

Literature Review:
Immigrant Integration in 2nd and 3rd
Tier Canadian Communities

Peterborough Partnership Council on Immigrant Integration

Michael C.K. Ma, Ph.D.

January 2010

Introduction

Currently, all provincial and many municipal governments have begun to devise and deploy new strategies to attract and retain immigrants. Many provinces have drafted either memorandums of understanding or federal-provincial agreements outlining manners by which federal immigrant processes can be better shared locally. These developments tell us that many communities across Canada have come to realize that immigrant newcomers are a key component for future growth and prosperity.

Given that 75% of all immigrants during the past decade have relocated to only three urban centres (i.e. Vancouver, Toronto, and Montreal) many smaller communities are concerned with their slowing population growth and lack of ability to attract immigrants. To address this lack of attraction to smaller communities, many such communities are commissioning studies and reports to investigate whether this trend in immigrant resettlement can be altered and re-directed to smaller communities or centres (e.g. 2nd and 3rd tier cities).

For this literature review, I have been asked to conduct a review of peer-reviewed and grey literature regarding how the issue of immigrant integration has been examined in second and third-tier Canadian communities (findings from 1995 and on). This report involves itself with two main tasks. First, it examines best practices that have been proposed and/or adopted for the promotion and improvement of social inclusivity. Second, it investigates and aggregates various strategies that have been designed and/or adopted in the effort to create a welcoming community for immigrants. In so doing, I have sought to organize the various strategies and recommendations found in the literature under five categories: 1) Employment, 2) Immigrant Services, 3) Housing, 4) Social and Community Engagement, and 5) Demography.

1) Employment

Jobs are the key issue in newcomer attraction and retention in smaller centres. In many smaller communities across Canada, studies have shown that although attraction to an area for immigrant relocation is most often based on connections derived from family and friends, employment has been shown to be an over-riding factor in the decision to stay in a smaller community (Derwing, 2008). Immigrants may come to a smaller centre for family, but they stay because of jobs. It has also been demonstrated that a majority of refugees, who move from smaller cities to larger ones, do so because of insufficient or inadequate employment (Abu-Laban, 1999).

The literature shows that the retention rates are similar for many smaller communities in Canada. Many smaller cities and regions have difficulty in attracting immigrants and have even greater difficulty retaining them. For new immigrants who move away quickly in the first few years, these immigrants tend to move mainly because of the attraction to areas of higher urban density and greater immigrant density. For those who move later on, after a period of resettlement and attempted integration, these immigrants tend to move because of barriers to access to trades and professions in which they were trained. In terms of attraction to smaller communities, only 20% of immigrants tend to move to smaller areas to join family and friends (Chui, 2003). The vast majority of studies consulted in this review show that immigrants would stay in smaller communities if they could find work that was consistent with their education or their area of

expertise. Statistics show that most immigrants, who move from smaller areas, tend to move to take on a pre-arranged job or move to seek work. Studies also show that immigrants who move from smaller areas tend to enjoy a higher employment rate after their move.

A key factor in employment related resettlement barriers is the also lack of acceptance of foreign credentials. Immigrant credentials and work experiences of are often not well recognized in the Canadian workplace environment (deSilva 1997; Li 2001a; Reitz 2001a; 2001b; Aydemir, 2005). Research has shown that the credentials process is understood to have a deep effect on the labour market as it contributes to under-employment among recent immigrants and labour market barriers (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2004). Such barriers to accreditation have also been determined to have a ripple effect as its effects extend beyond the honoring of academic credentials and into areas relating to how language and cultural difference are understood or interpreted by an employer.

The devaluation of such credentials not only creates barriers to employment but also creates economic loss for those newcomers who must take on lower income jobs in the absence of professional or trade accreditation. Studies suggest that foreign work experience outside of North America or Europe is a great disadvantage for an immigrant candidate when applying for work in Canada (Green, 2002; Schaafsma, 2001). This devaluation of work experience and accreditation also extend beyond occupations that are nationally or provincially regulated, which make up only 15% all occupations. This phenomenon also affects non-regulated trades and professions.

Some provinces (e.g. British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia) have attempted to address these issues through immigration initiatives and strategies but given that education, skills, and point system evaluations are made before an immigrant lands in Canada, it is extremely difficult to improve or harmonize a system of accreditation that can only occur once the immigrant has landed. Once the immigrant arrives, there is a certain period of transition time and delay as he or she enters into a long and complex process of re-accreditation and/or acquiring Canadian work experience. During this transition period immigrants are often required to take on jobs that are significantly different from their experience and training (e.g. service sector employment). And there is also the mitigating effect of how qualification recognition is dependent not only on professional organizations but on how those trades or professions are regulated in a specific province or territory.

In 2004, the National Public Policy Forum spearheaded a survey and conference to discuss the issues of employers and immigration. The study revealed that although most employers may be in agreement with national strategies to increase immigrant participation in the workplace, these employers themselves did not enshrine immigrant attraction strategies within their own human resource policies. Especially in areas of low immigration, employers were most likely to not have immigrant employees. And if and when they did have immigrant employees, they typically were hired at levels below their training. More than half of the employers admitted that foreign work experience was not assessed as being equal to Canadian work experience (Public Policy Forum, 2004).

