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Introduction to the study

- Precarious Housing and Hidden Homelessness among Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Immigrants in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver
- Team leader: D. Hiebert, UBC; co-researchers: V. Preston & R. Murdie (York), D. Rose (INRS)
- Funded (Sept. 2010-May 2011) under National Metropolis proposal call based on strategic partnership between the Homelessness Partnerships Strategy (HRSDC) and the Metropolis Secretariat (CIC) for a “Comparative study of housing and homelessness among refugees in MTV”
  - Outputs to date: published research reports & summaries for each city (all are here http://mbc.metropolis.net/media.html); presentations (community, government, academic); media releases
Metropolis Project context

Study was made possible by and reflects unique qualities of the Metropolis Project experiment:

- Space for negotiating between “policy relevance” and respect for researcher autonomy to reframe questions, define policy problems differently

- Communities of practice built-up over time
  - Trust-building at local scale between academic researchers, settlement services sector and government stakeholders → feasibility of partner collaboration in compressed time-frame, access to refugee claimants awaiting decision
  - Inter-provincial networking within NGO sector → support for MTV comparative aspect
Metropolis Project, 1996-2012 – organization and discursive spaces
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Parameters and hypotheses underlying proposal call (based on existing literature)

- Affordable, decent housing as anchor point for a new start
  - Practical and symbolic aspects
- Whereas precarious housing and homelessness are barriers to social and economic integration
- Both refugees (pre-selected) and refugee claimants at greater housing risk than other admission categories
  - Uprootedness, lack of family and/or co-ethnic support networks
  - Extreme economic precariousness: no savings, reliance on social assistance
- But need for comparison of respective housing experiences of refugees and claimants (in main gateway cities)
Revisiting Renaud’s “One’s bad [GARs] and the other one’s worse [refugee claimants]” hypothesis

Does this finding (JIMI 2003) regarding employment and earnings also apply to housing?

• Since IRPA 2002, admission of more GARs with “multiple barriers” (protracted displacee existence, language, education...)

• but GARs admitted as “future citizens” whereas refugee claimants are temporary residents (e.g. TFW work permit)
  – GARs: enhanced federally-funded settlement services in year 1, refugee claimants: excluded from federal assistance (except basic info about housing)

• Especially high housing vulnerability of refugee claimants who are alone (D’Addario et al. 2007; Murdie 2008)

• Worsening stigmatization of refugee claimants (political/media discourses of de-legitimation of inland claim-making)?
Re-contextualizing the RFP objectives

Our proposal argued for:

- Need to avoid danger of de-contextualization and overemphasis on immigration status - Despite RFP focus on refugees and asylum seekers only, the comparison should also extend to non-refugee immigrants, especially in view of
  - well-documented deterioration in labour market integration of economic immigrants
  - Worsening housing affordability and housing quality problems for low-income households in MTV over past decade
- Relevance of comparisons between MTV because of housing market and other difference in context of newcomer settlement
Study methodology: questionnaire survey & focus groups

- Focus groups with key informants in community-based organizations assisting newcomers (with aid of state funding)
- Questionnaire survey & focus groups with newcomers and recent immigrants (3mths-10yrs in Canada) drawn from clients using settlement agency services in 3-4 wk period: 200 questionnaires / city
  - 25% refugee claimants/landed-in-Canada refugees
  - 25% GAR/PSR
  - 50% non-refugee immigrants
- Follow-up focus groups with refugee claimants/LCRs and GARs
- Agency workers trained for the questionnaire survey
- Local research advisory committee of community partners (finalizing research instruments, debating recommendations...)
Methodological limits and challenges (1)

- Sampling universe excludes extremes i.e. those not needing settlement services + those too excluded to access them
  - Bias/limitation in terms of lack of generalizability to non-clients
  - But advantage in terms of focus on circumstances and needs of those already using settlement services (better comparability)
Methodological limits and challenges (2)

- Common research protocol versus local circumstances
  - Standardized questionnaire versus differences in housing typology, market, social housing policy
  - Between-city differences in organization and funding of settlement services (e.g. key Toronto organization, Housing Help has no equivalent in Mtl or Van.)
  - Balancing desire for consistency of sampling universe across cities with partner organizations’ desire to buy-in to study

