*

Design and validation of a survey instrument to assess the attraction, retention, and integration of official language minority immigrants in Canada

Report prepared by: Victoria Esses, University of Western Ontario Leah Hamilton, Mount Royal University Zenaida Ravanera, University of Western Ontario Carlo Lavoie, University of Prince Edward Island Aurelie Lacassagne, Laurentian University

February 2015



Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Cédric de Chardon, Anne-Marie Robert, and Nicolas Garant of Research and Evaluation, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, for supporting this project. Their assistance in obtaining the landing data required to contact Official Language Minority Immigrants across the country and in discussing the survey questions with us was invaluable. We would also like to thank Alina Sutter and Guliz Akkaymak - graduate students at University of Western Ontario - for assistance in data coding and preparation of tables, and Marjie Brown of the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadienne (FCFA) for consultations on the survey instrument and write-up of the pilot study findings. Finally, we thank Derek Leebosh of the Environics Research Group for consultations on the survey instrument and data collection.

Ci4-152/2016E-PDF 978-0-660-05168-0

Ref. No.: R107-2013

Table of contents

Executive summary	v
Objective and overview	1
Methodology 3	
Overview	3
Survey population and sample	4
Data collection	5
Analysis of survey instrument	6
A. Characteristics of the respondents	7
B. Attraction, Retention, and Mobility Factors that May Affect Official Language Minority Immigrants	11
C. Availability, Access to, and Satisfaction with French Institutions, Services, and Activities in Communities Outside of Quebec, and with English Institutions, Services, and Activities in Communities in Quebec.	17
D. Language Practices and Retention	
E. Social and Cultural Integration	
F. Economic Integration	
G. Well-Being	
Recommendation for a large-scale survey	35
Appendix A: Survey Instrument	37
Appendix B: Breakdown of Responses in the Rest of Canada by Region	53
Section A: Demographics	53
Section B: Attraction, Retention, and Mobility Factors that May Affect Official Language Minority Immigrants	56
Section C: Availability, Access to, and Satisfaction with French Institutions, Services, and Activities in Communities	60
Section D: Language Practices and Retention	65
Section E: Social and Cultural Integration	
Section F: Economic Integration	71
Section G: Well-Being	75
References	76

List of tables

Table 1:	Gender, Age, Education, and Linguistic Profile7
Table 2:	Current City and Region of Residence, Length of Permanent Residency, Country and Region of Birth, and Ethnicity
Table 3:	Immigration Category, Last Country Lived in for More than Five Years, Country of Citizenship10
Table 4:	Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to Canada11
Table 5:	First City of Residence as Permanent Resident 12
Table 6:	Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to First Location in Which Resided as a Permanent Resident in Canada12
Table 7:	Planned to Stay Permanently in First City or Town in which Lived as a Permanent Resident, and Whether Still Live in that City or Town
Table 8:	Rest of Canada – Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to Second and Third Location in Which Resided as a Permanent Resident in Canada
Table 9:	Rest of Canada – Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to Third Location in Which Resided as a Permanent Resident in Canada14
Table 10:	Likelihood of Moving from Current City or Town in Next Five Years and Where Most Likely to Go
Table 11:	Endorsement of Possible Reasons for Moving from One's Current City or Town in the Next Five Years
Table 12:	Access to Information; Availability, Satisfaction, and Helpfulness of Settlement Services in French (ROC) and English (Quebec)
Table 13:	Availability, Participation, and Satisfaction with Sports, Recreation, and Cultural Activities in French (ROC) and English (Quebec)
Table 14:	Children Attending Primary or Secondary School, Types of Schools Attended, Types of Schools Preferred
Table 15:	Main Reason(s) Why Your Child/Children Have Not Attended Your Preferred Language School
Table 16:	Availability and Satisfaction with Elementary and Secondary Education and Health Care Services in French
Table 17:	Ability to Speak, Understand, Read, and Write in English and French
Table 18:	Languages Spoken at Home, With a Spouse or Partner, With Children, At Work, and With Friends
Table 19:	Change in Use of French Since Coming to Current Community25

Table 20:	Sense of Belonging to Canada, Sense of Belonging to Local Community and Trust in People in Local Community	. 26
Table 21:	Number and Type of Friends, Sense of Belonging, and Trust in People in Francophone and Anglophone Community	. 28
Table 22:	Current Employment Status	. 29
Table 23:	Type and Skill Level of Occupation	. 30
Table 24:	Current Employment Situation Compared to Employment Situation Before Coming to Canada, and Satisfaction with Current Job	. 31
Table 25:	Use of Skills from Education and Training on Current Job, Difficulty in Finding a Job That Uses Qualifications, and Reasons for Difficulty in Finding a Job That Uses Qualifications	. 32
Table 26:	Personal Earnings and Ease in Paying For Needs	. 33
Table 27:	Well-Being	. 34
Appendix	Table 1: Gender, Age Groups, Education and Linguistic Profile	. 53
Appendix	Table 2: Length of Permanent Residency, Country and Region of Birth, and Ethnicity	. 54
Appendix	Table 3: Immigration Category, Last Country Lived in for More than Five Years, Country of Citizenship	. 55
Appendix	Table 4: Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to Canada	. 56
Appendix	Table 5: First City of Residence as Permanent Resident	. 56
Appendix	Table 6: Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to First Location in Which Resided as a Permanent Resident in Canada	. 57
Appendix	Table 7: Planned to Stay Permanently in First City or Town in which Lived as a Permanent Resident, and Whether Still Live in that City or Town	. 57
Appendix	Table 10: Likelihood of Moving from Current City or Town in Next Five Years and Where Most Likely to Go	. 58
Appendix	Table 11: Endorsement of Possible Reasons for Moving from One's Current City or Town in the Next Five Years	. 59
Appendix	Table 12: Access to Information and Availability of Settlement Services in French	. 60
Appendix	Table 13: Availability, Participation, and Satisfaction with Sports, Recreation, and Cultural Activities in French	. 61
Appendix	Table 14: Children Attending Primary or Secondary School, Types of Schools Attended, Types of Schools Preferred in French	. 62
Appendix	Table 16: Availability and Satisfaction with Elementary and Secondary Education and Health Care Services in French	. 63

Appendix	Table 17: Ability to Speak, Understand, Read, and Write in English and French	35
Appendix	Table 18: Languages Spoken at Home, With a Spouse or Partner, With Children, At Work, and With Friends6	37
Appendix	Table 19: Change in Use of French since Coming to Current Community	57
Appendix	Table 20: Sense of Belonging to Canada, Sense of Belonging to Local Community and Trust in People in Local Community	38
Appendix	Table 21: Number and Type of Friends, Sense of Belonging to Francophone Community, and Trust in People in Francophone Community	39
Appendix	Table 22: Current Employment Status	70
Appendix	Table 23: Type and Skill Level of Occupation	71
Appendix	Table 24: Current Employment Situation Compared to Employment Situation Before Coming to Canada, and Satisfaction with Current Job	72
Appendix	Table 25: Use of Skills from Education and Training on Current Job and Difficulty in Finding a Job That Uses Qualifications	73
Appendix	Table 26: Personal Earnings and Ease in Paying for Needs	74
Appendix	Table 27: Well-Being	75

Executive summary

The goal of this project was to design, implement and analyze a pilot survey of recent Official Language Minority Immigrants in Canada, with the ultimate aim of providing a valid and reliable survey instrument that can be used to enhance understanding of the settlement and integration experiences of Official Language Minority Immigrants (OLMIs) in Canada, and the factors that drive their attraction, retention, and integration. To this end, a pilot survey was designed and administered to 150 recent Official Language Minority Immigrants across the country using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI).

Official Language Minority Immigrants were identified and their contact information obtained through Landing Data provided by Citizenship and Immigration Canada. We define Official Language Minority Immigrants as immigrants in Quebec whose preferred official language is English and immigrants in the Rest of Canada whose preferred official language is French. In the current case, this was based on a combination of official language ability at landing and language chosen for the landing interview.

The survey was designed to include the following key modules, some of which are specific to Official Language Minority Immigrants and some of which apply to immigrants in general:

- Attraction, retention, and mobility factors that may influence Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Availability, access to, and satisfaction with French institutions, services, and activities in communities outside of Quebec, and with English institutions, services, and activities in communities in Quebec
- Language practices and retention
- Social and cultural integration
- Economic integration
- Well-being
- Demographics

As a pilot with a small sample size, the current survey was intended to develop and test the survey instrument, rather than provide findings on Official Language Minority Immigrants. That is, the results are not for interpretation but instead are for illustrative purposes in terms of the usefulness of the survey instrument. Thus, for example, we aimed for approximately equal numbers of participants in each region of the Rest of Canada (British Columbia, Prairies, Ontario, Atlantic), though the population of OLMIs in these regions differs. We combined these regions for the Rest of Canada (ROC) without weighting in order to examine the utility of the survey instrument, rather than for the purpose of interpretation.

The pilot survey demonstrates the feasibility of the procedure utilized, and analyses of the responses indicate that the instrument was very effective in eliciting information on each of the key topics of interest. The analyses also provide information on questions and response options that require adjustment, and the type of adjustments that should be made. In order to test out as many questions as possible, the survey instrument used in the pilot was quite long, averaging just over 32 minutes to complete. The analyses indicate questions that can be combined or removed in order to reduce the length of the survey without compromising the breadth of topics addressed.

Based on these findings, we recommend that a full-scale survey be launched using a revised version of the pilot survey instrument. Such a survey will go a long way to filling major gaps in our knowledge of the settlement and integration experiences of Official Language Minority Immigrants, and contribute to the Immigration pillar of the *Roadmap for Canada's Official Languages 2013-2018* (Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, 2013). This fits with the Senate Committee on Official Languages' recommendation that a survey be conducted "on French-speaking immigrants outside Quebec and on English-speaking immigrants in Quebec so that official language minority communities can be better equipped to deal with the immigration challenges they will be facing over the coming years" (2014, p. vii). It will also provide an evidence base to support the evaluation of the Support for Official Language Minority Communities program to be conducted by Citizenship and Immigration Canada starting in the fall of 2015.

Specifically, results will provide an evidence base for:

- Better understanding the settlement needs of Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Providing information on what aspects of Official Language Minority Immigrant settlement need to be improved
- Identifying gaps in services for Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Designing new settlement resources and services for Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Identifying potential pre- and post-arrival services and information that will improve the settlement and integration outcomes of Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Developing effective initiatives for recruiting new Official Language Minority Immigrants and informing them of the services available to them
- Developing strategies for contributing to the vitality of Official Language Minority Communities through immigration.

Objective and overview

The objective of this project was to design, implement and analyze a pilot survey of recent Official Language Minority Immigrants in Canada, with the ultimate goal of providing a valid and reliable survey instrument that can be used to enhance understanding of the settlement and integration experiences of Official Language Minority Immigrants (OLMIs) in Canada, and the factors that drive their attraction, retention, and integration. It is a priority for Citizenship and Immigration Canada to better understand the mobility, retention, and integration factors that contribute to the vitality of Official Language Minority Communities through immigration, and the survey instrument will assist in this regard. In particular, the survey instrument will assist in developing an evidence base to guide decisions about the selection and the provision of supports for the settlement and integration of Official Language Minority Immigrants. This fits with the Senate Committee on Official Languages' recommendation that a survey be conducted "on French-speaking immigrants outside Quebec and on English-speaking immigrants in Quebec so that official language minority communities can be better equipped to deal with the immigration challenges they will be facing over the coming years" (2014, p. vii). It will also provide an evidence base to support the evaluation of the Support for Official Language Minority Communities program to be conducted by Citizenship and Immigration Canada starting in the fall of 2015.

We define Official Language Minority Immigrants as immigrants in Quebec whose preferred official language is English and immigrants in the Rest of Canada whose preferred official language is French. In the current case, this was based on a combination of official language ability at landing and language chosen for the landing interview.

The survey instrument was designed to include the following key modules, some of which are specific to Official Language Minority Immigrants and some of which apply to immigrants in general:

- Attraction, retention, and mobility factors that may influence Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Availability, access to, and satisfaction with French institutions, services, and activities in communities outside of Quebec, and with English institutions, services, and activities in communities in Quebec
- Language practices and retention
- Social and cultural integration
- Economic integration
- Well-being
- Demographics

Though a number of settlement outcome surveys have been conducted within the last two to three years (e.g., Alberta Settlement Outcomes Survey, Western Settlement Outcomes Survey, Making Ontario Home Survey, Pan-Canadian Settlement Outcomes Survey - see http://p2pcanada.ca/library/results-of-settlement-outcomes-surveys/), the small number of Official Language Minority Immigrants in their samples does not allow for specific analyses of these individuals. The one exception is the Pan-Canadian Settlement Outcomes Survey that has a large sample size, but it is restricted by the fact that information on the specific community in which respondents reside was not collected. In addition, none of these surveys included

questions specific to Official Language Minority Immigrants. Thus, overall, there is a need for quantitative and qualitative data to guide policy decision-making on Official Language Minority Immigrants. This project is designed to address this gap by developing a survey instrument that can be used to specifically examine the experiences and outcomes of Official Language Minority Immigrants.

The results from projects utilizing the new survey instrument would contribute to the Immigration pillar of the *Roadmap for Canada's Official Languages 2013-2018* (Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, 2013). They would also contribute to two strategic outcomes (SO) of Citizenship and Immigration Canada's Program Alignment Architecture: "Migration of permanent and temporary residents that strengthens Canada's economy" (SO 1) and "Newcomers and citizens participate to their full potential in fostering an integrated society" (SO 3). Specifically, results from projects utilizing the new survey instrument would help in:

- Better understanding the settlement needs of Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Providing information on what aspects of Official Language Minority Immigrant settlement need to be improved
- Identifying gaps in services for Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Designing new settlement resources and services for Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Identifying potential pre- and post-arrival services and information that will improve the settlement and integration outcomes of Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Developing effective initiatives for recruiting new Official Language Minority Immigrants and informing them of the services available to them
- Developing strategies for contributing to the vitality of Official Language Minority Communities

Once the survey instrument has been developed and validated, further research can deploy it for these functions, including surveys at the national and provincial levels, as well as at the level of individual Official Language Minority Communities of interest. The design of the survey instrument also allows for the selection of blocks of questions for use in specific surveys, depending on the needs and requirements of these surveys.

Methodology

Overview

This research included the design, implementation, and analysis of a pilot survey of Official Language Minority Immigrants in Canada regarding their settlement and integration experiences, and the factors that drive their attraction, retention, and integration in Canadian communities. Our final sample included 143 Official Language Minority Immigrants to Canada, 18 years of age and over, who had been living in Canada for a period ranging from 3 to 60 months at the time of the survey.

The research team included five university researchers with expertise in survey design and implementation, survey analysis and interpretation, immigration policy and practice, official language minority communities, and report writing. Prior experience included, most recently, work on the Alberta Settlement Outcomes Survey and on the Western Settlement Outcome Survey, These team members have advanced degrees in Psychology, Sociology, Political Science, and Modern Languages. The team also included two PhD students in Psychology and Sociology. The project spanned over a year of work, including development of the survey instrument in consultation with Research and Evaluation, Citizenship and Immigration Canada; testing of the survey instrument by the graduate students and researchers; adjustment of some survey questions; translation of the survey instrument; obtaining the landing data; data collection; data analysis and interpretation; and preparation of this report.

Our partner for data collection was the Environics Research Group - a Canadian polling and market research firm that has been in operation for over 40 years. In order to identify potential respondents and access their most recent contact information, the Environics Research Group was sent an encrypted data file from Citizenship and Immigration Canada that included contact information for all permanent residents who were indicated as landing in Canada between February 1, 2009 and October 31, 2013 and met the following criteria as Official Language Minority Immigrants. Official Language Minority Immigrants outside of Quebec were identified as immigrants who indicated at landing that: 1) they had official language ability in French only and they planned to reside outside of Quebec, or 2) they had official language ability in French and English, their preferred language of interview was French, and they planned to reside outside of Quebec. Official Language Minority Immigrants in Quebec were identified as immigrants who indicated at landing that: 1) they had official language ability in English only and they planned to reside in Quebec, or 2) they had official language ability in English and French, their preferred language of immigration interview was English, and they planned to reside in Quebec. From this population, Environics randomly selected participants to contact, with the stipulation of having approximately 75% of participants outside of Quebec (relatively evenly split between the Atlantic, Ontario, Prairies, and British Columbia) and 25% of participants in Quebec.

Of the 150 respondents, seven were excluded because they were not official language minority immigrants at the time of the survey. One respondent identified as an OLMI on the basis of the above criteria intended to go to Quebec but was living in Saskatchewan at the time of the survey. Six respondents identified as OLMIs on the basis of the above criteria intended to go elsewhere but were living in Quebec at the time of the survey. Thus, the final sample contained 143 respondents, with 104 respondents in the Rest of Canada (ROC) and 39 respondents in Quebec.

The survey was administered using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) with the option of completing it in French or English. It included blocks of questions assessing:

- Attraction, retention, and mobility factors that may affect Official Language Minority Immigrants
- Availability, access to, and satisfaction with French institutions, services, and activities in communities outside of Quebec, and with English institutions, services, and activities in communities in Quebec
- Language practices and retention
- Social and cultural integration
- Economic integration
- Well-being

The survey also included questions on important demographic variables to allow, in a full survey, a comparison of responses as a function of these key variables.

Some questions included in the current survey were original or adapted questions from the Alberta Settlement Outcomes Survey (Esses et al., 2012), and the Western Settlement Outcomes Survey (Esses et al., 2013). The adaptations included additional response options specifically applicable to Official Language Minority Immigrants. Questions from the Alberta Settlement Outcomes Survey had previously been professionally edited to conform to Canadian Language Benchmark 5. Additional new questions specifically focusing on Official Language Minority Immigrants (e.g., those on language practices and retention, those on services and institutions in one's preferred Official Language) were designed for the current survey. The full set of questions was developed by the project team in close consultation with Research and Evaluation, Citizenship and Immigration Canada. The survey was developed in English. It was then translated into French by a member of the team and back-translated by another team member into English to verify the translation.

Questions used a variety of formats. The majority were seven-point scaled responses (e.g., "On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is very weak and 7 is very strong, how would you describe your sense of belonging to your Anglophone/Francophone community?"), forced choice (e.g., "What type of school would you have preferred your child/children to have attended since coming to your current community?"), or yes/no endorsement of a set of options (e.g., "Would you say each of the following is or is not a reason why it has been difficult for you to find a job in Canada that makes use of your qualifications?"). Questions on language ability used eleven-point scaled responses (e.g., "On a scale of 0-10, if zero is none and ten is excellent, tell me what you think your level of French is?") to follow previous surveys, a few questions used three response options (e.g., "What is your job now?").

