After the Flight

After the Flight:

The Dynamics of Refugee Settlement and Integration

Edited by

Morgan Poteet and Shiva Nourpanah

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

After the Flight: The Dynamics of Refugee Settlement and Integration

Edited by Morgan Poteet and Shiva Nourpanah

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-9074-X
ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-9074-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The challenging process of successfully settling refugees in a reception country may never be more topical than it will be in Canada over the next few years. “After the Flight: The Dynamics Of Refugee Settlement and Integration” is a diverse, contemporary discussion of the complexities of refugee resettlement. It examines the many forces and philosophies in a variety of social, political and economic contexts that intricately influence the multilayered concept of settlement. This scholarly endeavour could not be more timely.

International human rights organizations are united in their estimation that there is at the time of writing this a staggering 50 million human beings on our planet displaced from their homes and countries seeking a safe destination. Included in that number are over 4 million Syrian people existing in primitive refugee camps or wandering on foot, in boats, by bus, or by any means possible, to or from such camps. These are desperate human souls, not a strange mutation of humanity genetically predisposed to more easily endure the violence of war. Like each of us, they feel pain and grieve losses. They grow traumatized by the horrors around them and, like many of us would, they succumb to the death of hope. Canada must be the human and spiritual force that returns civility and security to their lives. Our Canadian home must become their home and that transition must occur as soon as possible. No more people should be permitted to die.

Prime Minister (elect) Justin Trudeau promised in the recent Canadian federal election to bring to Canada 25000 displaced Syrian people by the end of 2015. Some Canadians experienced in refugee settlement, and who generally support this initiative, also fear irreparable stresses on the already fragile settlement infrastructure in Canada. Years of government underfunding, disinterest and, perhaps, other more sinister motives, have made it difficult for Canada’s settlement professionals to design and implement effective settlement programs. Inviting to Canada an additional 25000 displaced Syrian people in the remaining eight weeks of 2015 seemed daunting.

It was impressive that after his successful federal election campaign, the new Prime Minister remained resolute in his intention to “make good” on this bold election promise. The Prime Minister’s Syrian resettlement

plan is indeed ambitious, but human lives in peril demand that it be ambitious. And while bringing to Canada a large group of people over a short period will tax an already pressed settlement system, taking the time to do it better later is a luxury that despairing Syrians can ill afford. We do want to be the best we can be when resettling people in Canada, but we must recognize the priority of getting such people out of harm's way without further delay.

Some Canadians think we should welcome fewer Syrians over a longer period of time. Some of that analysis comes from a practical place. Other Canadians argue that Canada's door should be closed altogether. Doing the right thing can be challenging. There are always reasons not to do so. Canada's immigration history is full of such travesties. In the refugee context, saving human lives is paramount. It must trump all other considerations.

Why, then, has Canada not yet taken substantive action to rescue Syrian citizens when the human need has been so obvious for so long? How do we explain Canadians who think Canada should close its doors to the world's oppressed? Why has Canada's settlement infrastructure not kept pace with international need so that we can be ready when the world's displaced need us to be ready? I fear that some of the answers to these questions may be less complimentary than we would wish.

My first professional awareness of the challenges facing those claiming refugee protection in Canada occurred in the 1980s when I became involved in the case of 174 Sikh people from India. This large group arrived silently in the middle of a July night on the south shore of a rural Nova Scotia community. Shortly after daybreak, the local residents reported this mysterious group to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who promptly transferred all 174 claimants to the Stadacona military base in north end Halifax where they were detained en masse in the base gymnasium.

The unusually large size of this group coupled with the uncommon manner of their arrival to Canada, and the fact they were suspected of being members of the outlawed All India Sikh Student Federation, drew law enforcement agencies and media from all over the world. Canadian Immigration officers were flown to Halifax from Montreal and Toronto to process refugee paper work. International media held daily scrums reporting back to their national audiences. And the confused refugee claimants from India, unsure of what was transpiring around them, were frequently disturbed in the middle of the night when they would be removed from the gym and subjected to late night interrogations by plain clothed security police and immigration officers.

Of the many disturbing things I observed during that dramatic case, the most troubling was the shameless bigotry I experienced on the streets of Halifax. Some of that vitriol was about me, my ethnicity, questioning my right to be in Canada, but most was directed toward my 174 unwelcome clients.

I realized then, and have had reinforced many times since, that at the core of immigration law and policy in Canada is the matter of race. Historically, immigration law in Canada was overtly racist. Currently, however, it is unconstitutional to discriminate based on race. This requires that exclusion from Canada be more cleverly engineered through policy and legislative amendments. In the 1950s and 60s when many of the world's asylum seekers were Caucasians who managed to escape from behind the iron curtain, there was no Canadian inclination to identify a global refugee crisis. Canada was not motivated to draft federal legislation limiting access to Canada nor, if already in the country, to limit access to Canada's legal, social, health, and settlement services.

The original signatories to the UN refugee convention could not have imagined that a few decades later global events would be such that the Soviet Union would disintegrate, the number of displaced people globally would grow to almost 50 million, and that most of those needing a safe destination would come from non Caucasian and non Christian countries. It was with that realization that Canada did declare a refugee crisis about which successive Canadian federal governments have gradually whittled away the rights and hopes of those looking to Canada to save their lives.

On the Canadian immigration continuum, we are at a unique time in our history. Unlike any previous moment in my professional career, many sectors and institutions in Canada identify significantly increased immigration to Canada as a fundamental requirement for future nation building. Regardless of whether Canadians are motivated selfishly or altruistically, or both, it seems that opening our national door to those who want or need to be in Canada is both just and smart. This is fortunate as it is not often in life that following through on a moral imperative is also materially advantageous.

If increased migration to Canada is in Canada's national best interest, why has recent Canadian refugee policy rapidly moved to render Canada so inhospitable to the world's most frightened? If Canadian institutions as diverse as the banks, academia, provincial governments, industry, labour, agriculture, and small business all agree that Canada must actively grow our population, it is puzzling in the extreme to understand why our federal government has chosen to aggressively obstruct such an influential and unified call to action.

