

RESEARCH REPORT

External Research Program



Settling In: Newcomers in the Canadian Housing Market, 2001-2005



CMHC—HOME TO CANADIANS

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has been Canada's national housing agency for more than 60 years.

Together with other housing stakeholders, we help ensure that Canada maintains one of the best housing systems in the world. We are committed to helping Canadians access a wide choice of quality, affordable homes, while making vibrant, healthy communities and cities a reality across the country.

For more information, visit our website at **www.cmhc.ca**

You can also reach us by phone at 1-800-668-2642
or by fax at 1-800-245-9274.

Outside Canada call 613-748-2003 or fax to 613-748-2016.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation supports the Government of Canada policy on access to information for people with disabilities. If you wish to obtain this publication in alternative formats, call 1-800-668-2642.

Settling In: Newcomers in the Canadian Housing Market, 2001-2005

Daniel Hiebert and Pablo Mendez

**Prepared for CMHC
July 2008**

This project was funded (or: partially funded) by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) under the terms of the External Research Program, but the views expressed are the personal views of the author(s) and do not represent the official views of CMHC.

Settling In: Newcomers in the Canadian Housing Market, 2001 – 2005

INTRODUCTION

This study updates previous work¹ that examined data from the first wave of Statistic Canada's *Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada* (LSIC) in conjunction with special tabulations from the 2001 Census. That study found that the degree of homeownership attained by immigrants just six months after landing in Canada was impressive. This study examines the following issues using data from the three waves of the LSIC:

- Is there evidence that newcomers to Canada build on this initial success to create a progressive housing career?
- Which groups are experiencing a greater degree of progression in their housing situation, and which groups are not?
- Are there systematic differences between European-origin and visible minority immigrants in the housing market?
- If so, are these consistent across Canada or specific to certain places, especially the three largest immigrant reception centres of Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver?
- How much do the housing careers of immigrants landing in these three cities differ?

DATA SOURCES

The Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada as a source of information

LSIC is a longitudinal survey with three waves of questionnaires taken approximately six, 24, and 48 months after landing in Canada. It covered the period 2001 to 2005. LSIC contains several key variables that are not available in the Census, notably the admission class of immigrants, the identification of difficulties experienced while looking

for housing and, perhaps most importantly, LSIC is a longitudinal survey with three waves of questionnaires taken approximately 6, 24, and 48 months after landing in Canada

LSIC therefore provides new information on the entry of immigrants into Canada's housing market. There are limitations to LSIC, especially related to the sample size of the survey and attendant data suppression to protect respondents' confidentiality. LSIC provides data on individuals, not households, which means that it cannot be used to answer some particularly important questions on the relationship between income and housing expenditure. Nevertheless, LSIC provides a rare glimpse into the dynamics of housing consumption of newcomers in their early settlement process. LSIC has some important advantages for studying the experience of newcomers in Canada's housing market. The master file of LCIS has been made available to Canadian researchers by Statistics Canada, in its system of Research Data Centres. This enables flexible, iterative research, in contrast to the expensive extraction of special tabulations from the Census.

FINDINGS

Household Size

According to the 2006 Census, there are 2.5 people in the average Canadian household. Newcomers live in much larger households, with an average of between 3.6 and 3.7 persons over the first four years of settlement. This reflects the age and life cycle characteristics of immigrants and economic imperatives. The latter point is most clearly seen in the ratio of LSIC respondents living in composite households (defined as those with non-related members beyond the nuclear family, which could include a family with boarders, or two or more families in the same dwelling), which is much higher than in the Canadian population as a whole.

1 "The Housing Situation and Needs of Recent Immigrants in the Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver CMAs", (2007) CMHC *Research Highlight*, No.65682

Labour Market Integration

The first-wave survey of LSIC was taken at around six months after immigrants landed in Canada and represents an early moment in the settlement process. Relatively few newcomers had found work (half of those associated with the Skilled Worker program and much less for other admission classes) and average employment earnings were quite low. Family income levels were also low and many relied upon their savings or, especially in the case of refugees, social assistance, to pay for housing. There was a marked improvement in labour market participation and employment earnings between the first and second waves of the survey, and again by the third wave.

By the termination of the survey, about 68 per cent of respondents were in the labour market and the average total family income was around \$53,000. This compares with a 2006 Census figure of \$62,300 for all Canadian families for income received in 2005,² the same year as the final wave of LSIC. Although newcomer family incomes are not that far below those of Canadians generally, it is important to remember that immigrant families are typically larger than the average Canadian family. Nevertheless, the substantial rise in individual and family income figures means that there was a marked increase in the purchasing power of newcomers over their first four years in Canada.

Homeownership

Much of this purchasing power was dedicated to housing. The ratio of LSIC respondents owning homes jumped from less than one in five at the time of the first-wave survey to more than half by the third wave. It should be noted that this trend towards ownership occurred at a time of escalating prices. Real estate data show that average rents in Canada more or less kept pace with inflation over the period covered by LSIC (2001-2005), but house prices rose substantially in real terms.³ As more newcomers purchased homes, the proportion living in apartments fell while those living in houses of various types rose.

In an effort to better understand the factors leading to this outcome, a special longitudinal analysis of ownership data was conducted. Demographic characteristics were important, with respondents in the 35-54 age group most likely to purchase a home, especially in the interval between the first and second waves of LSIC. Also, newcomers living in composite households (that is, with a nuclear family plus others) had a high propensity to own a home by the time the first wave of the survey was taken, but that this strategy did not lead to higher rates of ownership acquisition after that. Quite the opposite

happened, whereby multiple-family households had above-average rates of ownership loss over the course of the survey.

There were profound differences in ownership dynamics across landing classes. Individuals admitted to Canada through the “Family Class” and those classified as “Other Economic” (mainly “Business-Class”) immigrants already had high rates of ownership recorded in the first wave. In the former case, this likely reflected the fact that these newcomers joined existing households in Canada who sponsored them while, in the latter, the transfer of wealth to Canada was probably decisive.

Over time, “Family Class” immigrants were unable to turn this initial advantage into a high rate of ownership acquisition (that is, “Family Class” tenants were more likely than average to remain in the rental market), while those in the “Other Economic Class” continued to increase their rate of ownership consistently over the subsequent two waves of the survey.

Those entering Canada as “Skilled Workers” overwhelmingly started their life in the Canadian housing market as tenants. However, their propensity to purchase a home was the highest of any group, and they had the lowest rate of ownership loss over the course of the survey of any group as well. As might be expected, “Refugees” had the lowest rate of ownership in all three waves of the survey, an outcome that was associated with below-average earnings and family income.

In general, educational attainment was not strongly associated with ownership acquisition, as was also the case for the language variables included in this analysis. Similarly, the variables selected to represent social capital and the attitude of immigrants (that is, their satisfaction with Canada) were not highly correlated with change in ownership.

Crowding

Given the limitations of LSIC, a single variable was selected as a proxy for the adequacy of housing inhabited by newcomers: the degree of crowding, measured by the proportion of respondents living in homes with more than one person per room. It is clear that immigrants are much more prone to live in crowded circumstances than the Canadian population generally, though the proportion in this category fell from about one-quarter in the first wave to 15 per cent by the end of the survey. Still, it seems clear that many newcomer households are trading access to space for the prospect of homeownership.

² The annual reported income is for the previous year, i.e., 2005 for the 2006 census

³ i.e., after taking general inflation into account

Housing Affordability

The analysis of affordability of housing for newcomers was confined to tenants. As would be expected given the income data reported earlier, the income reported by survey respondents in the first wave was insufficient to provide housing and other needs. In fact, nearly three-quarters spent more than 30 per cent of their monthly income on housing, and half spent more than half of their income on housing. The change in access to affordable housing for newcomers over the 18 months between the first and second waves can only be described as remarkable. Given the substantial rise in average incomes over this period, the proportion living in affordable housing (less than 30 per cent on rent) increased from a little over a quarter to fully half by the second wave of the survey. This trend continued from the second to third wave of LSIC, though not quite as spectacularly as in the earlier interval.

Data on difficulties finding housing are consistent with the larger picture described thus far, with a pronounced decline in the number reporting problems such from approximately 30 per cent in the first wave to 14 per cent in the second wave and eight per cent in the third.

The Differential Housing Careers of Landing Classes

Differences in the acquisition of homeownership across landing classes have been discussed above. More broadly, “Family Class” immigrants were by far the most prone to reside in multiple-family households, which was associated with a rapid path to homeownership by the first wave of LSIC though, as noted, their rate of ownership acquisition after that lagged behind other groups. “Family Class” immigrants also were associated with above-average rates of crowding. Still, the advantage of pre-existing social networks upon arrival to Canada, plus the tendency toward large households meant that this group experienced the fewest problems finding housing. Also, tenants who were admitted through the family program were the least likely to face affordability problems.

“Skilled Workers” were more prone to live in nuclear families (as opposed to composite households). Few owned homes at the time of the first wave, but their subsequent rate of ownership acquisition was particularly high. At the outset, many “Skilled Workers” experienced difficulty finding housing, but this figure declined rapidly across the survey waves. There was also a great deal of improvement in the degree of housing affordability for this group, and only a small proportion lived in crowded circumstances.

Respondents associated with the “Other Economic Class” brought substantial wealth to Canada and tended to invest in housing quickly.

Their rate of ownership acquisition was also relatively high. Very few lived in crowded housing or experienced problems finding housing. However, the small number of tenants in this category were highly pressed financially, with the highest rent/income ratio of all groups.

The situation of “Refugees” in the housing market echoes the great challenges that most refugees face in their integration into Canadian society. Their income levels are typically low and the overwhelming majority cannot afford to buy a home (though by the third wave this ratio had begun to rise towards 20 per cent). They face the most crowded circumstances, are the most likely to experience problems when looking for housing, and over half of the tenants within this group dedicated more than 30 per cent of their income to housing in the third wave.

Ethnocultural Groups

Income levels were certainly higher among those of European origin, but this did not translate to significantly higher rates of homeownership, in part because the size of households of immigrants in this category tended to be small. The largest distinctions between these broad groups could be found in the variables that proxy experience in the housing market related to housing quality, and affordability. In all three cases, newcomers who identified a European origin were in a more favourable situation throughout the three waves of the survey. There is clear evidence, therefore, of ethnocultural differences in the housing market, but these do not extend to all aspects of housing consumption.

The analysis showed substantial differences among self-identified visible minority groups. The most striking of these are the extraordinary degree of homeownership among South and Southeast Asian⁴ respondents, vs. poorer housing conditions of West Asian (including Arab) and black respondents who reported a high incidence of difficulties locating housing.

Metropolitan Specificities

In many ways, there is no Canadian housing market in the sense of a unified set of prices and consumption patterns across places. This is abundantly clear when we examine the situation of newcomers in the housing markets of Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver.

Montréal has the most affordable housing market, but the immigrant population there has the least ability to pay for housing, given lower rates of labour market participation and the fact that few bring capital with them when landing in Canada. So there is a kind of alignment in the Montréal market, with lower ability to pay and lower levels of

4 All ethnic/cultural terms used in this report, e.g., white, black, Asian, are derived from the LSIC questionnaire.

rent, and lower housing purchase prices as well. Few can or do take advantage of these lower purchase prices (compared with Toronto and Vancouver), and most newcomers remain in the rental market through their first four years of settlement. Moreover, immigrants who are tenants in Montréal (which is some 78 per cent of the total surveyed population) face serious affordability challenges, although crowding is not prevalent.

Toronto has the most challenging housing market for tenants and purchase prices that are far above the national average. On the other hand, Toronto appears to have offered newcomers the best economic opportunities of the three centres. Newcomers adjust to the Toronto housing market through combining forces into larger households. Members of several visible minority groups, most notably newcomers from South Asia, are at the forefront of the trend towards large households and owner-occupied housing, often in crowded circumstances. Turning to tenants, the rent/income ratio was slightly lower in Toronto than in the other two cities.

The rental market in Vancouver is slightly cheaper than that of Toronto, but income levels for immigrant families are lower, so issues of affordability loom large. Remarkably, although house prices are much higher in Vancouver than anywhere else, including Toronto, some 55 per cent of newcomers have managed to purchase a home in the four years covered by LSIC. As in Toronto, this process is often facilitated through a multi-family strategy, and is associated with crowded dwellings. However, the particularly large number of business-class immigrants in Vancouver means that many families purchase housing using transferred capital, despite low earnings and aggregate family income.

CONCLUSION

Our study reveals some of the contours of a highly dynamic engagement of newcomers with the Canadian housing market during the first four years of their settlement. The most significant story is the remarkable improvement in the housing circumstances—by several relevant criteria—over the period covered by LSIC (2001–2005). The rate of homeownership acquisition was particularly significant and speaks to the impact of immigration in the Canadian housing market. Clearly, there is an impact in housing demand (and, we would speculate, price), given the large and rapid investment on property shown in the data.

This favourable outcome was not universally experienced, and a number of newcomers continued to struggle with problems of affordability, crowding, and difficulties finding housing even in

the third wave of the survey. There are several groups who experience such problems more consistently than others, notably “Refugees” and immigrants self-identifying as black, Arab, and West Asian.

