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Abstract

Drawing upon qualitative interview data, this dissertation critically examines the integration experiences of immigrants from Turkey to Canada, who comprise an understudied immigrant group. I am interested in how immigrants access and develop social networks, how they integrate into the labour market, and how being an immigrant affects their workplace experiences. Relying theoretically on the work of Pierre Bourdieu, I aim to address social inequalities existing among Turkish immigrants in particular and in Canadian society in general.

The first manuscript (Chapter 2) examines immigrants’ intra- and inter-group differences and hierarchies, and their impact on study participants’ access to and development of social networks in Canada. The findings highlight the importance of going beyond a simplistic binary between bonding and bridging networks to better understand a complex process of network development in which such various factors as social class, ethnicity, habitus, and different forms of capital jointly shape the opportunities to access network, as well as the nature of such social networks.

The second manuscript (Chapter 3) examines the labour market integration experiences of Turkish immigrants. The findings show that capital and habitus traveled with participants from Turkey, and that the intersection of their immigration status with the set of written and unwritten rules of the Canadian labour market and its subfields (both professional and non-professional) shaped their integration experiences.

The third and final manuscript (Chapter 4) focuses on how immigrants with professional jobs perceive, experience and interpret their workplace experiences. The findings show that participants encountered challenges that stemmed from a lack of fit between valued capital and their habitus. They managed to overcome the former challenge, however transformation or adjustment of dispositions constituted the most difficult part of integration into the workplace and became the markers of racialised/ethnic immigrant
identity. My analysis suggests that immigrants experience a slower form of assimilation in workplaces, despite the increasing ethno-racial diversity in the Canadian workplaces.

The manuscripts presented in this dissertation demonstrate that the ways in which immigrants experience integration in the host country are dependent on the intersection between their immigration class, socio-economic background, habitus, and forms of capital, as well as the segment of the labour market.
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Chapter 1

1. Introduction

Every year, millions of individuals cross a country’s borders, either voluntarily or involuntarily, and about a quarter of a million of these individuals start their new life in Canada (Simmons 2010). While many begin their journey in search of better economic and social opportunities, others move to escape various forms of conflicts (e.g., political and social) or to follow family members who have already moved (Castles and Miller 2009; Samers 2010). The ways in which immigrants and/or refugees integrate in their host societies, including Canada, have been one of the major research interests of many scholars across various disciplines. The definition of integration, however, has been a topic of discussion in both the academic and the policy circles of immigrant-receiving countries (Blokland and van Eijk 2010; Galabuzi and Teelucksingh 2010; Li 2003; Samers 2010). Its definition is mostly based on “normative presumptions about what an integrated society looks like” (Blokland and Eijk 2010, 314). In Canada, unlike in many other immigrant-receiving countries, “multicultural immigrant integration” is a normative model officially adapted by the Canadian state (Simmons 2010, 172). This model defines integration as a two-way process of accommodation between newcomers and Canadians: it encourages immigrants to adapt to Canadian society without requiring them to abandon their cultures. It encourages people and institutions to respond in kind by respecting and reflecting the cultural differences newcomers bring to the country (Dorais 2002, 4).

Previous studies, however, have argued that immigrants in Canada face a series of challenges and integration barriers due to the contradictions between the official policy and practice (Galabuzi and Teelucksingh 2010; Huot et al. 2013; Li 2003; Reitz and Banerjee 2007). Immigrants are indeed expected to “converge to the average performance of native-born Canadians and their normative and behavioural standards” (Li 2003, 1). Further, their integration experiences are closely dependent on their ethnic, racial, national, and cultural backgrounds (Hum and Simpson 2004; Oreopoulos 2011; Reitz and Banerjee 2007; Reitz et al. 2009; Simmons 2010).

Drawing upon qualitative data, this PhD research project aims to contribute to the literature on immigrant integration in Canada and elsewhere. This study offers a critical and empirical
analysis of the integration experiences of immigrants from Turkey to Toronto and London, Ontario, Canada. This is an understudied immigrant group despite its growing population since the late 1960s (Karpat 2004; Statistics Canada 2011). The major purpose of the study is to analyse how ethnicity and class intersect and shape the integration trajectories of Turkish\(^1\) immigrants. This intersectional approach has allowed me to examine heterogeneity in immigrant experiences, and thus to develop a more complex and critical understanding of immigrant integration.

Integration is a broad term and involves various dimensions in the economic, social, and political realm (Beach, Green, and Reitz 2003; Castles and Miller 2009; Driedger 1996; Simmons 2010). In this research, I examine three different, yet related, dimensions of integration: social integration, economic integration, and workplace integration. Social integration relates to the participation of immigrants in the social life of the host society (Li 2003; Simmons 2010). For this research, it is understood as the processes used to gain access to social networks in Canada as well as the nature of these networks. Economic integration refers to the participation of immigrants in the labour market (Simmons 2010). In this research, economic integration is examined in relation to the types of jobs participants held (i.e., professional and non-professional) and their level of education. Last, workplace integration is conceptualised in this study as the everyday relationships between the participants and their colleagues in the workplace as well as the participants’ experience with respect to promotion. To examine the integration experiences of Turkish immigrants in Canada, this study relies on Pierre Bourdieu’s theoretical framework, which focuses on both the structural and individual level.

This chapter is composed of five main sections. The first is an introduction of the Canadian immigration system. In this part, a brief historical overview of Canada’s immigration policy is provided to illustrate the changing nature and composition of Canada’s population diversity. Relying on existing research, I discuss the integration experiences of immigrants in Canada. Gaps in the literature are also identified. The second section outlines the theoretical background. In this part, the core theoretical framework of this research, Bourdieu’s Theory

\(^{1}\) Turkish refers to all population groups in Turkey: Turks, Kurds, and others. When I use the adjective Turkish, it means immigrants from Turkey, not Turk.
of Practice, is described and its application to the current research project is discussed. The third section presents research objectives and the questions guiding the research. Here, a brief history of migration from Turkey to Canada is also provided. The fourth section outlines the research design. In this part, the methods, data collection, data sample, and analysis are described. This section also explores reflexive issues related to researcher positionality in relation to the research context and the research participants. The last section is the dissertation outline, which briefly presents three distinct, but mutually related, manuscripts and explains their contributions.

1.1 Canadian Immigration Policy and Immigrant Integration

Canada is considered a classical immigration country (Castles and Miller 2009), as it has one of the highest rates of legal immigration per capita in the world relative to the size of its population (Satzewich and Liodakis 2013). According to the 2011 Census, one in five persons in the country was foreign-born (Statistics Canada 2013) and around 250,000 immigrants continue to arrive in Canada annually (Simmons 2010). The government of Canada grants immigrant status under three major immigration classes: economic, family, and refugee. The percentage of immigrants admitted under these classes in 2013 is as follows: approximately 62 percent were admitted under the economic class, 27 percent were admitted under the family class, and the remaining 11 percent were admitted under the refugee class (CIC 2013). Immigrants in the economic class are selected for their potential socio-economic contribution, and immigrants in the other two classes are selected for humanitarian reasons (Green and Green 1999; Simmons 2010). Immigrants to Canada come from various countries—the top source countries being from Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. To illustrate, in 2011, approximately 13 percent of all immigrants were from the Philippines, 10.5 percent were from China, and 10.4 were from India (Statistics Canada 2013). There is no doubt that immigrants with different national backgrounds have created ethno-racial and cultural diversity in Canada. The diversity of the Canadian population,

---

2 Castle and Miller (2009, 14) define classical immigration countries (e.g., Canada, Australia, and the USA) as countries that “have generally seen immigrants as permanent settlers who were to be assimilated or integrated.”

3 To increase the country’s competitive power in a global capitalist economy by creating a more skilled and flexible workforce and to mitigate the negative consequences of an aging population, the Canadian government began to maintain immigration levels at one percent of the total population level in the early 1990s (Green and Green 1999; Simmons 2010).
however, is a relatively recent phenomenon and understanding the changing nature of the Canadian population requires a historical analysis of Canadian immigration policy.

In contrast to contemporary Canadian society, Canada was envisioned as a European nation in the Americas until the 1960s and the goal of the federal government was to keep the country as a white settler society. The immigration acts enacted before the 1960s established an immigration system that was based on institutional racism (Satzewich and Liodakis 2013). Immigration to Canada was limited largely to immigrants from Britain, Northern European countries, and the United States (i.e., traditional source countries) (Satzewich and Liodakis 2013; Simmons 2010). These preferred source countries of immigrants were determined through the criteria of ultimate assimilability to Canadian society. Immigrants from countries in Eastern and Southern Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Africa and South America were perceived as being incapable of assimilating into the prevailing norms of decency and democracy. Therefore, they were considered a threat to the social, political, and economic stability of the country (Banting and Kymlicka 2010; Castles and Miller 2009; Fleras 2012; Satzewich and Liodakis 2013). There was, however, a distinction created between Eastern and Southern European countries when compared to non-European countries. The former were considered in-between: while they were viewed as posing short-term problems due to the lack of a cultural fit, they could still be admitted as a last resort depending upon the needs of the labour market. In the 1950s and 1960s, for instance, many immigrants came from Eastern and Southern Europe (Reitz and Banerjee 2007, 489). Non-European and non-white groups, on the other hand, were deemed to be unable to assimilate and to be racially unsuitable (Satzewich and Liodakis 2013). Immigration practices regarding whom to let in and whom to keep out in this period can be described as essentially racist in orientation and assimilationist in objective (Fleras 2012).

Canada discarded some of its more explicitly racist immigration legislation with the Immigration Act of 1952, which allowed entry for various groups, such as Indians,

---

4 Here, I would like to respectfully acknowledge that Canada is a settler country, in which, with the exception of Aboriginal Peoples, all Canadians are indeed immigrants or descendants of immigrants.
5 There were indeed migrants from non-European countries, such as China and India. However, these migrants were recruited as guest workers (either in the farms or in mining) for a certain period of time (Banting and Kymlicka 2010; Driedger 1996; Satzewich and Liodakis 2013; Simmons 2010).
Pakistanis, and Sri Lankans. However, this act did not mark a significant departure from previous regulations. It established quotas for immigrants from non-European countries. Furthermore, it allowed immigration officers to deny entry on certain grounds including nationality, occupation, and cultural and social unsuitability (Boyd and Vickers 2000; Satzewich and Liodakis 2013). As a result of the new legislation, formerly blatant racist practices in the immigration system became more covert (Satzewich and Liodakis 2013; Simmons 2010). A major step towards the deracialisation of immigration control was taken in the 1960s. In particular, the introduction of the points system in 1967 rationalised immigrant selection and opened immigration to individuals from all around the world. Under this system, applicants are awarded points toward admission based on criteria such as education, age, and knowledge of one of the official languages. The points system was a move away from an explicitly racist immigration policy and considered by far the most significant development in immigration policy in the twentieth century (CIC 2006). It changed the composition of source countries drastically, as seen in Figure 1.

**Figure 1.** Place of birth of immigrants, Canada, before 1971, and 2006-2011

![Chart showing place of birth of immigrants] *Source: Chart based on data from Statistics Canada, 2013*

The major reason for changing the immigration system in the 1960s was to meet the economic needs of the country. A shift in the Canadian economy from a resource-based...
system to a manufacture- and service-based system in the late 1950s dramatically increased the need for skilled workers. However, the chances of filling this gap with immigrants from Europe were low. Canada was in competition with other industrialised countries hoping to attract skilled labour and the supply of skilled immigrants from preferred source countries was inadequate to meet the needs of these changing economic conditions. This was mainly because the economies of many European countries boomed and created well-paid jobs in the aftermath of the Second World War, which motivated Europeans to stay in Europe (Simmons 2010, 68). Another factor was Canada’s declining birth rate and aging population (Green and Green 1999; Simmons 2010). In order to meet its economic and demographic needs, Canada opened the door to immigrants from non-traditional source countries.

Four years after the introduction of the points system, Canada also replaced its assimilationist discourse with multiculturalism. The policy of multiculturalism was officially adopted in 1971 (Simmons 2010). Recognising Canada’s ethno-racially and culturally diverse society, this policy affirms “the value and dignity of all Canadian citizens regardless of their racial or ethnic origins, their language, or their religious affiliation” and “ensures that all citizens can keep their identities, can take pride in their ancestry and have a sense of belonging” (CIC 2012). The policy of multiculturalism made it clear that immigrants and minorities could retain their culture while becoming integrated, and also helped ensure that they would have equal access to Canadian economic, social, and political institutions (Simmons 2010, 172). In this respect, the policy has further recognised Canada’s open attitude towards immigrants with non-European ethnic and racial backgrounds (i.e., visible minorities). Consequently, there has been a significant increase in the numbers of visible minorities since the early 1970s (Green and Green 1999; Simmons 2010). For example, between 1981 and 2011, the visible minority population grew from 4.7 percent of the total Canadian population to 19.1 percent (Figure 1.2).
Figure 2. Share of visible minority persons in Canada, 1981-2011

Canada’s commitment to facilitating the reunion of Canadian residents with close family members from abroad and to fulfilling legal obligations with respect to refugees has also contributed to the increasing population of visible minorities, albeit to a lesser degree than the immigrants selected through the points system (Simmons 2010; Green and Green 1999).

The term visible minority refers to “persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour” (Statistics Canada 2013). The visible minority population consists mainly of the following groups: Chinese, South Asian, Black, Arab, West Asian, Filipino, Southeast Asian, Latin American, Japanese, and Korean (Statistics Canada 2013). According to this definition, immigrants from Turkey are also categorised as visible minorities by Statistics Canada. As Boyd (2008, 21) notes, “the term ‘visible minority’ was developed by the Canadian federal government to meet data needs of federal employment equity legislation in the 1980s.” The increasing numbers of visible minorities among Canada’s immigrants has raised questions regarding their integration. In other words, transition from a white-settler society to a more diverse one has generated concerns that immigrants face ethnic and racial antagonism as well as discrimination (Boyd 2008; Hum and Simpson 2004; Reitz and Banerjee 2007b; Simmons 2010). In particular, given that Canada gives priority to recruiting skilled immigrants, an important question for both policy
makers and researchers has been whether these immigrants could become economically established in Canada.

Studies have shown that the economic integration of immigrants has not been an easy process, and that they face certain challenges and barriers in the labour market (e.g., Bauder 2003; 2005; 2008; Buzdugan and Halli 2009; Girard and Bauder 2007; Hum and Simpson 2004; Nakhaie 2006; Reitz 2001b; Warman and Worswick 2004). These studies found that immigrants experience a disadvantage in the labour market compared to native-born Canadians in terms of employment rates and earnings. For instance, despite being twice as likely as Canadian-born residents to have a university degree (Galarneau and Morissette 2008), the employment rate of university-educated immigrants (79 percent) remains lower than that of Canadian-born residents who are university educated (90 percent) (Bollman 2014; 2013). Furthermore, highly educated immigrants who arrived between 2006 and 2010 had earnings approximately $30,000 lower than highly educated, native-born Canadians (Bollman 2014).

These discrepancies are a result of several structural factors, including the devaluation or non-recognition of the educational credentials and foreign experience of immigrants from non-traditional source countries, and employers’ preference for applicants with Canadian education and work experience (Buzdugan and Halli 2009; McBride and Sweetman 2003; Picot 2004; Fuller and Vosko 2008). Ferrer and Riddle’s (2008) analysis of census data, for instance, showed that while immigrants from traditional source countries receive similar returns for their educational attainments, immigrants from non-traditional source countries experience lower returns. There are also issues of immigrants’ limited access to networks and social capital; employers’ prejudice towards visible minority immigrants in hiring and promotion; racism, and Islamophobia particularly since 9/11 (Buzdugan and Halli 2009; Jimeno et al. 2009; Simmons 2010). Not surprisingly, then, visible minority immigrants are overrepresented in jobs with low educational requirements (e.g., clerks and taxi drivers) in comparison with native-born Canadians and immigrants from traditional source countries, controlling for influential factors such as education (Galarneau and Morissette 2008; King 2009; Thompson 2000; Zeitsma 2010). Aycan and Berry’s (1996) study of Turkish immigrants in Montreal revealed that, similar to other immigrant groups from non-European
countries, Turkish immigrants experienced problems finding a job relevant to their educational training, an inability to achieve upward mobility, unemployment, and underemployment.

The aforementioned studies show that even though the points system has opened the doors to individuals from non-traditional source countries and the policy of multiculturalism has recognised the diversity of Canada’s population, immigrants’ ethnic, racial, and national background make a difference to the economic opportunities available to them. This suggests that the change in the traditional composition of immigrant populations has increased the potential for discrimination (Hum and Simpson 2004; Oreopoulos 2011; Oreopoulos and Dechief 2012; Reitz 2007a; 2007b; Simmons 2010). While preceding studies give us a clear idea of the kinds of barriers faced by immigrants in the labour market, we know far less about how immigrants interpret their experiences and how they overcome these barriers. Further, while studies have explored the barriers faced by immigrants, the role of immigration class and how this role intersects with other factors, such as education, have not been adequately explored. In addition, much of the existing research within migration studies has focused almost exclusively on job search experiences and employment rates of immigrants, but has paid little attention to their experiences inside the workplace. I seek to fill these gaps in the literature through this dissertation.

Furthermore, scholars have studied the extent to which immigrants develop networks with people outside their ethnic and racialised groups, identify themselves as Canadians, and become involved in various organisations and associations (Reitz and Banerjee 2007b; Reitz et al. 2009). The general findings show that compared to immigrants of European origin, minority immigrants are more likely to be stigmatised due to ethnic and racial discrimination and a greater reluctance on the part of native-born Canadians to accept them as legitimate Canadians (Basavarajappa and Verma 1985; Li 2001; 2003; Reitz and Banerjee 2007b; Reitz et al. 2009). Studies also highlighted that in addition to the specific treatment of immigrants by the receiving society, immigrants’ attitudes towards the receiving society as well as their socio-economic status (SES) in the host country could impact their integration experiences (Allahar 2010; Ataca and Berry 2002; Castles and Miller 2009; Simmons 2010; Pries 2004). Ataca and Berry’s (2002) study of the psychological and sociocultural integration of Turkish
immigrant couples in Toronto, for instance, showed that Turkish immigrants with a high SES are more likely to be in contact with Canadians than those with a low SES. Allahar’s (2010) study of Caribbean immigrants revealed similar findings.

Considering the importance of social networks in social integration, I will conclude this section with a discussion of the conceptualisation of social networks and social capital in sociology in general and in migration studies in particular. Social networks and social capital are two closely related concepts, as the former constitutes the core of the latter. More specifically, social networks refer to the underlying structure of relationships that “hold the capacity for providing social capital; social capital is the capacity of networks to provide goods for people within these networks” (Clear 2007, 80). Granovetter, Coleman, Putnam, and Bourdieu are four pioneers in the study of social networks and social capital. Their empirical and theoretical work relating these concepts has started widespread interest in the wider social sciences in the form and function of social networks and social capital. Although differences in the theorisation of the concepts among these scholars exist, a broad consensus is that “social capital is a valuable asset and that its value stems from the access to resources it engenders through an actor’s social relationship” (Moran 2005, 1129).

Granovetter (1973; 1974) examines the impact of social networks on social mobility by focusing on the spread of information in such networks. Based on his empirical studies, he has conceptualised two forms of network: strong ties and weak ties. The strength of a tie is dependent on the combination of time that individuals spend together, emotional intensity, intimacy, and reciprocal services (Granovetter 1973, 1361). His major theoretical argument can be summarised as follows: weak ties are more likely than strong ties to ease social mobility, as they bridge otherwise disconnected groups and provide novel information.

Similarly, for Coleman (1988, 98), social capital refers to resources that are “productive, making possible the achievement of certain ends that in its absence would not be possible”. However, in contrast to Granovetter’s emphasis on the significance of weak ties, Coleman (1988; 1990) argues that social capital is embedded in a closed network of relations at the parental or community level within which obligations and expectations, social norms, and
reciprocity are reproduced. Contacts in closed networks are more likely to be in cooperation and to share information than in open networks (Moran 2005).

Putnam’s (1993; 1995; 2000; 2007) theorisation of social capital shares certain aspects of the competing views of Granovetter and Coleman. On the one hand, as did Coleman, he examines social capital at the community level and underlines the importance of norms, trust and reciprocity by defining social capital as “features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Putnam 1993; 167). For him, social capital is built through encouraging voluntary associations (i.e. through civic engagement) and constitutes a cure for collective action problems and social inequality (Putnam 2000; 1995; 1993). On the other hand, similar to Granovetter, Putnam (2007; 2000) distinguishes social capital in two forms: bonding and bridging, arguing that the latter eases an individual’s access to broader resources more than does the former. Bonding capital refers to links within groups that strengthens exclusive identities and homogeneous group, whereas bridging social capital refers to links between people across diverse social cleavages (Putnam 2000).

Many studies in the migration literature rely on Robert Putnam’s (1993; 2000) theorisation of social capital in order to conceptualise social networks developed within the host society and within the immigrant community. In so doing, they conceptualise intra-ethnic group networks as bonding social capital and inter-ethnic networks as bridging social capital (e.g., Kanas, van Tubergen, and van der Lippe 2009; Kazemipur 2006; Nakhai and Kazemipur 2013). Some scholars have also highlighted the parallels between Putnam’s conceptualisation of social capital and Granovetter’s conceptualisation of networks as weak and strong, arguing that bridging social capital is characterised by weak ties while bonding capital is associated with strong ties (see Leonard and Onyx 2003). The binary between intra-ethnic group networks and inter-ethnic group networks is based on the assumption that the latter benefits immigrants to a greater extent than the former, as they enable immigrants’ access to different resources (Leonard 2004; Leonard and Onyx 2003). This binary view of social capital and social networks, however, ignores power relations in society and treats immigrant populations as homogeneous groups. As stated in the beginning of this chapter, my focus in this study is also on the social network development aspect of social integration.
Theoretically, my analysis relies on Pierre Bourdieu’s (1986) conceptualisation of social networks and social capital (discussed in detail in the next section), and focuses on the differences and power dynamics existing within and across groups. To this end, I pay particular attention to the ways in which the participants in this study formed networks with other immigrants from Turkey, with members of other immigrant groups, and with society as a whole.

1.2 Theoretical Framework: Bourdieu’s Theory of Practice
For the core theoretical foundation of this dissertation, I primarily draw on Pierre Bourdieu’s *Theory of Practice*. Bourdieu is centrally concerned with the nature of divisions within society and the mechanisms of differentiation. According to Bourdieu, understanding social inequality and social reproduction requires a theoretical framework that focuses on the impact of structure and the role of agency at the same time. To this end, he proposes a relational understanding of society in which structure and agency are formed in relation to each other (Bourdieu 1977; 1984; 1990). That is, individuals’ experiences are structured by social reality, yet they construct social reality through their practices. This theory of practice allows researchers to examine “the dialectic of the internalization of externality and the externalization of internality” (Bourdieu 1977, 72). Bourdieu developed three major theoretical concepts to explain practice: capital, field, and habitus. I will present each of these concepts and discuss the complex interplay between them in the following subsections.

1.2.1 Capital
Similar to Marx, Bourdieu sees capital as a social relation (Swartz 2013; Townley 2014), but expands it beyond its economic conception through applying the economic metaphor of capital to nonmaterial resources (e.g., cultural, religious, scientific, and familial resources) (Swartz 1997; 2013). He conceptualises capital as a generalised resource that can exist in monetary and non-monetary as well as tangible and intangible forms (Anheir 2005). In so doing, he considers all capital as forms of power in their own right that shape the social positioning of individuals in social fields (Bourdieu 1986; 1987). More specifically, he defines capital as “accumulated labor (in its materialized form or its ‘incorporated,’ embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private, i.e. exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labour” (Bourdieu 1986, 46).
Bourdieu, based on his empirical investigations, distinguishes between three fundamental social powers or *forms of capital*: economic, social, and cultural. *Economic* capital, which is at the root of all other forms of capital, refers to resources that are “immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the form of property rights” (Bourdieu 1986, 47). *Social* capital consists of the sum of actual or potential resources based on connections and group membership (Bourdieu 1987, 4). *Cultural* capital includes a wide variety of resources such as “verbal facility, general cultural awareness, aesthetic preferences, information about the school system, and educational credentials” (Swartz 1997, 75). According to Bourdieu, cultural capital exists in three different forms. In the embodied form, cultural capital is linked to and incorporated within individuals and denotes what they know and can do. It is a product of socialisation processes as well as investment in self-improvement in the form of learning (Abdulla 2007; Bourdieu 1986; Tatli and Özbilgin 2012). In the objectified form, cultural capital is materially represented in such artefacts as books and works of art (Bourdieu 1986; Moore 2008). Last, in the institutionalised form, cultural capital refers to the educational credential system, which “makes it possible to establish conversion rates between cultural capital and economic capital by guaranteeing the monetary value of a given academic capital”7 (Bourdieu 1986, 51).

In Bourdieu’s thinking, resources become capital only when they function as a social relation of power, and in order to maintain or enhance their positions in the social order, agents need to accumulate and convert various forms of capital (Swartz 1997; 2013). For example, an acquisition of a post-secondary educational degree (cultural capital) would be converted to economic capital in the form of a salary in the labour market.

Bourdieu argues that the unequal distribution of different types of capital across social classes and their transmission from one generation to another is one of the major mechanisms creating and reproducing social inequality in modern societies. The key to understanding social inequality is to focus on both material and nonmaterial resources. Another important

---

7 Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of institutionalised cultural capital should not be confused with Schultz’s conceptualisation of human capital (Schultz 1961). Although both notions involve educational credentials, human capital ignores power structures and lacks a class-based analysis, which constitutes the core of Bourdieu’s theoretical framework.
feature of Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of capital is that the value of various forms of capital is determined within a particular social and spatial context. In Bourdieu’s words, “a capital does not exist and function except in relation to a field” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 101, emphasis in the original). This brings us to the concept of field.

