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Abstract

In examining the economic and social integration of Chinese immigrants in Calgary and Edmonton, this study reveals that recent immigrants have encountered multi-faceted barriers, particularly in employment and language. Furthermore, they have experienced deskilling and devaluation of their prior learning and work experience after immigrating to Canada. As a consequence, many have suffered unemployment and underemployment, poor economic performance, and downward social mobility, which has adversely hindered their integration process. Immigrants’ negative experience can be attributed to a triple glass effect consisting of a glass gate, glass door, and glass ceiling. While a glass gate denies immigrants’ entrance to guarded professional communities, a glass door blocks immigrants’ access to professional employment at high-wage firms. It is the glass ceiling which prevents immigrants from moving up to management positions because of their ethnic and cultural differences. This study calls for the adoption of an inclusive framework that works toward recognizable justice in balancing freedom of mobility with recognition and full membership in Canada.
Introduction

Canada has a rich history in hosting immigrants, and immigration continues to play a strategic role in shaping the country’s future. However, Canada’s immigration system today is plagued by at least three prominent issues. First, immigrants are unevenly distributed across Canada; consequently most are concentrated in Canada’s large metropolitan areas. The most recent Canadian census reveals that between 2001 and 2006, 1.1 million new immigrants arrived, and almost 70% chose to live in Canada’s three largest cities: Toronto, Vancouver and Montréal (Statistics Canada, 2007). In comparison, only one third of Canada’s total population live in these cities. High concentrations of recent immigrants put pressure on the hosting communities to provide adequate housing, employment, education, and social services to assist new arrivals with their settlement and adaptation. Because of the imbalances created by these concentrated communities of immigrants, we have witnessed the emergence of Canada’s “new solitudes” which are dividing the country into multicultural metropolitans and mono-cultural others.

A second concern facing Canada, partially owing to the imbalanced distribution just described, is that Canada’s immigration policies tend to favour the large, mega-cities. The situation of medium- and small-sized Canadian cities is being largely ignored. Given that immigration is increasing in smaller metropolitan areas, the second- and third-tier immigrant-receiving cities, such as Calgary and Edmonton, require more attention and recognition from researchers and policymakers. The third issue facing Canada’s immigration concerns how research about immigrants has been carried out in the past. Because the majority of immigrants settled in three major metropolitan areas, research has also primarily focused on these areas. With a few exceptions (Cook & Pruegger, 2003; Krahn, Derwing & Abu-Laban, 2005), the experiences of immigrants in second- and third-tier cities have been largely overlooked by researchers. This has created a large gap in immigration scholarship. As the process of immigrant settlement and integration is inherently local, conclusions arrived upon at the national level focusing on Canada’s large metropolitans underestimate the real impact felt in specific urban areas (Frideres, 2006). Hence, there is a clear and significant need for research focusing on second- and third-tier cities in Canada.

Against this backdrop, this study aims to address an important gap in immigration studies by exploring the economic and social integration of recent immigrants from the People’s
Republic of China who have settled in Calgary and Edmonton. The article is organized into five parts. A review of literature focusing on immigration in the age of globalization is followed by contextual information pertaining to Canada’s immigration policy and the history of Chinese immigrants in Canada. The article then discusses the research methodology. Next, it reports the findings of the study. Finally, a discussion of the results is presented, along with policy implications.

**Globalization of Migration**

Contemporary transnational migration is fuelled by conditions brought about by processes of globalization. The integration of the world economy has required the mobility of people across national boundaries as “global nomads” (Jordan & Düvell, 2003). Conceived thus, migration is less about a choice of work than “a requirement of, a response to and a resistance against, global institutional transformations and the integration of the world economy” (p. 63). Globalization and migration, then, are inextricably intertwined. Where migration is a response to globalization, globalization accelerates migration. Castles and Miller (2009) use the term “globalization of migration” to describe the tendency for more and more countries to be crucially affected by migratory movements at the same time. It is therefore necessary to first examine the phenomenon of globalization, in particular its relationship with migration.

Globalization is a contested concept that incites ongoing controversy (McGrew, 2007; Robertson & White, 2007). It is not surprising then, that there is no agreed-upon definition. Attempts at definition focus on the following dimensions: speed and time, processes and flows, space, and increasing integration and interconnection (Ritzer, 2007). Careful negotiation of these aspects leads Ritzer to a definition of globalization as “an accelerating set of processes involving flows that encompass ever-greater numbers of the world’s spaces and that lead to increasing integration and interconnectivity among those spaces” (p. 1). The genesis of contemporary globalization can be traced to the early 1970s, a period that included the development and rise of sophisticated information technology, economic competition from Japan, the demise of the Bretton Woods Agreement, and the oil crisis (Jarvis, 2002). According to Robertson and White (2007), globalization is comprised of four major dimensions: the economic, the social, the political, and the cultural.