The progressive housing career identified at the first wave of the survey prevailed for a large number of immigrants through the second and third waves. The degree of improvement in housing circumstances continued to vary a great deal by group, a fact that was associated with the broad distinction between European and visible minority newcomers, but also more complex than such a simple categorization could ever capture.

CMHC Project Manager: Jim Zamprelli

This project was funded (or partially funded) by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) under the terms of the External Research Program (ERP), an annual research grant competition. The views expressed are the personal views of the author(s) and do not represent the official views of CMHC. For more information on the ERP, please visit the CMHC website at www.cmhc.ca or contact the Project Officer, Responsive Programs by e-mail at erp@cmhc-schl.gc.ca, or by regular mail: Project Officer, Responsive Programs, External Research Program, Policy and Research Division, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 700 Montreal Road, Ottawa ON K1A 0P7.

To find more *Research Highlights* plus a wide variety of information products, visit our website at

www.cmhc.ca

or contact:

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
700 Montreal Road
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0P7

Phone: 1-800-668-2642

Fax: 1-800-245-9274

©2009, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
Printed in Canada
Produced by CMHC

11-02-09

Although this information product reflects housing experts' current knowledge, it is provided for general information purposes only. Any reliance or action taken based on the information, materials and techniques described are the responsibility of the user. Readers are advised to consult appropriate professional resources to determine what is safe and suitable in their particular case. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation assumes no responsibility for any consequence arising from use of the information, materials and techniques described.

S'établir au Canada : expérience des nouveaux arrivants sur le marché de l'habitation, 2001-2005

INTRODUCTION

L'étude résumée dans le présent rapport donne suite à l'analyse¹ entamée après la première vague de l'Enquête longitudinale auprès des immigrants du Canada (ELIC) menée par Statistique Canada, dont les résultats avaient été examinés en parallèle avec des données du Recensement de 2001. Cette première analyse avait révélé que, seulement six mois après leur arrivée au Canada, une proportion impressionnante d'immigrants étaient propriétaires d'une habitation. L'étude décrite ci après repose quant à elle sur les données des trois vagues de l'ELIC. Elle aborde les questions suivantes :

- Existe-t-il des preuves qu'une telle situation initiale favorable aide les immigrants au Canada à améliorer progressivement leurs conditions de logement par la suite?
- Pour quels groupes les conditions de logement s'améliorent-elles relativement rapidement? Lesquels connaissent une situation plus difficile?
- Y a-t-il des différences entre la situation résidentielle des immigrants d'origine européenne et celle des immigrants formant une minorité visible?
- Si de telles différences existent, est-ce qu'elles sont les mêmes partout au Canada, ou varient elles selon les régions? Sont-elles comparables dans les trois centres qui attirent le plus d'immigrants, c'est-à-dire Montréal, Toronto et Vancouver?
- Dans quelle mesure l'évolution des conditions de logement des immigrants diffère-t-elle selon que ces derniers sont établis à Montréal, à Toronto ou à Vancouver?

SOURCE DES DONNÉES

L'Enquête longitudinale auprès des immigrants du Canada (ELIC) : principale source des données

Trois vagues d'entrevues ont été réalisées dans le cadre de l'ELIC, la première environ six mois après l'arrivée des immigrants au Canada et les deuxième et troisième, 24 et 48 mois après leur arrivée, respectivement. L'Enquête s'est déroulée pendant les années 2001 à 2005. Elle tient compte de plusieurs variables clés sur lesquelles le recensement ne nous renseigne pas, notamment la catégorie d'immigrants et les difficultés éprouvées dans la quête d'un logement. Mais ce qui importe peut-être le plus, c'est qu'il s'agit d'une étude longitudinale durant laquelle les répondants ont été interrogés à trois moments différents (6, 24 et 48 mois après leur arrivée).

L'ELIC a ainsi permis de recueillir des renseignements nouveaux sur l'entrée des immigrants dans le marché canadien de l'habitation. Elle comporte toutefois un certain nombre de limites, qui ont trait surtout à la taille de l'échantillon et à la suppression de données sur les répondants pour des raisons de confidentialité. Les données tirées de l'ELIC portent sur les personnes plutôt que sur les ménages; elles ne permettent donc pas de répondre à certaines questions très importantes sur le lien entre le revenu et les dépenses consacrées au logement. Néanmoins, l'ELIC fournit un aperçu tout à fait particulier de la dynamique du logement chez les nouveaux arrivants au début de leur établissement. Elle offre certains avantages de taille pour l'étude de l'expérience des immigrants sur le marché canadien de l'habitation. Statistique Canada, par l'entremise de son réseau de centres de données de recherche, a mis le fichier maître de l'ELIC à la disposition des chercheurs, ce qui leur permet d'analyser les

1 Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logement, *Aperçu de la situation et des besoins en matière de logement des immigrants récents dans les RMR de Montréal, Toronto et Vancouver*, SCHL, 2007, « Le Point en recherche. Série socio-économique », n° 07 018 (OPIMS 65683).

données en toute liberté et de faire des recherches itératives – nul besoin de demander que les données soient extraites des résultats du recensement et fournies sous forme de totalisations spéciales, une démarche coûteuse.

RÉSULTATS

Taille des ménages

Selon les résultats du Recensement de 2006, le nombre moyen de personnes par ménage au Canada est de 2,5. Les nouveaux arrivants forment des ménages de taille beaucoup plus importante : durant leurs quatre premières années de vie au Canada, les ménages d'immigrants comptent en moyenne entre 3,6 et 3,7 personnes. Cet écart s'explique par l'âge et les caractéristiques du cycle de la vie des immigrants, ainsi que par des impératifs d'ordre économique. Ces impératifs ressortent très clairement lorsqu'on examine la proportion des répondants de l'ELIC faisant partie de ménages complexes (familles nucléaires vivant avec des personnes non apparentées, par exemple avec une ou plusieurs autres familles ou avec des chambreurs). Cette proportion est beaucoup plus élevée chez les immigrants que dans l'ensemble de la population canadienne.

Intégration au marché du travail

La première vague de l'ELIC a été réalisée environ six mois après l'arrivée des répondants au Canada, période qui correspond au tout début du processus d'établissement. Parmi les nouveaux arrivants interrogés à ce moment-là, un pourcentage relativement faible avait trouvé du travail (c'était le cas de la moitié des « travailleurs qualifiés » et d'une proportion nettement inférieure des immigrants appartenant aux autres catégories), et le revenu d'emploi moyen était assez bas. Le revenu familial n'était pas très élevé lui non plus, et beaucoup d'immigrants devaient utiliser leurs économies ou – surtout les réfugiés – des prestations d'aide sociale pour se loger. On notait une nette amélioration du revenu d'emploi et de la participation au marché du travail entre la première et la deuxième vague de l'Enquête, ainsi qu'entre la deuxième et la troisième.

À la fin de l'Enquête, environ 68 % des répondants étaient actifs, et le revenu familial moyen tournait autour de 53 000 \$. Selon les données du Recensement de 2006, le revenu moyen de l'ensemble des familles canadiennes était de 62 300 \$ en 2005 – année où a été réalisée la dernière vague de l'Enquête.² Il ne faut toutefois pas oublier que, si leur revenu n'est pas très loin de celui des familles canadiennes en général, les familles d'immigrants sont souvent de taille beaucoup plus importante. Quoi qu'il en soit, la hausse substantielle des revenus

individuel et familial moyennée entre les vagues de l'Enquête signifie que le pouvoir d'achat des immigrants s'est considérablement accru durant les quatre années ayant suivi leur arrivée au Canada.

Taux de propriétaires d'habitation

Une grande partie de ce pouvoir d'achat a été consacrée au logement. Parmi les répondants de l'ELIC, le pourcentage de propriétaires d'habitation a bondi entre la première et la troisième vague de l'Enquête, passant de moins de 20 % à *plus de 50 %*. Soulignons que cette tendance à la hausse s'est produite à une période où les prix grimpaient. Les données sur le marché immobilier montrent que, durant la période où s'est déroulée l'ELIC (2001-2005), le loyer moyen au Canada a évolué à peu près au même rythme que l'inflation, mais les prix réels³ des habitations ont connu une ascension abrupte. Puisque, avec le temps, une proportion croissante d'immigrants a acheté un logement, le pourcentage de nouveaux arrivants habitant un appartement a régressé, tandis qu'une part grandissante vivait dans une maison.

Pour essayer de mieux comprendre les facteurs à l'origine de ces tendances, on a effectué une analyse longitudinale spéciale des données sur les propriétaires d'habitation. Premier constat : les caractéristiques démographiques sont déterminantes. En effet, les répondants de 35 à 54 ans étaient les plus susceptibles d'acheter un logement, surtout entre la première et la deuxième vague d'enquête. En outre, une proportion élevée des répondants faisant partie d'un ménage complexe étaient propriétaires lors de la première vague, proportion qui ne s'est toutefois pas maintenue par la suite. Bien au contraire, les ménages multifamiliaux ayant acheté un logement au début de leur établissement étaient en moyenne plus susceptibles que les autres immigrants devenus propriétaires à la même période de *cesser* de posséder une habitation après la première vague de l'Enquête.

Il y avait des différences fondamentales entre les groupes d'immigrants en ce qui a trait à la possession d'un logement. Chez les immigrants admis au Canada dans les catégories « regroupement familial » ou « immigrants économiques » (surtout des « gens d'affaires »), les taux de propriétaires d'habitation étaient déjà élevés lors de la première vague de l'Enquête. Chez ceux de la première catégorie, cela tient sans doute au fait que ces nouveaux arrivants se sont joints à des ménages déjà établis au Canada, qui les ont parrainés. Chez ceux de la deuxième catégorie, l'explication réside fort probablement dans les richesses avec lesquelles ils sont arrivés au Canada. Dans la catégorie « regroupement familial », cette situation initiale favorable ne s'est pas

2 Les données sur le revenu annuel issues du Recensement de 2006 portent sur l'année d'avant, c'est à dire 2005.

3 Corrigés en fonction de l'inflation.

traduite, avec le temps, par un taux élevé de propriétaires d'habitation (autrement dit, les immigrants de cette catégorie qui louaient un logement étaient plus susceptibles que la moyenne des nouveaux arrivants de rester locataires). En revanche, chez les « immigrants économiques », le taux de propriétaires a augmenté de façon constante après la première vague de l'Enquête.

Les nouveaux arrivants admis au Canada en tant que « travailleurs qualifiés » sont, de loin, ceux qui ont eu le plus tendance à entrer sur le marché de l'habitation comme locataires. Par contre, parmi tous les immigrants, ils étaient les plus susceptibles d'acheter un logement et présentaient le plus faible pourcentage de propriétaires ayant cessé de posséder une habitation durant la période visée par l'Enquête. Enfin, les « réfugiés » avaient le plus faible pourcentage de propriétaires d'habitation dans chacune des trois vagues de l'Enquête, un résultat peu surprenant qui s'explique par leurs revenus individuel et familial inférieurs à la moyenne.

En général, le niveau d'études des immigrants n'était pas étroitement lié à l'accession à la propriété, pas plus que les caractéristiques linguistiques prises en considération dans l'analyse. De même, les variables retenues pour décrire le capital social et l'attitude des immigrants (c'est-à-dire leur satisfaction à l'égard du Canada) n'y étaient pas non plus fortement associées.

Surpeuplement

Étant donné les limites de l'ELIC, une seule variable a été retenue pour évaluer la qualité du logement occupé par les nouveaux arrivants : le degré de surpeuplement, mesuré par la proportion des répondants vivant dans un logement où il y a plus d'une personne par chambre. Il est clair que les immigrants sont beaucoup plus susceptibles que l'ensemble de la population canadienne d'occuper un logement surpeuplé, même si la proportion des immigrants dont c'était le cas a diminué entre la première et la troisième vague de l'Enquête, passant d'environ 25 % à 15 %. Néanmoins, il semble évident que bien des ménages immigrants sont prêts à vivre dans un espace restreint pour pouvoir accéder à la propriété.

Abordabilité du logement

L'analyse de l'abordabilité des logements occupés par les nouveaux arrivants s'est limitée aux locataires. Compte tenu des données sur le revenu mentionnées précédemment, il n'est pas étonnant de constater que le revenu des répondants lors de la première vague était insuffisant pour répondre à la fois à leurs besoins en matière de logement et à leurs autres besoins. En fait, près de trois quarts de ces répondants consacraient plus de 30 % de leur revenu au

logement, et la moitié y consacraient plus de 50 %. L'augmentation de la proportion d'immigrants vivant dans un logement abordable durant les 18 mois écoulés entre la première et la deuxième vague de l'Enquête est tout simplement remarquable. Grâce à la forte hausse du revenu moyen survenue pendant cette période, le pourcentage de répondants occupant un logement abordable (dont le loyer correspond à moins de 30 % du revenu) est passé d'un peu plus de 25 %, à la première vague, à un bon 50 %, à la deuxième vague. Cette tendance ascendante s'est poursuivie entre la deuxième et la troisième vague, même si la progression n'a pas été aussi spectaculaire que durant l'intervalle précédent.

