



**Sussex Migration
Working Paper no. 14**

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction.....	4
1.1 Aims and Objectives of this Study	4
1.2 Specific Questions Posed	5
1.3 Structure of the Paper.....	5
Chapter 2 Longitudinal Surveys of Immigrants in Canada	6
2.1 Introduction.....	6
2.2 History and Objectives	6
2.3 Sampling and Survey Design	8
2.4 Implementation.....	9
2.5 Analysis.....	10
2.6 Evaluation.....	11
Chapter 3 Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia	13
3.1 Introduction.....	13
3.2 History and Objectives	13
3.3 Sampling and Survey Design	14
3.4 Implementation.....	14
3.5 Analysis.....	15
3.6 Evaluation.....	15
Chapter 4 Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to the United States	16

List of Acronyms

BIMPR	Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research (Australia)
BIR	Bureau of Immigration Research (Australia)
CAPI	Computer-Assisted In-Person Interview (US)
CATI	Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview (US)
CCSD	Canadian Council on Social Development
CEETUM	<i>Centre d'Études Ethniques des Universités de Montréal</i> /Centre for Ethnic Studies of the Universities of Montreal (Canada)
CIC	Citizenship and Immigration Canada
CILS	Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey (US)
CSDS	Community Social Data Strategy (Canada)
DIMIA	Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (Australia – was Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs)
DoL	Department of Labour (New Zealand)
ÉNI	<i>Établissement des Nouveaux Immigrants</i> /New Immigrants Settlement in Montreal (Canada)
FaCS	Department of Family and Community Services (Australia)
GSOEP	German Socio-Economic Panel Survey
HILDA	Household Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia

IMDB	Longitudinal Immigration Data Base (Canada)
INS	Immigration and Naturalization Service (US)
LDS	Longitudinal Data Set (Australia)
LIDS	Landed Immigrants Data System (Canada)
LisNZ	Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to New Zealand
LS	Longitudinal Survey
LSAC	Longitudinal Survey of Australian Children
LSIA	Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia
LSIC	Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada
MRCI	Ministry of Relations with Citizens and Immigration (Canada)
NIS	New Immigration Survey (US)
NIS-P	New Immigrants Survey Pilot (US)
NLSY	National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (US)
PSID	Panel Survey of Income Dynamics (US)
SDB	Settlement Data Base (Australia)
SLID	Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (Canada)
STC	Statistics Canada

Acknowledgements

This paper was commissioned by the Immigration Research and Statistical Service of the UK Home Office as a review of the experience of conducting longitudinal surveys in Canada, Australia, the US and New Zealand. The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, not necessarily of the Home Office (nor do they reflect Government policy).

Chapter 1: Introduction

This paper responds to the interest of the Home Office's Immigration, Research and Statistics Service (IRSS) in creating a longitudinal database to provide information on the social and economic outcomes for refugees and other migrants entering and settling in the United Kingdom. The research team were asked to provide information on current longitudinal methods used worldwide in creating suitable databases on migrant profiles and outcomes, with specific reference to four existing longitudinal surveys (LS) in Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand.

The background to this need for further insights into LS experience elsewhere is as follows. Whilst there is much emerging research on migrants and refugees in the UK in the

its breadth of experience in the field. Tiemoko visited Canada (Ottawa, Montreal) during 3–10 June 2002, and Black was able to visit Toronto on 14 June 2002 as an offshoot from another trip to the US. Discussions also took place with Australian researchers during a visit by Skeldon to Bangkok in June 2002.

1.2 Specific Questions Posed

The following is a more specific listing of questions posed, grouped into categories. These questions were used to frame the interrogation of the Canadian experience in particular; as many of them as possible were also confronted in the other three countries.

A. History and objectives

- 1 Reasons for the survey
- 2 History and age of the survey
- 3 Who initiated and implemented the project, and what consultations with stakeholders (academics, government departments, NGOs etc.) took place?
- 4 What were seen as the key objectives?