1.2.2 Field

Modern society for Bourdieu is made up of a number of relatively autonomous fields (e.g., the cultural field) and multiple subfields (e.g., artistic field and literary field) in which various forms of power circulate and practices are performed. Each field has its own logic, rules, and regularities (Bourdieu 1993; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Fields are hierarchically structured and each has its dominated and its dominators (Bourdieu 1990, 140). The positions of agents in the field depend on the volume and structure of the capital they possess relative to others as well as the success with which they can make use of their capital (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 99–101). The crucial point here is that each field determines the relative value of capital (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). This means that a form of capital that is valued in a particular field may not be valued in another one. Agents are more likely to succeed in a field if they can utilise field-specific capital. To understand the field, one must understand what forms of capital are valued in it (Bourdieu 1990; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). According to Bourdieu,

One of the goals of research is to identify … these forms of specific capital. There is thus a sort of hermeneutic circle: in order to construct the field, one must identify the forms of specific capital that operate within it, and to construct the forms of specific capital one must know the specific logic of the field (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 107–108, emphasis in the original).

Central to the concept of field is the emphasis on the struggle for relative positions within the field. Bourdieu writes that:

[the field as a structure of objective relations between positions of force undergirds and guides the strategies whereby the occupants of these positions seek, individually or collectively, to safeguard or improve their position and to impose the principle of hierarchization most favourable to their products. The strategies of agents depend on their position in the field, that is, in the distribution of the specific capital, and on the perception that they have of the field (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 101).

This suggests that capital is both the instrument and the object of competitive struggles within the field (Bourdieu 1990, 141). Agents try to maximise their field-specific capital, yet
their strategies are shaped by the volume and structure of capital at hand. Despite inequality of chances and outcomes in the field, they seldom become sites of social transformation (Swartz 1997, 121). This is because the relations in a field appear to be natural and agents tend to think that succeeding or failing in a field is a result of their own achievement or failure, rather than a result of the structural relations (Bourdieu 1977, 164–165). Bourdieu calls this experience doxa (i.e., taken-for-granted) and argues that it ensures the reproduction of social inequality (Bourdieu 1977; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). This takes us to the other issue raised in the above excerpt—that an agent’s strategies in fields also depend on “the perception that they have of the field;” that is on their habitus.

1.2.3 Habitus

Bourdieu considers habitus as the “feel for the game”—the field being the game itself (Bourdieu 1990, 66). Habitus makes agents accept the necessity of the game, recognise and embrace its rules, and take responsibility for its continuation (Glastra and Vedder 2010, 82). Bourdieu theorises that the relationship between habitus and field is dialectical:

The relation between habitus and field operates in two ways. On one side, it is a relation of conditioning: the field structures the habitus, which is the product of the embodiment of the immanent necessity of the field ... On the one side, it is a relation of knowledge or cognitive construction. Habitus contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world, a world endowed with sense and value, in which it is worth investing one’s energy (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 127).

This account of relationship highlights that habitus acts as “structured structures” and “structuring structures” at the same time. This theorisation of habitus allows Bourdieu to incorporate the objective structures of society and the subjective role of agents within it (Bourdieu 1977). As such, habitus represents a meso-level of analysis that connects field (macro) with capital (micro) (Özbilgin and Tatlı 2005).

Bourdieu (1991, 11) defines habitus as “a set of dispositions which incline agents to act and react in certain ways.” The dispositions of habitus are acquired through socialisation, which start in early childhood socialisation and are internalised as a second nature (Bourdieu 1977; 1990). Habitus generates perceptions, thoughts, expectations, attitudes, feelings, and practices that are consistent with the class positions generating them (Bourdieu 1977, 95; 1990, 55) and that are “‘regular’ without being consciously co-ordinated or governed by any
‘rule’” (Thompson 1991, 12). Individuals brought up in a working-class family, for example, are more likely to unconsciously develop an appreciation for manual labour, learn how to use their hands, and choose to attend vocational schools than individuals raised in a middle-class family (Lehmann and Taylor 2015). However, it is important to note that habitus is not determining, but generative. It mediates the orientations of agents, rather than determining their actions (Bourdieu 1977, 73). It shapes agents’ strategies in the competitive arena of field by informing them on how to use, as well as accumulate, capital (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).

We can think of different forms of habitus generating individuals’ practices. Agents who are subjected to homogenous material conditions of existence tend to develop the same class habitus, such as a middle-class habitus or a working-class habitus (Bourdieu 1984; 1977; 1990). Social class and its relation to the development of habitus has been the primary focus of Bourdieu’s writing. Yet, the concept of habitus has been expanded to include gender and ethnic/racial differences (Bonilla-Silva, Goar, and Embrick 2006; Kelly and Lusis 2006b; Perry 2012; Rapoport and Lomsky-Feder 2002). Habitus in this sense enables researchers to uncover how class, “race”/ethnicity, and gender are embodied and played out in a range of dispositions (Reay 2004, 437).

Habitus, as “the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product” (Bourdieu 1990, 56), tends to perpetuate itself into the future by making itself present in similarly structured practices (Bourdieu 1977, 82; 1990, 54). In so doing, it protects “itself from crises and critical challenges” and provides “itself with a milieu to which it is as pre-adapted as possible” (Bourdieu 1990, 61). Habitus in this sense is durable and transposable. However, it is not immutable. It is continually, yet slowly, re-structured through agents’ encounters with different fields (Swartz 2002; Reay 2004). In other words, “while habitus reflects the social position in which it was constructed, it also carries with it the genesis of new creative responses that are capable of transcending the social conditions in which it was produced” (Reay 2004, 434–435).

---

8 I put the word ‘race’ in quotation marks to highlight its social construction and to avoid suggesting a biological difference.
1.2.4 Applying Bourdieu to Migration Research

Bourdieu’s theoretical concepts, particularly capital, have gained popularity among migration scholars in the last ten-fifteen years (Bauder 2003; 2005; Cederberg 2012; Nee and Sanders 2001; Glastra and Vedder 2010; Girard and Bauder 2007; Ryan et al. 2008; Huot et al. 2013; Friesen 2011). For instance, Ryan et al. (2008) employed the notion of forms of capital to examine the networking experiences of Polish migrants in the UK. They showed that migrants with economic and cultural capital (e.g., language abilities) could access a wider array of networking opportunities, and thus enhance their access to support and resources in the host country. Focusing on the structure of migrant and/or ethnic minority communities in Sweden, Cederberg (2012) further showed that the socio-economic position of these communities determines whether their members could access resources that could be converted into social capital.

The notion of forms of capital has also been applied to studies looking at the economic integration of immigrants. Bauder (2003; 2005) examined challenges facing immigrants searching for jobs in Canada, and argued that devaluation or non-recognition of institutionalised cultural capital brought from the country of origin systematically excludes immigrants in the labour market. It is further argued in the literature that this mechanism of exclusion compels immigrants to accumulate institutionalised cultural capital of the host country (Bauder 2003; George et al. 2012; Girard and Bauder 2007). Friesen’s (2011) study of immigrant engineers in Manitoba showed how accumulation of Canadian cultural capital in the form of credentials, accreditations, and professional skills could ease immigrants’ integration into the labour market and workplaces. These studies illustrate how the value of capital can change in the process of migration and immigrants might need to acquire new forms of capital valued in the host country.

Bourdieu’s concept of habitus has also been used to explain the integration experiences of immigrants. In her study of Chinese immigrants in Australia, Wise (2010) argued that habitus developed in and brought from the country of origin constitutes a barrier to developing networks with native-born residents unless it “fits” with the interaction norms of the host country. Girard and Bauder (2007) examined immigrant engineers’ job-search experiences in Ontario, and argued that immigrant applicants are assessed on both their institutionalised
cultural capital in the form of academic credentials and on their familiarity with cultural norms specific to the profession as it is practiced in Canada. In other words, foreign-trained engineers, who lack exposure to the habitus of the engineering profession in Ontario, are less likely to gain admission to the engineering profession. In another study, Bauder (2005) showed that immigrants from different countries of origin might employ different employment strategies in the labour market depending on the dispositions brought from the home country.

At the theoretical level, my aim in this research is to build on and expand the preceding studies by applying Bourdieu’s theory of practice. Rather than including selected concepts in my analysis, I emphasize the complex interplay of capital, field, and habitus to situate and analyse the study participants’ integration trajectories in the broader socio-economic context. Despite the relatively high number of studies that employed the concepts of capital and habitus, there are less studies in the migration literature addressing the interconnectedness of Bourdieu’s three major concepts (Glastra and Vedder 2010; Huot et al. 2013; Oliver and O’Reilly 2010; Samaluk 2014). Oliver and O’Reilly (2010), for example, have employed Bourdieu’s theoretical framework to understand British migrants’ engagement with the reinventing of classed habitus in different social fields in Spain. In my research, I examine how the capital and the habitus of the participants have affected their integration experiences to different fields in Canada. This framework has allowed me to understand how uneven power relations influence participants’ integration experiences, without limiting my analysis either to structural constraints or to individual factors.

1.3 Study Objectives and Research Questions
This research is centrally concerned with providing a critical analysis of the integration experiences of immigrants whom migrated from a non-traditional source country, Turkey, and whom have been employed in different segments of the labour market in Canada. The main purpose of this research is to contribute to the literature on migration studies in general and on immigrant integration in particular. I first seek to examine how Turkish immigrants access and develop social networks, and what factors play a role in the formation of these networks. Second, I aim to examine the ways in which Turkish immigrants integrate into the labour market. Last, I seek to provide a discussion on how being an immigrant affects the
workplace experiences of immigrants with professional jobs. Before presenting the research questions guiding this research, I will briefly outline the history of migration from Turkey to Canada and state the importance of conducting research on Turkish immigrants’ integration experiences.

Migration from Turkey to Canada began mainly in the late 1960s, and it has continued to increase (Karpat 2004; Statistics Canada 2011). By the year 2011, there were 27,145 immigrants from Turkey living in Canada (Statistics Canada 2011). The immigration flow from Turkey can be divided into two major periods in terms of the socio-demographic profile of immigrants. In the pre-1980s period, many were skilled professionals (e.g., engineers and medical doctors) with urban backgrounds. The main factors leading these people to migrate were a search for better economic opportunities and a better life for the next generation. In the post-1980s period, immigration from Turkey was more diversified with an increasing number of immigrants coming from rural or low-income urban backgrounds with low levels of education (Ozcurumez 2009). The profile of these immigrants in this respect has been similar to Turkish immigrants in Europe (Abadan-Unat 2011; Kirisci 2003). This period also constitutes a breakthrough in migration to Canada, following a series of economic crises, military coups, and economic restructuring in Turkey (Angin 2003).

Immigrants born in Turkey have been admitted to Canada under three classes of immigration: economic class, family class, and refugees. Similar to immigrants from other countries, most came to Canada as members of the economic class, followed by members of the family class and refugees (CIC 2013). The majority of Turkish immigrants have settled in metropolitan areas like Toronto, Vancouver, and Montreal (Statistics Canada 2011). In terms of their location in the labour market, Turkish immigrants are divided into the professional and non-professional segments of the Canadian labour market (Ataca and Berry 2002). Immigrants in the latter segment are concentrated within specific employment sectors: manufacturing, wholesale, retail (Angin 2003), and construction.

There are three main reasons to study immigrants from Turkey. First, even though the Turkish population has been increasing, few studies exist that examine their integration into Canadian society (Aycan and Berry 1996; Ataca and Berry 2002; Ozcurumez 2009). This is
in contrast to the relatively high volume of research conducted on Turkish immigrants in Europe, the United States, and Australia (e.g., Abadan-Unat 2011; Ehrkamp 2006; Erzan and Kirisci 2009; Kaya 2005; Köser-Akçapar 2006; Senay 2009). Second, Turkish immigrants are coming from a non-traditional source country and their experiences could shed some light onto the experiences of other immigrants (Aycan and Berry 1996). Last, the above-described differences among Turkish immigrants in terms of immigration trajectory and socioeconomic status allow me to focus on how the intersection of class and ethnicity shapes immigrants’ integration experiences.

In light of the above-mentioned objectives, the main research question for this study is as follows: How does ethnicity and class intersect and shape integration trajectories of immigrants from Turkey to Canada? I examined this question by looking at three sub-categories: social network development, labour market integration, and workplace integration. I then formulated the following sub-questions:

Social Network Development
- How do immigrants from Turkey access social networks in Canada? What role do capital and habitus play in this process?
- What is the role of social class in accessing and creating networks?
- Are there any differences in the ways in which immigrants form networks with other immigrants from Turkey, with members of other immigrant groups, and with native-born Canadians?

Labour Market Integration
- How can we define the rules of the Canadian labour market field from immigrants’ viewpoints? Do the rules of the market differ within its various segments?
- How do immigrants navigate and mitigate the rules of the market?
- How do forms of capital and habitus affect the experiences of immigrants and the strategies they develop to enter the field?

Workplace Integration
- Do immigrants continue to face challenges and barriers once they are hired?
• How do Turkish immigrants in professional occupations perceive, experience, and interpret their workplace experiences?
• How do relational functioning of field and habitus shape immigrants’ workplace integration?

To explore answers to these questions, qualitative methods were employed. The next section describes the methods, presents the research process (sampling, data collection, and data analysis) and ethics issues as well as discusses my positionality as a researcher.

1.4 Research Methods and Design

1.4.1 Research Methods

This research is based upon qualitative data collected in Toronto and London, Ontario, between February 2013 and March 2014 by means of exploratory, in-depth, semi-structured, face-to-face interviews and group interviews. These interviews sought the participants’ reflections on three major areas of the study: access to social networks in Canada, job search experiences, and experiences inside the workplace. To situate participants’ experiences in a broader and comparative socio-economic context, participants were also asked to reflect on their experiences in Turkey, reasons for migration, and future plans. The same interview guide was used for both interviewing methods (see Appendix I). The only difference between personal interviews and group interviews was the collection of demographic information (e.g., age, marital status). In group interviews, demographic information was collected individually from participants after the interviews were conducted. This strategy prevented the group discussions from being interrupted by the collection of demographic information while protecting the confidentiality of participants on socio-demographic variables.

Using a semi-structured interview guide (Patton 1990) allowed me to identify the topics to be covered and to structure the major interview questions in advance. It also provided flexibility in terms of changing the order of questions and asking follow-up and probing questions based upon participants’ responses to pre-structured questions. This approach made data collection more systematic than informal conversational interviews but also more conversational and situational than standardised, open-ended interviews (Patton 1990). In
order to test the scope of my interview guide, I also conducted one pilot interview, which gave me the opportunity to revise the guide accordingly.

1.4.2 Sampling
Creswell (1994, 148) notes, “the idea of qualitative research is to purposefully select informants that will best answer the research question.” Given that the purpose of my study was to compare the experiences of immigrants with professional and non-professional jobs to examine how the intersection of ethnicity and social class impact their integration trajectories in Canada, I used a *purposive sampling* approach for selecting study participants. Criteria for inclusion were as follows: being born and raised in Turkey, having migrated to Canada as an adult, holding either permanent residency or citizenship, being currently employed or having had employment experience in Canada, and having been a resident in London or Toronto for at least one year.

I aimed to have an equal number of participants with professional and non-professional jobs. Participants were divided into a two-cell sampling matrix in each city. The education level required for the job was used to determine participants’ location in the labour market. Jobs requiring university education or higher were considered professional (e.g., engineer, financial analysts)\(^9\), and jobs that require less than university education were considered non-professional (e.g., construction worker, cleaner).

1.4.3 Data Collection and Recruitment Strategies
The data for this research were collected in Toronto and London, Ontario between the winter of 2013 and the spring of 2014. Both cities are geographically located in Southwestern Ontario. Toronto is the provincial capital of Ontario; it is also Canada’s most ethnically and

\(^9\) There is a substantive body of literature that deals with the conceptualisation of professions (e.g. Adams 2010; Adams and Welsh 2007; Broadbent and Roberts 1997; Eliot 1995; Larson 1977; Leicht and Fennell 2001). Despite the lack of consensus in the literature, the concept has been broadly defined in relation to the following key characteristics: recognition by government, regulation by professional associations, educational requirements, and social status. Although I realise the importance of this literature, I am using the term professional to simply denote whether a job requires higher formal education. I made the decision to use the concepts of professional and non-professional jobs to compare the experiences of participants with different jobs after I started to collect my data. Before I went into field, my plan was to use the concepts of white-collar and blue/pink collar jobs. However, some of my participants in the construction and taxi driving sectors were independent contractors, which made it inappropriate to use the concept of blue collar to discuss their experiences. Yet, in my third manuscript (Chapter 4), I use the concept of white-collar, as I discuss the workplace experiences of only the participants with professional jobs.
racially diverse and most populous city. Moreover, it is Canada’s centre of business, finance, arts, and culture. Similar to the migration patterns of other immigrants (Hiebert 2005; McDonald 2004), the majority of Turkish immigrants have settled in Toronto \((n = 11,125)\) (Statistics Canada 2011). London is a mid-sized city and has much less diversity than Toronto (MacTaggart and Zonruiter 2013). The manufacturing sector constitutes an integral part of London’s economic base; the knowledge-based sector has lagged well behind the manufacturing sector. The city’s economy has been negatively impacted by continental and global restructuring over the past three decades, resulting in the closure of manufacturing plants and the relocation of financial head offices. Nevertheless, London is still Canada’s tenth-largest market area (Bradford 2014). There were a total of 120 Turkish immigrants in London in 2011 (Statistics Canada 2011). The purpose behind collecting data in two cities with different socio-economic context was to have a complementary view of the processes shaping participants’ experiences, rather than making a comparison.

Advertising and passive snowball sampling methods were used to recruit participants for the research. I advertised my research on social media (LinkedIn), through email distribution to established associations and email groups created by immigrants from Turkey, and with poster and/or flyers. Turkish restaurants, markets, associations, mosques, religious centers and the Consulate-General of Turkey in Toronto were asked for permission to post posters and flyers. I visited these locations regularly to provide additional posters and flyers. As a recruitment strategy, I also attended a number of social events organised in Toronto and London, and got permission from the event organizers to place my flyers on the registration table.

For ethical reasons, I used passive snowball sampling, meaning that initial participants who were recruited via the above-described methods were given a business card that contained brief information about the study on its reverse side. Participants were then asked to pass the card to other Turkish immigrants that they knew. For each group of participants (professional and non-professional) different methods of recruitment were effective. I recruited the majority of participants with professional jobs through advertisements on LinkedIn and e-mail groups while community restaurants, markets, and passive snowball sampling were the most effective methods for recruiting non-professional participants.
Interviews were scheduled at the participants’ convenience and in a location of their choice. The majority of interviews \( (n = 67) \) were conducted in public places like coffee houses; six interviews were conducted at the participants’ homes, and the other five interviews were conducted at the participants’ workplaces. The duration of the interviews ranged between 55 minutes and 2.5 hours, with an average length of approximately 90 minutes. With the consent of the participants, all interviews were recorded on a digital audio recorder. Interviews were conducted in Turkish, yet some participants switched between English and Turkish during the course of interview. All interviews were transcribed verbatim and I translated quotes from the interviews into English. I also had my translation reviewed by someone fluent in Turkish and English to ensure the accuracy of translation.

1.4.4 The Research Participants

During my fieldwork, I conducted 78 interviews with immigrants from Turkey whom were living in either Toronto or London, Ontario. I conducted personal, one-on-one interviews with 69 of the 78 participants. Although I intended to collect all my data through personal interviews, on three occasions, participants came with their friends and I proceeded with group interviews using the same interview guide. More specifically, I conducted three group interviews (one with professionals and two with non-professionals), each involving three participants. A comparison of data collected through group interviews with those collected in personal interviews showed that both methods yielded similar information.

At the time of the interview, 38 of the participants had professional jobs and 40 had non-professional jobs. Table 1.1 shows the distribution of participants by location and type of job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Non-professional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample of professional immigrants consisted primarily of engineers and information/technology employees, whereas that of the non-professional sample consisted primarily of construction workers and taxi drivers in addition to some factory and service-sector workers.
More specifically, professional participants held the following occupations: engineer ($n = 12$), information technology developer ($n = 9$), financial analyst ($n = 6$), project manager ($n = 5$), human resources agent ($n = 3$), academic ($n = 2$), and marketing agent ($n = 1$). Non-professional participants held the following occupations: construction worker ($n = 17$), taxi driver ($n = 7$), cleaner/janitor ($n = 6$), factory worker ($n = 5$), and server/cook ($n = 5$).

Participants were diverse with regard to age, gender, ethnic identity (Kurd and Turk), immigration entry status, and duration of residence, but all were permanent residents or citizens of Canada at the time of the interview. Fourteen of my participants were between the ages of 20 and 29, twenty-five were between the ages of 30 and 39, twenty-seven were between the ages of 40 and 49, and twelve were between the ages of 50 and 60. Fifty-five of the participants were male and 23 were female. Thirty participants had moved to Canada under the economic class, twenty-five under the refugee class, and fifteen under the family class. Eight participants first came to Canada on a student visa and stayed in the country upon their completion of education. They received their permanent residency under the economic class. Participants had been living in Canada for an average of ten years.

Participants arrived in Canada with different levels of education. Four had doctorate degrees, ten had a master’s degree, thirty-six had a bachelor’s degree, eighteen had a high school diploma, and ten had less than a high school diploma. Fifty-two of the participants had work experience prior to migrating to Canada. Thirty-five of the participants with a bachelor’s degree or higher started work in non-professional jobs (e.g., server, cleaner) and twenty-one managed to find a job matching their educational training. The remaining fourteen, who came to Canada under the refugee class, however, could not switch to a professional job and experienced de-skilling and downward social mobility. In particular, the experiences of these participants allowed me to examine the ways in which the intersection of immigration class and education level affect labour market integration.

Table 2 provides an overview of the characteristics of the participants, in terms of their gender, age, entry status, education level at arrival, education level at the time of the interview, and current occupation.
Table 2. The Description of Participant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>Non – Professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 20 – 29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 30 – 39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 40 – 49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50 – 60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic class</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education at Arrival</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school education</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below high school education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education at the Interview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below high school education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Developer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Analyst</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Agent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Agent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Worker</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi Driver</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner/Janitor</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Worker</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server/Cook</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These two participants began their bachelor’s degrees in Turkey and completed them in Canada.*
1.4.5 Research Ethics
The study was reviewed and approved by the Non-Medical Research Ethics Board of the University of Western Ontario (Appendix II). Following the guidelines of the Research Ethics Board, each participant was provided a letter of information (Appendix III) in advance of the interviews or before the interviews started. The letter of invitation briefly presented the objectives of the research, informed participants about the nature of the interviews, explained the role of both participants and researcher, and listed the rights of participants (e.g., the right to refuse to answer any questions or to withdraw from the study at any time). The letter also guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality, and included my own, my supervisor’s and the Ethics Board’s contact information in case participants had any questions about the research or their rights as a research subject.

At the start of each interview, participants were provided a copy of the interview consent form (Appendix IV) for their signature. By signing the form, participants confirmed that they were informed about the nature of the study and agreed to participate of their own free will.

I have been committed to maintaining participants’ anonymity and confidentiality. The identity of the participants, or any information that may identify them (e.g., company names and any third parties referred to during the interviews), were either removed from the data or replaced with pseudonyms to ensure anonymity. Interview recordings were available only to a transcriber and myself. I did the transcription of fifty-three interviews, and the transcriber did the transcription of the other twenty-five interviews. Before the interviews were transcribed, the transcriber was asked to sign a letter of confidentiality in order to ensure the confidentiality of the participants and their responses (Appendix V).

1.4.6 Analysis and Interpretation
In the analysis of the data, I paid special attention to the participants’ narratives that touched upon the challenges they faced in the host country and the strategies they developed to overcome these challenges. Ontologically and epistemologically, this research is guided by critical realism, which combines realist ontology with constructivist (relativist) epistemology (Bhaskar 1998). Critical realism acknowledges the role that individuals play in defining their experiences while it also takes into account the ways the broader social context impacts
individuals’ experiences (Braun and Clarke 2006; Houston 2001; Sims-Schouten, Riley, and Willig 2007). Put more simply, in critical realism, individuals’ actions and understandings are interpreted in relation to the societal conditions that clearly exist and are not simply constructed. Applying a critical realist approach to an analysis of immigrants’ integration would require researchers to examine the ways in which immigrants narrate their experiences while conceptualising these narratives in a structural and historical context. For example, as the findings presented in the following chapters will reveal, immigrants’ socio-economic background and immigration class are important factors shaping their practices, but also structure the narratives they mobilise to explain their practices.

In analysing data, I applied Braun and Clarke’s (2006) thematic analysis approach, which is compatible with critical realism. Thematic analysis is a method used for “identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data”10 (Braun and Clarke 2006, 79). I followed a number of stages in the process of data analysis. The word stages though should not mislead the reader. Analysis was an iterative process, rather than a linear one. I moved back and forth between the stages as needed throughout the analysis and interpretation of data. In the first stage, I read the complete transcripts of all textual data line-by-line to get a sense of each individual interview as a whole (Creswell 2013) and to familiarize myself with the entire data (Braun and Clarke 2006). I wrote notes in the margins and marked ideas for coding while reading though the transcripts. The formal and systematic coding process began in the second stage and was performed through NVivo 10 data analysis software. Using both open (data-driven) and theoretical (theory-driven) coding, I systematically coded interview transcripts. In the third stage, I began searching for themes by finding connections between the codes. Once the connections were identified, codes were collated and combined to form overarching themes (broader patterns). For instance, open coding included such categories as Volunteer Job, Attainment of Canadian Education, and Reliance on Network to Access a Job. These categories, some of which had a number of sub-categories, were combined and formed the theme of Strategies in Job Search. In the fourth stage, I reviewed my themes to ensure they accurately represented the data and were not redundant. In the fifth stage, I further

---

10 Braun and Clarke’s (2006) thematic analysis approach in this sense is akin to Corbin and Strauss’ (1990) grounded theory approach. However, the key difference between the two approaches is that while researchers applying the latter ‘ideally’ aim to generate a plausible theory of the phenomena, researchers applying the former need not subscribe to the commitment of theory development.
refined my themes and focused on the relationship between the themes and theoretical framework of the study. This process continued until I finished writing my empirical chapters, which constituted the final stage of data analysis and interpretation.

### 1.4.7 Reflexivity

England (1994) states that, “the positionality (i.e., position based on class, gender, race, etc.) and biography of the researcher plays a central role in the research process, in the field as well as in the final text” (England 1994, 251–252). Being reflexive during the entire research process is essential for a researcher (Fine et al. 2003) and I acknowledge that my class, ethnic background, gender, age, education, and theoretical orientations impacted the choice of research topic and the course of the research as well as its analysis and interpretation.