Jarvis (2007) describes the globalization process in terms of a global substructure, and the exercise of centralized power over the world’s superstructure through transnational corporations.
The global substructure consists of the economic system as well as the technological one; the world’s superstructure includes everything else in the social and cultural life (e.g., the state, culture). The technological-economic core has the power to advertise its products globally, and to generate an enormous market for its products. For Jarvis, this powerful core is protected by the political and military might of the United States, and through the institutions over which it exercises hegemonic control (e.g., World Bank, IMF). Through political, military and institutional might, the substructure exercises power over the superstructure at international, national, local and individual levels. In discussing its outcomes, Jarvis maintains that globalization has led to an increasing degree of standardization, McDonaldization, and Americanization. To be more specific, through investment, transnational corporations exercise power economically and politically without regard to national boundaries, a consequence of which is an ever-greater degree of standardization between countries in the superstructure. The McDonaldization model has created mass production, mass selling and mass consumption. However, Jarvis argues, it is technology that provides the means by which this is achieved. By generating and providing the necessary knowledge for the production of consumer commodities, the substructure controls both the knowledge and capital required for an increasingly unfettered market economy. Some scholars draw attention to the ways in which markets and deregulation produce greater wealth at the price of increased inequality (Appadurai, 2002). There is evidence to suggest that we are experiencing widening gaps between the “haves” and the “have nots” in global society, devastating environmental problems, declining civic participation and community, and increasing mistrust and alienation among citizenries (Welch, 2001). Global capitalism, it seems, has created a global society that is unequal and unjust (Jarvis, 2002).

According to Anderson (2002), one of the new world disorders created by globalization is mass migration. It is estimated that about 3% of the world’s population, about 200 million people, live outside their countries of birth (Castles & Miller, 2009). Because resources are not equally distributed across the globe, migration tends to move from less developed nations to advanced industrial countries. According to recent OECD annual reports (OECD, 2007, 2008), net migration from outside the OECD to OECD countries is steadily rising. In terms of permanent migration, averages have grown from 790,000 persons per year between 1956 and 1976, to 1.24 million per year during 1977-1990, to 2.65 million per year from 1991 to 2003. Numbers in 2006 reached 4 million. Temporary migration is also increasing, but at a slower pace.
than permanent-type migration, sitting at 2.5 million in 2006. It is important to note that 57% of immigrant inflows in Europe were of European origin, while movements from Asia to OECD countries outside of Europe accounted for almost 50% of total flows to that area. In terms of source countries, the top twenty countries of origin accounted for fully 60% of all inflows in 2006, with China (10.7%), Poland (5.3%), and Romania (4.6%) at the top of the list. As a result, the foreign-born population of OECD countries reached 12% of the total population in 2006, with Australia leading at 22.2%, followed by Canada at 19.8% (Statistics Canada, 2007).

Castles and Miller (2009) identify six trends in contemporary migration. The first is the “globalization of migration” – increasing numbers of countries are affected by migratory movements with entrants from a broad spectrum of economic, social and cultural backgrounds. The “acceleration of migration” shows that the international movements of people are growing in volume in all regions. The third trend, the “differentiation of migration”, indicates that more countries have diversified their intake of immigrants to include a whole range of types. The “feminization of migration,” the fourth trend identified by Castles and Miller, demonstrates that, particularly since the 1960s, women play a significant role in all regions and in most types of migration. The growing “ politicization of migration” suggests that domestic politics, bilateral and regional relationships, and national security policies of states are increasingly affected by international migration. The last of these trends is the “proliferation of migration transition” that occurs when traditional lands of emigration become lands of transit for both migration and immigration. Taken together, these trends highlight the links between migratory flows and economic, political and cultural change in the context of globalization.

In Canada, recent trends of migration mirror those identified by Castles and Miller (2009). Canada has benefited from the globalization, acceleration, differentiation and feminization of migration. Canada has an aging population, migration has supplied one-fifth (21.2%) of the country’s total labour force between 2001 and 2006 (Statistics Canada, 2008b). As the globalization of migration intensifies, Canada has joined an international competition for the most talented, skilful, and resourceful workers. Among recent immigrants to Canada (2001-2006), over half (51%) had a university degree – twice the proportion of degree holders among the Canadian-born population (20%) (Statistics Canada, 2008c). It is worth noting that among recent immigrants aged 25 to 64, many held doctoral (49%) and master’s (40%) degrees. Despite Canada’s preference for highly skilled immigrants and the fact that immigrant professionals
bring significant human capital resources to Canada, many well-educated migrants have encountered difficulties in integrating into Canadian society and the Canadian labour market. Upon arriving in Canada, many immigrants find their prior learning and work experience undervalued or unrecognized. A number of studies reveal that immigrant professionals hit a “glass ceiling” in the career and socio-economic mobility (Pendakur & Pendakur, 2007; Pendakar & Woodcock, 2010; Wong & Wong, 2006).

The “glass ceiling” metaphor was introduced in the late 1970s as a way of understanding the barriers confronting American women in moving up the corporate hierarchy (Wong & Wong, 2006). It is called glass ceiling because “one can see through it to a desired management position but cannot go through the impenetrable barrier that it represents” (Wong, 2006, p.23). It was not until the late 1980s that the term was broadened to include issues of racial discrimination in the workplace. According to Wong and Wong (2006), research on barriers for visible minorities in Canada is often presented under rubrics of systemic racism and unequal access rather than via the glass ceiling concept per se. In recent years, however, there has been an emerging body of research in Canada and elsewhere applying this concept to analyze immigrants’ experience (Albrecht, Björklund & Vroman, 2003; de la Rica, Dolado & Llorens, 2005; McCoy and Masuch, 2007; Pendakur & Pendakur, 2007; Pendakar & Woodcock, 2010; Wong, 2006; Wong & Wong, 2006).