B. Questions of sampling and survey design

- 1 What categories does the survey include (refugees, other migrants, children, the elderly)?
- 2 What was the population sample used? How was it located?
- 3 What was the coverage of the survey?
- 4 What were the variables and topics covered?
- 5 Did the survey use a control group? If so, how was it established?
- 6 How was the survey representative?
- 7 How many waves, and length of time between them?

C. Questions of methodology and implementation

- 1 Who carried out the survey?
- 2 The period of the survey
- 3 Were pilot and/or feasibility studies conducted, and how were they evaluated? What use was made of pilot data?

- 4 How were the questionnaires administered?
- 5 How were translation issues dealt with?
- 6 Were there any links to other surveys (linking of administrative data etc.)?
- 7 Mechanisms to check accuracy and reliability of data (post-enumeration checks etc.)

D. Questions of analysis

- 1 Were the analyses carried out in-house?
- 2 If subcontracted, to which agencies/i 0 10.02 3e4n -0.66d, to

Chapter 2: Longitudinal Surveys of Immigrants in Canada

2.1 Introduction

In recent decades, Canada has launched a number of Longitudinal Surveys (LS)¹ and several are specifically on immigration. Two early LS on immigration, conducted in 1969–71 and 1976 respectively, involved several thousand newly-arrived immigrants selected from those awarded permanent residence visas (Ornstein 1982; Ornstein and Sharma 1981). Then, in 1980, the Longitudinal Immigration Data Base (IMDB) was established, which links administrative records on immigration, employment and taxation. The most recent LS is the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada (LSIC), which was initiated in the late 1990s, and remains in its first phase (Martin 2002). In addition, in the late 1980s, the province of Quebec

programme of Canada and the changes in the composition, ethnic origin and volume of immigrants. For instance in the thirty years from 1970 to 2000, the top two source countries changed from Britain and the US to China and India, bringing new challenges related to linguistic and cultural integration. These changes, coupled with a shift towards selection of more highly skilled and business immigrants and away from family reunification, as well as trends towards economic and cultural globalisation and an internationally mobile labour force, have made the issues of immigrant integration and the government's role in enabling this process much more important. Policy-relevant information is therefore needed to improve understanding of the settlement process and thus help government at all levels in providing the effective responses that are deemed necessary to maximise the positive impact of immigration.

In 1998, at an early stage of the LSIC, a Joint Working Group on the advancement of research using social statistics expressed the 'need to design social policy informed by social statistics'. The Group wrote:

there is a general sense among many Canadians that the major problems we face are not economic, but social. Government at all levels has acknowledged the need to redesign our social policy so that it fits better with our current economic policy (Joint Working Group 1998: 1).

It went on to say that such social policy requires an understanding of the life-course and the complexity of social relations through a well-integrated system of social surveys. Specifically:

the descriptive data available from cross-sectional surveys were inadequate for monitoring changes in social outcomes, or understanding the causal mechanisms that led to desired outcomes. This required longitudinal surveys... (Joint Working Group 1998: 1).

The LSIC was thus designed to fill these information gaps by studying how newly-arrived immigrants adjust to living in Canada during the first four years of their settlement. In 1995, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) held a meeting with academics and

representatives of the provincial governments to identify key policy issues and which specific aspects of settlement to include in the LSIC, although one of our informants suggested that discussions had first been initiated by CIC at least five years earlier.

How long does the settlement and integration process take and what are the main factors? In particular:

How long does it take an adult immigrant to get stably established in the labour market, and in accommodation?

Do immigrants continue their training/education once settled in Quebec?

To what extent does this education/training affect their employability?

What kinds of social network have they established?

2.3 Sampling and Survey Design

The IMDB covers only workers or those filing tax returns, and as such does not include children. While in its approach it does not

Immigration) after arrival for orientation and information on services and utilities available to them. Through such reporting it was possible to trace and if necessary correct the address of the respondent. Most importantly, the consent of all participants

research, focusing on concerns such as income security, employment, poverty, child welfare, pensions and government social policies. Its current interests are poverty, youth, family and cultural diversity. It claims to have been a regular user of the IMDB and other datasets to provide relevant policy research to government, non-profit organisations and political parties.