Survey population and sample

Environics drew the survey sample using the landings data file from Citizenship and Immigration Canada containing a total of 57,366 permanent residents who landed in Canada between February 1, 2009 and October 31, 2013, were 18 years of age or older, and were considered Official Language Minority Immigrants. The following four groups of permanent residents were included in the landings data file: 1) 11,214 individuals whose official language was French only and intended province of residence was outside of Quebec; 2) 4,024 individuals whose official language was English and French, preferred language was French, and intended province of residence was outside of Quebec; 3) 39,338 individuals whose official language was English only and intended province of residence was Quebec; and 4) 2,790 individuals whose official language was English and French, preferred language was English, and intended province of residence was Quebec.

To obtain 150 completed surveys, Environics called 3,945 individuals from the landings data file. At times this involved multiple calls to the same individual in order to eventually contact them. Of the 3,945 individuals called, 3,038 were considered to have "valid" phone numbers while 907 were "invalid." Ninety percent of the invalid numbers were categorized as such because the identified person from the landings data no longer resided at the telephone number provided to Citizenship and Immigration Canada. The final response rate was 36%. This was calculated by dividing the number of completed surveys (150) by the number of completed surveys (150) + refusals (216) + language difficulties (54).

Because the landings data file was sent directly to Environics and was not available to the research team, it was not possible to compare the final sample to the immigrant population of interest (i.e., the population included in the sampling frame).

Data collection

Telephone interviews were conducted from December 1-14, 2014 by the Environics Research Group using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). CATI was utilized because, in comparison to written survey methods, it reduces the potential for error because data entry occurs in concert with survey participation, and error detection capabilities are integrated into the system. Respondents were asked at the start whether they would like to complete the survey in English or French. Unexpectedly, only 14 individuals (9.8%) completed the survey in French, and 129 individuals (90.2%) completed the survey in English. Of interest, though Official Language Minority Immigrants outside of Quebec tended to prefer to have the survey administered in English, they were equally likely to provide their responses in English or French. The outset of the survey also included screening questions for linguistic profile, age, and time since one became a permanent resident.

Before data collection was initiated, this project was approved by the Human Research Ethics Board at Mount Royal University (project approval #2014-31b). Prior to commencing the interview, prospective respondents were assured of the voluntary nature of their participation and of the confidentiality of their responses. They were also told that they could terminate the interview at any time and could skip any questions they didn't want to answer. They were informed that the information they provide would be used in conformity with federal privacy legislation and with the Alberta and the Ontario Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Acts (FOIPP and FIPPA). Interviews were only started after Environics received individuals' consent to participate in the survey. At the end of the interview, participants were reminded that their answers would be kept confidential and anonymous, and they were directed to a feedback sheet available on the Pathways to Prosperity website. On average, it took respondents 32 minutes and 42 seconds to complete the survey.

Analysis of survey instrument

For this pilot project, the following aspects of each survey item were examined: distribution of responses, "other" responses specified (where relevant), and no response. As noted for certain tables below, there would be a need to further break down the "no response" into finer categories of "not applicable", "don't know" and "no response" in future surveys. In the current report, "not applicable" is used only when a question was not posed to some respondents because of the skip logic in the survey instrument. Where relevant, we also looked at the relation among items to determine redundancies and items that could be combined or removed.

The report is organized by tables that depict both the absolute number and percentage of respondents who selected a given response to each survey item. Each table depicts a number of survey items (e.g., Table 1 includes gender, age, education, and linguistic profile). For each survey item, responses have been divided into OLMIs living in the Rest of Canada followed by OLMIs living in Quebec. It is important to reiterate that no weighting of regions for the Rest of Canada were utilized because the results are for illustrative purposes only, and are not for interpretation. Appendix B shows the results for the Rest of Canada further broken down into region - Atlantic, Ontario, Prairies, and British Columbia. This separation into regions is again for illustrative purposes only and further supports the main conclusions as to the utility of the instrument items.

A. Characteristics of the respondents

(See Screening Questions and Section A in Appendix A)

Table 1 depicts the gender, age groups, education level, and linguistic profile of respondents (in the rest of Canada and Quebec, respectively). As expected, responses to these survey items were fairly evenly distributed. There were no cases of no response. Interestingly, among OLMIs living in the rest of Canada, 44% identify as Francophone while 56% identify as both Anglophone and Francophone. In contrast, among respondents living in Quebec, approximately three-quarters identify as Anglophone and one-quarter identify as both Anglophone and Francophone.

	Rest	of Canada		Quebec
Gender				
Male	51	49.0%	22	56.4%
Female	53	51.0%	17	43.6%
Age Groups				
20-29	25	24.0%	10	25.6%
30-39	44	42.3%	19	48.7%
40-49	16	15.4%	7	17.9%
50-59	8	7.7%	2	5.1%
60 & Older	11	10.6%	1	2.6%
Highest Level of Education				
Secondary School	17	16.3%	4	10.3%
College / Vocational Training	25	24.0%	9	23.1%
University Undergraduate Degree	23	22.1%	11	28.2%
University Graduate Degree	38	36.5%	14	35.9%
Professional Degree	1	1.0%	1	2.6%
Linguistic Profile				
Francophone	46	44.2%	29	74.4%
Both Anglophone and Francophone	58	55.8%	10	25.6%
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 1: Gender, Age, Education, and Linguistic Profile

Table 2 depicts respondents' current city and region of residence, length of permanent residency, country and region of birth, and ethnicity. Region of birth was categorized based on country of birth using the categories for place of birth from the 2011 National Household Survey (Statistics Canada, 2013). As expected, responses to these survey items had a reasonable distribution and the items tended to function as intended.

Among OLMIs living outside of Quebec in this sample, one respondent was living in the Yukon. Given the small population of OLMIs living in the territories, it would be difficult to obtain a large enough sample to understand these OLMIs' experiences, even in a large-scale survey. Thus, in future surveys, when asked the screening question, "Which city and province/territory do you live in now?" the survey should be terminated for individuals who live in the territories. It is worth noting that over 80% of OLMIs in Quebec resided in Montreal at the time of the survey.

There is an interesting distribution of responses to the question, "How long have you been a permanent resident in Canada?" In the full sample (including both ROC and Quebec), 17 individuals indicated that they have lived in Canada for 60 months (i.e., 5 years). It is possible that, after spending a number of years in Canada, people no longer count in exact months (e.g., four-and-a-half years rather than 54 months). In future surveys, we suggest that respondents be

asked to select a category (e.g., less than three months, three months to one year, over one year to two years, etc.) rather than being asked to specify an exact number of months.

In the pilot survey, the ethnicity question was, "Which of the following best describes your ethnicity?" The interviewers were instructed to read all ethnicity options to respondents and to ask them to select all that apply. Few participants provided more than one response to this question and, for simplicity, the table shows the first response only. Thus, in future surveys it is recommended that respondents are asked "Which of the following best describes your main ethnicity?", and interviewers are instructed to allow only one response. That said, it is important to keep the "other" option because several respondents used this option as their second response (e.g., two people identified as Metis, and two as African, in addition to another ethnicity). Only three people from the total sample (two in the ROC and one in Quebec) provided no response to the ethnicity question.

Table 2: Current City and Region of Residence, Length of PermanentResidency, Country and Region of Birth, and Ethnicity

	Rest o	of Canada		Quebec
City of Residence				
Calgary	6	5.8%		
Edmonton	8	7.7%		
Ottawa	7	6.7%		
Toronto	12	11.5%		
Vancouver	15	14.4%		
Winnipeg	6	5.8%		
All other places in ROC	50	48.1%		
Montreal			32	82.1%
All other places in Quebec			7	17.9%
Region of Residence				
British Columbia	24	23.1%		
Prairies	28	26.9%		
Ontario	28	26.9%		
Atlantic	23	22.1%		
Yukon, NWT, Nunavut	1	1.0%		
Months of Permanent Residency				
Less than 12	1	1.0%	3	7.7%
12-23	19	18.3%	7	17.9%
24-35	22	21.2%	9	23.1%
36-47	20	19.2%	10	25.6%
48-59	28	26.9%	7	17.9%
60	14	13.5%	3	7.7%
Country of Birth				
France	42	40.4%		
Haiti	7	6.8%		
Congo	15	14.4%		
lvory Coast	5	4.8%		
Могоссо	5	4.8%		
Philippines			3	7.7%
China (including Hong Kong)			6	15.4%
India			4	10.3%
All Other Countries	30	28.8%	87	66.6%

Table 2: Continued

	Resto	of Canada		Quebec
World Region of Birth				
Caribbean and Bermuda	7	6.7%	4	10.3%
Western Europe	47	45.2%		
Western Africa	9	8.7%		
Eastern Africa	7	6.7%		
Northern Africa	9	8.7%		
Central Africa	19	18.3%		
West Central Asia and the Middle East			4	10.3%
Eastern Asia			6	15.4%
Southeast Asia			4	10.3%
Southern Asia			6	15.4%
All Other Regions	6	5.7%	15	38.3%
Ethnicity				
White	47	45.2%	9	23.1%
Black	41	39.4%	3	7.7%
Filipino	1	1.0%	4	10.3%
Latin American	3	2.9%	4	10.3%
Arab	9	8.7%		
West Asian	1	1.0%		
Chinese			6	15.4%
South Asian			5	12.8%
Southeast Asian			2	5.1%
Arab			2	5.1%
West Asian			3	7.7%
No Response	2	1.9%	1	2.6%
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 3 depicts respondents' immigration category, last country lived in for more than 5 years, and country of citizenship. As expected, responses to these survey items had a reasonable distribution and the items functioned as intended. There were some no responses (e.g., four individuals from outside of Quebec did not respond to the country of citizenship question) but it was not a sufficient number to be of concern.

Interestingly, in the total sample, eight individuals (7 in the ROC and 1 in Quebec) answered "other" when asked under which immigration category they entered Canada or became a permanent resident. An examination of their specific responses (e.g., "sponsorship," "Working Holiday Program," "as a visitor") suggests that some individuals may not know exactly in which immigration category they became a permanent resident. In future surveys, it would also be useful to try to clarify this question so that we make clear that we are asking about how respondents obtained permanent resident status, and not how they potentially first entered on a temporary basis (prior to becoming permanent residents).

Table 3:	Immigration Category, Last Country Lived in for More than Five
	Years, Country of Citizenship

Rest of Canada		Quebec		
Immigration Category				
Skilled Worker or Professional - Principal	17	16.3%	6	15.4%
Skilled Worker or Professional - Dependent	3	2.9%	6	15.4%
FamilyClass	42	40.4%	17	43.6%
Provincial Nominee - Principal	10	9.6%	1	2.6%
Provincial Nominee - Dependent	1	1.0%		
Refugee	14	13.5%	6	15.4%
Business Class - Principal	1	1.0%		
Business Class - Dependent			1	2.6%
Canadian Experience Class - Principal	6	5.8%		
Live-in Caregiver	1	1.0%	1	2.6%
Other	7	6.7%	1	2.6%
No Response	2	1.9%		
Last Country Lived in for More than 5 Years				
Country of Birth	69	66.3%	28	71.8%
Another Country	34	32.7%	10	25.6%
No Response	1	1.0%	1	2.6%
Country of Citizenship				
Canada Only	6	5.8%	2	5.1%
Canada and Other	15	14.4%	6	15.4%
Other Country	79	76.0%	31	79.5%
No Response	4	3.8%		
Specific Other Country of Citizenship				
Belgium	5	4.8%		
Congo	7	6.7%		
lvory Coast	5	4.8%		
France	42	40.4%		
Haiti	5	4.8%		
China			5	12.8%
India			4	10.3%
Philippines			3	7.7%
All Other Countries	40	38.5%	27	69.2%
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

B. Attraction, Retention, and Mobility Factors that May Affect Official Language Minority Immigrants

(See Section B in Appendix A)

Table 4 shows respondents' endorsement of possible reasons for choosing to move to Canada. Interestingly, all the reasons provided were endorsed to a reasonable extent in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec, with a number of other reasons also provided. Thus, none of the options included in the current survey seem like candidates for removal. Of the other reasons spontaneously provided, two stand out as possible additions for future surveys: "Because Canada is bilingual" (5 respondents) and "Because Canada is a safe and secure place to live" (11 respondents). It is interesting to note that more people endorsed the response, "Because you were sponsored or resettled by the government as a refugee" than indicated that their immigration category was refugee in the earlier section. Perhaps some people who were sponsored as family class immigrants misinterpreted the first part of this response option as any type of sponsorship. Thus, future surveys should clarify this response to be, "Because you were sponsored as a refugee or resettled by the government as a refugee."

	Rest	of Canada		Quebec
Main Reasons				
To join family or friends, or get married	51	49.0%	23	59.0%
To find a good job in your field	51	49.0%	19	48.7%
To start your own business	14	13.5%	7	17.9%
For you and your family members to further your education	34	32.7%	21	53.8%
Because Canada looked like it was a good place to live	98	94.2%	33	84.6%
Because you were sponsored or resettled by the government as				
a refugee	19	18.3%	6	15.4%
Another member of your family made the decision	32	30.8%	9	23.1%
Because French is an official language of Canada	51	49.0%		
Because it is possible to live and work in Canada in French	65	62.5%		
Because Canada has many services for French speakers	50	48.1%		
Because English is an official language of Canada			15	38.5%
Because it is possible to live and work in Canada in English			25	64.1%
Because Canada has many services for English speakers			23	59.0%
Because you felt that your family would do well here	69	66.3%	25	64.1%
Other	45	43.3%	16	41.0%
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 4: Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to Canada

Table 5 shows the cities that respondents lived in when they first became permanent residents in Canada. As expected, in the Rest of Canada, many respondents were first in Toronto and Vancouver, but also Winnipeg, Calgary, and a variety of other cities. In Quebec, the majority of respondents were first in Montreal.

	Resto	Rest of Canada		Quebec
First City of Residence				
Calgary	7	6.7%		
Halifax	5	4.8%		
Ottawa	4	3.8%		
Toronto	16	15.4%		
Vancouver	21	20.2%		
Winnipeg	10	9.6%		
Montreal			29	74.4%
Quebec City			3	7.7%
All Other Places	41	39.5%	7	17.9%
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 5: First City of Residence as Permanent Resident

Table 6 illustrates respondents' endorsement of possible reasons for choosing to move to the first location in which they resided as a permanent resident. Interestingly, all the reasons provided were endorsed to a reasonable extent in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec, with a number of other reasons also provided. Thus, none of the options included in the current survey seem like candidates for removal. Among the other reasons provided, there were no consistent themes for possible inclusion in future surveys.

Table 6: Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to First Location in WhichResided as a Permanent Resident in Canada

	Rest	of Canada		Quebec
Main Reasons				
To join family or friends, or get married	53	51.0%	24	61.5%
To find a good job in your field	52	50.0%	16	41.0%
To start your own business	15	14.4%	5	12.8%
For you and your family members to further your education	40	38.5%	20	51.3%
Because the community looked like it was a good place to live	88	84.6%	29	74.4%
Because that was the location to which you were sent by the				
government as a refugee	15	14.4%	3	7.7%
Another member of your family made the decision	33	31.7%	12	30.8%
Because the community had a large French-speaking				
population	34	32.7%		
Because you thought it would be possible to live and work in				
French	51	49.0%		
Because the community had many services for French				
speakers	50	48.1%		
Because the community had a large English-speaking				
population			12	30.8%
Because you thought it would be possible to live and work in				
English			20	51.3%
Because the community had many services for English				
speakers			15	38.5%
Because you felt that your family would do well here	71	68.3%	28	71.8%
Other	35	33.7%	11	28.2%
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 7 shows responses to questions about whether respondents had planned to stay permanently in the first city or town in which they resided as a permanent resident and whether they still live in that first city or town.

The distribution of responses to the question about whether respondents had planned to stay permanently in the first city or town is interesting in that approximately 25% of respondents had not planned to stay in the first city or town in which they settled and an additional 15% were unsure. Nonetheless, over 75% in the Rest of Canada and over 90% in Quebec are still living in that first city or town.

Table 7:	Planned to Stay Permanently in First City or Town in which Lived as a Permanent Resident, and Whether Still Live in that City or Town)
	Rest of Canada Quebec	

	Rest of Canada			Quebec	
Planned to Stay Permanently?					
Yes	59	56.7%	22	56.4%	
No	28	26.9%	10	25.6%	
Unsure	15	14.4%	7	17.9%	
No Response	2	1.9%			
Still Live in First City?					
Yes	79	76.0%	36	92.3%	
No	24	23.1%	3	7.7%	
No Response	1	1.0%			
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%	

Tables 8 and 9 show endorsement by respondents in the Rest of Canada of possible reasons for moving to a second or third city or town after the first city or town in which they lived as a permanent resident. The results for Quebec are not shown due to small sample size of those who no longer live in the first city or town (3 respondents). For the Rest of Canada, all of the possible reasons are endorsed to some extent, though push factors – such as feeling unwelcome or isolated in the first city or town, or experiencing discrimination there – are least likely to be endorsed and thus are possible candidates for exclusion from future surveys. If there is an opportunity to expand the response options, it might be beneficial to divide the option, "You wanted to live closer to family or friends, or to people of the same linguistic background as you" into two options, with one focusing on family or friends and the other on people of the same linguistic background as you. A number of respondents endorsed other reasons for moving and, among these, "Cost of living" stands out as another possible addition to the options offered in future surveys. It is also the case that reasons for moving to additional locations seem to be similar for second and third locations, suggesting that in future surveys, questions could focus on just the first move or ask about reasons for moves in general (rather than reasons for each move).

