

Vancouver Centre of Excellence



Research on Immigration and
Integration in the Metropolis

REPORT OF RIIM ACTIVITIES: 2006-2007

Daniel Hiebert
Co-Director, RIIM/Metropolis British Columbia

September 2007

REPORT OF RIIM ACTIVITIES: April 2006 – March 2007

September, 2007

Daniel Hiebert
Co-Director, RIIM / Metropolis British Columbia
Department of Geography, UBC

I. INTRODUCTION: KEY ACTIVITIES

This is the final annual report of the second cycle of funding of the *Vancouver Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis* (RIIM). It is hard to resist the temptation at this point to write about the future, since so much of our year was spent thinking about the renewal of the Centre. However, that will be for another day. Here I will summarize the achievements of the 2006-07 year. Despite the year-long cloud of uncertainty over the future and all of the collective time and energy devoted to resolving that issue, the achievements of RIIM in 2006-07 have been impressive.

The strongest and most tangible demonstration of research activity at RIIM has been the extensive set of Working Papers produced over the life of the project. On average, the Centre has posted 20 regular Working Papers per year on its website, with 229 produced during the full life of the Centre (1996-2007). Of these, 21 papers were posted in the 2006 calendar year and another 6 in January-March 2007. In the year of record (ending March 2007), there were more than 400,000 downloads of Working Paper files (with more than 240,000 separate visits and 1.4 million hits) from the RIIM website. Our three most popular Working Papers were downloaded more than 5,000 times each. Our web-based outreach has therefore continued to be extremely successful.

Following the publication of a Working Paper, dissemination can take two paths, and ideally both occur. First, for projects that have captured the interest of policy analysts and practitioners, researchers have been invited to give additional presentations, locally and in Ottawa. As will be described in greater detail below, RIIM researchers have made important interventions in the policy process this year (see the description of activities by research domain). RIIM researchers have been approached by the media on dozens of occasions during the past year. This has been an important element of public education associated with the Centre.

Working Papers have also been revised with academic audiences in mind and published as journal articles and book chapters. As one indication of quality, revised Working Papers have been submitted and published in leading peer-reviewed journals dealing with

immigration and diversity, such as *International Migration Review*, and the *Journal of International Migration and Integration*.

The output of researchers is tracked differently at RIIM compared with the other Metropolis Centres. At RIIM, only researchers with active projects are required to submit an annual report. This decision was made at the outset of the Centre and will be changed in 2007 if the funding base of RIIM is renewed. The current practice provides an incomplete data base,¹ but has the advantage in allowing us to specify the *direct* impact of RIIM funding at a given time (i.e., it does not include publications generated from other funding). According to this measure, active RIIM researchers published 20 journal articles, 8 chapters in books, and 7 other items during the year of record.² In other words, the approximately \$325,000 provided to the Centre per year can be seen as responsible for 35 publications arising *directly from that funding base*. This is excellent value for money, especially when the cost of administration of the Centre is taken into account (see the annual budget, appended to this report).

I turn now to a description of the main activities of RIIM during the past year, emphasizing our attempts to consult with partner institutions and disseminate the research findings of the Centre as widely as possible.

The start of the period of record was dominated by the aftermath of the national conference, which we hosted in the final week of March 2006. The task of clearing up all financial obligations was substantial. This included assembling a variety of reports to the funding agencies that had supported the conference. The conference also generated a wealth of new material, most notably a set of video records of the plenary sessions, and literally hundreds of PowerPoint files of the presentations made in workshops. We have made good use of these resources, by making the videos available to the Metropolis network and by posting the PowerPoint slides on the conference website, enabling wide access to the material and ideas they contain.

We also conducted our last Call for Proposals in the early new fiscal year, with a deadline of April 5th. The release of the CFP coincided with the conference which was both positive in the sense that interest was high, and negative in the sense that our capacity to administer both activities stretched the Centre to its limit. In any case, we received 13 proposals and provided funds to nine of them (discussed in greater detail below).

The annual Research Retreat and Policy Symposium was held on September 7th and was attended by over 40 people. The theme of the event was the research-policy nexus and this issue was addressed through four panels across the day (a report of the Retreat is

¹ It is incomplete in that researchers who were given funds several years ago no longer need to submit annual reports but may continue publishing work from their projects. Researchers in this category are invited to submit a report but not required to do so.

² The fact that these numbers are under-estimates can be seen in the discrepancy in the number of Working Papers reported in the table (9) and the number actually published between April 2006 and March 2007 (21). My 2005-06 report indicated that researchers submitted 6 WP drafts last year, which were published this year. The remaining 6 papers were generated by international collaborators on the *economics of citizenship* project and international visitors.

appended to this document). In keeping with the model developed over the past few years, these panels included representatives of the ministries that provide funds to RIIM, representatives of partner organizations, and of course, researchers. The presentations were a mix of reflections from researchers on the policy implications of their work and reflections of policy analysts on the kinds of research they value. The question of the future of Metropolis arose frequently, and the retreat can be seen as an extended conversation about how we could improve communication between research and policy/practice if the Metropolis project is provided funds to continue.

Two concerted efforts were made to build a greater awareness of RIIM research in Ottawa. The first of these efforts followed the retreat in October with a much abbreviated version of the event in Ottawa, with a half-day workshop organized around presentations by three RIIM researchers: Daniel Hiebert on immigrants and housing in Vancouver; Jennifer Hyndman on the settlement of Acehnese refugees in Vancouver; and Geraldine Pratt on the migration dynamics of live-in caregivers in Vancouver. These projects were chosen to represent something of the methodological and topical diversity of RIIM research, and also to demonstrate the national policy significance of what could appear to be parochial studies (i.e., all focused on a single metropolitan area). That is, a greater understanding of the “on-the-ground” consequences of policies provides vital information to the policy-making process. Each of the three presenters subsequently met with the most relevant set of policy analysts the following day, for further discussion (Hiebert with CMHC; Hyndman with members of the refugee branch of CIC; and Pratt with members of the immigration branch of CIC who specialize in the LCP program).

The second attempt to engage more fully with Ottawa was based on a grant provided by Canadian Heritage (through a competitive process, with D. Hiebert as Principal Investigator), titled *Learning together: Fostering knowledge transfer between Metropolis, Canadian Heritage, and the larger community*. The project had four major components:

- Disseminating presentations from the 2006 National Metropolis conference through DVD video and/or PowerPoint slides posted on a website
- Commissioning a special Working Paper that synthesizes all research on the topic of multiculturalism done across the five Canadian Metropolis centres (i.e., by reviewing the five Working Paper series)
- Producing a summary of the methods used by Collingwood Neighbourhood House to foster intercultural dialogue and integration, in the form of a manual that other community groups could use
- Publishing, in conjunction with AMSSA, the umbrella organization of multicultural and immigrant service societies in British Columbia, a summary of the 2006 conference, in the form of a widely-distributed magazine

All of these activities were completed in the year of record, but the reports/publications will be released in 2007-08 (except for the magazine, which is already available).

In the fall of 2006, a reasonably large contingent of RIIM researchers participated in the Lisbon International Metropolis conference. This included a plenary presentation by David Ley, workshops organized by Leonie Sandercock and Kathy Sherrell (PhD candidate), and presentations in workshops by: Francois Bertrand (MA candidate),

Gillian Creese, Chris Friesen (NGO representative funded by RIIM), Daniel Hiebert, David Ley, Arlene McLaren, Pablo Mendez (PhD candidate), Leonie Sandercock, Kathy Sherrell, and Arthur Sweetman.

A much larger group was able to participate in the Toronto National Metropolis conference in March 2007. This included a plenary presentation by Daniel Hiebert and numerous workshops organized by RIIM delegates, plus dozens of presentations. RIIM was grateful to receive a contribution from the Ministry of Attorney General, province of British Columbia, of \$10,000 to support NGO travel to the conference, and also \$7,000 for the same purpose from CIC. We worked closely with AMSSA to disperse these funds to relevant representatives of organizations dedicated to immigrant settlement and social diversity in British Columbia and the Yukon, eight in total. Some seventeen graduate students were also provided support to attend the conference.

As in the past, RIIM hosted approximately a dozen visiting researchers over the year, mainly from outside Canada. Each gave a seminar either at SFU or UBC. I will just single out two here, Steven Vertovec from Oxford and Wei Li from the University of Arizona, since each of them provided us with a Working Paper based on their local presentation.

The Management Board of RIIM typically meets quarterly and followed that pattern in the Summer and Fall of 2006. Only one meeting was held in 2007, however. We planned to hold a meeting as soon as an announcement was made with the detailed instructions for funding renewal, but this did not occur until March. The final meeting of the Management Board of RIIM occurred on March 22, shortly after the release of the (draft) MOU that will govern the 2007-2012 period. The MOU makes it clear that the third phase will be different from the first and second, and that a competition will be held to decide whether existing Centres will receive funds to continue. This, of course, meant that the future of RIIM was uncertain.