Although much is heard about the barriers that doctors and engineers face in re-accreditation, it is important to remember that these problems extend beyond the highest paid professions to the lower paying trade and service positions. Addressing this problem and how it impacts local immigration will involve the participation of many stakeholders (i.e. employer, province, federal government, and trade and professional associations) to agree to work on a long-term strategy for credential and work experience recognition. For the realization of successful resettlement and retention outcomes, it is imperative that local research takes into consideration the issues of employment.

Curiously, much of the literature on attraction and retention strategies for smaller communities (Derwing, 2005; Carter, 2008; Garcea, 2006; Saskatchewan, 2002) do not leverage their criticality through a research lens focused on economic impacts. Rather, many studies tend towards a normative stance recommending improvements to economic and labour outcomes for newcomers, but without doing so with specific local studies of the areas in need of improvement (e.g. local immigrant employment rates, local barriers to immigrant employment, local immigrant economic contributions, and so). Although many studies draw on existing Statcan literature (e.g. 2001 and 2006 general census data), the data sets referred are often not sufficient for providing the detail or granularity needed to extrapolate to local and smaller communities (Frideres, 2006). Often we find that the reference research privileges the main immigrant gateway cities as their point of interest.

For example, barriers to trades, professions and accreditation are often cited as causes for the chronic underemployment of newcomers. However, in much of the literature seldom is there specific data or research gathered, local or otherwise, on the subject of employment as pertains to that specific community. In a study on Manitoba and its provincial nominee program, the authors argue that some of the benefits of better regional distribution include "improved economic performance" and the possibility of "help[ing] more immigrants find employment" (Carter, 2008). However, the cited quantitative study only allows the generalist statement: the "[I]labour force participation of recent immigrants is highest in areas outside of the three largest urban centres and unemployment rates are lower, their income are higher" (CIC 2005). That is, although we may know that immigrants seem to succeed in smaller communities outside of major cities, it is unclear how or why they perform in those smaller local areas, and we do not know in what numbers? It is also unclear how far outside of major cities this prosperity extends. What are lacking are specific data sets and analysis that would allow local studies to understand how a general phenomenon of immigrant barriers to employment is played out on the local level.

Although most literature in this area is not singularly focused on issues regarding employment, there are few studies cited that actually demonstrate the economic benefits of regional distribution. That is, even though these studies examine immigrant outcomes they often rely on a tacit understanding of the benefits of immigrant contributions to smaller communities and better immigrant regional distribution. Further, many studies cite the advantage that recent newcomers possess because they are often university or college educated. However, this supposition is usually not correlated with data (local or otherwise) regarding success in employment or employability.

In the context of smaller cities, studies have applauded the value of legislated equity policies and their ability to contribute to the creation of innovative work environments (RBC, 2005; Cassin, 2004, 2006, 2006b). Others have proposed evaluating city managers on their success in hiring newcomers (Derwing, 2008). These strategies can be useful in that they produce greater immigrant representation within work environments and create services that have equitable representation. Although a common problem involving equity initiatives or evaluations of management is the perception of "reverse discrimination" and/or a perception that these initiatives are an unnecessary nuisance (Khan, 2006). Such initiatives could have real benefits; however, the literature lacks studies evaluating the recorded benefits of employment equity initiatives in smaller communities.

Unsurprisingly, many recommendations found in studies regarding economic integration of newcomers prescribe strategies to decrease barriers and to strengthen settlement services to improve employment outcomes. Some also prescribe internships and/or mentorship programs where immigrants may have an opportunity to gain Canadian work experience and where the employer also has a risk free opportunity to consider the personal compatibility, academic credentials, and suitability of the immigrant intern. However, aside from studies based on major cities there are few reports that indepthly document the design, implementation, and successes of such initiatives in smaller communities.

Recommendation: In the case of future research for Peterborough, this review recommends that we begin to design a methodology by which to study in detail the existing immigrant employment rates, barriers to employment, and their relationship to education and other mitigating factors affecting employment. It would also be important for our future research in the area of employment to investigate how the class and education composition of newcomers affect their employment outcomes. For example, we know that immigrants to Canada who arrive with higher skill and economic class tend to have a more difficult time of resettlement and finding meaningful work. In previous periods, immigrants with higher education had greater success in finding meaningful employment in their areas of training; however, in our most recent period, immigrants have had a far greater difficulty in finding work even when their levels of university and college education were greater (Omidvar, 2003). Does this national phenomenon have much effect in our area? How is this expressed in the context of Peterborough?

2) Immigrant Services

Immigrant services were perhaps the most common area selected for recommendation and improvement. The vast majority of local, provincial, and federal studies point out that efforts must be made to make immigrants to smaller communities feel more integrated and a part of the social and political fabric of their new communities. Various studies recommend improvements to immigrant services as an essential part of that welcoming effort (Belkhodja, 2009; Carter, 2008; Pat Lorjé, 2003; National Working Group, 2007). Recommendations include the increase of the service capacity of local settlement programs, improvements to immigrant housing services, improvements to public service accessibility, improvements to healthcare accessibility, better provision of language training, more accessible childcare programming, better host programming, and speedier credential recognition processes. In many cases, these recommendations were made on the tacit assumption that an expansion of immigrant services

would necessarily mean an improvement of those services as well. Although these recommendations are made in a spirit to improve immigrant services, most studies do not address how communities would go about securing additional funding—beyond federal and/or provincial monies—to augment existing services. Nor do these studies describe the mechanism nor processes by which federally supported resettlement services could be expanded and funded. Many of the studies consulted lacked sufficient detail regarding implementation across governance and jurisdictional barriers.