I was born to middle-class parents (my father has a university education and my mother has a high school education), whom identify themselves as Turk and Muslim. I grew up in a small-sized city in Turkey. I moved to Ankara (the capital city) for my bachelor’s degree and then to Istanbul for my master’s degree. I also had the opportunity to be an exchange student in England during my bachelor’s degree. Upon completion of my master’s degree, I moved to London, Ontario, Canada to pursue my doctoral degree. It was here that I developed my interest in international migration. While taking courses on migration and sociology of work, I became interested in the experiences of immigrants in Canada. Growing up in Turkey, I was exposed to both academic and non-academic discussions on Turkish immigrants in Europe, and I was surprised that the experiences of Turkish immigrants in Canada have failed to capture sociologists’ attention. This is probably due to the relatively small size of the Turkish immigrant population. This was one of the first gaps I noticed in the literature. I began to visit Turkish restaurants and to attend events organised by immigrants from Turkey, both in London and Toronto. I was lucky to have my partner in Toronto, which eased my access into these places and events. During this preliminary fieldwork, I noticed that immigrants from Turkey were fragmented along socio-economic, sectarian, and ethnic lines. Turkish immigrants in North America are usually portrayed as professionals, whom, in contrast to Turkish immigrants in European countries, are admitted as immigrants due to their educational background (Köser-Akçapar 2006). Yet, my observations in the field
showed that there were Turkish immigrants in Canada with low levels of education. I also noticed that finding a professional job in Canada has been a challenge to those immigrants who arrived with bachelor’s or higher education degrees. Eventually, I decided to focus on the integration experiences of immigrants from Turkey employed in different segments of the Canadian labour market.

While collecting my data, I represented myself as a PhD student from Turkey interested in the experiences of immigrants from Turkey. It is important to note that representing myself as a person “from Turkey” instead of a “Turk/Turkish” person was a considered decision. First, I personally do not use ethnicity to define my identity. Second, given that I did not know my participants’ ethnic affiliation, I refrained from creating any kind of distinction between myself and the study participants at the outset. I will discuss shortly the reasons for referring to immigrants from Turkey as “Turkish” in this study, but will first focus on my insider/outsider status (Dwyer and Buckle 2009; Mullings 1999).

I believe that I occupied the position of both insider and outsider during this research process. My shared positionality as a person from Turkey and speaking Turkish afforded me some insider status and allowed participants to be more open while reflecting on their integration experiences. For instance, while reflecting on their experiences inside the workplace, some participants created a hierarchy between themselves and immigrants from other developing countries, arguing that Turkish immigrants are superior to these immigrants. These participants might have been less open if the researcher were from a different background. Insider status also made it easier to contextualise participants’ experiences in a broader socio-historical context. My migration trajectory, age, and gender, on the other hand, made me an outsider among many participants to a certain extent. Furthermore, with the exception of participation in social events during this research process, I have not been active in the community.\footnote{Although I used the word community here, immigrants from Turkey are fragmented, which makes it difficult to consider them as a “community.” This will be discussed in the second chapter.}

I also do not identify myself with any kind of ethnicity or religion.

Denzin and Lincoln (2003, 9) note that “research is an interactive process” that is shaped not only by the positionality of the researcher, but also by the positionality of those being
researched. Engaging in reflexivity in this respect requires recognising power imbalances in the course of research. I believe that there was a power dynamic for me to consider being a university-educated female student who was asking professional and non-professional immigrants whom had arrived in Canada under different immigration classes about their migration and integration experiences. During the interviews, the participants’ comments about my research and/or about me being a doctoral student abroad showed how they perceived me as a researcher. For many participants who were in professional jobs, I was “still” a student who needed to complete her research and they were there to help me complete this research. For participants who were in non-professional jobs with less than a high school education, I was a “brave woman” who decided to leave her family in Turkey and move to Canada to pursue her degree. As part of the reflexivity, I took notes after each interview in which I reflected on the place where the interview was held, the interaction between the participant and me, and my feelings about the power relations during the interview.

Another issue relating to the power dynamic in the research process was that I had to make a decision on using the concept of Turkish immigrants. Given that study participants self-identified as both Turkish and Kurdish, I had to negotiate how I would name them when I reported my findings: *Turkish immigrants* or *Türkiyeli immigrants* (see Grigoriadis 2007; Oran 2014, for a discussion on these two concepts). *Türkiyeli* is a Turkish word, which can be translated as “the one from Turkey” or “a citizen of the Republic of Turkey,” and it is not an identifier of ethnic group. I first decided to employ this concept in my research; however, after having a discussion with my friends in the field, with my supervisor, and my professors in Turkey, I eventually decided to name immigrants from Turkey as “Turkish immigrants,” with a footnote stating that the adjective Turkish refers to all population groups in Turkey, not only Turks. This decision was basically taken to make reading the English text easier. Any material that will be produced from this research in Turkish will employ the concept of *Türkiyeli*.

Overall, I have been aware of the importance of the positionality of the researcher as well as the study participants, and have tried to continually engage in reflexivity throughout the research process.
1.5 Thesis Outline

This dissertation consists of three distinct, but mutually related, manuscripts as well as an introduction and a conclusion. Each manuscript has its own structure and presents relevant literature, theoretical frameworks, results, and conclusions.

The first manuscript (Chapter 2), entitled “Social Network Development Experiences of Immigrants from Turkey to Canada,” is published in the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. In this manuscript, I examine the ways in which Turkish immigrants develop social networks in Canada as well as the nature of these networks. The analysis is situated in the literature on immigrant networks and social capital. It starts with a general overview of Putnam’s and Bourdieu’s use of the terms social capital and critiques of the former, arguing that an understanding of social networks requires analyses explaining their connection to economic and structural relations (Bourdieu 1977; 1986) and hence social inequalities (Lin 2000). Bourdieu’s theoretical perspective enables researchers to understand how immigrants located in different structural positions are able or not able to access and accumulate networks that can be utilised in different ways and in different contexts. Based upon the analysis of interviews with all 78 participants, this manuscript demonstrates that network development with co-nationals, members of other immigrant groups, and native-born Canadians is a complex process in which various factors such as social class, ethnicity, habitus, and different forms of capital jointly shape the opportunities to access networks as well as the nature of such social networks. This manuscript contributes to the literature by suggesting that processes of network development were not structured by national origin or ethnicity per se; instead, they were mainly governed by participants’ capital and habitus.

The second manuscript (Chapter 3), entitled “A Bourdieuian Analysis of Job Search Experiences of Immigrants to Canada,” is forthcoming in the *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. This manuscript explores the participants’ labour market integration experiences. I apply Bourdieu’s theoretical framework in order to understand the ways in which members of certain immigrant groups follow varied integration trajectories. This manuscript contributes to the literature by first focusing on the experiences of immigrants whom arrived with varied levels of education and under different immigration classes, settling in diverse segments of the labour market; and second, by exploring strategies
developed to deal with job search challenges. The findings show that capital and habitus traveled with participants from Turkey, and that the intersection of their immigration status with the set of written and unwritten rules of the Canadian labour market and its subfields (both professional and non-professional) shaped their integration experiences.

The third manuscript (Chapter 4), entitled “Experiences of Immigrants inside the Canadian Workplace,” draws on the subsample of the 38 participants with white-collar jobs as a case study. In this manuscript, I focus on how immigrants with white-collar jobs perceive, experience, and interpret their workplace experiences in Canada. At the theoretical level, this manuscript integrates Goffman’s concept of impression management and Bourdieu’s concepts of field, habitus, and capital. The findings illustrate that employment in the host country’s white-collar field required participants to actively engage in impression management given that they were entering into a new social setting (field) with different written and unwritten rules. Participants’ use of impression management, however, was shaped by their habitus and capital. To perform valued impression management, they needed to accumulate local cultural capital and alter their behaviours and attitudes to comply with the norms and values of the various workplaces. This suggests that ethno-racialised immigrants experience a slower form of assimilation in such workplaces, despite the increasing ethno-racial diversity in Canadian workplaces. The findings further show that the socio-historical context of immigrants’ country of origin affects the ways in which they interpret their experiences in relation to their colleagues.

The fifth and the last chapter provides a conclusion to the dissertation by summarising the major findings and unifying themes of these empirical chapters. One of the overarching arguments is that the integration experiences of Turkish immigrants vary by immigration class, location in the labour market, and the forms of capital, habitus, and the rules of the field. Based on the major findings of the study, directions for future research and policy suggestions are also provided in this chapter.
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Chapter 2

2. Social Network Development Experiences of Immigrants from Turkey to Canada

2.1 Introduction

The concept of social capital has gained popularity in migration studies in the last two decades (e.g. Landolt and Portes 1996; Nakhaie and Kazemipur 2013; Ooka and Wellman 2006; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993; Zhou and Kim 2006); yet we still know relatively little about how immigrants develop social networks, despite the fact that networks constitute the core of social capital (Eve 2010; Ryan 2011; Ryan et al. 2008). This article presents the findings of a qualitative study examining the social network development experiences of immigrants from Turkey to Canada. While there exist numerous studies on the subject of immigrants from Turkey to European countries, particularly Germany and the Netherlands, very little sociological research has examined the experiences of Turkish immigrants in Canada, despite their growing population (Statistics Canada 2011). We know from existing studies that immigrants from Turkey to Europe are confined within segregated neighbourhoods, and have very limited contact with natives (e.g. Martinović 2013; Ogan and d’Haenens 2012). In contrast with such cases in Europe, no neighbourhood in Toronto or London (the cities where the present research took place) is specifically associated with immigrants from Turkey. Moreover, Canada represents a multiethnic society in which one in five people is foreign-born (Statistics Canada 2011), and in which multiculturalism has been an official policy for more than four decades (CIC 2012). In such a diverse society, how do immigrants from Turkey create social networks? Are there any differences in the ways in which immigrants form networks with other immigrants from Turkey, with members of other immigrant groups, and with native-born Canadians? What is the role of intra- and inter-group power relations in accessing and creating networks? Lastly, how does community size affect the nature and structure of social networks?

To answer these questions, I apply Bourdieu’s theoretical perspective, arguing that an understanding of social networks requires analyses explaining their connection to economic

---

1 *Turkish* refers to all population groups in Turkey: Turks, Kurds, and others. When I use the adjective Turkish, it means immigrants from Turkey and rather than someone of Turkish ethnicity.
and structural relations (Bourdieu 1977; 1986) and hence social inequalities (Lin 2000).
Much of the migration literature utilises Putnam’s theory of social capital (e.g. Cheung and Phillimore 2013; Kazemipur 2009), and neglects the differences and power dynamics existing within and across groups. Bourdieu’s theoretical perspective, on the other hand, enables us to examine the ways in which social networks are produced by social inequality while reproducing social inequality (Kelly and Lusis 2006). In this respect, I am concerned with both intra- and inter-group differences, and their impact upon the development and nature of social networks in the host country. Based upon findings from interviews and group discussions with Turkish immigrants, I argue that network development in the host country is a complex process in which such various factors as social class, ethnicity, habitus, and different forms of capital jointly shape the opportunities to access social networks, as well as the nature of such networks.

2.2 Theoretical Framework
Putnam and Bourdieu represent two important scholars in the study of social capital, but in migration studies, Putnam’s approach to the concept has been more influential than Bourdieu’s. I begin this section with presenting the former and discussing its drawbacks. Then, I discuss ways in which Bourdieu’s theorising of social capital provides a more critical understanding of immigrants’ network development experiences in the host country.

Putnam examines social capital at the community and national levels, and defines it as ‘features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit’ (Putnam 1993, 167). He distinguishes between two forms of social capital: bonding and bridging. The former is ‘inward-looking, and tends to reinforce exclusive identities and homogenous groups’, while the latter is ‘outward-looking, and encompasses people across diverse social cleavages’ (Putnam 2000, 22). The assumption here is that bridging social capital benefits individuals to a greater extent than bonding capital, as it enables individuals to gain access to different resources (Leonard 2004). In analysis of immigrants’ networks, bonding is used for intra-ethnic networks, and bridging for inter-ethnic networks (e.g. Kanas, van Tubergen, and van der Lippe 2009; Kazemipur 2006; Nakhaie and Kazemipur 2013). It is usually argued that members of an ethnic group form ‘ethnic social capital’ (i.e. bonding social capital) through
immersion in their ethnic community in the host country. Confrontation with the host society due to different phenotypical and cultural characteristics, shared cultural memory brought from the home country (Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993), and cultural and class barriers faced at the new destination (Li 2004) stand out among various factors that make immigrants most likely to develop bonding social capital.

This view of social capital, however, is flawed – for a number of reasons. First, it glosses over the complex and diverse nature of immigrant communities (Anthias 2007; Kelly and Lusis 2006; Ryan et al. 2008). Assumption of a homogenous community conceals an unequal distribution of various resources and of power within them, which may contribute to the reproduction of inequalities in the host country. Instead an analysis of social capital should address how such various factors as educational resources, employment status, and social distinctions – both within immigrant groups and the host society – influence the nature of social relations (Cheong et al. 2007). Second, in relation to the first critique, bonding and bridging social capital can indeed be heterogeneous (Cederberg 2012; Ryan et al. 2008). Hence, the assumption that the former is good for only ‘getting by’ while the latter is necessary for ‘getting ahead’ (Putnam 2000, 23) is over-simplistic. The influences of social networks developed with people of diverse backgrounds on social mobility in fact depend upon the social location of the individuals comprising these networks. Similarly, bonding social capital formed with another co-ethnic immigrant occupying a higher social position in the host country can facilitate social mobility – depending upon the individual’s cultural capital. My purpose in this article is therefore to challenge such binary divisions by examining immigrants’ networking experiences in relation to their wider socio-economic context (Favell 2003). Unlike Putnam’s functionalist and normative approach, Bourdieu’s critical conceptualisation of social capital fits well for this purpose, as he is concerned with unequal access and distribution of social capital.

Bourdieu (1986, 51) defines social capital as the sum of the actual or potential resources that are embedded in ‘a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition’ and these resources can be mobilised to gain benefits. Accumulation of social capital requires accessing and becoming part of particular relationships and the nature of these relationships is dependent upon the volume of economic
and cultural capital possessed by an individual (Bourdieu 1986; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Economic capital refers to monetary resources such as income and other financial assets, and cultural capital refers to non-monetary resources such as academic credentials, language skills, and familiarity with specific cultural norms, traditions, and standards of behaviour (Bourdieu 1986). These two forms of capital determine whether an individual is a member of a specific group, as all three forms of capital are interconvertible. To illustrate, an immigrant fluent in English (cultural capital) can access networks through membership in associations and clubs, and can use these networks (social capital) to find a job (economic capital) in the Canadian labour market. Similarly, economic capital can facilitate the acquisition of cultural and social capital. This theorisation of interconnections between different forms of capital enables us to address and examine the complex process of network development in the host country.

The various forms of capital are disproportionately accumulated by some groups over others and this shapes the opportunity structures and forms the basis of structural constraints and unequal access to networks (Bourdieu 1986; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Furthermore, value of a particular capital is dependent upon a context (Bourdieu 1986) and immigrants may need to find ways to validate their capital (Erel 2010) and/or need to accumulate new forms of capital that are valued in the host country (Huot et al. 2013) to facilitate their access to social networks. In the context of Canada, for instance, immigrants may need to learn English and/or French and familiarise themselves with Canadian cultural norms. Unequal distribution of capital and its context-related value demonstrates that it is indeed in the nature of intersubjective relations to reflect power relations in society (de Nooy 2003). In other words, Bourdieu’s framework addresses ‘structural conditions that shape the interactions of actors without their being aware of them’ (Swartz 1997, 44). Therefore, an analysis of an actual network of individuals is significant for assessing the amount and distribution of capital (de Nooy 2003).

Another key significance of Bourdieu’s work in the context of this paper is the relationship between habitus and the accumulation of social capital. Although recent studies have applied the concept of capital to the analysis of immigrants’ network development, they paid less attention to its relation to the notion of habitus (e.g. Cederberg 2012; Ryan et al. 2008).
Bourdieu (1990, 63) considers habitus as ‘society written into the body’ and defines it as ‘a system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a *matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions*’ (Bourdieu 1977, 83, emphasis in the original). Habitus as a set of unconscious dispositions thus is a product of socialisation and forms the basis of individuals’ understandings of the world around them, and predisposes them to act in certain ways in certain social contexts (Bourdieu 2005). Bourdieu formulated habitus in order to understand how material conditions of social class are embodied in the body as a class habitus. In this sense, people occupying similar social positions have every chance of possessing the same habitus (Bourdieu 1987, 5). Likewise, ‘proximity of conditions, and therefore of dispositions, tends to be translated into durable linkages and groupings’ (Bourdieu 1985, 730).

The notion of habitus has been extended beyond social class by “race”/ethnicity and migration theorists, who contend that habitus is also structured through racialised and ethnic dispositions (Bonilla-Silva et al. 2006; Kelly and Lusis 2006; Perry 2012; Rapoport and Lomsky-Feder 2002). Reay (1995, 360) has stated that ‘prejudices and racial stereotypes ingrained in the habitus of members of dominant groups can affect the life chances of any group who are clearly different in some way’. Racialised/ethnic habitus in this sense can promote in-group solidarity and negative views about minorities (Bonilla-Silva et al. 2006). Conversely, members of minority groups can maintain power relations by internalising particular ways of being, acting, thinking and interacting. Considering that individuals’ social milieu exerts an impact upon their habitus, Bauder (2005), Kelly and Lusis (2006), and Huot et al. (2013) have further suggested that immigrants might possess a habitus specific to their home country. Immigrants might have ‘a *matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions*’ (Bourdieu 1977, 83, emphasis in the original) that is different than the one in the host country. For example, Wise (2010) studied intercultural interactions between long-term Anglo-Celtic elderly residents and Chinese immigrants in a particular Australian neighbourhood. She argued that these two groups of people possessed different types of habitus, and therefore had different understandings of and expectations from interaction norms, which decreased their chances of creating networks in this cross-cultural context. Networking experiences of immigrants are therefore affected by the fit of their habitus within their new social context. This suggests that immigrants may be more likely to develop
networks in the host country with individuals sharing a common or similar habitus (Bauder 2005).

The above discussion on habitus demonstrates that different factors (e.g. class, ethnicity, and nation) play a role in its formation. At the theoretical level, this suggests that on the one hand, immigrants from the same country can be differentiated from one another in relation to their class habitus; on the other hand, they can be differentiated from broader society based on home country habitus. It is therefore important to examine how the intersection of two types of habitus shapes their opportunities and constraints in accessing and developing social networks.

In short, Bourdieu’s concepts of social capital and habitus offer analytical tools for understanding how immigrants located in various structural positions are able (or unable) to access and accumulate networks that can be utilised in various contexts. Drawing upon the experiences of Turkish immigrants in Canada, I will explore the ways in which habitus and forms of capital impact networks that are created with other immigrants from Turkey, members of other immigrant groups, and native-born Canadians.

2.3 The Present Study
This article draws upon data from semi-structured personal interviews and group interviews involving immigrants from Turkey who now reside in Toronto and London, Ontario. The data were collected for a broader research project that explored labour market integration and the workplace experiences of these immigrants. Our knowledge about Turkey-born immigrants in Canada is currently very limited, as they are one of the most understudied immigrant groups in the country. Immigrants from Turkey constitute a small group, yet their population has been growing (Statistics Canada 2011) and this presents a sociological need for an understanding of their experience in Canada. The 2011 census data reported that 27,145 immigrants were born in Turkey and live in Canada (Statistics Canada 2011). Previous studies in Europe demonstrated that members of smaller and more dispersed immigrant groups were more likely to meet with natives and members of other immigrant groups (Martinović 2013). By focusing upon an immigrant group whose numbers are smaller compared with commonly studied immigrant groups (e.g. Chinese, Filipino, and Indian) in
Canada, this paper aims to examine the ways in which community size affects social network development.

Immigrants born in Turkey have been admitted to Canada under three migrant classes: economic class, family class, and refugees. Most came to Canada as members of the economic class, followed by members of the family class and refugees (CIC 2013). These immigrants are divided into the professional and non-professional segments of the Canadian labour market (Ataca and Berry 2002). Immigrants in the latter segment are concentrated within specific employment sectors: manufacturing, wholesale, retail (Angin 2003), and construction. These differences in immigration trajectory and socioeconomic status allow me to focus upon distinctions among immigrants from the same country of origin, which tend to be neglected in the literature on immigrants’ social capital.

I interviewed 69 individual immigrants from Turkey and held three group interviews involving nine additional participants between February 2013 and March 2014. Of these 78 participants, 38 were professionals and 40 were non-professionals. I used the education level required for the job to determine participants’ occupational status. Jobs that required less education than the completion of a university degree were considered non-professional, and vice-versa. The sample of professional immigrants consisted primarily of engineers and information technology employees, whereas the non-professional sample consisted primarily of construction workers and taxi drivers in addition to some factory and service-sector workers. It is important to note that 14 of these non-professional immigrants came to Canada with a high level of education under the refugee class, but experienced de-skilling and downward social mobility. Participants were diverse with regard to age, gender, ethnic identity (Kurd and Turk), entry status, and duration of residence, but all were permanent residents or citizens of Canada at the time of the interview.

Since the focus of the research is on social networks, participants were recruited via various methods: posters at community restaurants, markets, and associations; advertisements on social media (i.e. LinkedIn) and e-mail groups; and by passive snowball sampling. The majority of participants with professional jobs were recruited through advertisements on social media and e-mail groups. For the non-professional participants, I relied more on
community restaurants and markets, and passive snowball sampling. For ethical reasons, I used passive snowball sampling, meaning that initial participants who were recruited via other methods were given a business card that contained brief information about the study on its reverse side, and asked to pass the card to other Turkish immigrants that they knew. Based on the focus of this research, personal interviews and group interviews focused on the following questions: participants’ immigration trajectory from Turkey to Canada; experiences of integration into the labour market; leisure and recreation activities; social relations and the nature of these relations (e.g. how participants knew and/or met with people in their social milieu, how often they spent time with them, the occupation of these people, and the activities they did together). Interviews were conducted in Turkish. They were held in public places (e.g. coffee shops) or at the participant’s home or workplace, and lasted between 55 minutes and 2.5 hours, with an average length of approximately 90 minutes. All interviews were transcribed and analysed with NVivo analysis software to develop codes, themes and conceptual constructs. The interview quotes in the analysis were translated into English. I tried to preserve and take into account slang and idioms. The true identities of the participants are not given in order to respect their right to privacy. I have used pseudonyms throughout the paper.

2.4 Findings

Analysis of the data shows that participants had developed social networks, both with immigrants from Turkey and the broader society, since their arrival in Canada. The nature of such social networks depended very much upon participants’ placement within the labour market, cultural capital, and immigration category (e.g. family class and refugee versus economic class), as these factors jointly shaped the opportunities for and limitations on accessing and developing networks. In the following subsection, I discuss networks created with other Turkish immigrants. In the second subsection, I focus upon networks created within the context of the broader society.

2.4.1 Fragmented Immigrant Networks

All of the participants but one stated that they were in contact with other immigrants from Turkey, and that their close circle of friends was Turkish. More than half of the participants, 2

---

2 More than half of participants with non-professional jobs came to Canada as asylum seekers and made refugee claims in Canada.
both professional and nonprofessional, had pre-existing networks upon arrival which facilitated their integration process and access to other networks. Immigrant associations, ethnic restaurants and coffee shops, and mosques enabled several participants to develop social networks with other immigrants from Turkey. When asked why they had developed networks with co-nationals, participants listed several reasons, including shared language and cultural background. Analysis of the interviews, however, showed that the nature of these networks was not homogenous, and that intra-immigrant differences in relation to social class, hometown background, religious affiliation, and ethnic identity (Kurd or Turk) were reflected in the network development process.

Like many respondents with professional jobs, Caner (M, 40, engineer) expressed that ‘there are some Turkish people here working in blue-collar jobs, and their culture and lifestyle are different, so I can’t be with them. I wasn’t with them in Turkey, and can’t be with them here, either’. Caner’s excerpt suggests that participants were selective when developing their networks. They looked for people employed in the same segment of the labour to create a social milieu similar to that which they had in Turkey. Similarly, Nergis (F, 50, information technology developer) addressed the importance of engaging similar cultural practices.

My networks are composed of professionals. I met them at alumni meetings, at friends’ houses… We enjoy doing similar things. For instance, we recently started to take a wine-tasting class. We usually go to film festivals. There are numerous festivals in Toronto and I really enjoy going to them… I believe that the level of income and having similar lifestyle interests play a big role in who becomes part of your social networks.

These two factors together – cultural capital and labour market position – shaped the nature of professional participants’ networks. The responses of many participants with non-professional jobs similarly indicated that they were confined within classed enclaves. Moreover, many were unaware of the existence of immigrants with professional jobs. Hamdi (M, 37, construction worker), who had been in Canada for eleven years, did not notice that there were highly-educated Turkish immigrants working in diverse labour market sectors until he attended the Republic Ball\(^3\) in 2009:

\(^3\) The Republic Ball is an event organised every year on October 29, in Turkey and abroad, to celebrate the anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Turkey. The Republic Ball in Toronto is organised by a number of Turkish associations.
I saw first-class Turks there. It was so interesting! I always say that Turks that I have seen here are different from those I saw there. I saw first-class Turks there! How can I put it? …Well, their clothing, their posture, the way that they speak; they were more educated and cultured than people here. Then I said, well, there were those types of Turks in Toronto. We hadn’t seen them. I mean, I had never seen them before… Well, we [his family and friends] don’t know where those people are in Toronto. But they exist; I mean, I saw that they exist here!

Labour market integration trajectories of participants have located them in social spaces that, for the most part, fail to intersect. Hamdi’s reference to ‘here’ and ‘there’ in this excerpt exemplifies the way in which separation is reflected in social and spatial positioning in everyday life. I further asked him if he was able to create networks at the ball. He said that even if he wanted to create and maintain networks with those immigrants, the different lifestyle of each group would make it difficult. These quotes from participants with professional and non-professional jobs suggests that they created a living space in the host country that corresponds to their cultural capital and class habitus.

The role of habitus in developing intra-immigrant networks became more evident in the narratives of participants who experienced downward mobility. Ceyhun (M, 29, construction worker), for example, was born in Istanbul to university-educated parents. He came to Canada as an asylum-seeker following his graduation from a prestigious university in Istanbul. Before his migration, he was expecting to find a job in his field, economics, in Canada. However, like many other skilled asylum-seekers and refugees, he encountered various obstacles in the labour market including devaluation of his credentials and discrimination due to his legal status (see Krahn et al. 2000). After several failed attempts to find a professional job, he began to work outside of his field of education and training.