Table 8:Rest of Canada - Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to Second
and Third Location in Which Resided as a Permanent Resident in
Canada

	Secon	d location
Main Reasons		
There were better job opportunities	16	66.7%
There were better educational opportunities	12	52.2%
There were more or better services for immigrants	10	45.5%
There were more people who spoke French	6	25.0%
You could work in French	12	50.0%
You could educate your children in French	12	54.5%
There were services for immigrants in French	13	54.2%
You wanted to live closer to family or friends, or to people of the		
same linguistic background as you	14	58.3%
You thought your family would do well there	15	65.2%
You did not feel welcome in the city or town you moved from	2	8.7%
You felt isolated or lonely in the city or town you moved from	2	8.7%
You experienced discrimination in the city or town you moved		
from	3	13.0%
Other	10	41.7%
Total	24	100.0%

Table 9:Rest of Canada - Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to Third
Location in Which Resided as a Permanent Resident in Canada

Third loca		location
Main Reasons		
There were better job opportunities	14	73.7%
There were better educational opportunities	12	66.7%
There were more or better services for immigrants	8	44.4%
There were more people who spoke French	6	33.3%
You could work in French	9	47.4%
You could educate your children in French	9	50.0%
There were services for immigrants in French	11	57.9%
You wanted to live closer to family or friends, or to people of the		
same linguistic background as you	9	47.4%
You thought your family would do well there	13	68.4%
You did not feel welcome in the city or town you moved from	2	10.5%
You felt isolated or lonely in the city or town you moved from	3	15.8%
You experienced discrimination in the city or town you moved		
from	2	10.5%
Other	10	52.6%
Total	19	100.0%

The next set of questions focus on future mobility. Table 10 displays respondents' reported likelihood of moving out of their current city or town in the next five years, and where they would be most likely to go. Of interest, for likelihood of moving in the next five years, the full range of responses was utilized in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec. In addition, in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec, respondents were much more likely to indicate that they would move within Canada than leave the country. For clarity, in future surveys it would be useful to change the response, "Another province or territory in Canada – please specify" to "Another city or town within a different province or territory in Canada – please specify" to match the option of "another city of town within the same province – please specify." This option would allow a determination of whether the individual would remain an OLMI (e.g., moving from one ROC province to another) or would no longer be an OLMI (e.g., moving from ROC to Quebec). In addition, given the few responses for Country of origin, United States, and Another country, in future surveys these three responses could be merged into one option – Another country – please specify.

Table 10: Likelihood of Moving from Current City or Town in Next Five Years and Where Most Likely to Go

	Rest of Canada		Quebec	
Likelihood of Moving				
1 - Not at all likely	26	25.0%	8	20.5%
2	11	10.6%	6	15.4%
3	8	7.7%	4	10.3%
4	15	14.4%	4	10.3%
5	16	15.4%	6	15.4%
6	4	3.8%	8	20.5%
7 - Extremely likely	15	14.4%	2	5.1%
No Response	9	8.7%	1	2.6%
Mean Score:	N = 95	M = 3.6	N = 38	M = 3.7
If Moving, Where Most Likely To Go?				
Another City or Town Within the Same Province	24	23.1%	5	12.8%
Another Province or Territory in Canada	48	46.2%	19	48.7%
Country of Origin	2	1.9%	1	2.6%
United States	2	1.9%	0	0.0%
Another Country	8	7.7%	2	5.1%
No Response	20	19.2%	12	30.8%
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 11 displays reasons endorsed for possibly moving from one's current city or town in the next five years. All of the possible reasons presented are endorsed to a considerable extent, including, in this case, the push factors (e.g., feeling isolated or having experienced discrimination in one's current location). Thus, none of the options included in the current survey seem like candidates for exclusion from future surveys. Once again, it might be beneficial to divide the option "You want to live closer to family or friends, or to people of the same linguistic background as you" into two options, with one focusing on family or friends and the other on people of the same linguistic background as you. Other responses were also quite frequently provided. No specific themes emerge from these responses, with the possible exception of "Cost of living," which could be added as an option to future surveys.

Table 11: Endorsement of Possible Reasons for Moving from One's Current City or Town in the Next Five Years

	Rest of Canada			Quebec	
Main Reasons					
There are better job opportunities in another city or town	70	67.3%	36	92.3%	
There are better educational opportunities in another city or					
town	43	41.3%	20	51.3%	
There are more or better services for immigrants in another city					
or town	35	33.7%	16	41.0%	
There are more people who speak French in another city or					
town	20	19.2%	20	51.3%	
You could work in French in another city or town	49	47.1%	25	64.1%	
You could educate your children in French in another city or town	41	39.4%	19	48.7%	
There are services for immigrants in French in another city or					
town	34	32.7%	19	48.7%	
You want to live closer to family or friends, or to people of the					
same linguistic background as you	46	44.2%	15	38.5%	
You think your family will do well in another city or town	61	58.7%	29	74.4%	
You do not feel welcome in the city or town in which you live	20	19.2%	9	23.1%	
You feel isolated or lonely in the city or town in which you live	26	25.0%	8	20.5%	
You have experienced discrimination in the city or town in which					
you live	23	22.1%	12	30.8%	
Other	30	28.8%	10	25.6%	
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%	

C. Availability, Access to, and Satisfaction with French Institutions, Services, and Activities in Communities Outside of Quebec, and with English Institutions, Services, and Activities in Communities in Quebec

(See Section C in Appendix A)

Table 12 shows respondents' answers to questions about how difficult it has been to get information in French (ROC)/English (Quebec) about settling in their community, to what extent settlement services are available in French/English in their current community, use of settlement services in French/English, satisfaction with these settlement services, and helpfulness of these settlement services. Settlement services were defined for respondents as "services that you or a member of your family might have used that are specifically for recent immigrants to Canada, such as those provided by settlement service agencies." For each question, the full range of responses was utilized in both the Rest of Canada and Ouebec. Interestingly, in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec, approximately 50% of respondents indicated that they have used settlement services in French (ROC) or English (Quebec). It is worth noting that although all respondents indicated whether they had used these settlement services, the number of individuals who did not respond to some of the questions about these services is rather high. For instance, 20 individuals in the Rest of Canada did not respond to the question, "To what extent are settlement services available in French in your current community?" It is possible that these numbers are large because some individuals did not know whether settlement services in French are available in their community. In future surveys, it will be important to capture this by separately coding "don't know" and "no response." In addition, in the Rest of Canada, 31 respondents did not provide a rating for satisfaction with settlement services in French and 27 did not provide a rating of helpfulness of these settlement services. The vast majority (all except 2) of these individuals had not used settlement services in French. Thus, in future surveys, these questions could be directed at only those who indicate that they have used these settlement services. Alternatively, because a number of individuals who have not used these settlement services themselves still responded to the questions about service satisfaction and helpfulness (which asked about services for both them and their families), the questions could be asked of all participants but a separate "not applicable" response option would need to be provided. It is important to note that the pilot survey suggests that satisfaction with settlement services and perceived helpfulness of settlement services are not redundant, with moderate correlations between them of .59 and .67. Thus, future surveys should maintain both items.

One issue to consider is whether it is optimal to ask about services in English or French, or to ask about services provided by Francophone or Anglophone organizations. These are not equivalent (e.g., services in French may be provided by a primarily Anglophone organization), and future surveys may choose to include one or both forms of this question.

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			,	
		of Canada		Quebec
Difficulty in Getting Information		n French		n English
1 - Not at all difficult	41	39.4%	11	28.2%
2	16	15.4%	5	12.8%
3	2	1.9%	6	15.4%
4	10	9.6%	7	17.9%
5	13	12.5%	3	7.7%
6	5	4.8%	3	7.7%
7 - Extremely difficult	8	7.7%	1	2.6%
No Response	9	8.7%	3	7.7%
Mean Score:	N = 95	M = 2.8	N = 36	M = 3.0
Availability of Settlement Services				
1 - Not at all available	12	11.5%	2	5.1%
2	10	9.6%	2	5.1%
3	6	5.8%	5	12.8%
4	7	6.7%	5	12.8%
5	8	7.7%	11	28.2%
6	14	13.5%	4	10.3%
7 - Extremely available	27	26.0%	7	17.9%
No Response	20	19.2%	3	7.7%
Mean Score:	N = 84	M = 4.7	N = 36	M = 4.7
Used Settlement Services ?	N = 04	101 – 4.7	N = 50	101 - 4.7
Yes	50	48.1%	20	51.3%
No	50 54	40.1 <i>%</i> 51.9%	17	43.6%
	54	51.9%	2	
No Response Satisfaction with Settlement Services			Ζ	5.1%
	0	7 70/	4	10.20/
1 - Not at all satisfied	8	7.7%	4	10.3%
2	2	1.9%	1	2.6%
3	6	5.8%	1	2.6%
4	7	6.7%	5	12.8%
5	8	7.7%	7	17.9%
6	15	14.4%	7	17.9%
7 - Extremely satisfied	27	26.0%	6	15.4%
No Response	31	29.8%	8	20.5%
Mean Score:	N = 73	M = 5.2	N = 31	M = 4.8
Helpfulness of Settlement Services				
1 - Not at all helpful	11	10.6%	5	12.8%
2	2	1.9%	3	7.7%
3	8	7.7%	4	10.3%
4	9	8.7%	5	12.8%
5	12	11.5%	5	12.8%
6	11	10.6%	7	17.9%
7 - Extremely helpful	24	23.1%	4	10.3%
No Response	27	26.0%	6	15.4%
Mean Score:	N = 77	M = 4.8	N = 33	M=4.2
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 12: Access to Information; Availability, Satisfaction, and Helpfulness of
Settlement Services in French (ROC) and English (Quebec)

Table 13 shows respondents' answers to questions about the extent to which sports, recreation, and cultural activities are available in French (ROC)/English (Quebec) in their current community, whether they have participated in these activities, and their satisfaction with these activities. For each question, the full range of responses (with one exception) was utilized in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec. In both the Rest of Canada and Quebec, over 40% of respondents have participated in these sports, recreation, and cultural activities. Interestingly, although 100% of respondents answered the question about whether they have participated in these activities, between 5% and 26% of respondents did not respond to the availability and satisfaction questions. This non-response rate to the question about availability is likely large because some participants do not know whether these activities are available in their community. The non-response rate to the question about satisfaction was caused by participants who have not participated in these activities themselves. All of the individuals who did not respond to the question about satisfaction with activities had not participated in any activities themselves. Thus, in future surveys, this question could be directed only at those who indicate that they have participated in these activities. Alternatively, because a number of individuals who have not participated in these activities themselves still responded to the question about satisfaction (which asked about activities for both them and their families), the question could be asked of all participants but a separate "not applicable" response option would be provided.

Table 13: Availability, Participation, and Satisfaction with Sports, Recreation
and Cultural Activities in French (ROC) and English (Quebec)

	Rest o	of Canada		Quebec
Availability of Activities	in	in French		English
1 - Not at all available	21	20.2%	3	7.7%
2	7	6.7%	0	0.0%
3	12	11.5%	2	5.1%
4	8	7.7%	5	12.8%
5	14	13.5%	12	30.8%
6	4	3.8%	7	17.9%
7 - Extremely available	26	25.0%	8	20.5%
No Response	12	11.5%	2	5.1%
Mean Score:	N = 92	M = 4.1	N = 37	M = 5.1
Participated in Activities?				
Yes	50	48.1%	16	41.0%
No	54	51.9%	23	59.0%
Satisfaction with Activities				
1 - Not at all satisfied	11	10.6%	3	7.7%
2	2	1.9%	1	2.6%
3	3	2.9%	3	7.7%
4	11	10.6%	4	10.3%
5	13	12.5%	9	23.1%
6	12	11.5%	9	23.1%
7 - Extremely satisfied	25	24.0%	7	17.9%
No Response	27	26.0%	3	7.7%
Mean Score:	N = 77	M = 4.9	N = 36	M = 4.9
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

The next set of questions concern whether respondents had any children attending primary or secondary school, and if so, what type of school they attended and what type of school respondents would have preferred (Table 14). Approximately one-fifth of respondents in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec had children attending primary or secondary school. Only two people from the total sample (both in the ROC) provided no response to this question. In this pilot survey, respondents were asked, "What type of school have your child/children mainly attended in your current community?" The interviewers were instructed to read all options to response to this question. Thus, in future surveys it is recommended that respondents be limited to selecting one response to this question. When asked, "What type of school would you have preferred your child/children to have attended since coming to your current community?" other responses were provided by five respondents from the Rest of Canada. Two of these individuals listed a bilingual school as their preferred choice. This could be added as an option to future surveys.

	Rest of Canada		Quebec	
Child/Children Attending School?				
Yes	22	21.2%	9	23.1%
No	80	76.9%	30	76.9%
No Response	2	1.9%		
Type of School Child/Children Attended				
English language school	13	12.5%	1	2.6%
English immersion school	1	1.0%	0	0.0%
French language school	8	7.7%	6	15.4%
French immersion school	0	0.0%	1	2.6%
Other	0	0.0%	1	2.6%
Not Applicable	82	78.8%	30	76.9%
Second Response for Type of School Child/Children Attended				
English language school	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
English immersion school	0	0.0%	1	2.6%
French language school	2	1.9%	0	0.0%
French immersion school	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	2	1.9%	0	0.0%
Not Applicable	100	96.2%	38	97.4%
Type of School Preferred				
English language school	5	4.8%	2	5.1%
English immersion school	3	2.9%	1	2.6%
French language school	8	7.7%	3	7.7%
French immersion school	0	0.0%	2	5.1%
Other	5	4.8%	0	0.0%
No Response	1	1.0%	1	2.6%
Not Applicable	82	78.8%	30	76.9%
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 14: Children Attending Primary or Secondary School, Types of SchoolsAttended, Types of Schools Preferred

Respondents whose children were not attending their preferred choice of school (8 in ROC and 5 in Quebec) were provided with a list of possible reasons and asked to select all that apply. Interestingly, all the reasons provided were endorsed to a reasonable extent in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec. Thus, none of the options included in the current survey seem like candidates for removal. Among the other reasons provided, there were no consistent themes that emerged.

Table 15: Main Reason(s) Why Your Child/Children Have Not Attended Your Preferred Language School

	Rest of Canada		Quebec	
Main Reasons				
There are no preferred language schools in the neighbourhood	5	71.4%	4	80.0%
Transportation to a preferred language school would be difficult	5	62.5%	1	20.0%
There are no preferred language schools in the town or city in				
which you live	1	14.3%	2	40.0%
You were not able to register your child/children in a preferred				
language school	4	57.1%	1	20.0%
Your child/children chose to go to a particular school	2	28.6%	2	40.0%
The other parent chose to send the child/children to a particular				
school	3	42.9%	1	20.0%
You were not aware that there was an option to send your				
child/children to a preferred language school	3	50.0%	1	20.0%
Other	2	28.6%	2	40.0%
Total	8	100.0%	5	100.0%

Table 16 shows respondents' answers to questions about the extent to which elementary and secondary education is available in French (ROC)/English (Quebec) in their current community, how satisfied individuals are with the elementary and secondary education in French/English, the extent to which health care services are available in French/English in their current community, and how satisfied individuals are with the health care services in French/English. For each question, the full range of responses (with one exception) was utilized in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec. It is worth noting that the number of individuals who did not respond to some of these questions is rather high. For instance, between 18% and 36% of respondents did not respond to the questions about education. In future surveys, perhaps these questions should only be asked to respondents who indicate that they have school-aged children.

	Rest of Canada		Quebec		
Availability of Elementary and Secondary Education	in French		in English		
1 - Not at all available	2	1.9%	6	15.4%	
2	4	3.8%	5	12.8%	
3	3	2.9%	4	10.3%	
4	7	6.7%	4	10.3%	
5	11	10.6%	2	5.1%	
6	8	7.7%	5	12.8%	
7 - Extremely available	43	41.3%	6	15.4%	
No Response	26	25.0%	7	17.9%	
Mean Score:	N = 78	M = 5.8	N = 32	M = 3.9	
Satisfaction with Elementary and Secondary Education					
1 - Not at all satisfied	4	3.8%	4	10.3%	
2	3	2.9%	0	0.0%	
3	5	4.8%	1	2.6%	
4	9	8.7%	10	25.6%	
5	14	13.5%	4	10.3%	
6	14	13.5%	3	7.7%	
7 - Extremely satisfied	17	16.3%	4	10.3%	
No Response	38	36.5%	13	33.3%	
Mean Score:	N = 66	M = 5.1	N = 26	M = 4.4	
Availability of Healh Care Services					
1 - Not at all available	23	22.1%	1	2.6%	
2	8	7.7%	2	5.1%	
3	2	1.9%	6	15.4%	
4	7	6.7%	2	5.1%	
5	9	8.7%	12	30.8%	
6	10	9.6%	5	12.8%	
7 - Extremely available	36	34.6%	10	25.6%	
No Response	9	8.7%	1	2.6%	
Mean Score:	N = 95	M = 4.5	N = 38	M = 5.0	
Satisfaction with Health Care Services					
1 - Not at all satisfied	15	14.4%	1	2.6%	
2	5	4.8%	5	12.8%	
3	6	5.8%	2	5.1%	
4	8	7.7%	4	10.3%	
5	16	15.4%	12	30.8%	
6	11	10.6%	5	12.8%	
7 - Extremely satisfied	28	26.9%	8	20.5%	
No Response	15	14.4%	2	5.1%	
Mean Score:	N = 89	M = 4.7	N = 37	M = 4.8	
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%	

Table 16: Availability and Satisfaction with Elementary and Secondary Education and Health Care Services in French (ROC) and in English (Quebec)

D. Language Practices and Retention

(See Section D in Appendix A)

Table 17 focuses on official language ability. Respondents were asked to rate their English and French language ability in speaking, understanding, reading, and writing on 0 to 10 scales. In the Rest of Canada, the responses tend to fall between the midpoint and high end of the scale, with very few respondents indicating no or poor knowledge of English or French. In Quebec, in contrast, the responses for English tend to show a similar pattern, but the responses for French cover the full range of the scale with a sizeable proportion of respondents indicating no or poor knowledge of French. This is also reflected in the overall mean across the ratings, which are 7.0 and 9.0 in the Rest of Canada, but 7.7 and 3.9 in Quebec. In the Rest of Canada a few respondents chose to provide no response, whereas in Quebec no respondent did so.

Asking four questions to get at language ability may not be an optimal use of time in a survey. Examination of the correlations among the responses to speaking, reading, writing, and understanding English or French in the Rest of Canada and in Quebec reveals strong correlations that range from .76 to .95. Thus, future surveys could utilize one question that asks about overall English or French language ability across speaking, understanding, reading, and writing.