The immigrant service recommendations found in the literature can be grouped under five key areas: They suggest improvements to the way immigrant services are delivered by first creating a broad coalition made up of settlement and integration stakeholders to design ways to better coordinate the local and provincial funding and delivery of service. Second, they suggest the optimization of immigrant services by changing existing policies and programming that may obstruct or hamper pathways to immigration and integration. Third, they suggest increasing immigrant services that can facilitate the improvement of employment, career, education and immigrant re-training. Fourth, they suggest increasing the capacity of immigrant services by developing partnerships with governmental and non-governmental counterparts. Fifth, they suggest increasing service provision in the resettlement sector areas that support housing, transportation, childcare, counseling, and social inclusion.

Recommendation:

It may be important for Peterborough to begin developing mechanisms and collaborative relationships where we begin to seek ways to expand immigrant services. However, it is imperative our research and planning efforts also simultaneously involve themselves in the investigation of how such expansion would be funded and implemented within the broader context of existing federal resettlement services. Not only issues of funding and implementation are important, but the question of integration of expanded services needs to be addressed. If we take seriously the recommendation to involve multi-governmental (and non-governmental) counterparts in our efforts to expand immigrant services, then it stands to reason that the involvement of local government would also be critical for this initiative. City council would have to be brought on board as key participants to help articulate immigrant attraction and retention policy and also to help formulate collaborative working groups to develop and implement community-municipal strategies and actions related to the enhancement of immigrant services.

There are few studies that focus on longitudinal data examining the capacity of local settlement programs, the success of local language training, the efficacy of host programs, and the local barriers found in the credential recognition processes. Most studies typically recommend diverse methods by which immigrant services can help the newcomer to better find a career, an accredited profession, a house, or a community. What most smaller communities lack is locally specific research that details both the capacity and gaps of existing immigrant settlement services. In this regard, local investigations of such issues would reveal not just the need for research regarding these impacts on local Peterborough resettlement patterns, but it would also provide researchers/planners with a baseline measurement of the key areas from which to begin the design of real improvements to existing immigrant services.

3) Housing

Affordable housing is a key component in the successful resettlement of new comers to Canada. In research focusing on newcomers in smaller communities, the literature has shown that housing is becoming more problematic for new immigrants than those who came before. In the area of housing, we know that older immigrants tend to have higher incidence of home ownership, but with recent immigrants home ownership is less common. Only 20% of households consisting exclusively of very recent immigrants owns its home, compared to 60% of Canadian-born households and nearly 80% of earlier immigrant households. (Statcan 2001, 2006). More than 25% of recent immigrant households spend more than 30% of their income on accommodations. For 50% of these households, the cost of accommodations exceeds 50% of income. Very recent immigrant households are even more likely to have a relatively high housing cost, with 33% spending 30% or more of their income on housing. Of Canadian-born households, only 20% have housing costs in excess of 30% of income.

There is also overcrowding. Household accommodations of immigrants who landed before 1986 are similar to the households of the Canadian-born in size, but those who arrive later find themselves in housing situations that are more prone to crowding (Haan, 2005). Since crowding is related to size of household, the larger the household, the greater the chance that there are more persons than rooms in the dwelling. This pattern is found among households of the Canadian-born as well as immigrants, even though there is much less crowding in households of the Canadian-born than in households of recent immigrants. (Statscan 2001; 2006)

Literature shows that, in the past, immigrant families in larger urban areas had higher rates of homeownership than those who were Canadian-born. More recently, in the last twenty years, this trend in ownership has dramatically decreased. There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that increases in discrimination due to increase of visible minorities and decline of wealth of new immigrants is the cause of this drop in home ownership (Boyd 2003; Hou, 2004). Unfortunately, virtually none of the literature consulted on housing and immigration makes specific recommendations on how to directly address these gaps. One report recommends financial incentives (e.g. tax incentives, immigrant loans, and interest holidays), however, such recommendations are made without addressing or explaining for the decline in immigrant home ownership. And such recommendations are often made without specific discussion of the details of implementation. Often the studies on smaller communities aggregate recommendations regarding housing within broader issues of employment and integration.

In the area of rental market housing, evidence has been found that demonstrates immigrant newcomers to smaller communities meet significant barriers when seeking appropriate accommodation. The evidence indicates that new immigrants, who may be attracted to smaller communities, because existing family or friends are already resettled and established, typically rely on this informal and family network to find suitable housing. Literature shows that only a minority of new comers employs formal resettlement services to seek and find housing. Literature also shows that these self-directed attempts to find rental accommodations are commonly meet with frustration. The most commonly cited barriers identified include: ethnic and racial prejudice on the part of the landlord, high housing costs, lack of reliable housing information, and lack of access to housing services (Teixeira, 2009).

Studies examining rental housing in smaller centres make various recommendations that include: securing more government funding for affordable non-profit housing, the creation of immigrant housing subsidies, improving housing information available through government and settlement agencies, and better enforcement of law in cases of housing discrimination and racial abuse.