There might be a variety of partial answers to some of these questions, but we will shame ourselves if we do not include in that reply Canada's ongoing failure to adequately grapple with the matter of race.

People familiar with Canadian immigration and refugee history will know this is not the first time Canada has chosen to not take the lead in a humanitarian crisis to resettle people escaping peril. More disturbing, however, this is not the first time Canada has deliberately and actively obfuscated saving lives. Moral failures not learned from our past are repeating themselves at this moment. While many Canadians last month sat comfortably around Thanksgiving dinner tables and probably chatted at least briefly about "the Syrian refugee crisis" or the north African "boat people", real people, including children, were killed, starved to death, drowned, sexually abused, or languished hopelessly in refugee camps. I try to imagine what it must be like for a child in Aleppo, Latakia, or Homs having to endure and emotionally process the deafening noise of jets and guns and bombs, the bloodshed, the death, and the absence of anything resembling safety or security, and I am unable to do so. These images should not be in the head of any child any where at any time, and Canada should be rescuing these children and their parents in numbers so large that we can actually begin to feel good about ourselves.

I never tire of seeing the expression that gradually emerges on the face of a successful refugee claimant at that poignant moment when the claimant finally realizes that their refugee case has been won. Watching years of fear and despair involuntarily give way to relief and new hope is a personal reward unequaled in anything I have ever seen or done. And yet, months or years later, when I encounter that former client on the street, I will sometimes ask how they are settling into life in Canada. Too often the embarrassed person will reluctantly confess to me feelings of deep loneliness.

The reluctance, I have been able to conclude, comes from guilt. Refugees are grateful. They are deeply thankful to Canada for saving their life and they feel embarrassed that their gratitude becomes shrouded by an overwhelming, sometimes debilitating, loneliness. On those occasions when I feel angry enough to probe, I am surprised to learn that the loneliness is often not the anticipated result of living so far from family and all that is familiar. That, too, is a challenge. But, refugees are the quintessential entrepreneur. They are by definition the consummate risk taker and are not defeated by challenges. This loneliness, I am told, is a deeper alienation that is sourced in the Canadians around them.

One former refugee client politely explained this to me. In her gentle manner she humbly explained that "Canadians are very friendly people.

When you pass them on the street they say hello. I always say hello back. Some Canadians will even stop on the street to have a short conversation with me. I like that. But I never get invited to anybody's home for a cup of tea and a piece of cake."

Nobody wants to be a refugee. Nobody wants to be forced from their family and home, from their culture, and from everything that gives their life context and meaning. There are now tens of millions of such people seeking safety. Canada is morally and legally obliged to be a safe home for the tortured, the vulnerable, and the displaced. And, after their flight to Canada, those seeking safety in our country should expect that we will do as much as we possibly can to better understand the complex nature and interactions of race, culture, gender, and religion so that future refugees to Canada will not know the bigotry and alienation previously experienced by many who have come before. We need to do more. "After the Flight: The Dynamics Of Refugee Settlement and Integration" is an important step in that direction.

M. Lee Cohen Q.C.
November 1, 2015

INTRODUCTION

MORGAN POTEET AND SHIVA NOURPANAH

Refugees have typically undergone long and difficult journeys from their initial flight from their homeland, and their reception into a resettlement country seems to be the end point, signaling the end of instability, uncertainty and fear of persecution. It marks the start of a hopeful chapter in their lives. However, as settlement and service workers know, and as asylum seekers and refugees come to learn very quickly, the process of integrating into a new community can be very challenging, affected by a wide range of social, cultural and economic factors. The chapters in this collection explore these integration issues in selected national contexts of the global north, capturing some of the diversity and heterogeneity of this experience. While the integration of immigrant families, children and youth, and second-generation immigrants has received substantial academic attention, the experiences of refugees are often subsumed under this broader category. In this volume, we focus on refugees and the structural and systemic challenges they face as they integrate in their new host societies. The collection is further strengthened by the inclusion of critical studies of various settlement programs that have been implemented with a view to facilitating the integration of refugees. Importantly, the qualitative approaches of the studies consider the lived experience of integration, and the ways in which integration challenges and the settlement policies and services that are put in place to facilitate integration are viewed, received, and responded to by refugees. The majority of the contributions were originally presented at the Annual Conference for the Canadian Association for Refugee and Forced Migration Studies (CARFMS) in Halifax, Nova Scotia on the east coast of Canada in 2013.

Refugee movements span the globe as people fleeing danger and persecution seek to rebuild their lives in new places. Accordingly, the studies in this volume are not confined to a particular country. The majority of chapters focus on settlement of refugees in Canada, with other chapters focused on comparable settlement for refugees in the U.S., Australia, and Northern Ireland. This reflects Canada's long-standing international humanitarian reputation in setting standards for refugee

protection, as well as the fact that current national political trends in Canada threaten to undermine this reputation - indeed have already to a certain extent done so- issues which will be further examined below.

The main objective of this volume is to contribute in-depth qualitative knowledge about refugee integration in countries of the global north. In order to achieve this objective, we examine systemic barriers to integration as well as various settlement services and programs designed to facilitate refugee integration in countries of the global north. To this end our scholars address: the conditions in reception countries that allow for the successful resettlement of refugees, and conversely hinder the process; the ways that state policies and practices intersect with race, class, gender, age, ethnicity, and other socially structured inequalities during the integration process; the agency and voice of refugees, and the extent to which refugees influence their own integration process; and the role of advocates, activists, and service-providers for the protection, settlement and integration of refugees. We begin this introductory chapter with an overview of refugees in the global context, followed by an extensive review of the literature focusing on the process of integration for refugees in the global north, including studies of settlement services and support. We conclude by outlining the structure of the book and the chapters that follow.