- Training community interviewers and doing survey in very tight timeframe
THE MONTRÉAL COMPONENT:
CONTEXT, SELECTED FINDINGS
“Housing vulnerability”: a view from census data

% renters spending ≥50% of income on housing, Montréal CMA, 2006:

- Renter households in general: 18%
- Recent immigrants (2001–’06): 30%
- Nonpermanent residents: 43%

- putting them at risk of homelessness, or cutting back on other essential needs

- Similar situation in Toronto & Vancouver

Source: Statistics Canada, “core data” compilations for Metropolis project researchers (Rose et al., 2012, forthcoming)
Housing supply context: Vacancy rates, Island of Montréal, 1992-2010

Moreover, vacancy rates are much lower for units at low end of rent scale (CMM 2009)

Source: Rose & Charette, 2001, based on CMHC, Rental Housing Survey, various years; data are for units in buildings containing 3 or more units and exclude units in the secondary rental market.
Montréal survey (2010-2011) respondents by arrival status and settlement organization of recruitment (N=201)
Number of children under 18, by arrival status, Montréal survey, 2010 (N=179)

Source: Rose & Charette 2011
Highest level of education attained, by arrival status, Montréal survey, 2010 (N=200)

- **Secondary school not completed**
- **Secondary school completed**
- **Post-secondary college or technical training**
- **University studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Non Refugee Immigrant</th>
<th>GAR/PSR</th>
<th>Refugee Claimant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school not completed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school completed</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary college or technical training</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University studies</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rose & Charette 2011

Likely impact of GARs’ low education on navigating complex housing system (language, bureaucracy)

Pearson chi²: differences significant at 99% confidence level
Housing vulnerability: resettled refugees (GAR) with large families

“The [French] language, I’ll end up learning it, God willing. Our problem is housing. We need a larger apartment, but we’re afraid [to give our present landlord notice]. People say that nobody will want to rent to you because you’re a large family.”

‘Maria” (GAR, 7 months in Canada, focus group 1, Montreal survey, 2011: translation Arabic to French to English)

Source: Rose & Charette (2011b)

- Overcrowding and its consequences need more research (see also Pruegger & Tanasescu 2007)
Experience of unsanitary/unfit housing conditions, Montréal survey, 2010 (n=190)

- **Refugee Claimant**: 63% have not had a problem, 37% have had a problem.
- **GAR/PSR**: 65% have not had a problem, 35% have had a problem.
- **Non-Refugee Immigrant**: 84% have not had a problem, 16% have had a problem.

Source: Rose & Charette 2011

Pearson chi²: differences significant at 95% confidence level.
Satisfaction with current housing, Montréal survey, 2010 (n=200)

- Refugee claimant:
  - 4% very satisfied
  - 49% satisfied
  - 35% dissatisfied
  - 12% very dissatisfied

- GAR/PSR
  - 13% very satisfied
  - 45% satisfied
  - 34% dissatisfied
  - 9% very dissatisfied

- Non-refugee immigrant
  - 10% very satisfied
  - 68% satisfied
  - 19% dissatisfied
  - 3% very dissatisfied

Pearson chi²: differences significant at 95% confidence level; 99% if both categories of refugees are combined.

Source: Rose & Charette 2011
Satisfaction with current neighbourhood, Montréal survey, 2010 (n=197)

Pearson chi²: differences significant at 95% confidence level when both categories of refugees are combined.
Housing vulnerability: refugee protection claimants awaiting the decision

“’There’s always a fear that stops us from doing anything [about landlords’ negligence]… we say to ourselves… we are refugees… what rights do we have to claim something from a person who is from here?’”

“Elsa” (current refugee claimant, focus group 4, Montréal survey, 2011; translation: Spanish to French to English)

Source: Rose & Charette (2011b)
Housing vulnerability: very high shelter cost to income ratios, Montréal survey, 2010

- Most (64-68%) GARs and claimants/LCR currently spend over 50% of income on rent; but so did 51% of the economic immigrants in our sample (n=165)
  - These rates higher than for recent immigrants according to 2006 census
- Focus groups highlighted especial difficulties of single people in coping with housing costs
- Findings reflect inadequacy of social assistance levels
Experiences of housing discrimination, Montréal survey, 2010 (n=194)

Difficulties linked to discrimination = family type/age/gender/disability; country of origin/skin colour/religion/ethnicity; income source (social assistance); immigration status. Respondents were given an exhaustive list of possible housing difficulties. The word “discrimination” was not used in the question. Source: unpublished survey data.