Perhaps surprisingly, it took a great deal of time and effort to ascertain the procedural rules that govern a research centre under these circumstances. After extensive probing it became clear that the nature, and lines of authority, of Metropolis Centres is defined under the Institutional Grant system of SSHRC. Institutional grants are distinct from other types in the sense that there is no specific *Principal Investigator* empowered to make decisions. Instead, each Centre is required to have a *contact person* who represents the institution in charge of the Centre. The institution that has authority over a Centre is the consortium of universities that hosts it (not the Management Board), led by the *Lead Institution*, or in our case UBC. Legally, the universities are responsible to appoint the Directors of the Centre, and Directors are ultimately responsible to the Vice Presidents Research of the host universities.

While the preceding paragraph may appear arcane, these structures were vital in a number of decisions made at the end of the 2006-07 year. But before explaining their significance, I must pause to reflect on a critical development.

Don DeVoretz, who has been a Co-Director of RIIM since its inception in 1996, announced at the penultimate Management Board meeting (December 2006) his intention to step down from that position at the end of the second phase. Don's contribution to RIIM over the 11-year period of its existence has been fundamental. From the outset he championed several issues that became part of the core *culture* of the Centre: the production of Working Papers and providing free access to them via a website; mentorship of graduate students; and the need to emphasize policy relevance in research supported by RIIM. These core values have guided the Centre, and Don has led by example. He has published the largest number of Working Papers of any researcher affiliated with the Centre, has supervised a score of students who have gone on to prominent positions in universities and government, and has helped shape the Canadian policy debate (e.g., by drawing attention to the issue of retention of immigrants). Farewell and thanks, Don.

In announcing his intention to step down, Don noted that the new SFU Co-Director would be announced imminently, early in 2007. Ideally, this would have happened quickly and the UBC and SFU Co-Directors would have worked together to develop a vision of the future to present to the Management Board in its final meeting. Unfortunately, for complex reasons, Don's successor was not selected in time for this to happen. Given the structures explained above, this meant that all planning for the future of RIIM was held in abeyance since a key partner in the institutional consortium governing the Centre did not have a representative who would be part of the Centre in the third phase.

Despite the energizing announcement that Metropolis would, in the larger sense, be renewed, the tone of the final RIIM Board meeting was somber, with a sense of finality and uncertainty. The Board was officially disbanded, since the MOU mandated a new type of governing structure for Centres in phase 3 and decisions about the new Board could not be made in the absence of a new Co-Director. The Board was informed that the universities were committed to the future of the Centre but that plans would be defined later. The Board members were warmly thanked for their service to RIIM.

Fortunately the story has a happy ending, but the major developments that secured a positive future for RIIM occurred after the period of record of this report and will be explained in a future document. The point to emphasize here, though, is that the final three months of the 2006-07 year were dominated by the search for a new Co-Director and a structural inability to engage in the most important activity of all: planning for the next phase of RIIM's development.

RIIM RESEARCH IN 2006-2007: THE GENERAL PICTURE

Eleven research projects were approved for funding by RIIM in 2004, and nine in 2005 (of these, four were two-year projects with additional funds dispersed in 2006-07). Most of these remained active in the 2006-07 period. In addition, 10 new projects were approved in 2006-07 (nine in the CFP held in April and one—by DeVoretz—was directly approved by the Management Board, in a special meeting).³ Details are provided in the following table:

Principal Investigator	Domain	Title of Project	Approved Funding 2006-2007
Eugene McCann	Citizenship	Indo-Canadian youth	14,980
Leonie Sandercock	Citizenship	Constructing citizenship	16673
Catherine Dauvergne	Social	Racial profiling	14,939
Don DeVoretz	Economic	Changing faces	30,000
Jasmina Arifovic	Education	Student diversity	15,000
David Ley	Education	Identity formation	10,233
Steeve Mongrain	Citizenship	Border control	8,500
Wendy Chan	Social	Fear of crime	14,740
Neil Guppy	Social	Media portrayals	13,296
Sean Lauer	Social	Social capital	15,028
TOTAL			\$153,389

A total of just over \$200,000 was transferred to research grants by RIIM in 2006-07 (\$50,604 for the second year of the two-year projects approved in 2005, plus \$153,389 in new projects). This did not actually exhaust the funding capacity of the Centre for the year, and some \$28,000 was not spent. The Management Board decided that the amount of money remaining did not justify a second Call for Proposals and the Centre carried a surplus into 2007-08. It was thought that these funds could either be used for dissemination if RIIM would be terminated by SSHRC, or applied to a new CFP in 2007-08 if the Centre was to be renewed.

As has become standard practice, the Research Program Committee was chaired by the Co-Directors and included a mix of members equally drawn from academic and policy/practice backgrounds.

The outputs of RIIM research are summarized in Appendix B, which shows that 48 presentations were given to academic conferences (if we include Metropolis conferences in that general category), and another 41 were given to non-academic audiences. Significantly, RIIM researchers collectively made 25 presentations to policy groups over the course of the year, demonstrating a high level of interaction between the research and

³ Don DeVoretz Chaired the Management Board in 2006-07 but excused himself for the meetings when this proposal was discussed.

policy/practice communities at the heart of the Centre. Researchers submitting reports⁴ contributed nine working papers, plus another six submitted to be published in 2007-08 and, as noted earlier, published 35 items, mainly in the peer-reviewed literature (28 items).

I would also emphasize the fact that 35 graduate students were supported by RIIM funds during the year, which has immediate benefits in terms of their thesis research, and longer-term benefits for the development of expertise in the field of immigration and diversity. It is also important to note that four of the 14 projects supported this year were conducted in collaboration with non-academic partners (representatives of NGOs or government ministries), and half a dozen of the 14 projects received media coverage.

RIIM RESEARCH IN 2006-2007: ACROSS THE DOMAINS

Citizenship and Social Integration

Research Projects	06/07	05/06	04/05
1. Active Projects from Previous Years			
<i>The Changing Structure of Canadian Public Opinions about Immigrants and Immigration</i>	Neil Guppy, Sociology, UBC	\$17,500	\$2,800
2. Projects in Year Two			
<i>A Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Separated Children Asylum Seekers in British Columbia</i>	Geraldine Pratt, Geography, UBC	\$15,000	\$15,000
<i>The Linkages Between Migration & Security in Canada and France</i>	Diana Lary, History, UBC	\$0	\$14,441
3. New Projects			
<i>Belonging in Place, Ethnocultural Identity, and Multiculturalism: Indo-Canadian Youth Violence in Vancouver</i>	Eugene McCann, Geography, SFU	\$14,980	
<i>How Strangers Become Neighbours: Constructing Citizenship Through Community Development</i>	Leonie Sandercock, School of Community & Regional Planning, UBC	\$16,673	
<i>Optimal Border Control</i>	Steeve Mongrain, Economics, SFU	\$8,500	

Working Papers

06-05 [Naturalisation and Socioeconomic Integration: The Case of the Netherlands](#)

⁴ Over 90 researchers are affiliated with RIIM, but 24 submitted reports, which they were obliged to do having received funding in 2005 or 2006.

AUTHORS: Pieter Bevelander, IMER, Malmö University, and Justus Veenman, Erasmus University Rotterdam

06-14 [*The Emergence of Super-diversity in Britain*](#)

AUTHOR: Steven Vertovec, ESRC centre on Migration, University of Oxford

06-21 [*Are Cross-border Movements and Border Security Complements?*](#)

AUTHOR: Basil Golovetsky, RIIM, Simon Fraser University

07-01 [*Propensity to Naturalize and its Impact on Labour Market Performance and Public Coffers in the United States of America*](#)

AUTHOR: Ather H. Akbari, Sobey School of Business, St. Mary's University

Funding was allocated in a previous competition to a proposal by Don DeVoretz to study the economic impact of naturalization. Two Working papers associated with this project emerged in the year of record (06-05 and 07-01), both by researchers from outside the RIIM network, providing analyses of this relationship in other countries. Another project led by Steeve Mongrain, in this case an economic analysis of border security, led to a new working paper by one of his PhD students (Basil Golovetsky was awarded the Chris Taylor Prize for the most significant contribution by a graduate student to RIIM). Finally, Professor Steven Vertovec, Director of the COMPAS research centre at the University of Oxford, visited RIIM for several weeks in the Summer of 2006, to study the accommodation of diversity in Canada compared with the UK. He generously allowed us to post one of his presentations given while here as a Working Paper.