The global context

A sharp increase in the number of forced displacements over the past five years, together with continuing global imbalance in responsibility for refugees make this book timely and relevant. At the end of 2014, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) announced that the number of forcibly displaced persons had reached a staggering 59.5 million- a figure unrivalled since the end of World War II (UNHCR, 2015). 14.4 million refugees are recognized under UNHCR's mandate, the rest being internally-displaced people, Palestinian refugees registered by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA), and asylum-seekers. 86% of refugees are hosted in developing countries. Meanwhile, only 105,200 individuals were admitted for resettlement to third countries during 2014 (UNHCR, 2015). The total number of resettled refugees during the past decade is estimated at 900,000, which is roughly the same as it was the decade prior, 1995-2005. With less than 1% of refugees worldwide resettled in any given year, this leaves the great majority in situations of uncertainty. In the current geopolitical context, expanding resettlement programs is one of the few viable options for addressing this

global imbalance in responsibility for refugees. While our contributors do not limit themselves solely to the study of resettled refugees, these figures are important for contextualising the number of refugees who are able to gain access to durable protection in third countries. Furthermore, the lack of in-depth knowledge about refugee integration specifically, as distinct from other immigrants, prevents informed decision-making about how to implement successful resettlement and integration programs for refugees. Accordingly, the studies in this volume explore settlement in countries that have traditionally implemented viable resettlement programs for refugees, and developed a strong suite of services and programs to facilitate integration processes.

Refugee studies and integration

A look at the current literature on refugee affairs points to four broad groupings. First, there are volumes that specifically discuss legal protection regimes for refugees. Classic examples include Howard Adelman's *Refugee policy: Canada and the United States* (1991), or James Hathaway's *The rights of refugees under international law* (2005). In a more recent example, *Give refuge to the stranger: The past, present and future of sanctuary* (2011), Linda Rabben discusses the increasingly mean-spirited interpretation of the 1951 Convention by developed countries in North America and Europe in a historic context. These works are of course not disjoint from issues surrounding integration and settlement, and indeed, as will be discussed further below, there is scholarly research that emphasizes the impact of refugee protection policy on integration outcomes. Specifically, the bureaucratization of legal protection regimes in host countries directly determines the types and levels of services and rights to which refugees are entitled. For example, Alice Bloch (2001) examines the impact of immigration status on the labour market participation of refugees and asylum-seekers in the UK. She concludes that policy which erodes access to social and economic institutions will adversely affect settlement. Monica Boyd (1999) further explores the close linkages between protection and integration. Boyd convincingly argues that gendered biases inherent in the international refugee protection regime carries over to settlement outcomes. Charging that the international protection regime is at best "gender-blind" and at worst privileges male "prototypical" refugees whose civil and political rights are violated in public settings, and thus overlook private violations more commonly faced by women, she traces how such gender biases continue to impact refugee women as they enter settlement processes. The gender inequality which

many women face in their home countries continues to hinder their efforts to settle in industrialized countries, which present their own forms of gender stratification. Ethnicity and race have also been shown to be significant structural inequalities in socioeconomic integration for refugees and immigrants that can persist into the second generation as demonstrated by work in Canada (Abada et al 2009) and the United States (Baum and Flores 2011). Literature in the UK starting with the edited work by Hall (1997) has explored the impact of racialization on the integration of different ethnic communities or lack thereof. More recently, literature in the UK has largely used the concept of social exclusion to examine the increasingly restrictive refugee regime. Collectively, this work demonstrates that social inequalities of race, class, gender, age, and others have an impact on concrete integration outcomes of employment, education, health and housing for refugees in all national contexts of reception.

A second group of work is devoted to social work with immigrants and refugees, and relevant policies and settlement practices. *Best Practices for Social Work with Refugees and Immigrants* (2002) by Miriam Potocky-Tripodi is a fine example of this genre, discussing empirically based service approaches, relevant policies, and service delivery systems, together with assessment and intervention techniques. Memoirs and refugee narrations form a third body of work. Often containing first-person narratives, books such as *Refugee sandwich: Stories of exile and asylum* (2006) by Peter Showler recount personal experiences of "going through" the asylum and refugee process.

Finally, there is the literature on the social, cultural and economic experience of integration in the global north, which we review in more detail below, and to which this volume makes its most significant contribution. We begin our review immediately below with a discussion of the significant and systematic barriers that challenge the efforts of refugees and the agencies mandated to serve them as they settle into their new host societies. Secondly, we discuss the literature on formal policies, practices and services developed to respond to these challenges. Thirdly, we examine informal settlement support and the agency of refugees, concluding with a broad analytical framework for understanding a range of re/settlement and integration processes and outcomes.

A: Integration: The barriers and challenges

The movement of refugees is not random, but rather takes place within complex global dynamics that are shaped by economic, political, and social forces. Castles (2003) notes that while economic migration seems

"inevitably" tied to economic globalization, the connection between forced migration and globalization is still not fully acknowledged. Castles argues further that globalization is not and has never been an equitable, fair project in which all people have participated willingly and advantageously-quite the contrary. It has deepened inequality both at the geographical and social level. Failed or unstable economies lead to weak states, human rights abuses and greater possibilities of violence. Often, refugees are already scarred by violence, instability and insecurity upon arrival in resettlement countries, adding a layer of complexity to their integration. For example, Wilson et al (2010) document the mental health issues in a group of newly-arrived refugees in Toronto. Many describe traumatic or distressing pre-migration experiences which severely impact integration in host societies. Meanwhile, post-migration factors such as poverty, interracial conflict and family instability including intergenerational conflict exacerbate mental health issues and continue to act as barriers to integration.