Recommendation: Peterborough needs a policy governing immigrant housing. However, there is much that we do not know. How do new immigrants go about finding housing and rental accommodations? What are current immigrant home ownership rates in Peterborough? Are the subsidized housing options accessible for new comers to Peterborough? Is there residential segregation in Peterborough? Does class factor into this pre-selection? Some literature assume that a better regional distribution of immigrants will help to revitalize declining neighbourhoods (Carter, 2008). Can this supposition be tested and measured in the context of Peterborough's immigrant and housing context? The last federal study on immigrant housing and home-ownership was published by CIC in 2005, and much of the data and studies referenced are from the previous decade. In the area of housing, there is currently far more that we do not know about immigrant needs and outcomes than we do know. Alongside employment and settlement services, housing constitutes a key area for study and improvement. In what ways can Peterborough be involved in generating its own housing references and base-line studies?

4) Social and Community Engagement

Many studies have investigated the current outcomes for newcomers in the context of cultural and political life or the success of social inclusion (Omidvar, 2003). These studies involve themselves in the investigation of whether newcomers have been able to easily engage with the political and cultural life of the pre-existing community.

Through extrapolation of the national census, many current studies of newcomers to smaller communities often assume that there are local barriers of access; however, often the existing data sets do not offer specific insights on local barriers to access simply because the granularity of data relating to smaller municipal communities (i.e. local civic participation) is not recorded through the national census. In the absence of such data, studies often rely on extrapolation from employment, housing, or resettlement data. How can we improve what we know?

Existing literature regularly recommends smaller communities to engage in practices that involve community members, mainstream stakeholders, ethno-racial groups, and NGOs in partnerships and collaborations so as to improve outcomes regarding newcomer integration with existing civil society and social service groups (National Working Group, 2007). However, one shortcoming of such commonly found recommendations is the lack of specificity and knowledge of what types of collaborations or working relationships are best needed to improve civic engagement outcomes in specific communities. That is, recommendations typically suggest communities to make improvements to all areas that involve immigrant settlement, but without providing detail regarding the manner of prioritization nor the process of identification. In the case of Peterborough, it will be important for us to identify and target specific areas of civic and cultural practice and political participation for improvement. It would then be necessary to follow up on implemented strategies with suitable practices of measurement and assessment.

Some literature also recommends social marketing campaigns to demonstrate the benefits of immigration and diversity (Garcea, 2006; Halifax Reginal Municipality, 2005; National Working Group, 2007). For example, events where immigrant recognition is profiled are often recommended as solutions to increase public awareness of newcomers and the benefits of immigration. Although events centred around recognition and appreciation of newcomers can increase public knowledge it does not in any way guarantee improvements in attraction and retention. Nor does it guarantee the lessening of bias and prejudice. If raised levels of public knowledge do not necessarily lead to improved civic engagement with newcomers at the levels of institutional or structural governance, then how can inclusion be unpacked and reframed as more than public engagement or social marketing? It is this issue of efficacy that is typically left out of the literature regarding social inclusion engagement.

Much more work can be done in the areas of data collection regarding local perceptions of immigrants and immigration, studies on immigrant practices and perceptions of civic engagement, or longitudinal studies on the capacity of local institutions to integrate newcomers into the civic fold of decision-making and participation. Without an investigation of the local barriers to civic engagement it is impossible to measure the success of newcomer social inclusion. By gaining a fuller understanding of existing conditions of newcomer engagement—or exclusion—it will then be possible to establish targets for future improvements to resettlement outcomes. But it should be noted that without establishing measurable targets for civic engagement the implementation and success of future engagement strategies cannot be accurately measured or assessed.

Recommendation: In the context of Peterborough, it is important for us to examine what it really means to engage in civic projects that socially include newcomers into our existing civic practices of decision-making and political governance. It would be instructive for the Partnership Council to investigate the ways by which “social inclusion” can go beyond the mere implementation of diversity or cultural window dressing on existing institutional structures and practices. We can also ask: In what ways does social and political isolation potentially occur due to a lack of social engagement by an existing dominant group? What are the features of this phenomenon and how can this be changed? Do ethnic and/or class ties pre-select newcomers in a way that isolates them from mainstream civic practices? Are civic engagement outcomes the same for all immigrants, regardless of their social and economic levels, or are they class and social based? In what way does this phenomenon of ethnic and class-based resettlement play itself out in the context of civic participation?

5) Demography

Canada has no population policy. And by default neither does Peterborough. Although local settlement services, community organizations, and interested institutions in Peterborough are currently working together through the Peterborough Partnership Council on Immigrant Integration (PPCII), there is no existing population plan underlying the initiative to better attract and retain newcomers. In this sense, the efforts to attract and retain newcomers are being conducted only through a tacit understanding of the importance of population renewal and through an ad hoc framework privileging the improvement of immigrant settlement outcomes.

Based on the data made available through the national census our knowledge of Canadian demography is highly detailed. With an aging population and workforce, Canada is increasingly relying on immigration to fulfill its population (Bourne, 2001). However, given that there is no official federal or provincial target sizes or rates of growth—other than immigration ceilings established by the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism—Canada and its regions it is difficult to measure the actual success or failures of immigration against specific criteria of population growth, national, provincial, regional or otherwise. For example, although the Ministry of Energy and Infrastructural Renewal has authored a Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe Area, the prescriptions for urban renewal and growth contain no mention of population targets or resettlement targets for these newly renewed urban areas (Ministry of Energy, 2006). How can the success of urban renewal be objectively measured if the population growth cannot be measured? Although physical and spatial urban renewal is important for the well-being of any urban centre, human population is the true measure of urban growth.