I worked there [at a pizza house] for a long time, and there was a coffee house next to it. I mean a Turkish kind of coffee house. Then, I started to go to this coffee house, but the Turks there, I mean, they were strange. I had never left Istanbul [when I was in Turkey], never been to a rural area. I come from a wealthy and educated family, you know. So, they were strange to me…You know what? You are lonely here, everyone is lonely. But they aren’t [people at the coffee house]; only those of us who are wise and educated are lonely.

Habitus dislocation was evident among deskilled participants who expressed a sense of foreignness in their new social and working environment in Canada. In this vein, Sami (M, 55, construction worker) stated:
I was a doctor in Turkey and now I work in construction. It’s a very difficult transition. This downward social mobility has affected every aspect of my life including my acquaintance. Actually, I haven’t developed many networks here… I feel like my co-workers and myself are from different worlds and I couldn’t fit into their world… I don’t want to look down on them, though what they say, how they talk, the things they care about don’t appeal to me at all. I still don’t feel that I belong to this social environment but I’m also not brave enough to start over again and search for a professional job after all these years.

It is notable that these participants’ diminished cultural capital in the form of educational credentials in the Canadian labour market and employers’ discriminatory practices toward individuals with precarious legal status located them in fields that did not correspond to their middle-class habitus, and shaped their social networking trajectories. Not surprisingly, unlike other participants, deskilled participants considered themselves lonely in Canada.

As stated at the beginning of this section, hometown background, religious affiliation, and ethnic identity (Kurd or Turk) also affected participants’ approaches to and experiences of network creation. Hometown background played an important role in the formation of non-professional participants’ networks. The number of people migrating from rural areas or smaller cities in Turkey to Canada has increased since the mid-1980s (Ozcurumez 2009), and more than half of my participants with non-professional jobs were from particular cities (Denizli, Konya, Nevsehir, and Kahramanmaras) or nearby rural areas, with an education level equating to less than a high school education. Their migration to Canada proceeded along chains of networks. These participants mentioned that their social networks in Canada were composed of relatives, friends, and fellow townspeople. Mumtaz (M, 32, construction worker), for example, pointed at the importance of his hometown in accessing networks: ‘I spend my time mostly with people from Denizli. They are my fellow townsmen. We grew up in the same place, and we share a lot, so it is very easy to be friends with them and to chat with them’. Originating from same geographical locations, being employed in similar jobs (mainly construction), and settling in the same or closer neighbourhoods shaped the nature of these participants’ networks. Hometown community ties that were either carried over from Turkey or developed in Canada constituted the major source of social networks for these participants, and they did not feel they needed to search for other sources of connection. These networks provided them a social space in which they felt – in their own words – at ‘home’.
The intimate social circle of participants with both professional and non-professional jobs was comprised of immigrants from Turkey. However, similarly to Ryan et al.’s (2008) findings concerning Polish migrants’ networks in the U.K., the participants in my study differentiated between their intimate social circle and the wider population of Turkish immigrants. My analysis shows that solidarity among Turkish immigrants operates primarily within the boundaries of sub-groups, friendships, and extended family. Although participants trusted other immigrants from Turkey at the level of individual relationships, they were hesitant about connecting with the wider population, and in particular about connecting with immigrant associations. Judging that participants’ approaches to the associations established by Turkish immigrants would enable me to characterise the diversity of the Turkish population as well as the complexity of Turkish immigrants’ social network development, I asked my participants whether they were involved in immigrant associations. Their responses revealed that the fragmented nature of the associations prevented them from being a key source for participants’ access to networks. The majority of professional immigrants, for example, stated that they felt uncomfortable being part of a specific association, and preferred to attend selected events when they had time. The words of Tahsin and Defne are representative:

Unfortunately, associations here are very fragmented. There is one association in Mississauga, and it has its own agenda. There is another one in North York, and it has its own agenda. There is a religious one – I don’t even want to pronounce its name. Since the community is very fragmented, I don’t want to be involved in any of these associations (Tahsin, M, 53, information technology developer).

Look at the associations – there are many! We are a small immigrant group, but we have tons of associations. Each group has its own association: elites, non-elites, religious people, Kurdish people, Alevi4 people. I mean, everyone restricts him/herself within his/her group, so we have a very scattered community (Defne, F, 47, financial analyst).

Similarly, non-professional participants highlighted the fragmented nature of associations, in particular the religious and ethnic character of associations, as factors causing them to be selective. Altay (M, 25, construction worker), who was a self-identified Turk and Sunni Muslim, said:

---

4 *Alevi* are adherents of a specific Shi’a strand of Islam. It is practised mainly in Turkey.
Altay: I’m not a member of any association. I haven’t been to any association. There are some associations here created by people like us [labourers], but I’ve never been to these associations.

Guliz: Why haven’t you considered going to these associations?

Altay: Well… I mean, do Turks also have any associations here? Where are they? I don’t know, I really don’t know. Do you know any? Have you been to them?

Guliz: Yes, I know there are a couple of Turkish associations…

Altay: I don’t know anything about them. And I also don’t know much about the Internet.

Guliz: Can you tell me what associations you know here?

Altay: There is a Kurdish association; well, there is an Alevi association. And, we [his family] don’t have anything to do with them. This is why I don’t go to their associations.

Altay’s lack of knowledge about Turkish associations is important, as it illustrates the intersection between social class and ethnic and religious differences. Since the 1960s, a number of associations have been established representing different groups of Turkish immigrants, such as Kurds, Turks, and different religious sects (e.g. the Alevi sect). The above-mentioned Kurdish association and Alevi association were established by immigrants from Turkey who arrived in Canada as asylum-seekers and mostly settled in non-professional jobs. The majority of their members comprise Kurds and Alevis, and they emphasise cultural activities and political advocacy in both Turkish and Canadian politics concerning Kurdish and Alevi people (Erol 2010; Sciortino 2000). Turkish associations, on the other hand, are composed of mostly Turks who came to Canada under the economic class and mostly settled in professional jobs, and they are committed to cultural representation of Turks in Canada (Ozcurumez 2009). These associations are separated along religious, ethnic and socio-economic lines, reflecting the diversity within the Turkish population and showing how social divisions in Turkey have been perpetuated in the host country. Those Kurd and/or Alevi participants with non-professional jobs stated that they did not get involved in Kurdish or Alevi associations due to long working hours and lack of spare time for extra activities.

Though previous studies have attributed importance to associations in the production of social capital (Leonard and Onyx 2003; Putnam 2000), this study suggests that the fragmented nature of the immigrant population may exclude associations as a key source of social networks. Moreover, we cannot assume that shared ethnicity and/or country of origin constitutes a major basis for immigrants’ social networks. Though participants’ intimate social circles were composed of people from Turkey, their responses show that we need to reinterpret the ways in which ethnicity intersects with socio-spatial background, labour
market location, and religious affiliation to determine the nature of networks developed with other Turkish immigrants.

2.4.2 Networking within Broader Society

Participants with professional and non-professional jobs were able to widen their networks after settlement in Canada. Yet, they had different perceptions about developing networks within the broader society. While the latter were unconcerned about this, the former considered it a *sine qua non*, as for them it symbolised ‘successful’ integration. The words of Ekin (M, 48, engineer), who arrived in Canada under the economic class with a bachelor’s degree and eight years of professional work experience, are representative:

> We [Ekin and his wife] have, of course, many Turkish friends. They came to Canada as immigrants, as well. But, of course, we also have become friends with foreigners [Canadians and other immigrants] over the years. In fact, if you don’t make any friendships with non-Turkish people, if you don’t have any foreign friends, then it means that there is something wrong. If you stay in touch only with Turkish people, then it will be similar to the Turkish immigrants’ case in Germany. Same as those immigrants who couldn’t integrate in Germany; you would start living in a ghetto.

Ekin’s reference to immigrants in Germany is important. Migrants from Turkey to Germany arrived under Germany’s guest worker program in the 1960s, and despite the program’s intention to allow migrants residence only on a temporary basis, the majority of them stayed. Concerns arose with regard to their integration into German society due to their relative lack of education and skills, as well as the importance of religion in their daily life (Martin 1994). Studies have shown that these immigrants were less accepted socially, had reduced contact with Germans, and exhibited very limited German proficiency (Diehl and Schnell 2006). My professional participants often evoked the plight of migrants in Germany, and spoke of them as a group that had not successfully integrated in comparison with their own experience in Canada.

By contrast, Riza (M, 55, cleaner), who arrived in Canada under the family class with a primary school education, provided a different account of integration.

> Many people I spend time with are from Turkey. I have relatives in Europe and it is the same for them… I don’t really care whether or not I know people from other nationalities. I came to
Canada to provide a better life for my family, not to interact with people from other nationalities. I have friends here from my hometown…

These quotations highlight the role of class habitus in forming different appreciations toward social relations in the host country. For professional participants, connecting with the broader society should be an unquestioned consequence of migration. Bourdieu (1990) suggests that habitus is the embodied materialisation of individuals’ capital and shapes their thoughts. In this sense, we can say that professional participants’ cultural capital (e.g. possession of a post-secondary degree, fluency in English, and previous experience abroad) shaped their habitus, and therefore shaped their perceptions of living abroad and networking with people from diverse backgrounds. The social milieu and cultural resources possessed by non-professional participants, on the other hand, resulted in the development of different dispositions toward migration and the expansion of their social relations into the host society.

The responses of highly educated yet deskillled participants demonstrated that similarly to participants with professional jobs, they had expected to have diverse networks. However, employment in a non-professional job and working for long hours, as well as not being able to improve their language skills, limited the opportunities of these participants in expanding their networks.

Nevertheless, many participants with non-professional jobs – both highly educated and less educated – formed networks within the broader society over time. Such networks, however, were almost completely restricted to members of other immigrant groups. Participants discussed their segment of the labour market and limited language skills as major barriers to the development of networks with native-born Canadians. Zeynep (F, 36, cook), who arrived in Canada with a secondary school education, said:

It’s difficult for people like me to create networks with Canadians. I can barely speak English. I work six days a week at a restaurant owned by an Iranian immigrant and my co-workers are immigrants, too.

---

Some participants had experience of living abroad prior to migrating to Canada.
For these participants, the workplace constituted the main source of social network development within the broader society. Like many other immigrants, Vural (M, 47, construction worker), who arrived in Canada with a primary school education, said:

I have a lot of immigrant friends [co-workers]. They’re mostly from Asian countries, like the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Iran. They’re all immigrants. Otherwise, how can we meet?! People at my workplace are Sri Lankan, Asian…South Asian, North Asian, also Chinese. They’re all immigrants.

Participants also expressed that the challenges they went through in Canada made them feel closer to the members of other immigrant groups. For example, Ege (M, 35, taxi driver), who arrived in Canada with a bachelor’s degree and experienced de-skilling, stated:

How can I put it? We [immigrants] share the fact that we are ‘the other’ in this country. We face similar problems; we can’t find a job, our degree isn’t recognised. What else? We sometimes have language problems. We all try to find cheap places to stay and to shop. So, we share all these problems together, and they make us closer to each other.

These networks, however, were not always stable, as they were mostly restricted to the duration of the work.

I know a couple of people with diverse backgrounds. I met them at the construction sites. But these relationships aren’t stable. I mean, let’s say I work in construction for two or three months, so this is the time that I see those people. Unless we work at another site together, we don’t see each other. So, if this counts, then I know non-Turkish people. But I can say that nearly all people that I spend time with on a regular basis are Turks (Hamdi, M, 37, construction worker).

Participants with professional jobs developed networks with both non-Turkish immigrants and native-born Canadians. Their experiences, however, demonstrated that they had to accumulate new forms of cultural capital in Canada to ease their development of networks, particularly with native-born Canadians. Fisun (F, 33, engineer), for example, moved to Canada with a master’s degree in engineering and seven years of professional work experience, and pointed to the importance of acquisition of the host country’s cultural capital.

I was thinking that I wouldn’t face any challenges in connecting with Canadians. But, I realised that I didn’t have any idea about many Canadian cultural things. If you want to become a part of a Canadian group, for example, you should be familiar with hockey and baseball. You should
learn how to ski and skate, because people spend their leisure time engaging in these types of activities.

However, the idea that ‘it is easier to create networks with immigrants than with native-born Canadians’ was expressed by a substantial number of participants. Comparison of their narratives about relationships with Canadians and with other immigrants shows that while they may have experienced difficulties adjusting to Canadian social interaction norms, they found more cultural commonalities with other immigrants. It is also noteworthy that participants rated their connections with native-born Canadians based upon perceived cultural similarities and distinctiveness. They made comparisons, stating that ‘white’ Canadians have distinct cultural practices, while ‘non-white’ Canadians have somewhat similar cultural practices to Turkish immigrants. Hence, they found it more difficult to create relationships with ‘white’ Canadians than ‘non-white’ Canadians. Tolga, for instance (M, 41, academic), stated:

Well, it’s not difficult to have a relationship with Canadians. But within my norms... I mean, although I contacted them either via phone or e-mail, or sometimes in person, and expressed my empathy when they had a health issue or... problems or a happy event, I haven’t seen similar behaviours from them. And I found it very strange. I thought maybe it wasn’t in their culture. Now I know that these kinds of intimate interactions [and] behaviours aren’t part of their culture. Then we [he and his wife] realised that it’s easier for us to make contact with people who are closer to our culture, who care about these kinds of behaviours. Who are those people? Well, they are Brazilians, Mexicans and Italians. Also some Arabs. So we became closer to those people when we realised that we could have a better relationship with them.

Although Tolga interpreted his interaction within the broader society in relation to ‘culture’, his quotation in fact demonstrates how he became aware of differences in the dispositions of his home country and of the host society in relation to social interaction norms. In other words, he noticed the taken-for-granted aspects of his habitus in the context of expectations from social relations and maintenance of these relations. Tolga’s and his wife’s preference of people with certain cultural backgrounds over Canadians in developing and maintaining networks suggests that they have searched for a social milieu to which their home country habitus would have the best fit. This is not to say that immigrants from Turkey and other countries (either first or second-generation immigrants) possess the same habitus. Yet, they might have more similarities than do Canadians, allowing participants to feel more like a fish
in the water (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 127). Several participants further mentioned that in order to develop close networks with Canadians, they had to ‘be’ and ‘act’ Canadian.

You know, when you’re in Italy, you will act like an Italian. When you are in Toronto, you should act like a Torontonian. So the relationships that you will develop depend on whether you are like them or not. It’s all up to you. So, I don’t want to criticize the system here; I mean, I don’t want to judge Canadians or anything. Again, it is up to you. You have to change. You can’t expect, for example, the nature of friendships in Canada [to] be similar to that in Turkey. It is a false expectation (Ilker, M, 32, engineer).

Apart from the necessity of accumulating new forms of capital and being familiarised with the host country habitus, the social character of the encounter situation affected participants’ chances of expanding their social networks. For example, Ersan (M, 28, Toronto, engineer), who received his master’s degree in Quebec and later moved to Toronto, said:

It’s not easy to be one of the Canadians. It’s not easy because, I mean, it’s easier at school, because everyone is a student, or you join a club and meet people. There are always people who look down on you, but I’ve never taken them seriously… The difficult thing, for example, is that you’re in Toronto, [and] you’ve never gone to school here. But those people who were born and raised here already have their own friendships. They don’t have any space in their life for new people. So it’s not easy…I believe you get along with people whose culture is similar to yours.

2.5 Conclusion
I have examined the network development processes of immigrants from Turkey to Canada, and the nature of these networks – both within the Turkish population and in the context of broader society. Drawing upon qualitative interviews, this paper analysed networks developed with other immigrants from Turkey, members of other immigrant communities, and native-born Canadians. Applying a Bourdieuan approach to migration research, I sought to understand immigrants’ network development within the framework of social inequality based upon occupation and class. My findings demonstrated that while participants were able to develop post-migration social networks, their labour market location, cultural capital, and habitus played the major role in shaping the nature of networks developed in the host country.
This study demonstrated the complexity of intra- and inter-group networks. In fact, participants developed and maintained intimate connections via intra-immigrant networks. At first glance, this might appear to support Putnam’s (1993; 2000) conceptualisation of bonding social capital and its application in the migration literature. However, analysis of the nature of intra-immigrant networks illustrated that they were fragmented along lines of social class, religious affiliation, hometown in Turkey, and ethnic identity (Kurd or Turk), and were therefore more complex than bonding social capital would suggest. Bourdieu’s (1977; 1986; 1987; 2005) theoretical perspective provided a useful framework for understanding this complexity. Processes of network development were not structured by national origin or ethnicity per se; instead, they were mainly governed by participants’ capital and habitus. Ultimately, the networks of participants with professional and non-professional jobs were nearly all confined within their classed enclaves in Canada. Yet, networks within these classed enclaves were further fragmented by such additional factors as those mentioned above (e.g. religious affiliation). This suggests that the polarisation of Turkish politics and the ethnic, religious, and geographical fragmentation of Turkish society (Chhokar et al. 2007; Kirisci and Winrow 1997) are reproduced in Canada. This finding further shows the ways in which the socio-political dynamics of the home country are reflected in the host country and shape the structure of the immigrant population in more important ways that does mere population size.

The networking experiences of participants facing downward mobility further illuminated ways in which the intersection of immigration class, habitus, and the labour market location can affect social network development. These participants had the most difficulty in developing networks, as their cultural capital lost its value in the Canadian context, resulting in non-professional work, which meant working in a field of which that their middle-class habitus was not the product. Their middle-class habitus did not align with the working-class habitus of other immigrants from Turkey with similar jobs. Unlike other participants, they experienced habitus dislocation and expressed a sense of ‘not fitting’ into their new social context. It is therefore not surprising that de-skilled participants who defined themselves as ‘lonely’ in Canada were the most reluctant to form networks both with Turkish immigrants and society as a whole.
Analysis showed that professional participants attributed greater importance to broadening their social networks than did non-professional participants. Though participants in both groups managed to develop networks with people from diverse backgrounds, workplace structure, language skills, and cultural capital all affected the nature of these networks, as these factors determined the opportunities of participants in accessing networks. Non-professional participants’ networks within the broader society, for instance, were restricted to members of other immigrant groups due to lack of opportunities to meet native-born Canadians. The workplace represented the main resource for broadening networks in Canada, yet almost all of non-professional participants’ colleagues were immigrants.

Professional participants, on the other hand, encountered opportunities to form networks with members of other immigrant groups and native-born Canadians, as they had Canadian colleagues, language skills, and had accumulated new forms of cultural capital. However, findings showed that they, too, struggled to form networks with native-born Canadians due to differences in dispositions toward social relations. Moreover, the social context (e.g. school) in which participants interacted with Canadians had an impact on their access to social networks. Though participants underscored the importance of connecting with the broader society and considered this a determinant of ‘successful’ integration, their networks were mostly confined to Turkish immigrants and members of other immigrant groups. The findings on networks developed within the broader society suggested that the term ‘bridging social capital’ also fails to explain the complexity of network development and the nature of networks (Anthias 2007; Cederberg 2012).

In summary, this research has showed that immigrants’ forms of capital, habitus, labour market location, immigration trajectory and immigration class enable us to better understand the development and nature of social networks in the host country. These findings corresponded, for the most part, with those of studies conducted in the European context (Cederberg 2012; Ryan et al. 2008; Ryan 2011; Wimmer 2004). This study also suggested that there exists ample evidence of reproduction of social class among immigrants from Turkey to Canada. With the exception of immigrants who experienced downward mobility, social networks were formed with others from similar class backgrounds and similar forms of cultural capital. Moreover, those who experienced downward mobility struggled with the
formation of social networks precisely because of the difference between their class origin and the class position they held in Canada. In this respect, the experiences of participants with regard to network development showed that the labour market integration trajectories and network development experiences of immigrants were closely related.

Research on social networks and social capital needs to take into account the innate complexity of networks. When we assume ethnic/immigrant population as the primary factor ‘grasping the everyday praxis of group formation’, we overlook other factors determining the nature of these networks (Wimmer 2004, 4). Echoing Wimmer (2004), I have emphasised the necessity, in mainstream migration research, of examining the complexities of network formation rather than identifying immigrants’ networks simply by the terms ‘bonding’ and ‘bridging’.
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Chapter 3

3. A Bourdieuian Analysis of Job Search Experiences of Immigrants to Canada

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine the labour market integration experiences of immigrants from Turkey to Canada. I am particularly interested in the challenges these immigrants faced in the Canadian labour market, and the strategies they developed to mitigate these challenges. Immigrants are defined as individuals who have settled permanently in Canada, and who have been granted permanent resident status or citizenship (Statistics Canada 2009). The job search experiences of immigrants in Canada have been the subject of considerable research in recent decades. Studies have shown that there exist distinct barriers to employment for immigrants, including devaluation of their educational credentials (Basran and Zong 1998; Galarneau and Morissette 2004) and exposure to ethnic and racial discrimination, particularly for those from regions other than Western Europe and the United States (Hiebert 1999; Oreopoulos 2011; Oreopoulos and Dechief 2012; Pendakur and Pendakur 1998). Several studies have further suggested that immigrants’ class of admission (e.g. economic and family) affects how they will be treated in the labour market (Bauder 2005; Krahn et al. 2000; Hiebert 2009). While we already possess a clear idea of the kinds of barriers immigrants face when trying to enter the labour market, we know far less about how they overcome these barriers. This paper accordingly seeks to contribute to the literature by first examining immigrants’ expectations of the labour market; second, their experiences in both looking for and finding an employment in the Canadian labour market. In doing so, I rely on Pierre Bourdieu’s theoretical framework (Bourdieu 1984; 1985; 1989; 1993; 1996; 2005b), focusing upon the ways in which interconnections among participants’ habitus, various forms of capital, and class of admission shape their experiences within the field of the Canadian labour market.

This paper also contributes methodologically to the labour market integration literature. Most of the empirical research on this topic in Canada has been quantitative, and conducted at the macro level (but see Bauder 2003; 2005; Girard and Bauder 2007). This work, in contrast, relies on qualitative interviews, allowing immigrants to express their individual feelings and
opinions about their labour market integration experiences (Christinas 2011). I interviewed Turkish immigrants employed at both the professional and non-professional levels, who came to Canada under different classes of admission and held varying levels of education. Drawing on Bourdieu’s concepts, this paper shows the complexity of the labour market integration experiences of immigrants from Turkey to Canada.

3.2 Literature Review: Immigrants in the Canadian Labour Market

Canada admits immigrants under three major classes: economic (e.g. skilled workers, entrepreneurs, and investors), family (e.g. spouses and children of Canadian residents living in Canada), and refugees and/or asylum-seekers. While immigrants in the latter two classes are admitted for humanitarian reasons, immigrants in the former, the largest entry class, are selected by a points system. Introduced in 1967, this system allows admission of immigrants from all over the world based on socioeconomic characteristics predictive of employment success, such as education, work experience, and language skills (Green and Green 1999; Simmons 2010). Before the 1960s, admission was mostly limited to applicants from Western European countries and the United States (i.e., traditional source countries, or TSCs). Not surprisingly, the points system changed the traditional composition of the immigrant population, as the proportion of immigrants from non-traditional source countries (NTSCs) increased (Green and Green 1999; Simmons 2010). To illustrate, while the ratio of immigrants from TSCs to those from NTSCs was about 9:1 until the 1960s, the ratio dropped to about 3:1 by the middle of the 1980s (Nevitte and Kanji 2008, 48). The increase in the number of immigrants from NTSCs has led scholars to focus on the labour market integration of these immigrants.

Previous studies have demonstrated that immigrants from NTSCs are disadvantaged in the Canadian labour market in comparison with native-born Canadians and immigrants from TSCs (Baker and Benjamin 1994; Grant and Sweetman 2004; Hiebert 2009; Li 2008; Nakhaie and Kazemipur 2013; Pendakur and Pendakur 1998; Simmons 2010; Thompson
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1 Turkish refers to all population groups in Turkey: Turks, Kurds, and others. When I use the adjective Turkish, it means immigrants from Turkey, not Turk.
2 Refugee class comprises subcategories. For more information: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/refugees/outside/index.asp
Before presenting the labour market outcomes of these immigrants, it is important to note that with few exceptions (Shields et al. 2010; Sweetman and Warman 2012; Xue 2008), previous studies have been conducted using census or other micro-data in which respondents were not asked their class of admission to Canada. Their analysis therefore includes all individuals granted permanent residency in Canada (Hiebert 2009; Sweetman and Warman 2012). These studies showed that 34 percent of Canadian residents with a university degree were immigrants (Bollman 2013). Furthermore, immigrants were twice as likely as Canadian-born residents to have a university degree (Galarneau and Morissette 2008). In contrast, the employment rate of university-educated immigrants (79 percent) remains lower than that of Canadian-born residents who are university-educated (90 percent) (Bollman 2014; 2013). Immigrants are also disadvantaged in terms of earnings. For instance, highly educated immigrants who arrived between 2006 and 2010 had earnings about $30,000 lower than highly educated, native-born Canadians (Bollman 2014). Moreover, immigrants from NTCSs were overrepresented in jobs with low educational requirements (e.g. clerks and taxi drivers) in comparison with native-born Canadians and immigrants from TSCs, controlling for influential factors such as education (Galarneau and Morissette 2008; King 2009; Thompson 2000; Zeitsma 2010).

Certain factors can explain the disadvantaged position of immigrants in the labour market. Though immigrants are often highly educated, employers and regulatory bodies undervalue their educational qualifications and foreign work experience relative to those acquired in Canada or in TSCs (Aycan and Berry 1996; Basran and Zong 1998; Bauder 2003; Galarneau and Morissette 2004; Thompson 2000). This is considered justified because of their presumed lack of familiarity with the social and cultural norms of the Canadian workplace (Girard and Bauder 2007; Liu 2007). Another barrier to finding a professional job is the demand for Canadian work experience. Some employers place a high value on Canadian work experience, and exclude immigrants who are otherwise qualified (Buzdugan and Halli 2009; McBride and Sweetman 2003; Reitz 2001). Ethnic and racial discrimination also exist in the labour market (Basran and Zong 1998; Hiebert 1999; Oreopoulos 2011; Oreopoulos and Dechief 2012; Pendakur and Pendakur 1998). Factors such as these systematically impede immigrants’ entrance into the professional field, as do individual-level factors such
as limited English and/or French proficiency (Alboim, Finnie, and Meng 2005; Reitz 2001; Sweetman 2004).