In a Calgary-based study, Wong and Wong (2006) found the existence of a glass ceiling for Chinese engineers in Canadian firms. They report that a significant proportion of Chinese engineers perceived and experienced a glass ceiling owing to their ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent or religion. They are under-represented in management, and the higher the management level, the greater was the under-representation they perceived. Glass ceilings also restricted many talented Chinese in Silicon Valley from rising to management positions, which consequently forced many to start their own businesses (Wong, 2006). Pendakur and Pendakur (2007) used the glass ceiling concept to analyze earnings disparity between white Canadians and visible minorities. They found evidence of glass ceiling for older and more educated visible minority men in comparison with similar white men owing to the limited access of the former group to high-wage jobs.

Spinning off from the concept of glass ceiling, other terms have been introduced to describe barriers facing immigrants, such as a “glass/sticky floor” (de la Rica, Dolado & Llorens,
2005), a “glass wall” (McCoy & Masuch, 2007), and a “glass door” (Pendakur & Woodcock, 2010). The glass floor or sticky floor is often used to account for factors that keep immigrants in low-level, low-wage jobs and prevent them from obtaining upward career mobility (de la Rica, Dolado & Llorens, 2005). In examining the experience of well-educated immigrant women seeking work in non-regulated professional occupations, McCoy and Masuch (2007) found that they encountered a “glass wall” – an invisible barrier that kept them on the outside. Furthermore, Pendakur and Woodcock (2010) argue that glass ceilings are often driven in large measure by “glass doors,” a metaphor that describes the barriers that limit disadvantaged workers’ access to employment at high-wage firms. Just as a glass ceiling truncates the distribution of wages, Pendakur and Woodcock argue, a glass door truncates the distribution of firms at which an educated immigrant worker might find employment. In keeping with this body of research, this study aims to further explore immigrants’ downward social mobility by focusing on the experiences of Mainland Chinese, and determining the extent to which glass ceiling and related effects apply to this group.

**Contextual Information**

To understand the experience of recent Chinese in Canada, it is important to trace the history of Chinese immigrants in Canada, Canada’s immigration policies, and the interconnections between these. The Chinese are one of the oldest immigrant groups in Canada, and the history of the Chinese in Canada reflects, and is shaped by, a long historic trajectory of Canadian immigration policies. From the Confederation of Canada in 1867 to the 1960s, the selection of immigrants in Canada was based on racial background, with British and Western Europeans being deemed the most desirable citizens. Asians and Africans were considered unassimilable and, therefore, undesirable. To illustrate, the Canadian government brought in Chinese workers to build the railroad so fundamental to the expansion of the West, but imposed a head tax in 1885 to keep out their families and passed a restrictive *Chinese Immigration Act* in 1923 that virtually prohibited Chinese immigration into Canada until its repeal in 1947. Thus since very early in Canada’s history immigration has served as a means of social, racial, and ideological control. In deciding who are the most desirable and admissible, the state sets the parameters for the social, cultural, and symbolic boundaries of the nation.
The post-war period marked the beginning of a new era in Canada’s immigration history. By the mid-1960s, Canada was experiencing “the greatest postwar boom” in Canadian history (Whitaker, 1991, p.18). Skilled labour was required to help Canada build its expanding economy, but Europe, the traditional source of immigrants, was caught up in post-war economic recovery and unable to meet Canadian demand. The Canadian government thus turned its recruitment efforts to traditionally restricted areas: Third World countries. In 1967, a point system was introduced by the Liberal government that based the selection of immigrants on their education, skills, and resources rather than their racial and religious backgrounds. This new system represented “a historic watershed,” and “did establish at the level of formal principle that Canadian immigration policy is ‘colour blind’” (Whitaker, 1991, p.19). The point system was successful in reversing the pattern of immigration from Europe in favour of Asia and other Third World countries. By the mid-1970s, more immigrants arrived from the Third World than from the developed world. The largest number came from Asia, followed by the Caribbean, Latin America, and Africa. Many among the Asian group were from Hong Kong. In fact, Canada admitted 30,546 Chinese immigrants between 1956 and 1967, a number that increased to 90,118 between 1968 and 1976 (Li, 1998). Because the People’s Republic of China had been isolated from the rest of the world since its founding in 1949, Hong Kong had been the source of two-thirds of the total immigrants from Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Mainland China.

Additional major shifts occurred in the last two decades of the 20th century. In the late 1980s, a business immigration program was created to favour an entrepreneurial class of immigrants who would invest in Canada’s continuous economic development. This program attracted a large number of entrepreneurs and investors from Hong Kong and Taiwan. Since the mid-1990s immigrant selection practices in Canada have shifted to favour economic and skilled immigrants over family-class immigrants and refugees. As a result, economic class immigrants made up more than half of all immigrants admitted throughout the late 1990s. Among them, a considerable number were highly educated immigrant professionals, particularly scientists and engineers. This new shift was based on the assumption that economic immigrants brought more human capital with them than family-class immigrants and refugees and were therefore more valuable and desirable (Li, 2003a). This shift has clearly influenced the sharp increase of independent immigrants from mainland China. Mainland immigrants outnumbered those from Hong Kong and Taiwan in 1998, and became the top source country of immigrants with an
annual intake of around 30,000 people. It is not clear, however, how recent Chinese immigrants are doing in Canada. It is hoped that findings from this study will provide further knowledge of the economic and social integration of mainland Chinese immigrants in Canada, many of whom are well-educated and highly credentialed professionals.