Although the CCSD considered the LSIC as important in understanding the settlement process, it was not sure whether it will use these data, since the resources required are enormous and most of its clients might not be ready to pay for the service. Another problem of this longitudinal survey is the long time required to obtain and then prepare the data for analysis. The results of the LSIC should, however, be used by federal government departments, provincial ministries, immigration settlement agencies and some non-governmental organisations. For example, some provinces have already clearly expressed their

Secondly, both the ÉNI and the LSIC adopted the study of one cohort of immigrants, which enables analysis of the process of settlement over time. However, what the ÉNI and LSIC cannot do is compare the experience of different cohorts of immigrants, meaning that they cannot, for example, examine differences in the experience of immigration before and after a policy change or a major historical event (9/11, for example). The IMDB data are helpful in this respect, since they do allow for isolation of different cohorts of immigrants, and comparison of their experience.

A third criticism of the LSIC raised during interviews was the lack of key policy questions that could have been elaborated at the initial phase of the project. One interviewee pinpointed the fact that some groups of migrants (e.g. those from particular places) might be particularly important for policy, but the current design of the LSIC fails to address this issue because of its general random sampling design.

Finally, the LSIC and the ÉNI may not be representative of the immigrant population because not all visa-holders will actually come to Canada and, with the survey being voluntary, and with problems in tracing respondents, the final sample may be biased.

The unit of analysis is the individual, but all the surveys except the ÉNI have a module on household dynamics. The IMDB income data are accumulated over the taxation year without a part-time/full-time distinction. In the IMDB the personal attributes are frozen at 'landing' – the point at which an individual enters Canada.

Chapter 3: Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia

3.1 Introduction

The development of the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (LSIA) dates from the late 1980s and was associated with the establishment of the then Bureau of Immigration Research (BIR) in 1989. This quasi-governmental institution was established to co-ordinate and implement research into immigration to Australia and, in the early 1990s, became one of the most innovative as well as best-funded institutions researching migration anywhere in the world. This chapter reviews this experience. It is based on a paper by Hugo (2000), and supplemented by discussions with him in Bangkok in June 2002 as well as by email discussion with other Australian researchers.

3.2 History and Objectives

The first step on the way to establishing the LSIA was the recognition that there was a lack of representative, relevant and timely information relating to immigration to Australia. This recognition emerged from the initial findings of the research co-ordinated by the BIR that showed a virtual complete lack of data on which to base meaningful government policy on immigration matters. The history of the LSIA has therefore been closely associated with the history of the BIR and its later manifestations. With the abolition of its final manifestation, the BIMPR (Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research), by the incoming Liberal-National government in 1996, the fate of the LSIA, too, was less than assured. The fact that it has survived, albeit in a reduced form, is tribute to the value that Australia's leaders have seen in the results from the survey.

The key objective of the LSIA was to generate up-to-date data that would facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of specific immigration and settlement programmes and to assess programmes providing services to recently-arrived migrants. A pilot survey was set up in 1991 to test the feasibility of establishing a full survey. The results from the pilot survey started to be used by the BIR in 1992 and were used to supply well-documented answers to questions asked in parliament of the Minister of Immigration. The success of the pilot survey in generating new

data convinced the government to approve funding for the full LSIA in 1993.

However it should be noted that, like Canada, Australia has also established, or is embarking upon, a number of other types of longitudinal survey, quite apart from the study of immigrants. These include the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children (LSAC)³, the Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey⁴, both panel

designed to give a 2.5 per cent absolute standard error for each visa entry category and 7 per cent absolute standard error on birthplace group. The sample was to be 'rolling', that is, collected over four six-month segments, to allow the information to be collected as soon after arrival as feasible.

