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The ethnically diverse composition of East Asian nations is recent and largely attributable to international marriages between women from poorer nations, such as China, Vietnam, Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines, to men from South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and Japan. Men from these countries go on marriage tours to ‘supply’ countries – organized by marriage brokers and agencies – to find a wife and then take her home. After arriving in their husband’s country of residence, these women are rarely referred to as 'immigrant women', but rather as 'foreign brides'. In addition to the compulsory household registration system that produces data on these women, both Taiwan and South Korea governments have conducted national ‘foreign brides’ surveys in the past several years in the name of good governance.

This paper analyzes the objectives and contents of these surveys and elaborates a criticism of the ethnic statistics produced from them. We argue that these surveys provide relevant information for a better understanding of foreign brides’ needs, but also have the potential to reinforce discrimination and segregation of new immigrants due to the negative prior assumptions that led to their design, implementation and analysis. The surveys do not produce data on new immigrants or citizens, but rather on foreign women who are primarily constructed as wives, mothers and daughters-in-law. Furthermore, pre-existing ideologies of gender, class and ethnicity are reproduced in these survey questionnaires. This paper shows that the political nature of the production of ethnic statistics in East Asia is intertwined with ideals of nationalism and ethnic homogeneity, on the one hand, and with the reality of ethnic diversity, on the other.
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Introduction

East Asian nations are currently being transformed through increasing numbers of foreign-born residents and their children living within their national borders, either temporarily or permanently. In addition, the two countries this paper focuses on – South Korea and Taiwan – were mostly emigration countries from the 1960s until recently with North America as the main destination (Tseng, 1995); they now have become the destination country of immigrants from China, Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia, The Philippines, Burma, Mongolia and other developing countries in Asia. These major transitions – from relatively homogenous to multi-ethnic and from emigration to immigration – challenge dominant ideologies of nationalism, population homogeneity, ethnicity, citizenship and mobility. The remote ‘other’ of the past could now be one’s neighbour, wife, daughter-in-law, co-worker, customer or patient. New residents and citizens are transforming the social landscape of these nations in an unprecedented way.

The ethnic diversity of East Asian countries intensified in the early 1990s as a result of two migration flows: temporary unskilled and low-skilled labour migration (documented and undocumented) and marriage-based settlement migration. These two types of migration are generally treated separately in research, but, in reality, they are intertwined and related, as argued by Piper and Roces (2004). Immigrant spouses are also workers (paid or unpaid) in their country of destination and some contract workers eventually settle permanently through marriage to a national of the host country. In Taiwan and South Korea, labour migrants and immigrant spouses may interact and form a...
received scholarly attention from migration scholars interested in labour import/export programs, the recruitment of workers and the economic costs and benefits of guest worker programs in Asia. In contrast, the permanent migration of Chinese and Southeast Asian women to South Korea and Taiwan has been studied mostly by feminist scholars and critical sociologists, perhaps because this migration flow consists primarily of women and takes place through marriage or family reunification. While neither South Korea, nor Taiwan, have comprehensive immigration policies (other than special provisions for highly qualified workers\(^2\)), immigrant spouses have been, nonetheless, entering their borders in increasingly larger numbers, slowly forming new ethnic communities. This social change led to the prevailing notions of ethnicity, national harmony and blood purity being questioned. Not only do immigrant spouses marry ethnic nationals; they also birth the nation’s next generation, which raises numerous questions with respect to the formation of identities and the meaning of origins. This paper focuses on this group of immigrant spouses, mostly comprised of women from China and Southeast Asia.

In this analysis, our first objective is to examine how the governments of countries that receive marriage-migrants from China and Southeast Asia deal with this new population from an administrative and policy point of view, particularly through the collection of data on this new ethnic community. Some immigrant spouses in Taiwan, for instance, open ethnic businesses that serve migrant workers from their country of origin. Permanent settlers thus economically benefit from the presence of their co-ethnic residents who are there on temporary visas. Despite the obvious connections between these two migration flows and their importance in the formation of ethnic communities, the factors that prompted them differ.

\(^2\) In recent Taiwan’s finished ‘Whitepaper on Migration’, the government has explicitly excluded the possibility of blue-collar migrant workers to settle permanently, while it has devoted a great part of the research to ‘how to attract high quality human resources to settle permanently in Taiwan’. See Tsai (2007). Interestingly, this recommendation is not consistent with Taiwan’s need for cheap labour. The underlying idea of this report is that working class individuals can be easily replaced by new migrants and are not worthy of Taiwanese citizenship, while educated and highly specialized individuals should settle in Taiwan.
group. If these countries do not consider themselves as immigration countries, they nonetheless compile data on ‘foreigners’. There is no debate about whether the state should or should not count foreigners, collect information on their characteristics and eventually use this information. In fact, it is taken for granted that the state has the power to collect data and to use them to either control foreigners or design policies to promote their assimilation. More specifically, we proceed to a critical discussion of the collection and use of data on immigrant spouses, generally referred to as ‘foreign brides’, through an analysis of survey questionnaires. Through our analysis, we examine state discourse about ethnicity and diversity because data collected on ‘foreigners’ reveal how these individuals are categorized, labelled, positioned and, thus, statistically constructed. We argue that, while the data produced may inspire good governance of the immigrant population, they can also serve to reinforce stereotypes and spread discrimination. We also assess the impact of these newly produced ‘ethnic’ data. Both the similarities and differences between Taiwan and South Korea are discussed, while references to Japan come from existing literature and research.

The paper begins with a presentation of our conceptual framework. We then provide background information on the collection of statistics on ethnicity in South Korea and Taiwan from an historical perspective. We then provide a brief overview of the trend of marriage-migration, and proceed to the analysis of three surveys conducted on ‘foreign brides’, two in South Korea and one in Taiwan. We close with a discussion of how these surveys contribute to the construction of identities.
Conceptual framework

Research in the social sciences documents that modern states keep statistics on population as a way of categorizing and controlling its citizens. Historically, governing powers were mostly interested in collecting taxes and recruiting military forces and paid little, if any, attention to ethnicity (Kertzer and Arel, 2002). However, in the 20th century, ethnicity, as a marker of identity, became increasingly at stake in the collection of demographic data.