Les données sur les difficultés éprouvées dans la recherche d'un logement cadrent avec les constatations globales décrites jusqu'ici : le pourcentage de répondants disant avoir eu du mal à trouver un logement a beaucoup diminué durant les quatre années visées par l'Enquête. D'environ 30 % lors de la première vague, il est descendu à 14 % à la deuxième vague, puis à 8 % à la vague suivante.

Évolution de la situation résidentielle selon la catégorie d'immigration

Les différences observées au chapitre de l'accession à la propriété entre les catégories d'immigration sont abordées dans une section précédente. On y explique que les immigrants de la catégorie « regroupement familial » étaient, de loin, les plus susceptibles de faire partie d'un ménage multifamilial et que l'appartenance à un tel ménage était associée à un passage rapide à la possession d'une habitation. En effet, une proportion élevée des immigrants de cette catégorie étaient propriétaires d'un logement au moment de la première vague de l'ELIC, bien que le taux de propriétaires chez ces nouveaux arrivants descendait ensuite en dessous de la moyenne des autres groupes. Toujours dans la catégorie « regroupement familial », on observait également un pourcentage supérieur à la moyenne d'immigrants vivant dans un logement surpeuplé. Cependant, les membres de ce groupe étaient nombreux à posséder un réseau social au Canada à leur arrivée et ils avaient tendance à former des ménages de grande taille, de sorte que ces nouveaux arrivants sont ceux qui ont eu le moins de difficulté à trouver un logement. De plus, les locataires ayant été admis dans la catégorie « regroupement familial » étaient les moins susceptibles d'éprouver des problèmes liés à l'abordabilité.

Quant à eux, les « travailleurs qualifiés » avaient tendance à former des familles nucléaires (plutôt que des ménages complexes). Peu étaient propriétaires d'une habitation lors de la première vague, mais par la suite, le taux de propriétaires était particulièrement élevé. Au

début, une forte proportion de « travailleurs qualifiés » ont eu du mal à trouver un logement, mais le pourcentage dégringole aux deuxième et troisième vagues d'Enquête. On note également une importante amélioration de l'abordabilité dans ce groupe d'immigrants, de même qu'une faible proportion de personnes vivant dans un logement surpeuplé.

Les répondants appartenant à la catégorie des « immigrants économiques » sont arrivés au Canada avec beaucoup de richesses et ont eu tendance à investir rapidement dans un logement. Le taux d'accession à la propriété était donc relativement élevé chez ces nouveaux arrivants. Une très faible proportion vivait dans un logement surpeuplé ou a eu du mal à se loger. Cependant, les quelques « immigrants économiques » qui étaient locataires avaient des moyens financiers très limités et présentaient le rapport loyer/revenu le plus élevé parmi toutes les catégories de nouveaux arrivants.

La situation des « réfugiés » sur le marché de l'habitation est un reflet des énormes difficultés que la plupart de ces personnes éprouvent dans leur intégration à la société canadienne. Leur niveau de revenu est souvent faible, de sorte qu'une très forte majorité n'a pas les moyens d'acquiescer un logement (bien que, dans la troisième vague de l'Enquête, la proportion de propriétaires commençait à augmenter et approchait les 20 %). Les « réfugiés » étaient, proportionnellement, les plus nombreux à éprouver des problèmes de surpeuplement et des difficultés dans la quête d'un logement. Lors de la troisième vague d'Enquête, plus de la moitié des locataires parmi ces immigrants voyaient la part de leur revenu consacrée au logement dépasser 30 %.

Groupes ethnoculturels

Les niveaux de revenu étaient nettement supérieurs chez les immigrants d'origine européenne que chez les autres, mais cela ne se traduisait pas pour autant par un taux de propriétaires d'habitation beaucoup plus élevé, en partie à cause de la taille généralement petite des ménages d'immigrants européens. Les différences les plus marquées entre les groupes ethnoculturels ont trait à l'expérience vécue sur le marché de l'habitation, c'est-à-dire à la qualité et à l'abordabilité du logement – ou plus précisément aux variables utilisées pour les évaluer. À ces chapitres, les immigrants ayant déclaré être d'origine européenne étaient en meilleure posture que les autres, tant dans la première vague que dans les deux suivantes. Il y a donc des preuves évidentes qu'il existe des différences ethnoculturelles sur le marché de l'habitation, lesquelles ne s'étendent toutefois pas à tous les aspects du logement.

L'analyse effectuée montre d'importantes différences entre les groupes d'immigrants ayant déclaré appartenir à une minorité visible. La plus saisissante est la suivante : chez les répondants venant de l'Asie du Sud ou de l'Asie du Sud-Est,⁴ le taux de propriétaires d'habitation était extrêmement élevé, tandis que chez les répondants venant de l'Asie occidentale (dont une partie sont arabes) ou les répondants de race noire, les conditions de logements étaient moins bonnes et les difficultés étaient fréquentes dans la quête d'un logement.

Caractéristiques des marchés des régions métropolitaines

De plus d'une façon, il n'existe pas de marché *canadien* de l'habitation, en ce sens que les prix ne sont pas uniformes d'une région à l'autre, pas plus que les tendances de consommation. Ce fait ressort très clairement lorsqu'on examine la situation des nouveaux arrivants sur les marchés de l'habitation de Montréal, de Toronto et de Vancouver.

Montréal possède le marché le plus abordable, mais c'est dans ce centre que les immigrants ont le plus de mal à payer leur logement – les taux de participation au marché du travail y sont faibles, et peu d'immigrants installés à Montréal sont arrivés au pays avec des ressources financières. Le marché de Montréal semble être adapté à cette réalité : la faible capacité de payer des immigrants est compatible avec le niveau relativement bas des loyers et des prix des logements pour propriétaire-occupant. Peu de nouveaux arrivants profitent de ces prix abordables (moins chers qu'à Toronto et à Vancouver) parce qu'ils ne peuvent ou ne veulent pas acheter, et la plupart restent locataires durant les quatre premières années de leur vie au Canada. De plus, les immigrants qui louent un logement à Montréal (c'est le cas d'environ 78 % des immigrants interrogés dans cette ville) ont de graves problèmes liés à l'abordabilité. Par contre, une faible proportion vit dans un logement surpeuplé.

Le marché de l'habitation le plus difficile pour les locataires est celui de Toronto, où les prix des logements pour propriétaire-occupant sont également beaucoup plus élevés que la moyenne nationale. En revanche, des trois grands centres, Toronto est celui qui semble avoir offert aux immigrants les meilleurs débouchés économiques. Pour s'adapter au marché torontois de l'habitation, les nouveaux arrivants s'unissent et forment des ménages élargis. Plusieurs « minorités visibles », surtout les personnes provenant du Sud de l'Asie, ont fortement tendance à constituer de grands ménages et à occuper un logement de propriétaire-occupant, souvent surpeuplé. Quant aux

4 Tous les termes ayant une connotation ethnique ou culturelle (p. ex., « race noire », « arabe ») utilisés dans le présent rapport sont dérivés du questionnaire de l'ELIC.

immigrants locataires de Toronto, ils présentaient un rapport loyer/revenu légèrement plus bas que leurs homologues de Vancouver et de Montréal.

À Vancouver, le marché locatif est un peu moins cher qu'à Toronto, mais le niveau de revenu des familles immigrantes est plus faible, de sorte que les problèmes liés à l'abordabilité y sont plus fréquents. Étonnamment, même si les prix des habitations sont beaucoup plus élevés qu'ailleurs (y compris Toronto), environ 55 % des nouveaux arrivants ont réussi à acheter un logement à Vancouver durant les quatre années visées par l'ELIC. Comme à Toronto, l'accession à la propriété est souvent rendue possible par la formation de ménages multifamiliaux vivant à l'étroit dans le même logement. En outre, étant donné que les revenus individuel et familial des immigrants étaient bas à Vancouver et qu'un nombre particulièrement élevé de nouveaux arrivants étaient des « gens d'affaires », on peut supposer que beaucoup de familles immigrantes ont acheté une habitation grâce au transfert de richesses.

CONCLUSION

Notre étude brosse un tableau partiel de l'expérience – très dynamique – des immigrants sur le marché canadien de l'habitation durant les quatre années suivant leur arrivée au pays. Le fait le plus saillant est l'amélioration remarquable de la situation résidentielle – mesurée selon plusieurs critères pertinents – pendant la période visée par l'ELIC (2001-2005). Le taux particulièrement élevé de propriétaires d'habitation témoigne de l'incidence de l'immigration sur le marché de l'habitation au Canada. De toute évidence, l'immigration influe sur la demande de logements (et sans doute sur les prix également), compte tenu des investissements considérables et rapides dans le logement dont font état les données recueillies durant l'Enquête.

La situation n'était pas favorable pour tous : un certain nombre de nouveaux arrivants ont continué d'éprouver des problèmes liés à l'abordabilité, de vivre dans un logement surpeuplé et d'avoir du mal à se trouver un logement – même dans la troisième vague de l'ELIC. Ces difficultés étaient plus répandues chez certains groupes que chez d'autres, par exemple parmi les « réfugiés » et les immigrants ayant déclaré être noirs, arabes ou originaires de l'Asie occidentale.

Il reste que pour un grand nombre d'immigrants, les conditions de logement étaient déjà favorables lors de la première vague et ont continué d'évoluer par la suite. Le degré d'amélioration variait beaucoup d'un groupe à l'autre, notamment selon l'origine des

nouveaux arrivants (immigrants d'origine européenne ou immigrants faisant partie d'une minorité visible). Par contre, l'évolution de la situation résidentielle des immigrants est une question trop complexe pour être entièrement expliquée par une simple analyse réalisée en fonction de catégories.

Directeur de projet à la SCHL : Jim Zamprelli

Ce projet a été réalisé (ou réalisé en partie) grâce au soutien financier de la Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logement (SCHL) dans le cadre de son Programme de subventions de recherche, subventions qui sont octroyées au terme d'un concours annuel. Les idées exprimées sont toutefois celles de l'auteur (ou des auteurs) et ne représentent pas la position officielle de la SCHL. Pour en savoir plus sur ce programme, visitez le site Web de la SCHL à www.schl.ca ou communiquez avec l'agent de projets, Recherche d'initiative privée, par courriel, à erp@cmhc-schl.gc.ca, ou par la poste à : Agent de projets, Recherche d'initiative privée, Programme de subventions de recherche, Division de la recherche et des politiques, Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logement, 700 chemin de Montréal, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P7.

Pour consulter d'autres feuillets ***Le Point en recherche*** et pour prendre connaissance d'un large éventail de produits d'information, visitez notre site Web au

www.schl.ca

ou communiquez avec la

Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logement
700, chemin de Montréal
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0P7

Téléphone : 1-800-668-2642

Télécopieur : 1-800-245-9274



National Office

Bureau national

700 Montreal Road
Ottawa ON K1A 0P7
Telephone: (613) 748-2000

700 chemin de Montréal
Ottawa ON K1A 0P7
Téléphone : (613) 748-2000

Puisqu'on prévoit une demande restreinte pour ce document de recherche, seul le résumé a été traduit.

La SCHL fera traduire le document si la demande le justifie.

Pour nous aider à déterminer si la demande justifie que ce rapport soit traduit en français, veuillez remplir la partie ci-dessous et la retourner à l'adresse suivante :

Centre canadien de documentation sur l'habitation
Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logement
700, chemin Montréal, bureau CI-200
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0P7

Titre du rapport: _____

Je préférerais que ce rapport soit disponible en français.

NOM _____

ADRESSE _____

rue

App.

ville

province

Code postal

No de téléphone () _____

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
LSIC as data source	4
The housing context: Real estate and census data	5
LSIC data	7
Housing tenure and household composition	7
Income and employment	7
Household structure	9
Dwelling types	11
Market dynamics: Changing rates of home ownership	12
Longitudinal analysis of home ownership across the 3 waves of LSIC	14
Challenges of housing quality and affordability	19
Difficulties in the housing market	24
Metropolitan variations	25
Background	25
Income and demography	26
Dwelling type	27
Home ownership	27
Crowding	29
Affordability for tenant families	30
Metropolitan variations: Summary and analysis	30
Discussion and synthesis: Housing and the settlement process	32
Conclusion	37
References	38
Tables	40

Introduction

On a *per capita* basis, Canada maintains one of the largest immigration systems in the world. In 2006, over 250,000 permanent immigrants landed in Canada. We know that a large majority of newcomers settle in a small number of places. In fact, just under 70 percent of immigrants landing in 2006 indicated their intended destination as either Montréal, Toronto, or Vancouver (CIC *Facts & Figures* 2006). These are places with low vacancy rates and, particularly in Toronto and Vancouver, high real estate prices and rental fees.¹ How are immigrants coping in the housing markets of Canada? Are they able to find suitable housing? At what cost, relative to their financial resources? Finally, what impacts are immigrants having on the housing markets of Canada generally and its three largest metropolitan areas in particular? We explore these issues using unique data that have recently become available, the three waves of the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada (LSIC).