Sampling practices were made more complex than originally intended by incomplete contact address information on the sample frame used. The DIMIA Settlement Database was used as the sampling frame. This is an internal system which links data from several sources, including entry and exit records. The main address source on the SDB was obtained from a Settlement Assistance Information Form. Permanent settlers are requested to complete this form in their country of origin but, as completion is voluntary, it was found that certain origin groups had lower completion rates than others. The contact address information from these forms had to be supplemented with that from the Arrival Cards that all persons entering Australia must complete.

Refusal rates of those contacted were very small (2.2 per cent) but the major problem lay in contacting the selected principal applicants and there was considerable attrition between those selected for interview and those actually interviewed: only about 60 per cent of those selected could be interviewed. Fully 12.4 per cent could not be tracked and a further 13.3 per cent of the principal applicants were overseas.

Initially, there was a very complex questionnaire as a result of responding positively to the many stakeholders with an interest in the LSIA. There were some 330 questions under 12 policy topics. Topics covered in the questionnaire administered to principal applicants included (asterisked items were included on spouse/partner questionnaire):

- Household data
- Relatives living in Australia
- Information on pre-migration situation*
- The immigration process, decision-making and information sources
- Sponsorship information*
- Housing, moves, cost, quality, type
- Support services
- Financial assets and transfers
- Household budget
- Religion/ethnicity*

- Return visits/settler loss*
- Citizenship*
- Language/knowledge of English*
- Qualifications and their assessment*
- Further study/training*
- Work history/job-seeking*
- Health*
- Income and finances*
- Perception of Australia*
- Tracking details

A very thorough discussion of design issues associated with LSIA 1 is provided by Gartner (1996).

3.4 Implementation

Prior to implementation of the main survey, there was a major pilot study, the prototype LSIA, which was used to develop the final methodology. This study resulted in simplification of the questionnaire, provision of visual support materials translated into the 10 most common migrant languages, improvements to interviewer training and use of other sources than the SDB for contact address information.

The first wave of the survey was carried out in March 1994 by a commercial company. This was seen to put the survey at arms' length from the government and helps to improve the response rate and quality of information collected. Prior to this, there was a pilot survey of 100 applicants in one city that resulted in the questionnaire being considerably simplified.

Interviews were conducted face-to-face. The sample covered some 60 different language groups. Recruiting interviewers with ability to conduct interviews in the migrant's language was not viable for all language groups. While bilingual interviewers were used if available, it was decided to recruit interviewers primarily for interview skills and to use a mix of agency supplied interpreters and family or friend members for interpretation. Problems that could arise when friends and relatives were used as interpreters were addressed in interviewer training. While main questionnaires were produced only in English, visual support show cards were provided in the 10 most commonly encountered migrant languages.

The need to use languages other than English declined from wave to wave. Initially there were two questionnaires, one for the principal applicant and one for the spouse.

The first version of the LSIA involved three waves. Some 75 per cent participated in all three waves; 86 per cent in the first two waves. The issue of sample maintenance is crucial to the success of the LSIA and several techniques were tested during the pilot with the following adopted for the main survey:

- Collection of addresses of two contact persons at the time of the first interview
- Distribution of small gifts such as fridge magnets
- Sending of reminder cards every six months
- Provision of a pamphlet outlining the project

A second round of the survey, LSIA 2, has been initiated, although it is somewhat smaller, covering around 3,000 settlers who arrived in Australia between 1 September 1999 and 31 August 2000. Thus the reference period was reduced to a single year and two rather than three waves were taken. Given the changing priorities of Australian immigration, a greater emphasis towards the selection of highly skilled migrants was made in LSIA 2. Most of the other methodological procedures remained the same.

3.5 Analysis

Closure of the BIMPR resulted in less analysis of the LSIA than would otherwise have occurred. Nevertheless, the information has been used extensively at the policy level within government and it is important to stress that the use is not dependent upon the completion of the three waves of the survey. Results from the first wave were quickly found to answer questions about immigration to Australia. It can be noted that the major value of the LSIA is as a migrant survey rather than a longitudinal survey. The time-series data do, nevertheless, provide the best view of the whole process of settlement in Australia, and have led to some significant academic studies on the general experiences of new migrants (VandenHeuvel and Wooden 1999), as well as their specific experience of the labour force (Richardson *et al.* 2001).