A Foucauldian approach to power considers how the state’s labelling of individuals has been utilized to justify the power to govern these individuals in a certain way. In other words, the power of categorizing and naming has led to the power of controlling. While this is true of sexual orientation as illustrated in the History of Sexuality, it may also be true in the case of ethnicity, as argued by Susan Greenhalgh and Edwin Winckler (2005) in the case of China’s one-child-policy that differentiated the Han Chinese from other ethnic groups. This policy was designed as a two-tier policy based on the ethnicity of citizens whereby Han Chinese were submitted to a one-child-policy and the other ethnic groups to a two-child-policy. Through the creation of categories (through labelling), the state enforced its control over births and bodies.

In addition to broader theoretical considerations about power, identity and ethnicity, this paper will respond to critiques of demography and social statistics who call for better documentation underlying assumptions leading to the design of so-called objective indicators, measures and survey instruments (Riley et al., 2005). Unlike other social sciences, quantitative sociology and demography have largely been left out of the postmodern debate.
raising numerous questions on categories, ethics and the power of science and of researchers to construct individuals in potentially harming or negative ways. Kerzer and Arel (2002) provide a rich discussion on how the census – and demographic data by extension – is a vantage point of observation on how states have constructed identities and statistical ‘realities’ through the design of certain questions and categories. Simply put, these authors argue that ‘the census does not simply reflect reality but plays a role in constructing reality.’ (p. 2) This issue is particularly important to study, since categories assigned to individuals can shape how they self-construct and identify themselves as individuals and in relationship to other ‘groups’. Many ethnic conflicts of the XXe century were the outcomes of internalized political and social constructions of ethnicity created by governments and leaders in prior decades. Ethnic conflicts in the Balkans and Rwanda are among them and have resulted in devastating consequences. In addition, ethnic constructions from below arise from daily encounters between residents from various backgrounds and classes – perceived as ethnic differences by the people involved – and can also lead to ethnic tensions. Saracoglu argues that in the case of Turkey, the Kurds-Turks daily life tensions mostly originate from class differences, but they are thought to have ethnic roots (ref). He calls this ethnicization process ‘exclusive recognition’, a process whereby the dominant group first ethnicizes another group in a certain way and then excludes them on the basis of the ethnic construction produced.

Thus, constructions of ethnicity, in part, result from various typologies categorizing individuals into groups according to an array of often fluid and problematic criteria. The confusion between race and ethnicity, evident in the data collected in the United States, is a case in point frequently discussed by scholars (ref). Censuses around the world and
throughout history have served to construct ethnic identities, and one of the first
categorizations produced by censuses ‘was the division between citizens and non-citizens or
the related – but distinct – division between those born within the state and those born
abroad.’ (Kertzer and Arel, p.). Some countries have moved from an administrative measure
of ethnicity to one that encompasses its subjective experiences. Census or survey questions on
ethnic ancestry, ethnic self-identification, sense of belonging to ethnic communities and
languages are among the many ways that censuses construct individuals and communities
along ethnic lines. Canada’s model, with its notion of ‘visible minorities’, is one response to
the need for recognizing ethnic plurality in statistical data.

Governments have dealt in various ways with census or survey taking when used to collect
ethnic statistics. Rallu, Piché and Simon (2005) provide a useful framework for analyzing
practices concerning the collection of ethnic statistics across time and space. They document
the various strategies and positions adopted by countries. Their typology can be summarized
as follows:

1. Counting to dominate, to exclude. In this type of ethnic ‘counting’ the dominant wish is to
identify ‘others’ in order to exclude them from citizenship rights. This approach was common
during the colonial period. The authors specify that, in extreme cases, ethnic markers are
recorded on identification documents. Here, ideologies of racism and hierarchy lead to social
exclusion and social segregation. Examples from this type of approach abounded in the
colonial period and continue to exist.
2. *Not counting to unify and assimilate.* Countries choosing not to count claim that labelling is excluding. In this case, the fear is that essentializing individuals to their established ‘ethnicity’ could lead to equating social and cultural identities to biological markers.

3. *Counting or not counting in the name of multiculturalism.* This approach refers to the Latin American experience where the idea of a ‘radically democratic and non-discriminatory society’ (536) prevails. In response to an openly acknowledged racial mixing of its positive value, some countries do not collection any data on ethnicity, race or color, while others do.

4. *Counting as positive action.* This recent approach recognizes multiculturalism, but it also acknowledges structural inequalities due to ethnicity. The objective of this strategy is closely associated with policy change to promote greater equality for all residents or citizens. Positive discrimination policies can be the outcome of such an approach to ‘counting’.

Following their review of various examples based on this typology, the authors argue that, ‘In short, the intrinsically ambivalent nature of ethnic data must be emphasized, in the sense that, as we stated previously, they can confirm hierarchical organization, as well as be used in aiming for equality.’ (533).

East Asian countries’ approach to ethnic diversity offers an interesting combination of ‘positions’ found elsewhere through time and space. First, East Asian nations share the French Republican concept of the nation-state where the divides between the citizens and the foreign-born is particularly sharp. In France, assimilation is taken for granted as a process that will occur with time and over several generations. For this reason, ethnic data are not collected because these data are perceived as having the power to reinforce differences and discrimination. Even the counting of foreign-born or second-generation citizens (children of
immigrants born in France) led to a tumultuous controversy among scholars (ref). In contrast, East Asian nations collect data on foreigners and judge these operations as essential to good governance and policy planning. Given that stance on ‘counting’, East Asian countries never question the necessity and usefulness of ‘counting’. In East Asia, nationalism and ideologies of homogeneity compete with emerging discourses around multiculturalism. These antagonistic positions, however, are difficult to reconcile and lead to contradictions.

Informed by these various ideas and conceptions the ‘counting’ of ethnicity, we, thus, endorse the viewpoint that ‘others’ in Taiwan and South Korea are, in part, being constructed through statistical data collected, analyzed and disseminated. Through the analysis of survey questionnaires designed to collect data on immigrant spouses and their families, we attempt to begin a critical analysis of the social constructions of female immigrants. Our aim is not simply to deconstruct a process, but to open a discussion on its impact – both positive and potentially negative – on society and on immigrants themselves.