Research Methodology

The study was guided by the following research questions:

- Who are the recent Chinese immigrants in Calgary and Edmonton?
- What motivated them to move to Canada?
- How are they adapting to a society that is very different from their own? Have they encountered any difficulties in their integration process? If so, what are they?
- In what areas do they need most help? Where do they usually go for help? In particular, what suggestions do they have for government organizations concerning what could be done to help them integrate into Canadian society more effectively?

To answer these questions, a questionnaire approach was adopted. The same instrument was used in both Calgary and Edmonton. The questionnaire was designed to explore the above questions in great depth than census data, which traditionally provides secondary sources to assess the experience of immigrants, particularly their economic performance. It also maximizes the number of responses that can be gathered within a reasonably short period of time. The questionnaire was divided into four sections: i) basic demographic information; ii) motivation for immigrating to Canada; iii) their integration experience including their level of satisfaction with Canada and its employment situation; and iv) concluding remarks. The first section sought to profile participants with respect to age, sex, place of birth, current residence, citizenship status, immigrant category, marital status, family members, and education background. The second section aimed to examine reasons for immigrating to Canada. It included participants’ length of stay in Canada, expenses related to moving, motivations for moving to Canada, and whether participants had achieved the original goals they had established for themselves. The third section, the core of the questionnaire, focussed on participants’ integration experiences in Canada, including economic and social integration, and asked participants to identify areas in which they needed more support. The last section consisted of open-ended questions, which
invite participants to comment more generally on changes that need to be made in order to help immigrants integrate into Canadian society more effectively.

The questionnaire contained 56 questions. These provided the primary data for a comprehensive assessment of participants’ immigration experiences. It was made available in both English and Chinese. Participants were recruited through immigrant service organizations and churches where Chinese immigrants were more likely to congregate. Records from Canada’s Landed Immigrant Data System (now Permanent Resident Data System) guided a purposeful selection of economically active, Chinese-born Canadian immigrants, aged 20 to 65. The study was conducted in two stages, and a total of 255 completed questionnaires were received. During the first stage, from October 2004 to June 2005, 124 questionnaires were collected from Edmonton. Another 131 were received from participants in Calgary in the second stage from October 2005 to June 2007. SPSS was used to analyze all data.

The reasons for choosing Calgary and Edmonton were twofold. First, as already mentioned, Calgary and Edmonton, as second-tier immigrant receiving cities, require greater attention by researchers and policymakers, since both are receiving increasing number of immigrants. In particular, the booming Alberta oil and gas industry over the past decade has created significant labour demand. Both Edmonton and Calgary have sought a large number of immigrant professionals, particularly scientists and engineers, to help ameliorate their labour shortages. As a result, nearly one in every four Calgary residents (22.2%) belongs to a visible minority group, ranking fourth nationally; two-thirds of its visible minorities were born outside Canada (Statistics Canada, 2008a). Ranking fifth is Edmonton, with 17.5% of its population as visible minorities. The second reason for choosing Edmonton and Calgary is that the Chinese are the largest visible minority in Alberta (26.5%). Calgary and Edmonton rank fourth and fifth nationally in receiving Chinese immigrants, behind Toronto, Vancouver and Montréal (Statistics Canada, 2008a). Because many of the existing studies pertaining to Chinese immigrants focus on the top three cities (Guo & DeVoretz, 2006; Ley, 2010; Man & Preston, 1999; Salaff, Greve & Wong, 2001; Wang & Lo, 2005; Waters, 2003), little is known about the settlement and integration experiences of this immigrant group in prairie cities. Therefore, the focus on recent Chinese immigrants in Calgary and Edmonton is timely and strategic.
Report of Findings

Characteristics of Recent Chinese Immigrants

Drawing from the Landed Immigrant Data System that contains all landing records of individual immigrants, Guo and DeVoretz (2006a) analyzed the changing characteristics of Chinese immigrants to Canada between 1980 and 2001. The authors show that Chinese immigrants to Canada are a substantially different group from their predecessors. Chinese immigrants are no longer a homogeneous group coming from the rural areas of Guangdong and Fujian provinces. Instead, they come from different parts of the world and different walks of life, with the majority from PR China (49.7%), Hong Kong (37.5%), and Taiwan (12.4%). Among more recent Chinese immigrants, females (52.1%) slightly outnumbered males; the majority arrived in Canada at their working age of 20-60 (65.4%); and about one third (30%) came under the independent class. Another noteworthy development was the large number with post-secondary education (43%). Among the mainland Chinese, more immigrants in the family class arrived in the 1980s. However, since the mid-1990s, an unprecedented number of independent immigrant professionals with post-secondary education (60.5%) have been admitted into Canada.