Information from the LSIA is used by all sections of DIMIA but especially the Migration and Temporary Entry and the Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship divisions. Requests for information from the survey have been made by the following sections of these divisions,

showing the range of interests that can find use for the LSIA data:

Economics

immigrants settling outside the capital cities and those entering on non-settler visas. It will be particularly difficult to generate any information on undocumented migrants, although it might be possible to include within the sample frame those who entered as asylum-seekers and were later granted the right to stay in Australia.

Chapter 4: Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to New Zealand

4.1 Introduction

The principal objective of the Longitudinal Immigration Survey: New Zealand (LisNZ) is 'to provide reliable authoritative statistics about migrants' initial settlement experiences in New Zealand and the outcomes of immigration policies'. The information collected will allow a picture to be built up of the contributions, as well as the costs, of migrants to New Zealand, their experiences and labour market outcomes. That is, it will become much easier to assess the net benefits (or otherwise) of immigration using the data generated from the survey. Consultations on the survey began in late 1999 and the pilot survey in mid-2001.

So far, the main survey has not been initiated, placing limits on the conclusions that can be drawn. Nonetheless, the aim here is to draw out key points from the experience of the pilot survey, and design of the main survey, that are of interest. The chapter is based on analysis of documentary and web-based material, as well as on email discussion with key actors involved in establishing the LisNZ.

4.2 History and Objectives

Interest in establishing a longitudinal survey of immigrants in New Zealand can be traced to a report of the Department of Labour (DoL – of which the New Zealand Immigration Service is part) as recently as 1998, in which they noted the absence of data that would allow evaluation of policies on immigration, and the lack of generalisable data on immigrant adaptation. This information gap was seen as significant, in spite of the existence of census material and 'hundreds' of studies on international migration to New Zealand.

There are 12 major survey objectives for the LisNZ and within each of these there are specific policy objectives. The major survey objectives are:

- To describe key family, household and other general characteristics of migrants
- To describe the reasons for migration, migration information sources used, locations chosen within New Zealand, and perceptions of and satisfaction with New Zealand
- To describe the types of housing used by migrants, the problems experienced in

accessing suitable housing, and expectations of and satisfaction with housing in New Zealand

To describe migrants' labour market experiences and identify issues associated with labour market integration

To describe the characteristics of migrants involved in business and the nature of their business activities

To describe levels of personal and business assets brought to New Zealand, and levels of migrant income and expenditure

To identify levels of English-language proficiency, issues relating to language proficiency, and English-language acquisition and training for migrants

To describe levels of schooling and qualifications on arrival, factors affecting use of qualifications, participation in schooling and further education and training in New Zealand, and issues relating to schooling in New Zealand

To identify migrants' need for and use of government and/or community social services and health services, issues relating to service use, and unmet needs in the provision of these services

To describe the social networks which migrants develop, identify factors affecting the establishment of these networks, and investigate some initial indicators of settlement

To identify migrants' perceptions of their health status

To collect key information on partners of migrants which can be analysed as characteristics of the survey respondent.

To give an idea of the policy concerns identified under each objective, the following relate to the second objective only, the reasons for migration:

Reasons why migrants come to New Zealand

Whether New Zealand is seen as an interim or a final destination

Whether the experiences of settlement influence migrants' duration-of-stay intentions

Reasons for moving within New Zealand and on-migrating from New Zealand to another destination

Whether migrant retention rates differ by immigration approval category; and generally, whether specific selection criteria were useful.