**Background**

*National statistics and ethnicity in Taiwan and Korea*

In 1905 the colonial Japanese government began the first population census in its empire, which was carried out in Taiwan only (not even in Japan). In this first census there were four ethnic groups: Japanese (*Naichijin*), Taiwanese (*Hondojin*), Aborigines (*Seibanjin*) and foreigner (*Gaikokujin*). In the second population census, the colonial government began to distinguish Minnan, Hokkien and Plains Aborigines, who had been categorized as Taiwanese (*Hondojin*) in the previous census. In the five subsequent censuses, this ethnic categorization
did not change. When China took over Taiwan in 1945, its first population census also used colonial categories. In the 1956 census, there were only two ‘ethnic’ categories: Taiwanese (Bensheng) and Mainlander (Waisheng). On the national ID card, there was a column marking one of these two ‘ethnicities’ (jiguan). This ethnic category on the ID card was abolished in 1992. In the post-war Nationalist censuses, Taiwan’s aboriginal category was abandoned and then restored in the 2000 general census. The ethnic identity of aboriginals was reinstated in official statistics, since aboriginals were recognized as being a different ethnic group that receives dissimilar treatment from the Taiwanese government. Lobbying for the rights of indigenous people likely played a role in the reinstatement of this category in the Taiwanese census.

Both the colonial and post-war Nationalist governments used censuses to enhance their political control over the colonized. The household registration was created by the Japanese colonial government in 1905 to monitor and control the rebels and to design a national security system that kept track of all activities of the Taiwanese. Using the population census, the Japanese colonial government immediately improved the household registration system, and required from all individuals living in Taiwan to register. The household registration system was administered by the police (Chan, 2005). After the Nationalist government took over Taiwan in 1949, they modified the existing ethnic census categories and grouped all indigenous peoples into one category (Shanbao, equivalent to Seibanjin in Japanese colonial period) and created the Mainlander category (Jiguan). Since the Mainlanders took power in

---

3 After the Communist Party under the leadership of Ma Zedong won the civil war in China, the members of the Nationalist party led by Chiang Kai-shek sought refuge in Taiwan. An estimated 2 million refugees fled to Taiwan after 1949. They were mostly males and working in the government, in the military or in business. It 1987, these refugees were allowed to visit China.

4 In the 2000 census, there are 397,535 people classified as aboriginals in Taiwan. See DGBAS (2007).
1949, they initiated a process of ethnic differentiation to allocate more benefits to Mainlanders, who were the recent immigrants from Mainland China, and to exclude Taiwanese from political power and other advantages (Wang, 2001). The census and other tools used to label and categorize people, like the ID card and residents’ registration system, have been important means of ethnic differentiation and population control in post-war Taiwan.

The first population census in Korea was conducted in 1925 under Japanese colonial rule. Its legal basis was the 1925 Simplified Population Census Ordinance (the Chosun Governor Ordinance No. 66) as promulgated in May 1925 (Kim, 2004: 34-35). According to the 1925 Ordinance, there were five ethnic categories (nationalities): 1) Japanese (內地人), 2) Korean (朝鮮人), 3) Chinese (支那人), 4) Other Foreigner (其他外國人), and 5) colonial (殖民地人)5. After 1925, the population census was conducted every five years under Japanese rule, with the last one being carried out in 1944. This particular census was done one year prior to regular years ending in “0” or “5” by the Resource Survey Act with the purpose of identifying human resources for conscription during World War II. The population census conducted under Japanese colonial rule was aimed at controlling the colonized and maximizing the exploitation of the Korean labour force. Thus, the results of the population censuses of 1940 and 1944 were kept confidential and public use was prohibited (Kim, 2004: 35). After independence, the first Korean government constructed the new nation as essentially Korean and homogeneous with only differentiated two groups: Koreans and non-Koreans.

5 The numbers were 1) Japanese (443,402), 2) Korean (19,020,030), 3) Chinese (58,057), 4) Other Foreigner (1,447), and 5) colonial (9) in 1925.
After 1955, the questions regarding Korean or foreign nationality were abandoned and the Ministry of Justice began to collect data on foreigners living in Korea (emigration and immigration data). The population census, in a more modern sense, began with the 1960 census. This census was conducted according to the UN World Census Program and the UN Statistical Advisory Commission visited Korea to provide technical advisory support. One of the distinctive features of the 1960 population census was that it was conducted on a *de jure* basis as in many other countries (Kim, 2004: 36). Due to rapidly increasing marriage migration and the settlement of new groups of residents, a question on foreigners’ country of origin was reinstated in the 2005 census. This was in response to the need for additional data on immigrants.

*Migration and ethnic diversity*

South Korea, Japan and Taiwan qualify as ‘ethnic nationalist regimes’ that do not consider themselves ‘immigration countries’. The political leaders of these countries construct their nations as ethnically homogeneous, and this homogeneity is perceived as being fundamental to the nation’s stability (in the case of both South Korea and Taiwan) and population quality (in the case of Taiwan). When they opened their doors to foreign-born individuals, East Asian governments favoured their ethnic counterparts living in other countries: Taiwan let many ethnic Chinese in Southeast Asia resettle in Taiwan after 1960; South Korea allowed the migration of ethnic Korean women to work as domestic workers starting in 1990s; and Japan

---

6 The first census after liberation from Japanese rule in 1945 was conducted as of May 1st, 1949. It was done after one year earlier than the regular census year because the new government established in 1948 immediately required population statistics for various policies and plans. All census data, however, were lost during the Korean War with the exception of the preliminary report which only provides the size of the total population (Kim, 2004: 35).

7 In addition to census data, both Taiwan and South Korea have excellent vital statistics and residents’ registration system.
opened migration to South American ethnic Japanese in the early 1990s to fill labour shortages. The ‘co-ethnic foreign-born’ is constructed as sharing a similar culture and, thus, having less potential to harm national homogeneity. Taiwan is the exception to this general position towards Chinese from Mainland China. Due to ‘security’ issues, migrants from China cannot work in Taiwan, but women from Mainland China, however, can reside in Taiwan as the wives of Taiwanese men.