As mentioned above, few recent studies have examined the impact of immigration class on labour market outcomes. Sweetman and Warman (2012) found that economic-class immigrants garner greater earnings than immigrants entering through other classes. Similarly, Shields et al. (2010) reported that economic immigrants are more likely to be employed in their area of education than immigrants who enter under other immigration classes. Among all immigrant classes, refugees experience the greatest difficulty in finding a job that matches their field of training or education, despite having the legal right to work (Sweetman and Warman 2012, Shields et al. 2010, Xue 2008). In addition to devaluation of educational credentials and work experience, negative stereotyping and prejudice encountered hiring explain their labour market outcomes (Krahn et al. 2000; Renaud, Piche, and Godin 2003). Refugees may also be less familiar with Canadian labour market rules than other immigrants and the Canadian-born residents (Bauder 2005; Krahn et al. 2000).

These studies rely mostly on quantitative data, and offer generalizable findings that provide an important overview of the labour market situation encountered by immigrants. They cannot offer insights into the lived, everyday experiences of distinct immigrant groups, or convey experiences from immigrants’ viewpoints. Previous studies presented limited analysis of the ways in which admission class affects labour market integration, and how this intersects with other factors, such as education. In my analysis, I focus on the ways in which heterogeneity within a particular immigrant group shapes the experiences of participants. To this end, I have drawn on the theoretical framework of Pierre Bourdieu to examine the labour market integration experiences of Turkish immigrants.

### 3.3 Theoretical Framework

In Bourdieu’s conception, capital presents itself in three forms: economic, social, and cultural. Cultural capital can appear in three sub-forms: embodied (e.g. accent, dialect, or bodily conduct), institutionalised (e.g. degrees or diplomas) and objectified (e.g. works of art or instruments) (Bourdieu 1986). The use of one form of capital is understood in relation to other forms of capital. To find a job, for example, an immigrant may need to possess a form
of cultural capital (e.g. knowledge of social and cultural conventions in the host country) that can be converted into economic capital in the host country’s labour market. The value of capital is not fixed or permanent, and can change spatially (Kelly and Lusis 2006; Ryan et al. 2008). The devaluation of immigrants’ foreign education and credentials exemplifies a lack of recognition of their non-Canadian institutionalised cultural capital. In interviews with institutional administrators and employers in Greater Vancouver, Bauder (2003) showed that non-recognition of institutionalised cultural capital of immigrants impedes their access to upper segments of the labour market, and reserves professional occupations for Canadian-born and Canadian-educated workers. Exclusion of immigrants from high-status occupations compels them to pursue accreditation of their educational certificates and/or accumulate Canadian institutionalised cultural capital (Bauder 2003; George et al. 2012; Girard and Bauder 2007).

Immigrants might also leave behind their social networks, and need to accumulate social capital in the host country to facilitate their job search (Nakhaie 2006; Nakhaie and Kazemipur 2013). They may also face significant challenges in restoring social networks within their host country (Cederberg 2012), or their social capital may concentrate them within particularly low-income economic sectors (Bauder 2005; Lusis and Bauder 2010; Hiebert and Walton-Roberts 1997), depending on the kinds of resources controlled within their social networks (Ooka and Wellman 2006). The value and structure of capital are tightly interconnected within the concept of field.

According to Bourdieu, every society is structured in fields, such as educational and labour market field. A field is a social space or setting (Huot et al. 2013, 9), and has its own rules of functioning and hierarchical structure (Bourdieu 1993). The position of an individual in the field is dependent on his/her amount and type of capital as well as his/her habitus (Bourdieu 1984; 1985; 1989; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Habitus can be defined as “an active residue of an individual’s past that functions within the present to shape his or her perceptions, thought, and bodily comportment” (Swartz 2002, 63). It consists of our thoughts, interests, and ways of being and acting (Bourdieu 1977; 2005a). Furthermore, such dispositions of habitus are developed through simultaneous intersection of class, gender, and ethnicity/race (Bridge 2004; Wimmer 2004).
The concept of habitus enables migration scholars to examine how the habitus of immigrants formed in their home countries travels with them as a “culturally-embodied cognitive structure” (Glastra and Vedder 2010, 82). The act of migration causes immigrants to enter into fields whose rules of functioning may differ from those in their home country (Glastra and Vedder 2010; Huot et al. 2013). As a result, an immigrant might feel like a fish out of water as his/her habitus encounters social fields of which it is not the product (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 127). Bauder (2005) suggests that immigrants’ habitus can either constrain or create labour market opportunities for them, depending upon their level of familiarity with the rules of the market. Likewise, immigrants may be excluded from social fields in the host country because of their distinct cultural practices. Girard and Bauder’s (2007) study of foreign-trained engineers showed that immigrants’ admission into a profession is dependent upon whether or not employers think the applicant “fits” into the dominant habitus of the profession, according to conventions of workplace behaviour and business. However, habitus is not a destiny; it is open to innovation when faced with novel situations (Bourdieu 1984; 2005b). A complete understanding of habitus requires focus upon the social, cultural, and economic fields of the home country in addition to the changes it undergoes in the host country (Kelly and Lusis 2006; Loyal 2009). Analysis of an immigrant’s experience in the fields of their host country requires careful attention to the complex ways in which his/her habitus generate strategies for integration.

In the present study, the Canadian labour market constitutes a field with its own set of rules and power dynamics in which immigrants renegotiate the value of their capital, accumulate host-country capital, and reinforce, transform, and/or reinvent their habitus (see Bourdieu 1990). Here, I build on and extend the perspectives of preceding studies in two ways. First, though previous research applied Bourdieu’s concepts of capital and habitus to the labour market integration of immigrants, it paid less attention to the concept of field and its relation to habitus and capital. Hence, there exists a need to address and examine the interconnectedness of these concepts in order to better understand the struggles of immigrants in the host country (Kelly and Lusis 2006). Second, in my analysis, I focus on the ways in which habitus, immigration class, and level of education intersect and shape the labour market integration trajectories of study participants. A number of questions guide the focus of this paper: how can we define the rules of the Canadian labour market field from
immigrants’ viewpoints? Do the rules of the market differ within its various segments? How do immigrants navigate and mitigate the rules of the market? How do forms of capital and habitus affect the experiences of immigrants, and the strategies they develop to enter the field?

3.4 Methodology

This paper draws on the findings of a larger study examining social network development, labour market integration, and workplace experiences of immigrants from Turkey to Canada. It focuses specifically on the experiences of these immigrants in their search for employment in the Canadian labour market. The study was conducted in Toronto and London, Ontario between February 2013 and March 2014. I interviewed 78 participants, facilitating individual interviews and group interviews. The sampling method was purposive, and participants were selected according to certain criteria: being born and raised in Turkey, migration to Canada as an adult (i.e. 18+), permanent residency or citizenship in Canada, current employment or employment experience in Canada, and residency in Toronto or London for at least one year. Participants were employed in professional (e.g. engineering) or non-professional (e.g. construction) jobs. I interviewed immigrants with varying levels of education and from different segments of the labour market to assess the role of forms of capital and habitus in their employment trajectories. Study participants were diverse with regard to age, gender, entry status, and duration of residence; however, they were all permanent residents or citizens of Canada at the time of the interviews.

Participants were recruited through posters, advertisements on social media (e.g. LinkedIn), and passive snowball sampling. Interviews were held in public places or at participants’ workplaces or homes, and lasted between 55 minutes and 2.5 hours, with an average length of approximately 90 minutes. Following transcription and translation (by myself), the data were analysed through NVivo software to develop codes, themes, and conceptual constructs. The interview quotes in the analysis were translated into English. I tried to preserve and take into account slang and idioms. In order to respect the participants’ right to privacy, their true identities are not given, and pseudonyms are used throughout the paper.
3.5 Findings

Study participants came from different educational backgrounds. Fifty-two came to Canada with a bachelor’s degree or higher, and began their job search in the professional field. With the exception of those who came as asylum-seekers ($n=14$), within two years, all had managed to find jobs similar or identical to those they had in Turkey. Highly educated asylum-seekers, in contrast, held non-professional jobs and experienced downward social mobility. The remaining twenty-six came with a high school degree or less, and as asylum-seekers or through family reunification, began to work in non-professional jobs. The challenges participants encountered in the labour market, and the strategies developed to mitigate these challenges, varied according to the segment in which they conducted their job search as well as their forms of capital, habitus, and immigration class. In this section, I will first discuss the experiences of less-educated participants, and second, the experiences of highly educated participants. Analysis of the latter is divided in two subsections—skilled immigrants and highly educated asylum-seekers—to show the ways in which intersection of immigration class and capital affected participants’ employment trajectories.

3.5.1 Less-Educated Participants in the Labour Market

Participants with a high school degree or less did not have many difficulties in the labour market, and found a non-professional job soon after arrival in Canada (from a couple of days to three months). This can be attributed to two main causes. First, they searched for jobs in bureaucratically less-structured places, such as construction sites. The majority of them did not face the problem of preparing a resume or preparing for a formal interview. If they needed a resume, they got help from their friends. Second, nearly all participants had pre-existing networks in Canada in the form of family, relatives, and friends, and they relied upon these networks in their job search.

Guliz: Do you think it’s difficult for immigrants to find a job?
Mahmut: No, it isn’t difficult. If you have a friend here, I mean an employed friend, then finding a job isn’t difficult at all. He would definitely make you work in his workplace.
Ihsan: Language skills don’t matter.
Mahmut: Yeah, when you work as a plasterer or painter, language isn’t a problem. You learn the work and the language eventually.
Ihsan: If you don’t know anyone here, you can’t find a job! Your acquaintance tells the employer he knows you, and that you can do the job. This is how we found our jobs.
(Mahmut, M, 30; Ihsan, M, 25).
Less-educated participants had no knowledge of the English language when they arrived in Canada. Though some had attended English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) courses, they had not completed them—because of their long work hours, and because they lacked motivation to learn a new language. When asked about their English proficiency, many participants stated that their degree of knowledge had become sufficient to maintain basic conversations with their employers and colleagues. Interview data, and my observations during data collection, showed that participants’ personal networks, combined with their limited language skills and low level of education, channelled them into particular sectors—namely the construction sector in Toronto and taxi-driving in London.

Even though participants considered their entrance into the labour market smooth, they made it clear that finding a job was easier only in the non-professional field.

There are so many challenges in the labour market, but these challenges aren’t for people like me. They are for engineers, for computer scientists. They came here with higher education, but they struggle in finding a job for a long time, because they don’t have Canadian experience! I have seen those people. We worked in the same workplaces. This is all I can do with my education, but I’m so sorry for those highly educated immigrants (Eray, M, 50).

Eray’s excerpt demonstrates that unique sets of rules governing segments of the labour market determine the experiences of immigrants. Prior to their migration to Canada, participants “knew” that they would work in non-professional jobs, because of their level of education and degree of English-language knowledge. The notion of “What else could I expect?” emerged frequently during the interviews. This suggests that participants had an internal sense of the labour market, specifically of the non-professional field. Non-Canadian cultural capital of less-educated immigrants did not prevent them from entering the labour market. Social capital, rather than cultural capital, was needed in order to enter the field. Only a few participants in this group had no pre-existing social networks in Canada. Nonetheless, they managed to accumulate social capital within the Turkish community soon after their arrival by going to associations, restaurants, coffee shops, and mosques, and utilised their connections to find non-professional jobs.
3.5.2 Highly Educated Participants in the Labour Market

3.5.2.1 Skilled Immigrants

Based on prior knowledge of Canada and expectations of a Canadian society centred upon equality and meritocracy, highly educated participants assumed that their credentials and qualifications, along with their knowledge of the English language, would enable them to find a professional job in their field upon arrival in Canada. Their assumptions, however, did not fit the objective structures of the Canadian labour market. Shortly after commencing their job search, they realised that their educational credentials and foreign work experience were of lesser (or no) value in the Canadian labour market. Moreover, they needed Canadian work experience to find a professional job. Migration made participants aware of their distinct cultural capital and habitus. As in other research (e.g. Basran and Zong 1998; Bauder 2003; George et al. 2012), this shift in the value of institutionalised cultural capital constituted one of the biggest challenges to their labour market integration. Devaluation of cultural capital made it more difficult, if not impossible, to compete in a job search on equal terms. More than half of participants began work in survival jobs, such as cashier or clerk; but within two years, all had managed to switch to careers similar or identical to those they had held in Turkey. I will focus on strategies developed by the participants shortly, but remain for the time being on differences experienced in the new field.

The importance of social networks in the job search created another mismatch between participants’ expectations and the reality of the labour market. The majority of participants expressed their astonishment that many jobs were filled via connections or word of mouth, “even in Canada.” Though they were already familiar with the importance of social networks in the labour market, they were now in a new field as outsiders, perhaps with low amounts of social capital. When asked, for instance, if there are any challenges in the labour market specific to immigrants, participants pointed to lack of access to the “hidden job market.”

The thing that we immigrants sometimes don’t want to admit is that lots of jobs are hidden in Canada. They are advertised, because job posting is a legal requirement. Companies advertise jobs, and you apply thinking that there is a chance. Most of the time, companies know who
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3 Only a few participants attended language courses (ESL or others).
they will hire. Then the company sends you an e-mail saying, “Sorry, you are not a suitable
candidate.” The important thing is to be part of this network (Hulya, F, 40).

Similarly, they highlighted the role of companies in solidifying the importance of social
capital within the labour market.

HR [human resources] sends an internal e-mail saying, “We have a job opening that you can
forward to the people you know.” There are also incentives. I mean, if your friend gets
employed, the company gives you an incentive. [In our company] the incentive used to be $100,
and now it has increased to $1000 (Ilker, M, 32).

Hiring practices that place high importance on networks put immigrants lacking such
networks at a disadvantage (George and Chaze 2014). The hidden job market and incentives
offered by companies show how the structure of the Canadian labour market perpetuates the
importance of social capital. Participants felt that Canadians are always privileged, because
they have access to broader social networks.

Participants also identified distinct interviewing structures in a labour market with which
they were completely unfamiliar. During job interviews, participants became aware of the
fact that their formerly taken-for-granted dispositions of habitus did not help them with job
interviews in Canada. They expressed that they were unfamiliar with the Canadian norm of
“self-promotion.”

There is definitely a cultural difference. The ways in which you reply to interview questions
aren’t the same as in Turkey…well, here, people promote themselves. It’s all about self-
promoting, all about marketing. I mean, they market their skills. They say “I’m good at this and
that…” Just marketing! In Turkey, no one would appreciate it. People would ask, “Are you
crazy?” You can’t show off in this way in interviews in Turkey. So it takes a long time to get
used to the system here, to adapt to their system. It took me a good two years! But now I know
how to behave in a job interview. (Gamze, F, 40).

While such differences constituted a challenge in fitting into the new field, participants’
professional habitus enabled them to develop strategies to negotiate the rules of the field.
Because the labour market rewards immigrants complying with the normative values and
practices of Canada (Li 2003), participants tried to transform their embodied dispositions in
order to attract employers’ attention during the interviews, despite being uncomfortable with
the Canadian norm of self-promotion. Similarly, they decided to acquire Canadian credentials and mobilise their social capital as a strategy to gain positions and accumulate and exchange different forms of capital valued within the new field (see Bourdieu 1993). Nearly half of participants accumulated institutionalised cultural capital (i.e. a certificate or degree) in Canada. Without social capital, this strategy remained relatively ineffective. Not surprisingly, many participants stated that mobilisation of personal networks was the most important strategy in facilitating their integration into the labour market. After receiving a one-year human resources management graduate certificate from a college, Hulya (F, 40) thought, “Okay, I even went to a college, now I can find a professional job. But still the same problem; I didn’t have a network.” She further stated that:

I talked to my classmates later [after graduation]. They were all Canadian, so they have friends from elementary school, high school, university. Their partners and parents also have friends. So I was the only one who had difficulty in finding a job. They used their networks and found a job. It is so hard for immigrants; if you don’t have any networks, then you have to struggle.

As Bourdieu (1996, 134) reminds us, the rate of return on educational capital is a function of the social capital that can be devoted to exploiting it. Although Hulya’s involvement with college education allowed her to acquire Canadian institutionalised cultural capital, she could not convert it into social capital, as her classmates did not become part of her network. She then decided to volunteer to increase her chances of finding employment. This strategy worked, and after six months of volunteering in her field, she found her first professional job. Volunteering in different places is an important strategy utilised by several participants in negotiating the challenges of the labour market and creating social networks, which could then be converted into social capital on job applications.

Analysis showed that almost two-thirds of participants relied on their social capital to enter the Canadian labour market. Several mentioned news reports in the national media discussing the findings of Oreopoulos’ (2011) study on the impact of ethnic-sounding names on employment trajectories. In his study, Oreopoulos sent thousands of randomly manipulated resumes to online job postings across multiple occupations in Toronto in order to examine why immigrants struggle in the labour market. He found “substantial discrimination across a variety of occupations toward applicants with foreign experience or those with Indian,
Pakistani, Chinese, and Greek names compared with English names” (Oreopoulos 2011, 148). Some participants in my study changed their names to British-sounding names; however, they stated that information about their educational background and previous work experience on their resumes still disclosed their country of origin. Foreign education and work experience, in this context, act in a manner similar to ethnicity and race, and can represent a basis for discrimination (Khan 2007). Participants had not experienced overt discrimination in the labour market due to their ethnic/racial, national or religious backgrounds; however, they had concerns about being victims of covert discrimination. Referring to their job search experiences and the findings of Oreopoulous’ study, they expressed that networks were crucial to overcome employer prejudice and discrimination against immigrants. The following excerpt illustrates participants’ perceived importance of social networks in mitigating ethnic/racial discrimination in Canada.

Networks are so important! Especially here in Canada. Networks are important in Turkey, as well, but they are extremely important here because there are people from all around the world, from various backgrounds. Since the society is very diverse, employers might not know anything about your background, or they might be very biased towards your background. You know, diversity may result in stereotyping, discrimination, and so on (Mete, M, 31).

The experiences of two participants demonstrated the role of social capital in overcoming major barriers in the labour market particularly well. Adil (M, 32) and Esra (F, 41) found jobs in their fields within three and four months, respectively, after their arrival in Canada. Adil utilised his network, which had been developed prior to his migration. Through his professor in Turkey, he connected with Melda (the professor’s close friend). Melda had been in Toronto for more than ten years, and worked as an engineer. She facilitated Adil’s job search by introducing him to another engineer from Turkey working in his field. Adil explained his job search process:

I met my current manager through Melda. He was then the lead engineer in the company. He liked my resume, and gave it to his company’s human resources department. Then, you know, the company called me for an interview. The interview went well, and I got the job.

He further stated, “You can apply individually to human resources, but you need someone in the company to make sure your application will be taken into consideration.” Similarly, Esra
described how she perceived her advantage as her Canadian friend facilitated her employment. Esra had met her friend, Laura, at an international conference in 2010, two years before her immigration to Canada, and had been in contact with her since then. Following her immigration to Canada, Esra began to search for a job, and came across an advertisement in her field (management). She called Laura to ask if she knew someone in the company. Laura knew the manager of the department, and she talked to him/her regarding Esra’s application. Esra told me during the interview that her manager had asked Laura if it was worth inviting her for an interview, and Laura had confirmed that Esra was a good candidate to consider for the position. Esra expressed that her friend was the major reason she got the interview. She had previously applied to several other job openings without receiving any responses.

Esra and Adil found their first jobs matching their level of education without Canadian degrees or work experience. This suggests that newly arrived immigrants lacking recognised institutionalised cultural capital could enhance their chances of finding a professional job when they gain social capital. This finding challenges the perception that a lack of Canadian experience or degree represents a legitimate reason not to hire immigrants. More importantly, it illustrates that these two criteria of hiring act as a discriminatory tool unless immigrants have social capital. When asked whether there was any reference, for instance, to their lack of Canadian work experience in their job interviews, both participants said “no.” Previous studies (e.g. Bauder 2003; Hiebert 2006; Khan 2007; Oreopoulos 2011) have suggested that employers give preference to Canadian-born and educated applicants, and thus prevent immigrants’ access to professional jobs. The excerpts above, however, suggest that social capital can serve as a functional equivalent to a Canadian degree and work experience. It enabled study participants to evade major challenges in the labour market by eliminating potential discrimination and validating their cultural capital. It also allowed them to convert their social and cultural capital into economic capital. I am not presenting social capital as a panacea for all challenges in the labour market; it mitigates labour market barriers only if immigrants possess the required qualifications and comply with the rules of the field. In other words, social capital is not a substitute for institutionalised cultural capital in the process of immigrants’ integration into the Canadian labour market. Nevertheless, as the quotes above indicate, social capital represents an important factor in creating trust in the hiring process.
Employers value the institutionalised and embodied cultural capital of immigrant applicants, and recognise them as employable when recommended by other members in their network (for a discussion on trust, see Cohen and Prusak 2001; Fernandez, Castilla, and Moore 2000). This finding provides support for the argument that a combination of various capitals, particularly social and cultural capitals, enables us to understand and explain the multifaceted labour market integration of immigrants (Hiebert 2006). The next subsection takes these analyses a step further by focusing on the experiences of highly educated asylum-seekers.

3.5.2.2 Asylum-seekers

Highly educated asylum-seekers also came to Canada expecting that their institutionalised cultural capital would help them find a professional job. Like skilled immigrants, they faced barriers such as lack of Canadian work experience and devaluation of their foreign credentials. However, some barriers were specific to (or more severe for) these participants. First, nearly all arrived with a low level of English language skills. Second, they could not consider obtaining post-secondary education to accumulate Canadian institutionalised cultural capital, because they were not permitted to apply for student loans while holding asylum-seeker status—and had to pay international student fees. Lastly, they were obligated to deal with the long legal process of obtaining asylum, which rendered their residency status uncertain. Despite access to temporary work permits, participants felt that employers’ discrimination against residents with temporary status made it almost impossible to enter the professional field (see also Jackson and Bauder 2013; Krahn et al. 2000). Their opinions about discrimination against asylum-seekers on the labour market were further solidified by their interactions with de-skilled immigrants and refugees, and they became even more discouraged. The following excerpt by Enes (M, 35), who came to Canada as an asylum-seeker in 2003 with a university degree in business administration and high level of English proficiency, is symbolic of the challenges of other highly educated asylum-seekers:

"Everything was uncertain when I first arrived. It wasn’t certain whether I could stay in Canada. Also, there were certain rules for us; I mean, you had to be either a permanent resident or citizen not to pay high amounts of money for education. This was the first obstacle. Also, it was very difficult to look for a job in my field, as I didn’t have recognised status and an ID. You know, it is almost impossible to be part of the professional world until you get your permanent residency."
At the time of the interview, Enes had worked in different non-professional jobs since his arrival: he had been working in the construction sector for almost nine years. He, like the other participants and the majority of highly educated asylum-seekers, utilised social networks he developed in places like coffee houses, where non-professional Turkish immigrants socialise in order to enter the labour market.

Though participants in this group had obtained either permanent residency status or citizenship by the time of the interview and improved their language skills, they were all still employed in the non-professional field. This raises an important question: what caused the majority of participants in this group to stay in the non-professional field? The major explanation is that many participants’ approach toward the field had changed during the long legal process, as illustrated by the following excerpt:

Guliz: Did you consider looking for a professional job once you became a permanent resident?
Arif: You know what? To work as an engineer after all these years, I should get some sort of higher education degree. If I want to get Canadian credentials, I would spend at least two years…I would spend money, as well. Also, I should quit my job. I can still survive with part-time jobs, but it isn’t logical. Now I’m making money same as an engineer, although I know that if I become an engineer, I would have an office job, a business card, etc. My working conditions would be better. But I’m satisfied with my job, and don’t want to start from scratch once more.
(Arif, M, 30).

Satisfying income, declining motivation to pursue a degree, and unwillingness to “start from scratch once more” kept many participants in the non-professional field, even after they had obtained permanent status. This finding points to the relationship between strategies of individuals in social fields and the importance of “the evolution over time of the volume and structure” of his/her capital (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 99, emphasis in the original). Highly educated asylum-seekers could not accumulate Canadian institutionalised cultural capital over time, as their access was limited during their refugee determination process. They were also restricted to non-professional jobs for years due to certain barriers, which caused modification of their embodied expectations. Instead of starting the job search process all over again, they preferred to stay in non-professional jobs. Indeed, they formed a refugee habitus, to use Morrice’s (2013) term. Their subjective experiences, combined with negative
stereotyping, prejudice against asylum-seekers (and refugees), and limitation to non-professional jobs, had become incorporated into their habitus.

The overall experience of highly educated asylum-seekers suggests that they likely have the cultural competence to be successful in their search for a professional job, yet the barriers resulting from their immigration category constitute the major obstacle to their job search. Accordingly, their experience illustrates how the classification of immigrants affects their labour market experiences. We can say that possession of a “permanent” immigration status is one of the primary rules of the Canadian labour market in order to secure a job in the professional field. Immigrants who cannot achieve this status, or require a long time to achieve it, are compelled to accept the position assigned to them in the labour market.

3.6 Conclusion

Drawing on qualitative interviews, this paper explored the labour market integration experiences of Turkish immigrants. I framed my analysis by relying on Bourdieu’s theoretical framework, in order to elucidate a more holistic understanding of the experiences of immigrants and to understand the ways in which members of immigrant groups follow varied integration trajectories. This paper extended and contributed to existing studies, first, by focusing on the experiences of immigrants who came with different levels of education and under different immigration classes, settling within different segments of the labour market; and second, by exploring strategies developed to deal with job-search challenges. My findings show that capital and habitus travelled with participants from Turkey, and the intersection of their immigration status and the rules of the Canadian labour market and its subfields (i.e. professional and non-professional) shaped the integration experiences of Turkish immigrants.