4.3 Sampling and Survey Design

The survey sample will be based upon a representative sampling of approved applications, which consist of the principal applicant and accompanying family members. Separate sample frames for those applying onshore and for those applying offshore are being drawn up. The target population for interview includes all those 16 years of age and older at approval who are already in New Zealand or who arrive in New Zealand within 12 months of approval. Stratification will be made by visa entry type and by business category. Excluded from consideration are the following:

- Refugees
- Temporary visitors
- Persons in New Zealand unlawfully
- People (citizens) of Australia, Niue, the Cook Islands and Tokelau

Chapter 5: The New Immigration Survey (US)

5.1 Introduction

There are several longitudinal studies of migrants in the United States. However, many of them are either indirect – the initial project did not specifically target migrants – or specific to certain groups of migrants. For example, a Longitudinal Study of Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the US was conducted in 1973–74 and 1979, providing data for a classic study of immigration by Portes and Bach (1985), whilst the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey (CILS) has been conducted more recently in Southern California and South Florida which traced children from 1992 to 1995–96 (Rumbaut 1998). These studies are not included in this review, as they are not representative of general populations of immigrants.

It is a matter of some surprise that, to date, the US has never had a nationally representative survey of immigrants and their children, given the major impact that immigration has had

ha1B.89 Tm5f Cuand theirwo2.02235470.92 435.6186society.(that)Tj5.0002 Tc80.00

made. The sectgl1nou83 7T.6976 Tm(The f0 Tc 10.84se the number)Tj10.00 1 1274(The f0 Tc 107.1781f the design

conducted every four years and will be exclusively in the form of face-to-face interviews. The length of each interview depends on the category of respondents. The immigrant interview takes on average 90 minutes, the interview of the spouse lasts about 60 minutes and child assessments average 20 minutes.

A distinctive feature of the NIS is the provision to follow sampled immigrants wherever they may locate after arrival in the US, even if they subsequently leave the country. In particular, there is a financial provision to conduct a 25-minute phone interview with up to 300 interviewees overseas in each wave. To increase participation and tracking, respondents are offered US\$ 10 (£6.70) for their participation and different methods (door-to-door, tele-matching service, directory assistance, National Address Changes File) are used to track respondents.

A pilot survey (NIS-P) has already been completed (Jasso *et al.* 2000a). Its main aims were:

- to assess the cost-effectiveness of alternative methods for locating sampled immigrants and maximising initial response rates;

- to explore the costs, feasibility and effectiveness of alternative methods of tracking sampled immigrants after the initial contacts (a necessary feature for a longitudinal survey of a highly mobile population);

- to obtain useful information that would

difficulties in capturing short or repetitive events or other important details (IMDB, for instance, cannot distinguish part-time and full-time jobs).

Bibliography

BC Stats (1999) Immigration Highlights, Special issue: Income characteristics of recent immigrants, 99/3 (online at <http://www.bcstats.gov.bc.ca/pubs/immig/im993sf.pdf>) and 99/4 (online at <http://www.bcstats.gov.bc.ca/pubs/immig/im994sf.pdf>).

Black, R. (2001) 'Fifty years of refugee studies: from theory to policy', *International Migration Review*, 35: 55–76.

Buck, N., Ermisch, J.F. and Jenkins, S.P. (1995) 'Choosing the Type of Longitudinal Survey Design: Issues'. Online at <http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/pubs/occaps/pdf/op96-1.pdf>

Dunstan, S. and Bedford, R. (2000) 'Longitudinal surveys of immigrants: why have them? The New Zealand experience'. Paper presented at the Fifth International Metropolis Conference, Workshop on the Development and Use of Longitudinal Surveys of Migrants, Vancouver, 13–17 November 2000.

Fielding, A.J. (1997) 'Migration and poverty: a longitudinal study of the relationship between migration and social mobility in England and Wales', *IDS Bulletin*, 28: 48–57.

Fielding, A.J. and Halford, S. (1999) 'A longitudinal and regional analysis of gender-specific social and spatial mobilities in England and Wales 1981–91', in Boyle, P. and Halfacree, K. (eds) *Migration and Gender in the Developed World*. London: Routledge, 30–53.

