES

81 Are you satisfied with the number of friends you have made since coming to Canada?

1. NO  ⇒ Go to 81b
2. YES  ⇒ Go to 82

81b) If not, what do you think is preventing you from making as many friends as you would like? [INTERVIEWER: Please circle as many as apply.]

1. language barrier
2. too busy - family and work commitments
3. am not active in community, hard to meet people
4. people are unfriendly
5. don't have the money for a social life
6. other (specify) ___________________________
82 Using the next card in your booklet (page 21), how much do you feel like you belong in your local neighbourhood? Please explain why you feel this way.

1. Don’t belong at all
2. Belong a little bit
3. Completely belong

Now I would like to ask you about your involvement in community activities which are specific to your ethnic or cultural group.

83 Please use the next response card (page 22). On average, how much do you participate in ethnic community activities specific to your ethnic or cultural group? Would you say that you participate...

1. At least once a week
2. Every other week
3. Once a month
4. 6-10 times a year
5. Less than 6 times a year
6. Never

84 What types of activities are you involved in? Please describe them.

85 Turn to the next card (page 23). How satisfied are you with your involvement in your ethnic community?

1. Completely Dissatisfied
2. Dissatisfied
3. Somewhat Dissatisfied
4. Somewhat Satisfied
5. Satisfied
6. Completely Satisfied

[IF 1-4 are circled, Go to 85b; ELSE SKIP to Question 86.]

85b) What do you think could be done to improve your level of satisfaction?
Turn to page 24. How much do you feel like you belong in your ethnic community? Please explain why you feel this way below.

1. Don’t Belong at All
2. Belong a Little Bit
3. Completely Belong

HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

Many immigrants experience some feelings of loneliness or sadness after they arrive in Canada. Have you experienced any of these, or similar, feelings?

1. NO   → Go to 88
2. YES  → Go to 87b

87b) When you felt this way, did you call anyone for any emotional support?

1. YES  → Go to 1i)
   i) If YES, Who did you call? Please give me their name(s)

2. NO   → Go to 2i)
   i) If NO, Why didn’t you ask anyone for help when you were feeling this way?
   (1) didn’t have anyone to call
   (2) did not want to bother anyone
   (3) was too busy to ask for help
   (4) in my family, people don’t ask for that kind of help
   (5) other (specify) __________________________

Please turn to page 25. How would you describe your overall health since coming to Toronto? Please explain.

1. I feel very well
2. I feel well
3. I feel somewhat well
4. I feel somewhat unwell
5. I feel unwell
6. I feel very unwell

Using the same card, How would you describe your overall sense of well-being since coming to Toronto? Please explain.

1. I feel very well
2. I feel well
3. I feel somewhat well
4. I feel somewhat unwell
5. I feel unwell
6. I feel very unwell
SECTION D: USE OF THE SETTLEMENT SYSTEM

SETTLEMENT SERVICES

I would like to ask you about the services you have used during your settlement, and about your satisfaction with these services.

1. Did you know about any settlement services when you first arrived here?
   1. NO
   2. YES
      i) How did you find out about them?
         (1) someone I know - What is their name? ______________________
         (2) no one - didn’t ask for help
         (3) checked the newspaper
         (4) settlement agency
         (5) other (specify) ______________________

2. Have you used any settlement services such as language training or job training, orientation services, interpreter services -- anything to help you in your settlement?
   1. NO
      i) If you did NOT use one of these services, why not? Was it because you....
         [Please check all that apply.]
         (1) Didn’t need the service
         (2) Didn’t know about the service
         (3) Found the service to be too far from where you work and live
         (4) Didn’t have time to use the service
         (5) Were ineligible -- you didn’t qualify for the service
         (6) Other (specify) ______________________
      ii) Would you have liked to use some of these services?
         (1) YES
         (2) NO

   2. YES
      i) Please describe all of the services you have used in detail: what type was it (i.e. language, job training); did the service had a formal name (i.e. LINC, Futures Program); and where did you obtained the service (i.e. church, community centre, and the name of the community centre or agency if possible).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Formal Name of Service</th>
<th>Where Obtained Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Please turn to page 26. How satisfied were you with the service(s) you used? Feel free to explain your answer.