If immigration is but a subset of population growth—alongside domestic birth/mortality rates and internal migration—and also a close determining factor of economic growth and contraction (e.g. retirement rates), then the establishment of greater clarity regarding local population targets is necessary as we begin to investigate the means by which to improve immigrant attraction and retention. For immigrant strategies of attraction and retention to fully achieve its goals, we must first identify for ourselves our own actual local population targets by which to measure our future successes. Given that there are no overtly stated national population goals, it falls to the responsibility of local community and municipal stakeholders to work collaboratively to arrive at such goals and measures. It should be noted that Statcan has shown that even a rise in birth rate or higher immigration to Canada has only a minor effect on the overall participation in the labour force, and cannot stop the downward trend and decline of projected future population. That is, although immigration attraction and retention may provide more working persons per retiree the number of workers per retirees will still decrease by 50% in the next 25 years. Therefore, immigration may stem the tide in local population and retirement loses; however it cannot act as a panacea for Peterborough and Canada's projected future population decline (Martel, 2007).

Without a local population target and strategy there can be no objective means by which to measure immigration success. Although qualities such as cultural diversity, accessible services, or employment equity can be measured without population targets, the success of an immigration strategy necessitates a larger overarching framework that a population policy provides. For example, it is well known that the last census reports Peterborough as having the highest number of residents in a census metropolitan area (CMA) who self-identify as persons of British Isles origin in all of Canada. If population data expressing the homogeneity of Peterborough's population, which is out of sync with both the national and provincial averages, tells us (by default) that we proportionally have one of the lowest number of recent immigrants of all Canadian CMAs, then this becomes not just a question of immigration, but of population. By 2031, it is predicted that all net population growth will arise only from new inbound immigration. And it is compounded by the existing trend in smaller centres where there is a high rate of out-migration among men and women between 20 and 29. It is an outward migration that is currently not balanced by inward migration. (Statscan 2006).

What does the literature say? Most literature focus on the question of improving immigrant outcomes but do so without addressing the broader question of population. This question has largely been omitted except in very few studies where immigration policy is understood to be and ad hoc population policy (Ley, 2001). But some literature attempts to address this issue. For example, the National Working Group on Small Centre Strategies recommends the development of a population strategy to address various population issues (e.g. out-migration of young people) where "immigration would be but one component within it." And the province of New Brunswick launched a Population Growth Secretariat on April 1, 2007 to address similar concerns. The mandate of the Secretariat is to address demographic concerns, halt the exodus of young workers, encourage repatriation of New Brunswick workers and increase the number and long term settlement of immigrants in the province (National Working Group, 2007). The New Brunswick Population Growth Secretariat was established in complement to existing local immigrant attraction and retention initiatives.

Many would agree that immigration is neither a substitute for an adequate birthrate that can sustain existing population levels, nor is it a comprehensive population strategy. Therefore it is important for us to understand immigration within a broader population plan. What happens if/when migration is not able to maintain existing population levels in Peterborough and surrounding area? Would future attraction and retention numbers be able to demonstrate that our plans to improve resettlement outcomes have succeeded or failed? Without a population policy and target this outcome would be difficult to measure. Current literature demonstrates that immigration is an undeclared population policy. And unstated population policies are but a part of a larger framework of national and local prosperity. Therefore, if local immigration policy is to succeed, then it must be re-framed and pursued as part of a broader policy for population growth and economic prosperity.

The establishment of a population policy and target will aid in the efforts to understand Peterborough's current population situation (e.g. is it underpopulated or overpopulated, what are the population projections for this area, is the population currently well served by essential and social services, do newcomers need more services, does the area need better immigration outcomes, do we attract sufficient immigrants, how much more immigration do we need?) Such questions would be more objectively answered if there were population targets and policies, which regulate population growth, that allow scientific and social measurement of population outcomes. Without targets there can be no measurements of success or failure. Without a population policy there cannot be measurement of the efficacy of immigrant resettlement policies. Without targets we will not know whether we have exceeded or fallen short of our attraction and retention goals. Population and immigration are one and the same.

Recommendation:

Future research on immigrant attraction and retention must be conducted within the broader purview of population growth and strategy. Research into immigrant outcomes are much more useful when understood within the broader context of birth rates, mortality rates, and rates of out migration of current residents. Alongside the capacity building and local development of a population policy, the Partnership Council can also begin supportive research to understand the efficacy of immigration as a method of repopulation. For example, is it more cost effective to

import newcomers --instead of producing them through local births-- through an immigration program? Can such a policy of immigrant repopulation be healthily sustained? In the raising and education of an immigrant adult is it fair to the immigrant-sending country for them to absorb our externalizations of such "production" costs? What does this mean for us in terms of our own shrinking capacity to sustain mechanisms by which a locally born population is produced (i.e. healthcare and schools)?

Conclusion:

The literatures examined in this review overwhelmingly investigate similar factors and identify similar issues and problems. Time and again, the studies on immigrant integration and retention tend towards framing outcomes within the parameter of service provision and with a framework of social inclusion and raising public awareness around the importance of immigration. The strategies and suggestions often identify and prescribe the need for popular education about immigrant cultures and the realities of their situation. Studies also suggest that resettlement services must be expanded to better address newcomer needs. And studies also suggest that civic participation is a necessary factor for the successful integration and empowerment of newcomers.