Labour needs, however, could not be fulfilled with co-ethnic foreign-born alone (due to supply and political reasons) and the door had to be opened to other foreigners; therefore, the multi-ethnic make-up of these countries increased. Southeast Asian labour migrants are now found in all economically developed countries of East Asia and in Malaysia, since the demand for workers in the 3Ds sectors cannot be met by the national work force. ‘Labour import policies’ – as opposed to ‘immigration policies’ – are, thus, designed to deal with shortages of cheap labour. Under these policies, foreign workers are not entitled to stay beyond the duration of their contract and do not come accompanied by family members. While guest worker programs in Europe have failed, due to the large number of workers who overstay and eventually settle in ethnic communities, East Asian countries hope to avoid settlement by implementing harsh policies that give limited rights to temporary migrants and repatriate undocumented workers who are caught almost immediately.

---

8 The entry granted to co-ethnic individuals is generally for labour purposes. It is not designed to facilitate the return and settlement of co-ethnic individuals who happened to be born abroad and desire to ‘come back’ to the motherland, as in the case of Germany and its ‘ethnic citizenship regime’. Even in Germany, however, this rhetoric does not exclude that bringing in co-ethics as migrants responds to the need for labour.

9 The exception to this treatment is South American Japanese ethnic migrants who were entitled to settle in Japan.
In addition to pressures to fill labour shortages, East Asian countries began to ‘import foreign wives’ in the 1990s. The literature on the causes of this migration flow can be divided into three groups. First, for feminist scholars this migration flow, for the most part, is the outcome of regional inequalities and globalization. In these processes, women are agents seizing migration opportunities or victims trapped in unequal relationships in which they have limited power and face numerous vulnerabilities. Some of this research focuses on trafficking networks embedded in this migration flow. Some activists consider all marriage-migration to be trafficking, since many women are, at some point of the process, deceived, ill-informed and, in some cases, abused. Second, research in demography emphasizes the increasing proportion of East Asian women remaining single beyond the ages of 30 and 35, which leads to a marriage squeeze for men in their early 40s. Since marriage remains highly desirable for men, they and their families have to turn to the ‘international marriage market’ and ‘import a bride’. Third, other researchers stress the role of institutions in promoting these marriages, which ‘creates’ a demand for foreign brides’. The intermediary sector with its private brokers and matchmaking agencies, as well as religious institutions and local governments subsidizing or favouring international marriages, have been studied as critical agents of the increase in marriage-migration in the region. A complete perspective, we contend, would incorporate all three factors.

It is only recently that receiving countries have begun to consider ‘foreign wives’ as permanent residents to which attention must be paid. As a result, in the past few years, there has been a surge in funding and new initiatives to deal with the ‘foreign bride problem’ (Taiwan) or the ‘international family issue’ (South Korea). Both countries have begun to
promote the idea of multiculturalism. As part of this political desire to acknowledge the presence and impact of the newcomers, initially constructed as being able to assimilate, since they are ‘members of our families, not immigrants’\textsuperscript{10}, research and programs have been heavily funded by the State, through public services or state-funded NGOs.

The Taiwanese government changed its policy toward foreign spouses from exclusion to inclusion after 2002. This change is most obvious in the entitlement of social rights, including easier access to the job market, free Mandarin language instruction and public health coverage. The government also started collecting data on a regular basis on this group of immigrants in order to improve their policies and programs. Since 2003, the Taiwanese government has devoted significant funding to social services for immigrants. Some of these state resources are channelled to NGOs, who are encouraged to develop service provision and delivery for immigrant spouses. Tsai and Hsiao (2006) point out that 46 registered NGOs in Taiwan claimed that their main task is to serve the needs of foreign spouses. Almost all of these organizations were set up between 2003 and 2005 in response to the government’s funding allocation to NGOs serving the immigrant spouses community\textsuperscript{11}. These NGOs are project-oriented, and, without government funding, they might not be able to function. In return for providing funding, as in Japan, the government expects these NGOs to work as an extension of the government by providing essential social services (Takao, 2001: 298).

Prior to 2004, the Korean government was not concerned about foreign spouses; only some local governments and NGOs were (Lee, 2008). The central government began to pay

\textsuperscript{10} Expression used by a Taiwanese researcher during a conversation with the first author of this paper.

\textsuperscript{11} One NGO representative said “government funds did play an important role to facilitate the direction and functioning of the NGOs for foreign spouses” (2006: 25)
attention to the new immigrants when 16 congressmen, most representing rural constituencies, submitted a law in February 2005, proposing the regulation of international marriage agencies. Upon their request, the Ministry of Health and Welfare asked several scholars to investigate the characteristics and situations of foreign wives in 2005 (one of the surveys analyzed in this paper). Based on the findings this nationwide survey (Seol et al., 2005), the government announced the ‘Grand Plan’ on April 26, 2006, and the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family became the leading coordinating department, while other ministries including the Ministry of Justice, Labor, Health and Welfare, along with local and central government departments had to participate in the ‘Grand Plan’. The 2006 ‘Grand Plan’ includes various services, such as Korean language instruction, cultural education and employment training. Since 2006, the Korean government has devoted considerable funding to social services for immigrant wives (Lee, 2008).

The ethnic diversity of South Korea is tangible when considering that, in 2006, over 900,000 of the population consisted in foreign residents. Of this total, about 94,000 were marriage migrants. In Taiwan, there were about 439,000 foreign workers in 2006. Figure 1 shows the increase in international marriages in Korea and Taiwan since the late 1990s. We see the larger numbers for Taiwan than for Korea. Figure 2 shows the most important countries of origin of the foreign spouses. The two countries share as their top sending countries of marriage migrants China, Vietnam and Japan. Figure 3 alludes to the depth of the phenomenon in Taiwan with data on the proportions of all registered marriages that were international marriages (one foreign spouse) and the proportion of all newborn babies per year.