There were important developments associated with other projects in this domain during the year. The study of public opinion led by Neil Guppy generated several presentations, a Working Paper manuscript, and a forthcoming article in one of the top international journals of sociology (both will appear in the 2007-08 year). Geraldine Pratt was engaged in two RIIM-related studies this year, one on Filipina domestic workers and their migration dynamics (especially in terms of family reunification) and the other on children asylum seekers. The first was funded in an earlier round and was associated, this year, with important policy presentations in Ottawa (to a general group of policy analysts and also a small group of those responsible for the Live-in Caregiver Program). This work was also presented to policy audiences in Vancouver and Toronto, generated media attention, and yielded two publications. The second is still at the “gathering” stage. The project by Leonie Sandercock and Paula Carr has also led to important developments, including international exposure to the successful integration programs of Collingwood Neighbourhood House (CNH) in Vancouver. In particular, in 2007 CNH and Leonie received the BMW Group Award for Intercultural Learning, the first time the award has ever been made outside Europe. Media attention has also been significant, including CBC radio and *The Vancouver Sun*.

The McCann project is now fully under way, after a very difficult process of obtaining access to students. This is understandable given the potential sensitivities involved in any study of violence.

Economic and Labour Market Integration

Research Projects	06/07	05/06	04/05
1. Active Projects from Previous Years			
<i>Is There a Glass Ceiling for Visible Minority Workers in Canada?</i>	Krishna Pendakur, Economics, SFU	\$9,750	\$14,250
3. New Projects			
<i>The Challenges of the Changing Faces of Vancouver</i>	Don DeVoretz, Economics, SFU	\$30,000	

Working Papers

06-01 [*Explaining Socio-economic Well-being of Immigrants and Returned Migrants: An Econometric Analysis of the Hong Kong and Canadian 2001 Census*](#)

AUTHORS: Fangmeng Tian and Zhongdong Ma, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

06-06 [*The Economics of Citizenship: Is There a Naturalization Effect?*](#)

AUTHOR: Kirk Scott, Lund University, Sweden

06-09 [*The Economics of Norwegian Citizenship*](#)

AUTHOR: John E. Hayfron, Western Washington University

06-13 [*Why do Low- and High-Skill Workers Migrate? Flow Evidence from France*](#)

AUTHORS: Dominique M. Gross, and Nicolas Schmitt, Simon Fraser University

06-18 [*The Liability of Foreignness: Survival Differences Between Foreign- and Native-owned Firms in the Basque Country*](#)

AUTHOR: Nahikari Irastorza, University of Deusto

06-20 [*Social Relations and Remittances: Evidence from Canadian Micro Data*](#)

AUTHORS: Don J. DeVoretz, Co-director, RIIM, Simon Fraser University, and Florin P. Vadean, Migration Research Group - HWWI, Germany

07-03 [*Why do Immigrants from Hong Kong to Canada Stay or Leave?*](#)

AUTHOR: Nuowen Deng, Dept. of Economics, Simon Fraser University

07-06 [*Global Banking and Financial Services to Immigrants in Canada and the United States*](#)

AUTHORS: Wei Li, Arizona State University, Alex Oberle, University of Northern Iowa, and Gary Dymski, University of California at Sacramento

Several of the Working Papers associated with this domain also arose from the DeVoretz project on the economics of citizenship (in fact, deciding whether they should be

classified as citizenship or economic papers has been difficult and perhaps somewhat arbitrary). Like those in the citizenship area, these deal with the relationship between naturalization and economic outcomes in other countries (WP 06-06, 06-09). The circulatory migration model explored by DeVoretz (again, based on an earlier round of funding) was also well represented in the Working Paper series this year (WP 06-01, 06-13, 06-20, 07-03). The paper published by Wei Li (07-06) was the result of another extended visit by a non-Canadian scholar. Wei came to Vancouver to study the role of immigrant-oriented financial services in Canada, compared with similar developments in the US.

The project by Krishna Pendakur, on glass ceilings for visible minorities in the Canadian labour market, was fully engaged in the year of record, and produced a number of presentations, a book chapter, and an article submitted to a top-quality international journal. Krishna also received the *Purvis Prize* in 2006 for a paper published on consumption inequalities. The new project by Don DeVoretz is intended to be a capstone book summarizing the most important findings of RIIM research over the past decade. A draft is expected in 2007-08. As has been the case in the past, Don maintained a vigorous schedule of presentations, speaking in nine countries over the period of record. He also had four papers accepted in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals.

Finally, Arthur Sweetman, an affiliated researcher at Queen's University, gave a set of presentations over the year to both academic and policy audiences, including one to the Clerk of the Privy Council's Deputy Ministers' Retreat. He also published several papers, one in a significant peer-reviewed journal.

Education

Research Projects	06/07	05/06	04/05
1. Active Projects from Previous Years			
<i>Examining Equality of Opportunities and Outcomes in the Academic Trajectories of ESL Youth: Implications for Policy and Practice</i>	Charles Ungerleider, Education, UBC	\$13,000	
2. Projects in Year Two			
<i>Mapping and Assessing African Students' Educational Needs and Expectations</i>	Marianne Jacquet, Education, SFU	\$14,998	\$15,000
<i>Mobility, Diversity, and Access for ESL Students in BC</i>	Jane Friesen, Economics, SFU	\$5,606	\$15,262
3. New Projects			
<i>How does student diversity in BC classrooms shape the attitudes of children and youth towards their</i>	Jasmina Arifovic, Economics, SFU	\$15,000	

visible minority peers? A cross-disciplinary approach

06/07

05/06

04/05

Identity Formation and the Educational Achievement of Indo-Canadian Youth in Vancouver Schools

David Ley,
Geography, UBC

\$10,233

Working Papers

06-11 [*Hidden Losses: How Demographics Can Encourage Incorrect Assumptions About ESL High School Students' Success*](#)

AUTHORS: Kelleen Toohey, Simon Fraser University, and Tracey M. Derwing, University of Alberta

06-16 [*The Education, Immigration and Emigration of Canada's Highly Skilled Workers in the 21st Century*](#)

AUTHOR: Don J. DeVoretz, Co-director, RIIM, Simon Fraser University

The work of the education domain was highlighted at the Research Retreat/Policy Symposium held in September 2006, which focused on the integration of immigrant youth (see Appendix A). An important presentation at that event, the result of collaboration between RIIM and a researcher at the Prairie centre (drawn from an earlier project not listed above) spoke to the vital issue of high school completion rates, and found these to vary substantially across groups. Interestingly, students who come from homes where Chinese is spoken actually have higher completion rates than the population speaking English at home. Students from other linguistic backgrounds, however, suffer higher drop-out rates, in some cases significantly so (cf WP 06-11). At the same event, Heather Frost also presented her early research on the socialization of Indo-Canadian youth, and Marianne Jacquet spoke about her project on francophone African youth in Greater Vancouver (also at an early stage of research).

Another project that was funded in a previous round of competition reached fruition this year, yielding a working paper on the propensity of foreign students to remain in Canada vs. re-migrate or return to their source country (WP 06-16).

Active research was under way in the other projects funded through the education domain. Of these, the Ungerleider study of the academic trajectories of ESL students was the most advanced, generating six presentations over the year. A Working Paper manuscript was submitted by Ungerleider, and will be published in the 2007-08 year.

Housing and Neighbourhoods

Research Projects

06/07

05/06

04/05

1. Active Projects from Previous Years

Mapping and Assessing the

Jennifer Hyndman,

\$7,480

\$10,500

		06/07	05/06	04/05
<i>Settlement Process among Achnese Refugees in BC</i>	Geography, SFU			
<i>Where is Home? 'Return' Migration and the New Geographies of Cultural Citizenship Amongst Recent People's Republic of China Immigrants in Vancouver</i>	David Ley, Geography, UBC		\$22,360	\$12,640
<i>Concentrated Immigrant Settlement and Neighbourhood Deprivation in Canadian Cities</i>	David Ley, Geography, UBC		\$18,550	\$17,080
<i>Multicultural Planning and the 'Group Homes' Issue in Richmond</i>	David Edgington, Geography, UBC			\$14,250
2. Projects in Year Two				
<i>Immigration, Entrepreneurship, and the New Economy</i>	Daniel Hiebert, Geography, UBC		\$0	\$25,000

Working Papers

06-07 [*The First 365 Days: Acehnese Refugees in Vancouver, British Columbia*](#)
AUTHORS: James McLean, Simon Fraser University; Chris Friesen, Immigrant Services Society of B.C., and Jennifer Hyndman, Simon Fraser University

06-10 [*Locating Spatially Concentrated Risk of Homelessness amongst Recent Immigrants in Greater Vancouver: A GIS-based approach*](#)
AUTHORS: Rob Fiedler, Jennifer Hyndman, and Nadine Schuurman, Simon Fraser University

06-12 [*Immigrant Rites of Passage: Urban Settlement, Physical Environmental Quality and Health in Vancouver*](#)
AUTHORS: Michael Buzzelli, University of British Columbia, and K. Bruce Newbold, McMaster University

06-15 [*Beyond the Polemics: The Economic Outcomes of Canadian Immigration*](#)
AUTHOR: Daniel Hiebert, Co-director, RIIM, University of British Columbia

07-02 [*Vancouver's Newest Chinese Diaspora: Settlers or "Immigrant Prisoners"?*](#)
AUTHOR: Sin Yih Teo, Dept. of Geography, University of British Columbia

07-05 [*Immigrant Entrepreneurship and the Role of Non-Government Organizations in an era of Neo-liberal Governance*](#)
AUTHORS: Min-Jung Kwak and Daniel Hiebert, Dept. of Geography, University of British Columbia

As in other domains, most of the Housing & Neighbourhoods Working Papers produced this year arose from projects funded 1-3 years ago. The paper by Buzzelli is a good case in point, the fruition of a grant provided in 2003-04 to investigate the physical

environmental qualities of immigrant neighbourhoods. A revised version of the paper has been submitted to a peer-reviewed journal. Similarly, the paper by Fiedler et al. also was produced out of an earlier project, in this case to use advanced techniques to merge census information with city planning administrative data sets to get a clearer sense of the degree of crowding in households and thereby pinpoint areas of potential hidden homelessness. Again, a journal article will emerge from this study.