Literature also prescribes that it is important to begin to involve the whole community in the exercise and enjoyment of cultural diversity and healthy race relations. However, such social and cultural improvements will mean little without a concomitant implementation of locally developed immigration (and population) policies that can help us maintain healthy and sustainable levels of population growth.

Three caveats:

First, what is interesting is that in virtually all the literature consulted (but not all cited), the overlapping and cross-referencing research into the barriers to access to employment, housing, services, and civic participation all arrive at the same uniform conclusion regarding barriers to immigration to smaller centres. The language is the same. The problematic is always framed as: how can we remove barriers, educate the public, provide better services, create new services, and improve outcomes. So, the language and framing is all very similar. It is couched in a language of "identification" of problems, in the sense that a naming of the problem alongside normative prescriptions are often seen as enough. But what much of the literature lacks are: 1) concrete and in-depth descriptions of the problems and the offering of task specific solutions 2) a deconstruction of the institutional framing of immigrant solutions/problem. That is, in part, the problem stems from the ideological framing that a better institutionalization of the issue via better immigrant service provision, social service delivery, or better government bodies will then "naturally" and necessarily allow for new and better outcomes. What is seldom acknowledged is the possibility that new layers of institutional programming create the possibility for further entrenchment of existing immigrant barriers. In addition, this paradigm of institutionally framing "immigrants" as "challenges and problems" needs to be changed. What needs investigation is whether the institutionalization and consolidation of the problem (i.e. immigrants) via taskforces or targeted studies will indeed provide a solution arising from the generation of better and/or new data. That is, does finding out more about the situation without simultaneously trying to generate

solutions provide the answer we need? Often such efforts expend the bulk of the reserved energies on the research and strategy and little is left over for the far more difficult and marathon task of political implementation, on-the-ground adjustments, and community assessment. In part, the trajectory of research-data collation-prescription-strategy-implementation often does not lead to net gains. That is, it is possible that the problem rests within the implementation and assessment or accounting of the results/solution. The premise of study and institutional solution often precludes the inclusion of on-the-ground action items that can occur separate from study or in advance of study.

Second, the great shortcoming of many these studies is their lack of primary research regarding local populations. Although all the studies consulted for this review agree with one another regarding the poor state of current immigrant outcomes for smaller communities, very few of these studies have involved themselves in local data collection. More locally situated research and data collection must be conducted to help support the arrived upon suppositions and recommendations.

Third, instead of recommending specific strategies drawn from this larger pool of research and planning, this review recommends: how can we begin to re-imagine our local landscape of resettlement by unpacking and investigating what it actually means—on the ground—to remove barriers and provide better services, and how can that be achieved with our current resources?

Multi-scalar

A key issue in addressing immigrant issues that cut across multiple levels of governance is the manner and way in which social actors interpret and internalize their roles in this chain of accountability and planning. Addressing immigrant resettlement necessitates a new multi-scalar framework for investigation (Isin, 2007; Sharma, 2006). Too many existing studies rely on a framework of investigation where municipalities, provinces, and federal government are seen as working discretely in separate worlds of governance. The prevailing model of investigation remains rooted in understanding immigrant outcomes as the purview of different levels of government. An approach that de-privileges and de-emphasizes an understanding of the way separate levels of governance works in relation to immigrant resettlement may bear new insights into the existing challenges that Peterborough faces. For example, from the perspective of a settlement agency, the issue of immigrant employment is not understood—neither by client nor agency—as a federal immigration policy not meeting the expectation of a municipal market driven labour market. That is, in the case of, say, an unemployed skilled immigrant professional, it is not just a disconnect between federal immigration processes and existing local labour market realities, but rather it is an expression of how a federal points system evaluations, officer evaluation, existing labour conditions, professional associations, re-certification or accreditation, family and community network support, among others, all mix together to form the sometimes bleak reality of professionally trained and practicing professionals who find themselves unemployed in Canada. That is, the federal, provincial, and local levels of governance and co-ordination all play out on a very real, personal and lived level of reality that actually challenge conventional understandings of immigrant outcomes as the purview of multiple and separate levels of governance.

Most existing studies continue to study immigrant outcomes through models of reference that accept these levels of governance as separately constituted. It may be fruitful and innovative for Peterborough's future research and community planning to engage with a model of research and planning that sets aside the convention of local, provincial, and federal scale to begin to develop a new model that attempts and achieves a more holistic modeling and projection of immigrant realities and outcomes.

Population and Immigration

How can we rethink and reframe immigration policy within a broader framework of a local population strategy? As is the case with other smaller centres, Peterborough must begin to proactively negotiate and develop a progressive population strategy in concert with provincial and federal counterparts. And it must be a population strategy where attraction and retention of immigrants is but one aspect of a larger "made in Peterborough" prosperity plan. In so doing, it is instructive for Peterborough to study the strategic initiatives of other cities and smaller communities --as has been the case in this review. However, in considering what needs to be done, we must remember to go beyond a facile imitation of the proposed solutions offered by other 2nd and 3rd tier Canadian cities. Our efforts must honestly measure our own immigrant realities and closely audit the institutions and services that serve immigrants.