Refugees do not arrive in homogeneous cultural and national blocks, rather just as movements are taking place in "transnational social spaces" (Faist 2000, quoted in Castles 2003, 27), so too does integration. While social ties and networks are generally considered to be a contributing factor to successful integration (see Hyndman 2011), refugees are broadly acknowledged to lack these in their country of settlement. The maintenance of transnational connections -for both immigrants and refugees- can be deemed problematic (Hyndman 2011 23), but ties within and with geographical sites beyond immediate localities must be considered in order to develop a full representation of settlement and integration. Basically, refugees do not settle into their new communities with a blank slate, ready to be inscribed with fresh sociocultural codes and practices, and their arrival initiates a complex series of interactions and negotiations with existing social structures. Accordingly, as scholars of integration, we take into account the transnational and multi-dimensional nature of the social processes in the host society as well as the cultural "baggage" of refugees.

Studies on refugee integration from over twenty years ago document the difficulties encountered during this process (Opoku-Dapaah 1994; Opoku-Dapaah 1992, Stephenson, 1995, Castles et al. 2002). These scholars note that the hardships such as violence and assault undergone by refugees before their flight combine with their recent experiences in their country of asylum –long delays in the acquisition of legal status, restrictive access to settlement-related services, and racism- to create anxiety, discouragement and economic dependency. Castles et al's meta-review of the literature on refugee integration documents barriers in host societies

such as exclusionary mechanisms on accessing social and welfare benefits, the ongoing need for comprehensive healthcare, and the different aspects of exclusion as experienced by women, youth and ethnic minorities. It further reveals significant gaps in the literature, specifically on the historical experiences of refugees, their labour market participation, gender and ethnic awareness, transnational networks and the impact of the immigration process and bureaucratic categorizations on integration (Castles et al. 2002).

Yu, Ouellet and Warmington (2007) differentiate economic from sociocultural integration, drawing on a list of indicators that can be read from quantitative survey data in order to measure integration. Economic integration, measured through the employment rate and earnings, is shown to be lower than those of other streams of immigrants, and although the gap decreases after five years, it does not quite close. But for sociocultural integration, which is a "much more elusive concept to define and to quantify" (21), they admit to a "dearth of evidence" (22), and call for further research into the trends and patterns which constitute sociocultural integration. Despite their binary of economic / sociocultural, they acknowledge that this is a blurred line. For example, the impact of ethnic and friendship networks on employment is known to be significant for immigrants, but little is known about how such networks could benefit refugees.

Jennifer Hyndman (2011) builds upon this research and presents a similar schema of integration indicators in her meta-analysis of current integration research. Echoing the challenges in defining and measuring successful integration, which she relates partially to the methodological challenges of gathering data on such a complex social process, she is yet able to discern six thematic indicators generally accepted by government and non-government actors, and she subsequently summarizes the available academic research on them. These indicators are: 1-economic, referring mainly to employment earnings; 2-official languages; 3-education; 4-housing; 5- social; and 6-legal and citizenship. The indicators are interrelated, for instance higher earnings are closely linked to knowledge of official language and education. Secure and affordable housing remains a "vital piece" of the settlement and integration puzzle (19), with refugees consistently found to be living in more crowded conditions than other migrants. Lack of decent housing for refugees in large cities has effectively pushed them to the margins of society. This echoes Murdie's qualitative research on the housing situation for refugees in larger cities (2008), which is contextualized within the broader literature on housing for immigrants and refugees in Britain and Canada. However,

while Murdie's research acknowledges the gap between the housing situation of refugee claimants and sponsored refugees, his remarks indicate that the gap is not as significant as may appear: "Both are in the unenviable position of having to trade-off choices between shelter, food, clothing and other essentials" (99). Social indicators are complex, difficult to define, and to measure, but highly important. Finally, refugees consistently display the highest uptake of any other migration category of political citizenship- hardly surprising, given the circumstances of their entry. However, the relationship between political citizenship and sense of belonging remains to be fully explored.

Hyndman's meta-review demonstrates the *problematique* of comparing refugees with immigrants, as well as the differences across categories of refugees. And although not articulated as such, it also displays the holistic nature of the integration process- it is virtually impossible to talk of any of these indicators without taking into account the others. Existing qualitative social research, while often focusing on the experiences of one particular refugee group, takes on this holistic nature in complex ways. For example, Danso (2001) explores the settlement experiences of Ethopian and Somalian refugees in Toronto. He studies pre- and post-migration attitudes, tracing how the high hopes of refugees prior to arrival are often dashed as they experience the harsh reality of life in an urban Canadian sprawl. These refugees discuss how they do not feel truly welcomed, despite the show of welcome which is proffered to them on arrival. They cite their difficulties in accessing jobs or creating a sense of belonging and true friendship, and while some of these experiences can be attributed to language barriers, overall they are seen as evidence of the hostility and racism which they feel foreigners face. Danso concludes that they face "formidable barriers" in the forms of systematic and institutional racism, excluding them from full socioeconomic civic participation, which lies at the heart of successful integration and settlement. The lack of adequate funding for social services exacerbates the situation, which is reflective of the lack of meaningful support for refugees, issues we will address in more detail in the next section.

In a similar vein, Mckeary and Newbold (2010) study systemic barriers to health care access by Canada's refugee populations. Focusing on the challenges faced by health and social service providers at the local level in Ontario, the authors argue that the healthcare system is generally unresponsive to refugee health care needs, despite the fact that they typically experience greater vulnerabilities. Meanwhile, the diversity and heterogeneity of refugee groups must also be considered. The differential impact of country of origin, language, culture, and refugee status leads to

diverse health needs. In order to shape effective public policy, these systematic barriers must be acknowledged and dealt with accordingly.

We will now turn our attention to review the literature on some of the services, programs and practices that have been developed specifically to facilitate the integration of refugees, and the role that refugees play in their own integration.

B: Formal settlement support during the integration process

Asylum seekers and refugees are diverse in many respects, as are the local reception contexts in which they seek to rebuild their lives, however the literature does point to some common characteristics of settlement that foster or inhibit the integration of refugees in a given host society. We begin below by outlining the legal protection framework in which integration takes place, followed by a historical overview of settlement support for immigrants and refugees, examine some recent challenges, and finally explore different models of settlement service and support. We focus primarily on the case of settlement and integration policies in Canada and to a lesser extent, primarily for comparative purposes, on countries with similar protection regimes, such as the UK and Australia.