Participant demographics from the current study are similar overall to those reported by Guo and DeVoretz, although there are some differences. Fifty-one percent (51.4%) of the 255 completed questionnaires were received from Calgary, and the rest from Edmonton (48.6%), which reflects the difference between the two cities in receiving Chinese immigrants in the past. There were slightly more females (50.6%) than males (49.4%). The age of this group is much younger than that of the cohort previously reported by Guo and DeVoretz (2006a) with 82% between the prime working age of 26-45 and a mean age of 34 (see Figure 1). This is exactly the age group that Canada targets with its immigration programs. The majority came as skilled immigrants (68.3%) and only 18.3% came under family reunification. These figures reflect Canada’s preference, in recent years, for economic and skilled immigrants over family-class immigrants and refugees. With respect to the two-city difference, Calgary (79.8%) attracted more skilled immigrants than Edmonton (56.1%).
In terms of educational background, the overwhelming majority of participants (95.2%) came with post-secondary education. Of particular interest are those with bachelors (49.4%), masters (19.4%) and doctoral degrees (13.4%), adding up to 82.2% of the sample (see Figure 2). While Calgary attracted more immigrants with bachelors (53.8%), Edmonton had a bigger share of those with masters and doctoral degrees (39.8%). Statistics Canada (2008c) reports that among recent immigrants to Canada between 2001 and 2006, over half (51%) had a university degree – twice the proportion of degree holders among the Canadian-born population (20%). Recent arrivals from China constitute a highly educated group to an extent that they can be labelled “the model minority,” a contested American term used to describe the high educational and occupational achievements of the Japanese and Chinese and their successful assimilation into North American culture (Wong & Wong, 2006). Drawing from the 2001 Census data, Wong and Wong found that despite a relatively large proportion of Chinese who had completed university (34.8%), there was no evidence to support the model minority thesis. Compared with the earlier immigrants who arrived before the 2001 census, recent mainland Chinese constitute a different calibre of immigrants who have come, collectively, with tremendous human capital. The crucial question is whether they will be able to fully exploit their education and skills in Canada. The model minority thesis claims that these recent immigrants should expect their high
educational attainment to deliver in terms of occupational achievement and upward social mobility. As will be shown, this scenario has, to date, been overly optimistic.

When asked where they had received their highest level of education, more than three-quarters (78%) indicated China, and 16.1% stated they had obtained their highest credential in Canada. Over half (54.1%) reported intermediate or advanced English language proficiency – a figure consistent with the findings of the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada (Statistics Canada, 2005). With respect to the length of stay, about half of respondents (49.8%) reported that they were new immigrants with less than three years in Canada. Smaller proportions had lived in Canada between 3-10 years (37.6%) or more than ten years (12.6%). Overall, participants’ relatively short lengths of stay were reflected in their citizenship status; only 30% had received their Canadian citizenship.

Figure 2: Education Background

Motivations for Moving to Canada
Moving to a new country is a big decision that requires careful thinking and planning. It is always fascinating to explore what motivates people to migrate from one country to another. Generally speaking, migration can be attributed to “push” and “pull” factors. The former are events or features that drive people away from their home countries, such as overpopulation, poverty, natural disasters, war, political and religious persecution, and human rights abuses. “Pull” factors are those events or features that attract people to a destination country, including economic opportunities, a higher standard of living, social and political stability, free and
accessible social services, a clean environment, and a favourable educational system (Guo, 2005).

With respect to Chinese immigrants, previous studies show that they moved to Canada for economic opportunities (Li, 1998; Tan & Roy, 1985). Findings from this study, however, demonstrate that non-economic reasons, such as Canada’s clean natural environment (52.5%) and its liberal education or school system (47.5%), are also significant “pull” factors (See Figure 3). Other reasons cited less frequently in this study included seeking new opportunities (25.1%) and acquiring Canadian citizenship or permanent residency (22.7%). Among the top four motivations, three were non-economic. This finding is significant because it differs from the traditionally cited economic motivations for migration and raises the question of how the presence of non-economic factors might alter existing policy approaches.

![Figure 3: Motivations for Moving to Canada](image)

The next question in the study explored whether Chinese immigrants in Calgary and Edmonton had achieved their main goals since immigrating to Canada. Fewer than half (43.5%) indicated that they had. Of those who had not, language difficulties (83.1%) and lack of Canadian work experience (66.3%) were the most frequently cited obstacles, followed by Chinese work experience not being recognized (43.8%), lack of Canadian qualifications (41.6%), and lack of social network (39.3%) (see Figure 4). Language barriers are also reported by the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada as the most serious obstacle faced by immigrants.
born in Asia and the Middle East (Statistics Canada, 2003, 2005). Language barriers prevent immigrants from finding jobs, accessing social and health services, and pursuing further education and training. The *Longitudinal Survey* also reported that lack of Canadian job experience and lack of foreign credentials recognition or work experience were serious problems for immigrants. The challenges faced by skilled immigrants point to the need for policy-makers to develop programs and policies that will ensure the fair evaluation and recognition of immigrants’ credentials and prior work experience.

**Multiple Barriers Facing Immigrant’s Integration**

The core of this study is an investigation of the integration experiences of recent Chinese immigrants to Calgary and Edmonton, including any difficulties they have faced in their integration processes. First, it is necessary to examine what the term ‘integration’ means. One difficulty with this task lies in its lack of agreed-upon definition, even though it appears on the surface to be a self-evident term that should not require further explanation. In fact, integration is a fluid term which “means various things to various people in varying situations” (Jedwab, 2006, p.97). Sometimes it is used interchangeably with adjustment, adaptation, and acculturation. Very often it is treated as a process as well as an outcome; an individual and a group phenomenon; and a change in attitudes as well as behaviours (George, 2006). In other cases it is portrayed as an alternative to “assimilation,” a more negatively-connoted term that describes a one-way process wherein immigrants abandon their previous cultures and adapt to their new society (Modood,
As Modood describes, assimilation places few demands on the host country to make changes; the onus is on immigrants to conform. Despite the claim that integration in Canada is a “two-way street” requiring accommodation and adjustments on the part of both newcomers and the host society (Winnemore & Biles, 2006), critics argue that “integration” still endorses a conformity model in assessing immigrants, and upholds a monolithic cultural framework that preaches tolerance in the abstract but remains intolerant towards cultural specificities deemed outside the mainstream (Li, 2003b).