Gartner, M. (1996) The Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia. The Survey Design and Implementation. Report on the development and implementation of the LSIA with special emphasis on questionnaire design and field

Ornstein, M. (1982) The work experience of immigrants to Canada: 1969–1976, York University Institute for Behavioural Research, Report submitted to Department for Employment and Immigration, Ottawa.

Ornstein, M. and Sharma, R. (1981) Adjustment and economic experience of immigrants in Canada: 1976 Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants, York University Institute for Behavioural Research, Report submitted to Department for Employment and Immigration, Ottawa.

Pergamit, M.R., Gordon, L.W. and Roney, L.S. (2000) The New Immigrant Survey (NIS). A Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants in the United States: Background, Description, and Policy Uses. Paper presented at the Fifth Metropolis Conference, Workshop on The Development and Use of Longitudinal Surveys of Migrants, Vancouver, 13–17 November 2000.

Portes, A. and Bach, R. (1985) *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Reitz, J.G., Frick, J.R., Calabrese, T. and Wagner, G.C. (1999) 'The institutional framework of ethnic employment disadvantage: a comparison of Germany and Canada', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 25: 397–414.

Renaud, J. and Gingras, L. (1998) *Landed Refugee Claimants' First Three Years in Quebec*. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Studies, Research and Statistics Collection no.2, August 1998.

Renaud, J., Desrosiers, S. and Carpentier, A. (1993) 'Trois années d'établissement d'immigrants admis au Québec en 1989: portrait d'un processus'. Département de Sociologie, Université de Montréal et Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture, Montréal. Available online at http://www.ceetum.umontreal.ca/eni/portrait_t3.pdf

Renaud, J., Carpentier, A., Ouimet, G. and Montgomery, C. (1992) 'La première année d'établissement d'immigrants admis au Québec en 1989: portrait d'un processus'. Département de Sociologie, Université de Montréal et Institut québécois de recherche

sur la culture, Montréal. Available online at http://www.ceetum.umontreal.ca/eni/portrait_t1.pdf

Renaud, J., Gingras, L., Vachon, S., Blaser, C., Godin, J.-F. and Gagné, B. (2001) *Ils sont maintenant d'ici! Les dix premières années au Québec des immigrants admis en 1989*.

Appendix 1: Individuals and organisations consulted

Australia

Graeme Hugo, University of Adelaide, janet.wall@adelaide.edu.au

Neil Mullenger, Canberra, Department of Immigration, Multiculturalism and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA), neil.mullenger@immi.gov.au

David Osborne, Canberra, DIMIA, david.osborne@immi.gov.au

New Zealand

Richard Bedford, University of Waikato, rdb@waikato.ac.nz

Sharon Boyd, Research Analyst (Immigration), Department of Labour, New Zealand Government, sharon.boyd@nzis.dol.govt.nz

Stephen Dunstan, New Zealand Immigration Service, manager of the NZ longitudinal survey. stephend@nzis.dol.govt.nz

United States

Jenn Larimer, Project Manager, New Immigrants Survey, University of Pennsylvania, ilarimer@ssc.upenn.edu

Thomas McDevitt, International Statistics Programs Center, Washington, US Bureau of the Census, Thomas.McDevitt@ccmail.census.gov

Philip Martin, University of California, Davis; Editor of *Migration News*, martin@primal.ucdavis.edu

Lisa S. Roney, US Immigration and Naturalization Service, Lisa.S.Roney@usdoj.gov

Joanne Van Selm, Migration Policy Institute, Washington DC, jvanselm@migrationpolicy.org

Canada

Jean Bergeron, Senior Research officer, CIC, in charge of LSIC, jean.bergeron@cic.gc.ca

Meyer Burstein, Metropolis International, Ottawa, mb@meyerburstein.com

George DeVoretz, Professor of Economics, Simon Fraser University, devoretz@sfu.ca

Claude Langlois, Senior Research Officer, CIC, Responsible for IMDB, claudio.langlois@cic.gc.ca