The other three papers came from more recent grants. McLean et al. is an important study that documents and analyzes the experience of Acehnese refugees who were settled in Vancouver by CIC, during their first year in Canada. The largest challenge identified by the group was language acquisition. The papers by Hiebert, and Kwak and Hiebert, are part of a project designed to understand the place of immigrants in the economy of Canada, particularly the ‘new’ knowledge economy. They are included in this domain because they pay close attention to geographic issues, especially the distinct opportunities associated with different metropolitan economies in one case, and the transformation of a local NGO in the other.

The two projects by Ley and Smith, and Ley and Teo both registered important achievements in 2006-07. Perhaps most notably, Heather Smith and David Ley have been invited to resubmit an article to the top international journal in geography, in addition to three publications in the year of record. Both Ley and Smith have been highly active in presenting their work, especially in the US, and have engaged with media on several occasions. Another of David Ley’s projects, with Sin Yih Teo, yielded four presentations at academic workshops and conferences and, significantly, Sin Yih was invited to present her work in a plenary session of the *Immigration Futures* international conference, in Italy—a rare honour for a graduate student. This project also generated extensive media coverage.

Jennifer Hyndman and her various co-investigators, produced *six* peer-reviewed journal papers out of the studies of Kosovar (earlier funding), and Acehnese refugees, and immigrant homelessness. Daniel Hiebert’s RIIM projects also generated one journal article and two chapters in the year of record, and he gave a number of international presentations during the year. He was also selected to participate in the Canadian delegation to the G8 Roundtable on Diversity and Integration and was invited by the Deputy Minister of CIC to discuss his research, and present it to a meeting of FPT Deputy Ministers. He also gave three presentations to policy analysts in Ottawa during the year and sits on the City of Vancouver’s Mayor’s Task Force on Immigration, and the CIC-BC Ministry of the Attorney General Advisory Council on Immigration.

Society and Health

Research Projects

	06/07	05/06	04/05
1. Active Projects from Previous Years			
<i>Bridging Newcomers in the Neighbourhood Scale: A Study on Settlement/Integration Roles and Functions of Neighbourhood Houses</i>	Miu Chung Yan, School of Social Work and Family Studies, UBC	\$7,332	\$12,040

in Vancouver

*Mapping Integration and Belonging
in Greater Vancouver over Time:
Comparing East Vancouver and the
Tri-Cities*

Gillian Creese,
Sociology, UBC

\$9,100

\$4,584

2. Projects in Year Two

*Raising New Policy Questions
Through Narratives of Trauma: Case
Study of Afghan Refugees*

Parin Dossa,
Sociology &
Anthropology, SFU

\$15,000

\$15,000

3. New Projects

Fear of Crime and Immigrant Women

Wendy Chan,
Criminology, SFU

\$14,740

*Portrayals of Immigration in the
Canadian Media: the Representation
of Immigrants Through Time, 1970 to
the Present*

Neil Guppy,
Sociology, UBC

\$13,296

*Racial Profiling – Impacted
Communities Survey*

Catherine
Dauvergne, Law, UBC

\$14,940

*Social Capital and the Labour
Market Process Among
2nd Generation Immigrant Youth*

Sean Lauer, Sociology
UBC

\$15,028

Working Papers

06-02 [*Creating Politicized Spaces: "Here" and "There": Lives of Elderly Afghan Women in Metropolitan Vancouver*](#)

AUTHOR: Parin Dossa, Simon Fraser University

06-03 [*"Witnessing" Social Suffering: Migratory Tales of Women from Afghanistan*](#)

AUTHOR: Parin Dossa, Simon Fraser University

06-04 [*Bridging the Gap in Social Services for Immigrants: A Community-Based Holistic Approach*](#)

AUTHOR: Shibao Guo, University of Calgary

06-08 [*Parental Sponsorship - Whose Problematic? A Consideration of South Asian Women's Immigration Experiences in Vancouver*](#)

AUTHOR: Arlene Tigar McLaren

06-17 [*Economic Insecurity and Isolation: Post-Migration Traumas among Black African Refugee Women in the Greater Vancouver Area*](#)

AUTHOR: Adrienne Wasik, Simon Fraser University

06-19 [*The 'Flexible' Immigrant: Household Strategies and the Labour Market*](#)

AUTHORS: Gillian Creese, University of British Columbia; Isabel Dyck, Queen Mary, University of London; and Arlene Tigar McLaren, Simon Fraser University 07-04 [*Multiculturalism: A Canadian Defence*](#)

AUTHOR: David Ley, Dept. of Geography, University of British Columbia

The project led by Parin Dossa was particularly productive this year, with three Working Papers emerging out of several years of detailed ethnographic research (06-02, 06-03, 06-17). Studies led by Gillian Creese and Miu Yan also reached important milestones this year, with two Working Papers in the former case (06-08, 06-19), and a WP manuscript submitted in the latter, which will appear in 2007-08. The Working Papers by Guo (06-04) and Ley (07-04) are, essentially, offshoots from other projects supported by RIIM in the past.

There were a number of other products generated by the studies funded in Society and health, beyond these Working Papers. The project by Gillian Creese led to a presentation at the international Metropolis conference and an article submitted to a leading international migration journal. Similarly, a paper by Lauer and Yan is under review at a peer-reviewed international journal, and the same project yielded conference presentations in three countries. Parin Dossa's research on immigrant women and their experiences of trauma led to two peer-reviewed journal articles and additional (non-RIIM) funding to extend her work into Afghanistan.

Four new projects were approved for funding in this domain in 2006-07. Work commenced on all of them during the year, and each employed at least one graduate student.

CONCLUSION: COMPLETING THE SECOND PHASE AND CONTEMPLATING A THIRD

I concluded the annual report last year with this paragraph:

As we enter the final year of the second phase of RIIM, the prospects for continuing funding, beyond 2007, are quite good. Both SFU and UBC have committed support for RIIM should this occur. The coming year will be dominated by three large questions: will there be a third phase (this should be known by October, 2006)?; how will the "new" Metropolis Project be structured nationally?; and, how will RIIM be transformed if it continues to operate in a third phase? Clearly, there is much to discuss.

I speculated that we would hear about the renewal by October because that was the timing expected by SSHRC and CIC. If this schedule had happened planning for the third phase of Metropolis could have been done seamlessly. But that was not to be. We received official word that CIC would support the renewal of the project, and allocate funds accordingly, in early December. Word from SSHRC about its decision was not

released until the new year. The first draft of the MOU governing the third phase was released at the end of February and revised March 29th. We learned on March 16th that SSHRC had decided to extend the second phase of Metropolis to March 2008 and that \$125,000 would be provided to support the Centre while the adjudication process for Phase 3 would take place.⁵ While it is beyond the scope of this report (in that it extends past the year of record), it is worth noting that the deadline for applications from individual Centres for renewal was expected to be in February but was delayed several times and then ultimately set for the end of June, 2007.

My intention here is not to paint a bleak picture or criticize SSHRC / CIC. There were reasons for these delays. I simply want to emphasize the cost to RIIM of this process, which was characterized by long delays punctuated by sudden requirements to provide information vital to the decision making process. Moreover, given my inability to guarantee continuing employment, my administrative secretary (the only UBC staff person employed by RIIM) resigned in March to take up another position in the university. I did not feel sufficiently confident to hire a replacement for several months, relying on a temporary arrangement with the Geography Department for secretarial help. It was an unnerving time, to say the least.