Pearson chi$^2$: differences significant at 95% confidence level.
MTV comparisons

- This part of our research not completed...
- Overall, surprise at similarity of findings between MTV despite housing market and settlement context differences
- Challenge of comparative analysis to be faced soon, taking account of study’s limits
Main recommendations (Montréal component) - targeted

- Better housing-related information, earlier
- Resources for option of longer stays in transitional accommodation, and accompaniment to help finding suitable housing
- Fight discrimination and stigmatization
- Combat barriers to employment
- Expand settlement services for refugee claimants
- Related research need on interprovincial variations in their social citizenship access, re-framed not only in humanitarian debate but also in wider context of expansion of temporary migration statuses in Canada
Main study recommendations (Montréal component) - mainstream

- Priority funding (all levels of govt.) for rehabilitation of private rental apartment buildings in 1946-1970 stock
  - This is where newcomers are concentrated, but benefits much wider segment
- More social housing...
  - Though this emphasized this less in Mtl than in Toronto & Vancouver reports, due to context differences
Challenges of “knowledge mobilization”

- Winding-down of Metropolis Secretariat has meant loss of KM channels to senior federal policy officials
- Refugee claimants: policy (C-31) going toward increasing precariousness for some, no guarantee of fast-track approvals
- More optimism re housing and GARs? Our study findings dovetail with CIC program evaluation (Nov. 2011)
- Also important not to neglect traditional refereed publications – held in high regard by senior policy officials at “elite” ministries like CIC: issue of competing truth claims in politicized decision-making context...
Thank yous...

- To the PMER at Western, for the invitation
- To our partners who made the study possible:
  
  Questionnaire survey and focus groups (Montréal):
  - CARI St-Laurent – Centre d’accueil et de référence sociale et économique pour immigrants
  - La MIRS – Maison internationale de la Rive-sud
  - La Maisonnée – Service d’aide et de liaison pour immigrants
  - CSAI – Centre social d’aide aux immigrants
  - CACI – Centre d’appui aux communautés immigrantes
  
  Focus group only:
  - Le Projet Refuge – Maison Haidar (Centre d'hébergement de transition pour hommes en migration forcée)
APPENDIX: DISCRIMINATION QUESTIONS IN SURVEY
Peu de réponses affirmatives à une question qui fait mention **explicite** de « discrimination »

Q16. « Je vais vous lire une liste de difficultés que vous auriez pu avoir sur le plan du logement. Avez-vous en ce moment ou avez-vous vécu depuis votre arrivée dans le Grand Montréal un problème de... »

• « Discrimination (quelle qu’elle soit) ? »
  – Oui : 7% (11% chez les demandeurs d’asile)
    [N=191 pour cette question. Source: Rose et Charrette 2011, 46.]

Mais une question plus « neutre » sur les sources de difficultés vécues sur le plan du logement est plus révélatrice (→ diapo suivante)
Q.19 Pensez-vous que vous avez vécu des difficultés sur le plan du logement pour l’une ou l’autre des raisons suivantes? (vous pouvez cocher plus d’une réponse)

- Langue
- Manque de références
- Historique de crédit inexistant ou mauvais
- Pas de garant (personne ne peut garantir qu’il paiera votre loyer si vous ne pouvez pas le faire)
- Taille de la famille
- Type de famille (ex. monoparentale) *
- Genre (sexe) *
- Âge *
- Handicap *
- La couleur de votre peau/celle des membres de votre famille *
- Votre pays d’origine/celui de votre famille *
- Religion ou provenance ethnique *
- Statut de réfugié ou de résident temporaire *
- Votre source de revenus (ex. solidarité sociale, bien-être social) *
- Crise financière ou problèmes financiers
- Autres raisons__________
  - x. Refusé

* = obstacles qui sont, selon nous, de nature discriminatoire. Lors de l’analyse nous avons donc créé une nouvelle variable binaire, « vécu d’obstacle discriminatoire (oui/non) »