This study mainly focuses on the economic and social dimensions of integration. Respondents were asked about their employment experiences, social life, and level of satisfaction with life in Canada. When asked if they had encountered any major difficulties in their integration process, the majority (70%) indicated that they had. Language (84%) and employment (50.9%) were the most serious difficulties, followed by social networking (43.4%), and cultural adjustment (41.1%). A comparison of the two cities indicates that Chinese immigrants in Edmonton (56.8%) faced more difficulties in employment than in Calgary (45%). These findings are not unique to Calgary and Edmonton. Previous research shows that recent Chinese immigrants in Vancouver have faced similar difficulties (Guo & DeVoretz, 2006b).

With respect to the quality and appropriateness of their employment, respondents comparing their situation in Canada with China, were most likely to have experienced deterioration. Only 28.6% indicated their employment was “better” or “much better” in Canada. In light of this, comparison was made to highlight changes of immigrant’s employment before and after immigration (See Table 1). The study findings show that most participants’ employment situations took a downturn after immigrating to Canada. Prior to moving to Calgary and Edmonton, the majority (76.7%) held jobs in natural and applied sciences, teaching, managerial occupations, or finance and business; after immigration, however, the number working in these occupations had dropped to 41.9%. On the other hand, there had been a 17% increase in people working as labourers in processing and manufacturing. Even worse, 11.3% of respondents were unemployed after immigration. The most interesting change was in the number of respondents who stated that they were students (11.3% in Canada compared to 3.8% in China). It is unclear at this point whether these people had applied to study before arriving in Canada, or were forced to go back to school owing to failure to secure employment. Canadian
Census data shows that recent immigrants have lower employment rates (67%) and higher unemployment rates than the Canadian-born citizens (Statistics Canada, 2008b).

Collectively, employment statistics for Canada’s Chinese immigrant professionals illustrate that these individuals face “glass ceilings” and “glass doors” in the Canadian labour market (Pendakur & Woodcock, 2010; Wong & Wong, 2006). Their high educational achievements fail to yield high occupational achievements owing to devaluation of their foreign credentials, and in-access to employment at high-wage firms. Instead, recent Chinese immigrants experience downward social and occupation mobility, which hinders their integration. This study thus supports previous findings, along with the contention of Wong and Wong that high educational attainments do not, themselves, constitute Chinese immigrants as a “the model minority” (2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Occupational Change Before and After Immigration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job before migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations in natural and applied sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other manager occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional occupations in business and finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour in processing, manufacturing and utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glass ceiling and glass door effects are also manifested in immigrants’ weak economic performance. In this study, deteriorated employment directly affected participants’ annual household incomes. More than one third (37.2%) reported a poverty level income of less than $20,000 (see Figure 5). This poverty rate is significantly higher than the 16% low-income cut-off rate for the overall Canadian population, and 26% low-income rate found for the Chinese
population in Canada overall (Lindsay, 2007). Census data also shows that the earnings gap between recent immigrants and the Canadian-born citizens has widened significantly over the past quarter century (Statistics Canada, 2008d). In 1980, recent immigrant men who had some employment income earned 85 cents for each dollar received by Canadian-born men. By 2005, this figure had dropped to 63 cents. It is important to note that these figures were drawn as the unemployment rate reached its lowest in 33 years, both nationally and in the province of Alberta (Statistics Canada, 2008e). We need to ask: Who benefited from the economic boom in Alberta? What is the situation like under the current economic conditions with unemployment at 8% for Canada and 6.2% for Alberta (Statistics Canada, 2010), which are far more difficult than five years ago?

Turning to the social life of recent Chinese immigrants, many respondents indicated that they had made new friends after arriving in Calgary and Edmonton. In comparison with China, only one third (35%) felt their social life in Canada is ‘better’ or ‘much better’. It is not surprising that the negative evaluation of their employment and social life had an impact on the overall situation in Canada with 48.2% reporting ‘better’ or ‘much better’. When asked if they regret about moving to Canada, the majority (55.9%) surprisingly answered ‘No’. It appears clear that recent Chinese immigrants are forward looking individuals who are not easily discouraged by all the difficulties and barriers facing their integration.
Given the difficulties of immigrants’ employment situations, it is not surprising that the top two areas in which respondents stated they needed help were finding a job (54.1%) and finding a job for their spouse (15.3%) (See Table 2). Other identified areas of need included ESL programming (13.3%), applying for loans to buy apartment or house (9.1%), and applying for loan to start business (7.1%). Cross-tabulations were conducted to determine if length of stay had an impact on their help seeking patterns. The results show that the longer they had stayed in Canada, the less help they needed. Specifically, respondents who had been in Canada more than ten years, indicated almost no need of help. Conversely, respondents who had been in Canada for less than ten years still needed help, particularly in finding work. The group most in need were new arrivals who had stayed less than three years, and expressed support needs in multiple areas. These findings suggest that even skilled immigrants require considerable time, perhaps as much as ten years, to integrate. This finding has important policy implications regarding funding policies in defining eligibility for immigrant receiving settlement and integration programs and services.
Table 2: Areas in Which Immigrants Need Help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding a Job</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding a Job for Spouse</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolling in ESL</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for Loans to Buy Apartment or House</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for Loans to Start Business</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked where they got help when needed it, respondents cited government organizations, non-government organizations, their employer, and friends or family. The majority stated that they usually sought help from friends and family (66.4%). More than half reported non-government organizations (57.5%) as their next source, followed by government organizations (21.7%). Given that Canada has invested heavily in providing settlement and integration programs and services, it seems necessary to assess the effectiveness of existing programs and practices and to develop more innovative approaches that reach more immigrants more effectively.