As discussed above, integration is an important phase in the continuum of protection offered to refugees. According to the UNHCR, integration is: a mutual, dynamic, multifaceted and on-going process. From a refugee perspective, integration requires a preparedness to adapt to the lifestyle of the host society without having to lose one's own cultural identity. From the point of view of the host society, it requires a willingness for communities to be welcoming and responsive to refugees and for public institutions to meet the needs of a diverse population (UNHCR 2002, 12).

The array of social services and agencies are often the refugees' first and main point of contact, and are required to implement integration and settlement policy. Important pieces of legislation operating at international and domestic levels animate these services. The 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees specifically mentions qualified non-governmental agencies to provide "suitable help" to refugees facilitated by governmental bodies, and calls on its signatories to facilitate their assimilation and naturalization (UNHCR, 1951). Meanwhile, in Canada for example, one of the objectives of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) is the promotion of "successful integration of permanent residents into Canada, while recognizing that integration

involves mutual obligations for new immigrants and Canadian society" (IRPA 2001).

The development of legislation at the national and international level for the protection of human rights of asylum seekers and refugees is relatively recent historically speaking. In Canada organized settlement support in the 19th Century for European-origin immigrants was obtained primarily from fraternal societies, with community-based churches picking up some of the slack, but most support was informal in nature. In this social climate ethno-racial minorities such as those of African heritage faced intense discrimination and marginalization and were socially excluded rather than integrated. During the depression of the 1930s and WWII racism and anti-Semitism towards immigrants increased, Chinese and Japanese-Canadians were targeted, and the immigration of Jewish refugees fleeing the Holocaust was blocked. Following WWII, trade unions became involved in supporting immigrants indirectly through the confluence of labour activism with human rights activism (Goutor 2011, 414), and settlement became institutionalized with immigration officials working on placement, settlement, and newcomer integration (Hawkins 1988, 443). However, discrimination in the delivery of settlement services paralleled the explicit discrimination in immigration policy, which continued for roughly the first two decades of the postwar period. In 1966 the Citizenship Branch took over responsibility for socio-cultural and political integration, while Manpower and Immigration handled economic integration (Bloemraad 2007). In 1974 the government settlement sector was established, further expanding services to respond to the needs of large numbers of Indo-Chinese refugees who were being resettled in Canada (CIC 2001). In contrast to the expansion of the settlement sector outlined above which continued somewhat into the 1980s, the 1990s witnessed the beginning of cutbacks to the settlement sector, effectively downloading responsibility onto the provincial and municipal levels. Furthermore, rates for the Refugee Assistance Program (RAP), which provides support and resources to Government Assisted Refugees (GARs) remain below the poverty level (Siggner, 2007, iii). Siggner (2007) also notes challenges in the process of transitioning out of RAP at the end of the first year. As eligibility for most settlement programs is restricted to initial settlement, this is likely a widespread problem.

Immigration settlement, like immigration policy, is guided by a cost-benefit analysis, which has overshadowed and undermined Canada's humanitarian efforts. Increases in spending on settlement have generally been offset by increases in immigration application fees. Budget decisions affecting the settlement sector reflect a narrow emphasis on economic

integration. For instance, the HOST program intended to ease culture shock for newcomers had a budget of only $3 Million per year in 2005 (Kunz 2005). Government services for refugees are differentiated in terms of various refugee categories. Differential access based on legal status and location represent structural barriers that severely hamper integration efforts. Most formal settlement support in Canada is actually provided by non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and McGrath and McGrath (2013) note the emerging and increasing role of municipalities in resettling refugees in Canada as a result of changes in the structure of funding. Specialized services such as the Canadian Centre for Victims of Torture (CCVT), and ethno-specific agencies such as the Hispanic Development Council (HDC) and the Centre for Spanish Speaking Peoples (CSSP) are located in large urban multicultural contexts such as Toronto where the greatest number of people that most require the services reside. The agencies that provide settlement support are often involved in a wide array of activities that support the integration of immigrants and refugees, addressing issues around gender, youth, health, homelessness prevention and others (HDC Website). Overall, changes in the structure and levels of funding have meant that these community organizations are expected to do more with less. Quoting from the CCR:

> …refugees and other immigrants have faced reduced services from the Immigration Department, cuts in social assistance and job training programmes, reduced medical coverage and legal aid coverage, increased fees in many areas... Organizations offering services to refugees and immigrants have had to respond to these new difficulties faced by their clients, at the same time that they are themselves often suffering funding cutbacks (16).

Cooper (2000,14) argues that the contemporary political rhetoric around securitization and protection of borders guides service-delivery models for refugees in Canada, and that these cutbacks to services for refugees are further justified through the public perception of hard economic times in a globalized world.

Private sponsorship by individuals or groups is another important means through which refugees are resettled and receive support in Canada. Refugee activists continue to raise serious concerns about policy changes affecting the private sponsorship program (CCR 2015). These changes affect refugees and their sponsors during the pre-entry phase, that is, in terms of selection and processing applications, but they also have spill over effects on the integration and settlement of accepted refugees. Refugee advocates in Canada specifically note the cuts to healthcare for

refugee claimants as part of a broader policy of increasing the divide amongst different categories of refugees, and cutting back services to the most vulnerable and marginalized populations (CCR 2015). The cuts to the Interim Federal Health program, dubbed as "cruel and unusual treatment" by a Supreme Court judge, has had the unique effect of galvanizing a range of social actors, including healthcare providers and doctors. These cuts directly impact refugee claimants and we can speculate that this will likely have long-term impacts on the quality of life and prospects for those refugees who are later accepted. The policy of the Canadian government to provide air ticket funds as a loan to accepted refugees, and then extract repayment with interest has also provoked the ongoing outcry of refugee activists (CCR 2015), and has begun to draw the attention of refugee scholars as constituting a worrisome burden on refugees (see Hynie, Korn and Tao this volume).