	Rest of Canada				Quebec			
		English		French		English		French
Speaking								
0 - None	2	1.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	12.8%
1	2	1.9%	1	1.0%	1	2.6%	6	15.4%
2	1	1.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	5	12.8%
3	1	1.0%	2	1.9%	1	2.6%	5	12.8%
4	8	7.7%	2	1.9%	1	2.6%	3	7.7%
5	18	17.3%	2	1.9%	5	12.8%	4	10.3%
6	10	9.6%	1	1.0%	6	15.4%	2	5.1%
7	11	10.6%	8	7.7%	5	12.8%	3	7.7%
8	32	30.8%	8	7.7%	11	28.2%	1	2.6%
9	11	10.6%	14	13.5%	1	2.6%	4	10.3%
10 - Excellent	8	7.7%	62	59.6%	8	20.5%	1	2.6%
No Response			3	2.9%				
Mean Score: Speaking	N = 104	M = 6.7	N = 101	M = 8.9	N = 39	M=7.2	N = 39	M = 3.9
Understanding								
0 - None	2	1.9%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	7	17.9%
1	2	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	4	10.3%
2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	5.1%
3	3	2.9%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	5	12.8%
4	6	5.8%	4	3.8%	1	2.6%	2	5.1%
5	11	10.6%	1	1.0%	3	7.7%	3	7.7%
6	7	6.7%	2	1.9%	6	15.4%	3	7.7%
7	11	10.6%	5	4.8%	4	10.3%	6	15.4%
8	22	21.2%	7	6.7%	9	23.1%	1	2.6%
9	21	20.2%	12	11.5%	3	7.7%	3	7.7%
10 - Excellent	17	16.3%	67	64.4%	12	30.8%	3	7.7%
No Response	2	1.9%	4	3.8%				
Mean Score: Understanding	N = 102	M = 7.3	N = 100	M = 9.1	N = 39	M = 7.8	N = 39	M = 4.4

Table 17: Ability to Speak, Understand, Read, and Write in English and French

Table 17: Continued

	Rest of Canada			Quebec				
		English		French		English		French
Reading								
0 - None	3	2.9%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	6	15.4%
1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	10.3%
2	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	10.3%
3	2	1.9%	2	1.9%	0	0.0%	3	7.7%
4	7	6.7%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	4	10.3%
5	11	10.6%	3	2.9%	3	7.7%	4	10.3%
6	9	8.7%	4	3.8%	4	10.3%	0	0.0%
7	9	8.7%	3	2.9%	7	17.9%	7	17.9%
8	22	21.2%	4	3.8%	5	12.8%	2	5.1%
9	19	18.3%	15	14.4%	2	5.1%	2	5.1%
10 - Excellent	21	20.2%	69	66.3%	17	43.6%	3	7.7%
No Response			3	2.9%				
Mean Score: Reading	N = 104	M = 7.4	N = 101	M = 9.1	N = 39	M = 8.2	N = 39	M = 4.4
Writing								
0 - None	3	2.9%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	12	30.8%
1	1	1.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	3	7.7%
2	1	1.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	8	20.5%
3	3	2.9%	2	1.9%	0	0.0%	2	5.1%
4	10	9.6%	3	2.9%	2	5.1%	2	5.1%
5	9	8.7%	2	1.9%	5	12.8%	4	10.3%
6	14	13.5%	3	2.9%	6	15.4%	0	0.0%
7	18	17.3%	4	3.8%	6	15.4%	2	5.1%
8	20	19.2%	8	7.7%	6	15.4%	2	5.1%
9	13	12.5%	16	15.4%	3	7.7%	1	2.6%
10 - Excellent	12	11.5%	60	57.7%	11	28.2%	3	7.7%
No Response			3	2.9%				
Mean Score: Writing	N =104	M = 6.8	N = 101	M = 8.8	N = 39	M = 7.6	N = 39	M = 3.1
Mean Ability to Speak,								
Understand, Read and Write	N = 104	M = 7.0	N = 101	M = 9.0	N = 39	M = 7.7	N = 39	M = 3.9
Total	104	100.0%	104	100.0%	39	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 18 focuses on whether official languages are used in various aspects of one's life, including at home, with family members, at work, and with friends. There are a number of no responses to the questions about language spoken with spouse or partner, with children, and at work. For example, in the Rest of Canada, 43 respondents did not respond to the question about language spoken with children. It is likely that these non-response rates at times reflect the fact that the question isn't applicable because the respondent does not have a spouse or partner, does not have children, or is not working. In addition, examination of the other responses provided suggest additional response options that should be provided in future surveys: "English and French," "English and another language," and "French and another language."

In this pilot survey, we specifically asked about language use across a variety of situations to determine whether all of these questions are required for future surveys. Chi-square analyses suggest that the questions asking about language use at home, with a spouse or partner, and with children overlap and are non-independent, and thus could be asked in one question about language use at home. In contrast, language use at work and with friends seems to be relatively independent of the other questions and should be maintained.

	Rest of Canada		Quebec	
Language Spoken at Home				
English	29	27.9%	12	30.8%
French	36	34.6%	1	2.6%
Other	39	37.5%	25	64.1%
No Response			1	2.6%
Language Spoken With Spouse or Partner				
English	33	31.7%	15	38.5%
French	32	30.8%	1	2.6%
Other	26	25.0%	21	53.8%
No Response	13	12.5%	2	5.1%
Language Spoken With Children				
English	8	7.7%	9	23.1%
French	23	22.1%	2	5.1%
Other	30	28.8%	15	38.5%
No Response	43	41.3%	13	33.3%
Language Spoken at Work				
English	69	66.3%	26	66.7%
French	10	9.6%	8	20.5%
Other	12	11.5%	3	7.7%
No Response	13	12.5%	2	5.1%
Language Spoken with Friends				
English	49	47.1%	18	46.2%
French	17	16.3%	6	15.4%
Other	38	36.5%	15	38.5%
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 18: Languages Spoken at Home, With a Spouse or Partner, With Children, At Work, and With Friends

Table 19 focuses on change in use of French (ROC)/English (Quebec) since coming to one's current community. Very few respondents did not provide an answer to this question. Of note, in the Rest of Canada, use of French is relatively evenly distributed across the responses of "Increased," "Stayed the same," and "Decreased." In contrast, in Quebec, use of English is more likely to have increased.

Table 19: Change in Use of French (ROC) or English (Quebec) since Coming to Current Community

	Rest		Quebec		
Has Your Use of French (ROC) or English (Quebec)					
Increased	37	35.6%	25	64.1%	
Stayed the Same	24	23.1%	9	23.1%	
Decreased	41	39.4%	5	12.8%	
No Response	2	1.9%			
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%	

E. Social and Cultural Integration

(See Section E in Appendix A)

Table 20 focuses on sense of belonging to Canada, sense of belonging to local community, and trust in people in local community. Local community was defined for respondents as "the city, town, or neighbourhood where you live." In both the Rest of Canada and Quebec, the responses tend to fall between the midpoint and high end of the scale, with few respondents indicating a weak sense of belonging to Canada or the local community, or a lack of trust in people in the local community. The response rates for these questions were high (the number of respondents who did not respond to the questions ranged from 0 to 3).

Table 20: Sense of Belonging to Canada, Sense of Belonging to LocalCommunity and Trust in People in Local Community

	Resto	of Canada	Quebec		
Sense of Belonging to Canada					
1 - Very weak	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
2	4	3.8%	1	2.6%	
3	5	4.8%	2	5.1%	
4	12	11.5%	1	2.6%	
5	24	23.1%	7	17.9%	
6	20	19.2%	12	30.8%	
7 - Very Strong	36	34.6%	16	41.0%	
No Response	3	2.9%			
Mean Score:	N = 101	M = 5.6	N = 39	M = 5.9	
Sense of Belonging to Local Community					
1 - Very weak	2	1.9%	0	0.0%	
2	4	3.8%	1	2.6%	
3	5	4.8%	3	7.7%	
4	14	13.5%	3	7.7%	
5	33	31.7%	10	25.6%	
6	16	15.4%	5	12.8%	
7 - Very Strong	29	27.9%	16	41.0%	
No Response	1	1.0%	1	2.6%	
Mean Score:	N = 103	M = 5.3	N = 38	M = 5.7	
Trust in People in Local Community					
1 - Not at all	5	4.8%	0	0.0%	
2	1	1.0%	2	5.1%	
3	6	5.8%	2	5.1%	
4	10	9.6%	3	7.7%	
5	28	26.9%	11	28.2%	
6	27	26.0%	13	33.3%	
7 – Extremely	24	23.1%	5	12.8%	
No Response	3	2.9%	3	7.7%	
Mean Score:	N = 101	M = 5.3	N = 36	M = 5.3	
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%	

Table 21 focuses on how many friends' respondents have in their local community, how many of these friends are Francophones, how many of these friends are Anglophones, sense of belonging to their Francophone (Rest of Canada) or Anglophone (Quebec) community, and trust in people in their Francophone (Rest of Canada) or Anglophone (Quebec) community. For the question about how many friends respondents have in their local community, the full range of responses was utilized in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec. A fairly high number (33 in the Rest of Canada and 17 in Quebec) indicated that they have more than 12 friends in their local community. For the questions about how many of these friends are Francophones and how many of these friends are Anglophones, the full range of responses was utilized in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec. A few respondents provided no response to these questions, with some, but not all, of these respondents being individuals who said they have no friends in their local community.

For the questions about sense of belonging to Francophone/Anglophone community, and trust in people in Francophone/Anglophone community, there was generally a good range of responses utilized in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec. In both the Rest of Canada and Quebec, the responses tend to fall between the midpoint and high end of the scale, with few respondents indicating a weak sense of belonging to their Francophone/Anglophone community or a lack of trust in people in their Francophone/Anglophone community. There was a fairly high (13%) non-response rate for the question about trust in people in Francophone community (Rest of Canada). While there are several plausible explanations for this, it is possible that some individuals do not feel that they have a Francophone community. Thus, in future surveys, a question should be added asking respondents if there is a local Francophone/Anglophone community where they live. For those individuals who indicate that they do not, questions about sense of belonging and trust in this community would be skipped.

		(0	Quehas		
	Resto	of Canada		Quebec	
Number of Friends in Local Community		0.00/		0.004	
None	4	3.8%	1	2.6%	
1-3	19	18.3%	4	10.3%	
4-6	18	17.3%	5	12.8%	
7-9	11	10.6%	5	12.8%	
10-12	16	15.4%	4	10.3%	
More than 12	33	31.7%	17	43.6%	
No Response	3	2.9%	3	7.7%	
Of These Friends, How Many are Francophones?					
None of them	17	16.3%	4	10.3%	
Less than half	29	27.9%	14	35.9%	
About half	22	21.2%	10	25.6%	
More than half	18	17.3%	3	7.7%	
All of them	11	10.6%	3	7.7%	
No Response	7	6.7%	5	12.8%	
Of These Friends, How Many are Anglophones?					
None of them	8	7.7%	3	7.7%	
Less than half	19	18.3%	11	28.2%	
About half	21	20.2%	5	12.8%	
More than half	27	26.0%	6	15.4%	
All of them	20	19.2%	9	23.1%	
No Response	9	8.7%	5	12.8%	
Sense of Belonging to Community	Franco	phone	Anglop	hone	
1 - Very weak	13	12.5%	2	5.1%	
2	7	6.7%	1	2.6%	
3	5	4.8%	2	5.1%	
4	13	12.5%	5	12.8%	
5	25	24.0%	8	20.5%	
6	17	16.3%	9	23.1%	
7 - Very Strong	18	17.3%	10	25.6%	
No Response	6	5.8%	2	5.1%	
Mean Score:	N = 98	M = 4.6	N = 37	M = 5.2	
Trust in People in Community	Franco		Anglop		
1 - Not at all	3	2.9%	0	0.0%	
2	5	4.8%	0	0.0%	
3	4	3.8%	2	5.1%	
4	11	10.6%	5	12.8%	
5	24	23.1%	15	38.5%	
6	25	24.0%	6	15.4%	
7 - Extremely	19	24.0 <i>%</i> 18.3%	8	20.5%	
No Response	13	12.5%	3	20.3 <i>%</i> 7.7%	
Mean Score:	N = 91	M = 5.2	N = 36	M = 5.4	
Total	<u>104</u>	100.0%			
	104	100.0%	39	100.0%	

Table 21: Number and Type of Friends, Sense of Belonging, and Trust in Peoplein Francophone and Anglophone Community

F. Economic Integration

(See Section F in Appendix)

Table 22 illustrates respondents' current employment status. As expected, responses are not equally distributed among the response options, but all response options (with the exception of 'Retired' in Quebec) were utilized. Interestingly, in the Rest of Canada, 53% of respondents were employed full-time, while in Quebec, 36% of respondents were employed full-time. In this survey, respondents were asked, "What is your current employment status? Are you...." The interviewers were instructed to read all employment options to respondents and to allow multiple responses. Very few respondents (5 in Rest of Canada and 3 in Quebec) provided more than one response to this question and, for simplicity, the table shows the first response only. Thus, in future surveys it is recommended that respondents are asked "Which of the following best describes your current employment status?" and interviewers are instructed to allow only one response. Three respondents who selected "other" as one of their responses were on maternity leave. For future surveys, this response should not be allowed but instead should be probed further so that respondents provide their employment status when not on parental leave.

	Rest of Canada			Quebec
Current Employment Status				
Employed full-time (30 hours a week or more)	55	52.9%	14	35.9%
Employed part-time (Less than 30 hours a week)	10	9.6%	6	15.4%
Self-employed or own your own business	9	8.7%	4	10.3%
Unemployed, looking for work	10	9.6%	8	20.5%
Unemployed, not looking for work	2	1.9%	3	7.7%
Retired	4	3.8%	0	0.0%
Student	7	6.7%	3	7.7%
Homemaker	2	1.9%	1	2.6%
Other	2	1.9%		
No Response	3	2.9%		
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 22: Current Employment Status

Table 23 shows the skill type and skill level of respondents' occupation. Respondents who indicated that they were currently employed were asked "What is your job now? Please be as detailed as possible, including job and industry." Responses to this question were coded using the National Occupational Classification (NOC) 2011 (Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, 2011). Skill type refers to "the type of work performed" (e.g., business, finance, and administration occupations), while skill level refers to "the amount and type of education and training required" in the job (Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, 2011, pp.9-10). To ensure reliability of this coding, two independent raters both coded 19 job descriptions. Agreement was high at 17 of 19 codes, and, following discussion of the discrepancy, one coder then completed the rest of the job codings. All skill types and levels were represented. It is important to note that it was not possible to code 9 jobs (6 in Rest of Canada and 3 in Quebec) because the answers provided were too vague, despite the fact that respondents were asked to be as detailed as possible, including job and industry. Thus, for future surveys, it will be important that interviewers be trained to probe for sufficient detail to enable NOC coding of all job descriptions.

Table 23: Type and Skill Level of Occupation

	Rest of Canada			Quebec
Type of Occupation				
Management	6	5.8%	1	2.6%
Business, finance and administration	9	8.7%	5	12.8%
Natural and applied sciences and related occupations	7	6.7%	3	7.7%
Health	1	1.0%	1	2.6%
Education, law and social, community and government services	18	17.3%	3	7.7%
Art, culture, recreation and sport	2	1.9%	1	2.6%
Sales and service	11	10.6%	2	5.1%
Trades, transport and equipment operators and related	10	9.6%	3	7.7%
Manufacturing and utilities	5	4.8%	1	2.6%
Occupation not classifiable	6	5.8%	3	7.7%
No response			1	2.6%
Not Applicable	29	27.9%	15	38.5%
Skill Level				
A – University degree	27	26.0%	9	23.1%
B – Two to three years of post-secondary education at				
community college, institute of technology, or CEGEP; or two to				
five years of apprenticeship training; or three to four years of				
secondary school and more than two years of on-the-job				
training, occupation-specific training courses or specific work				
experience	18	17.3%	5	12.8%
C – Completion of secondary school and some short duration				
courses or training specific to the occupation; or some				
secondary school with up to two years of on-the-job training,				
training courses, or specific work experience	18	17.3%	5	12.8%
D – Short on-the-job training; or no formal education	6	5.8%	1	2.6%
Skill level not classifiable	6	5.8%	3	7.7%
No response			1	2.6%
Not Applicable	29	27.9%	15	38.5%
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 24 shows respondents' perceptions of how their current employment situation compares to the employment situation they had before they came to Canada, and their satisfaction with their current job. All response options (with one exception) were utilized. Interestingly, approximately 50% of respondents in the Rest of Canada, and 26% of respondents in Quebec indicated that their current employment situation is better than the employment situation they had before they came to Canada. In both the Rest of Canada and Quebec, the responses to the job satisfaction question tend to fall between the midpoint and high end of the scale, with few respondents indicating they are not at all satisfied with their current job. The response rates for these questions were high (the number of respondents who did not respond to the questions ranged from 0 to 3).

	Rest	of Canada		Quebec
Compared to Before You Came to Canada, Curre	nt Employment Situation	is		
Better	52	50.0%	10	25.6%
The same	15	14.4%	3	7.7%
Worse	5	4.8%	8	20.5%
No Response	3	2.9%	3	7.7%
Not Applicable	29	27.9%	15	38.5%
Satisfaction with Current Job				
1 - Not at all satisfied	5	4.8%	1	2.6%
2	0	0.0%	1	2.6%
3	3	2.9%	3	7.7%
4	11	10.6%	5	12.8%
5	11	10.6%	5	12.8%
6	20	19.2%	6	15.4%
7 - Extremely satisfied	24	23.1%	3	7.7%
No Response	1	1.0%		
Not Applicable	29	27.9%	15	38.5%
Mean Score:	N = 74	M = 5.4	N = 24	M = 4.8
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 24: Current Employment Situation Compared to Employment SituationBefore Coming to Canada, and Satisfaction with Current Job

Table 25 focuses on skill utilization in current job, and difficulty in finding a job that uses qualifications (including reasons for this difficulty). For the questions about how much one's current job uses skills from education and training, and how difficult it was to find a job that uses qualifications, the full range of responses was utilized in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec. In the Rest of Canada, 12 respondents provided no response to the question about difficulty finding a job that uses their qualifications. Understandably, though based on a small sample, the estimated percentage who did not respond to this question is higher for those who are retired and those unemployed and not looking for work.

Respondents who answered at or above the scale mid-point when asked how difficult it has been to get a job that makes use of qualifications were subsequently asked about reasons it has been difficult. A list of reasons was read to respondents and they were asked to select all that apply. The majority of respondents provided more than one reason and thus it is recommended that future surveys continue to use the "read, select all" format. "Other" responses were also quite frequently provided (by 17 respondents in the Rest of Canada and 6 in Quebec). One theme emerges from these other responses, provided by 5 respondents in the Rest of Canada; future surveys might consider adding "discrimination against immigrants" as an additional response option.