Understanding Immigrant’s Downward Social Mobility

The pre- and post-immigration employment and occupational changes identified in this study confirm the findings of a number of similar studies concerning immigrants’ downward social mobility (Basran & Zong 1998; Grant & Nadin, 2007; Henry et al. 2006; Krahn, Derwing, Mulder & Wilkinson 2000; Li, 2008a, b; Mojab 1999; Ng 1999). In a study with Indo- and Chinese-Canadian immigrant professionals in Vancouver, Basran and Zong (1998) found that only 18.8% of their respondents worked as professionals (doctors, engineers, school/university teachers, and other professionals) after immigrating to Canada. Highly educated refugees encounter similar barriers in Canada. In a study with 525 refugees, Krahn et al. (2000) showed that refugees with high educational and occupational qualifications experienced downward occupational mobility after arriving in Canada. In comparison with Canadian-born individuals, refugee professionals are more likely to experience unemployment and underemployment (such as part-time and temporary employment). The situation for immigrant women is even worse.
Many argue that in the labour force, the category of “immigrant women” has served to commodify these women as cheap, docile labour in the eyes of employers and the state (Mojab 1999; Ng 1999). Almost all the studies cited here attribute inaccessibility to professional occupations and resulting downward social mobility to devaluation of foreign credentials and work experience. It is important to note, however, not all foreign credentials are devalued in Canada (Li, 2008a). According to Li, foreign credentials held by majority member immigrants bring a net earning advantage; only those held by visible minority suffer an earnings penalty.

In light of this, chi-square analysis of the data from this study illustrates the relationship between origins of education and immigrants’ downward social mobility (see Table 3). The analysis demonstrates that the origin of immigrant’s highest level of education is significantly and positively correlated with immigrant’s current employment situation in Canada, household income, overall situation in Canada, and achievement of original immigration goals. However, no correlation was found between the origin of immigrants’ highest level of education and their social life. In assessing their employment situation, fifty-eight percent (57.9%) of Canadian degree holders indicated that their employment situation in Canada was “better” or “much better,” while only 25% of Chinese degree holders said so. A majority of Chinese degree holders (57.7%) felt that their employment situation in Canada was “worse” or “much worse” than it had been in their home countries.

Employment situations had a major impact on household income. For those with Canadian degrees, almost half (44.7%) earned $46,000-$78,000 and one third (34.2%) reported income greater than $78,000; in comparison, only 19.2% and 14% of Chinese degree holders reported the same level of earnings respectively. At the lower end of the income spectrum, almost half (45.9%) of Chinese degree holders reported less than $20,000 annual household income while for the Canadian degree holders only 5.3% indicated the same (see Figure 7). For their social life, however, the experience of both groups was similar, with slightly over one third indicated their social life in Canada is “better” or “much better”. This implies that for Canadian degree holders, their degrees may help them yield more income, not necessarily they feel happier. The origin of degrees ultimately determined whether immigrants had achieved their original goal of immigrating to Canada. An overwhelming majority (82.9%) of Canadian degree holders reported that they had achieved their main goals compared with only one third of Chinese degree holders.
Table 3
Variation of Integration and Downward Social Mobility across Canadian Degree Holders ($n = 41$) and Chinese Degree Holders ($n = 199$) amongst Chinese Immigrants in Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic factor</th>
<th>Canadian degree holders</th>
<th>Chinese degree holders</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>phi/crv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current employment situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>14 46.7</td>
<td>25 15.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.74***</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same</td>
<td>9 30.0</td>
<td>43 26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>7 23.3</td>
<td>49 30.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much worse</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>44 27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current household income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20,000 CAD</td>
<td>2 5.3</td>
<td>79 45.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.54***</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 46,000 CAD</td>
<td>6 15.8</td>
<td>36 20.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46,001 - 78,000 CAD</td>
<td>17 44.7</td>
<td>33 19.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 78,000 CAD</td>
<td>13 34.2</td>
<td>24 14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation in Canada as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.20*</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>21 67.7</td>
<td>72 42.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same</td>
<td>8 25.8</td>
<td>47 27.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>2 6.5</td>
<td>51 30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of personal goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.74***</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34 82.9</td>
<td>65 33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know or hard to say</td>
<td>5 12.2</td>
<td>42 21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 4.9</td>
<td>88 45.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major difficulties encountered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.76***</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19 46.3</td>
<td>148 76.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22 53.7</td>
<td>46 23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needing help from GOs or NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.26***</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 12.8</td>
<td>149 77.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34 87.2</td>
<td>44 22.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. crv = Cramer’s V.
*p < .05. ***p < .001.
Discussion and Conclusion

This study set out to investigate immigrants’ downward social mobility with a focus on the integration experience of recent Chinese immigrants in Calgary and Edmonton. It reveals that globalization and migration are inextricably intertwined. As a result of the integration of the world economy, an increasing number of countries are affected by migration. As the globalization of migration has intensified, Canada, like other countries, has accelerated its efforts to recruit skilled and economic immigrants to help ameliorate labour shortages and the effects of an aging population.