---

12 The total population in 2006 was about 48,000,000. The proportion of foreign born was thus relatively small, but compared to what it was just a few years before, it is a notable increase.
13 Taiwan’s total population was approximately 23,000,000 in 2006.
that have a foreign mother. In 2003, nearly a third of all marriages registered that year involved a foreign spouse and over 13% of children born that year had a foreign mother. In South Korea, we see on figure 3 that the proportion of international marriages among all marriages is lower than in Taiwan but has surpassed 13% of all marriages in 2005. These data show that the phenomenon of international marriage is no longer anecdotal but that it is transforming these societies.

Recent immigrants and ethnic diversity: Surveying foreign spouses and their families

The Taiwan survey, called the “Census on Living Conditions of Foreign and Mainland Chinese Spouses”, was conducted in 2002 by the Ministry of Interior Affairs. The census intended to survey nearly all registered foreign spouses in Taiwan and had an original list of 240,834 respondents. In the end 175,894 responded to the questionnaire administered face-to-face by an army of trained civil servants (Chen, 2006). The Ministry of Interior (2003), as reported in the preface of the final report of this census, had invited experts, different government bodies and local governments to design questions. Before the government conducted this census, it organized information campaigns (for instance, on TV) to disseminate the objectives: firstly, the data collected were to provide an important reference for the government to enact laws concerning foreign and Chinese spouses; secondly, data were to be used to build a databank for future surveys and services provided for foreign spouses; and thirdly, information collected would be utilized to analyze spouses’ family life, fertility, children’s conditions, employment situations, medical care and other needs so that
the government and civil organizations could provide medical care, employment and other services to those in need.

In contrast to the short questionnaire administered to the majority of foreign brides living in Taiwan in 2002, South Korea opted for sample surveys and was thus able to administer much more comprehensive questionnaires. The first Korean survey, funded by the Ministry of Health and Welfare in 2005, was called the ‘Survey for the welfare state of the international marriage family’ (n=945). The second survey, conducted in 2006, funded by the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, was called the ‘Survey on the conjugal life of the international marriage family’ (n=1,177)14.

The following main themes were identified to describe the various categories of questions included in the three questionnaires (see appendix of paper for details on the structure and contents of the three surveys): Demographic and personal information; immigration process; family structure and health (in Korea or Taiwan); raising and educating children; relationship with spouse; economic activities (employment and management of family financial resources); financial status of the family; assessment of needs and demands of social welfare; daily life; social attitudes and values; and roles (including questions on self-assessed ethnicity and ethnicity of children).

---

14 Of this total sample of 1,177, 1063 were foreign female spouses and 114 were foreign male spouses. The questionnaire was mostly designed for female spouses so we focus our analysis on the identity construction process of this group.
The construction of identities through survey questions

These questionnaires primarily constructed immigrant women as foreigners married to nationals or citizens. The three survey names do not include the word ‘immigrant’ (although some questions of the South Korean surveys do). In Taiwan, these immigrants are called ‘foreign and Mainland Chinese spouses’, which binds them with their spouse and in their marriage. The South Korean surveys explicitly locate these ‘foreigners’ in marriages and families by calling the target population ‘the international marriage family’. In all three surveys, the women are, therefore, primarily defined as foreign wives and mothers, and their status as immigrant and new resident or citizen is secondary. In terms of their status as immigrants, women are pre-defined as ‘having problems’. Thus, the surveys project an idea of numerous areas of difficulties met by foreign wives and mothers. On the one hand, a paternalistic attitude towards ‘poor foreign women in need of help’ underlies many of the questions. On the other hand, questions about past use of, current need for and adequacy of social services for immigrants signal a political will to develop and improve services in the context of a multi-ethnic society. An examination of the questionnaire reveals the following constructions of this group of immigrant women.

Immigrant spouses as having adaptation problems

One obvious impetus for conducting surveys with immigrant spouses is that these new immigrants are considered at risk of experiencing difficulties. An untold assumption is that, because these women come from ‘poor’ countries of Southeast Asia, they are prone to facing difficulties in adapting to daily life in a developed society. Questionnaires, therefore, ask
respondents (1) if they need assistance to adapt and (2) if existing services have answered their needs.

Immigrant spouses as potential victims

Immigrant spouses are portrayed in the Taiwanese, Vietnamese and South Korean mass media as opportunists who are using marriage to migrate internationally, but also as potential victims of trafficking, domestic violence and abuse. In the surveys, the second construction is adopted and women are classified as vulnerable, particularly to domestic violence. In the Taiwanese survey, in a question about the types of training the respondents would like to have, women have to choose from list that includes ‘seminar on domestic violence and sexual offences’. The Korean surveys also include questions on whether or not the respondent was in need of counselling about abuse or family violence. A direct question about past experience of domestic violence since migration to South Korea is also included.

Immigrant spouses as problematic mothers

A major concern of receiving nations of immigrant spouses from Southeast Asia and China has to do with the impact on the next generation. These women are considered, a priori, as being problematic mothers who will encounter difficulties in raising their children. Survey questions reveal the type of difficulties that are foreseen throughout their children’s lives. First, the ability to provide proper infant care is questioned. The South Korean surveys ask whether a child has been vaccinated properly. The Taiwanese questionnaire includes a series of options to a question on demand for health care that include ‘antenatal and postpartum advice, information on contraception, information on children’s health and children’s health
checkups. The question on the need for training includes the option of training about ‘parenting and baby care’ and ‘women and children’s safety’.

The issue of language and education is particularly at stake here. Given the highly demanding and competitive education system of East Asian countries, a foreign mother who does not master the language her child is being taught in is perceived as being unable to offer adequate support to her child. In Taiwan, the reality is that most working parents, particularly in urban areas, have limited time to offer help with homework. Rather, after the regular school day, their children attend a private school where they are supervised to complete their homework and are taught additional classes. The questionnaires suggest that women bear most of the responsibility for their children’s success or failure as students. The South Korean surveys ask elaborate sets of questions on the mother’s ability to help with homework (the same question is asked about her spouse) and any difficulties she faces15. A question asks whether the child ever had problems with schoolwork or relationships with teachers; a general question asks about difficulties encountered in child rearing.