	Resto	of Canada		Quebec
Use of Skills from Education and Training on Current Job				
1 - Not at all	7	6.7%	3	7.7%
2	6	5.8%	2	5.1%
3	3	2.9%	4	10.3%
4	11	10.6%	4	10.3%
5	7	6.7%	2	5.1%
6	12	11.5%	5	12.8%
7 - Extremely	28	26.9%	4	10.3%
No Response	1	1.0%	15	38.5%
Not Applicable	29	27.9%		
Mean Score:	N = 74	M = 5.1	N = 24	M=4.3
Difficulty in Finding a Job that Uses Qualifications				
1 - Not at all difficult	20	19.2%	7	17.9%
2	10	9.6%	4	10.3%
3	8	7.7%	4	10.3%
4	12	11.5%	4	10.3%
5	9	8.7%	9	23.1%
6	11	10.6%	4	10.3%
7 - Extremely difficult	22	21.2%	5	12.8%
No Response	12	11.5%	2	5.1%
Mean Score:	N = 92	M = 4.1	N = 37	M = 4.0
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%
Reasons for Difficulty in Finding a Job that Uses Qualifications	104	100.070		100.070
There are not a lot of jobs available that match your				
qualifications	31	57.4%	12	54.5%
You do not have 'Canadian experience'	28	51.9%	11	50.0%
Some employers do not recognize the education or experience	20	01.070		00.070
you have brought with you to Canada	43	79.6%	12	54.5%
You are not fluent in English	43 18	33.3%	12	63.6%
Employers discriminate against people who are primarily	10	55.576	14	03.078
Francophones	7	13.0%	6	27.3%
-	, 19	35.2%	6 5	27.3%
You do not have good career information or guidance	19	35.2%	5	22.170
You wish to work in a regulated trade or profession and have				
not been able to register or receive a license to practice in this	04	20.00/	0	20 40/
trade or profession in Canada	21	38.9%	8	36.4%
The skills required in Canada for your chosen profession are	00	10 10/	-	04.00/
different from the ones you have	26	48.1%	7	31.8%
Employers do not accept your qualifications as equal to	~~~	E4 00/	10	
Canadian qualifications	28	51.9%	10	45.5%
You do not have the connections that would help you to obtain a	. .	00.001		
job	34	63.0%	13	59.1%
You do not know enough about how to find a job in Canada	21	38.9%	7	31.8%
Other	17	31.5%	6	27.3%
Total	54	100.0%	22	100.0%

Table 25: Use of Skills from Education and Training on Current Job, Difficulty in Finding a Job That Uses Qualifications, and Reasons for Difficulty in Finding a Job That Uses Qualifications

Table 26 shows respondents' personal earnings and ease in paying for needs. The personal earnings question was asked only of those who had indicated that they were employed full- or part-time or were self-employed. For both questions, the full range of responses was utilized in both the Rest of Canada and Quebec. Quite a few respondents (10 in Rest of Canada and 7 in Quebec) did not respond to the question about personal earnings. This is not surprising given the personal nature of this question and the fact that some respondents might not feel comfortable answering it. Nonetheless, because of the useful information obtained and the fact that there is an option not to respond, this question should be retained in future surveys, positioned as it is here near the end of the survey.

	Rest of Canada			Quebec
Personal Earnings Before Taxes and Deductions				
Less than \$7.00/hour or < \$14,500/year	2	1.9%	2	5.1%
\$8.75 to \$9.99/hour or \$18,001 to \$21,000/year	1	1.0%	0	0.0%
\$10.00 to \$14.99/hour or \$21,001 to \$31,000/year	16	15.4%	7	17.9%
\$15.00 to \$19.99/hour or \$31,001 to \$42,000/year	10	9.6%	5	12.8%
\$20.00 to \$24.99/hour or \$42,001 to \$52,000/year	14	13.5%	0	0.0%
\$25.00 to \$29.99/hour or \$52,001 to \$62,000/year	11	10.6%	1	2.6%
\$30.00 to \$34.99/hour or \$62,001 to \$73,000/year	5	4.8%	1	2.6%
\$35.00 to \$39.99/hour or \$73,001 to \$83,000/year	3	2.9%	1	2.6%
\$40.00 to \$44.99/hour or \$83,001 to \$94,000/year	1	1.0%	0	0.0%
\$45.00 to \$50.00/hour or \$94,001 to \$104,000/year	1	1.0%	0	0.0%
More than \$50.00/hour or \$104,000/year	1	1.0%	0	0.0%
No Response	10	9.6%	7	17.9%
Not Applicable	29	27.9%	15	38.5%
Ease in Paying for Needs				
1 - Not at all easy	8	7.7%	2	5.1%
2	4	3.8%	4	10.3%
3	8	7.7%	5	12.8%
4	15	14.4%	8	20.5%
5	24	23.1%	8	20.5%
6	17	16.3%	4	10.3%
7 - Extremely easy	23	22.1%	8	20.5%
No Response	5	4.8%		
Mean Score:	N = 99	M = 4.9	N = 39	M = 4.54
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Table 26: Personal Earnings and Ease in Paying For Needs

G. Well-Being

(See Section G in Appendix A)

Table 27 shows responses to the last question in the survey, "How satisfied are you with your life these days?" In both the Rest of Canada and Quebec, the responses tend to fall between the midpoint and high end of the scale, with few respondents indicating that they are not satisfied with their life these days. The response rate for this question was high (only 4 respondents, all from the Rest of Canada, did not respond), especially considering it was the last question in the survey.

Table 27: Well-Being

	Resto	Quebec		
Satisfaction with Life These Days				
1 - Not at all satisfied	2	1.9%		
2	1	1.0%	1	2.6%
3	3	2.9%	6	15.4%
4	8	7.7%	6	15.4%
5	29	27.9%	9	23.1%
6	22	21.2%	7	17.9%
7 - Extremely satisfied	35	33.7%	10	25.6%
No Response	4	3.8%		
Mean Score:	N = 100	M = 5.7	N = 39	M = 5.2
Total	104	100.0%	39	100.0%

Recommendation for a large-scale survey

The results of this pilot survey demonstrate the feasibility of the procedure utilized and the overall effectiveness of the survey instrument we have developed for assessing the settlement and integration experiences of Official Language Minority Immigrants in Canada. The instrument was very effective in eliciting information on each of the key topics of interest, with a wide variety of responses provided. The analyses also provide information on questions and response options that require adjustment, and the type of adjustments that should be made.

Based on these findings, we recommend that a full-scale survey be launched using a revised version of the pilot survey instrument. Our consideration of the populations of interest and the confidence intervals that are desirable suggests a sample size of approximately six thousand. This would include differentiating between individuals who primarily have ability in one versus both official languages. It would also include comparison groups to assist with the full interpretation of findings.

The Pathways to Prosperity research team is in an excellent position to conduct a full-scale survey based on our extensive experience in this area, including the design, implementation, analysis, and presentation of the current survey. We also have extensive experience in complex data analyses and interpretation needed to frame the findings within the context of current immigration policy and practice, and knowledge of official language minority communities.

We found that working with the Environics Research Group was productive and that they were responsive to the instructions we provided and the adjustments recommended. In addition, this group now has experience with the survey instrument and we would work with them to fine tune the data collection procedures to ensure data configured for optimal utility.

It should be noted that for optimal effectiveness, the research team would require access to the Citizenship and Immigration Canada landing data file. For the pilot survey, these data were provided directly to the Environics Research Group in order for them to contact potential respondents, but were not available to the research team. For a large-scale survey, the team would require access to this data file in order to compare the populations included in the sampling frame to our final samples and ensure their representativeness.

A large-scale survey would go a long way to filling major gaps in our knowledge of the settlement and integration experiences of Official Language Minority Immigrants in Canada. In addition to descriptive statistics, analyses would provide comparisons of responses as a function of key characteristics of respondents and their situation (e.g., country of birth, immigration category, education level, place of residence) and relations among variables (e.g., satisfaction with services and activities in preferred official language and likelihood of moving from current city or town). This would provide a rich body of information on which to develop evidence-based strategies for promoting the attraction, retention and integration of Official Language Minority Immigrants, and for supporting the vitality of Official Language Minority Communities across Canada.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

This is the version for Anglophones in Quebec; the words highlighted in yellow were appropriately altered for Francophones outside of Quebec.

Hello, my name is _____. I'm calling from Environics Research Group. I would like to speak to <FNAME><LNAME>. Are you _____ or is he/she at home now?

Environics Research Group is collecting information for the Government of Canada and researchers from the Pathways to Prosperity Partnership about the settlement and integration experiences of immigrants in Canada, and the factors that may affect attraction, retention, settlement and integration of immigrants in local communities. Your opinions are very important to us. The information will be used to develop better policies and programs for immigrants to Canada.

The survey will take about 20 minutes.

I would like to assure you that your participation in this interview is completely voluntary. If there are any questions you don't want to answer, please let me know and we will skip them. You may end this phone call at any time.

The information you provide will be used only for the indicated purposes in conformity with federal privacy legislation and with the Alberta and the Ontario Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Acts (FOIPP and FIPPA). Your answers are confidential and will be stored in a secure database and used only for study purposes. The results of this study will be analyzed only in group format. No single person will be identifiable.

I would like to ask you some questions; I hope that now is a good time for you. May we start the interview?

1 Yes [Continue]

2 No [Schedule a callback time or TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW]

DATE:

LENGTH OF TIME AS PERMANENT RESIDENT IN CANADA

How long have you been a permanent resident in Canada? [READ]

- 1. 3 months to 60 months (i.e., 5 years) record specific number of months [Go to LENGTH]
- 2. Less than 3 months [TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW: Must have been permanent resident from 3 to 60 months]
- 3. More than 60 months (i.e., 5 years) [TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW: Must have been a permanent resident from 3 to 60 months]

LENGTH

Months____

-1 No response [TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW IF NO RESPONSE]

AGE

Are you 18 years old or older?

1 Yes, 18 years or older 2 No, underage

[TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW: If Respondent is not 18 years or older.]

PROVINCE

Which city and province/territory do you live in now? (DO NOT READ)

City: _

Province:

British Columbia
 Alberta
 Saskatchewan
 Manitoba
 Ontario
 Quebec
 New Brunswick
 Nova Scotia
 Prince Edward Island
 Newfoundland and Labrador
 Yukon
 Northwest Territories
 Nunavut
 No response
 2 Don't know

LINGUISTIC PROFILE

Which of Canada's two official languages do you consider to be your preferred language that you speak, read, and write best? Do you consider yourself to be...? (SELECT ONE):

- 1. Anglophone
- 2. Francophone
- 3. Both Anglophone and Francophone
- 4. Neither Anglophone nor Francophone

[TERMINATE INTERVIEW FOR THOSE WHO DO NOT RESPOND 2 OR 3 OUTSIDE OF QUEBEC, AND FOR THOSE WHO DO NOT RESPOND 1 OR 3 IN QUEBEC. IF SELECT 2 OR 3 OUTSIDE OF QUEBEC, ANSWER QUESTIONS ABOUT SERVICES ETC IN FRENCH. IF SELECT 1 OR 3 IN QUEBEC, ANSWER QUESTIONS ABOUT SERVICES ETC IN ENGLISH.]

LANG

Please enter language that the interview was conducted in:

- 1 French
- 2 English

SEX

RECORD GENDER OF RESPONDENT (IF NOT SURE, PLEASE ASK)

1 Male 2 Female

TIME

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: START TIMING NOW]

Section A: Demographics

To begin, I'd like to ask you some questions about your background

A1

In what year were you born?_____

-1 No response

-2 Don't know

[IF RESPONDENT IS BORN IN 1997 OR LATER, TERMINATE INTERVIEW - NOT 18]

A2

Under which immigration category did you enter Canada or become a permanent resident in Canada?

(READ LIST, select one only)

1 Skilled worker or professional - ASK A2a

- 2 Family class
- 3 Provincial nominee ASK A2a
- 4 Refugee

5 Business class (investor, entrepreneur, or self-employed) - ASK A2a

- 6 Canadian experience class ASK A2a
- 7 Live-in caregiver

8 Other, please specify _____

-1 No response

-2 Don't know

IF SKILLED WORKER/PROFESSIONAL, PROVINCIAL NOMINEE, BUSINESS CLASS OR CANADIAN EXPERIENCE CLASS, ASK:

A2a

Were you the principal applicant or a dependent?

1 Principal applicant 2 Dependent

A3

What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

[DO NOT READ]

1 No formal education

- 2 Elementary school
- 3 Secondary school (high school)
- 4 College / vocational training

5 University undergraduate degree (B.A., B.Sc.)

6 University graduate degree (Master's or Ph.D.)

A4

In what country were you born? (DO NOT READ)

A5

What was the last country you lived in for more than 5 years?

- 1 Country of birth
- 2 Another country (please specify) _____
- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

A6

What countries are you a citizen of?

Canada Only
 Canada and Other, please specify: _____
 Other, please specify countries: _____
 No response
 -2 Don't know

A7

Which of the following best describes your ethnicity? [READ, select all that apply]

- 1. White
- 2. Chinese
- 3. South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.)
- 4. Black
- 5. Filipino
- 6. Latin American

- 7. Southeast Asian (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodian, Malaysian, etc.)
- 8. Arab
- 9. West Asian (e.g., Iranian, Armenian, Afghani, etc.)
- 10. Korean
- 11. Japanese
- 12. Other, Please specify
- 13. No Response
- 14. No other, exit [DO NOT READ]

Section B: Attraction, retention, and mobility factors

B1

Would you say each of the following factors was or was not a main reason for you choosing to move to Canada? Did you choose to come ... [READ]

- 1. To join family or friends, or get married
- 2. To find a good job in your field
- 3. To start your own business
- 4. For you and your family members to further your education
- 5. Because Canada looked like it was a good place to live
- 6. Because you were sponsored or resettled by the government as a refugee
- 7. Another member of your family made the decision
- 8. Because English is an official language of Canada
- 9. Because it is possible to live and work in Canada in English
- 10. Because Canada has many services for English speakers
- 11. Because I felt that my family would do well here
- 12. Other, please specify: _

B2

What city or town, and province/territory, did you live in first when you came to Canada as a permanent resident or became a permanent resident? (DO NOT READ)

1Vancouver, British Columbia 2 Edmonton, Alberta

- 3 Calgary, Alberta
- 4 Regina, Saskatchewan
- 5 Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
- 6 Winnipeg, Manitoba
- 7 Hamilton, Ontario
- 8 Ottawa, Ontario
- 9 Toronto, Ontario
- 10 Quebec City, Quebec
- 11 Montreal, Quebec
- 12 Other, please specify: _____

B3

Would you say each of the following was or was not a main reason for you choosing to live in that city or town? Did you choose that city or town ... [READ, select all that apply.]

- 1. To join family or friends, or get married
- 2. To find a good job in your field
- 3. To start your own business
- 4. For you and your family members to further your education
- 5. Because the community looked like it was a good place to live
- 6. Because that was the location to which you were sent by the government as a refugee
- 7. Another member of your family made the decision
- 8. Because the community had a large English-speaking population
- 9. Because you thought it would be possible to live and work in English
- 10. Because the community had many services for English speakers
- 11. Because you felt that your family would do well there
- 12. Other, please specify: _
- 13. No response [DO NOT READ]
- 14. No other, exit [DO NOT READ]

B4

When you came to that city or town, did you plan to stay there permanently?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Unsure
- -1 No response

B5a

Do you still live in the city or town that you lived in when you first came to Canada as a permanent resident or became a permanent resident?

Yes (Skip to B7)

No (Continue to B5b)

Unsure

-1 No response

B5b

Please list the additional cities or towns in which you have lived since becoming a permanent resident, including your current city or town, listing them in the order in which you lived there (indicate city and province):

- a) first city you moved to City and province
- b) City and province
- c) City and province
- d) City and province
- -3 Not applicable

B6

Would you say each of the following was or was not a main reason for you moving to a) b) c) d) (select all that apply)? - these are each done individually

- 1. There were better job opportunities in another city or town
- 2. There were better educational opportunities in another city or town

- 3. There were more or better services for immigrants in another city or town
- 4. There were more people who spoke English in another city or town
- 5. You could work in English in another city or town
- 6. You could educate your children in English in another city or town
- 7. There were services for immigrants in English in another city or town
- 8. You wanted to live closer to family or friends, or to people of the same linguistic background as you
- 9. You thought your family would do well there
- 10. You did not feel welcome in the city or town you moved from
- 11. You felt isolated or lonely in the city or town you moved from
- 12. You experienced discrimination in the city or town you moved from
- 13. Other, please specify: _
- 14. No response [DO NOT READ]
- 15. No other, exit [DO NOT READ]

B7: To be completed by all participants

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all likely and 7 is extremely likely, how likely is it that you will leave your current city or town to live somewhere else within the next five years?

Enter Rating_

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

B8

If you were to move away from your current city or town to live somewhere else within the next five years, what would be your reason for moving? Would you say each of the following is or is not a main reason why you would move... [READ, select all that apply.]

- 1. There are better job opportunities in another city or town
- 2. There are better educational opportunities in another city or town
- 3. There are more or better services for immigrants in another city or town
- 4. There are more people who speak English in another city or town
- 5. You could work in English in another city or town
- 6. You could educate your children in English in another city or town
- 7. There are services for immigrants in English in another city or town
- 8. You want to live closer to family or friends, or to people of the same linguistic background as you
- 9. You think your family will do well in another city or town
- 10. You do not feel welcome in the city or town in which you live
- 11. You feel isolated or lonely in the city or town in which you live
- 12. You have experienced discrimination in the city or town in which you live
- 13. Other, please specify_
- 14. No response [DO NOT READ]
- 15. No other, exit [DO NOT READ]

B9

If you were to leave your current city or town to live somewhere else within the next five years, where would you most likely go? DO NOT READ

1. Another city or town within the same province, please specify:

- 2. Another province or territory in Canada, please specify: _____
- 3. Country of origin, please specify:
- 4. United States
- 5. Another country please specify:

Section C: Availability, access to, and satisfaction with Francophone/Anglophone institutions, services, and activities in the community

C1

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all difficult and 7 is extremely difficult, since you came to your current community, how difficult has it been for you to get information in English about settling in your current community?

Enter Rating

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

Now I'd like to ask you about your experience with services for immigrants since you came to your current community. These are services you or a member of your family might have used that are specifically for recent immigrants to Canada, such as those provided by settlement service agencies.

C2

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all available and 7 is extremely available, to what extent are settlement services available in English in your current community?

Enter Rating

-1 No response

-2 Don't know

C3

Have you used any settlement services that were provided in English in your current community?