David Ley, Professor of Geography, University of British Columbia (also with the Metropolis project), dley@geog.ubc.ca

Peter Li, Professor of Sociology, University of Saskatchewan, li@sask.usask.ca

Martin Marger, Associate Director, Canadian Studies Centre, Centre for International Studies and Programs, Michigan State University, marger@pilot.msu.edu

Ruth Martin, Assistant Director, Special Surveys Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, ruth.martin@statcan.ca

Michael Ornstein, Director, Institute for Social Research, York University, Toronto, ornstein@YorkU.ca

Chantelle Ramsay, Ministry of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation, Ontario Provincial Government, Toronto, Chantal.Ramsay@edt.gov.on.ca

Jeffrey Reitz, University of ch Officer,2sn

Appendix 2: List of websites

Canada

<http://www.statcan.ca/english/survey/household/immi/immi.htm>

Detailed information on the LSIC.

<http://data.library.ubc.ca/rdc/pdf/LSICContentOverview.pdf>

An overview of the content of the LSIC

<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/srr/research/reports-a.html>

Site listing publications that have been derived from analysis of the IMDB:

- o *Economic Returns of Immigrants' Self-Employment*, July 2001
- o *Immigrants' Propensity to Self-Employment*, July 2001
- o *Inland Determination Refugees Before and After Landing*, July 2001
- o *The Interprovincial Migration of Immigrants to Canada*, January 2000
- o *The Economic Performance of Immigrants: Education Perspective*, May 1999
- o *The Economic Performance of Immigrants: Immigration Category Perspective*, December 1998
- o *The Economic Performance of Immigrants: Canadian Language Perspective*, October 1998
- o *The Changing Labour Market Prospects of Refugees in Canada*, March 1998

Australia

www.immi.gov.au/research/lisia

The Home Page of the LSIA, which includes an overview of the LSIA 1 and 2 surveys, and links to relevant publications and other longitudinal surveys.

New Zealand

http://www.immigration.govt.nz/research_and_information/lisnz.html

The Home Page of LisNZ, which includes an overview of the survey, and regular updates.

US

<http://www.pop.upenn.edu/nis/about/about.htm>

The Home Page of the NIS, which includes an overview of the survey, and information about the researchers, the pilot survey, and publications.

Appendix 3: Fact Sheets

Fact sheet: Canada

	IMDB Canada	LSIC	ÉNI Montreal
Objectives	Provide data to understand the performance and impact of the immigration programme by linking outcomes to immigration policy levers	Collect information on new immigrants' integration in Canada; understand the factors and constraints of adjustment; study the timeframe surrounding integration; identify immigrants' contributions to Canada's economy and society	Provide relevant and up-to-date policy information on new immigrants to Quebec to help in improving immigration programmes and actions
Organiser	STC and CIC	STC and CIC	CEETUM
Main users	Federal and provincial governments; researchers		

Fact sheet: New Zealand and USA

	New Zealand	USA
Objectives	To provide reliable authoritative statistics about migrants' initial settlement experiences in New Zealand and the outcomes of immigration policies	To provide better immigration data and fill perceived information gaps, in particular children, re-migration out of the US, the role of irregular immigration, factors affecting assimilation and the contributions and costs of immigrants to the economy
Organiser	Department of Labour and Statistics New Zealand	Researchers at University of Pennsylvania, New York State University and RAND Corporation
Main users	Federal and regional governments; researchers	Researchers
Period covered	2001–08	2000–10
Sample size	7,500 in first wave and 5,000 expected in last wave	11,000 in first wave
Population	Permanent settlers aged 16 and over, including onshore and offshore applicants who have already arrived in New Zealand	All permanent settlers in 2001, including in-country and out-of-country applicants
Number of waves	3	4
Inter-wave interval	6, 18 and 36 months after residence	1 year for the first three years then 2 years
Cost	NZ\$ 9 million (£2.8 million)	US\$ 22 million