It was apparent in the interviews that participants’ expectations of the Canadian labour market prior to their migration was dependent upon their habitus and institutionalised cultural capital. Highly educated participants, regardless of their immigration class, anticipated an “easy” entry to the labour market. They expected the Canadian labour market to be more meritocratic, and thought educational qualifications and previous work experience would be valued. However, they did not realise that the value assigned to capital is subjective. From
the perspective of employers and regulatory bodies, foreign educational credentials and work experiences are associated with foreign cultural practices that do not fit into the Canadian workplace (Girard and Bauder 2007). In addition, the demand for Canadian work experience further challenged the job search process. The importance of social capital in finding a job, and differences in interviewing techniques between two countries, represented two other mismatches between participants’ expectations and the structure of the Canadian labour market. Findings also illustrated that the immigration class created more barriers for participants who came as asylum-seekers. Their temporary status, restricted access to education, and stigmatisation in the labour market confined them to non-professional jobs. Less-educated participants, on the other hand, did not experience a mismatch between their pre-arrival expectations and labour market trajectories in Canada. Despite their lower level of education and language skills, they did not describe difficulty in finding a job. This finding contradicts the argument that knowledge of the official language stands as a prerequisite for labour market integration (Yu, Ouellet, and Warmington 2007). Mobilisation of social capital, both in the job search and in non-professional employment, represented an important factor in avoiding the demand for high-level language skills.

Highly educated participants developed various strategies for finding a position within the field, the nature of which was subject to their class of admission. Immigrants who came under the economic class accumulated Canadian institutionalised cultural and social capital to mitigate the challenges of the labour market. Though they experienced devaluation of their home-country cultural capital, their professional habitus enabled them to understand the importance of reinventing themselves in the new field—by adapting new forms of capital and mobilising their job search. Conversion of cultural capital to employment remained highly dependent on the mobilisation of social capital. Moreover, social capital helped participants overcome major challenges of the labour market, and assisted them in finding professional positions similar to the ones they had in Turkey. Based on this finding, I contend that lack of social capital in the host county constitutes a crucial exclusionary factor in the labour market, as its importance is solidified by the hidden job market and incentives offered to employees by companies to give referrals. Lack of social capital is not just an individual-level factor affecting immigrants’ labour market outcomes. In reality, the importance given to social capital turns its absence into a structural barrier. Findings further showed that social capital
could be particularly important in a multiethnic society, which, according to participants, increases the skepticism of employers about applicants from diverse cultural backgrounds.

The story was very different for highly educated participants who arrived as asylum-seekers. The temporary status they held during their first couple of years, due to their immigration class and limited proficiency in English, constituted the biggest challenges in mobilising their cultural capital. Constrained by a combination of barriers, these participants were confined to non-professional fields, at least until they became permanent residents. Findings showed that many gave up their pre-arrival plans upon finding professional jobs and/or pursuing degrees in Canada, and stayed in the non-professional field even after receiving their permanent residency. This suggests that these participants’ habitus, in terms of credentials and occupational prestige, had been transformed by their downward mobility.

Ultimately, this paper first demonstrated that the job-finding experiences of immigrants are varied and complex. The rules of the Canadian labour market vary within different segments, and determine the experience of immigrants within various classes of admission and forms of capital and habitus. It is imperative to consider the challenges specific to certain segments of the market, and to focus on the effects of immigration class upon the job search. In doing so, we can avoid generalising the structure and rules of the field, and point to diverse experiences while exploring those of immigrants seeking and finding jobs. This paper contributes to the literature on social capital and immigrant labour market integration (Li 2008; Nakhaie and Kazemipur 2013) by highlighting the importance of social capital in participants’ job search process in Canada. In contrast with previous arguments that reliance on social capital in the job search could vary depending upon immigration status (Bauder 2005; Marger 2001), the experiences of Turkish immigrants showed social capital to be crucial to labour market integration, regardless of immigration status and educational background. It also showed that Bourdieu’s theoretical framework enables migration scholars to offer a more comprehensive analysis of the labour market integration experiences of immigrants, and to identify intra-immigrant group differences by focusing on interconnections amongst the concepts of field, habitus, and capital. Future research could explore ways in which other immigrant groups identify and respond to the rules of the labour market.
3.7 References


Chapter 4

4. Experiences of Immigrants Inside Canadian Workplaces

4.1 Introduction

Canada has had the highest annual immigration rate among the industrialised countries in proportion to its population (Picot and Hou 2010). Each year, around 250,000 immigrants from various countries are admitted, which is equivalent to almost one percent of the country’s population. The most recent census and the Labour Force Survey have revealed that immigrants represent 20.6 percent of the total population (Statistics Canada 2013) and 21.2 percent of the Canadian total labour force, respectively (Kustec 2012). The relatively high rate of proportion of immigrants who are in the workforce offers a rich environment for examining the ways in which they experience their workplaces. However, much of the existing research within migration studies has focused almost exclusively on job search experiences and employment rates of immigrants and has paid little attention to their experiences inside the workplace. This paucity is equally visible in the studies on workplaces and organisations, which seem to be focused on gender, “race”/ethnicity, and class while paying relatively little attention to immigrant-specific workplace experiences. This paper, therefore, aims to contribute to the literature in the fields of migration and sociology of work by exploring the experiences of immigrants in white-collar occupations in Canadian workplaces. Drawing on qualitative interviews with immigrants from Turkey as a case study, it focuses on how immigrants perceive, experience, and interpret their workplace experiences.

Previous studies on the job search experiences of immigrants in Canada demonstrated that immigrants, particularly immigrants from non-European countries, encounter certain challenges in the labour market, including devaluation of their educational credentials (Aycan and Berry 1996; Bauder and Cameron 2002; Galarneau and Morissette 2004) and exposure to ethnic and racial discrimination (Oreopoulos 2009; Oreopoulos and Dechief 2012; Pendakur and Pendakur 1998). Studies have also shown that employers give priority to Canadian-born residents over (non-European) immigrants, by claiming that the latter would

---

1 I put the word ‘race’ in quotation marks to highlight its social construction and to avoid suggesting a biological difference.
have difficulty “fitting in” the workplace culture (Girard and Bauder 2007). Immigrants, therefore, encounter problems finding jobs that match their educational credentials and work experience. Yet, what happens when immigrants attain white-collar positions (e.g., engineering) in the Canadian labour market? In light of previous studies on immigrants’ job search experiences, I contend that it is equally important to examine whether immigrants continue to face challenges once they are hired as well as their subjective interpretations of these potential challenges.

This paper integrates Goffman’s concept of impression management and Bourdieu’s concepts of field, habitus, and capital in examining the experiences of immigrants in white-collar workplace settings. The findings of this study illustrate that employment in the host country’s white-collar field required participants to actively engage in impression management given that they were entering into a new social setting (field) with different written and unwritten rules. Participants’ use of impression management, however, was shaped by their habitus and capital. To perform valued impression management, they needed to accumulate local cultural capital and alter their behaviours and attitudes to comply with the norms and values of the workplace. The findings further suggest that the socio-historical context of immigrants’ countries of origin affects the ways in which they interpret their experiences in relation to their colleagues.

4.2 Theoretical Framework
Workplaces are important social settings in which individuals engage in on-going social interaction with others, such as colleagues, supervisors, and customers (Acker 2006; Rosenfeld, Giacalone, and Riordan 1994). Research on workplaces and organisations has utilised the concept of impression management for understanding the behaviours of these individuals and the social interactions among them inside the workplace (Giacalone and Rosenfeld 1989; Mendenhall and Wiley 1994; Peluchette, Karl, and Rust 2006; Rosenfeld et al. 1994; Zaidman and Drory 2001). Impression management can be defined as “the attempt by individuals to influence the impressions others form of them by what they do, what they say, and how they look” (Riordan, Gross, and Maloney 1994, 715). In The Representation of Self in Everyday Life, Goffman (Goffman 1959, 4) asserts that when individuals are in the presence of others, they consciously or unconsciously mobilise their performances to create
and convey an impression of themselves that is in their interest to convey. Impression management, therefore, is about the presentation of self and the construction of identity during interactions (Jenkins 2014) via verbal and non-verbal (e.g., eye contact, smiling, and clothing) means (Peluchette, Karl, and Rust 2006) with the purpose of creating a desired self-image (Giacalone and Beard 1994; Goffman 1959).

As suggested within the literature on workplaces and organisations, proper impression management entails conformity to prevailing white-collar norms and the performance of context-appropriate behaviour to gain acceptability (Riordian, Gross, and Maloney 1994; Rosenfeld et al. 1994). Previous studies suggest that engagement in impression management to create a positive self-image in the workplace is more challenging as well as more important for racialised/ethnic minorities and women since they might be more uncertain than the majority group members (white males in North America and Europe) about the range of acceptable social norms and behaviours (Rosenfeld et al. 1994). Moreover, research demonstrates that impression management has a significant impact on individual success and promotion opportunities at work. Therefore, in order not to be victims of the glass ceiling, racialised/ethnic minorities and women might need to modify their behaviours in accordance with the expectations of the majority group members (Smith and Calasanti 2005; Rosenfeld et al. 1994; Rosenfeld, Giacalone, and Riordan 1994; Zaidman and Drory 2001).

Furthermore, impression management is a culturally constructed phenomenon and the desired image that an employee should convey is context specific (Zaidman and Drory 2001). Considering that culture and cultural values shape the ways in which individuals present themselves (Clary-Lemon 2010; Giacalone and Beard 1994; Goffman 1967; McCann and Giles 2006; Sonn and Lewis 2009), immigrants might have a different understanding of impression management and performance. Zaidman and Drory’s (2001) study of Russian immigrants with professional jobs in Israel showed that unfamiliarity with valued impression management put these immigrants at a disadvantage when compared to native-born Israelis, as their performance was evaluated by Israeli managers. Researchers have further highlighted that immigrant employees might feel compelled to perform accepted impression management, regardless of its consistency or inconsistency with their values and attitudes, to reduce the uncertainty inherent in cross-cultural interactions and to negotiate their immigrant
identity in their new setting (Clary-Lemon 2010; Giacalone and Beard 1994; Mendenhall and Wiley 1994; Valenta 2008). The ways in which immigrants experience their workplaces in the host country, therefore, is closely related to their command of the official language(s) (Fang, Zikic, and Novicevic 2009) and adjustment to the new white-collar cultural rules and local social codes (e.g., style of communication) (Giacalone and Beard 1994; Remennick 2013) that “are not written down in any one place” but “that are learned over a lifetime by the host nationals” (Mendenhall and Wiley 1994, 610).

Although the concept of power is not used as an analytical tool in the aforementioned studies, their findings in relation to gender, “race”/ethnicity, and the state of being an immigrant suggest that social structures and power relations in social spaces and settings need to be included in social inquiry (Huot 2011). Why people perform as they do, and how structures of power and social positions of individuals within these power structures condition and shape their performance are critical questions (Fogel 2007). In contrast to the extensive focus of impression management studies on individual impetus and behaviour, Bourdieu’s theoretical framework focuses on the relationality between micro (habitus) and macro (field). This enables us to address the issue of power in social interactions and, thus, increases the depth of analysis. For Bourdieu, understanding the practices of individuals is dependent on understanding their habitus and forms of capital, and the nature of the field(s) in which they are active (Bourdieu 1984; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992; Nowicka 2015).

Bourdieu defines habitus as “embodied history, internalised as second nature and so forgotten as history … the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product” (Bourdieu 1990, 56). Habitus is formed within social settings through similar conditions of socialisation in a distinct group or social class (Bueger and Gadinger 2014) and demonstrates how these settings are imprinted and encoded in the body (Jenkins 1992, 76), as largely unconscious and permanent system of dispositions—ways of acting, speaking, walking, feeling, and thinking (Bourdieu 1984, 466; 1977, 94). It constructs, in essence, the way individuals understand the social world and reflect upon it (Webb, Schirato, and Danaher 2002). Bourdieu thinks of the social world as composed of multiple fields, such as economy and workplace. Each field has its particular rules and norms that are naturalised over time (Bourdieu 1986a; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992; Rossi et al. 2015). As Swartz (1997, 117)
states, “field defines the structure of the social setting in which habitus operates” (Swartz 1997, 117). In this sense, there is a dynamic interaction between habitus and field in which habitus is both the result of the field and yet acts upon it and reproduces its rules and norms (Pringle 2009). Correspondingly, when the dispositions of habitus encounter fields “different to those in which they were constructed and assembled, there is a dialectical confrontation” between habitus and the field (Bourdieu 2005, 46). The positions and strategies of individuals in the field (white-collar workplaces in this study), therefore, are the results of an interaction between the rules of the field and individuals’ habitus, as well as the capital they possess (Bourdieu 1984; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).

Fields are always arenas of power struggles in which individuals compete against one another for valued forms of capital—“the set of actually usable resources and powers” (Bourdieu 1984, 114). Capital can exist in different forms such as economic (e.g., wealth), cultural (e.g., education, skills and taste), social (e.g., networks), and linguistic (Bourdieu 1986b), and its value and worth depends on the field (Webb, Schirato, and Danaher 2002). Different levels of access to capital and its context-dependent value create “a social relation of power that differentiates the holder from the nonholder” and establishes “a relation of inclusion and exclusion” (Swartz 2013, 51). Capital in this sense functions to legitimise social differences (Moore 2008) and individuals are positioned within the field in relation to the volume and composition of their capital (Bourdieu 1984).

The relationality among habitus, field, and capital constitutes an important advantage when applying Bourdieu’s theoretical framework to the examination of the workplace experiences of immigrants. This relational thinking of micro and macro shows that “the truth of social interaction is never entirely in the interaction as observed” (Bottomley 1992, 12); instead analyses of social interactions and impression management require the recognition of the reflexive relationship between practice and structure (Sayce 2006). In the context of this study, we can assume that the value of immigrants’ forms of capital would change following migration as they enter various new social fields including workplaces (described in detail later) (Kelly and Lusis 2006; Ryan et al. 2008) and they would need to accumulate field-related capital to progress. Immigrants, for example, are likely to be disadvantaged with respect to linguistic capital in comparison with native speaker colleagues (Fang, Zikic, and
Novicevic 2009; Friesen 2011). Similarly, given that habitus generates action in relation to a field and “the same habitus can lead to very different practices and stances depending on the state of the field” (Reay 2004, 432), immigrants might possess different dispositions than those taken-for-granted in Canadian workplaces. In other words, habitus formed in the country of origin might manifest itself as a distinct set of manners, clothing, and eating preferences as well as perceptions of communicative behaviour (Bourgois and Schonberg 2007; Hinnenkamp 1991) that likely shape immigrants’ expectations of work as well as their engagement with impression management. Consequently, their habitus might need to be transformed given that a static habitus might lead to exclusion (Girard and Bauder 2007; Huot et al. 2013; Schneider and Lang 2014). Considering that capital, habitus, and rules of the field affect the ways in which immigrants experience their workplaces, it is important to introduce the field of white-collar workplaces before presenting the findings of the analysis.

4.3 Field: White-Collar Workplaces in Canada

Canada is a country of immigrants with a population composed of more than 200 ethnic origins (Statistics Canada 2013). The introduction of the points system in 1967 allowed for the admission of immigrants from around the world when it replaced the immigration criteria of “race” and national origin with a set of universal criteria including educational credentials and labour market potential (Triadafilopoulos 2013). This opened the door to a high influx of immigration, particularly from Asian, African, and Middle Eastern countries, and resulted in a significant change in the demographics of the country (Simmons 2010). About 85 percent of immigrants in 2011 were visible minorities, up from 12.4 percent in 1971 (Statistics Canada 2013). Not surprisingly, the increase in the proportion of people belonging to visible minority groups changed the ethno-racial composition of Canadian workplaces. To illustrate, members of visible minorities in the Canadian labour force increased from 10 percent to 15.7 percent between 1996 and 2006 (Statistics Canada 2012). As a more specific example, members of visible minorities in the federally regulated private sector has risen from five percent in 1987 to 19.6 percent in 2013 (Employment and Social Development Canada 2014, 12).

The category of visible minority refers to “persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour” (Statistics Canada 2013). Under this
definition, the visible minority population include both Canadian-born individuals and immigrants (Samuel and Basavarajappa 2006), while the latter comprises about 80 percent of the total visible minority population (Conference Board of Canada 2004). This category was created by the Employment Equity Act of 1986, aiming to prevent discrimination against visible minorities and to promote diversity management efforts in organisations (Agocs 2002; Bakan and Kobayashi 2007; Hiranandani 2012). The visible minority category includes the following groups: Chinese, South Asian (e.g., Bangladeshi, and Sri Lankan), Black, Arab (e.g., Egyptian and Kuwaiti), West Asian (e.g., Turkish, Iranians, and Afghans), Filipino, Southeast Asian (e.g., Vietnamese and Malaysian), Latin American, Japanese, and Korean (Statistics Canada 2009).

Although workplaces have become increasingly multicultural over the last several decades, research reveals that there is a lack of diversity in key decision-making positions in Canadian organisations (Cukier et al. 2011; Giscombe 2008; Oliver 2005). A survey of 69 medium and large Canadian organisations on the representation of visible minorities at senior management levels found that just two of them had a visible minority chief executive officer and only three percent of the 900 senior executives in the surveyed firms were visible minorities (Oliver 2005). Similarly, members of visible minorities hold only 14.5 percent of the leadership positions in the largest and most influential employment sectors in the Greater Toronto Area and their representation varies considerably by sector. While they have the highest representation in the education sector (19 percent), they are least likely found in the corporate sector (4.2 percent) (Cukier et al. 2011). Research suggests that the ethno-cultural characteristics of visible minorities, including accent and religion, constitute barriers to their career progression (Samuel and Basavarajappa 2006) and make them more likely to encounter a glass ceiling (Dion and Kawakami 1996; Reitz 2005).

Whether visible minorities think their workplaces are inclusive is just as important as their numerical representation in workplaces and in leadership positions. Processes of inclusion and exclusion derive from the way the work is organised, which includes not only the technical aspects of the work, but also the dominant cultural norms and even “the particular forms of humour that might permeate a workplace” (Creese 2011, 124). Given that the dominant norms, values, and perceptions at work are socially constructed by dominant
groups and embedded within everyday actions, they have become taken-for-granted over time and constitute the workplace habitus (Borman 1991; Girard and Bauder 2007; Perry 2012). This eventually creates relations in the workplace field that privileges a certain habitus and all those whose habitus does not fit struggle to understand the rules of the field. Despite the relatively high numbers of visible minorities in the Canadian labour force, most white-collar workplaces are run by white men and remain dominated by Eurocentric values, norms, cultures, and management styles (Agocs and Jain 2001; Creese 2007). In these workplaces where whiteness is constructed as normative, visible minorities may feel excluded or marginalised as they do not belong to the de facto reference group for work processes, for competence and excellence, or for the dominant norms and values at work (Agocs and Jain 2001; Creese 2011; Maume 1999). It is also important to highlight that Canadian-born visible minorities may be in a better position in the field compared with foreign-born visible minorities, as they may acquire certain forms of valued capital and become relatively more familiar with the cultural codes through their socialisation in Canada (Sadiq 2005).

At first glance, the above discussion on a dominant white habitus in workplaces might seem to be in contradiction with Canada’s official commitment to multiculturalism, which recognises cultural plurality. However, as discussed by Fleras (2012), Creese (2007; 2011), Bannerji (2000), and many others, despite the replacement of Anglo-conformity with multiculturalism as official policy, its discourses are indeed based on the resilient white privilege that is evident in workplaces and elsewhere. While providing a naturalised political language, multiculturalism, in fact, obscures historical and present social relations of power. In other words, it reduces powered differences into so-called neutral diversity (Bannerji 2000; Hiranandani 2012). It also designates “some cultures as real culture, while others fall into the category of sub-culture and multiculture, cultures of the peripheries” (Bannerji 2000, 55, emphasis in the original). Following these arguments, this paper aims to address and understand how racialised/ethnic immigrants experience the power relations concealed behind the official multiculturalism policy of the government and the notion of workplace diversity.
4.4 Methodology

This paper is part of a larger study exploring (a) how immigrants from Turkey to Canada develop social networks and how they utilise these networks as social capital in the Canadian labour market, and (b) how being an immigrant affects their experiences inside the workplace. Immigrants from Turkey constitute a small group, but their population has been growing (Statistics Canada 2011). However, compared to the relatively high volume of research on Turkish immigrants\(^2\) in Europe, the United States, and Australia, surprisingly, few studies have been conducted in Canada (Aycan and Berry 1996; Ataca and Berry 2002). Moreover, immigrants from Turkey represent an especially interesting group to study because Turkey and its population sit at the “fault line” between Europe and the Middle East, which makes Turkish immigrants, for lack of a better term, “a bit” European and “a bit” Middle Eastern.

I conducted 35 semi-structured individual interviews and one group interview with three participants in Toronto and London, Ontario between February 2013 and March 2014. They varied in length between one hour and 2.5 hours and relied on purposive sampling. Participants were selected according to the following criteria: born and raised in Turkey, migrated to Canada as an adult, held either permanent residency or citizenship, were currently employed or had employment experience in Canada, and were a resident in Toronto or London for at least one year. 23 of the participants were male and 15 were female. Their ages ranged from 25 to 60, and they had been living in Canada for an average of 10.5 years. Participants were recruited through posters at community restaurants, markets, and immigrant associations; advertisements on social media (i.e. LinkedIn) and e-mail groups; and by passive snowball sampling.

All but two interviews were conducted in Turkish. Participants were asked to discuss and interpret their workplace experiences in Canada. More specifically, I asked questions about their job search trajectory, everyday practices at work, social interactions, experiences and expectations with regard to promotions, social and cultural behaviours and preferences valued at their workplaces, and how they compare their workplace experiences in Canada to

\(^2\) Turkish refers to all population groups in Turkey: Turks, Kurds, and others. When I use the adjective Turkish, it means immigrants from Turkey, not Turk.
working in Turkey (if applicable). I also asked questions about the diversity structures of their workplaces (e.g., “race”/ethnicity of managers/employers and colleagues). Following transcription and translation (by myself), the data were analysed through NVivo software to develop codes, themes, and conceptual constructs. The interview quotes in the analysis were translated into English. I tried to preserve and take into account slang and idioms. In order to respect the participants’ right to privacy, their true identities are not given, and pseudonyms are used throughout the paper.

4.5 Findings

Participants were employed in various workplace settings, such as engineering companies, retail companies, and banks, and held the following occupations: engineer ($n = 12$), information technology developer ($n = 9$), financial analyst ($n = 6$), project manager ($n = 5$), human resources agent ($n = 3$), academic ($n = 2$), and marketing agent ($n = 1$). All but four participants were employed in the private sector in medium or large companies. Nearly all participants were employed in ethnically and racially diverse workplaces, yet participants agreed that all the middle- or upper-level managerial positions and nearly all of the directors were white Canadians.

The responses demonstrated that participants framed their experiences as a process of learning the rules of the field. As they started working in white-collar work settings, they became aware of a misfit between the workplace field in Canada and their dispositions shaped in Turkey. They consequently began negotiating the state of being an immigrant by learning the ways in which they could convey a positive impression of themselves. These negotiations were connected to the participants’ habitus and forms of capital, some of which were devalued following migration and often needed to be re-acquired. Nearly all made an effort to fit in through acquiring local capital and trying to transform their set of dispositions, yet the responses demonstrated that participants considered full adoption to the workplace habitus almost impossible. The results of this study further demonstrate that participants evaluate their workplace experiences in relational and transnational frameworks. These findings will be discussed in detail below.
4.5.1 Encounter with the Field and Adjusting to its Rules

I will start this section by briefly presenting the participants’ labour market integration trajectories. The majority of participants encountered various structural barriers like devaluation of their foreign credentials and lack of Canadian work experience during their job search. These barriers delayed their entrance into the white-collar field, with more than half of the participants starting out by working in survival jobs, such as a cashier or a clerk. On average, it took one year to find a job in their profession. Being employed in their field of training allowed the participants to regain (for those with prior work experience) or gain (for those without prior work experience) their “white-collar identity.” Considering the challenges they overcame, they took pride in establishing their white-collar identity in Canada. However, differences in cultural and social norms meant that they continued to negotiate their self-image as white-collars and immigrants. In other words, they found themselves constantly challenged by new requirements to change, recreate, deconstruct, and reconstruct their vision of the world and of themselves (Sonn and Lewis 2009) because of being in an unfamiliar field. Participants engaged in a multi-layered and complex negotiation process. I look at this negotiation process by examining three areas: language and communication, socialising, and promotion.

4.5.1.1 Language and Communication

Many of the participants discussed communication in English as an important challenge. The majority arrived in Canada with what they considered proficiency in English and did not anticipate having any difficulty with regard to language. However, after being employed, they recognised that speaking English among native speakers created challenges.

I was thinking that I knew English [laughs]. I didn’t think that writing an email or talking at meetings would be such a pain. I was reading my emails a couple of times before sending them out. I was worried about how to express myself at meetings. I was also worried about my pronunciation, my accent. You know, “are they going to understand my accent?” I didn’t expect any of these to happen. This process was very challenging because my self-esteem at work was very high in Turkey. I had a degree from a good university with knowledge of English and I was involved in many important projects at work. There is an important difference between how people perceive you in Turkey and in Canada and I didn’t want to accept it at first (Olcay, F, 36, migrated to Canada in 2007).
Olcay’s excerpt demonstrates that the value of her institutionalised cultural capital (university degree and work experience) and linguistic capital changed following migration and challenged her self-image as a white-collar employee. Her accent, smaller range of vocabulary, and unfamiliarity with the dominant norms of the workplace (e.g., appropriate behaviour in a meeting) made her feel inadequate and obstructed her engagement with proper impression management. This eventually resulted in her reassessing her white-collar status. During the interview, she stated that she paid particular attention to email conversations and to the ways in which her colleagues were expressing themselves at work. In her engagement with impression management, she also tried to soften her accent by improving her pronunciation. Similar to other participants, she was able to improve some aspects of her linguistic capital and became more confident in conducting daily workplace tasks and conversations in English.

Despite the participants’ attempts to enhance their self-confidence and to convey positive impressions of themselves to their managers and colleagues, having an accent and thus being recognised as “other” or “foreign” remained a challenge for many:

I will always have an accent and it will always make me an immigrant in this country. Sometimes people interrupt and ask, “What did you say?” “Can you say it again?” I mean it still happens. Recently, a lady from another department in our company came to our office and while the two of us were talking about work, she asked me, “What is your accent?” Some people ask these questions because they are just curious, but others want to make you feel that you’re different. And, another thing is they [Canadians] are familiar with some other accents, such as Chinese and Indian. But, they aren’t familiar with our accent. So, I think by asking about the accent, they also want to learn where you are from so that it would be easier to make some assumptions about you. You know? Well, I don’t like this kind of question … OK, I’m an immigrant but I’m good at my work and know my stuff. So, I don’t think that accent should be an issue and honestly I try to speak as clearly as I can (Gaye, F, 47, migrated to Canada in 1995).