The South Korean surveys also include questions on the use of mother tongue16. Based on fieldwork that we have done in South Korea and Taiwan, we see that most women prefer not to speak their native language to their children. First, some husbands and in-laws forbid the mother’s usage of her native language because they cannot understand it. Second, many women have internalized the idea that their children must only speak Chinese or Korean for their own benefit. Not speaking one’s mother tongue could enhance school performance (by

15 Q B-32-1. What is the most difficult problem when you help your children with their home work?
16 C12. What language do you use when you talk to your children? Choose that all apply.
C13. When you talk with your children, how often do you use your mother tongue?
avoiding language confusion and taking longer to learn the father’s language) and social integration (by not being identified as the child of a foreign mother). The benefits of bilingualism are rarely underscored, particularly in South Korea\textsuperscript{17}.

Overall, parenting skills of immigrant women are, thus, assessed through different questions. Obviously, families with a foreign bride are constructed as potentially problematic and parents of children born into these families are under scrutiny for any problems that could harm the country and its future. Hsia’s (2007) argument that the Taiwanese mass media construct immigrant spouses as a ‘social problem’ is also echoed by government survey instruments that collect data on this group of residents.

\textit{Immigrant spouses as lacking support and suffering from social exclusion}

An examination of survey questionnaires reveals that immigrant spouses lack support. Women are surveyed about their use of social services for people in need of various forms of support, and they are asked whether they have experienced discrimination\textsuperscript{18}. Wang and Bélanger (forthcoming) note in another paper how, in Taiwan, the fact that immigrant spouses (permanent settlers) and migrant workers (temporary residents) have the same ID card leads to a de facto discrimination, since potential employers can suspect that a migrant worker is pretending to be an immigrant spouse. This problem creates difficulties when women try to

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} Given these prevailing norms, it is unlikely that women will openly declare whether they speak their mother tongue to their child or not.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} This question is : Q H4: “While staying in Korea, have you ever felt that Korean people discriminate against you (or your family)?” The questionnaire also includes a more positive question : Q H6: “While staying in Korea, how have you ever been shown a special hospitality since you’re foreigner?”
\end{flushright}
secure employment. Women must provide additional documentation to show that they are married to a Taiwanese man, but the potential confusion remains.

Children of immigrant spouses as potentially problematic

Children of foreign mothers from poor countries of Southeast Asia and from China are flagged by authorities as potentially problematic children. In the case of Taiwan, the issue of ‘population quality’ is raised in various ways. Government officials make statements on the importance of maintaining this quality for the future competitiveness of the country. Much research is being done on children of immigrant spouses to monitor their health, intelligence and school performance. In South Korea, foreign spouses have not been labelled as being a potential threat to population quality. However, fears that children of foreign mothers will face bullying and discrimination exist, as revealed by survey questions such as these:

C14. Among your children, has he/she ever had serious difficulties in friend relationship? C15. Have your children ever experienced bullying by other children of the same age? If so, why do you think? C16. What are the difficulties you face in bringing up your children?

Both South Korean and Taiwanese surveys include a set of questions about each of the respondents children: date of birth, gender, education and employment status. The last column of the table collecting this information is about the ‘health situation’ of the child. The categories include good, retarded development\(^{19}\), physically and mentally disabled and serious illness (Taiwanese questionnaire). The South Korea questionnaire added two categories to this question, learning ability and language development (normal or delayed).

\(^{19}\) On the Taiwanese questionnaire, a red-inked mark is put that defines ‘development retarded children’ as “children under the age of six who suffer from deviant development and need early treatment”.
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Gaps and silences of these surveys

Because these surveys locate female respondents in a patriarchal order (both in the household and within the nation), there are many silences (or questions not asked) in these surveys that are revealing of the statistically constructed identities of immigrant women. The questionnaires give very limited room to women as members of society beyond their households. Women’s contribution to their host society is confined to their roles as mothers and wives, and it gives little room for their participation in civil society. In other words, because women are constructed as disadvantaged needy individuals, they build networks to seek help, not to develop belonging and participation in their host societies.

A question in Taiwan survey is symptomatic of this void in the survey. Among all the presumptions of this census, the government does not conceive that these immigrants spouses can build their own social and support networks, or that they can contribute to Taiwanese society. The census does not collect information on their links with their natal families, though it is quite common that the two families are linked by their family members’ frequent mutual visits, e.g., natal family mother comes to Taiwan to help during the ‘sitting month’ (month-long postpartum rest and recuperation culturally prescribed after the birth of a child). Nor is the question of language used in family is asked, for the children of these immigrant spouses are supposed to be ‘Taiwan’s children’, and it is mother’s obligation to learn Mandarin and to teach it to her children, and not the Taiwan society to provide congenial environment to preserve multicultural lingual conditions (Wang and Belanger, 2007).

Therefore, these immigrant mothers are supposed to be in need of ‘life adaptation courses’ and the government should provide such language training course. In South Korea, the
construction, although at times paternalistic, is more open and situates the women not only in her family, but also in society and in relationship to her family in her home country.

Women’s work is not conceived as a way to seek self-fulfillment and empowerment. The following question practically reads as though if women work, it must be because they could not survive otherwise or because they are under pressure. The silence around women’s agency in the process of migrating, adjusting and integrating to their host society is also apparent throughout the questionnaires.

The issue of ethnicity

One primary focus of this paper is how statistical categories contribute in the construction of ethnic identities. So far, our examination of the ‘foreign brides surveys’ has mainly outlined how female foreigners living in the country through marriage are portrayed through certain survey questions and the absence of others.