The overall changes in settlement for refugees in Canada outlined above are mirrored in most other reception contexts, with some notable differences. One of the key differences identified by Van Selm (2003) is the private-public partnership. Focusing specifically on resettlement, she discusses the differing levels of involvement of private organizations (faith-based, NGOs, and civil society more broadly) in five countries – the US, UK, Finland, Sweden and the Netherlands. She finds that the US has an entirely different model of private-public partnership from its European counterparts, with private organizations closely involved in every step of the way, and especially so in integration services (Van Selm 2003, 169). Keles (2008) is particularly critical of US refugee policy, accusing it of suffering from "structural negligence". He notes it does not take into account "pre-resettlement variables" such as trauma or lack of language skills, and is designed to push refugees into the labour market as soon as possible. As a result, refugees often take up ill-paid and otherwise unsuitable labour for which they are not trained, becoming trapped in a cycle of vicious poverty.

US government support seems very meagre indeed compared to European models which have largely implemented (re)settlement services as part of their overall "cradle-to-grave" social welfare systems, albeit with UK offering the weakest support. Sales (2002) argues that refugees in the UK are also drawn into situations of poverty and stigma, emphasizing the lack of a coherent national settlement policy. She is especially critical of the policy discourse surrounding refugees and asylum-seekers in the UK, which has been increasingly divisive and exclusionary. Charging that refugee policy is preoccupied with control rather than protection, she unpacks the rhetoric surrounding "bogus" and "undeserving" vs.

"genuine" and "deserving" refugees which became a focal point in several UK election campaigns, as well as the notion that refugees are often regarded as "economic migrants" who are attracted to a life on welfare in rich western countries. She demonstrates that there is no correlation between decreasing refugee benefits and hand outs on the one hand, and the numbers of asylum-seekers arriving at UK shores on the other, effectively debunking this persistent and pernicious myth which has also found its way into Canadian political and public discourse (CCR 2013). Literature in the UK has largely understood this changing political rhetoric and policy discourse using the concept of social exclusion, which provides a useful analysis.

Finally, Australia deserves discussion as one of the principal countries involved in refugee integration and settlement, ranked third in the world in terms of its resettlement commitment (Fozdar and Hartley 2013). Similar to Canada, Australia's immigration and settlement policy is officially built on the principle of multiculturalism and equity, and scholars have traced its developments from the scrapping of the White Australia policy in the early 1970s in terms that recall the Canadian experience (Fozdar and Hartley 2013; Waxman 2000). Fozdar and Hartley, however, argue that initial settlement support for employment, housing and language training is lacking, and that service delivery is too fragmented. Finally, they also emphasize the less formal and quantifiable measures of integration such as the development of social networks, a sense of belonging and connections with the wider community (49), which highlights the agency of refugees during integration.

C: Informal settlement support and agency

Given the widespread cuts to formal support for refugees examined above, informal support has become more important. Social capital is increasingly used to analyze how refugees use and develop informal social networks in order to gain access to a number of resources that facilitate settlement. Social capital can be broken down further into bonding, bridging and linking forms (Putnam 1993). The concept of social capital figures prominently in Strang and Ager's (2010) framework for refugee integration. The importance of bonding for refugees encompasses pragmatic and emotional aspects of integration. The family and co-ethnic community are often important sources of bonding capital initially, but over time bridging capital that allows access to social networks and resources outside the co-ethnic community become more important. Finally, community organizations play an important role in linking refugees and refugee-origin

ethnic communities to mainstream institutions so that they can access additional key services, programs and resources. Strang and Ager (2010) emphasize further that bonding capital for refugees can sometimes provide access to bridging capital, through networks of reciprocity and trust, but also that not all aspects of co-ethnic bonding are positive. Furthermore, not all bonding is co-ethnic. Finally, they emphasize that spaces of social connection for refugees and non-refugees facilitate integration (Strang and Ager 2010).

Refugees typically lack social capital relative to others in a host context. Accordingly, the literature has emphasized in particular the importance of community organizations in connecting refugees with each other and other newcomers, but even more importantly with mainstream institutions and society. However, Zetter at al. (2005) question how well refugees can develop social capital in the UK, given the increasingly restrictive reception context. Similarly, Wood et al. (2012) point to the increasingly precarious nature of community sector work in Canada, which undermines the ability of social service agencies to connect refugees with mainstream society. Following a similar argument, McMichael and Manderson (2004) who study the settlement of Somali refugees in Australia go further by questioning the very utility of the concept of social capital for understanding settlement outcomes. Hopkins (2006) points to the sometimes exclusionary dynamics of Somali community organizations in the UK, which undermine the role of the organization in fostering belonging and integration for Somali refugees. These studies suggest that in the current context of increasing restrictions on refugee settlement and integration, addressing issues of exclusion and marginalization for refugees may be at least as important as trying to nurture social capital. However, we need to look more closely at the wider international policy context and responses to the challenges that this presents for integration before we can adequately assess the utility of the concept of social capital.

In addition to the principle of deterrence that is increasingly shaping, and undermining, refugee entry and integration in the contemporary period, policies and practices of dispersal have also characterized the management of refugee flows in Canada, the UK and Australia. Dispersal policies are designed to reduce the concentration of refugees and asylum seekers in large urban centres, by resettling them in less populated regions (Schech 2014; Griffiths et al. 2006; Zetter et al. 2005). The logic for dispersal is less clear, implying that ethnic minority concentrations pose a threat to social cohesion, or that they simply create too much housing demand pressure, or that they outstrip the capacity of available services.