Given that language is an instrument of power and that an accent serves “as an index of authority” (Bourdieu 1977, 653), this quotation demonstrates how the foreignness of an accent constitutes a medium through which power relations operate and are experienced by participants in social interactions. Despite acknowledging the presence of different accents, participants’ effort to soften their accent to comply with the dominant one is also an
important expression of power relations as it illustrates how they negotiate their feelings of language inferiority.

According to participants, being approached about their accent, whether discriminatory or non-discriminatory, stigmatises them as “different” and functions as a reminder of their “immigrant identity.” This also suggests that participants’ attempts to present a positive self-image were challenged by certain factors that were beyond their control. The challenges experienced due to “accented” English further show the complex and multiple ways of experiencing visibility.

Although the literature mainly conceptualises visibility in relation to phenotype, the struggle immigrants face is not limited to their racialised appearance; they also have to deal with “communicative visibility” (Valenta 2009). Many participants, not surprisingly, stated that they felt more comfortable when they talked to other immigrant colleagues. Communicative visibility is further experienced in speaking and communication style:

I’m from Turkey and since Turkey has its own culture and since I grew up in that culture … How should I say this, we [people from Turkey] are very straight, we speak straight. For Canadians, it should be in an indirect way. For example, they criticise you indirectly, or they first compliment, first smile at you, and then start criticising … I believe that this is a big problem, which addresses the importance of changing your behaviours. I’m working on it, but I will admit that it’s tough (Ersan, M, 28, migrated to Canada in 2007).

It isn’t just an issue of language. It’s about communication, which is, I believe, composed of three Vs: verbal, visual, and vocal. Your body language comes first, then how you talk and last what you say. For instance, people here are more distanced while they are speaking, or when they speak with one another, they wait for the other person to finish their sentence first. They don’t interrupt each other as we do. The way that they react to certain things is also very interesting. It’s difficult to understand whether they are angry or not because they don’t express their feelings explicitly (Hulya, F, 40, migrated to Canada in 2006).

Communicating and speaking in the ways that participants were used to prior to migrating created an impression of being too aggressive or direct. These excerpts from the interviews identify a number of unwritten rules regulating workplace communications, including appropriate ways of expressing feelings. As Bourdieu (1977, 660; 1991) notes, “linguistic capital is an embodied capital” and constitutes an aspect of the bodily and mental
dispositions of individuals. The use of English, in this regard, is part of a more complex process of understanding communication norms and negotiating distinctive aspects of habitus. In order for participants to develop new forms of capital in Canada, therefore, required not only learning how to use English or being comfortable with everyday talk, but also recognising what others expected of them and what they should expect of others. As the above excerpts demonstrate, the cultural preferences in Canada for indirect and distant communication and for not “expressing feelings explicitly” existed in contrast to participants’ understanding of “the standard.” Although participants wanted to protect themselves from potential moments of disgrace and embarrassment by attempting to change their dispositions and to comply with the dominant communication norms, they emphasised the difficulty of changing their dispositions:

Adapting to cultural behaviours is the hardest. It necessitates changing your mind. I mean a big shift in your mind. Learning the technical stuff is easier because you already know your job and may just need to learn some more technical stuff. So, you improve your knowledge. But, changing your habits is difficult. While one requires improvement, the other one requires change. I mean learning is easier compared to forgetting or changing your habits (Defne, F, 47, migrated to Canada in 1993).

4.5.1.2 Socialising

In addition to language and communication norms, participants reflected on their socialising experiences as a major challenge in negotiating their immigrant identity and in managing the impressions they convey in Canada. Socialising experiences of participants include two components: acquiring valued cultural capital and adapting to the individualistic culture at work. To begin with the first component, participants recognised the importance of becoming familiar with certain aspects of Canadian culture, as it was essential in order to be part of everyday conversations and to develop broader networks at work. Tolga (M, 41, migrated to Canada in 2010), for example, stated that:

In the beginning, I was hesitant about joining conversations or going to social events like pub nights … Migration changes the way you see yourself. I mean you suddenly become not knowledgeable about many things. While I have opinions and knowledge on many things in Turkey, here I felt like I was out of the game. People were talking about hockey, golf, and baseball. I didn’t know anything about them. So, as I said, I wasn’t joining conversations at first. Maybe language was also part of it. But, I think it was around the end of my first year, I
thought that I should learn some Canadian things, not to be an outsider at work and I’ve learned some rules of these sports … Although I still don’t know much about them [sports], I’ve learned how to handle conversations without feeling like an outsider.

Tolga’s comments show that participants’ previously acquired cultural capital had lost its value in Canada. They needed to compensate for this loss by accumulating valued cultural capital to mitigate the possibility of being excluded from daily conversations, as well as to enhance their self-confidence and manage their impressions in their new social context. It is also important to note that those participants who received a degree in Canada before being employed (n = 7) had an opportunity to accumulate cultural capital at university, which facilitated their social interactions in their workplaces. Although participants attempted to manage the impressions they presented by acquiring particular forms of capital, some were nonetheless categorised along racialised lines during social interactions. To illustrate, those participants who are perceived as stereotypically Middle Eastern looking stated that their phenotype constituted a barrier in accessing networks:

I don’t want to generalise it to all Canadians but still want to share this story with you. You know we [people from Turkey] are friendly people. Greeting people in the morning or talking about how they are doing is part of our culture. And I try to continue this culture in my workplace ... But, some Canadians at work, particularly women, are so cold against immigrants. Unless I greet them, for example, they rarely talk to me. But, I see them talking to Canadian male employees. When it comes to us, I can feel that their feeling is that “oh those immigrants.” I can feel that they aren’t happy about seeing us around. I know that men from Eastern countries are stereotyped, who knows; maybe this is why they don’t want to talk to us (Adil, M, 32, migrated to Canada in 2011).

Participants also commented on the difficulty of building meaningful friendships at work, which constitutes the second component of their socialising experiences. All participants pointed out differences in how social interactions were performed in Canada and Turkey. Their previously internalised perceptions of workplace socialising shaped their expectations and they anticipated that they would be working in more hospitable environments that were open to the development of friendships. Dispositions that value closer interaction and mutual support (Aycan and Berry 1996) made them initially hopeful that friendships developed in their workplaces would allow them to broaden their social networks and facilitate their social
integration in Canada. However, after beginning their employment, they realised that there is a distinction between being a colleague and a friend in Canada.

The distinction between a colleague and a friend is very strict here. People don’t become friends with their colleagues. And you also begin to make the same distinction, as you can’t socialise with your colleagues [outside work] (Fisun, F, 33, migrated to Canada in 2011).

Your colleagues are just your colleagues; this is kind of a rule here. They never know what’s happening in your life. Nor do you know about their life. People aren’t open to this kind of conversation. They just share the office together (Nergis, F, 50, migrated to Canada in 1997).

Migration changed many taken-for-granted aspects of working. Things participants considered normal in Turkey often seemed to violate workplace practices in Canada. As a response to this mismatch between their expectations and the actual socialising culture, participants either adapted to the dominant culture by making a distinction between a colleague and a friend (see Shan 2012) or looked for people who were similar to them. In this sense, adaptation to the distinction between a colleague and a friend did not completely alter their habitual inclination to establish friendships with their colleagues. Findings showed that whenever participants began to work in a new company, they looked for people that might have similar dispositions. Tahsin (M, 53, migrated to Canada in 2003), for instance, was able to develop a friendship with his colleague from Albania. He had previously worked in different companies in Toronto and emphasised the uniqueness of this situation:

You can’t meet people like my friend. You can’t find an Albanian friend very easily. We have lunch together, we have coffee breaks together, and even sometimes we see each other on the weekends. He’s like a Turk. I can’t see any difference.

When asked what he meant by his expression, “he is like a Turk,” he highlighted shared innate cultural behaviours such as body language, gestures, and emotions, which allowed him to know how to behave with his Albanian friend without the necessity of looking for cues. This familiarity with “how to behave” or “similar expectations for practice” essentially reflects the embodiedness of habitus (Perry 2012). In other words, individuals are more likely to develop and maintain contacts with others whose acts, feelings, and behaviours are “isomorphic with elements of their habitus” (Ignatow 2009, 110). Through searching for
people who possess a similar habitus in the host country’s workplace, participants tried to create a comfort zone in which they needed to be less reflexive about their behaviours and the ways in which they manage their impressions.

4.5.1.3 Promotion

Participants’ experiences with and comments on promotion further illustrated the interplay between habitus, capital, and the workplace field. Ekin (M, 48, migrated to Canada in 1993), the only participant who climbed the career ladder to the executive director level in a private company, highlighted his technical knowledge and expertise in his field, his ability to express himself well in English, and his ability to “stop acting and thinking Turkish” as crucial factors that facilitated his success in Canada.

I worked in different places in Toronto, and in each of these places, I observed the workplace culture. Because I knew that I was good in my field and wouldn’t have any problems in applying technical knowledge to my work, as well as in improving it. So, I first tried to understand the expected behaviours and attitudes in the workplace and I then worked on presenting myself to my managers accordingly. When there were things that were conducted in different ways than I used to do, I always reminded myself that “you are in Canada now, and the rules of the game might be different.”

He also added:

I feel like your DNA should change, otherwise all you do is just to polish. It’s like you shave or wax, but the important thing is to change your essence … Unless you stop acting and thinking Turkish, it’s impossible to climb the career ladder.

Although all participants acknowledged the importance of changing or transforming their set of dispositions, they also pointed at its difficulty and expressed that not being “Canadianised” enough constituted a challenge in getting promoted beyond lower-level management positions. Fevzi (M, 54, migrated to Canada in 1990) said that:

I should say that promotion experiences are complicated. I didn’t face any challenges in getting promoted as long as the position was more about the technical stuff. I mean the workplaces are composed of too many positions and I didn’t find it difficult to climb up to the low-level. But, I felt that it gets harder to climb up further … I believe it’s difficult for Turkish immigrants because our culture is completely different, which increases the chances of being the odd one out … Your speaking style, your communication style, these things need to change … Here,
people are always polite to one another. For instance, they don’t criticise you directly. I think I’ve also changed over these years. I’m less outspoken when I speak to people. But, I also think that I haven’t changed enough to climb the upper levels.

According to participants, in order to achieve successful advancement in organisations immigrants are required to comply with the dispositions of white Canadians. This results in the devaluation of immigrants’ behavioural codes and values. The demand for displaying particular dispositions, which is exercised through evaluations of soft skills, is the cultural manifestation of workplace inequality and justifies exclusion of many immigrants from decision-making positions. It solidifies and reproduces segregation of immigrants to more technical positions. Despite participants’ ongoing effort to fit in at their workplaces, there was nearly a consensus among them on the impossibility of fully adapting to the dominant norms and practices. Although they agreed on the importance of the length of time spent in Canada for acquiring appropriate practices, they expressed that conducting self-surveillance at work regarding how they acted and behaved always existed at varying levels. Similarly, all the challenges that participants had gone through in the Canadian workplace made them feel constantly in need to prove their technical and social competence.

You definitely feel the necessity to work harder or to prove yourself. You really feel that you should work harder and this feeling is inevitable. Well, you should be ambitious. Right? As I said they [native-born Canadians] are one step ahead of you. So, you should work harder and prove yourself to narrow the gap (Acar, M, 37, migrated to Canada in 2003).

Prejudice against immigrants from certain countries also constituted a barrier in several participants’ career trajectory. Mete (M, 31, migrated to Canada in 2004) completed bachelor’s and master’s degrees in Canada and acquired several designations and certificates in his field (finance). Despite possessing Canadian degrees and seven years of work experience, he faced differential treatment and encountered barriers in getting promoted in his workplace due to his racialised immigrant identity. The excerpt below is about a conversation he had with his manager one week before we conducted the interview:

I always think that as an immigrant you can only reach a certain point. I believe that immigrants struggle a lot [to be promoted]. As an example, I fought with my manager to get my current position. First, I had begged him for two years, but he didn’t do anything. And, do you know what happened? He told me to do this and that, this and that and I did them all. But each time,
there was another thing to do. I even told my manager that he did all these to me because I’m an immigrant. Then, he said, “Why are you saying that? You have lots of accomplishments.” And, I asked him, “How come those people with less accomplishments are promoted while I’m still being asked to do this and that?” He couldn’t say anything. It’s obvious that there’s a barrier for us. I mean as an immigrant from Turkey, as a person from the Middle East, you can’t make it. Despite all my credentials and accomplishments, he still doesn’t trust me. There’s a serious distrust toward immigrants. There’s some sort of prejudice.

Mete felt that he was treated differently and that being an immigrant from a Middle Eastern country had limited his opportunity for promotion despite his qualifications and accomplishments. Nergis (F, 50, migrated to Canada in 1997), similarly, discussed how the intersection of “race”/ethnicity and immigrant status affects immigrant employees’ workplace experiences.

No one can say that racism or discrimination does not exist in Canada. It happens here too. Maybe not as severe as in other countries. Maybe not as explicitly as in other countries, but it’s out there. Canada has laws that proscribe discrimination and racism. Why do we have these laws? Because discrimination was a problem here. Yet, these laws haven’t eradicated discrimination altogether. Prejudices are still alive and so do the subtle forms of discrimination. No one would tell that you aren’t promoted because you’re an immigrant, you have a foreign accent and so on. Your soft skills would be scored low. It’s that simple.

To conclude, participants’ negotiations with being an immigrant and the challenges that they faced in engaging proper impression management emerged from the disconnection between their habitus, cultural capital, and the field. Analysis of the interview data revealed that participants conceptualised their adjustment to their workplaces as a process of “assimilation.” Although their workplaces were demographically multicultural, they felt that “success” in the workplace is, nonetheless, dependent on whether they became “Canadianised,” which includes both accumulation of different forms of capital and the transformation or expansion of immigrants’ habitus. In the next section, I focus on how participants evaluated their overall experiences at work.

4.5.2 Transnational and Relational Understanding of Experiences

The analysis showed that participants evaluated their struggles and negotiations in the Canadian workplace within a transnational and relational framework. The career trajectories and lifestyles of friends or former colleagues in Turkey constituted a frame of reference for
participants to evaluate their experiences at work. For instance, Gamze (F, 40) migrated to Canada fourteen years ago and had been working in the finance sector for twelve years. Before she left Turkey, Gamze was working as a financial analyst in a multinational company with good career prospects. During the interview, she commented that:

I still have friends in Istanbul working in the same company or in other companies, and many of them are managers now. I sometimes think that if had stayed in Turkey, I would have probably become a manager too. You know? But then I compare my life here to the one in Turkey. I mean the stress level is definitely higher in Turkey. You have lots of things to worry about like traffic, economy, and so on. In contrast, I have a less stressful life here. So, I think this has allowed me to handle being an immigrant at work and made me stay here.

Gamze’s comment, which was echoed by the majority of participants, highlights two important aspects of the process of negotiating the experiences in the host country. First, participants normalised the challenges that they encountered inside the workplace against the enhanced living standards associated with life in Canada (see also, Kelly and Lusis 2006). Second, and in relation to the first point, the evaluation of experiences in one social context (e.g., workplace) is made in relation to other aspects of social life (e.g., economy and traffic).

Another frame of reference for participants to interpret their workplace experiences was their immigrant colleagues. Some constructed their identities as superior to immigrants from certain countries.

Since we aren’t originally from this country and culture, you’re always worried about whether John is satisfied with your work. You always have this feeling inside. You can’t feel as comfortable and self-reliant as Canadians. But I don’t want to name this feeling as inferiority; maybe to a certain extent. I don’t know. But there’re people who feel really inferior to Canadians and they came from colonies. They are from English or French colonies, and see those [Canadians] as masters. I’ve never considered them as masters because as a nation, we’d never been a colony. Since we’re [people from Turkey] already superior to many immigrant groups, I don’t think that I really feel inferior, but I’m of course concerned about whether my work would be appreciated and regarded (Ekin, M, 48, migrated to Canada in 1993).

There are people from all around the world in Canada, and I have Indian, Pakistani, and Arab colleagues at work … How should I say? Hmm … We [immigrants from Turkey] are very different. When I compare myself to them, I feel better at work. We’re more like Europeans in many ways compared to them (Eftal, M, 40, migrated to Canada in 2009).
These excerpts show a connection being made between the socio-historical context of home countries and the negotiation processes, which point to the complexity involved with interpreting workplace experiences. Ekin and Eftal think of themselves in more positive terms compared to their immigrant colleagues from countries with a colonial past. In so doing, they consider Turkish and other immigrant employees as different. The reference to colonial history used in Ekin’s response and perceived Europeanness expressed in Eftal’s response demonstrate the way in which some participants negotiated being an immigrant employee and made sense of their position in relation to their colleagues.

Given that Turkey is also a developing country located at an intersection between Europe and the Middle East, how can we explain the hierarchy established by the participants? Drawing on Bourdieu’s terminology, I contend that participants’ categories of perception originated in their past experience and the above excerpts need to be understood within the context of Turkish orientalism against other Eastern countries. Turkish orientalism refers to the self-identification of Turkey with the “modern” and “civilised” world while representing other Eastern or developing countries and societies, and their cultural practices, as backward (Eldem 2010; Zeydanlioglu 2008). Turkish orientalism solidified with the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923 after which the country entered into an intense Westernisation process. The process, not surprisingly, entrenched stereotypes regarding societies of other Eastern or developing countries, and constructed Turkey superiority to them (Eldem 2010; Ergin 2008; Zeydanlioglu 2008). Relying upon the Westernisation discourse and Turkey’s non-colonial history, participants in this study reproduced the previously constructed hierarchies and made sense of their experiences in Canadian workplaces accordingly. It seems that by doing this, participants aimed at evaluating their experiences as being more successful than other immigrants, which can be considered as self-impression management (Larson 1989; Reis 1981). Their engagement with impression management, in this sense, is not limited to only looking good in the eyes of others, but it also includes looking good in their own eyes.

4.6 Conclusion
In this paper, I examined the workplace integration of immigrants in Canada by focusing on the experiences and perceptions of Turkish immigrants as an empirical case study. In so
doing, I aimed to fill the gap in the literature on workplaces and organisations and migration studies by focusing on immigrant-specific experiences inside Canadian workplaces. Despite considerable research on job search experiences of immigrants, their experiences at work remains relatively unexplored (Agocs 2002; Agocs and Jain 2001). Relying upon Goffman’s concept of impression management and Bourdieu’s three major concepts of capital, field, and habitus, I found that immigrants actively engage in impression management in the field of the white-collar workplace in order to convey the best impression possible. However, the way in which they engaged with impression management and whether they could create the valued self-image were dependent on the relative weight of the forms of capital and habitus shaped in their home country. In other words, impression management is indeed embedded in the social structure and shaped by capital, habitus, and the rules of the field. Immigrants’ attempts to create a valued self-image, therefore, exist as a reflection of relationships among unequals (immigrants versus Canadians) and their experiences inside the workplace are expressions of relations of power.

The findings suggest that participants faced two major challenges inside the workplace: lacking valued capital and having a habitus that does not fit. Although they managed to overcome the former disadvantage through accumulating new forms of capital (e.g., linguistic and cultural), transformation or adjustment of dispositions (e.g., communication style and accent) was expressed as being the most difficult part of integration into the workplace in the host country. Participants’ comments indicated that the values, norms, and patterns of behaviours, including the speaking and communication style they brought to their workplaces, were different from that of their Canadian colleagues and became the markers of racialised/ethnic immigrant identity, addressing the significance of habitus in shaping their experiences. Despite the increasing ethno-racial diversity in workplaces, my analysis suggests that they are still structured by “race”/ethnicity and immigration status. Cultural norms, values and perceptions of white managers and employers appear to be established as norms that remain invisible, but to which immigrants are required to adjust. The white-collar workplaces, therefore, constitute an example of the racialisation of space in which a white habitus become the “normal” way of doing and interpreting things at work (Reitman 2006) and creates a disadvantage for immigrants when their habitus, shaped in the home country, does not fit. At the theoretical level, this finding adds to the existing and growing research on
the re-conceptualisation of habitus as durable, racial, and country-specific dispositions that generate racialised practices and reproduce racialised structures (Perry 2012; Samaluk 2014).

The findings of this study support the argument that even though ideal integration should be a two-way process in which both immigrants and the host society mutually transform each other, most commonly immigrants in Canada are expected to “assimilate” into the existing workplace culture (Li 2003). Experiences of immigrants with respect to promotion, in particular, illustrated that they are expected to become Canadianised to succeed in their workplaces.

The analysis further showed that despite participants’ attempts to change or adjust their dispositions and acquire valued forms of capital to better fit into the workplace culture and to eliminate potential barriers, some might still face discrimination as a result of their racialised/ethnic immigrant identity. These suggest that Canada’s commitment to multicultural policy and workplace diversity glosses over the unequal power relations and supports “a discourse of diversity in which ‘other’ Canadians (foreigners) and their differences are merely ‘patronized’ and tolerated; but not accepted” (James 2005, 20). Immigrants experience a slower form of assimilation in these “demographically” diverse workplaces. It is important to note, however, that I am not arguing that Canadians with the right habitus and valued capital face no challenges in the workplace. I rather argue that being an immigrant with devalued forms of capital and habitus in the host country’s field of workplace creates challenges that are unique for immigrant employees.

Further, participants’ interpretation of their workplace experiences demonstrated the complexity of the ways in which they negotiate their immigrant status at work. While some were victims of prejudice and discrimination against immigrants from Middle Eastern countries, they reproduced the power relations constructed between the West and the East by creating a hierarchy between immigrants from Turkey and those from other Eastern and developing countries. Turkey’s non-colonial history and in-betweenness in reference to Europe and the Middle East encouraged these participants to consider themselves as being superior to other racialised/ethnic immigrant colleagues. While participants engage in
impression management to convey the best possible image of themselves to others, they also deal with the fact of being an immigrant in a workplace through engaging in self-impression management (Larson 1989; Reis 1981). This finding is particularly important as it illustrates the ways in which the home country’s socio-historical context and geopolitics could function as a coping strategy for immigrants. Another strategy employed by the participants was that of making comparisons between the living conditions in Canada and in Turkey. Based on these findings, I argue that the experiences of immigrants at work and their interpretation of these experiences are not only context specific, but also relational and transnational.

Overall, through the examination of the experiences of immigrants inside the workplace, this study has sought to understand the invisible and ongoing power relations in the workplace setting. The findings have pointed at the need for replacing the focus of the diversity management policies and racialised/ethnic from the demographic aspect of diversity (i.e. the number of racialised/ethnic minorities) to the issues of workplace discrimination and racism.
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Chapter 5

5. Conclusion

5.1 Introduction
The objective of this dissertation was to critically examine integration experiences of immigrants from Turkey to Canada. The three manuscripts that comprise this dissertation were united by a concern about how the intersection of ethnicity and social class has shaped the integration experiences of Turkish\(^1\) immigrants. To this end, drawing upon qualitative data, I compared the experiences of immigrants with professional and non-professional jobs who arrived in Canada under different immigration classes with various levels of education. Integration of immigrants into the host society is complex and multidimensional (Beach, Green, and Reitz 2003; Castles and Miller 2009; Driedger 1996; Simmons 2010). Framing the analysis by using Bourdieu’s theoretical framework, each manuscript focused on a specific dimension of integration and aimed to address and understand the complexity of integration. In the following sections, I first review the main findings of each manuscript in response to the research questions defined in the introductory chapter. Then, I discuss the theoretical and empirical implications of the study. While doing so, I address the interconnection among the manuscripts. This is followed by policy implications, some directions for further research, and closing remarks.

5.2 Major Findings
The first manuscript (Chapter 2) explored the network development experiences of study participants as well as the nature of such networks. The development of networks with other immigrants from Turkey, with members of other immigrant groups, and with the broader society was considered part of their social integration process. I analysed the impact of capital and habitus on participants’ network development trajectories by focusing on the following research questions: How do immigrants from Turkey access social networks in Canada? What role do capital and habitus play in this process? What is the role of social class in accessing and creating networks? Are there any differences in the ways in which immigrants form intra- and inter-group networks? My analysis of the data indicated that

\(^{1}\) *Turkish* refers to all population groups in Turkey: Turks, Kurds, and others. When I use the adjective *Turkish*, it means immigrants from Turkey, not *Turk*.
access to intra- and inter-group networks and the nature of these networks were dependent mainly on participants’ cultural capital, habitus, and labour market location. The social integration of participants with professional jobs and non-professional jobs in this sense was distinctly different. Although participants in both groups formed networks with other immigrants from Turkey, these networks were class-bounded. That is, participants formed networks with people in similar class positions, due to shared capital and habitus. The highly educated participants with non-professional jobs experienced difficulty in developing networks, as de-skilling put them in a social context of which their habitus was not a part. The networks of many participants were further fragmented by their hometown in Turkey, religious affiliation and ethnicity (Turk or Kurd). Networks developed with members of other immigrant groups and the broader society had similar features. Yet, the inter-group networks of non-professional participants were composed of members of other immigrant groups, and did not include native-born Canadians. Professional participants, by contrast, had wider inter-group networks comprising both other immigrants and native-born Canadians. Differences in dispositions toward social relations, nevertheless, limited those participants’ development of networks with native-born Canadians.

Based on the preceding findings, I argue that the binary conceptualisation of networks as “bonding (ethnic) social capital” and “bridging social capital” prevents us from understanding the complex nature of network development in the host county. Factors other than ethnicity and/or national origin such as unequal distribution of capital and habitus need to be considered while analysing immigrants’ network development experiences. Bourdieu’s theoretical framework in this respect enables us to overcome such simplistic binary and examine how networks are situated in a wider socio-economic context (Cederberg 2012).