Fortunately the considerable momentum of research under way carried the Centre through this period, and the production of reports and papers remained relatively steady. We were also sustained by our wide network of partnerships, locally, in Ottawa, and internationally. So the year was tense, but also busy and productive. It might not have been clear by March 31st, but all the ingredients are in place now, as I write this report, for a renewed Centre ready to enter a new phase of research.

It is fitting to end on another positive note. This report closes the second phase of RIIM. There is no doubt that this has been a successful five years, with 56 separate research projects funded, generating 121 Working Papers and scores of academic publications between 2002-2007. RIIM research, and RIIM scholars, have been central to policy making and other forms of practice regionally and nationally, and have even been called upon as policy consultants in other countries. The history of the Centre suggests a positive future. It is well worth remembering that RIIM was fully transformed in 2002, at the outset of the second phase. The energy devoted to this process was clearly worth while, and I expect that the changes ahead will lead to another period of sustained productivity and significance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the capable staff of RIIM for their work during the past year: Nicky des Ormeaux and Linda Sheldon. Thanks also to Diane Coulombe and Sydney Preston for their work as Librarian and Webmaster of the Centre. I am also grateful to the many individuals

⁵ Although the second phase has been officially extended into 2007-08, if RIIM is successful in its bid for renewal, 2007-08 will be considered the first year of the third phase. Regardless of the outcome of the competition for renewal, this will therefore be the final report of the second phase of RIIM.

who donated their time and energy to the Management Board and Research Program Committee in the past year.

APPENDIX A



RESEARCH RETREAT September 7, 2006 SFU Harbour Centre

RIIM Policy Symposium
Presented by:

RIIM & the Ministry of Attorney General, Government of British Columbia

8:30 – 9:00 a.m.	Continental Breakfast
9:00 – 10:30	Youth & Second-Generation Integration (Part I) Daniyal Zuberi, University of British Columbia Kellen Toohey, University of British Columbia
10:30 – 10:45	Health Break
10:45 – 12:00	Youth & Second-Generation Integration (Part II) Charles Ungerleider, University of British Columbia David Ley, University of British Columbia
12:00 – 1:00	Buffet Lunch
1:00 – 2:30	Youth & Second-Generation Integration (Part II) Presenters (TBD)
2:30 – 3:00	Health Break
3:00 – 4:30	The Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada: Lessons and Emergent Themes Daniel Hiebert, University of British Columbia
4:30	End of Meeting

RIIM Research Consultation Retreat



September 7, 2006, SFU Harbour Centre

Summary of Proceedings by Dr. D. Coulombe,
Senior Researcher and Librarian, RIIM

Introduction

The fifth annual research retreat was attended by over 40 participants. As in the past, there were representatives from all levels of government, non-government organizations, and academic researchers. The retreat was built around four full-panel discussions arranged thematically. In the past, the objective of these panels was to serve as starting points to set research priorities for the upcoming fiscal year. This year, however, panels were structured to highlight and to orientate the main research issues and to further involve RIIM's policy partners in a dialogue. With that in mind, all panels focused on RIIM accomplishments of recent years, with an emphasis on its ability to draw from the local environment to bring immigration issues to the national level. The first panel focused on re-thinking multiculturalism, the second on issues pertaining to immigrants in the labour market, the third on the connection between research and policy, and the fourth on RIIM's role in shaping the national debate on immigration. In each panel four speakers gave 15-minute presentations and a question period followed.

The day began with Guest Speaker Mario Pinto (SFU Vice President Research) highlighting RIIM's various contributions to the university community and also to the community at large. Mr. Pinto considered the support and training given to graduate students at SFU and UBC as one of the main accomplishments of RIIM over the years. He also thanked RIIM's various funding agencies for their continuing support.

Next I will provide a brief summary of the presentations made in each panel. These discussions form the basis for reflection on future research themes in the event that RIIM funding is renewed at the end of the 2006-07 fiscal year.

Panel 1: Thinking about Multiculturalism: Perspectives on the Canadian Experiment

Facilitator: Mehroona Ghani (Ministry of Attorney General of BC)

Participants: Wendy Roth (Sociology, UBC), David Ley (Geography, UBC), Parin Dossa (Anthropology, SFU), Krishna Pendakur (Economics, SFU)

Wendy Roth began by comparing the success of Canadian multicultural policies to the reception of immigrants in the U.S. by stating that:

- a) the rate of naturalization of immigrants is higher in Canada than in the U.S.;
- b) the socio-economic and civic performances of immigrants are better in Canada than in the U.S.

Wendy further compared the admission rates of the economic and the family classes of immigrants for Canada and the U.S. Since Canada admits a much higher proportion of economic immigrants than the U.S., Wendy recommends that the following questions be kept in mind when comparing Canadian multiculturalism with the reception of immigrants in the U.S.:

- Is Canada actually “cherry-picking” its immigrants by favoring the economic class?
- To what extent is the success of multiculturalism more attributable to selection factors thanks to the context of reception?

David Ley invited the audience to reflect on the debate around multiculturalism raging in Canada and Europe. In light of the terrorist-driven violent events of recent years, David warned against lending faith to the following media-driven misrepresentations:

- a) multiculturalism separates, encouraging parallel lives and a lack of cohesion and integration;
- b) multiculturalism is complicit in social dysfunction.

David reminded us that the intent of multiculturalism was integration, not segregation. He also noted that multiculturalism has evolved, its focus now on guaranteeing groups’ rights to respect, to employment equity and to the absence of racism in society.

Parin Dossa reminded the audience that multiculturalism was adopted in 1971 by the Canadian federal government as a measure to ease the tension between the English and the French linguistic groups. She emphasized that multiculturalism was created for visible minorities, not for English and French speakers. The ensuing structural polarization between visible minorities and the “founding peoples” has not been diluted ever since the adoption of the multiculturalism policy.

Parin examined the representations of Muslims disseminated by the media in the post-9/11 era to better understand the implications of contemporary multiculturalism. Overall, the discourse behind the coverage of the 9/11 events and subsequent violent terrorist events depicted the West as the savior of the non-Western world. Further, set in a feminist framework, the discourse became, “white men saving brown women from brown men.” Moreover, Parin deplors that multiculturalism has failed marginalized Afghan women in Canada where the focus is on military involvement.

Parin argued that visible minorities have not been able to secure substantial citizenship rights. Social justice and equality for all should stem from a multiculturalism policy unfettered by historical differences, foster healthy diversity, and welcome pluralism.

Krishna Pendakur presented an overview of the main findings resulting from RIIM-sponsored research on visible minorities in Canada’s workplaces. He alleged that RIIM had been spectacularly successful in promoting research on Canadian visible minorities, and that very little was known of their performance in the labour market pre-RIIM. Some of Krishna’s and his co-author’s findings on immigrants’ economic performance follow:

- immigrant women tend to do better than immigrant men;
- visible minorities in Vancouver and Toronto tend to do better than others; • overall the Chinese do better than other visible minorities.

With regard to the future of immigrants in the labour market, Krishna offered not only a pessimistic view due to the over-time downward trend in earnings, but also an optimistic view since immigrants

can move to Toronto and Vancouver where signs of a healthier immigrant labour market were apparent.

Krishna deplored the inappropriateness of blunt policy tools suited to homogeneous targets when visible minorities differed greatly amongst themselves. He argued that this mismatch between policies and needs occurs since our society tolerates differences in aspirations and preferences while it concurrently rejects differences in treatment.

Panel 2: Intersections of the Labour Market and Immigration: Emerging Issues

Facilitator: Kenny Zhang (Asia Pacific Foundation; Member of the Vancouver Mayor's Working Group on Immigration)

Participants: Clifford Bell (Language College and Career Services, Immigrant Services Society of BC), Roslyn Kunin (R. Kunin Associates), Silvano Tocchi (Foreign Credential Recognition Program, HRSDC)

Discussant: Robert Mundie (Strategic Priorities, CIC)

Clifford Bell opened the panel with his presentation on the effects of the labour market on immigrants' employment. He explained that the primary mandate of ISS is to provide language training and employment counseling to newcomers, and he provided some numbers about his organization: ISS caters yearly to about 29,000 clients, employs 60 staff in five locations in the Greater Vancouver area and derives 75% of its funding from the government and the remainder from clients.

Clifford identified five considerations that hinder the smooth integration of immigrants into the Canadian labour market:

- many immigrants get their pre-arrival information about employment in Canada by word of mouth. As a result, their information is skewed and often obsolete by the time of their arrival. Moreover, since the problem of credential recognition of skilled immigrants persists, an increasing number of frustrated immigrants go back home and “bad-mouth” Canada after their experience here;
- the language skills of many newcomers upon arrival are insufficient to gain immediate entry into the labour market;
- immigrants need to hone their communications skills and cultural skills before they can secure employment in Canadian firms;
- mismatches between employers' demands and immigrants' qualifications are frequent.

For example, highly skilled immigrants with low-level language abilities can only aspire to entry-level positions, or to part-time or temporary work.