The goals of dispersal policies are perhaps better understood when considered in light of other policy changes including increased use of temporary status (Johnston et al. 2009), and the attempt to use refugee policy to supplement population growth and fill labour shortages (Schech 2014). The increased use of temporary "protection" (our quotes) and reduction in the acceptance of refugee claims effectively restricts access to essential services such as employment, education, language classes, and housing, leaves refugee claimants in limbo, and can potentially create divisions between "deserving" and "undeserving" refugees (Johnston et al. 2009). The combined use of temporary status and dispersal to deal with refugees is based on a cost benefit analysis, which is inconsistent with humanitarianism. Furthermore, this approach may backfire and end up costing the state more in the long run if it undermines the process of integration. The practice of dispersal may prevent refugees from settling close to friends, family, and wider co-ethnic networks, and thus prevent access to the social capital associated with such networks (Schech 2014). Sherrell et al (2005) argue further that in comparison to other migrants, refugees are not well suited for one of the stated objectives of dispersal - to supplement population and spur economic growth in struggling regions - because they typically lack human and financial capital. Furthermore, dispersal requires the spreading out of services across many locations at a higher cost to the state than having centralized services located in large urban contexts (Sherrell et al 2005). Zetter et al. (2005) suggest that the practice of dispersal for asylum seekers in the UK has actually undermined the primary role of Refugee Community Organizations (RCOs) to integrate refugees, and RCOs end up in a defensive position, responding to immediate crises, and filling in gaps left by the reduction of state support for services in large urban centres. This in turn promotes insularity and "institutionalized marginality" among refugee communities (Griffiths et al. 2006). The actual outcomes of dispersal in smaller communities are less well known. Some refugees may thrive in a smaller community, depending on how well they are integrated, although retention following initial settlement has been well noted as a challenge.

Whether or not refugees can benefit from dispersal versus being settled together in larger urban centres depends on the degree to which certain challenges for integration can be overcome. How to nurture more openness to diversity -- a widely acknowledged important factor influencing the integration of refugees (Sherrell et al. 2005; Zetter et al. 2005; Wood et al. 2012) -- is a complicated issue, especially in smaller contexts that lack diversity initially. Conversely in larger more diverse contexts, strong bonding social capital can prevent integration with the

wider community. Reflective of this problem, Tomlinson and Egan (2002) caution that emphasis on a refugee identity may reinforce an outsider status. Similarly, Hopkins (2006) noted the danger of exclusionary dynamics in ethno-specific organizations for Somali refugees in the UK. However, Bloemraad (2005) and Schech (2014) point to the value of multicultural resources in supporting the integration of refugees. Multicultural policies may be an important mechanism through which civil society can activate a more open and accepting reception context for refugees, regardless of the size of the community. Furthermore, Schech (2014) suggests that the dispersal of refugees may contribute to the transformation of communities, making them more open to diversity. Lack of economic opportunities in less populated regions, one of the reasons for the use of dispersal, is also a challenge. Adequate funding for both socio-cultural and economic integration is therefore crucial, especially for refugees who are settled in smaller communities that lack diversity.

A more precise understanding of the settlement process towards the development of a better model of service delivery can therefore be obtained by considering the ways in which both refugees and refugee-serving community agencies adapt and respond to the changing policy context and opportunity structure (Zetter et al. 2005). The positive potential of social capital in refugee communities can be harnessed by recognizing existing skills, knowledge and identities (Morrice 2007), which can serve as a platform to build organizational capacity (Bloemraad 2005). This is best achieved within a reception context that is open and supportive of diversity (Schech 2014; Sherrel et al. 2005), and state support both in terms of funding /infrastructure and policies that build on existing strengths within the community (Bloemraad 2005). In the absence of state support for the integration of refugees, advocacy from community organizations for the protection of human rights for refugees and asylum seekers is even more important (Johnston et al. 2009; Zetter et al. 2005). However, we disagree with Zetter et al. (2005) that community organizations no longer play an important integrative role for refugees and have been replaced by informal networks. We agree rather with Wood et al. (2012) that community agencies continue to play a crucial role in settlement, precisely because they are best placed to adapt to both the changing policy context and the needs of the refugee populations they serve, and to advocate for the protection of human rights for refugees and asylum seekers. Simich et al. (2003) find that refugees' understanding of social support for integration in Canada contains instrumental as well as emotional dimensions, both of which are more likely to be provided by community organizations, rather than solely by the state, or informally.

Furthermore, when RCOs experience difficulty in fostering connections with the wider society, this suggests wider structural issues are at play, and not necessarily a problem with the organizations.

We therefore suggest a broad analytical framework for understanding a range of re/settlement and integration processes and outcomes for refugees that takes into account the diversity among refugee populations and variations in reception context. The challenges for settlement explored above that factor into our suggested approach include: a global context that contributes to the creation of refugee flows combined with a disproportionate and inadequate response from the international community to the resettlement of those seeking asylum; national contexts of resettlement that are increasingly guided by a rhetoric of national security that depicts asylum seekers as potential threats rather than potential assets; the combination of these first two challenges that effectively downloads responsibility for integration onto the local level and refugees themselves; the importance of and yet difficulty for refugees to generate social capital from a position of disadvantage; and the challenge of activating and developing local contexts that are more open and welcoming of diversity. Finally, in light of these challenges, we emphasize four principles towards the development of a model for refugee settlement and integration that are highlighted in various existing studies:

1. Prioritizing refugee voice: McPherson's (2010) critique of "integrationism" (547), drawing on in-depth interviews with refugee women in Australia, suggests a shift is needed that prioritizes the voices of refugees to build a better understanding of refugee subjectivities, agency and self-development. This principle is consistent with a humanitarian understanding of refugee protection as a right, rather than an act of charity.

2. Multiple levels of support that include both formal and informal mechanisms: Bloemraad (2005) in a comparison between Boston and Toronto, argues that state support and the policy of multiculturalism in Canada, combined with migrant resources and agency lead to better political incorporation, illustrating the importance of multiple levels of support for integration. Activating local contexts that are more open and welcoming of diversity first and foremost requires attention to social issues that face refugees and non-refugees alike, such as employment, housing, and access to health care.