The second manuscript (Chapter 3) focused on the labour market integration experiences of participants. This manuscript addressed four major questions: How do participants define the rules of the Canadian labour market field? Do the rules of the market differ within its various segments? How do immigrants navigate and mitigate the rules of the market? How do forms of capital and habitus affect the experiences of immigrants, and the strategies they develop to enter the field? Although there are studies on immigrants’ economic integration (Buzdugan and Halli 2009; Krishna Pendakur and Pendakur 1998; Reitz 2001b; 2007a), little previous
research has qualitatively explored the experiences of immigrants in different segments of the labour market who arrived in Canada with various levels of education under different immigration classes. Further, there has been less attention to how immigrants mitigate the challenges they faced in the labour market (Bauder 2005). Hence, I sought to provide insight not only into the challenges in job search but also into the participants’ coping mechanisms in integrating into the labour market. The results of my analyses indicated that the experiences of participants in the labour market were influenced by the intersection among their level of education, habitus, immigration class, and the rules of specific segments of the labour market. Compared to highly-educated participants, those with a high school diploma or less faced fewer challenges finding work as they were looking for jobs that required neither a good command of English nor a Canadian degree. Furthermore, they were able to take advantage of pre-existing networks in Canada. Consistent with the findings of previous studies, highly educated participants experienced devaluation or non-recognition of their cultural capital. The strategies of these participants to overcome these barriers were dependent on their immigration class. Although many eventually found professional jobs through acquiring new forms of capital and mobilising social networks, coping mechanisms of those who arrived as asylum seekers were restricted due to their immigration class.

Another important finding of this manuscript was that social capital is an important factor facilitating immigrants’ job search regardless of their level of education and immigration class, as it creates a trust mechanism between an immigrant and the employer and validates the value of an immigrant’s cultural capital.

An overarching argument of this manuscript is that challenges faced in job search and strategies generated in response to these challenges vary by immigration class, education level, socio-economic background, and the segment of the labour market. This suggests that various forms of experiencing the labour market exist and that understanding these different experiences requires simultaneously examining individual level (e.g. level of education) and structural factors (e.g. the rules of the field).

The third manuscript (Chapter 4) investigated the experiences of participants inside the white-collar workplaces and sought answers to the following questions: Do immigrants continue to face challenges and barriers once they are hired? How do Turkish immigrants in
white-collar occupations perceive, experience, and interpret their workplace experiences? How do relational functioning of field and habitus shape immigrants’ workplace integration? This manuscript showed that immigrants continue to face unique challenges once they are hired. In other words, finding a white-collar job corresponding to one’s educational level and training does not mean a barrier-free integration into the workplace setting. The challenges include a lack of valued capital and misfit between the habitus acquired in the home country and the workplace field in Canada. The findings also revealed that a perceived Middle Eastern identity influenced the workplace integration experiences. Participants actively attempted to convey the best impression possible through accumulating capital valued in the workplace and transforming their dispositions towards social relations and communication style. Yet, they believed that achieving a perfect fit between their habitus and the field was almost unattainable and so, instead, accepted their differences and chose to consider their experiences in transnational and relational context.

There are two central arguments put forth in this manuscript. First, workplaces are still structured by “race”/ethnicity and immigration status. This suggests that increasing ethno-racial diversity at Canadian workplaces has not yet transformed the requirement for conformity to Anglo-Canadian ways of doing and interpreting things. Second, experiences of immigrants inside the workplace and their interpretation of these experiences might be contingent upon their country of origin. Hence, it is important to examine how the socio-historical context of their home country affects immigrants’ integration experiences. In other words, the findings offer insights for research exploring the relationship between country background, migration, and workplace experience. The findings of this manuscript contributed to the literatures on migration studies, immigrant integration, and sociology of work, by illustrating immigrant-specific experiences inside workplaces, which has received less attention in previous studies.

5.3 Discussion: Implications for the Literature
Considering the findings of each manuscript in relation to each other, in this section I will discuss the broader theoretical and empirical contributions of this dissertation to the literature.
5.3.1 Theoretical Contributions
This study has contributed and extended research on the implications of Bourdieu’s work for migration studies in three ways. First, Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus, forms of capital and field have been employed by migration scholars particularly in the past ten-fifteen years. With respect to the integration experiences of immigrants, his concepts of capital and/or habitus have been used to mainly examine economic integration (Bauder 2003; 2005; Girard and Bauder 2007; Nee and Sanders 2001). Literature on the network development of immigrants has paid little attention to Bourdieu’s theorising of capital and relied on Putnam’s conceptualisation of social networks and social capital (Kazemipur 2006; Nakhaie and Kazemipur 2013). Likewise, there exists only little research on immigrants’ workplace experience in general and from Bourdieu’s perspective in particular (Friesen 2011; Samaluk 2014). Further, there have been few attempts to integrate his three concepts. Nee and Sanders (2001), for instance, examined immigrants’ economic integration in the US using the concept of forms of capital. They argued that the supply of social, financial, and human-cultural capital possessed by immigrant families predicts their trajectories of integration. They, however, overlooked the impact of structural factors (e.g. racism, discrimination) on the valuation of capital brought from the country of origin and the access to new forms of capital in the host society. Further, they did not look at the role of habitus on immigrants’ integration experiences.

I argue that the interconnectedness between habitus, field and forms of capital, which constitutes the core of Bourdieu’s theorising of practice and social inequality, needs to form the basis of our analysis if we seek to understand practices of immigrants in a wider socio-economic context. How do immigrants perceive the fields of the host society? How do they enter these fields? What form of capital and habitus are valued in a certain field? Does immigrants’ habitus fit in the field? Who defines the value of capital in the field? Who benefits from this valuation? How do immigrants negotiate the rules of the field? In order to answer these questions habitus, field, and capital should be considered in relation to each other. As I tried to illustrate in the three interrelated manuscripts, Bourdieu’s theoretical framework allows us to provide a more complex understanding of immigrant integration into the host country. Immigrants arrive with habitus and forms of capital formed in the country of origin. Contingent on their habitus and the rules of each field, they form various strategies.
to validate and/or acquire forms of capital to integrate into the host society. In this process, they build on power relations of the country of origin and the host country (Erel 2010), and attempt to reproduce their class habitus in various fields. However, there might be limits to the possibilities of reinventing habitus given that immigrants enter into new fields in which their habitus renders them outsiders. Further, as the experiences of de-skilled participants showed, there might be structural factors limiting their chances of reinventing their class habitus. Hence, migration might require immigrants to transform their dispositions.

Second, this dissertation has contributed to the existing and growing research on the reconceptualisation of habitus. Bourdieu’s application of habitus is centred primarily on class. In his studies on the educational and cultural fields, he points at the importance of class habitus in reproducing social inequality in France. However, he has made “no mention of the way in which habitus is differentiated by ‘race’” or ethnicity (Reay 2004, 435). Recent studies have addressed the importance of the structural and cultural conditions in the development of a habitus unique to different racialised/ethnic groups (Bonilla-Silva 2003; Bonilla-Silva, Goar, and Embrick 2006; Bourgois and Schonberg 2007; Cicourel 1993; Perry 2012), which “tend to reproduce the very racial [and ethnic] distinctions and inequalities that produced them” (Perry 2012, 90). These studies’ reconceptualisation of habitus is based on the analysis of societies in which racialised/ethnic minority groups were native-born. Migration scholars have argued that immigrants also embody a racialised/ethnic habitus developed in the country of origin (Bauder 2005; Huot et al. 2013). Based on the experiences of my participants who moved to Canada from the same country of origin with different class backgrounds, I contend that habitus is developed through the intersection of class and ethnic/racialised differences. That is, habitus is not bounded solely either by class or ethnicity/“race”. This conceptualisation of habitus enhances our understanding of intra- and inter-group differences, and the impact of these differences on integration experiences. To illustrate, if habitus was understood as completely developed by class, the dispositions of highly skilled participants would have perfectly fit in the labour market and workplace fields. Similarly, if it was understood as determined by ethnicity/“race”, then study participants would have had similar expectations from migration. This study has demonstrated that habitus as durable dispositions formed through the intersection of class and ethnicity/“race”
explains how classed and ethnic/racialised structures are likely to be reproduced in the context of migration.

5.3.2 Empirical Contributions
This study has shown that integration occurs in various fields and in relation to one another. Processes of social, economic and workplace integration are not mutually exclusive. Economic integration trajectories of immigrants, for example, influence their interaction with intra- and inter-group members. For these reasons, while analysing data on a particular form of integration (e.g. social, political, and economic), we need to think relationally.

The findings have also demonstrated that immigrants might have different understandings of integration based on their class background. Li (2003) analysed the ways in which policy makers, immigration critics and academics interpret immigrant integration in Canada. His analysis showed that there is a homogeneous conceptualisation of integration that “immigrants should accept Canada’s prevailing practice and standard and become similar to the resident population,” (Li 2003, 1) which includes earning “as much as native-born Canadians” (p. 1) and developing “close relations with mainstream society” (p. 3). My research allowed me to examine whether immigrants shared similar understandings of integration. Participants with high and low levels of education expressed different expectations from integration. Responses of the former showed that their expectations were mostly in conformity with the above-described conceptualisation. Yet, the goal of these participants was not about catching up with native-born Canadians in terms of earnings. For them, the main goal was to regain their white-collar identity through finding a job matching their educational level and training. Hence, we can interpret their approach to integration as an attempt to reconstruct an identity. In contrast, immigrants with low levels of education, considered ‘successful integration’ as finding a job and staying in contact with their networks that were mostly comprised other immigrants from Turkey. This finding calls for a move away from rigid definitions of integration to a more flexible one, which involves different perspectives of immigrants with various backgrounds.

This dissertation also contributed to the literature on multiculturalism. The growth of immigrants from non-traditional source countries has intensified the critique of the policy of
multiculturalism as focusing too much on cultural differences while paying less attention to fundamental social inequalities based on individual’s class, ethnicity/“race”, and gender (Bannerji 2000; Fleras 2012; Satzewich and Liodakis 2013). For instance, Satzewich and Liodakis (2013, 166) state that the policy “purposefully ignores the structural contexts in which the Canadian society, economy, and polity have developed historically and operate currently.” My findings provided a support to this critical reading of multiculturalism. In particular, the experiences of participants in the white-collar workplaces showed how their experiences were bounded by power relations. This study has suggested that immigrants in white-collar workplaces are expected to comply with the dominant norms and values of workplaces. Challenges faced inside the workplace as well as while integrating into the labour market contradict the main goals of the policy of multiculturalism which includes achieving “a two-way process of accommodation between newcomers and Canadians” (Dorais 2002, 4).

Last, this study makes an empirical and sociological contribution to the literature on Turkish immigrants. As stated in the previous chapters, there is little research that examined the integration experiences of Turkish immigrants in Canada. Further, existing studies were conducted from a psychological perspective. For instance, Aycan and Berry (1996) explored the impact of economic integration on Turkish immigrants’ psychological well-being and adaptation in Montreal. Ataca and Berry (2002) examined the psychological and cultural adaptation of Turkish immigrant couples in Toronto. My research provided a different perspective by applying a sociological perspective to the integration experiences of Turkish immigrants in Canada.

5.4 Policy Implications
Having discussed the scholarly implications of the findings in the preceding section, I will focus here on the implications for policymakers. There are four major policy implications of the findings of this dissertation. First, the findings of the second and third manuscripts highlighted the ways in which social networks could ease the integration experiences of immigrants in Canada. This addresses the necessity of revising the immigrant selection system, as the current system overlooks the importance of social networks. Immigration applications under the economic class are assessed based on applicants’ human and cultural
capital (e.g. education, age, and knowledge of one of the official languages) (CIC 2015a). Prior to the latest amendment to the assessment system, certain factors, which could be considered as directly or indirectly constituting applicants’ social networks and social capital, were assessed under the category of adaptability. These factors included whether or not applicants or their spouse/common-law partner: have a family in Canada (e.g. parent, grandparent, sibling, and aunt); have studied in Canada; and have worked in Canada. Applicants could receive a maximum of 10 points (out of 100) under this category (CIC 2015b). In 2015, the category of adaptability was replaced with the category of skill transferability, and the factors relating to social networks were removed from the assessment system (CIC 2015a). Based on my findings, I contend that the Canadian immigration system needs to re-include these factors as part of the assessment process and to increase the points assigned to them. Moreover, adaptability factors should not be limited to family members; instead, they need to include friends and acquaintances. Further, the number of immigrants granted permanent residency under the family class could be increased. In 2013, the percentage of immigrants admitted under the family class was approximately 27 percent while the percentage of immigrants admitted under the economic class was approximately 62 percent (CIC 2013). Existing family networks in Canada could help immigrants arriving under the family class broaden their networks in a relatively short period of time, which can eventually ease their social and economic integration.

Second, as discussed in the second manuscript, immigrants arrive in Canada without having adequate prior knowledge about challenges they might encounter in searching for a professional job in their field of expertise. This finding is consistent with previous studies that have addressed similar lack of knowledge among immigrants from countries of origin other than Turkey (Bauder 2003; Reitz 2005; Walton-Roberts and Pratt 2005). This points to the necessity of informing immigrant applicants prior to migration about barriers they might face in the Canadian labour market in order to give them an opportunity to have more realistic expectations and be more prepared for the challenges. Further, as the findings showed, immigrants continue to face the problems of devaluation and non-recognition of their credentials and previous work experience. Hence, there still exists the need to develop policies, targeting to eliminate these long-standing and widely recognised problems. For instance, in order to combat prejudices and discrimination in the labour market, either a quota
system can be introduced, whereby a certain percentage of jobs must be reserved for racialised immigrants with foreign credentials, or a selection system can be developed, whereby racialised immigrants with foreign credentials must be given preference in the hiring processes.

Third, the findings relating to the experiences of de-skilled immigrants can also constitute valuable knowledge to inform policy. It is increasingly recognised that asylum seekers and refugees who are highly educated face unique challenges in finding a professional job, stemming from their precarious legal status (Jackson and Bauder 2013; Krahn et al. 2000). Based on the discussion in my second manuscript about challenges that the deskilled participants faced in Canada, I call on the government to develop policies that would ease highly educated asylum seekers’ search for professional jobs. Such policy changes could include allowing them to pay domestic student fees and permitting them to apply for student loans while holding asylum-seeker status.

Last, the findings of the third manuscript on immigrants’ experiences in white-collar workplaces have highlighted the importance of developing policies that would improve and ensure equity in workplaces. Although there have been attempts at the provincial and federal levels to mitigate systemic discrimination in the workplace (e.g. Employment Equity Act), existing policies do not contain provisions that directly address the issues pertaining to experiences of employees inside the workplace (Agocs 2002; Hiranandani 2012). The findings of this study have suggested that we are still far from having white-collar workplace settings in which racialised/ethnic immigrants experience full inclusion and full participation. Hence, the focus of diversity management programs should decentre their focus from the demographic aspect of diversity (i.e. the number of racialised/ethnic minorities) to the issues of workplace discrimination and racism.

5.5 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

While the findings of this dissertation have expanded our understanding about the integration experiences of immigrants, there are certain limitations to this study that should be acknowledged. First, limitations associated with the integrated article format apply to the present study and several issues could not be covered in the manuscripts. For example,
although analysis of the data suggested that network development and workplace experiences of immigrants might vary depending on gender, detailed discussions of the impact of gender on integration experiences was omitted for two major reasons: a) to restrict discussion to those factors that were found to be the most significant in shaping study participants’ integration trajectories, such as immigration class and type of employment, and b) to meet the manuscript page requirements. My plan is to write a separate manuscript in which I will discuss the relationship between gender and integration into the host society. A further limitation is related to the research methodology of the study. The study consisted of a relatively small sample of Turkish immigrants and, therefore, the findings cannot be generalized either to the Turkish immigrant population residing in Canada and elsewhere or to other immigrant populations. Another limitation of the study is its focus on a single immigrant population in a single host country. While the current study enables us to examine the integration experiences of Turkish immigrants in Canada, it is possible that experiences of Turkish immigrants in other countries differ from the experiences of the study participants. Similarly, considering that the socio-historical context of immigrants’ countries of origin affects the ways in which they interpret their integration experiences, immigrants from those countries other than Turkey could have different integration experiences.

Based on the study limitations, I will now address important areas to be pursued in future research. First, a cross-comparative study between Canada and European countries, in particular Germany, would be useful to compare differences and similarities among Turkish immigrants in terms of the challenges they face in integration and the strategies they develop to mitigate these challenges. This comparison would allow us to explore the ways in which migration policies, citizenship regimes, socio-economic structures, and religion affect the integration trajectories of immigrants.

Second, the manuscripts in this dissertation highlight the complex trajectories of immigrant integration into the host country. Future research would benefit from qualitatively exploring the similarities and differences between and amongst various immigrant groups in integrating into different fields of the host country. Also, future studies could look at the dimensions of integration that are not examined in this study, such as political integration, and examine its relation to other dimensions of integration.
Third, a longitudinal study of immigrants from their arrival to their integration into the workplaces would help to further develop our understanding of the complexity of integration as highlighted within this study. Also, mixed-method research combining qualitative and quantitative methods could generate results that are more holistic and generalizable.

Fourth, this study focused on immigrant-specific experiences in white-collar workplaces. It may be useful for future research to compare the experiences of immigrants, Canada-born visible minorities, and Canada-born non-racialized individuals that occupy similar and/or different positions in different workplace settings. This comparison would further illustrate the ways in which ethnicity/“race” and immigration status shape the experiences in workplace settings, and thus would provide a more complex understanding of power relations inside workplaces. Moreover, future studies could compare different occupations.

Fifth, the comments of some professional participants regarding their colleagues from other developing countries suggest that the nature of prejudices, segregations and discriminations among different racialized/ethnic groups is in need of additional research to examine multiple and complex encounters between various minority groups.

Last, future studies could enhance the reconceptualization of habitus by examining how ethnicity/“race”, gender, and class intersect and develop dispositions. To this end, they could examine the habitus formation of immigrant offspring. Moreover, the concept of habitus could be used to explore the socialisation experiences and habitus formation of biracial and/or multiracial individuals. These studies have the potential to improve our understanding of the formation and transformation of habitus.

5.6 Concluding Remarks

The manuscripts presented in this dissertation have sought to understand the complexity of the integration experiences of Turkish immigrants in Canada. They have demonstrated that immigrants enter into various fields of the host country, and the their integration experiences in such various fields are in relation to each other. The integration trajectories in one field (e.g., economic) influence the trajectories in another field (e.g., social). The manuscripts have
further highlighted that the ways in which immigrants experience integration in the host country are dependent on the intersection between their immigration class, socio-economic background, habitus, and forms of capital, as well as the segment of the labour market. These studies have demonstrated that analysis of power relations is crucial to understand the integration trajectories of immigrants. They have also pointed at the importance of looking at both structural constraints and individual factors, as they shape the experiences of immigrants simultaneously. I contend that examining different factors that shape immigrant integration is important for migration scholars in order to refrain from homogenising experiences of immigrants and to provide a better understanding of the complex integration experiences. Hence, our research on immigrant integration should be grounded in an approach that addresses the importance of intra- and inter-group unequal power relations. It is my overall conclusion that increasing number of immigrants from non-traditional source countries with different types and volumes of capital points at the continuing importance of exploring their integration trajectories.
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Appendices

Appendix I: Interview Guide

Study Title (Tentative): Labour Market Integration of Immigrants from Turkey to Toronto and London, Ontario, Canada

Interview Guidelines

This is a semi-structured interview with a few questions for outline purposes. The interview guide will be used as a checklist for each question. The probes will be formed based on participants’ responses.

Open statements

Interviews will start with the personal introduction of the research support staff and with brief information about the study. Then, letter of information and consent form will be provided to the participants. They will be reminded that there is no best answer for the interview questions. This study is interested in their experiences from their own point of view.

Questions

- Can you tell me about your current job in Toronto/London?
  - How long have you been in this job?
  - How do you like it?

- How long have you been in Canada?

- What was your entry status?

- How old were you when you came to Canada?

- How long have you been in Toronto/London?

- Did you migrate to Canada alone or with your family?

- What is your current marital status?
  - Do you have children? How old are they?
  - Is your partner in the labour market?

Now I want to ask you some questions about your migration to Canada.

- What were your reasons for migrating from Turkey to Canada?

- What did you know about Canada at that time, and how did you get that information?
  - Did you know anyone else in Canada?

- Did you have information about the Canadian labour market?

- What were your expectations of Canada before you migrated?

- What were you doing for a living in Turkey before coming to Canada?

- Can you tell me about your educational background in Turkey?

- Do you have any educational degrees in Canada?
• Also, can you tell me your parents’ level of education?

*Let’s talk about your social relations in Canada.*

• Can you tell me about people that you spend time with in Canada?
  o Are they mostly from Turkey? Why, why not?
• Can you tell me the activities you do together? And how often do you spend time with them?
• How did you form your networks/relationships in Canada?
• Do you attend events organised by Turkish associations? Why? Why not?
• Are you member of any Turkish association?
• Do you think that networks are important for immigrants’ labour market integration?

*Now, I want to ask you some questions about your job search and workplace experiences in Canada.*

• What were your first employment experiences when you first moved to Canada?
• How long did it take for you to find your first job?
  o If it was a long time, why did it take so long?
  o What kind of strategies did you use while searching for a job?
• In searching for a job, what was the most important thing that made you successful and what was the biggest barrier that kept you from employment?
• Have you ever changed your job?
  o How many times and why?
• Have you ever been in a period of unemployment? If yes, for how long?
• Have you ever been underemployed?
  o Do you think that unemployment and underemployment are common problems for all immigrant groups? Why, why not?
• Have you ever felt discriminated during your search for a job and at your workplace due to your name, country of origin, religion and so on; in short due to being a Turkish immigrant?
  o Can you please tell me more about why you felt in this way?
• Can you tell me about your workplace experiences?
  o Diversity? Relations with colleagues? Promotion experiences?
• Can you tell me about the similarities and differences between your experiences inside the workplace in Turkey and in Canada?
• Do you feel you have changed in any way? Examples?

• Overall, how do you interpret your integration process in Canada?
  o How satisfied are you with social relations? With working in Canada?
  o Have your first expectations from Canada changed over time?

This is the end of our interview. Is there anything more you want to add? Thank you for your time.
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Tentative Project Title: Labour Market Integration of Immigrants from Turkey to Toronto and London, Ontario, Canada

Version Date: December 16, 2012

Letter of Information

My name is Guliz Akkaymak and I am a graduate student in the Department of Sociology and the Collaborative Graduate Program in Migration and Ethnic Relations at Western University, working under the supervision of Professor Wolfgang Lehmann. You are being invited to participate in a research study looking at the labour market and workplace integration of immigrants from Turkey to Toronto and London, Ontario. This letter is yours to keep and provides you with the information you require to make an informed decision regarding your participation.

You are eligible to participate in this study if 1) you were born and raised in Turkey, 2) you migrated to Canada as an adult (i.e., 18+), 3) you are currently employed, 4) you have been a resident in Toronto or London for at least one year either as a landed immigrant or citizen, and 5) you are between the age of 19 and 64. If these conditions apply to you, I am interested in talking to you about your integration experiences in Canada. I will be asking you about your reasons for migration, network development experiences, labour market integration experiences, and workplace integration experiences. If you agree to participate, you can take part either in an individual interview or in a group interview.

Although you may not directly benefit from participating in this study, your participation may help us develop new knowledge that may benefit the integration of Turkish and other immigrant groups in the future. If at any time you have further questions about the content of this study, please contact me at [redacted] or via e-mail at [redacted], or my supervisor, Dr. Wolfgang Lehmann, at [redacted] via email at [redacted]. However, for the confidentiality purposes please do not leave or send any personally identifiable information via voice or text message.

Interviews will take place at a time and location convenient to you. Interviews will be audio taped with your permission and last approximately 60 to 90 minutes. Participants who do not wish to be audio taped will not be able to participate in this study. The audio tapes will also be transcribed. Once the transcript has been produced, you may review it and will correct any mistakes that have occurred during transcribing. This will also give you a final chance to withdraw from the study by telling me not to use your interview or any parts of your interview.

Participant Initials: _______
Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time. There are no known risks to participation in this study. However, while answering some of the questions you may feel sad or upset. If this happens please let me know and I will provide you some contacts if you would like counselling. I can also assure you that all your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Nobody outside the research team will have access to the data gathered during this study. All information will be either stored in a password protected computer or kept locked/secured in my office at Western University. Your confidentiality will be respected. I will be using pseudonyms in the transcript of the interview, as well as in all reports and other publications generated from the data. Furthermore, the audio tapes will be destroyed upon the completion of the project, and the transcripts will be destroyed after five years. If the results of the study are published, your name will not be used and no information that discloses your identity and/or helps you be identified will be released or published.

If you agree to participate in this research project and accept the conditions outlined above, please sign the attached form and return it back directly to me before the interview.

If you have any questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research subject you may contact the Director, Office of Research Ethics, Western University, 519-661-3036 or e-mail at ethics@uwo.ca.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Guliz Akkaymak
Research and Teaching Assistant
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Sociology
Western University
London, ON N6A 5C2

Participant Initials: _____
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**Tentative Project Title:** Labour Market Integration of Immigrants from Turkey to Toronto and London, Ontario, Canada

**INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM**

Principal Investigator: Dr. Wolfgang Lehmann  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology  
Western University  
London, ON N6A 5C2

Co-investigator: Guliz Akkaymak  
Research and Teaching Assistant  
Department of Sociology  
Western University  
London, ON N6A 5C2

I have read the Letter of Information, have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

______________________________
Date

______________________________
Interviewee Name (please print)

______________________________
Interviewee Signature

______________________________
Name of Person Obtaining Informed Consent (please print)

______________________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Content
Appendix V: Researcher-Transcriptionist Confidentiality Agreement

Confidentiality Agreement

Transcriptionist

I, _______________________, transcriptionist, agree to maintain full confidentiality in regards to any and all audiotapes and documentation received from Guliz Akkaymak related to her research study, ‘Labour Market Integration of Immigrants from Turkey to Toronto and London, Ontario, Canada’ (tentative title). Furthermore, I agree:

1. To hold in strictest confidence the identification of any individual that may be inadvertently revealed during the transcription of audiotaped interviews, focus group or in any associated documents,

2. To not make copies of any audiotapes or computerized files of the transcribed interview texts,

3. To store all study-related audiotapes and materials in a safe, secure location as long as they are in my possession,

4. To return all audiotapes and study-related documents to Guliz Akkaymak in a complete and timely manner,

5. To delete all electronic files containing study-related documents from my computer hard drive and any backup devices.

I am aware that I can be held legally liable for any breach of this confidentiality agreement, and for any harm incurred by individuals if I disclose identifiable information contained in the audiotapes and/or files to which I will have access.

Date

Date

Transcriber’s Name

Researcher’s Name

Transcriber’s Signature

Researcher’s Signature
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