In response to the problems experienced by its clients, ISS strives to strengthen its connections to the employer community by opening and maintaining two-way communication channels between immigrants who need to work and employers who need to develop an understanding of immigrants as potential employees.

Roslyn Kunin referred to the BC labour market of today as the tightest in 30 years. Human resources now act as a limiting factor, with economic activities postponed in the construction, mining, trucking, health, and oil and gas sectors.

Roslyn saw a mismatch between the local and immigrant populations and the labour market. She listed various factors that influence the labour shortage:

- the small number of young people entering the labour market;
- favoring First Nations workers cannot make a difference since natives represent only 5% of the Canadian population;
- late retirement means that the age of the labour force will increase overall;
- the trend towards automation in BC implies a need for fewer workers with skills;
- Canada has to compete for desirable immigrants and should revise its selection criteria to attract needed trades people rather than university-educated immigrants.

Roslyn recognized the need for new approaches to deal with the language problems experienced by immigrants and to prevent discrimination towards visible and audible minorities. She suggested that work permits valid for up to two years be granted to young people who want to come to Canada; the young could be landed thereafter upon request. This would be a welcome departure from the current rules whereby foreign graduates can apply for citizenship after two years of residency only if they work in their own field of specialization, a near impossible achievement.

Silvano Tocchi began by stating that, while 80% of immigrants to Canada find full-time employment, only 42% do so in their field of expertise. He attributed this situation to the newcomers' lack of Canadian work experience, to the non-recognition of their credentials, and to low language proficiency. Silvano explained that the main obstacles to foreign credential recognition (FCR) were:

- a very large number of assessment bodies and agencies;
- the duplicate levers at the federal and provincial government levels;
- individual employers are the ones who ultimately decide whether immigrants' credentials fit their needs.

Currently the FCR Program seeks to build the FCR capacity in BC and to improve the integration of immigrants in the labour market sectorally. In the local construction sector efforts are made to offer Canadian work experience to workers; local manufacturers are also called upon to facilitate the matching and placement of engineers.

To improve the outcomes of FCR, Silvano suggested that the credential assessment process and the language training of immigrants should take place before they arrive in Canada. Moreover, general information and databases about the Canadian labour market should be made available abroad. He finally referred to the new federal Bridge to Work program whose principal components include information prior to arrival, assessment and counseling, and targeted program interventions, such as skills upgrading, mentoring, cultural orientation and supported work experience in the Canadian labour market.

Robert Mundie brought to the forefront various aspects of the three panel presentations.

With regard to the anger and frustration experienced by some immigrants who lose the status they were used to in their country of origin, Robert reiterated the difficulty of managing expectations and disappointments, even if immigrants are forewarned that they may encounter problems during their settlement in Canada. He also pointed out that immigrants' self-assessment of their language proficiency often tended to be higher than their level as determined by standardized tests.

Robert mentioned that Ottawa held frequent consultations with stakeholders to reduce the labour shortage and he observed that there were limits to what immigration could do to alleviate it. He added that Ottawa was considering temporary immigrant flows as a possible stop-gap measure. He mentioned that the adaptability of immigrants had become as important as the skills they might contribute to the Canadian labour market.

Finally, Robert remarked that the problematic surrounding credential recognition did not apply to foreign students trained in Canada who were now allowed to work in Canada and encouraged to stay after graduation.

Panel 3: The Research-Policy Nexus: Ideas for a Better Connection

Facilitator: Barry Halliday (Ottawa Metropolis Project Team)

Participants: Tung Chan (S.U.C.C.E.S.S.), Dan Hiebert (RIIM; Geography, UBC), Tom Jensen (Ministry of Attorney General of BC), Neil Bouwer (Learning Policy, HRSDC), Robert Mundie (Strategic Priorities, CIC)

Tung Chan first reminded the audience that, created in 1973, S.U.C.C.E.S.S. now employs 350 people in 12 offices, oversees 9,000 volunteers, and offers services in 17 languages at its airport location. It totalled 560,000 contacts with immigrants in 2005.

According to Tung, the advocacy role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on behalf of immigrants takes place at three levels: at the bureaucratic level through consultation, at the political level via briefings, and at the community level where NGOs become opinion leaders. In addition, the survival of NGOs largely depends on government grants and on the on-going justification of the services and programs they offer. Since NGOs lack funding for community and volunteer development, they have to adopt cost-recovery strategies, including user-pay programs.

Tung concluded by offering the following insights on ways to strengthen the connection between research and NGOs:

- research should be conducted on issues highly relevant to NGOs' clients, such as language training;
- research based on reliable data could be used to justify the existence of NGOs' services and programs;
- RIIM can help NGOs to strengthen their own data collection capacity;
- RIIM can facilitate meetings and overall communication between NGOs that often have overlapping mandates.

Dan Hiebert set the stage for his exploration of the interface between policy and RIIM by characterizing two protagonists as follows: on the one hand, the “policy side” must monitor policy outcomes, needs real-time information on the quality of programs, has easy access to enormous databases and can generate new ones, *but* it has limited research capacity due to budget constraints and limited time to interact with outside researchers. On the other hand, on the “academic side”, researchers are groomed for scholarship and interested in rather abstract pursuits, do not call on their imagination when they access databases, and by tradition are more comfortable working solo than through collaboration.

While Dan recognized that policy makers and academics operate within different reward systems, address different questions and use different networks to answer them, he summed up the positive aspects of the dichotomy between policy and academia: policy needs more research; academics can offer broad perspectives and conduct rigorous research; academics want influence and strive for resources, especially data.

Dan described the existing various bridging strategies between the policy and the academic worlds by proposing the four following models:

- the passive model: areas of research overlap by hit and miss;
- the active model #1: research is contractual, whereby the government pays and gets what it wants;
- the active model #2: the Memorandum of Understanding format, like that of Metropolis;
- the active model #3: the collaborative team-based research design is built out of compromise, requiring very flexible participants; overall a process complicated by issues of accountability and differing work cultures.

Tom Jensen sought to offer ideas to *broaden* the connection between research and policy by asking, not whether or not research was relevant, but rather how to make research *more* relevant. He believed that knowledge ends up influencing policy making in any case.

Tom suggested that RIIM could network with those organizations called upon by the BC government to find out if their research interests overlap. He mentioned the Asia-Pacific Trade Council, the BC Progress Board for economic performance issues and the social index, the Premier’s Council on Aging and Seniors’ Issues, and the Competition Council for temporary workers.

Tom commented that, since immigration touches on most policy areas, RIIM researchers could make submissions to, and/or become board members of relevant associations and organizations. An illustration of such involvement was Dan Hiebert’s participation in the Joint Federal Provincial Immigration Advisory Council for BC. In sum, RIIM could strike partnerships with various stakeholders in immigration, the BC Chamber of Commerce to name only one.

Neil Bouwer offered a diagram representing the policy making process in the current federal government environment. In essence, the decision-making stage central to the process starts from a vision translated into options funneled down as advice to decision makers. Once policies are adopted, the funnel widens as various measures are implemented. An open evaluation of these measures completes the policy-making cycle.

Two vectors accompany the policy-making process: *support* for the initial vision must be strong and broad-based to ensure the progress of ideas through the process described above, and it reaches its lowest point in the evaluation phase when the work is basically completed; conversely, the *challenge*

of transforming a vision into options, then into advice to policy makers grows as time elapses and finally culminates when the evaluation of the implementation is performed.

Research linked to policy making must be integrated, proactive and engaging, and Neil gave as an example the child care policy recently adopted by the conservative government.

Robert Mundie gave the following clear hints to researchers to engage policy makers:

- research must be relevant and convey a succinct and clear message;
- researchers must know their audience so that policies can be drawn from their results;
- researchers must maintain a dialogue with policy makers;
- databases must be exploited;
- the federal government favours quantitative research based on large samples that allow implications to be drawn at the national level.

Panel 4: Locally Relevant and Nationally Significant: How RIIM Research Informs National Debate

Facilitator: Marilyn McGrath (CIC)

Participants: Jennifer Hyndman (Geography, SFU), Neil Guppy (Sociology, UBC), Don DeVoretz (RIIM; Economics, SFU), Arlene McLaren (Sociology; Women's Studies, SFU)

Jennifer Hyndman set out to illustrate the vital role of research in fine-tuning and understanding the implications of settlement policy. Having worked extensively on the settlement of refugees, Jennifer noted that research is recursive in that it shapes and is shaped by policy makers.

Over the last five years, Jennifer has worked closely with refugee service providers. She examined the settlement of Kosovar refugees based on the regionalization policy and that of Acehnese refugees settled in the Vancouver area as per a policy of centralization. She also sought to identify the measures and the geographical areas associated with the risk of immigrant homelessness.