A progressive housing career is a key contributing factor to the successful integration of immigrants into Canadian society (Murdie and Teixeira 2003). Securing adequate, suitable and affordable housing provides peace of mind and functions as a platform for social and economic mobility, and can be regarded as a key indicator of quality of life (Engeland and Lewis 2005). Predictably, then, interest in the issue of immigrant housing is high, and the academic and policy-related literature has correspondingly grown over the past decade. One important finding in this literature, emblematic of the trajectory followed by a majority of newcomers to Canada, is the tendency for immigrants to attain homeownership rates that in the aggregate are similar to (and in some cases even higher than) those of the Canadian-born (Haan 2005). For this reason, and given the importance of newcomers as a growing fraction of the population in Canada's largest cities, the impact of transnational migration on metropolitan housing markets is expected to continue expanding over time (Carter 2005). Newcomer housing patterns are clearly of substantial interest not just to immigrants and immigration researchers but also to society in general.

However, it is important to note that not all immigrants have the same experience with accessing and retaining acceptable housing over time. Some have little choice but to live in crowded housing and spend a large proportion of their income on housing (Murdie 2003), while others—particularly, but not exclusively, Refugees—may fall into homelessness (Hiebert *et al* 2005) or suffer discrimination in the housing market (Danso and Grant 2000). The North American dream of homeownership, especially, is not within the reach of all immigrants alike. While contextual factors can affect immigrants at various points of the lifecycle, Haan (2007: 458) has recently suggested that long-term differences in homeownership attainment among immigrants are largely tied to “differences that appear in the first few years after arrival.” It is therefore particularly important to develop a better understanding of the early housing

¹ According to the CMHC Housing Market Indicators (2007), the average MLS sale price of a housing unit in 2006 was \$216,000 in Montréal, \$352,000 in Toronto, and \$510,000 in Vancouver. The average monthly rent charged for a two-bedroom apartment was \$636, \$1,067, and \$1,045, respectively.

experiences of immigrants.

Most statistical studies of immigration and housing in Canada have relied on the census as their primary—in most cases exclusive—source of information. The census is a powerful source but has three inherent limitations: it provides cross-sectional data at a particular point in time rather than the potential for dynamic analysis; it does not include information on the critical issue of admission class for immigrants; and it is expensive to extract custom tabulations (though there are public use samples available for this purpose). In contrast, LSIC traces the experience of newcomers to Canada approximately 6, 24, and 48 months after their official landing in the country, and therefore enables research on the *process* of housing consumption by immigrants over a 4-year period. It also includes information on the class of entry of immigrants. Also, Statistics Canada has made the master file of LSIC available to Canadian researchers through its Research Data Centre system. LSIC therefore allows Canadian researchers to explore certain questions that have never been answered using traditional sources of data, though it has other limitations of its own (discussed below).

This study builds from previous work by a team of researchers. That earlier project built a comprehensive portrait of immigration and housing in Canada by examining the first wave of LSIC in conjunction with the 2001 census. Separate reports were produced for Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver (MTV), as well as a composite study of all three together and a stand-alone literature review. All five of these reports are available through CMHC (and some have been posted in the Working Paper series of Metropolis Centres). The present study should be seen, essentially, as the sixth volume in the foregoing set. In particular, this report follows the composite study, carrying forward the analysis of the first wave of LSIC summarized in that volume. The five pre-existing studies are:

- *Immigrants and Housing: A Review of Canadian Literature From 1990 to 2005*, by Robert Murdie, Valerie Preston, Magali Chevalier, and Sutama Ghosh (2006).
- *The Housing Situation and Needs of Recent Immigrants in the Montréal Metropolitan Area/La Situation Résidentielle des Immigrants Récents dans la Région Métropolitaine de Montréal*, by Damaris Rose, Annick Germain, and Virginie Ferreira (2006)
- *The Housing Situation and Needs of Recent Immigrants in the Toronto CMA*, by Valerie Preston, Robert Murdie, and Ann Marie Murnaghan (2006)
- *The Housing Situation and Needs of Recent Immigrants in the Vancouver CMA*, by Daniel Hiebert, Pablo Mendez, and Elvin Wyly (2006)
- *The Housing Situation and Needs of Recent Immigrants in the Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver CMAs : An Overview*, by Daniel Hiebert, Annick Germain, Robert Murdie, Valerie Preston, Jean Renaud, Damaris Rose, Elvin Wyly, Virginie Ferreira, Pablo Mendez, and Ann Marie Murnaghan (2006)²

² Also see the highlight, available for free on the CMHC website: http://im.metropolis.net/research-policy/research_content/doc/resume_Rose_octobre2007_eng.pdf

In order to make this connection as clear as possible, we quote from the conclusion of the fifth, composite report:

Summarizing our findings as succinctly as possible, our investigation of immigrants in the housing markets of the largest Canadian metropolitan areas shows that: over time, many immigrants experience “progressive” housing careers (i.e. over time, improving their living conditions and eventually joining the “mainstream” by becoming homeowners); this is achieved through considerable sacrifice by newcomers. Not all share in this positive trajectory, and we see a bifurcation in the long-term fortunes of immigrants in the housing market; this bifurcation begins to take shape quickly, and those who do move into homeownership frequently purchase housing even though they do not have high incomes (the “immigrant effect”). There are also structural differences in the housing situations of European-origin and Visible Minority immigrants, even though there are important differences within these coarsely-defined categories. (Hiebert *et al.* 2006).

Several key questions emerged from this earlier study, especially the LSIC portion of it, and have animated the current one.

- The degree of home ownership seen in the first wave of LSIC was impressive. Is there evidence that newcomers build on this initial success to create a progressive housing career (measured by: lower rates of crowding; better ratios of housing cost/household income; higher rates of ownership)?
- Which groups are experiencing a greater degree of progression in their housing situation, and which groups are not (measured by admission class and Visible Minority status)?
- Which groups are experiencing the most significant barriers when searching for housing?
- Are there systematic differences between European-origin and Visible Minority immigrants in the housing market? If so, are these consistent across Canada or specific to certain places?
- How does the situation of immigrants in the housing market differ between places in Canada?

Based on previous research, the working hypotheses for this study have been:

- Immigrants in general continue to experience a progressive housing career, and their housing situation two and four years after landing will be better than it was at 6 months.
- However, the degree of improvement, and the general housing situation, will vary widely between groups.
- Generally, there will be a gap between European-origin and Visible Minority groups. But there will also be substantial differences in the experiences of individual groups in the housing market (e.g., immigrants from India vs. China).
- Refugees experience the most significant problems accessing appropriate and affordable housing.

Two additional hypotheses are considered in the part of the report which will present the housing situation of immigrants in the Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver CMAs:

- The experience of immigrants in the housing markets of MTV will vary, with more crowding and affordability problems in Toronto and Vancouver given their higher-priced markets.
- Immigrants have a large impact on the rental markets of MTV (based on the number of units rented) but a small one on the real estate (home ownership) market.

LSIC as data source

Our use of LSIC data is outlined in Mendez *et al* (2006), and this section draws heavily from that document, but updates the story to include the second and third waves of LSIC, as well as the particular approach to data used in this study.

The LSIC panel is based on a target population of approximately 164,200 people who are aged 15 and over, were officially landed in Canada from abroad between October 2000 and September 2001, and who had lived in Canada for at least six months at the time of the survey. The target population accounts for just under two-thirds of the 250,000 people admitted to Canada during this period. Children and immigrants who went through the landing process from within Canada were excluded. It is vital to note that the Refugee category in LSIC only includes Government Assisted and Privately Sponsored Refugees, and not successful asylum seekers. Also, an estimated 5,200 immigrants landed from abroad during the reference period but subsequently left the country, so they are not in the survey (Statistics Canada 2006). A total of 12,040 respondents were interviewed in the first wave of the survey (hereafter W1). The number declined to 9,322 for the second wave (W2) of the survey and 7,716 for the third (W3). Respondents were lost to the survey over time for several reasons: a tiny number could have died; some would have returned to their country of origin or re-migrated to a third country; some would have moved within Canada and been un-traceable; and some refused to participate in the second or third waves of the survey. Unfortunately we do not know the relative importance of these causes. However, it is important to note that Statistics Canada has employed sophisticated weighting methods to ensure that the data from the second and third waves of the survey represent the same population as that of the first wave.

LSIC contains important information on the housing conditions, needs, and trajectories of new immigrants that is simply unavailable elsewhere. LSIC provides a systematic window on the initial experience of immigrants, very soon after their arrival in Canada. This type of information is not available in the census or other traditional sources of housing data. Secondly, LSIC replicates some of the information found in other surveys, such as the census, so researchers can engage in meaningful comparisons across surveys. Thirdly, LSIC includes some unique information, such as the landing class of each respondent, and data on problems that respondents experienced when looking for housing.

Apart from the sub-populations that have been excluded from LSIC, there are other limitations to the survey that should be noted. Unfortunately, LSIC was initiated just before the passage of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, which was implemented in 2002, and therefore provides feedback on an earlier policy system. In addition, LSIC has a small sample size, especially when compared to the census, which inhibits fine-grained tabular analysis. Due to the confidentiality regulations of Statistics Canada, we have had to design our tables to have at

least 50 individuals in each cell.

LSIC's sampling design also raises analytical issues for our study. The survey is based on individual respondents but care was taken to ensure that each respondent was from a different household. If things were straightforward, this would mean that LSIC could be treated as *both* a study of individuals and households. But things are not so simple. Statistics Canada developed a method to ensure that LSIC represents the universe of *individual* immigrants. To do so, a methodology was developed to give each respondent a weight in LSIC relative to the size of their particular group (e.g., based on gender, class of entry, provincial destination, etc). It is mandatory that all publications generated from LSIC use these weights and report findings of *population estimates* rather than raw sample statistics. Because these weights have been designed to replicate the characteristics of the universe of individual immigrants, we must exercise caution when trying to use LSIC to interpret the characteristics of households or families. Finally, readers should be aware of potential under-reporting in the income and earnings questions in the survey, and that Statistics Canada engaged in statistical imputation on the variables that were created in this module of the survey (Statistics Canada, 2005).

We had to make several difficult methodological choices for this project. The most important of these was a decision on the base population for analysis. Two general approaches can be taken. First, researchers can use the data gathered at each wave of LSIC in a cross-sectional analysis. Thus we could analyze the W1 using the 12,000 respondents who took part in the survey, and W2 using 9,300 respondents, and W3 using 7,700. This cross-section approach has an additional advantage: it provides the best level of information on immigrants actually in Canada at each of the waves of LSIC. Alternatively, researchers can use the respondents in the final sample of LSIC, which limits the sample number but ensures that all of the individuals in the survey were present throughout the entire period of analysis. This is a true longitudinal approach, meaning that changes registered in the data from one wave to another actually apply to the individuals surveyed. That is, if the level of home ownership increases from W1 to W2 by 10 percent, we know that was the case for the specific people who survived in the sample between the two waves. We cannot make this inference based on cross-section data, since the number of respondents fell by around 2,700 between W1 and W2. Given the lack of perfect correspondence between the individuals who took part in the two waves of the survey, we could not interpret the rise in home ownership in a straightforward way.

We resolved this issue pragmatically and, for nearly all of this study, have used a cross-sectional approach. In the first place, this maximizes the number of observations and enables us to report more information (i.e., there were fewer instances of having to drop categories due to confidentiality concerns). Secondly, as noted, this method gives us the best indication of the impact of immigrants on the housing market at each of the three moments in time covered by the survey. There was one exception, where we decided to emphasize the *process* of change in home ownership over time. In that case we switched to a longitudinal approach, and this choice is explained at the appropriate point in the analysis.

The housing context: Real estate and census data

Summary statistics on the housing market are provided in Table 1. When reading this table, it

is useful to note that, according to the Bank of Canada, the consumer price index in Canada increased 1.1 percent between May 2001 and the same month in 2002, and the rates in subsequent years were, respectively: 2.8, 2.4, and 1.6 percent. Together, these compound to an 8.1 percent change in general prices during the period of settlement covered by LSIC. Rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Canada closely approximated the rate of inflation, though the national average was based on highly differentiated local housing markets (e.g., rents in Montréal rose much faster than those in Toronto, though they were still higher in the latter city at the end of the period). The important point is that, taken in aggregate, if newcomers were able to achieve higher employment earnings in their initial years of settlement, they should have been able to pay rent more comfortably, or afford better housing.

The situation in the real estate market (2001-05) was quite different, where prices rose far in excess of the general cost of living. This was true in the Canadian market as a whole and all of the three major urban immigrant destinations (though the rate of increase varied between them, as did the average price of housing). In any case, prices in the market accelerated during these years which meant that newcomers needed substantially more money to enter the market between the second and third wave of the survey than was the case between the first and second.

Another context for this study is provided by Table 2, which summarizes a few important statistics on housing tenure and affordability reported in the 2001 census (these data were analyzed in much greater detail in the series of papers that were generated in the earlier project). It is difficult to compare census and LSIC data. First, the time frames are out of synch. The census reports on the housing situation of immigrants up to and including 2001, whereas LSIC tracks immigrants arriving in 2000-01 over the following four years. Secondly, the Census housing data we have accessed are reported at the household level, while LSIC data are at the individual level. Thirdly, the census rolls up the experiences of five-year cohorts, combining people who would be expected to have different levels of experience in the housing market. But we believe there is one census category that can be usefully employed to gain some insight into LSIC data. The broad group of immigrant households who arrived in Canada between 1991 and 2001 had been in the country an average of five years at the time the census was taken. This is not so different from the four years of the cohort tracked in LSIC (though of course they arrived earlier than the LSIC sample). We acknowledge that this is an extremely rough comparison, though it suggests an important point: immigrants arriving in the recent past (LSIC) appear to have had much more favourable housing experiences than those who arrived in the 1990s (census).