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat satisfied
4. Somewhat dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very dissatisfied

How did you find out about the service(s) you used? Who did you ask for help? [Please circle as many as apply. INTERVIEWER: Probe “Anyone else” if #1 is circled.]

1. someone I know - What is their name? __________________________
2. no one - didn’t ask for help
3. checked the newspaper
4. settlement agency
5. other (specify) __________________________

Please use the same satisfaction scale on page 26. How satisfied were you with the help you received in finding these services?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat satisfied
4. Somewhat dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very dissatisfied

If 4#4 settlement agency is circled, proceed with Question 6; Else, SKIP to Question 7.

What type of settlement agency was it that helped you? Please describe it in detail.

6a) What type of service did this agency provide to you?
If Respondent circled more than one source of help in 4, proceed; Else, SKIP to Question 8.

7 Of the organizations or people that helped you find out about these services, which one do you think provided the most useful assistance? Please explain your answer.

8 In what language(s) were you served?

9 Again, using the same card (page 26), how satisfied were you with this part of the service? Feel free to explain your answer.
   1. Very satisfied
   2. Satisfied
   3. Somewhat satisfied
   4. Somewhat dissatisfied
   5. Dissatisfied
   6. Very dissatisfied

10 If you could change the settlement service(s) in some way, in order to make them more useful, what would you change?

11 Are there any settlement services that you would be willing to pay for?
   1. YES
      i) What services? Please name them
      ii) Are you currently paying for any of these services?
         (1) NO
         (2) YES
         (a) Which ones are you paying for? Please list them
   2. NO
SECTION E: USE OF OTHER CANADIAN SOCIAL SERVICES

GENERAL SERVICES

Immigrants often have problems dealing with different tasks in their new countries, especially when they first arrive. Throughout this interview, we have discussed many of these areas already, and the problems you may have had.

1. Please turn to page 27. Now I will list several areas; I would like you to tell me who you would ask for help IF you had a problem in that area. Please give me the number beside each of the people you would ask for help.

1a) Education:

1. If you needed help finding a school for yourself, or for your children, who would you ask for help?

   i) no one - wouldn't ask for help
   ii) someone I know - What is their name? 
   iii) religious leader at mosque, temple or church
   iv) newspaper or magazine
   v) settlement agency
   vi) other (specify)

2. Have you asked this person or agency for help with such a problem since arriving here?
   i) YES
   ii) NO

1b) Language:

1. If you were having problems communicating or learning English, who would you ask for help?

   i) no one - wouldn't ask for help
   ii) someone I know - What is their name? 
   iii) religious leader at mosque, temple or church
   iv) newspaper or magazine
   v) settlement agency
   vi) other (specify)

2. Have you asked this person or agency for help with such a problem since arriving here?
   i) YES
   ii) NO
lc) Child Care:
1. If you had a small child and needed day care, who would you ask for help?
   i) no one - wouldn’t ask for help
   ii) someone I know - What is their name? ____________________________
   iii) religious leader at mosque, temple or church
   iv) newspaper or magazine
   v) settlement agency
   vi) other (specify)

2. Have you asked this person or agency for help with such a problem since arriving here?
   i) YES
   ii) NO

d) Settlement Programs:
1. If you needed support from settlement programs, how would you find out about them? Who would you ask for help?
   i) no one - wouldn’t ask for help
   ii) someone I know - What is their name? ____________________________
   iii) religious leader at mosque, temple or church
   iv) newspaper or magazine
   v) settlement agency
   vi) other (specify)

2. Have you asked this person or agency for help with such a problem since arriving here?
   i) YES
   ii) NO

e) Immigration Policy Regulations:
1. If you needed help understanding immigration policy regulations, who would you ask for help?
   i) no one - wouldn’t ask for help
   ii) someone I know - What is their name? ____________________________
   iii) religious leader at mosque, temple or church
   iv) newspaper or magazine
   v) settlement agency
   vi) other (specify)

2. Have you asked this person or agency for help with such a problem since arriving here?
   i) YES
   ii) NO
HEALTH CARE

The following questions ask you about your use of the health care system.