Yet, as this study illustrates, many recent Chinese immigrants have encountered multi-faceted barriers in their efforts to integrate into Canadian society, particularly in the areas of employment and language. The participants in this study experienced devaluation of their prior learning and work experience after immigrating to Canada resulting in unemployment and underemployment, poor economic performance, and downward social mobility, which adversely hindered their integration process. The negative experience triggered a myriad of strong emotions among immigrant professionals, including disappointment, sadness, anger, and major depression (Grant & Nadin, 2007; Nicklett & Burgard, 2009). While globalization has opened up the world market of skilled workers to facilitate the transference of human capital from less to more developed countries, it is unfortunate that the potential value of such a transfer is often not fully realized “due to features of the local market that differentially reward credentials depending
on the gender, race and foreign status of their holder” (Li, 2008b, p. 220). The racialized experience of Chinese immigrants speaks to the notion of immigrant as social construct, which uses skin colour as the basis for social marking (Li, 2003b).

The concept of glass ceiling may be employed to interpret the experiences of recent Chinese immigrants in Calgary and Edmonton. It is evident that Chinese immigrants hit glass ceilings in the process of transferring their human capital to Canada. Despite the fact that many came with masters’ and doctoral degrees, they faced serious barriers in their transition to Canadian labour market. Because the glass ceiling concept is primarily concerned with the ability to rise to management positions in the corporate hierarchy, it alone cannot fully explain immigrants’ experience. For Chinese immigrants, the main issue lies in entering the corporate hierarchy in the first place; institutional barriers prevent professional immigrants from entering the organizations wherein they can fully exploit their education and skills.

Among a number of players and institutions that may be blamed for the devaluation of immigrants’ foreign credentials and prior work experiences are professional associations and prior learning assessment agencies, which often function as gatekeepers by restricting immigrants’ access to high-pay professional jobs. By the exercising of technologies of power, such as invisible surveillance, examination, encouragement, and normalization, professional associations and prior learning assessment agencies have created a system of governing in devaluing and discounting immigrants’ prior learning and work experience (Andersson & Guo, 2009). These techniques function as practices dividing between acceptable and non-acceptable knowledge and competence, and thus between acceptance and non-acceptance as a professional. Rather than hitting a glass ceiling, it seems clear that immigrant professionals hit a “glass gate” which denies them access to the guarded professional communities because their knowledge and experiences are deemed different, deficient and inferior and hence not acceptable, transferable or recognizable.

In fact, immigrant professionals potentially face three layers of glass in their integration process. The first layer, the glass gate, determines whether immigrants should receive their professional membership and enter a gated professional community. However, successful license does not automatically guarantee a professional job, and immigrant professionals need a professional company to house them. In securing a professional job, many immigrants hit the second layer of glass – the glass door. As Pendakur and Woodcock (2010) point out, glass doors
put up barriers that limit disadvantaged workers’ access to employment at high-wage firms. At this level, employers are the key players. Employers may refuse to offer immigrants any professional jobs because they do not have Canadian work experience, or their prior work experience is devalued because it is inferior to the Canadian experience. Or, immigrants may not secure any professional job because of their skin colour or their English accents. For those “lucky” ones who are already within the doors of a professional company, a third layer of glass may be encountered in subsequent career stages– the glass ceiling. As discussed earlier, glass ceilings prevent immigrants from moving up to management positions. Worse still, some immigrants may work on the same job but be paid less than their white colleagues, creating racialized disparities in earnings.

It seems evident that glass gate, glass door, and glass ceiling are not terms which may be used interchangeably to describe immigrants’ economic integration experiences. Rather, these terms reflect independent institutional barriers that affect immigrants’ new working lives at different stages of their settlement and integration processes. The most worrisome is that they may converge to produce a triple glass effect – multiple institutional barriers that can cause unemployment and underemployment, poor economic performance, and downward social mobility.

The findings of this study fill an important gap in immigration studies regarding the experience of recent immigrants in second-tier receiving cities in a prairie province. It also has important implications for developing innovation programs in foreign credential recognition to help immigrant professionals with their settlement and integration. With the triple glass effect, the causes of immigrants downward social mobility are complex, occur at multiple junctures of the integration process, and therefore any solution should not aim for a quick fix. Instead, it requires a very coherent policy response, involving multiple players including government organizations, professional associations, employers, educational institutions, and prior learning assessment agencies. More importantly, this should be preceded by adopting an inclusive framework that allows us to work toward recognitive justice that balances freedom of migration with recognition and full membership in Canada (Guo, 2010). Instead of treating immigrants as deficient and inferior individuals, recognitive justice recognizes their special contributions to the host society. In rejecting the deficit model, recognitive justice acknowledges and affirms cultural difference and diversity as positive and desirable assets. Recognitive justice also offers pluralist
citizenship as alternative to universal citizenship that recognizes transnational flows of migration and multiple attachments to specific traditions, values, languages, and knowledge.
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