1 Yes 2 No

-1 No response

-2 Don't know

C4

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all satisfied and 7 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with the settlement services provided in English for you and your family in your current community?

Enter Rating____

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

C5

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all and 7 is extremely, how much have English settlement services helped you and your family to settle in your current community?

Enter Rating_____ -1 No response -2 Don't know

C6

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all available and 7 is extremely available, to what extent are sports, recreation, and cultural activities available in English in your current community?

Enter Rating_

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

C7

Have you participated in any sports, recreation, or cultural activities that were provided in English in your current community?

1 Yes 2 No -1 No response -2 Don't know

C8

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all satisfied and 7 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with the sports, recreation, and cultural activities provided in English for you and your family in your current community?

Enter Rating

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

C9

Since moving to your current community, have you had any children attending primary or secondary school?

1 Yes 2 No (Skip to C13)

C10

What type of school have your child/children mainly attended in your current community? Have they mainly attended (READ LIST - allow multiple responses)

1 English language school ____

2 English immersion school (i.e., instruction provided in English to children whose first language is not English)____

3 French language school _

4 French immersion school (i.e., instruction provided in French to children whose first language is not French)_____

5 Other, please specify _____

C11

What type of school would you have preferred your child/children to have attended since coming to your current community? (READ LIST)

1 English language school ____

2 English immersion school (i.e., instruction provided in English to children whose first language is not English)____

3 French language school _____

4 French immersion school (i.e., instruction provided in French to children whose first language is not French)____

5 Other : Please specify: _____

6 No preference

[If C10 and C11 match, skip to C13. If C10 and C11 do not match, proceed to C12]

C12

Would you say each of the following is or is not a main reason why your child/children have not attended your preferred language school (select all that apply):

1 There are no preferred language schools in the neighbourhood

2 Transportation to a preferred language school would be difficult

3 There are no preferred language schools in the town or city in which you live

4 You were not able to register your child/children in a preferred language school

5 Your child/children chose to go to a particular school

6 The other parent chose to send the child/children to a particular school

7 You were not aware that there was an option to send your child/children to a preferred language school

8 Other (please specify)

-3 Not applicable

C13

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all available and 7 is extremely available, to what extent are elementary and secondary education available in English in your current community?

Enter Rating_

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

C14

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all satisfied and 7 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with the elementary and secondary education in English for you and your family in your current community?

Enter Rating____

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

C15

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all available and 7 is extremely available, to what extent are health care services available in English in your current community?

Enter Rating____

-1 No response

-2 Don't know

C16

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all satisfied and 7 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with the health care services in English for you and your family in your current community?

Enter Rating

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

Section D: Language practices and retention

D1

On a scale of 0-10, if zero is none and ten is excellent, tell me what you think your level of English is, in:

Speaking ___ Understanding___ Reading ___ Writing ___ -1 No response -2 Don't know

D2

On a scale of 0-10, if zero is none and ten is excellent, tell me what you think your level of French is, in:

Speaking ____ Understanding ____ Reading ____ Writing ____ -1 No response -2 Don't know

D3

What is the main language you speak in each of the following situations: English, French, or Some other language (please specify):

D4

To what extent has your use of English changed since coming to your current community? Has your use of English

- 1 increased
- 2 stayed the same
- 3 decreased
- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

Section E: Social and cultural integration

The next questions ask you how you feel about Canada, your local community, and your Anglophone community.

E1

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is very weak and 7 is very strong, how would you describe your sense of belonging to Canada?

Enter Rating_____ -1 No response -2 Don't know

E2

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is very weak and 7 is very strong, how would you describe your sense of belonging to your local community? By local community we mean the city, town, or neighborhood where you live.

Enter Rating_____ -1 No response -2 Don't know

E3

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all and 7 is extremely, how much do you trust people in your local community? [If asked, repeat definition: By local community we mean the city, town, or neighbourhood where you live].

Enter Rating____

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

E4

How many friends would you say you have in your local community? [If asked, repeat definition: By local community we mean the city, town, or neighbourhood where you live.]

None [Go to E5] 1-3 4-6 7-9 10-12 More than 12

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

E5

Of these friends, how many are Francophones? [READ]

None of them Less than half About half More than half All of them -1 No response

-2 Don't know

E6

Of these friends, how many are Anglophones? [READ]

- 1 None of them
- 2 Less than half
- 3 About half
- 4 More than half
- 5 All of them
- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

E7

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is very weak and 7 is very strong, how would you describe your sense of belonging to your Anglophone community?

Enter Rating____

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know
- -3 Not applicable

E8

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all and 7 is extremely, how much do you trust people in your Anglophone community?

Enter Rating

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know
- -3 Not applicable

Section F: Economic integration

Now I'd like to ask you about your economic situation since you became a permanent resident in Canada and about your work.

F1

On a scale from 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all easy and 7 is extremely easy, in the past twelve months, or since you became a permanent resident in Canada how easy has it been for you to pay for the things that you need?

Enter Rating______-1 No response

-2 Don't know

F2

What is your current employment status? Are you...[Read - allow multiple responses]

1 Employed full-time (30 hours a week or more)

2 Employed part-time (Less than 30 hours a week)

3 Self-employed or own your own business

4 Unemployed, looking for work

5 Unemployed, not looking for work

6 Retired

7 Student

8 Homemaker

9 Other, (Please specify)

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: If respondent says they are "semi-retired", they must be placed in option 1, 2 or 3. Please probe "How many hours do you work per week?"]

-1 No response

-2 Don't know

F3

On a scale from 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all difficult and 7 is extremely difficult, how difficult have you found it to get a job in Canada that makes use of your qualifications?

Enter Rating____

-1 No response

-2 Don't know

(ROUTING: IF F3 = "1, 2, or 3" and F2 INCLUDES ANY OF "1, 2, or 3", SKIP TO F5) (ROUTING: IF F3 = "1, 2, or 3" and F2 INCLUDES ONLY "4-8", SKIP TO SECTION G)

(ROUTING: IF F3 = "4, 5, 6, or 7", GO TO F4)

F4

Would you say each of the following is or is not a reason why it has been difficult for you?

(READ - SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)

1 There are not a lot of jobs available that match your qualifications

2 You do not have "Canadian experience"

3 Some employers do not recognize the education or experience you have brought with you to Canada

4 You are not fluent in French

5 Employers discriminate against people who are primarily Anglophone

6 You do not have good career information or guidance

7 You wish to work in a regulated trade or profession and have not been able to register or receive a license to practice in this trade or profession in Canada

8 The skills required in Canada for your chosen profession are different from the ones you have 9 Employers do not accept your qualifications as equal to Canadian qualifications

10 You do not have the connections that would help you to obtain a job

11 You do not know enough about how to find a job in Canada

12 Other (Please specify)

-1 No response

-2 Don't know

[ROUTING: IF F2 HAS ANY RESPONSE "1, 2, or 3" GO TO F5. ALL OTHERS SKIP TO SECTION G]

F5

What is your job now: please be as detailed as possible, including job and industry (e.g., server at a restaurant, mechanical engineer in a manufacturing facility, etc) - if you have more than one job, please tell me about the job where you work the most hours:

[DO NOT LEAVE BLANK - Type "No Response" if Respondent Refuses]

[NOTE - Ask "What is your job title"]

Please respond to the next questions based on the job that you have just told me about:

F6

Compared to before you came to Canada, is your current employment situation:

Better The same Worse -1 No response -2 Don't know

F7

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all satisfied and 7 is extremely satisfied, please tell me how satisfied you are with your current job:

Enter Rating -1 No response -2 Don't know

F8

On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all and 7 is extremely, please tell me how much this job lets you use the skills you have from your education and training:

Enter Rating

-1 No response -2 Don't know

F9

How much do you personally earn (in Canadian dollars) before taxes and deductions? (\$/year assumes full-time work)

(DO NOT READ)

(INTERVIEWER OPTIONAL READ: WE ARE JUST LOOKING FOR A GENERAL NUMBER, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL)

1 Less than \$7.00/hour (equals < \$14, 500/year for full-time work) 2 \$7.00 to \$8.74/hour (equals \$14,500 to \$18,000/year) 3 \$8.75 to \$9.99/hour (equals \$18,001 to \$21,000/year) 4 \$10.00 to \$14.99/hour (equals \$21,001 to \$31,000/year) 5 \$15.00 to \$19.99/hour (equals \$31,001 to \$42,000/year) 6 \$20.00 to \$24.99/hour (equals \$42,001 to \$52,000/year) 7 \$25.00 to \$29.99/hour (equals \$52,001 to \$62,000/year) 8 \$30.00 to \$34.99/hour (equals \$62,001 to \$73,000/year) 9 \$35.00 to \$39.99/hour (equals \$73,001 to \$83,000/year) 10 \$40.00 to \$44.99/hour (equals \$83,001 to \$94,000/year) 11 \$45.00 to \$50.00/hour (equals \$94,001 to \$104,000/year) 12 More than \$50.00/hour (equals > \$104,000/year) -1 No response -2 Don't know

Section G: Well-being

Finally, I will ask you how satisfied you are feeling with your life.

G1

1. On a scale of 1 to 7, if 1 is not at all satisfied and 7 is extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with your life these days?

Enter Rating

- -1 No response
- -2 Don't know

We've reached the end of the survey. All of your answers will be kept confidential and anonymous. If you would like to learn more about this survey, please visit our website at: [link for Pathways to Prosperity website where we will put the feedback sheet] Thank you very much for your time and for helping with this important survey.

Appendix B: Breakdown of Responses in the Rest of Canada by Region

Section A: Demographics

Appendix Table 1: Gender, Age Groups, Education and Linguistic Profile

	British Co	olumbia	Prair	ies	Onta	Ontario		tic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gender								
Male	14	58.3	11	39.3	8	28.6	17	73.9
Female	10	41.7	17	60.7	20	71.4	6	26.1
Age Groups								
20-29	6	25.0	5	17.9	7	25.0	7	30.4
30-39	12	50.0	11	39.3	12	42.9	8	34.8
40-49	4	16.7	4	14.3	2	7.1	6	26.1
50-59	1	4.2	3	10.7	3	10.7	1	4.3
60 & Older	1	4.2	5	17.9	4	14.3	1	4.3
Highest Level of Education								
Secondary School	1	4.2	7	25.0	8	28.6	1	4.3
College / Vocational Training	4	16.7	4	14.3	8	28.6	9	39.1
University Undergraduate Degree	6	25.0	8	28.6	4	14.3	5	21.7
University Graduate Degree	12	50.0	9	32.1	8	28.6	8	34.8
Professional Degree	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Linguistic Profile								
Francophone	12	50.0	8	28.6	14	50.0	12	52.2
Both Anglophone and Francophone	12	50.0	20	71.4	14	50.0	11	47.8
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 2: Length of Permanent Residency, Country and Region of Birth, and Ethnicity

	British Co	olumbia	Prai	ries	Onta	ario	Atlar	ntic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Months of Permanent Residency								
Less than 12	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0
12-23	4	16.7	9	32.1	2	7.1	4	17.4
24-35	11	45.8	1	3.6	5	17.9	4	17.4
36-47	4	16.7	7	25.0	4	14.3	5	21.7
48-59	3	12.5	7	25.0	10	35.7	8	34.8
60	2	8.3	4	14.3	6	21.4	2	8.7
Country of Birth								
France	17	70.8	8	28.6	6	21.4	10	43.5
Haiti	0	0.0	1	3.6	5	17.9	1	4.3
Congo	0	0.0	7	25.0	6	21.4	2	8.7
lvory Coast	2	8.3	2	7.1	0	0.0	1	4.3
Morocco	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	3	13.0
All Other Countries	5	20.8	8	28.6	11	39.3	6	26.1
World Region of Birth								
Caribbean and Bermuda	0	0.0	1	3.6	5	17.9	1	4.3
Western Europe	19	79.2	8	28.6	7	25.0	12	52.2
Western Africa	2	8.3	4	14.3	0	0.0	3	13.0
Eastern Africa	0	0.0	1	3.6	6	21.4	0	0.0
Northern Africa	1	4.2	4	14.3	0	0.0	4	17.4
Central Africa	1	4.2	8	28.6	8	28.6	2	8.7
All Other Regions	1	4.2	2	7.1	2	7.1	1	4.3
Ethnicity								
White	18	75.0	9	32.1	6	21.4	13	56.5
Black	3	12.5	12	42.9	20	71.4	6	26.1
Filipino	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Latin American	1	4.2	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0
Arab	2	8.3	4	14.3	0	0.0	3	13.0
West Asian	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3
No Response	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 3: Immigration Category, Last Country Lived in for More than Five Years, Country of Citizenship

	British Co	lumbia	Prairi	ies	Onta	rio	Atlan	tic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Immigration Category								
Skilled Worker or Professional - Principal	3	12.5	5	17.9	5	17.9	4	17.4
Skilled Worker or Professional -	1	4.2	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0
Family Class	10	41.7	10	35.7	13	46.4	9	39.1
Provincial Nominee - Principal	2	8.3	3	10.7	0	0.0	4	17.4
Provincial Nominee - Dependent	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Refugee	1	4.2	6	21.4	6	21.4	1	4.3
Business Class - Principal	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3
Canadian Experience Class - Principal	1	4.2	2	7.1	1	3.6	2	8.7
Live-in Caregiver	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0
Other	5	20.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.7
No Response	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Last Country Lived in for More than 5 Year	s							
Country of Birth	18	75.0	17	60.7	17	60.7	16	69.6
Another Country	6	25.0	10	35.7	11	39.3	7	30.4
No Response	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Country of Citizenship								
Canada Only	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	17.9	1	4.3
Canada and Other	1	4.2	3	10.7	6	21.4	5	21.7
Other Country	23	95.8	22	78.6	16	57.1	17	73.9
No Response	0	0.0	3	10.7	1	3.6	0	0.0
Specific Other Country of Citizenship								
Belgium	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	3.6	3	13.0
Congo	0	0.0	3	10.7	4	14.3	0	0.0
lvory Coast	2	8.3	2	7.1	0	0.0	1	4.3
France	17	70.8	8	28.6	4	14.3	12	52.2
Haiti	0	0.0	1	3.6	4	14.3	0	0.0
All Other Countries	5	20.8	10	35.7	9	32.1	6	26.1
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Section B: Attraction, Retention, and Mobility Factors that May Affect Official Language Minority Immigrants

	British Columbia		Prairies		Ontario		Atlantic	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Main Reasons								
To join family or friends, or get married	7	29.2	17	60.7	15	53.6	12	52.2
To find a good job in your field	14	58.3	12	42.9	14	50.0	11	47.8
To start your own business	3	12.5	4	14.3	3	10.7	4	17.4
For you and your family members to								
further your education	4	16.7	11	39.3	14	50.0	5	21.7
Because Canada looked like it was a								
good place to live	21	87.5	27	96.4	28	100.0	21	91.3
Because you were sponsored or resettled								
by the government as a refugee	1	4.2	10	35.7	6	21.4	2	8.7
Another member of your family made the								
decision	3	12.5	11	39.3	11	39.3	7	30.4
Because French is an official language of								
Canada	10	41.7	13	46.4	15	53.6	13	56.5
Because it is possible to live and work in								
Canada in French	11	45.8	16	57.1	22	78.6	16	69.6
Because Canada has many services for								
French speakers	9	37.5	12	42.9	14	50.0	15	65.2
Because you felt that your family would do								
well here	8	33.3	22	78.6	24	85.7	15	65.2
Other	12	50.0	13	46.4	10	35.7	10	43.5
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 4: Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to Canada

Appendix Table 5: First City of Residence as Permanent Resident

	British Co	British Columbia		Prairies		Ontario		tic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
City of Residence								
Calgary	0	0.0	7	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Halifax	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	4	17.4
Ottawa	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	14.3	0	0.0
Toronto	1	4.2	2	7.1	13	46.4	0	0.0
Vancouver	20	83.3	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0
Winnipeg	0	0.0	9	32.1	1	3.6	0	0.0
All Other Places	3	12.5	10	35.7	8	28.6	19	82.6
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 6: Reasons Endorsed for Choosing to Move to First Location in Which Resided as a Permanent Resident in Canada

	British Co	lumbia	Prair	ies	Onta	rio	Atlan	tic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Main Reasons								
To join family or friends, or get married	7	29.2	19	67.9	16	57.1	11	47.8
To find a good job in your field	11	45.8	12	42.9	16	57.1	13	56.5
To start your own business	2	8.3	4	14.3	4	14.3	5	21.7
For you and your family members to								
further your education	5	20.8	16	57.1	14	50.0	5	21.7
Because the community looked like it was								
a good place to live	20	83.3	22	78.6	26	92.9	20	87.0
Because that was the location to which								
you were sent by the government as a	1	4.2	9	32.1	4	14.3	1	4.3
Another member of your family made the	4	16.7	12	42.9	12	42.9	5	21.7
Because the community had a large								
French-speaking population	6	25.0	9	32.1	9	32.1	9	39.1
Because you thought it would be possible								
to live and work in French	12	50.0	12	42.9	14	50.0	13	56.5
Because the community had many								
services for French speakers	9	37.5	13	46.4	12	42.9	15	65.2
Because you felt that your family would do								
well here	12	50.0	19	67.9	24	85.7	16	69.6
Other	12	50.0	11	39.3	6	21.4	6	26.1
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 7: Planned to Stay Permanently in First City or Town in which Lived as a Permanent Resident, and Whether Still Live in that City or Town

	British Columbia		Prairies		Ontario		Atlantic	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Planned to Stay Permanently?								
Yes	9	37.5	16	57.1	21	75.0	13	56.5
No	10	41.7	7	25.0	5	17.9	5	21.7
Unsure	5	20.8	3	10.7	2	7.1	5	21.7
No Response	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Still Live in First City?								
Yes	22	91.7	19	67.9	18	64.3	20	87.0
No	2	8.3	8	28.6	10	35.7	3	13.0
No Response	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 10: Likelihood of Moving from Current City or Town in Next Five Years and Where Most Likely to Go