Jennifer and her associates conducted their research according to Community-University Research Principles based on the following parameters:

- equitable partnership;
- appropriate recognition and compensation;
- respect for findings;
- dissemination of culturally appropriate information;
- precedence of participants over research priorities.

Neil Guppy talked about his current research on attitudes towards immigration from 1975 to 2005 and on media representations of immigration in Canada for the same time period. He went on to give reasons why we should care if the attitude of Canadians towards immigrants turns negative: i) the immigrant population of Canada is continually increasing, ii) the number of attacks on foreigners is increasing, and iii) immigrants make up an increasingly larger proportion of the Canadian population.

Theories posit that individuals' attitudes towards immigrants become negative as a response to economic insecurity; at the structural level, attitudes are negative when the economy is weak and

when the size of the immigrant group increases. Based on Gallup polls and Environics surveys, Neil's findings showed that:

- attitude changes towards immigrants are incremental;
- sharp changes are observed during periods of economic recessions;
- support for immigration has increased over the last years.

Don DeVoretz proposed to demonstrate how research ideas percolate from the grassroots up by providing the background for his interest in return migration to China. Don was initially made aware of the return migration phenomenon through talks with Lilian To, late director of SUCCESS, in 1997. Some time later, Vancouver realtors informed the public that they had a surplus of high-end properties for sale. Then the *World Journal* asked Don in an interview why the Chinese were leaving. Don did not know the answer to that question and endeavoured to find out. A few years later over 500 Chinese have filled out a web-based questionnaire posted up on RIIM's site, and face-to-face interviews have been conducted in Vancouver, Toronto, Edmonton, Calgary, Beijing, Hong Kong, and Shanghai.

The Chinese leave Canada mainly because of the gap between their expectations and the Canadian reality. Half the Chinese immigrants contacted felt that they had not achieved their goals in Canada, and 75% of them were not hopeful to do so within five years. Instead, they were going to go back to China after they obtained their Canadian citizenship. Moreover, they hoped that their children would do better than themselves. The immigrants likely to leave had not made use of S.U.C.C.E.S.S. or of other settlement agencies and deplored the lack of credential recognition.

Finally, Don brought his findings in the national arena via testimony to the House of Commons Committee on Citizenship and Immigration with the following questions: Should limits be imposed on Canadian citizenship?, Is the Canadian Chinese diaspora a liability or an asset?, Should Canada offer protection to its citizens in war situations?

Arlene McLaren has been conducting qualitative research involving elderly immigrant South Asian women sponsored by their parents. Arlene set the stage when she mentioned that the number of admissions in the family class had dropped by 50% from 2004 to 2005, but that the government had said that numbers of family-class immigrants would be boosted to 17 or 19,000 in 2006, after much lobbying. She reminded the audience that older family members are generally depicted as burdens to families and to Canadians, since, unlike independent immigrants, they cannot readily find employment upon arrival in Canada.

Arlene presented the following salient points of a preliminary analysis of interviews conducted via Punjabi interpreters with sponsored elderly women:

- sponsorship was not a unidirectional relationship since grandparents also offered financial support to families;
- women often took care of many children while they did housework;
- women played a crucial role in the house while their relatives were working since they cooked and cleaned;
- some women confined to their relatives' home viewed Canada as a prison;
- some women worked seasonally on farms seven days a week;
- some women depended on their family for mobility;
- relationships with sponsors could often be difficult, with some families demanding to be paid back by the sponsored women.

All in all, Arlene's work indicated that sponsored parents assisted families while they could also feel obligated to pay back their sponsorship.

Conclusion

The overall objectives of this fifth annual retreat were clearly achieved: RIIM research projects and their policy relevance were highlighted. If such compelling evidence of money well spent does not generate further funding, presenters cannot be blamed since they were well-prepared, some even riveting. Thoughtful panelists initiated discussions followed by lively question periods which needed to be curtailed given time constraints.

The much-maligned Canadian multiculturalism policy was not only revisited but also set in international, feminist and labour-market perspectives. In this context, the quandary of immigrants failing to find employment during a period of labour shortage was eloquently brought up, with the problem of credential recognition given special attention.

The case for more research useful to community partners was unequivocally made, and RIIM was encouraged to seek out new provincial partners. A stylized pathway to influence policy-making at the federal level was outlined, and various suggestions to optimize research impacts were offered. In addition, insights into the web of connections between policy-makers and researchers were shared.

Finally, past, present and future plans for RIIM research were described and convincingly situated in the national arena.

Since immigration flows to Canada are not likely to stop in the immediate nor the distant future, based on the evidence of this retreat RIIM can continue to provide valuable information to its partners and to policy makers. Like other Metropolis centres, RIIM's contributions to informed debates on immigration at the local, regional, provincial, national, and international levels are crucial. If ever in doubt, the dedication and competence of RIIM researchers shone throughout this last retreat, and one hopes that further decisions touching immigrant lives will be made with rational and thorough research-based input.

APPENDIX B

Summary of RIIM Research Activities and Outputs, 2006-07

	Citizenship	Economic	Education	Hous&Nbhd	Soc&Health	Total
Number of Reports	3	5	5	5	6	24
Presentations						
National Conf.	1	1	1	3	2	8
Int'l Conf.	1	1	0	1	1	4
Other Academic	1	11	6	13	5	36
Policy Audience	2	13	3	5	2	25
Other	6	6	0	4	0	16
Publications						
RIIM Working Paper	0	3	0	4	2	9
RIIM WP Submitted	0	0	0	2	2	4
Journal Article	1	6	1	9	3	20
Book Chapter	1	2	0	5	0	8
Book	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	2	0	0	4	1	7
Students						
Masters	1	3	0	7	4	15
Doctoral	2	5	6	5	2	20
PDF	0	0	0	0	0	0
Partnership	1	0	0	1	2	4
Media Impact	2	2	0	2	0	6

APPENDIX C

RIIM working budget, 2006-07

August 2007

EXPENSES	2006-07
Administrative Activities	
N. des Ormeaux	28,357
L. Sheldon (RIIM share)	25,000
Webmaster	18,000
Librarian	6,000
Materials	10,000
SFU general office expenses	5,000
UBC administration	5,000
Total	97,357
Dissemination	
Printing and copying	13,000
National conference	8,000
International conference	8,000
Public forum	5,000
Research Policy Seminars	5,000
China-Canada dialogue	5,000
Total	44,000
Research	
Commitments carried from previous year*	80,604
New research (latest CFP)**	123,390
Additional research funds	20,916
Total	224,910
Grand total: expenses	366,267
REVENUES	
Base grant from Metropolis/SSHRC	325,425
Carry over, Master account (research)	31,410
Funds in Administrative account, carried over	9,432
Grant total: revenues	366,267

*06-07 carry over: Dossa, Friesen, Jacquet, Pratt, 30k DeVoretz

**06-07: 9 new projects were approved

APPENDIX D

2006 and 2007 Working Papers

06-01 [*Explaining Socio-economic Well-being of Immigrants and Returned Migrants: An Econometric Analysis of the Hong Kong and Canadian 2001 Censuses*](#)

AUTHORS: Fangmeng Tian and Zhongdong Ma, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

06-02 [*Creating Politicized Spaces: "Here" and "There": Lives of Elderly Afghan Women in Metropolitan Vancouver*](#)

AUTHOR: Parin Dossa, Simon Fraser University

06-03 [*"Witnessing" Social Suffering: Migratory Tales of Women from Afghanistan*](#)

AUTHOR: Parin Dossa, Simon Fraser University

06-04 [*Bridging the Gap in Social Services for Immigrants: A Community-Based Holistic Approach*](#)

AUTHOR: Shibao Guo, University of Calgary

06-05 [*Naturalisation and Socioeconomic Integration: The Case of the Netherlands*](#)

AUTHORS: Pieter Bevelander, IMER, Malmö University, and Justus Veenman, Erasmus University Rotterdam

06-06 [*The Economics of Citizenship: Is There a Naturalization Effect?*](#)

AUTHOR: Kirk Scott, Lund University, Sweden

06-07 [*The First 365 Days: Acehnese Refugees in Vancouver, British Columbia*](#)

AUTHORS: James McLean, Simon Fraser University; Chris Friesen, Immigrant Services Society of B.C., and Jennifer Hyndman, Simon Fraser University

06-08 [*Parental Sponsorship - Whose Problematic? A Consideration of South Asian Women's Immigration Experiences in Vancouver*](#)

AUTHOR: Arlene Tigar McLaren

06-09 [*The Economics of Norwegian Citizenship*](#)

AUTHOR: John E. Hayfron, Western Washington University

06-10 [*Locating Spatially Concentrated Risk of Homelessness amongst Recent Immigrants in Greater Vancouver: A GIS-based approach*](#)

AUTHORS: Rob Fiedler, Jennifer Hyndman, and Nadine Schuurman, Simon Fraser University