On average, according to the census, just over 40 percent of the immigrant households who landed in Canada in the 1991-2001 period owned a home in 2001. A large fraction of those who were tenants faced affordability challenges, and in many cases these were acute. Around 56 percent of this large group were able to secure affordable rental housing—i.e., with monthly fees less than 30 percent of their gross household income. Around 20 percent of the remainder paid between 30-50 percent of their income on rent, and an even larger proportion, approaching one-quarter, dedicated more than half of their income to rent. According to these very coarse figures, at least, recent immigrants faced far more difficult housing challenges than the remainder of the population.

In contrast, the housing situation of LSIC respondents at the end of the four-year survey was much better: over half had achieved home ownership, and over 60 percent of tenants were paying affordable rents. We will have to wait for the full results of the 2006 census to be released to see whether all immigrants arriving in the new decade are better housed than their predecessors, or whether this appears to have been unique to the single-year cohort tracked in LSIC. But the picture that is emerging from LSIC (2001-2005) is a much more favourable one than seen in census data from a slightly earlier era (1991-2001).

LSIC data

Housing tenure and household composition

Tables 3 and 4 provide a sense of the changing demographic and economic characteristics of longitudinal respondents in LSIC. Household composition varied considerably between groups. On average, there were between 3.6 and 3.7 persons per household in the LSIC sample, but this figure was higher for those who were admitted to join their family in Canada or as Other Economic immigrants, and much higher for Refugees. Those admitted as Skilled Workers typically lived in smaller households. The variation across cultural groups was even larger, with immigrants who identified as Whites³ (non-Visible Minority) and East Asians living in small households, while the corresponding figures for South Asians, West Asians, and Filipinos were the largest.⁴

Generally, there was little change in household composition over time. There was a slight increase of 0.1 person per household, on average, between the first and third waves of the survey. Although we did not extract the appropriate data to verify this point, we suspect that this change was the result of two intersecting developments: a large proportion of newcomers arrive in their peak child-bearing years, and this would have translated to a number of births over the nearly four years of the survey; and some families must have chosen to join forces with others to form larger households in an effort to either purchase a home or make their rent more affordable. We reiterate the main point, though, that the average growth in household size over the period was small.

Income and employment

In the first wave of the sample there was a wide variation in the degree of employment across admission classes, with just over half of those arriving as Skilled Workers already in the labour market six months after landing, compared with 29 percent of the Other Economic group (mostly business-class immigrants and therefore expected to establish a business rather than

³ All ethnic/cultural terms used in this report, e.g., white, black, Asian, are derived from the LSIC questionnaire.

⁴ Note the particularly large difference in average household size for Arabs and West Asians. Unfortunately, we had to combine these groups for most of our analysis, and yet they were quite different in their demographic profile.

become employed) and 22 percent for Refugees (who were clearly at a much earlier point in the settlement process). There was an even larger gap in economic participation across cultural groups, ranging from a low of 24 percent among West Asians to nearly 68 percent for Filipinos.

The degree of variation between groups narrowed over the years of the survey. By the third wave, 56 percent of Family Class immigrants and Refugees were employed, compared with 76 percent of those who came as Skilled Workers. Similarly, the range in employment ratios across cultural groups had lessened a little (from 56 percent for West Asians to 83 percent for Filipinos). Significantly, the rank order of groups on this variable was highly consistent over time, with groups from the Middle East the most disadvantaged.

But the other, even more important, finding of LSIC is the rapid rise in employment over the three waves of the survey, from 46 to 68 percent of respondents. This was paralleled by increasing employment earnings and total family income. As noted in Table 3, income figures for Wave 1 of the survey must be treated with caution, since they only capture the period between official landing and the time of the survey, which was generally 6 months but varied from approximately 5 to 10 months. The other important caveat to make about these data is that they refer to employment and total income for economic families, which is of course different from both individual and household figures.⁵ That said, we see rapid income growth over these early years of settlement. Taking the whole survey population together, family-based employment earnings rose from something like \$30,000 in the first year of settlement to nearly \$50,000 by the fourth. Similarly, total income figures jumped from about \$35,000 in the first year to over \$53,000 by the fourth. As we will see later, much of this additional income was used to secure housing.

There is another remarkable aspect to these data. With the notable exception of Refugees, the total family income figures across landing classes are fairly consistent, ranging from \$47,300 to \$55,900 (a ratio of less than 1.2:1). Unfortunately, respondents were not asked questions about their remaining wealth in Canada after W1 of the survey, so we are missing a critical ingredient in understanding the potential for newcomers to purchase housing. Nevertheless, income figures suggest a growing capacity to enter the market—except for Refugees, whose income levels were well below those of other admission groups.

The relative evenness we have seen across landing groups was less evident across cultural groups. As Table 4 demonstrates, family-based employment earnings in W3 differed dramatically, ranging from under \$36,000 for West Asians to just under \$60,000 for Whites (a

⁵ Statistics Canada defines an economic family as: “a group of two or more persons who live in the same dwelling and are related to each other by blood, marriage, common-law or adoption. A couple may be of opposite or same sex. Foster children are included (Statistics Canada, *Census Dictionary*).” A household is defined as any group of people living in the same dwelling, which could include one or more census families. In this study we sometimes use the terms *complex*, or *composite* households to refer to either of two types: a dwelling that is shared by one economic family plus additional non-family persons, such as boarders, or a household that is comprised by at least two economic families (defined by Statistics Canada as a multiple-family household).

ratio of nearly 1.7:1).⁶ Statistics on total family income (Table 4) also reveal a great deal of difference in the capacity to pay rent or purchase housing between groups.

Household structure

A large majority of newcomer households were nuclear families at the time of the first interview: approximately half were couples with children and another 20 percent were either childless couples or lone-parent families (Table 5). The remaining 30 percent was comprised of single-person households (9 percent) and households that included either one or more unrelated persons (6 percent) or more than one economic family (15 percent). These latter two figures are remarkable and likely reflect difficult financial circumstances or, in many cases, an attempt to congregate into larger households with multiple people earning an income in order to achieve home ownership.

Household composition varied considerably by admission class. The Other Economic group was mainly comprised of couples with children, with just a scattering of Longitudinal Respondents in the other household categories, with a particularly low number of multiple families. Most households that came through the Skilled Worker program also were in nuclear families, but with a much larger ratio of childless couples compared with the Other Economic group. Also, Skilled Workers had the highest propensity to live in one-person households (i.e., they came to Canada as lone immigrants). The proportion of lone-parent families was highest among Refugees, though the majority of this group were dual-parent couples. Finally, the Family Class group was the most distinct, with by far the highest ratio of households comprised of families with unrelated persons and, especially, multiple families. Longitudinal Respondents in this group, therefore, were most prone to reside in large households. These immigrants came to Canada to join family already settled in this country. It is possible that these large households were assembled to pool resources for sponsorship purposes and/or—a point explored further below—to purchase housing.

There were many changes in the composition of immigrant households registered in the second and third waves of LSIC. The ratio of dual-parent households rose from just under half at W1 to well over 60 percent by W3 and this had clearly become the dominant category. Approximately half of this increase can be accounted for by the fall in the ratio of childless couples. In other words, the immigrant couples who remained in Canada and were willing to participate in the third wave of the survey probably had a relatively high fertility rate. The number of one-person households also fell significantly over the period. Similarly, there was a decline in the number of non-nuclear-family households, which dropped from 20.3 to 16.6 percent of the total (taking the last two categories in the table together). Despite this fact, newcomers still had a much higher tendency to live in these composite households than the Canadian-born population. We speculate that this is closely related to economic constraints and/or future oriented strategies to purchase housing.

⁶ Significantly, the gap in incomes between cultural groups was quite consistent (i.e., did not narrow) over the three waves of the survey. If anything, it increased slightly.

There are a few notable patterns in the way that household composition changed across the different admission groups. Perhaps the most striking point to make is that the ratio of Family-Class immigrants in complex (beyond nuclear family) households barely dropped over the period, remaining over 40 percent in each of the three waves (note the relatively large household size figures for this group shown in Table 3). Clearly, this continued to be an important economic strategy (or perhaps necessity) for the group. The growth in the number of dual-parent couples with children was most pronounced for those arriving as Skilled Workers, a shift that was mirrored in the decline of one-person households and multiple-family households. The household structure of the Other Economic group changed least. There was also relatively little change in the household composition of Refugees, though the proportion of multiple-family households fell considerably for this group—perhaps a sign of economic progress.

Generally, the differentiation in household composition between cultural groups was considerably less than that between admission classes (Table 6).⁷ There are several distinctions that are nevertheless worth noting: the exceptionally high proportion of multiple-family households within the South Asian group (which is no doubt related to the fact that this group also had the highest ratio of Family-Class immigrants); the opposite—particularly low utilization of multiple-family households—among White newcomers; and the relatively high ratio of lone-parent families among Black newcomers.

If anything, these distinctions intensified over the survey period. By W3 the South Asian group was overwhelmingly composed of either dual-parent, single-family households with children, or composite households. The household composition of those identifying as East Asian or Other Visible Minority was closest to the average for all newcomer groups. West-Asians had the highest tendency to live in nuclear families (dual- or single-parent) with children. Blacks appear to have had the most fragmented family units, with high ratios of single-parent households with children, single-person households, and families with additional, unrelated persons. Finally, newcomers of European heritage lived in smaller households, with the largest ratio of childless couples, an above-average ratio of single-person households, and very few composite households.

Taken together, these data show a shift towards nuclear families with children over the first few years of immigrant settlement. But the data on household composition also show different housing needs across admission and cultural groups, and hint at different capacities to afford housing. We can therefore expect complex distinctions between groups in the housing market.

⁷ For example, the average standard deviation value across the percentage figures in the rows of the admission class W1 table was more than double that for the Visible Minority group W1 table; the contingency coefficient for the latter table is also much lower; Table 6.

Dwelling types

The first evidence that groups are differentially housed can be seen by examining their residence across dwelling types. Unfortunately, LSIC only included this question in the first two waves of the survey, so we cannot explore this issue beyond the second year of settlement.

A small majority of Longitudinal Respondents lived in apartments in the first wave of the survey (52.4 percent), with approximately three out of five of these in high-rise buildings (Table 7). While this issue will be addressed in detail later in this report, this statistic is associated with the high proportion of immigrants residing in Toronto and the fact that the bulk of its affordable rental housing is of this type. Meanwhile, low-rise apartments constitute the predominant form of affordable rental housing in Montréal.

Approximately 30 percent of survey respondents in W1 lived in detached houses, with about half that proportion in other house types, including double-houses, duplexes, and terraces. Our earlier report shows that these were unevenly distributed across the three major metropolitan areas of Canada.

There was surprisingly little shift in the consumption of housing (in terms of dwelling types) over the 18 months separating the first and second waves of the survey, despite substantial change in household composition over the same period (e.g., there are no statistics in this table that correspond to the 7 percent increase in the proportion of dual-parent families between W1 and W2). That said, there was a subtle shift from apartment units to some other form of housing over the period, particularly from high-rise apartments to single-detached or town/terrace houses. As we will see in the next section, this change was associated with an increased rate of home ownership over the period.

Dwelling types across admission categories

There were large differences in the dwellings inhabited by newcomers across admission categories. The two most similar groups in this respect were those arriving as Family Class or other economic class immigrants. In both cases a large minority lived in single detached houses by the time the W1 survey was taken, and less than 40 percent lived in apartment units. As we have argued in previous research on this subject (Hiebert *et al* 2006) the former group benefited from the already-established situation of their sponsors, while the latter arrived with, by far, the largest amount of savings transferred to Canada. The ratio of houses/apartments was exactly the opposite for Skilled Workers (40/60), who were likely living in temporary housing while settling in. A large majority of Refugees lived in apartments (over 70 percent), reflecting their low incomes as well as their propensity to settle in Toronto and Montréal. While there were a number of subtle shifts in this pattern, there were no fundamental changes between the first and second waves of the survey.

Dwelling types across cultural groups

The degree of variation in dwelling type across cultural groups was also fairly high (Table 8). Four groups were particularly distinct in the W1 survey. West Asians were, by a considerable margin, the most likely to live in apartment units (over 70 percent) and correspondingly less likely to live in houses of all types, but especially single-detached homes (less than half the percent figure of the total newcomer population). As shown in earlier work, and in Table 4 of

this report, this reflects the economic situation of the group. Black newcomers were in similar, though less extreme, circumstances. Finally, Whites also tended to live in apartments rather than houses, an outcome that is probably associated with the small average household size of this group (Table 4). At the opposite end of the spectrum, the majority of South Asians were living in houses in W1, likely a product of their tendency to assemble large—and in many cases complex—households.