Peterborough needs a comprehensive and integrated strategy for the attraction and retention of newcomers, and this can only come about if community and government work closely together to formulate a multi-year and multi-scalar strategy that can be implemented in a sustainable manner. We currently have the community-based expertise to design and direct a policy direction that is both local and right for Peterborough. We must involve ourselves in drafting a multi-level settlement agreement that involves local community stakeholders, the municipality, the province, and federal government so that the notion of a vertical coordination is subverted and replaced by a multi-scalar model of collaboration. An agreement needs to be designed in such a way as to allow the local to be the driving force and architect of a population strategy and settlement plan. Provincial and federal levels must not be understood as levels of government that stand above and apart from the local, but re-configured as collaborative facilitators.

Given that our constitutional framework does not allow for direct federal-municipal relationships the need for better multi-level co-ordination forces us to think of innovative and new ways to create such connections. New networks and exchanges between municipality and federal counterparts are critically needed so as to allow for open and direct dialogue and co-ordination allowing for municipalities to design and implement "local" strategies that will successfully resettle and integrate newcomers (McIsaac, 2003). By lobbying the province and federal government for better multi-level governance around immigration and population management issues, we will be able to expand our provincial and federal relationships. By engaging federal and provincial counterparts on immigrant policy issues (e.g. provincial nominee program, expedited processing, prioritization of foreign workers and international students) we will be able to express local concerns to other levels of governance. Such expression also allows us to develop longer-term strategies that move us away from reactive and potentially unsustainable short-term responses.

Regionalization is currently a major issue of concern for both provincial and federal ministries responsible for immigration. At this juncture in time, it is important for Peterborough to make itself known as an innovator in the creation and adoption of a population strategy that not only includes immigrant attraction and retention, but also one that includes a broader framework involving the creation of a sustainable and healthy environment conducive for population growth.

Recommendation: Future Research Questions and Planning

- 1) Inventory existing services for newcomers so that we have an idea of: Who does what? Evaluate the accessibility of existing immigrant services with the participation of newcomers (social audit). By identifying useful services, we can identify areas for improvement and promote them.

- 2) Lobby the province and federal government for better multi-level governance around immigration and population management issues. Expand our provincial and federal relationships (e.g. provincial nominee program, expedite processing, prioritize foreign workers and international students). Attempt to express our local Peterborough concerns to other levels of governance in the attempt to create a long-term strategy where vertical notions of federal, provincial, and municipal government are collapsed into a new model of multi-scalar governance.

- 3) Revise and redesign “inclusion” language and strategies (e.g. WCI) such that “inclusion” is understood via very local and real civic structures and institutions. By establishing what is “inclusion” for Peterborough (e.g. structural/institutional, community, individual) we rescue the language of inclusion from the danger of cultural abstraction and political inaction. We can begin to design and implement a new language and policy of inclusion (made in Peterborough). Once we have begun and/or achieved measures of social inclusion, then it becomes necessary for us to monitor and report levels of inclusion so that we can judge our success or failure, progressions or regressions. By necessity these instruments of measure would have to be designed locally and collaboratively.

Works Cited:

- Abu-Laban, Y. (1998). "welcome/STAY OUT: The contradiction of Canadian integration and immigration policies at the Millenium." *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 30 (3), 191-211.
- Aydemir, Abdurrahman and Mikal Skuterud. 2005. "Explaining the deteriorating entry earnings of Canada's immigrant cohorts, 1966-2000." *Canadian Journal of Economics* 38(2):641-672.
- Belkhodja, Chedly. 2009. "Toward a more welcoming community? Observations on the Greater Moncton Area." <http://canada.metropolis.net/policypriority/welcoming_e.htm>
- Bourne L. S. & Rose, D. (2001). "The changing face of Canada: The uneven geographies of population and social change." *The Canadian Geographer*, 45 (1), 105-119.
- Boyd, Monica. 2003. "Educational Attainments of Immigrant Offspring: Success or Segmented Assimilation?" In *Host Societies and the Reception of Immigrants*, edited by J. Reitz, (ed.). La Jolla, CA. Center for Comparative Immigration Studies. 91-117.
- Carter, Tom. 2008. "Attracting Immigrants to Smaller Urban and Rural Communities: Lessons Learned from the Manitoba Provincial Nominee Program." *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 9, 161-183.
- Cassin, Marguerite. 2004. *Trends in Creating Quality of Life in Nova Scotia: Human Rights in Community, Workplace and Governance*. Halifax: Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission.
- Cassin Marguerite and Ann Divine. 2006. *Employment Equity Initiatives in Race and Inclusion: Progress, Culture and Change in Halifax LEEP and FCP*. Halifax: Atlantic Metropolis Centre.
- 2006b. "Employment Equity in Halifax: Issues of Race, Inclusion and Vitality" *Our Diverse Cities*. Vol. 2:
- Chui, Tina. October 2003. *Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada: Process, Progress and Prospects*. Cat. No. 89-611-XIE. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. 2004. "The Economic Performance of Immigrants: Immigration Category Perspective." *The Monitor*, Spring. Ottawa.
- City of Peterborough. (2009). *Planning Peterborough to 2031: How the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe will affect the City of Peterborough*.
- Derwing, Tracey, Harvey Krahn, Jennifer Foote, Lori Diepenbroek. 2005. *The Attraction and Retention of Immigrants to Edmonton. A Report Submitted to Edmonton City Council and Citizenship and Immigration Canada*. Edmonton: City of Edmonton.
- Derwing, Tracey, and Harvey Krahn. 2006. "Edmonton's Approach to Attracting and Retaining Immigrants." *Our Diverse Cities* Vol. 2: 9-13.