06-11 [*Hidden Losses: How Demographics Can Encourage Incorrect Assumptions About ESL High School Students' Success*](#)

AUTHORS: Kelleen Toohey, Simon Fraser University, and Tracey M. Derwing, University of Alberta

- 06-12 [*Immigrant Rites of Passage: Urban Settlement, Physical Environmental Quality and Health in Vancouver*](#)
AUTHORS: Michael Buzzelli, University of British Columbia, and K. Bruce Newbold, McMaster University
- 06-13 [*Why do Low- and High-Skill Workers Migrate? Flow Evidence from France*](#)
AUTHORS: Dominique M. Gross, and Nicolas Schmitt, Simon Fraser University
- 06-14 [*The Emergence of Super-diversity in Britain*](#)
AUTHOR: Steven Vertovec, ESRC centre on Migration, University of Oxford
- 06-15 [*Beyond the Polemics: The Economic Outcomes of Canadian Immigration*](#)
AUTHOR: Daniel Hiebert, Co-director, RIIM, University of British Columbia
- 06-16 [*The Education, Immigration and Emigration of Canada's Highly Skilled Workers in the 21st Century*](#)
AUTHOR: Don J. DeVoretz, Co-director, RIIM, Simon Fraser University
- 06-17 [*Economic Insecurity and Isolation: Post-Migration Traumas among Black African Refugee Women in the Greater Vancouver Area*](#)
AUTHOR: Adrienne Wasik, Simon Fraser University
- 06-18 [*The Liability of Foreignness: Survival Differences Between Foreign- and Native-owned Firms in the Basque Country*](#)
AUTHOR: Nahikari Irastorza, University of Deusto
- 06-19 [*The 'Flexible' Immigrant: Household Strategies and the Labour Market*](#)
AUTHORS: Gillian Creese, University of British Columbia; Isabel Dyck, Queen Mary, University of London; and Arlene Tigar McLaren, Simon Fraser University
- 06-20 [*Social Relations and Remittances: Evidence from Canadian Micro Data*](#)
AUTHORS: Don J. DeVoretz, Co-director, RIIM, Simon Fraser University, and Florin P. Vadean, Migration Research Group - HWWI, Germany
- 06-21 [*Are Cross-border Movements and Border Security Complements?*](#)
AUTHOR: Basil Golovetsky, RIIM, Simon Fraser University
- 07-01 [*Propensity to Naturalize and its Impact on Labour Market Performance and Public Coffers in the United States of America*](#)
AUTHOR: Ather H. Akbari, Sobey School of Business, St. Mary's University
- 07-02 [*Vancouver's Newest Chinese Diaspora: Settlers or "Immigrant Prisoners"?*](#)
AUTHOR: Sin Yih Teo, Dept. of Geography, University of British Columbia
- 07-03 [*Why do Immigrants from Hong Kong to Canada Stay or Leave?*](#)
AUTHOR: Nuowen Deng, Dept. of Economics, Simon Fraser University

07-04 [*Multiculturalism: A Canadian Defence*](#)

AUTHOR: David Ley, Dept. of Geography, University of British Columbia

07-05 [*Immigrant Entrepreneurship and the Role of Non-Government Organizations in an era of Neo-liberal Governance*](#)

AUTHORS: Min-Jung Kwak and Daniel Hiebert, Dept. of Geography, University of British Columbia

07-06 [*Global Banking and Financial Services to Immigrants in Canada and the United States*](#)

AUTHORS: Wei Li, Arizona State University, Alex Oberle, University of Northern Iowa, and Gary Dymski, University of California at Sacramento

APPENDIX F

SENIOR RESEARCHERS AFFILIATED WITH RIIM

(Note: the Domain Leader is shown in boldface font)

Citizenship and Culture Domain

Dan Hiebert (Geography, UBC)

Irene Bloemraad (Dept. of Sociology, UC Berkeley)

James D. Cameron (Dept. of History, St. Francis Xavier)

Wendy Chan (School of Criminology, SFU)

Xiaobei Chen (Social Work, UVic)

Christian Joppke (Dept. of Anthropology and Sociology, UBC)

Diana Lary (History, UBC)

Minelle Mahtani (Dept. of Geography, UBC)

Catherine Nolin (Geography, UNBC)

Leonie Sandercock (SCARP, UBC)

Yuko Shibata (Institute of Asian Research, UBC)

Margaret Walton-Roberts (Geography, U. Waterloo)

Economic Domain

Steve Mongrain, (Economics, SFU)

Ather H. Akbari (Economics, Saint Mary's University)

Heather Antecol (Economics, Claremont McKenna College, CA)

Jasmina Arifovic (Economics, SFU)

Pieter Bevelander, (School of Migration and Ethnic Relations, Malmö University)

Amelie Constant (Deputy Program Director: Migration, IZA)

Barry Chiswick (Economics, U. of Illinois, USA)

Diane Coulombe (RIIM, SFU)

James Dean (Economics, SFU)

Don DeVoretz (Economics, SFU)

Barry Edmonston (Sociology, UVic)

Jane Friesen (Economics, SFU)

Steve Globerman (Education, Western Washington University)

Alan Green (Economics, Queen's U.)

Dominique M. Gross (Graduate Public Policy Program, SFU)

Keith Head (Commerce, UBC)

Daniel Hiebert (Geography, UBC)

Thomas Hutton (Planning, UBC)

Roumi Ilieva (Education, SFU)

Alexander Karaivanov (Economics, SFU)

Brian Krauth (Economics, SFU)

Fernando Mata (Canadian Heritage)

Arti Nanavati (Economics, M.S. University of Baroda, India)

Kris Olds (Geography, U. Wisconsin)

Krishna Pendakur (Economics, SFU)
Ravi Pendakur (Social Development Canada)
David Prescott (Economics, U. of Guelph)
John Ries (Commerce, UBC)
Nicolas Schmitt (Economics, SFU)
Herbert J. Schuetze (Economics, UVic)
Abul Shamsuddin (Economics, The University of Newcastle, Australia)
Arthur Sweetman (School of Policy Studies, Queen's)
David Wilton (Economics, U. of Waterloo)
Vivek H. Dehejia (Economics, Carleton)
Florin-Petru Vadean (Migration Research Group - HWWA, Hamburg)
Chris Worswick (Carlton University)

Education Domain

Kelleen Toohey (Education, SFU)

Lesley Andres (Education, UBC)
June Beynon (Education, SFU)
Barry Chiswick (Economics, U. of Illinois, USA)
Diane Dagenais (Education, SFU)
Natalia Gajdamaschko (Education, SFU)
Marianne Jacquet (Education, SFU)
Yali Li (Education, UVic)
Danièle Moore (Education, SFU)
Linda LaRocque (Education, SFU)
Cecile Sabatier (Education, SFU)
Michele Schmidt (Education, SFU)
Peter Seixas (Director, Ctr. for Study of Historical Consciousness, UBC)
Pierre Walter (Education, UBC)

Housing and Neighbourhoods Domain

Jennifer Hyndman (Geography, SFU)

Harald Bauder (Geography, University of Guelph)
David Edgington (Geography, UBC)
Penny Gurstein (Planning, UBC)
Thomas Hutton (Planning, UBC)
Wei Li (Asian Pacific American Studies Program, Arizona State U.)
Eugene McCann (Geography, SFU)
Geraldine Pratt (Geography, UBC)
Leonie Sandercock (Planning, UBC)
Heather Smith (Geography & Earth Sciences, UNNC. Charlotte)
Nadine Schurrman (Geography, SFU)
Carlos Teixeira (Geography, OUC)
Elvin Wyly (Geography, UBC)

Society and Health Domain**Gillian Creese (Sociology, UBC)**

Joan Anderson (Nursing, UBC)

Maria Cristina Barroetavena (Fac. of Medicine, UBC)

Habib Chaudury (Gerontology, SFU)

Lyren Chiu (School of Nursing, UBC)

Catherine Dauvergne (Faculty of Law, UBC)

Parin Dossa (Anthropology, SFU)

Karl Froschauer (Sociology & Anthropology, SFU)

Donald Galloway (Law, UVic)

Bruce Guenther (TWU)

Neil Guppy (Sociology, UBC)

Edwin Hui (Theology, Regent College, UBC)

Patricia Janssen (Health Care & Epidemiology, UBC)

Phyllis Johnson (Social Work & Family Studies, UBC)

Joseph Kess (Linguistics, UVic)

David Ley (Geography, UBC)

Arlene McLaren (Sociology, SFU)

Anand Paranjpe (Psychology, SFU)

Ravi Pendakur (Strategic Directions Branch, Social Development Canada)

Margaret Walton-Roberts (Geography, U. Waterloo)

Habiba Zaman (Women's Studies, SFU)

Zheng Wu (Sociology, UVic)