As noted earlier, there was a modest shift from apartment units to houses in general between the first and second waves of the survey. This was true for nearly every group identified in the table (the exception was East Asians), but especially for Whites. By W2 those of European origin were, arguably, enjoying the most favourable housing situation given the relationship between their small average household size and increasing tendency to leave apartments in favour of houses.

Finally, it is worth noting the preponderance of Blacks and West Asians in low-rise apartments in W2 of the survey (in both cases over one-third of the total). We have not dissected the data sufficiently for this report to identify the cause of these high figures, but speculate that they are related to a combination of the purchasing power and metropolitan location of the groups. A quick analysis of 2001 census PUMF data shows that apartments in low-rise buildings make up a much larger proportion of buildings needing minor and major repairs than high rise buildings. So they are probably associated with cheaper rents.

Market dynamics: Changing rates of home ownership

The “big picture” in LSIC is the remarkable growth of home ownership among the newcomers who remained in the sample population through the years of the survey, from under 20 percent in W1, to one-third in W2, to a startling 52 percent in W3 (Table 9). Incredibly, within four years of officially landing in Canada, more than half of the Longitudinal Respondents lived in owner-occupied housing.⁸ This has obvious implications for the Canadian housing market but especially so in the three major metropolitan centres of the country.

Home ownership across admission categories

The different ratios of home ownership across groups in W1 corroborate speculations already made in this report. The leading groups on this particular measure are Family Class and Other Economic class immigrants, for the same reasons described earlier (family networks and transfer of capital). The proportion of home owners among the Skilled Worker class was less than one in 10, and for Refugees less than one in 30.

The rate of home ownership, already high, jumped nearly two-fold for the Other Economic

⁸ These figures beg the issue of sample selection bias. It is logical to predict that less successful immigrants to Canada would either leave the country, move frequently enough that they would be hard for Statistics Canada to trace, or simply refuse to participate in the survey to avoid discussing their difficult situation. We will never know the precise impact of this factor.

class between the first and second waves of the survey. Apparently, members of this group invested their savings into the Canadian housing market at a rapid pace over this 18-month period, and led the trajectory of tenure change for all groups. By W3 nearly three-quarters of this admission group were home owners.

Family Class immigrants also saw an increase in their rate of ownership over time, though not in as spectacular numbers as their counterparts who arrived in the Other Economic class. Nevertheless, their initial advantage in the housing market (in terms of ownership) was sustained.

The story for Skilled Workers in the sample is also highly progressive, with a home-ownership rate that increased from less than 10 percent at W1 to over one-quarter in W2 and just under half by the termination of the survey (the largest proportional increase of any group). This increase is related to rising employment levels and earnings for Skilled Workers (Table 3).

The increasing rate of home ownership level of Skilled Workers is particularly significant for the housing market, since this group is comprised of a relatively high number of small households (i.e., far more single-person households than the Family Class, for example). Moreover, Longitudinal Respondents associated with Skilled Workers constitute the majority of the survey population, and any change in the ownership status of this group therefore has particular weight in the housing market.

Finally, the figures for Refugees are perhaps the most surprising of all, with nearly one in five in an ownership position four years after arrival (up from less than 4 percent in W1 and a similarly low percentage in W2). Given that this group is most likely to arrive with no financial resources at all, this is quite remarkable. But what is being sacrificed for this outcome? We explore this issue below.

Home ownership across cultural groups

Differences in the rate of ownership between cultural groups were nearly as extreme as those across admission categories at the outset of the survey (Table 10). In this case the range was nearly five-fold, from just over 5 percent for those identifying as Arabs to nearly 25 percent for Southeast Asians (in this case excluding Filipinos). Apart from the small number of Southeast Asian respondents, the highest rates of home ownership were recorded among Whites and South Asians in the first wave of the survey (compare these figures with income levels reported in Table 4). Interestingly, these two groups achieved home ownership with quite different strategies (South Asians through assembling large households, while Whites rarely resided in composite households). Groups with particularly low earnings, and with the smallest amounts of capital transferred to Canada (cf. Hiebert *et al.* 2006) had the lowest home ownership rates (cf. Table 4).

While these general patterns held across the subsequent two waves of the survey, there was a slight “flattening” of outcomes across groups; the nearly five-fold differential between Arabs and Southeast Asians declined to a little over double by the third wave of the survey (in this case between Arabs and Filipinos). As seen earlier, this “flattening” also happened in the levels of employment, earnings, and income between groups (Table 4).

We examine these trends in greater detail below, in the longitudinal analysis of the dynamics of home ownership.

Longitudinal analysis of home ownership across the 3 waves of LSIC

LSIC data provide a glimpse into housing as a *process* that unfolds over time, in this case four years after newcomers land in Canada. It is this longitudinal dimension that makes LSIC a particularly powerful tool. In this section we examine the changing nature of home ownership between the three waves of LSIC for a number of relevant groups in the larger survey sample.

Note that the results for this part of the report, unlike the other parts of this analysis, were based exclusively on the W3 dataset, which includes W1, W2 and W3 but is based only on respondents who participated in all three waves. That is, in other parts of our study, we used W1, W2 and W3 datasets separately to maximize the size of sample for the first two waves. But a longitudinal analysis requires us to maintain the same individuals across the three waves of the survey, necessitating the use of the smaller W3 sample (which includes respondents who participated in all three waves).⁹

In general, this population had an ownership rate of 19.1 percent when they were first interviewed approximately 6 months after landing (which compares with 18.4 percent for the full population of 12,000 in the W1 sample),¹⁰ which rose to 36.5 percent in the 18-month period between the first and second interviews, and to 51.8 percent by the time the final interview was conducted approximately four years after landing (Table 11). As noted earlier, this is an extraordinary level of ownership given the relatively short time that had elapsed since landing.

Our analysis of housing market dynamics is based on a series of 2x2 transition tables (not included in the report). These were then used to build a new three-part table, each part consisting of a set of columns. The first set begins with the level of ownership for each group at W1 and then traces the rise in ownership for the group between W1 and W2, ending with the group's ownership level in the W2 survey. This is repeated for the W2-W3 period. The final set of columns traces, in the same way, loss of ownership. We defined ownership loss as occurring when a Longitudinal Respondent indicated home ownership in either W1 or W2 but

⁹ The data are still not perfectly comparable, however. Due to differences in the way some variables were coded from one LSIC wave to the next, the total number of valid responses for the tenure variable in W1 is higher than in W2 and W3. In W1, individuals in "unusual" tenure situations (e.g., living in hotels) were included whereas they were not in W2 and W3. Fortunately this is a minor issue and we do not believe it has much impact on the analysis.

¹⁰ The difference between 19.1 and 18.4 percent tells us that the respondents who removed themselves from the survey between the first and third waves were less likely to be home owners. In other words, those who were less materially successful in Canada (as indicated by attaining home ownership) had a higher propensity either to leave the country, or could not be found by Statistics Canada in later surveys, or refused to be interviewed in the third wave of the survey.

not in the W3 survey.

The “group %” column in the table specifies the relative size of the group in question (e.g., 16 percent of all respondents in the W1-W2 transition tables were between 15 and 24 years old at the time of landing in Canada, 6 months before the W1 survey). Theoretically, the figures in the “group %” columns of the W1-W2 and W2-W3 parts of the table should be identical. There are some minor discrepancies, though, which occur when slightly different numbers of respondents would not answer the question about ownership in different waves of the survey. The “group %” figures for the ownership loss part of the table are quite different, since this analysis uses a different base population (those who owned a home in either W1 or W2 as opposed to the total survey sample).

The “ownership increase” column specifies the percentage of respondents who were not home owners (i.e., tenants) in the first wave of the survey, who attained ownership by the second wave (or W2->W3 for the middle part of the table). It is important to understand that this is not simply a *change in ownership* figure (i.e., the difference between 23.5 and 41.6 percent for the 15-24 age group). Tracking the percentage of non-owners who became owners offers a superior way to understand tenure dynamics. For example, if a group has 10 percent ownership at the W1 that rose to 20 percent at W2, the change in ownership would appear to be 100 percent. Another group with 70 percent in the first survey and 90 percent in the second would only appear to have a 28.6 percent increase in ownership. However, in the first instance, 11.1 percent of the 90 percent who did not have initial ownership were able to acquire it (10/90 added to the 10 percent that already had ownership), compared with 66.7 percent in the second instance (20/30 added to the original 70 percent). Therefore, the probability to acquire ownership was much higher for the second group than the first. To correct for this potential misinterpretation, we have concentrated on the change in the percentage of non-owners acquiring ownership rather than the gross figure for ownership change. In aggregate, one in five, or 20.1 percent, of those classified as tenants in Wave 1 were able to purchase a home between that point and the second wave of the survey. Almost the same proportion, 18.3 percent of those who were tenants, acquired home ownership by the end of the survey. At the same time, nearly 4 percent of those who had been home owners in either the first or second waves of the survey had lost that status by the third wave.

Note that we removed young respondents from the analysis because these categories raised confidentiality issues related to sample size. However, we do not feel this affects the analysis because it is expected that many would lose home ownership “naturally”, in setting out on their own (i.e., in W1 they could have been a child living at home and by W2 they could have been an independently-housed young adult). Further, we also excluded respondents over the age of 65 for the same sample size considerations, but the effect on the analysis is also minimal because it is likely that some would have chosen to sell their home to move to a retirement complex. So the base population for the ownership loss part of the table is quite different from that for the other two parts of the analysis.

Finally, a simple index value has been calculated for each set of columns in the table. For the W1-W2 ownership acquisition part of the table, the “ownership change %” figure has been scaled to the overall statistic of 20.1, for example. Values over 100 indicate that the group in

question had an above-average propensity to purchase housing in the period in question, vs. values less than 100 which indicate the opposite. A boldface font was applied to index values 110 or more, while those below 90 are shown in red. The opposite font/colour arrangement was used for ownership loss.

Ownership transition analysis

The ownership transition analysis enables us to identify the groups that were at the forefront of the rapid upward housing mobility among immigrants. The variables used in this analysis have been classified into these groups:

Demographic

- Age of the Longitudinal Respondent (10-year groupings)
- Households with children under 18
- Living in a multi-family household

Admission class

- Family Class
- Skilled Workers
- Other Economic (the number was too small for the ownership loss columns)
- (note: the number of Refugees was too small for this analysis)

Socio-economic

- At least some university education
- Employment / Self-employment by W1
- Above-average family income (W1 and W2)

Language

- Personal knowledge of an official language
- An official language is mainly used in the home

Visible Minority

- Is a member of a Visible Minority group, or not

Social capital and attitudes

- Member of a group or organization, in the W1 survey (social capital)
- Satisfaction with immigration to Canada, in the W1 survey
- Belief that co-ethnic ties are important, in the W1 survey

Demographic patterns

Life cycle dynamics are clearly visible in the data. In general there is a clear relationship between age and ownership. The 15-24 category is anomalous as it includes both children still living at home with their parents as well as young adults who have started their own households. With the exception of this cohort, the rate of ownership increases consistently across age categories, regardless of the wave of the survey.

Turning to a dynamic perspective, between W1 and W2 the respondents with the highest rate of acquiring home ownership were between 35 and 54 years old. The next highest were the youngest group, from 15-25 years old, and it is reasonable to speculate that most of these respondents were living in households with older parents (corresponding to the 35-54 group). This conjecture is supported by the fact that households with children under 18 had an above-

average rate of home purchase during the same period.

Conversely, those in the 25-34 year old category had a low rate of acquiring ownership, likely because they were still establishing themselves in the Canadian economy. Older respondents had the highest level of home ownership at the outset of the survey. However, relatively few tenants in W1 in this age group were able (or had the desire) to purchase a home by the time the second survey was taken. This stands to reason, given that the majority of respondents in this category would not be active in the labour market and would be unlikely to qualify for a mortgage.

These patterns changed subtly in the second interval, the period between the second and third waves of the survey. By then, the 25-34 group appears to have become more settled, and exercised a high rate of ownership acquisition. Meanwhile, the rate for middle-aged newcomers and their children (those aged 35-54 and 15-24) fell somewhat, to approximately the average. The rate for older respondents was even lower than in the first interval, especially for those over 65.

These patterns are mirrored in the ownership loss table. In this case, younger households, once in the market, were most likely to retain home ownership. This was also true, generally, for households with children. Conversely, older respondents had much higher rates of ownership loss. Unfortunately we do not have adequate data to determine whether this was the result of economic exigencies or a choice related to retirement and downsizing.

As noted earlier, newcomers frequently assemble larger, multi-family households, apparently in an effort to acquire home ownership as early as possible. Note the high ownership rate for this group at the 6-month period after landing. But, in general terms, this strategy did not lead to above-average rates of ownership acquisition in the near future. For example, respondents in multi-family households in W1 had below-average rates of ownership acquisition in both of the intervals examined in this study. Similarly, respondents living in multi-family households at the second wave also experienced below-average rates of ownership acquisition in the following two years. Respondents living in multi-family households, in all three waves of the survey, also had a high rate of ownership *loss*. In other words, the use of this strategy undoubtedly enabled households with marginal income levels to purchase a home, when this would not have been possible otherwise. But households using this strategy were vulnerable. Also, in each wave there was a drop in the percentage of individuals who lived in a multi-family household; it is possible that they left a household that owned its housing and moved to a rental unit after the initial period of settlement.