	British Columbia		Prai	Prairies		ario	Atlantic	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Likelihood of Moving								
1 - Not at all likely	4	16.7	7	25.0	8	28.6	6	26.1
2	5	20.8	2	7.1	2	7.1	2	8.7
3	4	16.7	1	3.6	1	3.6	2	8.7
4	3	12.5	4	14.3	3	10.7	5	21.7
5	4	16.7	5	17.9	5	17.9	2	8.7
6	0	0.0	3	10.7	1	3.6	0	0.0
7 - Extremely likely	4	16.7	2	7.1	3	10.7	6	26.1
No Response	0	0.0	4	14.3	5	17.9	0	0.0
Mean Score:	N = 24	M = 3.6	N = 24	M = 3.6	N = 23	M = 3.4	N = 23	M = 3.8
If Moving, Where Most Likely To Go?								
Another City or Town Within the Same	6	25.0	8	28.6	8	28.6	1	4.3
Another Province or Territory in Canada	13	54.2	11	39.3	9	32.1	15	65.2
Country of Origin	1	4.2	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0
United States	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Another Country	3	12.5	1	3.6	1	3.6	3	13.0
No Response	1	4.2	6	21.4	9	32.1	4	17.4
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 11: Endorsement of Possible Reasons for Moving from One's Current City or Town in the Next Five Years

	British Columbia		Prairies		Ontario		Atlantic	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Main Reasons								
There are better job opportunities in								
another city or town	15	62,5	22	78,6	17	60,7	15	65,2
There are better educational								
opportunities in another city or town	10	41,7	15	53,6	13	46,4	5	21,7
There are more or better services for								
immigrants in another city or town	7	29,2	15	53,6	10	35,7	3	13,0
There are more people who speak								
French in another city or town	4	16,7	6	21,4	6	21,4	4	17,4
You could work in French in another city								
or town	7	29,2	14	50,0	19	67,9	9	39,1
You could educate your children in								
French in another city or town	7	29,2	11	39,3	17	60,7	6	26,1
There are services for immigrants in								
French in another city or town	4	16,7	9	32,1	12	42,9	9	39,1
You want to live closer to family or								
friends, or to people of the same								
linguistic background as you	15	62,5	11	39,3	14	50,0	6	26,1
You think your family will do well in								
another city or town	12	50,0	20	71,4	17	60,7	12	52,2
You do not feel welcome in the city or	_		_		_		_	
town in which you live	5	20,8	5	17,9	5	17,9	5	21,7
You feel isolated or lonely in the city or	_		_		-		_	
town in which you live	5	20,8	7	25,0	6	21,4	7	30,4
You have experienced discrimination in			_		-		-	
the city or town in which you live	4	16,7	5	17,9	6	21,4	8	34,8
Other	6	25,0	10	35,7	7	25,0	7	30,4
Total	24	100,0	28	100,0	28	100,0	23	100,0

Section C: Availability, Access to, and Satisfaction with French Institutions, Services, and Activities in Communities

Appendix Table 12: Access to Information and Availability of Settlement Services in French

	British C	olumbia	Prairies		Ontario		Atlantic	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Difficulty in Getting Information in Fren	ch							
1 - Not at all difficult	10	41,7	8	28,6	14	50,0	9	39,1
2	4	16,7	7	25,0	5	17,9	0	0,0
3	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	3,6	1	4,3
4	1	4,2	4	14,3	1	3,6	4	17,4
5	2	8,3	3	10,7	4	14,3	4	17,4
6	1	4,2	1	3,6	0	0,0	3	13,0
7 - Extremely difficult	2	8,3	3	10,7	1	3,6	2	8,7
No Response	4	16,7	2	7,1	2	7,1	0	0,0
Mean Score:	N = 20	M = 2.6	N = 26	M = 3.1	N = 26	M = 2.2	N = 23	M = 3.5
Availability of Settlement Services in I	French							
1 - Not at all available	4	16,7	2	7,1	2	7,1	4	17,4
2	3	12,5	4	14,3	1	3,6	2	8,7
3	1	4,2	2	7,1	3	10,7	0	0,0
4	2	8,3	1	3,6	2	7,1	2	8,7
5	0	0,0	2	7,1	2	7,1	4	17,4
6	4	16,7	6	21,4	3	10,7	1	4,3
7 - Extremely available	3	12,5	5	17,9	11	39,3	7	30,4
No Response	7	29,2	6	21,4	4	14,3	3	13,0
Mean Score:	N = 17	M = 3.9	N =22	M = 4.6	N = 24	M = 5.3	N = 20	M = 4.6
Used Settlement Services in French?								
Yes	10	41,7	12	42,9	17	60,7	11	47,8
No	14	58,3	16	57,1	11	39,3	12	52,2
Satisfaction with Settlement Services in	n French							
1 - Not at all satisfied	1	4,2	0	0,0	4	14,3	3	13,0
2	1	4,2	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	4,3
3	3	12,5	0	0,0	1	3,6	2	8,7
4	2	8,3	2	7,1	2	7,1	1	4,3
5	2	8,3	3	10,7	3	10,7	0	0,0
6	5	20,8	5	17,9	2	7,1	3	13,0
7 - Extremely satisfied	2	8,3	8	28,6	10	35,7	7	30,4
No Response	8	33,3	10	35,7	6	21,4	6	26,1
Mean Score:	N = 16	M = 4.6	N = 18	M = 6.1	N = 22	M = 5.1	N = 17	M = 4.8
Helpfulness of Settlement Services in F	rench							
1 - Not at all helpful	3	12,5	2	7,1	1	3,6	5	21,7
2	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	8,7
3	3	12,5	1	3,6	2	7,1	2	8,7
4	5	20,8	2	7,1	1	3,6	1	4,3
5	2	8,3	3	10,7	4	14,3	3	13,0
6	3	12,5	3	10,7	3	10,7	2	8,7
7 - Extremely helpful	0	0,0	8	28,6	11	39,3	5	21,7
No Response	8	33,3	9	32,1	6	21,4	3	13,0
Mean Score:	N = 16	M = 3.8	N = 19			M = 5.7	N = 20	M = 4.1
Total	24	100,0	28	100,0	28	100,0	23	100,0

Appendix Table 13: Availability, Participation, and Satisfaction with Sports, Recreation, and Cultural Activities in French

	British Columbia		Prai	Prairies		Ontario		ntic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Availability of Activities in French								
1 - Not at all available	8	33.3	6	21.4	5	17.9	2	8.7
2	1	4.2	3	10.7	0	0.0	3	13.0
3	3	12.5	3	10.7	4	14.3	2	8.7
4	1	4.2	4	14.3	1	3.6	2	8.7
5	1	4.2	5	17.9	2	7.1	6	26.1
6	2	8.3	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
7 - Extremely available	6	25.0	3	10.7	10	35.7	7	30.4
No Response	2	8.3	2	7.1	6	21.4	1	4.3
Mean Score:	N = 22	M = 3.7	N = 26	M = 3.7	N = 22	M = 4.6	N = 22	M = 4.6
Participated in Activities in French?								
Yes	15	62.5	9	32.1	11	39.3	15	65.2
No	9	37.5	19	67.9	17	60.7	8	34.8
Satisfaction with Activities in French								
1 - Not at all satisfied	3	12.5	3	10.7	1	3.6	4	17.4
2	1	4.2	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	1	4.2	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	4.3
4	3	12.5	4	14.3	3	10.7	1	4.3
5	2	8.3	2	7.1	6	21.4	3	13.0
6	5	20.8	4	14.3	1	3.6	2	8.7
7 - Extremely satisfied	5	20.8	4	14.3	8	28.6	8	34.8
No Response	4	16.7	10	35.7	8	28.6	4	17.4
Mean Score:	N = 20	M = 4.8	N = 18	M = 4.6	N = 20	M = 5.4	N = 19	M = 5.0
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 14: Children Attending Primary or Secondary School, Types of Schools Attended, Types of Schools Preferred in French

	British Co	olumbia	Prair	ies	Ontario		Atlan	Atlantic	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
Child/Children Attending School?									
Yes	4	16.7	7	25.0	8	28.6	3	13.0	
No	20	83.3	21	75.0	18	64.3	20	87.0	
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	
Type of School Child/Children Attended									
English language school	3	12.5	5	17.9	4	14.3	1	4.3	
English immersion school	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	
French language school	1	4.2	2	7.1	3	10.7	2	8.7	
French immersion school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Not Applicable	20	83.3	21	75.0	20	71.4	20	87.0	
Second Response for Type of School Chi	ld/Children	Attended							
English language school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
English immersion school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
French language school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	
French immersion school	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	
Other	1	4.2	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Not Applicable	23	95.8	27	96.4	27	96.4	22	95.7	
Type of School Preferred									
English language school	0	0.0	4	14.3	1	3.6	0	0.0	
English immersion school	1	4.2	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0.0	
French language school	2	8.3	1	3.6	3	10.7	2	8.7	
French immersion school	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Other	1	4.2	1	3.6	2	7.1	1	4.3	
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	
Not Applicable	20	83.3	21	75.0	20	71.4	20	87.0	
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0	

Appendix Table 16: Availability and Satisfaction with Elementary and Secondary Education and Health Care Services in French

	British C	olumbia	Prai	ries	Ontario		Atla	ntic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Availability of Elementary and Secondary	Education	n in Frenc						
1 - Not at all available	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0.0
2	2	8.3	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	4.3
3	3	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	1	4.2	2	7.1	2	7.1	2	8.7
5	1	4.2	5	17.9	4	14.3	1	4.3
6	1	4.2	4	14.3	2	7.1	1	4.3
7 - Extremely available	10	41.7	6	21.4	14	50.0	13	56.5
No Response	6	25.0	9	32.1	5	17.9	5	21.7
Mean Score:	N = 18	M = 5.4	N = 19	M = 5.4	N = 23	M = 6.0	N = 18	M=6.2
Satisfaction with Elementary and Seconda	ary Educa	tion in Fre	ench					
1 - Not at all satisfied	1	4.2	1	3.6	2	7.1	0	0.0
2	1	4.2	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	4.3
3	3	12.5	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0.0
4	1	4.2	2	7.1	3	10.7	3	13.0
5	3	12.5	4	14.3	4	14.3	3	13.0
6	1	4.2	5	17.9	4	14.3	4	17.4
7 - Extremely satisfied	3	12.5	2	7.1	7	25.0	5	21.7
No Response	11	45.8	12	42.9	7	25.0	7	30.4
Mean Score:	N = 13	M = 4.5	N = 16	M = 4.9	N = 21	M = 5.2	N = 16	M = 5.5
Availability of Healh Care Services in Fren	ch							
1 - Not at all available	6	25.0	10	35.7	3	10.7	4	17.4
2	3	12.5	1	3.6	4	14.3	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	1	4.2	1	3.6	3	10.7	2	8.7
5	3	12.5	2	7.1	2	7.1	2	8.7
6	1	4.2	4	14.3	1	3.6	4	17.4
7 - Extremely available	7	29.2	5	17.9	13	46.4	11	47.8
No Response	3	12.5	4	14.3	2	7.1	0	0.0
Mean Score:	N = 21	M = 4.1	N = 24	M = 3.7	N = 26	M = 5.0	N = 23	M = 5.4
Satisfaction with Health Care Services in	French							
1 - Not at all satisfied	4	16.7	6	21.4	0	0.0	5	21.7
2	2	8.3	2	7.1	1	3.6	0	0.0
3	3	12.5	1	3.6	1	3.6	1	4.3
4	2	8.3	1	3.6	3	10.7	2	8.7
5	3	12.5	4	14.3	6	21.4	3	13.0
6	3	12.5	1	3.6	2	7.1	5	21.7
7 - Extremely satisfied	4	16.7	5	17.9	12	42.9	7	30.4
No Response	3	12.5	8	28.6	3	10.7	0	0.0
Mean Score:	N = 21	M = 4.1	N = 20	M = 3.9	N = 25	M = 5.7	N = 23	M = 4.8
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Section D: Language Practices and Retention

Appendix Table 17: Ability to Speak, Understand, Read, and Write in English and French

	BC		BC		Prai		Prair		O		0		Atlan		Atlar	
	Engl Count	ısn %	Fren Count		Eng Count		Fren Count		Engl Count		Fren Count	icn %	Engli Count		Fren Count	icn %
Speaking	count	,,,	oount	70	oount	70	oount	70	oount	70	oount	,,,	oount	,,,	count	,,,,
0 - None	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	4.3	0	0.0
4	1	4.2	0	0.0	2	7.1	2	7.1	2	7.1	0	0.0	3	13.0	0	0.0
5	1	4.2	0	0.0	8	28.6	0	0.0	5	17.9	2	7.1	3	13.0	0	0.0
6	2	8.3	0	0.0	4	14.3	0	0.0	3	10.7	1	3.6	1	4.3	0	0.0
7	4	16.7	3	12.5	5	17.9	0	0.0	2	7.1	3	10.7	0	0.0	2	8.7
8	10	41.7	1	4.2	6	21.4	2	7.1	8	28.6	3	10.7	8	34.8	2	8.7
9	5	20.8	1	4.2	1	3.6	8	28.6	0	0.0	2	7.1	5	21.7	3	13.0
10 - Excellent	1	4.2	18	75.0	1	3.6	12	42.9	4	14.3	15	53.6	2	8.7	16	69.6
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mean Score: Speaking	N = 24 I	M = 7.7	N = 24 I	VI = 9.2	N = 28	M = 6.3	N = 26 I	M = 8.4	N = 28 I	M = 6.1	N = 27 I	M = 8.6	N = 23 I	VI = 7.2	N = 23	M = 9.4
Understanding																
0 - None	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	2	8.7	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	10.7	2	7.1	2	7.1	1	3.6	1	4.3	1	4.3
5	1	4.2	1	4.2	4	14.3	0	0.0	4	14.3	0	0.0	2	8.7	0	0.0
6	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	14.3	0	0.0	2	7.1	2	7.1	1	4.3	0	0.0
7	3	12.5	1	4.2	4	14.3	1	3.6	2	7.1	1	3.6	2	8.7	2	8.7
8	6	25.0	2	8.3	6	21.4	2	7.1	5	17.9	3	10.7	4	17.4	0	0.0
9	11	45.8	1	4.2	2	7.1	7	25.0	2	7.1	3	10.7	6	26.1	1	4.3
10 - Excellent	2	8.3	19	79.2	3	10.7	13	46.4	7	25.0	15	53.6	5	21.7	19	82.6
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	2	7.1	1	3.6	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mean Score: Understanding	N = 24 I	M = 8.2	N = 24 I	M = 9.5	N = 27	M = 6.7	N = 26 I	0.8 = N	N = 27 I	M = 6.8	N = 26 I	M = 8.7	N = 23 I	M = 7.7	N = 23	M = 9.4

		C		C		ries	Prai		0		0		Atla		Atla	
	Eng Count	llish %	Count	nch %	Eng Count	lish %	Frer Count		Eng Count	lish %	Count	nch %	Eng Count	lish %	Frei Count	ncn %
Reading	oount	,,,	oount	,,,	oount	70	oount	,,	oount	,,,	ocum	,,,	ocum	70	oount	,,,
0 - None	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	3	10.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.1	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	10.7	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	2	8.7	0	0.0
5	2	8.3	0	0.0	3	10.7	2	7.1	2	7.1	1	3.6	4	17.4	0	0.0
6	0	0.0	2	8.3	4	14.3	0	0.0	4	14.3	2	7.1	1	4.3	0	0.0
7	4	16.7	1	4.2	3	10.7	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	4.3	2	8.7
8	6	25.0	0	0.0	8	28.6	2	7.1	4	14.3	1	3.6	3	13.0	1	4.3
9	7	29.2	3	12.5	3	10.7	7	25.0	2	7.1	3	10.7	7	30.4	2	8.7
10 - Excellent	5	20.8	18	75.0	3	10.7	14	50.0	8	28.6	18	64.3	5	21.7	18	78.3
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mean Score: Reading	N = 24	M = 8.3	N = 24	M = 9.4	N = 28	M = 7.0	N = 26	M = 8.8	N = 28	M = 6.6	N = 27	M = 8.8	N = 23	M = 7.7	N = 23	M = 9.6
Writing																
0 - None	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	3.6	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	0	0.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	4.3	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	1	4.2	4	14.3	1	3.6	4	14.3	1	3.6	2	8.7	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	1	4.2	3	10.7	0	0.0	3	10.7	0	0.0	3	13.0	1	4.3
6	3	12.5	1	4.2	5	17.9	0	0.0	3	10.7	2	7.1	3	13.0	0	0.0
7	7	29.2	0	0.0	6	21.4	0	0.0	3	10.7	2	7.1	2	8.7	2	8.7
8	7	29.2	0	0.0	5	17.9	4	14.3	2	7.1	2	7.1	5	21.7	2	8.7
9	4	16.7	2	8.3	2	7.1	7	25.0	2	7.1	4	14.3	5	21.7	3	13.0
10 - Excellent	1	4.2	18	75.0	2	7.1	12	42.9	7	25.0	14	50.0	2	8.7	15	65.2
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mean Score: Writing	N = 24	M = 7.3	N = 24	M = 8.9	N = 28	M = 6.5	N = 26	M = 8.5	N = 28	M = 6.3	N = 27	M = 8.4	N = 23	M = 7.1	N = 23	M = 9.2
Mean Ability to Speak,																
Understand, Read and Write	N = 24		N = 24	M = 9.3	N = 28						N = 27					M = 9.4
Total	24	100.0	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 18: Languages Spoken at Home, With a Spouse or Partner, With Children, At Work, and With Friends

	British Co	olumbia	Prairi	ies	Onta	rio	Atlan	tic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Language Spoken at Home								
English	11	45.8	7	25.0	6	21.4	4	17.4
French	6	25.0	11	39.3	6	21.4	13	56.5
Other	7	29.2	10	35.7	16	57.1	6	26.1
Language Spoken With Spouse or Partne	r							
English	14	58.3	5	17.9	7	25.0	6	26.1
French	5	20.8	9	32.1	6	21.4	12	52.2
Other	4	16.7	7	25.0	12	42.9	3	13.0
No Response	1	4.2	7	25.0	3	10.7	2	8.7
Language Spoken With Children								
English	2	8.3	3	10.7	3	10.7	0	0.0
French	2	8.3	9	32.1	4	14.3	8	34.8
Other	6	25.0	7	25.0	12	42.9	5	21.7
No Response	14	58.3	9	32.1	9	32.1	10	43.5
Language Spoken at Work								
English	20	83.3	23	82.1	13	46.4	12	52.2
French	2	8.3	1	3.6	4	14.3	3	13.0
Other	2	8.3	0	0.0	5	17.9	5	21.7
No Response	0	0.0	4	14.3	6	21.4	3	13.0
Language Spoken with Friends								
English	10	41.7	17	60.7	13	46.4	9	39.1
French	4	16.7	4	14.3	5	17.9	4	17.4
Other	10	41.7	7	25.0	10	35.7	10	43.5
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 19: Change in Use of French since Coming to Current Community