The questionnaires reflect the divide between two categories of foreign wives: the co-ethnic foreign wives and the other foreign wives. Taiwan and South Korea define co-ethnic in different ways, at least in their statistical categories. In Taiwan, co-ethnic wives come from mainland China, although some Chinese ethnic spouses come from Indonesia. In statistical categories, however, country of origin (taken as country of citizenship) takes precedence over the ethnicity of the person. In data, Chinese wives are considered ‘Chinese” while Chinese-ethnic Indonesians are primarily considered ‘Indonesians’. In fact, it seems that the political elites’ priority is origin, rather then ethnicity, given the political dimension involved in having
a large number of immigrant spouses from Mainland China. Policies regarding access to Taiwanese citizenship also divide foreign wives into these two groups: Chinese spouses must reside eight years in Taiwan before they qualify for citizenship, whereas women from other countries can apply after only four years of residency. This differential policy is political, based on the military security problem between Taiwan and China. By the end of 2006, there were 2385,185 couples with a Chinese spouse. After 2003, Taiwan discouraged the entry of foreign wives from Mainland China due to the political concerns raised by the very large number of women married to Taiwanese men. For various reasons, for example, population quality, the Taiwanese government began restricting Vietnamese women from marrying Taiwanese men after 2004; this reduced the number of marriages between the Taiwanese and Vietnamese.

South Korea sometimes treats ethnic-Koreans from China as a distinct group, separate from all others, but this is mostly in research focusing on ‘foreign spouses’. In the two South Korean surveys analyzed, ethnic-Koreans of various groups are ‘counted’ and special questions on the ethnic origin of their parents are included. The 2006 questionnaire includes five groups of ethnic-Koreans: Japanese, Uzbekistani, Chinese, Kazakhstani and Russian. The question also includes 15 other nationalities\(^{20}\). For any of these groups, a question asks respondents if their mother, father or both parents are ethnic Koreans. Belonging to an ethnic-Korean group is, thus, a very important marker of identity among immigrants and seems to be given primacy over knowledge of Korean language (not necessarily automatic among all ethnic-Koreans born and raised outside Korea) or other characteristics.

\(^{20}\) List 15 others from questions A3 of 2006 questionnaire here. +one category for ‘others’.
In a Japanese survey on ethnic-Japanese from South America, more detailed questions were asked to trace the first immigrant from Japan in this person’s genealogy. Thus, questions made it possible to assess the ‘closeness’ or ‘distance’ between the original Japanese ancestor (or pioneer migrant) and the migrant from Latin America living in Japan. This degree of concern towards ethnic origin and distance from the ‘motherland’ is not apparent in Taiwan or South Korea. In Taiwan, since the government assumes that all Taiwanese are from China, there is no need to distinguish the ‘closeness’, although the social life and networks of the immigrants from China after 1949 are different from those Chinese who migrated to Taiwan before 1895, the year that Japanese took over from the Qing Dynasty.

The issue of ethnicity, citizenship and identity is addressed directly in the Korean surveys. First, the surveys include a set of questions on the respondent’s citizenship (previous and current) as well as questions on the respondent’s intentions and preferences with respect to future citizenship. Respondents are asked if they intend to acquire Korean citizenship or permanent residency and why. These questions are on facts and intentions. The 2006 survey includes an interesting module on perceptions of ethnicity. Respondents are asked if they think of themselves as ‘Korean citizens’ or as ‘citizens of their country of origin’, or both (in the questionnaire as ‘ethnic Koreans’ or ‘ethnic of their country of origin’, or ‘both’. The same two questions are asked about the respondents’ perception of their children (and, if they were still childless, to answer how they would feel about their children). These few questions allude to the issue of ethnicity as an issue of self-identity, particularly with the generation of so called ‘mixed blood’ children born into international marriages. Degree of assimilation is also a concern measured by these questions.
Another variable commonly used to ‘assess’ ethnicity in other countries is language. The 2006 South Korean survey includes two questions on languages: ‘what language do you use when you speak to your children?’ and a separate question asking ‘how often do you use your mother tongue with your children?’ These questions, however, are tied to the raising of children and seem to suggest that speaking Korean to one’s children will enhance their education and school performance, while speaking one’s mother tongue could be harmful to a child’s success. This question is, therefore, more a measure of assimilation than an attempt to capture ethnic diversity through the use of multiple languages in households.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the construction of ethnicity that we document suggests two ideologies. First, immigrant spouses are foreigner, but ‘foreigners’ that are part of national families. Although they are integrated in families upon their arrival in the host society, they still face challenges similar to the ones faced by immigrants in general. Surveys suggest that these challenges might be exacerbated when women originate from poor countries in the region. These women experience particularly difficult adaptive processes, since they must adapt at a fast pace under extraordinary conditions: they are parachuted into families that speak Korean or Chinese and have an existing network into which, in most cases, they can be inserted. Through their children, they rapidly connect with institutions, services and other families. Although they may form network ties with their co-ethnics in language programs, they spend most of their time with members of their host societies. The second ideology apparent in these questionnaires is assimilation. Despite political and policy discourse on multiculturalism that
exists in both countries, the desire to ‘erase’ differences and promote assimilation underlies survey questionnaires. In the surveys, migrants’ contributions to host societies other than in domestic and mothering work, knowledge of languages (other than English) as an asset for the future and connections to their mother’s home country as enriching their network are not present.

These complex and contradictory constructed identities of women as ‘foreigners’, ‘part of national families’ and ‘as easily assimilated’ (or at least their children) take us back to Rallu, Piche and Simon’s typology of approaches to ‘counting’ (2005). Going back to their four categories, Taiwan and South Korea suggest a mixed. First, given the underlying assimilation ideology of the surveys examined in this paper, the counting, to some extent, aims at controlling immigrant spouses. Although the aim is to assimilate and measure the degree of assimilation, data produced through these surveys may instead reinforce exclusion and stereotypes and, thus, make assimilation impossible. Second, despite discourse on multiculturalism, surveys do not display multicultural values. Finally, the surveys are evidently conducted to promote positive action through an assessment of needs for social services. Immigrants’ voices, however, are given little room in this assessment, since their categories of needs are defined in rather constraining ways. Given the confines of the current ‘foreign wife’ box, immigrant women’s resourcefulness, agency and ability to contribute to society as citizens has yet to be acknowledged through data and knowledge production.