Admission class

To a large degree this dynamic has already been discussed, but the values for ownership change, and loss of ownership, add important nuances.

While those who arrived through the Family Class had the highest rate of home ownership 6 months after arrival, this group did not see much gain in their degree of ownership over time, and had a high rate of ownership loss by the third wave of the survey. Clearly, this group's apparent early success in the housing market was precarious. But there could be another

explanation that we cannot verify given the data at our disposal. It could be that newcomers landing in the Family Class first live with their sponsors, who already own a home. Through the time period of the survey, they could move out to establish their own household and, if so, are likely to rent a dwelling. They would of course be registered as Family Class immigrants in both cases and it would appear as though they lost home ownership.

Exactly the opposite dynamic occurred for survey respondents who were admitted as Skilled Workers (or the spouses and dependents of Skilled Workers). While their rate of ownership was low initially, it increased quickly over the subsequent 3.5 years between the first and third waves, and this group had the lowest propensity to lose ownership during the same period.

Finally, the Other Economic group (mainly business-class immigrants) shared a high rate of ownership with Family-Class immigrants in the first wave, but had a much higher tendency to gain ownership in the first two years after landing in Canada. Following that, this group did not see a particularly high rise in the proportion owning a home between the second and third waves of the survey. It appears that households that transferred substantial capital to Canada purchased a home quickly. On the other hand, those who did not bring capital did not generate sufficient earnings in Canada to buy a home. Also note that this group experienced less ownership loss than average (though the actual statistic underlying this statement cannot be reported) due to sample size and confidentiality considerations.

Socio-economic characteristics

Socio-economic characteristics other than employment earnings played a surprisingly modest role in the acquisition of home ownership over the years of the survey. Those immigrants arriving with higher levels of education had below-average rates of home ownership in each of the three waves of the survey. Nevertheless, in each of the two intervals examined here, they were slightly more able than the average to purchase a home, and also less likely to lose ownership, but these are not particularly strong tendencies (especially the index value of 102 in the W1-W2 period).

Labour market participation and income level played a stronger role. Respondents who found work or established their own business by the time of the first survey were about 10 percent more likely than average to purchase a home between the first and second waves (and about 8 percent more likely to lose home ownership as well). The corollary of this statistic is that a considerable number of respondents who were not actively in the labour market were also able to attain ownership (given that the rate was only slightly above-average for those in the labour market). This might be seen as counter-intuitive given that banks are reluctant to provide mortgages to individuals without an ongoing source of income. However, there are two potentially mitigating factors. First, other members (i.e., not the Longitudinal Respondent) of a household could be gainfully employed or engaged in entrepreneurship. Or, secondly, households could have transferred sufficient wealth to Canada to purchase a home without a mortgage.

The level of family income received 6 months after arrival did help respondents attain ownership over the next 18 months (index value of 114), but this advantage dissipated in the interval between the second and third waves of the survey (and did not appear to suggest that

ownership could be maintained). However, higher family incomes at the second wave of the survey were associated with substantially increased rates of acquiring home ownership in both periods examined here. In other words, higher incomes at this stage provide a better indicator of economic capacity to purchase a home than those at the 6-month period.

Language

It is somewhat surprising that the language variables measured in the survey were not strongly correlated with the trajectory of home ownership. Respondents who were able to speak an official language well had a slightly above-average rate of ownership acquisition (and a lower tendency to lose home ownership). The results are even more equivocal for respondents living in households where an official language was spoken regularly. This group had a high rate of ownership in the first wave of the survey, and saw a substantial rise in ownership between the first and second waves. But this upward mobility was not shared, particularly, by those who were tenants in W2; relatively few in this sub-group were able to purchase a home by the third wave of the survey. So at least in the short term horizon of the first four years of settlement, language has more of a decisive impact immediately after arrival in Canada than it does a little later on.

Visible Minorities

Ownership dynamics also varied little between Visible Minority newcomers and their European counterparts, both in terms of acquiring and losing home ownership. As we will see later, however, there were important differences between these broad groups in terms of housing quality and affordability.

Social-attitudinal measures

Ownership dynamics also were not strongly associated with the three social capital and attitudinal measures examined in this study (the final rows in Table 11). We used group membership as a proxy for social capital. That is, we assume that individuals who had already joined a social group or organization at the time of the first interview were more socially “connected” than those who had not. These individuals were more likely to experience upward mobility in the housing market in the next 18 months, but not subsequently. They also faced a lower risk of losing home ownership. The two attitudinal measures—satisfaction with their decision to immigrate to Canada and the perceived importance of ethnic or cultural ties—were both independent of home ownership gain or loss. This is an interesting finding, as it suggests that these attitudes are formed at a “deeper” level than the everyday experience of material well-being in the housing market.

Challenges of housing quality and affordability

Crowding

We have elected to use a single measure of housing quality for both home owners and tenants. This makes for a simplified analysis but of course only tells part of a complex story. Our

definition of crowding is quite simple: more than one person per room in a dwelling.¹¹ This is much simpler than the definition generally used by CMHC (e.g., Engeland and Lewis 2005), which takes family structure and age characteristics into account. The structure of LSIC does not allow for analysis at the household level, meaning that it is not possible to determine the age characteristics of the individual members of a household or a family. For this reason, it is not possible to replicate CMHC's measure here.

At the time of the first interview, around 6 months after officially landing, about one-quarter of newcomers lived in crowded housing (Table 12). This proportion fell to 18.4 percent for those still in the sample at the W2 interview, and further to 15 percent for those in the final sample of the survey, four years after landing.

The degree of variation of crowding across admission categories actually increased over time. In the first wave of the survey, the range in this statistic was roughly double between economic immigrants (Skilled Workers and Other Economic) vs. Refugees. By the third wave, housing conditions had markedly improved for economic immigrants, with a reduction in the proportion in crowded housing falling by half. While Refugees and Family Class immigrants also saw an improvement in this respect, it was not as substantial. Therefore, by the third wave, Refugee households were three times as likely to live in crowded circumstances compared with economic-class immigrants.

Much the same dynamic occurred across the cultural categories included in the Visible Minority variable (Table 13). The degree of crowding fell dramatically for East Asian groups and those of European heritage, in both cases by approximately half, from figures that were either at or well below the average to begin with. But the degree of crowding—while lower in the third compared with the first wave—for those of West and South Asian origins remained relatively high. For South Asians this appears to have been associated with an ownership strategy (e.g., the number of multi-family households, as seen in the previous analysis, plus the high rate of ownership). But this was not the case for West Asians, who had a low rate of home ownership despite living in more crowded conditions.

Affordability (for tenants)

For this analysis we focus on tenants, who made up approximately four out of five households in the first wave of the survey and just under half by the third wave. We have divided respondents into three groups, those spending less than 30 percent of their gross income on rent, those spending between 30 and 50 percent, and those contributing at least half of their income to rent. In our earlier analysis of LSIC we labeled these groups as those for which housing is affordable (“no stress”), those with moderate to high stress, and those in extreme stress.¹²

¹¹ Excluding bathrooms, hallways, and rooms used for business purposes.

¹² As in the case of crowding, our measure of affordability is less sophisticated than that used more generally by CMHC (core housing need), but still enables us to identify groups that are in more vs. less affordable positions in the housing market. Also, in our original analysis, we included savings in our definition of housing stress. We

Based on the 2001 census, Engeland and Lewis (2005, Table 5.9) report that 21.8 percent of all households (owners and tenants combined) were not living in affordable housing. This statistic was higher for immigrants in general (25.5 percent) and especially so for newcomers who had arrived between 1996 and 2001 (39.4 percent). As might be expected, the proportion suffering from lack of affordability was lower for earlier cohorts of immigrants, though only those who had been in Canada for 25 years or more approached the same figure as the Canadian born (20.4 vs. 20.1 percent).

The ratio of households paying more than 30 percent of their income on housing differed sharply for owners (14.6 percent) vs. tenants (33.9 percent) (Engeland and Lewis 2005, Table 3.3; note that this table only includes households in CMAs).

According to LSIC, nearly three-quarters of the survey respondents at the first wave spent more than 30 percent of their income on rent (Table 14). In fact, only about 20 percent were able to pay between 30 and 50 percent on rent and the remainder—over half of survey respondents—lived in households that had to dedicate over half of their income to rent. In previous work we have shown that many respondents to the survey brought savings with them to Canada and the situation for immigrant tenants was not as dire as this statistic would otherwise imply (Hiebert *et al* 2006). Nevertheless, the majority of newcomers were certainly under financial pressure, and could ill afford depleting their savings given the high ratio of rent to income.

Within this larger picture, there were significant differences between groups based on their admission class. Newcomers who came to Canada to join family frequently entered established households and this meant that they both had a high ratio of home ownership and also, for those who were tenants, a much higher ratio of households paying 30 percent or less on rent (half). Skilled Workers, conversely, generally have come to Canada as independent individuals or family units and rarely were able to purchase housing upon their arrival. Most were therefore in the rental market and the majority paid over half of their income for housing. Skilled Workers are required to bring a sufficient amount of money with them when landing in Canada to survive approximately 6 months, while they hone their language skills and find suitable employment. During this period their income is low, meaning that rent accounted for a large proportion of it. The Other Economic group brought, by far, the most money with them and had a high rate of ownership when surveyed in the first wave. Two thirds of those who were tenants paid more than half of their income to rent. As in the case of Skilled Workers, most members of this group had not yet been able to find suitable employment or business opportunities in Canada. Finally, the vast majority of Refugees included in LSIC would have been on social assistance (or equivalent income) when they were interviewed in the first wave of the survey.¹³ Few Refugees found affordable housing given their income constraints,

did not replicate that practice here, however, as LSIC only asked a question about amount of savings left in Canada in W1.

¹³ Recall that Government Assisted and Privately Sponsored Refugees are included in LSIC, but successful

though less than half were in the least affordable category. That is, most Refugees had an income, just not a large enough one for appropriate housing.

The change in access to affordable housing for newcomers over the next 18 months can only be described as remarkable. First, note the drop from about 123,000 to 93,500 (Table 14) in the total number of respondents in the W2 table compared to the one for W1, reflecting the large number of newcomers who were able to purchase a home and were therefore excluded from the W2 analysis of tenants. Secondly, given the substantial rise in average incomes over this period, the proportion living in affordable housing increased from a little over a quarter to fully half by the second wave of the survey. Every admission group was better off. By the second wave of LSIC, nearly two-thirds of Family Class newcomers had found affordable housing, and the proportion in the 50 percent plus category had fallen from over 28 percent to less than 12. The situation for Skilled Workers was, if anything, even more dramatic, with the proportion paying more than half their income towards rent falling from 60 to 22 percent. For this group particularly the key factor was a much increased level of labour force participation and, therefore, higher levels of employment earnings (Table 3). It should be noted, however, that almost one quarter of newcomers in this category are still suffering extremely unaffordable housing conditions. This could be partly explained by the preponderance of single person households in this admission class.

The main improvement in the housing situation of the Other Economic class arose through their efforts to purchase housing; note the drop from nearly 6,000 to less than 3,000 in the number of tenants in this category. For those who were still tenants, there was a definite improvement in their level of affordability, but not as much as the two classes discussed earlier.

The situation for Refugee tenants in the second wave of the survey was intermediary—their level of affordability did not improve as much as we have seen for Family Class and Skilled Worker respondents, but did improve more than for those in the Other Economic category who were still tenants. However, recall that Refugees endured the most crowded housing conditions in the W2 survey.

The upward momentum in affordability continued between the second and third waves of the survey—tracing the circumstances of newcomers two and four years after landing—but outcomes were more variable. At the aggregate scale, the ratio of those living in affordable housing had climbed to just over 60 percent, which was not so different from the figure for all Canadian tenant households reported in Engeland and Lewis (cf Table 2).

Those who had arrived through the Skilled Worker program saw the most improvement. With a considerable rise in average income, more than 60 percent of newcomers in this category

asylum seekers are not. So all of the Refugees in the survey population would have arrived recently in Canada and either would have automatically been eligible for social assistance or, in the case of PSRs, received equivalent help from their sponsors.

were living in affordable housing, up from just under 50 percent two years earlier. The number paying more than half of their income for rent also fell considerably.

A much higher ratio (nearly half) of Refugees had also found affordable housing by W3. Interestingly, the rent/income ratio for Refugee tenants in W3 was almost identical to that of Skilled Workers in W2. This is an entirely new finding that has only become possible with LSIC. The general consensus is that Refugees face the most serious housing challenges in Canada, but the W3 results of LSIC suggest that at least some in this category are faring reasonably well in the housing market.

Access to affordable housing hardly changed between the second and third waves for Family Class immigrants. The early advantage experienced by this group may not have been sustainable. This stands to reason. If immigrants join already-existing households in Canada, they should have relatively good initial housing outcomes. However, this group is generally less educated and experienced than Skilled Workers, and does not share the same access to social services provided to Refugees. Therefore, they are likely to experience less upward mobility in the housing market in the long run. This seems to be particularly true of Family Class immigrants who are tenants.