--- .2008. Attracting and retaining immigrants outside the metropolis: Is the pie too small for everyone to have a piece? The case of Edmonton, Alberta. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 9, 359-380.

deSilva, Arnold. 1997. Earnings of immigrant classes in the early 1980s in Canada: A reexamination. *Canadian Public Policy* 23(2):179-202.

Elliott, Douglas. 2003. Demographic Trends in Saskatchewan: A Statistical Analysis of Population, Migration, and Immigration.

Frideres, J.S. 2006. "Cities and Immigrant Integration: The Future of Second- and Third-Tier Centres." *Our Diverse Cities* Vol. 2: 3-8.

Garcea, Joe. 2006. "Attraction and Retention of Immigrants by Saskatchewan's Major Cities." *Our Diverse Cities* Vol. 2: 14-19.

Ghosh, J. & Pyrcce, V. J. (1999). "Canadian immigration policy: Responses to changing trends." *Geography*, 84 (3), 233-240.

Green, David and Christopher Worswick. 2002. *Earnings of Immigrant Men in Canada: The roles of labour market entry effects and returns to foreign experience*. Strategic Research and Statistics. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

Haan, Michael. (2005) *The Decline of the Immigrant Homeownership Advantage: Life-cycle, Declining Fortunes and Changing Housing Careers in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver, 1981-2001*. Statcan, (Analytical Studies Branch).

Halifax Reginal Municipality. 2005. *Immigration Action Plan*. Halifax: City of Halifax.

Hou, Feng. 2004. "Recent immigration and the formation of visible minority neighbourhoods in Canada's large cities." Working Paper Series, no. 221. Analytical Studies Branch Research Paper Series. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 11F0019MIE2004221. Ottawa. Statistics Canada.

Inin, Engin. 2007. "City.State: Critique of Scalar Thought," *Citizenship Studies*, 11:2, 211-228.

Khan, Cindy. "The Blind Spot": Racism and Discrimination in the Workplace." *Our Diverse Cities* Vol. 2: 63-65.

Ley, D. & Hiebert, D. (2001). "Immigration policy as population policy." *The Canadian Geographer*, 45 (1), 120-125.

Li, Peter S. 2001a. The market worth of immigrants' educational credentials. *Canadian Public Policy* 27(1):1-16.

Lorjé, Pat. 2003. *Open Up Saskatchewan! A Report on International Immigration and Inter-Provincial In-Migration Initiatives to Increase the Population of the Province of Saskatchewan*. Regina: Government of Saskatchewan./ Government of Saskatchewan.

McIsaac, E. (2003). *Nation Building Through Cities: A New Deal for Immigrant Settlement in Canada*. Ottawa: The Caledon Institute of Social Policy.

Martel, Laurent, Eric Caron-Malenfant, Samuel Vézina, and Alain Bélanger. "Labour Force Projections for Canada, 2006-2031." *Canadian Economic Observer*, June 2007. Statistics Canada – Catalogue no. 11-010.

Ministry of Energy and Infrastructural Renewal. 2006. *Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe Area*. Toronto: Government of Ontario.

National Working Group on Small Centre Strategies. 2007. 2nd edition. *Attracting and Retaining Immigrants: A Tool Box of Ideas for Smaller Centres*. Victoria: Inter-Cultural Association of Greater Victoria.

Omidvar, Ratna. 2003. "Immigrant Settlement and Social Inclusion in Canada." *Working Paper Series, Perspectives on Social Inclusion*. Toronto: The Laidlaw Foundation.

Public Policy Forum. 2004. *Bringing Employers Into the Immigration Debate, Survey and Conference*. Ottawa.

RBC Financial Group. 2005. *The Diversity Advantage: A Case for Canada's 21st Century Economy*. Toronto: RBC Financial Group.

Reitz, Jeffery G. 2001. Immigrant skill utilization in the Canadian labour market: Implications of human capital research. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 2(3):347-378.

——— 2001b. Immigrant success in the knowledge economy: Institutional change and the immigrant experience in Canada, 1970-1995. *Journal of Social Issues* 57(3):579-613.

Saskatchewan Government Relations and Aboriginal Affairs. 2002. *Meeting the Needs and Making Connections: A Report on the Saskatchewan Immigrant and Refugee Settlement Needs and Retention Study*. Regina: Government of Saskatchewan.

Satzewich, Vic, and William Shaffir. 2007. "Immigrants and Immigrant Settlement in Hamilton." *Our Diverse Cities* Vol. 3: 118-122.

Schaafsma, Joseph and Arthur Sweetman. 2001. "Immigrant earnings: Age at immigration matters." *Canadian Journal of Economics* 34(4):1066-1099.

Shanes, Mary. 2006. "Recent Immigrants in Canada's Second-Tier Metropolitan Areas: Highlights Based on the 2001 Census." *Our Diverse Cities* Vol. 2: 44-48.

Sharma, A. & Gupta, A. 2006. "Rethinking theories of the state in an age of globalization," in: A. Sharma & A. Gupta (Eds) *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*, pp. 1–41. Oxford: Blackwell.

Walton-Roberts, Margaret. 2007. "Immigration Regionalization in Ontario: Policies, Practices and Realities." *Our Diverse Cities* Vol. 3: 13-19.