3. Cooperation and coordination among state actors, community organizations and social networks: Waxman (1998) found that refugees in Australia would benefit from cooperation between government and non-governmental organizations, including ethno-cultural organizations, to identify needs, for purposes of training settlement workers, and service

delivery. Cooper (2000) identifies the challenges of network management in the provision of services to refugees, given the present policy context and associated resource constraints, illustrating the importance of coordination among state actors, community organizations, and social networks.

4. Flexibility and openness to change over time: Illustrating the need for flexibility in order to build capacity, Morrice (2007) found that refugees are often treated as a homogeneous group, which can lead to refugees not being able to access the services they need and potentially wasted resources. Zetter et al. (2005) argue that policy changes in the UK such as greater use of dispersal were a reaction to the increase of in-land claims in the 1990s, and that this resulted in a shift in the role of RCOs. This flexibility of RCOs to adapt to the policy context and the needs of asylum seekers and refugees on the ground is important. They argue further that informal supports have become more important as RCOs shift to advocacy and protection of rights. These ongoing developments illustrate that refugee integration is a dynamic process that changes over time.

Structure of the book

The chapters in this collection contribute to the debates outlined above and develop a nuanced and complex portrait of interrelated processes of social, cultural and political integration. In the first section of this volume, authors use detailed case studies to analyze social and cultural processes of integration for refugees in host contexts. Baker, Martin and Price use the concept of identity as a key focal point in their exploration of the experiences of Bhutanese refugees as they make the long journey from Nepalese refugee camps to small town life in Newfoundland, Canada. They argue that refugees employ a sort of cultural toolkit, drawing from their past and present experiences, in order to build an identity which encompasses a sense of security and self-assuredness. These are of crucial importance to people who have barely known a sense of political and civic stability throughout their lived histories, vividly described by the authors. These processes of identity formation in turn dynamically shape refugees' relationship with the state. This leads to their key claim, backed up through their qualitative work and framed within theories of the state, that citizenship is a central concept in refugee identity, critical to the integration of refugees in their new community.

With the crucial importance of state and non-state organizations in the integration of refugees well established in the first chapter, Malischewksi

probes the settlement experience in a country already historically fractured. The divisive sectarianism of Northern Ireland and the heterogeneity of the host community set the stage for her exploration of the integration processes of refugees in this country. Malischewski's point is well made that all too often integration scholars assume homogeneity in the host context, and the case of Northern Ireland provides a vivid counterpoint to such assumptions. Utilizing intersectionality as her chosen theoretical lens, she analyses the dynamics of reception and integration in which the political sensitivities of both the hosts and the newcomers are foregrounded in the processes, necessitating an intricate dance of acceptance, tolerance and understanding.

Nourpanah's study of Afghan refugees in Halifax, Canada, turns the focus to refugee perceptions of their host society, as they weave their past and present "stories" in an attempt to build a solid sociocultural base on which to build their future. She utilizes concepts of structure, culture and agency to explore how refugees develop an active, meaningful life in their new communities, which can be presumed to adhere to very different sociocultural norms than their own. Her study of the integration experiences of refugees is a platform for broader theorizing about the interaction of structure and agency in our daily lives and the important role of culture in these interactions. She concludes with a call to policy-makers to consider more seriously the role of refugees in imagining a viable and sustainable migration policy for areas outside major metropolitan centres, struggling with population and labour market shortages across various sectors. Her representation of refugees as resourceful agents is meant to counter received and mainstream assumptions on their vulnerability and implied passivity, lack of voice and sociopolitical "silence".

MacLaren, McGrath and Smith sharpen the focus on government policy in considering the integration and settlement experiences of Karen refugees in Australia. They use Ager and Strang's framework for refugee integration and systematically discuss each factor as experienced by Karen refugees, in doing so offering a critique of government policy while noting the crucial role played by the social bonds, connections and networking skills of refugees themselves, honed by years of negotiating refugee camp settings and authorities. The importance of a genuinely welcoming reception and integration context for refugees is emphasized, and the chapter concludes with a call for settlement workers, policies and organizations to respond meaningfully to the injustices and sufferings faced by refugees and remain unswayed by political expediency and transience.

Patricia Ward's chapter draws timely attention to the role of the scholar in refugee discourse, and the way in which academia contributes and shapes understandings of the *problematique* of refugees. Through qualitative interviews with Canadian scholars engaged in research on the experiences of refugees in employment, she probes the relationship between academia, the politics surrounding refugee work, and the representations of refugees. Thus her work does not consider directly the integration experiences of refugees, rather it steps back and looks at the representations of the integration process –focusing on employment issues- within academic discourse, and how this is connected to broader political and media landscapes.

This brings us to the second section of this volume, which gathers the works of contributors who consider specific responses and approaches to integration. Mantei provides a feminist, critical ethnographic account of the cultural and personal significance of the weaving undertaken by Karen female refugees as they traverse the globe. Her research follows their long journey from refugee camps and secondary countries of asylum to their settlement in Canada. These experiences are marked by social, political and economic instability, and traditional weaving becomes a multi-dimensional practice through which the refuge women establish a sense of identity, memory and nostalgia as well as income-generation and skills development. Mantei argues that while NGO and refugee-serving organizations generally are only interested in these latter aspects of traditional Karen weaving, the former are equally important aspects of this artistic cultural practice.

Holt and Laitsch concentrate on refugee settlement as experienced through schools. The "Settlement Workers in Schools" (SWIS) program is considered as a specific response to the educational needs of refugee families in British Columbia, and their qualitative research with settlement workers highlights the gaps and challenges they face. Despite these, the workers articulate the reasons why they see this program as crucial and effective in fulfilling some of the specific needs of vulnerable newcomer populations. Their study draws out a specific theoretical model of integration in which the "pre-settlement" phase plays an important role, and they call for further attention, both by scholars and policy-makers, to this foundational phase.

Settlement houses, although not in widespread use, are an interesting microcosm for studying refugee experiences in host communities. Seinkiewicz and Nichols provide an ethnographic account of a settlement house and describe the reality of the inter-ethnic relations amongst the refugees who find themselves there. Their account highlights the diversity