	British Co	British Columbia		ies	Onta	rio	Atlantic	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Has Your Use of French								
Increased	9	37.5	9	32.1	13	46.4	6	26.1
Stayed the Same	6	25.0	5	17.9	8	28.6	5	21.7
Decreased	9	37.5	13	46.4	7	25.0	11	47.8
No Response	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	4.3
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Section E: Social and Cultural Integration

Appendix Table 20: Sense of Belonging to Canada, Sense of Belonging to Local Community and Trust in People in Local Community

	British C	olumbia	Prai	ries	Onta	ario	Atla	ntic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Sense of Belonging to Canada								
1 - Very weak	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	1	4.2	2	7.1	1	3.6	0	0.0
3	3	12.5	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	4.3
4	6	25.0	1	3.6	3	10.7	2	8.7
5	9	37.5	5	17.9	3	10.7	7	30.4
6	2	8.3	8	28.6	6	21.4	4	17.4
7 - Very Strong	3	12.5	10	35.7	14	50.0	8	34.8
No Response	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	3.6	1	4.3
Mean Score:	N = 24	M = 4.7	N = 27	M = 5.7	N = 27	M = 6.0	N = 22	M = 5.7
Sense of Belonging to Local Community								
1 - Very weak	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	2	8.3	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0.0
3	3	12.5	0	0.0	2	7.1	0	0.0
4	3	12.5	4	14.3	4	14.3	3	13.0
5	8	33.3	9	32.1	10	35.7	6	26.1
6	4	16.7	2	7.1	2	7.1	8	34.8
7 - Very Strong	4	16.7	10	35.7	8	28.6	6	26.1
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0
Mean Score:	N = 24	M = 4.9	N = 28	M = 5.3	N = 27	M = 5.3	N = 23	M = 5.7
Trust in People in Local Community								
1 - Not at all	0	0.0	3	10.7	2	7.1	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	1	4.2	0	0.0	3	10.7	2	8.7
4	3	12.5	3	10.7	3	10.7	1	4.3
5	9	37.5	6	21.4	10	35.7	3	13.0
6	6	25.0	9	32.1	2	7.1	9	39.1
7 – Extremely	5	20.8	4	14.3	7	25.0	8	34.8
No Response	0	0.0	2	7.1	1	3.6	0	0.0
Mean Score:	N = 24	M = 5.5	N = 26	M = 5.0	N = 27	M = 5.0	N = 23	M = 5.9
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 21: Number and Type of Friends, Sense of Belonging to Francophone Community, and Trust in People in Francophone Community

-	British C	olumbia	Prai	ries —	Onta	ario	Atlantic		
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	ano %	Count	//////////////////////////////////////	
Number of Friends in Local Community	Count	/0	Count	/0	Count	/0	Count	/0	
None	0	0.0	1	3.6	3	10.7	0	0.0	
1-3	2	8.3	6	21.4	5	17.9	6	26.1	
4-6	6	25.0	3	10.7	6	21.4	2	8.7	
7-9	2	8.3	5	17.9	2	7.1	2	8.7	
10-12	4	16.7	4	14.3	4	14.3	4	17.4	
More than 12	10	41.7	4	28.6	4	21.4	4 9	39.1	
No Response	0	0.0	0 1	3.6	2	7.1	9	0.0	
Of These Friends, How Many are Francop	-	0.0		5.0	2	7.1	0	0.0	
None of them	4	16.7	7	25.0	3	10.7	3	13.0	
Less than half	10	41.7	5	23.0 17.9	9	32.1	5	21.7	
About half	5	20.8	4	14.3	6	21.4	6	26.1	
More than half	4	16.7	6	21.4	3	10.7	5	20.1	
All of them	4	4.2	4	14.3	2	7.1	4	17.4	
No Response	0	4.2 0.0	4	7.1	5	17.9	4	0.0	
Of These Friends, How Many are Angloph	-	0.0	2	7.1	5	17.5	0	0.0	
None of them	0	0.0	3	10.7	3	10.7	2	8.7	
Less than half	4	16.7	4	10.7	4	10.7	2	30.4	
About half	4	16.7	4	21.4	4	21.4	4	30.4 17.4	
More than half	4	33.3	7	21.4 25.0	7	21.4 25.0	4 5	21.7	
All of them	8	33.3 33.3		25.0 17.9	2	25.0 7.1	5	21.7	
No Response	0	0.0	5 3	17.9	2	21.4	5 0	0.0	
Sense of Belonging to Francophone Com	-	0.0	3	10.7	0	21.4	0	0.0	
1 - Very weak	3	12.5	5	17.9	2	7.1	2	8.7	
2	3	12.5	5 2	7.1	2	3.6	2 1	4.3	
3	3	12.5	2	0.0	1	3.6	1	4.3	
4	3	12.5	5	17.9	3	10.7	2	4.3 8.7	
5	6	25.0	3	17.9		39.3	2 5	0.7 21.7	
6	3	23.0 12.5	6	21.4	3	39.3 10.7	5	21.7	
7 - Very Strong	2	8.3	6	21.4	5	10.7	5	21.7	
No Response	2	6.3 4.2	1	21.4 3.6	2	7.1	2	8.7	
Mean Score:	N = 23	4.2 M = 4.0	N = 27	3.0 M = 4.5	N = 26	M = 4.9	N = 21	0.7 M = 5.0	
Trust in People in Francophone Commun		W = 4.0	N = ZI	101 = 4.5	N = 20	101 = 4.9	IN = ZI	101 = 5.0	
1 - Not at all	1. 1	4.2	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	
2	1	4.2	2	7.1	1	0.0 3.6	0	0.0	
-	•		—				2	0.0 8.7	
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.1	2		
4	2 7	8.3	5	17.9	2	7.1		8.7	
5		29.2 20.8	6	21.4	6	21.4 21.4	5	21.7	
6 7. Extremely	5		6	21.4	6		8	34.8	
7 - Extremely	5	20.8	3	10.7	6	21.4	5 1	21.7	
No Response	3	12.5	4 N 24	14.3	5	17.9	1 N 22	4.3	
Mean Score:	N = 21	M = 5.3	N = 24	M = 4.7	N = 23	M = 5.4	N = 22	M = 5.6	
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0	

Appendix Table 22: Current Employment Status

	British Co	olumbia	Prair	ies	Onta	rio	Atlantic	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Current Employment Status								
Employed full-time (30 hours a week or								
more)	17	70,8	16	57,1	9	32,1	13	56,5
Employed part-time (Less than 30 hours								
a week)	3	12,5	4	14,3	3	10,7	0	0,0
Self-employed or own your own business	3	10 E	1	26	0	0.0	4	17 /
		12,5		3,6	0	0,0		17,4
Unemployed, looking for work	1	4,2	2	7,1	3	10,7	4	17,4
Unemployed, not looking for work	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	7,1	0	0,0
Retired	0	0,0	2	7,1	1	3,6	1	4,3
Student	0	0,0	1	3,6	6	21,4	0	0,0
Homemaker	0	0,0	1	3,6	1	3,6	0	0,0
Otehr	0	0,0	1	3,6	1	3,6	0	0,0
No Response	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	7,1	1	4,3
Total	24	100,0	28	100,0	28	100,0	23	100,0

Section F: Economic Integration

Appendix Table 23: Type and Skill Level of Occupation

	British Co	olumbia	Prair	ies	Onta	rio	Atlan	tic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Type of Occupation								
Management	4	16,7	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	8,7
Business, finance and administration	4	16,7	1	3,6	1	3,6	3	13,0
Natural and applied sciences and related								
occupations	2	8,3	2	7,1	1	3,6	2	8,7
Health	1	4,2	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Education, law and social, community								
and government services	3	12,5	6	21,4	5	17,9	4	17,4
Art, culture, recreation and sport	1	4,2	0	0,0	1	3,6	0	0,0
Sales and service	5	20,8	3	10,7	1	3,6	2	8,7
Trades, transport and equipment								
operators and related occupations	1	4,2	4	14,3	1	3,6	3	13,0
Manufacturing and utilities	1	4,2	3	10,7	0	0,0	1	4,3
Occupation not classifiable	1	4,2	2	7,1	3	10,7	0	0,0
Not Applicable	1	4,2	7	25,0	15	53,6	6	26,1
Skill Level								
A – University degree	9	37,5	5	17,9	4	14,3	9	39,1
B – Two to three years of post-secondary								
education at community college, institute								
of technology, or CEGEP; or two to five								
years of apprenticeship training; or three								
to four years of secondary school and								
more than two years of on-the-job								
training, occupation-specific training								
courses or specific work experience	5	20,8	3	10,7	4	14,3	5	21,7
C – Completion of secondary school and								
some short duration courses or training								
specific to the occupation; or some								
secondary school with up to two years of								
on-the-job training, training courses, or								
specific work experience	7	29,2	7	25,0	2	7,1	2	8,7
D – Short on-the-job training; or no								
formal education	1	4,2	4	14,3	0	0,0	1	4,3
Skill level not classifiable	1	4,2	2	7,1	3	10,7	0	0,0
Not Applicable	1	4,2	7	25,0	15	53,6	6	26,1
Total	24	100,0	28	100,0	28	100,0	23	100,0

Appendix Table 24: Current Employment Situation Compared to Employment Situation Before Coming to Canada, and Satisfaction with Current Job

	British C	olumbia	Prai	ries	Onta	ario	Atlantic	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Compared to Before You Came to Cana	ada, Current	Employm	ent Situa	tion is				
Better	17	70.8	15	53.6	8	28.6	11	47.8
The same	4	16.7	3	10.7	4	14.3	4	17.4
Worse	1	4.2	1	3.6	1	3.6	2	8.7
No Response	1	4.2	2	7.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Not Applicable	1	4.2	7	25.0	15	53.6	6	26.1
Satisfaction with Current Job								
1 - Not at all satisfied	2	8.3	1	3.6	0	0.0	2	8.7
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3
4	3	12.5	5	17.9	2	7.1	1	4.3
5	4	16.7	2	7.1	3	10.7	2	8.7
6	5	20.8	9	32.1	2	7.1	4	17.4
7 - Extremely satisfied	7	29.2	3	10.7	6	21.4	7	30.4
No Response	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Not Applicable	1	4.2	7	25.0	15	53.6	6	26.1
Mean Score:	N = 23	M = 5.2	N = 20	M = 5.3	N = 13	M = 5.9	N = 17	M = 5.4
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

Appendix Table 25: Use of Skills from Education and Training on Current Job and	
Difficulty in Finding a Job That Uses Qualifications	

	British C	olumbia	Pra	iries	Oni	ario	Atla	ntic
	Count		Count		Count		Count	%
Use of Skills from Education and Training on Curre		/0	Count	70	ocum	70	oount	70
1 - Not at all	4	16.7	2	7.1	0	0.0	1	4.3
2	. 1	4.2	3	10.7	1	3.6	0	0.0
3	1	4.2	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	4.3
4	2	8.3	3	10.7	4	14.3	2	8.7
5	1	4.2	3	10.7	1	3.6	2	8.7
6	5	20.8	2	7.1	2	7.1	3	13.0
7 - Extremely	9	37.5	6	21.4	5	17.9	8	34.8
No Response	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Not Applicable	1	4.2	7	25.0	15	53.6	6	26.1
Mean Score:	N = 23		-	M = 4.6	-		-	
Difficulty in Finding a Job that Uses Qualifications	N = 23	W = 0.0	N = 20	W = 4.0	N = 13	W = 0.4	N = 17	W = 0.7
1 - Not at all difficult	1	16.7	7	25.0	1	14.3	F	21.7
	4			25.0 7.1	4	7.1	5	
2	5	20.8	2		2		1	4.3
3	3	12.5	0	0.0	2	7.1	3	13.0
4	1	4.2	5	17.9	4	14.3	2	8.7
5	2	8.3	2	7.1	2	7.1	3	13.0
	3	12.5	4	14.3	2	7.1	2	8.7
7 - Extremely difficult	5	20.8	4	14.3	8	28.6	5	21.7
No Response	1	4.2	4	14.3	4	14.3	2	8.7
Mean Score:	N = 23	M = 3.9						M = 4.1
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0
Reasons for Difficulty in Finding a Job that Uses Qu	ualificatio	ns						
There are not a lot of jobs available that match your								
qualifications	8	72.7	4	26.7	9	56.3	10	83.3
You do not have 'Canadian experience'	8	72.7	8	53.3	8	50.0	4	33.3
Some employers do not recognize the education or							_	
experience you have brought with you to Canada	9	81.8	15	100.0	12	75.0	7	58.3
You are not fluent in English	3	27.3	8	53.3	6	37.5	1	8.3
Employers discriminate against people who are								
primarily Francophones	3	27.3	2	13.3	2	12.5	0	0.0
You do not have good career information or								
guidance	5	45.5	6	40.0	8	50.0	0	0.0
You wish to work in a regulated trade or profession								
and have not been able to register or receive a								
license to practice in this trade or profession in								
Canada	4	36.4	7	46.7	9	56.3	1	8.3
The skills required in Canada for your chosen								
profession are different from the ones you have	5	45.5	9	60.0	9	56.3	3	25.0
Employers do not accept your qualifications as								
equal to Canadian qualifications	7	63.6	8	53.3	10	62.5	3	25.0
You do not have the connections that would help								
you to obtain a job	10	90.9	8	53.3	10	62.5	6	50.0
You do not know enough about how to find a job in								
Canada	4	36.4	6	40.0	7	43.8	4	33.3
Other	2	18.2	6	40.0	4	25.0	5	41.7
Total	11	100.0	15	100.0	16	100.0	12	100.0

Appendix Table 26: Personal Earnings and Ease in Paying for Needs

	British C	olumbia	Prai	ries	Onta	ario	Atla	ntic
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Personal Earnings Before Taxes and D	eductions	5						
Less than \$7.00/hour or < \$14,500/year	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	8,7
\$8.75 to \$9.99/hour or \$18,001 to								
\$21,000/year	1	4,2	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
\$10.00 to \$14.99/hour or \$21,001 to								
\$31,000/year	6	25,0	5	17,9	3	10,7	2	8,7
\$15.00 to \$19.99/hour or \$31,001 to								
\$42,000/year	2	8,3	3	10,7	3	10,7	2	8,7
\$20.00 to \$24.99/hour or \$42,001 to								
\$52,000/year	4	16,7	6	21,4	2	7,1	2	8,7
\$25.00 to \$29.99/hour or \$52,001 to								
\$62,000/year	2	8,3	3	10,7	2	7,1	3	13,0
\$30.00 to \$34.99/hour or \$62,001 to								
\$73,000/year	1	4,2	1	3,6	1	3,6	2	8,7
\$35.00 to \$39.99/hour or \$73,001 to								
\$83,000/year	2	8,3	0	0,0	1	3,6	0	0,0
\$40.00 to \$44.99/hour or \$83,001 to								
\$94,000/year	1	4,2	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
\$45.00 to \$50.00/hour or \$94,001 to								
\$104,000/year	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	4,3
More than \$50.00/hour or \$104,000/year	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	4,3
No Response	4	16,7	3	10,7	1	3,6	2	8,7
Not Applicable	1	4,2	7	25,0	15	53,6	6	26,1
Ease in Paying for Needs								
1 - Not at all easy	1	4,2	1	3,6	5	17,9	1	4,3
2	0	0,0	2	7,1	1	3,6	1	4,3
3	3	12,5	1	3,6	1	3,6	3	13,0
4	5	20,8	3	10,7	6	21,4	1	4,3
5	3	12,5	7	25,0	5	17,9	8	34,8
6	5	20,8	7	25,0	3	10,7	2	8,7
7 - Extremely easy	7	29,2	5	17,9	4	14,3	7	30,4
No Response	0	0,0	2	7,1	3	10,7	0	0,0
Mean Score:		M = 5.2	N = 26	M = 5.1		M = 4.2	N = 23	M = 5.1
Total	24	100,0	28	100,0	28	100,0	23	100,0

Section G: Well-Being

Appendix Table 27: Well-Being

	British Columbia		Prairies		Ontario		Atlantic	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Satisfaction with Life These Days								
1 - Not at all satisfied	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	3.6	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3
3	2	8.3	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	2	8.3	2	7.1	2	7.1	2	8.7
5	9	37.5	7	25.0	7	25.0	6	26.1
6	5	20.8	7	25.0	5	17.9	5	21.7
7 - Extremely satisfied	6	25.0	9	32.1	10	35.7	9	39.1
No Response	0	0.0	1	3.6	3	10.7	0	0.0
Mean Score:	N = 24	M = 5.5	N = 27	M = 5.6	N = 25	M = 5.8	N = 23	M = 5.8
Total	24	100.0	28	100.0	28	100.0	23	100.0

References

- Canadian Heritage and Official Languages (2013). Roadmap for Canada's official languages 2013-2018: Education, immigration, communities. Retrieved February 12, 2015, from <u>www.pch.gc.ca/DAMAssetPub/DAM-secLo-olSec/STAGING/texte-text/roadmap2013-</u> 2018_1364313629232_eng.pdf?WT.contentAuthority=11.0
- Esses, V. M., Hamilton, L. K., Wilkinson, L., Zong, L., Bramadat, J., & Bucklaschuk, J. (2013). Western Settlement Outcomes Survey. Report written for Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Western Region. Retrieved from: <u>http://p2pcanada.ca/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files/2013/08/Western-Settlement-Outcomes-Survey.pdf</u>
- Esses, V.M., Ravanera, Z., Burstein, M., Hallman, S., & Medianu, S. (2012). Alberta Settlement Outcomes Survey. Report written for the Government of Alberta. Retrieved from: <u>http://p2pcanada.ca/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files/2013/12/Alberta-Outcomes-Settlement-Survey-Report.pdf</u>
- Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (2011). National Occupational Classification 2011. Retrieved from: <u>http://www5.hrsdc.gc.ca/NOC/English/NOC/2011/pdf/PrintableVersionNOC2011.pdf</u>
- Standing Senate Committee on Official Languages (2014, December). Seizing the opportunity: The role of communities in a constantly changing immigration system. Retrieved from: www.parl.gc.ca/Content/SEN/Committee/412/ollo/rep/rep04dec14-e.pdf
- Statistics Canada (2013). National Household Survey Dictionary: Appendix 1.5. Places of birth disseminated in the 2011 National Household Survey. Retrieved February 5, 2015, from http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/ref/dict/a1-5-eng.cfm