2 Have you obtained a health card since coming to Toronto?

1. YES → Go to 1i)
   i) Did anyone help you apply for the card — i.e. give you information on the types of forms required, or show you where the Ministry of Health is located?
      (1) NO → Go to 3
      (2) YES → Go to 2a)
         (a) Who helped you? Please give me their name(s) ____________________________

2. NO → Go to 2i)
   i) Why have you NOT obtained a health card? [Circle all that apply.]
      (1) does not know how to obtain card
      (2) has not been ill, not needed card
      (3) has delayed applying for card because of time-consuming process
      (4) other (specify) ____________________________

3 Have you obtained health cards for your other family members since coming to Toronto?

1. YES
2. NO → Go to 3b
3. Non Applicable

3b) Why have you NOT obtained their health cards? [Circle all that apply.]

1. same reasons as above
2. other (specify) ____________________________

4 Since arriving in Toronto, have you required the services of a doctor or other health care practitioner for yourself or a family member? (INTERVIEWER: Please include alternative health care practitioners).

1. YES → Go to 2i)
2. NO → Go to 2i)
   i) IF you had a health problem and needed a doctor, how would you find one? Who would you ask for help?
      (1) no one - wouldn’t ask for help
      (2) someone I know - What is their name? ____________________________
      (3) religious leader at mosque, temple or church
      (4) newspaper or magazine
      (5) settlement agency
      (6) other (specify)

→ NOW Go to Section F
5  Did you get help for this problem?

   1. YES
   2. NO
   i) If NO, Why not? What prevented you from doing so? Please explain.

6  Who was the visit to the doctor for? [Check all that apply.]

   1. Self
   2. Child
   3. Spouse
   4. Parent
   5. Friend
   6. Other (specify) ____________________________

7  Was this doctor a member of your ethnic group (or from same country of origin)?

   1. YES
   2. NO

8  What language(s) did you speak with this person?

9  Did you have any difficulty communicating with this person?

   1. YES  ➔ Go to 9b)
   2. NO  ➔ Go to 10

9b) If YES, please describe the problems you had.

10 How did you find out about this health practitioner? Who did you ask for help? [Please circle as many as apply. INTERVIEWER: Probe “Anyone else” if respondent circles #1.]

   1. someone I know - What is their name? ____________________________
   2. no one - didn’t ask for help
   3. checked the newspaper
   4. settlement agency
   5. other (specify) ____________________________
11 Turn to page 28. How satisfied were you with the help you received?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat satisfied
4. Somewhat dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very dissatisfied

If 10#4 settlement agency is circled, proceed with Question 12; Else, SKIP to Question 13.

12 What type of settlement agency was it that helped you? Please describe it in detail.

12a) What type of service did this agency provide to you?

12b) Again, use the same card (page 28). How satisfied were you with this service?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Somewhat satisfied
4. Somewhat dissatisfied
5. Dissatisfied
6. Very dissatisfied

13 Would you return to that health practitioner in the future if you required her or his services?

1. YES
2. NO
i) Why not? Please explain.

14 Are there any other comments you would like to make about your use of the health care system since your arrival?
SECTION F: RACISM IN CANADA

EXPERIENCE WITH RACISM AND PREJUDICE

Now I have a couple of questions about your general experiences in Canada, experiences which are common to many Canadians, as well as to many immigrants.

1 Have you ever experienced any type of negative behaviour from other people, such as insults or physical threat, because of your ethnic origin, the colour of your skin, because you do not speak English with a Canadian accent, or because you are an immigrant?

1. YES  ➔ Go to 2
2. NO  ➔ Go to 5

2 Please describe the incident(s) - can you tell me what happened exactly?

2a) Has this happened to you often?

1. YES
2. NO

3 How did you deal with this experience? Who did you ask for help? [Please circle as many as apply.
INTERVIEWER: Probe “Anyone else” if respondent circles #1.]

1. someone I know - What is their name? ________________________________
2. no one - didn’t ask for help ➔ Go to Question 3b
3. called the police
4. other (specify) ________________________________

3b) Please explain why you did not seek help.
4 Please use the same satisfaction card on page 28. How satisfied were you with the assistance you received?