Despite similarities between Taiwan and South Korea in the constructions of identities performed through the collection of statistical data, important differences emerge from our
analysis. First of all, Taiwan’s construction of immigrant spouses seems much narrower, compared to that in South Korea. South Korea focuses on ‘international marriages or ‘international families’, as opposed to ‘foreign brides’ only. Surveys in the two countries speak to these differences: in South Korea male foreign spouses were also surveyed in 2006, while in Taiwan it was female foreign spouses only and their Taiwanese spouses. Research on international marriage in Korea includes the presentation of data on foreign spouses from all origins, while in Taiwan the phenomenon is a priori constructed as mainly being an issue of ‘foreign brides’ from poor nations of Asia. South Korea’s approach to data collection seems more in line with the country’s attempts to grapple with rapidly increasing multiculturalism, while Taiwan’s approach remains exclusive, aimed at assimilation and even discriminatory. Policies have substantially evolved since Taiwan conducted this survey, however, a fuller political recognition of the new ethnic make-up of Taiwan has yet to come.

Why are there important differences in the Taiwanese and South Korean responses to immigration through marriage? First, academic researchers (men and women) from different disciplines were closely associated with the planning, design and conduct of the South Korean surveys. In Taiwan, foreign brides were, in part, brought in as a response to very low fertility, associated with singlehood. Due to this demographic take on the phenomenon and the fact that most academics involved were demographers (and not sociologists), the dominant construction of this migration flow is primarily focused on its demographic impact. The current left-wing government of Korea is also pro-immigrant and works in partnership with NGOs. In addition, this political inclination favoured the types of surveys that were conducted. In Taiwan, the pre-existing political divide between ‘Taiwanese’ and
‘Mainlanders’ and their descendents along political parties perhaps complicates the issue of ethnicity and origin in a way that does not in Korea.

Despite the critical approach adopted in this paper in the analysis of surveys conducted with immigrant spouses, we believe that these surveys are important and that more data should be collected on new immigrants. However, our endeavour was to document how the collection of ethnic data in this particular case contributes to the construction of ethnic identities in countries rapidly changing due to marriage-based migration.
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Appendix

Table A. Information on surveys analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Taiwan 2002</th>
<th>South Korea 2005 ‘Survey for the Welfare State of the International Marriage Family’</th>
<th>South Korea 2006 ‘Survey on the conjugal life of transnational marriage families’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main agency responsible</td>
<td>The Ministry of Interior</td>
<td>Ministry of Health and Welfare</td>
<td>Ministry of Gender Equality and Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of academics</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, 9 academics from Sociology, Social Welfare, Anthropology, etc.</td>
<td>Yes, 3 sociologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>n= 240,837</td>
<td>1) Sampling Survey: n=945 couples (wives &amp; husbands) 2) In-Depth Interview: 27 interviewees (all foreign wives)</td>
<td>1) Sampling Survey: n=1,177 couples 2) In-Depth Interview: 20 interviewees (16: Foreign wives, 4: Foreign husbands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample type (how was the sample drawn)</td>
<td>Census, The whole population</td>
<td>Systematic sampling &amp; weighted sampling</td>
<td>Systematic sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population surveyed (men and women immigrant spouses? Immigrant spouses and their Korean/Taiwanese spouse?)</td>
<td>Female immigrant spouses and their Taiwanese husbands</td>
<td>Female immigrant spouses and their Korean husbands</td>
<td>-Female immigrant spouses and their Korean husbands (1,063) -Male immigrant spouses and their Korean wives (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zealand</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of questions</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A: International Marriage and Immigration Process to Korea (18 Qs)</td>
<td>B. Conjugal Life in General (35 Qs)</td>
<td>C. Needs and Demands of Social Welfare (14 Qs)</td>
<td>D. Demands and Needs of Medical Welfare (8 Qs)</td>
<td>E. Socio-Demographic Variables (17 Qs)</td>
<td>A. Demographics (21)</td>
<td>B. Family make-up (5)</td>
<td>C. Bringing up and Educating Children (19)</td>
<td>D. Relationship with spouse (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Users of survey results</th>
<th>Ministry of Interior, all other ministries, Academics as well</th>
<th>Ministry of Health and Welfare, all other ministries, Academics as well</th>
<th>Ministry of GEF, all other ministries, Academics as well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-main purpose for work (self development)</td>
<td>A17-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-most difficult things for you to work in Korea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-future work, need to get a job in the future</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E10, E11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Who manages your earning &amp; spouse’s earning</td>
<td>A-17-4, 17-5</td>
<td>E5, E6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-family values (husband’s share of housework)</td>
<td>B4(g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-satisfaction of conjugal life</td>
<td>B5(d)</td>
<td>D9(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(husband’s housekeeping contributions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-visit home country</td>
<td>B19, B20</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-phone to home country</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-invite family members to Korea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A20, 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-close friends (home country people, Korean, another country people)</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-close co-workers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-close neighbors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-close people in other gatherings/meetings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-frequency of participation in the meetings/gatherings (with people from home country)</td>
<td>B22</td>
<td>G6, G7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-activities with your neighbors</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-need for social services (employment counseling, job training, job referral)</td>
<td>C11, Taiwan Q16 &amp; 17 also have such item (employment coaching, job training)</td>
<td>F4 (job training, computer training)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-plan to bring children from ex-husband to Korea</td>
<td>(B27-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-role as a wife, and a husband</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D21, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-relative importance of roles among wife, mother, or daughter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H8,9,10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-compare ‘woman’s social status’ &amp; ‘sex discrimination’ between Korea and their own country</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H1, H2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 We conducted a “Sampling Survey” and “In-Depth Interview” from October 17, 2006 to November 30, 2006 (45 days) to marriage-based immigrants and their Korean spouse. The survey was written in 8 different languages—Korean, English, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino (Tagalog), Thai, Mongolian Language, and Russian Language. Also, the sample group was extracted based on the distribution of the sex, nationality, domicile who are residing in Korea excluding Jeju province. We used the “Spouses of the People” and “Naturalized People” database of the Ministry of Justice for the framework. From the database, after setting the allocation based on the sex, nationality and domicile, we applied systematic sampling method within this quarter. The standard unit that was used throughout this study was family consisting of marriage-based immigrants and their spouse as the target interviewee. The goal was to collect sample of 1000 people, but after conducting actual research, we were able to collect valid sample of 1,177 people.