   1. Very satisfied
   2. Satisfied
   3. Somewhat satisfied
   4. Somewhat dissatisfied
   5. Dissatisfied
   6. Very dissatisfied

5 Have you ever experienced any other forms of prejudice or discrimination since coming to Canada?

   1. YES  ➔ Go to 5b
   2. NO   ➔ Go to 7

5b) IF YES, Please describe any other experiences you might have had.

5c) Is this something you experience often? Was this a common experience for you?

6 Please turn to the next card (page 29). Would you say that overall, your experience in Canada has been...

   1. Much better than expected
   2. Better than expected
   3. About what you expected
   4. Worse than expected
   5. Much worse than expected

7 Are there any other issues or problems which were not covered by this interview which you think are important for people to know, in order to be able to understand the experience of recent migrants to Toronto?
Question 7 (continued)
SECTION G: DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL NETWORK

Now I would like to get some information on the people you have named as having helped you, and on the people you named as being potential helpers if you were to need assistance. I would like to ask you about them, the quality of your relationship, and the types of activities you do together. I would like to remind you that this discussion is confidential, and that we are only interested in the person’s first name. We will not be contacting them.

Do you have any questions about this part of the interview before we begin?

INTERVIEWER: Transcribe the names mentioned earlier to the network questionnaire. Read these names to the respondent, then ask the following questions.

1. I would like to make sure I have the names of everyone that has helped you.

1a) Now, besides the people you have already mentioned, are there any others that you feel have significantly assisted your settlement in Toronto? If so, please give me their first name now.

1b) Finally, besides these people, is there anyone who YOU have significantly assisted since coming to Toronto, such as lending money, providing temporary housing?

PROBE: Is there anyone else?

INTERVIEWER: Ask the following questions of each network member mentioned.

DEMographics

First, I would like to get some more detailed information about the people you have named.

2. What is your relationship to each of the people you have named? Are they a friend, a sister or uncle, a co-worker, a neighbour, or something else? LIST ALL THAT APPLY.

3. I just want to make sure I have the right sex down by each name. (NAME) is male/female? (Check based on name of tie).

4. How old is (NAME)? PROBE: What is your best guess?

5. When did you first meet (NAME)? What year was that?
6 Please turn to page 30. Where does (NAME) live? Would you say...

1. The same house
2. The same neighbourhood
3. The same city
4. Within 100 miles
5. More than 100 miles away

7 Turn to the next card (page 31). How often do you see (NAME)? Would you say...

1. Not at all in the past year
2. Less than once a month
3. Once a month or so
4. Every other week
5. Once or twice a week
6. Several times a week
7. Daily

8 Using the same card (page 31), how often do you talk to (NAME) on the phone? Please use the same categories as in the last question.

1. Not at all in the past year
2. Less than once a month
3. Once a month or so
4. Every other week
5. Once or twice a week
6. Several times a week
7. Daily

9 Turn to page 32. To the best of your knowledge, what does (NAME) do now? Is s/he working for pay now, retired, a student, a homemaker, or something else?

1. Working full-time
2. Working part-time
3. Temporarily laid-off
4. Looking for work
5. Student
6. Retired
7. Homemaker
8. Other (specify) ________________

10 What kind of work does (NAME) do? (Write job title in box; code 9 if DK, skip if not employed).

11 On average, has (NAME) been employed consistently over the past year?

1. YES
2. NO

12 What was the highest grade of schooling completed by (NAME)? (write in box; code 9 if DK).
13 Where was (NAME) born (write in box; code 9 if DK)?

14 How long has (NAME) lived in Canada? What is your best guess?

15 What is (NAME)'s ethnicity? Is S/he a member of the same ethnic group as yourself? Please give your best guess.

   1. Same ethnicity as respondent
   2. Other (specify) __________

STRENGTH AND CONFLICT

Please turn to page 33. Now I would like to know something about your relationship with each of these people. For each statement below, please tell me the number on the card which best describes your relationship with each of these people.

16 I feel very close to (NAME)

   1. Very true
   2. True
   3. Somewhat true
   4. Not true at all

17 Sometimes I feel that I cannot completely rely on (NAME).

18 I sometimes feel that (NAME) makes too many demands on me.

19 If I was in trouble and needed help, I know that I could count on (NAME) to be there for me.

20 (NAME) and I often have disagreements about customs or traditions practiced by my ethnic group.

RECIPROCITY

Turn to the next card (page 34). Now, I'd like to ask you about the types of help or support that you and your friends and family give to one another. Please read me the number on the card which best describes your answer.

21 How often has (NAME) given you emotional support when you were discouraged or sad? Would you say...

   1. Never
   2. Once or twice
   3. Several times
   4. Many times

21b) How often have YOU supported (NAME) when they were discouraged or sad?

22 How often has (NAME) ever loaned or given you money?

22a) How often have YOU ever loaned or given money to (NAME)?
23 Has (NAME) ever given you information on possible job openings?
23a) Have YOU ever given (NAME) job information?

24 Has (NAME) ever helped you find services or organizations related to your settlement in Toronto?
24a) Have YOU ever helped (NAME) find services or organizations related to their settlement in Toronto?

25 Has (NAME) ever helped you find a place to live in Toronto?
25a) Have YOU ever helped (NAME) find a place to live Toronto?

26 How often do you and (NAME) have arguments or disagreements?

MULTIPLEXITY

Use the same card (page 34). Now I’d like to ask you some questions about the types of situations where you see the people we have been talking about, during the last year. Please select the number on the scale which best reflects how often you see these people in each situation. In the past year,

27 How often did you see (NAME) in each other’s homes or in the homes of friends or family?

1. Never
2. Once or twice
3. Several times
4. Many times

28 How often have you and (NAME) participated in leisure activities together, like playing or watching sports, going to movies, a party, the pub, or other special social occasions?

1. Never
2. Once or twice
3. Several times
4. Many times

29 How often have you and (NAME) seen each other at work or at school?

1. Never
2. Once or twice
3. Several times
4. Many times

30 How often have you and (NAME) participated in an organization, club or cultural event specific to your ethnic group?

1. Never
2. Once or twice
3. Several times
4. Many times
DENSITY

**INTERVIEWER: Transfer network member names to the density matrix.**

31 Turn to the last card (page 35). Finally, I would like to know if, and how well, these people know each other. Please select the number which best describes the relationship between each of the people we have discussed:

1. Don’t know each other
2. Just acquaintances
3. Know each other well
4. Know each other very well

This concludes the interview. I just have a couple of last questions for you.

32 Would you be willing to be reconctacted at some point in the future to discuss any changes that have occurred in your life. This contact would be a 15 minute phone call, sometime in the next couple of years.

1. YES
2. NO

33 How did you find out about the study?

1. settlement agency (name) ________________________________
2. I was sent a letter/called ________________________________
3. referred by another person - who? ________________________________

34 If you can think of anyone else who might be interested in being interviewed, we would really appreciate it if you would encourage them to give us a call, and if you could pass the number of the study on to that person. However, they CANNOT be a relation or a very close friend.

Once again, I would like to thank you for your participation. We really appreciate the time you have taken to tell us about your experiences. And as for the lottery, it will probably be help in the Fall.

**INTERVIEWER -- RECORD TIME:**

**GO TO NEXT PAGE AFTER INTERVIEW IS COMPLETED!!!!!!**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTERVIEWER: Rate Respondent’s accent privately</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Very pronounced, hard to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Pronounced, but can understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Moderate, but fairly easy to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Minimal, barely noticeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTERVIEWER: Rate respondent’s language ability privately</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER COMMENTS:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF NETWORK MEMBER</th>
<th>Tie #</th>
<th>1. Question Generated Name</th>
<th>2. Type of Relationship</th>
<th>3. Sex</th>
<th>4. Age</th>
<th>5. Year First Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF NETWORK MEMBER</td>
<td>Tie #</td>
<td>16. Feel very close to</td>
<td>17. Cannot completely rely on</td>
<td>18. Too many demands on me</td>
<td>19. If in trouble, could count on</td>
<td>20. Disagreements and arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T→R</td>
<td>R→T</td>
<td>T→R</td>
<td>R→T</td>
<td>T→R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T→R</td>
<td>R→T</td>
<td>T→R</td>
<td>R→T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETWORK MEMBER NAME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Don't know each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Just acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Know each other well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Know each other very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you say very well, that they are just acquaintances, or they don't know each other?