Similarly, those in the Other Economic group who did not purchase a home between W2 and W3 did not register an improvement in their access to affordable housing; if anything, their situation deteriorated a little. It appears that those who did not bring sufficient capital to purchase a home were not doing well and in fact suffered the worst affordability problems of any group. As is true of Family Class immigrants, individuals in this category are typically less educated than their counterparts in the Skilled Worker class.

How much did affordability vary by cultural group? Actually, very little in the first wave of the survey (Table 15). At that time, there was relatively little difference across groups in terms of the ratio paying more than 30 percent of their income toward rent. It was high for everyone. This compression of fortunes did not last, however. There was already a significant differentiation between groups by the second wave of the survey, which intensified by the third. By that time, newcomer tenants of European origin registered the least lack of affordability, closely followed by those from Southern Asia. Although we have not conducted cross-tabulations to verify this point, we believe that the former case reflects strong labour-market participation and growing earnings, while the latter reflects larger average household size and therefore a larger number of working adults (cf. Table 4).

The highly mixed group of *others*, which would include members of Visible Minority groups not specifically identified in the table, were closest to the average in terms of our measure of affordability.

The groups that suffered the greatest problems accessing affordable rental housing were those who identified as East Asian (most of whom identify more specifically as Chinese) and, especially, West Asian. In the former case, the high ratio of home owners suggests that households who could afford to do so, purchased a home as quickly as possible, leaving the most economically vulnerable in the rental market. The latter case is associated with

particularly low household incomes (Table 4).

Difficulties in the housing market

We also conducted an analysis of data on difficulties experienced by newcomers when looking for housing. While there were insufficient numbers of observations to analyze the detailed responses (i.e., the type of difficulty mentioned by respondents), the aggregate statistics tell an important story (Table 16). Nearly 30 percent of those interviewed in the first wave indicated that they had problems finding housing, and the vast majority of these were economic in nature (not shown in the table). The overall ratio of those experiencing problems fell to approximately 14 percent in the second wave and less than 8 percent in W3. In effect, the “difficulties” data provide a mirror image to the other statistics in this report; that is, as so many newcomers were able to purchase homes or rent more affordable dwellings, the number experiencing problems finding housing declined.

The proportion indicating these problems in W1 varied widely across admission classes. Few who came to Canada to join family were in this category (since most simply joined families that already had housing). While the ratio of Other Economic immigrants experiencing problems was much higher, it was still less than the average for all groups. Those entering Canada as Refugees and Skilled Workers found the greatest degree of difficulty locating housing.

The decline in the ratio of those experiencing problems was particularly profound for Other Economic and Skilled Worker immigrants (the figure for the former group was so low in W3 it could not be reported). Also, few Family Class immigrants identified problems in the W3 survey. Refugees continued to experience difficulty finding housing, as might be expected given their relatively low level of income and rate of home ownership. Also, though, it is likely that Refugees suffer from a variety of discriminatory barriers in the housing market, including racism (since most are members of Visible Minority groups), reluctance on the part of landlords to rent dwellings to large families, and reluctance to rent to families on social assistance. LSIC’s sample size is unfortunately too small to enable a more complete analysis at this high level of disaggregation.

The final table on this variable (17) shows differences in the proportion experiencing difficulty finding housing across cultural categories. The W1 data contain some surprises. The groups that indicated fewer problems than the average were: South Asians, West Asians/Arabs, and Blacks. This is unexpected given the prevailing belief that these groups, especially Blacks and, more recently, Muslims, are the most likely to face discrimination in the housing market.¹⁴

¹⁴ LSIC includes a specific category for those who mention that they experienced discrimination based, for example, on race. We contemplated analyzing these data but the number of respondents who mentioned this type of difficulty was so small that presenting these data would be prohibited due to confidentiality regulations. In other words, few newcomers complain of discrimination. This could be because there really is little discrimination in the Canadian housing market—or it could be a case that newcomers do not recognize existing

The proportion who identified problems when looking for housing was highest for: Other *Visible Minorities*, East Asians, and those of European origin. We suspect that the results for this question reflect a combination of access to networks (i.e., a lack of social capital) and/or financial constraints. The Other Visible Minority category is comprised of a large number of small groups, which is also generally true of European-origin newcomers. It may be that these groups have few internal, co-ethnic resources that would facilitate access to the housing market. Weak in-group support may have been compounded by low income for many in these groups.

The results of the second and third waves of the survey are more in keeping with conventional wisdom on discrimination. By this point in time, the groups identifying the highest level of difficulty when looking for housing were Other *Visible Minorities* and Blacks—both fragmented communities, with modest incomes and, also, vulnerability to racism. Newcomers from eastern and western Asia were in an intermediary position. Those of South Asian and European origin appear to have faced the fewest problems when looking for housing. As we have seen, South Asians had achieved a high rate of ownership by W3; the scale of the group and its extensive array of religious and other community organizations may also have helped. Newcomers of European origin were almost entirely in the Skilled Worker class, and their answer to this question has much in common with that group in the previous table. Also, European immigrants are least likely to have faced outright discrimination in the housing market, for a combination of reasons. In the first place they blend most easily with the dominant population of Canada and, secondly, have small household units and are rarely supported by social assistance.

Metropolitan variations

Background

In a number of important ways, the idea of a national housing market is unrealistic. All of the statistics explored in this report provide a grand summary of the average housing situation of immigrants across the country, but these conditions vary profoundly across the metropolitan centres where immigrants settle in the largest numbers, Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver. Of the three centres, Montréal is arguably the most distinct, with rent levels and home purchase prices that remained well below the national average through the period covered by LSIC (Table 1). Note that in a relative sense, these indicators of housing cost rose rapidly in Montréal between 2001 and 2005, but the end result was still a housing market with modest costs, comparatively. The dynamics of the Toronto market were almost exactly the opposite of those in Montréal. Prices rose slowly in Toronto, in fact much more so than the national average. Nevertheless, the cost of rent in Toronto was the highest of the three centres throughout the period while the purchase price of housing was nearly \$90,000 above the national average in 2005. The Vancouver housing market saw marked price increases over the

discrimination. It is also possible that newcomers are guided in their housing search by co-ethnic family and friends who have learned to avoid potential discrimination.

period, and were far above the national average in both 2001 and 2005 (the Vancouver market was the most expensive in Canada through these years). Rent levels in Vancouver were much higher than the national average in 2001 and escalated at approximately the national rate over the subsequent four years. Rent was cheaper than in Toronto in 2005, but still high by Canadian standards.

Income and demography

Of course housing affordability can only be understood by comparing income rates and the demographic characteristics of households to the supply and cost of housing, and a few relevant figures are provided in Tables 18 and 19. As we have just seen, the cost of renting or purchasing housing in Montréal is much lower than in the other metropolitan areas. While we have insufficient information to be able to pose a causal link in this respect, it is interesting that immigrants in Montréal have considerably smaller households than their counterparts in Toronto and Vancouver. Perhaps cheaper housing means that there is less economic pressure to assemble larger households with multiple individuals working in the labour market. While some sort of behavioural survey would be required to verify this hypothesis, income figures in the table provide a potential link between these points. In Montréal we see smaller households associated with much lower average labour market earnings and total income levels for immigrant families than in the other cities or, indeed, the national average.

Again, Toronto serves as a counterpoint to the Montréal situation. In Toronto, immigrant households are larger than the national average, perhaps in response to the cost of housing. While labour market earnings and total family income figures were lower in Toronto than the national average in the first wave of LSIC, by the third wave they were the highest of the three metropolitan areas (note also the higher levels of labour market participation in Toronto).

Immigrant households were also large in Vancouver. There, labour market participation rates were considerably higher than corresponding figures in Montréal but well below those in Toronto (Table 3). Employment earnings and family income figures were above the national average in W1 but had fallen in relative terms (that is, relative to those in other parts of Canada) by W3. We could expect particularly difficult affordability challenges in Vancouver given these statistics, which reveal a combination of high costs and low incomes.

Variations in the average size of immigrant households between the three metropolitan areas are explored further in Table 20. In the first wave of the survey, there were considerably more couples with children and multi-family households in Toronto and Vancouver than in Montréal. There was also a much higher proportion of single person households in the latter centre. To a large degree, the composition of immigrant households converged between the three metropolitan areas over the period covered by LSIC, with one important exception. Generally, the ratios of couples with children and couples without children became very similar across the centres. This was also true of the proportion of lone-parent families. But the exception in the W3 data, which helps explain the continuing difference in average household size between the centres, is the continuing contrast between the large number of single-person households in Montréal vs. multi-family households in Toronto and Vancouver.

Dwelling type

As noted earlier, information on dwelling type was only collected in the first two waves of LSIC. We have distilled this variable to a simple dichotomy for our analysis of metropolitan differences in this section of the report: the ratio of respondents living in houses, including row houses, duplexes and detached homes, as opposed to those living in apartments (Table 21). We have already discussed the fact that there are substantial variations in this measure across landing classes and ethno-cultural groups. Here we concentrate on landing classes as well as metropolitan differences. In all three cities, Family Class and Other Economic immigrants are more likely to live in houses, as opposed to apartments. We speculate that there would have been a pronounced increase in the ratio of Skilled Workers living in houses between the second and third waves of the survey, if this question would have been asked in the third wave. Our logic is based on the jump in the number in this landing class who owned their dwelling units by the third wave. We believe that the same trajectory towards detached dwelling types would also be true for Refugees, though to a lesser degree.

The most important distinction in the data on dwelling type, is across the three metropolitan regions included in our analysis. In very broad brush strokes, the proportion living in houses was moving towards 30 percent in Montréal by the second wave of the survey, 50 percent in Toronto, and was already well over 60 percent in Vancouver. These figures need to be considered in light of the housing cost differentials already discussed. Despite the significant drop in rental vacancy rates in Montréal, newcomers landing there still mainly gravitate towards apartments and pay relatively modest rents (compared with Toronto and Vancouver). The opposite is true in Vancouver. With a dearth of apartment units to begin with, and so few under construction, immigrants found shelter in houses, either through purchasing them or renting flats, typically in basements. Toronto occupies an intermediate position, with a substantial number of immigrants living in high-rise apartments, but also a widespread culture of ownership and a high priority (by longstanding residents and newcomers alike) on single-detached homes. The housing stock and associated costs therefore vary a great deal across the three centres.

Home ownership

So, too, does the degree of home ownership. From the first wave of the survey, immigrants were far more likely to purchase a home in Toronto and Vancouver than Montréal (Table 22). This difference was maintained over the next three and a half years. The rate of home ownership (for all admission classes) more or less doubled in all three centres between the first and second waves of LSIC. The rate nearly tripled from the first to third waves of the survey. In the period from the second to third waves, the rate of growth in ownership in Montréal was higher than that of Toronto or Vancouver, but this did not change the overall picture of a much lower tendency to purchase housing in that city.

There were subtle differences across landing classes in ownership rates across the three centres. At the national scale, the Other Economic group was associated with the highest level of ownership. This was also true in each of the three centres, but particularly so in Montréal, at least in relative terms (50 percent vs. 22 percent). By the third wave of LSIC, Refugees in Montréal were nearly half as likely as the total immigrant population to own a home (10 vs. 22

percent), which was a closer ratio than in the other two centres. Meanwhile, the variation in home ownership rates was lower in Vancouver.

How do we explain these variations? We begin by considering the ratio of income to house prices, using figures drawn from Table 18 (total family income at W3) and Table 1 (average MLS list price in 2005). For Canada as a whole, the average house was listed for \$249,000, approximately 4.7 times the average total income of families included in LSIC. Under these circumstances, few immigrant families should be able to afford to purchase a house. Based on one of the popular Canadian financial websites, an income of \$53,200 would enable a family to carry a mortgage of just under \$195,000 (assuming no other debt and an annual municipal tax rate of \$1,500). This would require a down-payment of well over \$50,000 for the average house. But, as noted earlier, there are three potential circumstances that could intervene to enable immigrants to buy a home even when the relationship between income and price does not appear to be favourable: they may have transferred savings to Canada for use as a down-payment; they may pool resources with two or more families occupying the same house; and they may purchase houses at the lower end of the price spectrum.

The price/income ratio for Montréal was close to the figure for the country as a whole (4.9 vs. 4.7), but it was markedly higher in Toronto (6.2) and even more so in Vancouver (8.6). These data would lead us to expect higher ownership rates in Montréal than the other two centres (i.e., exactly the opposite of what we observe in LSIC).

Why this reversal? First, in our earlier CMHC study, we were able to show that, at W1, immigrants to Montréal brought fewer savings than those landing in the other centres (Hiebert *et al* 2006). In part, this is related to the different admission class mix in Montréal compared with Toronto and Vancouver (e.g., fewer business-class immigrants, proportionally; more refugees). Although LSIC respondents were not asked about their level of savings left in Canada in W2 or W3, we suspect these early differences in the transfer of savings to Canada continued to be significant. Note, for example, this apparent discrepancy: the ratio of the average list price of a home in Vancouver in 2005 was 11.7 times the average total family income of Other Economic immigrants, and yet 75 percent of the respondents in that group had purchased a home. In fact the income level of this group suggests that even the lowest-priced forms of housing should be out of their reach. We believe that the transfer of savings is the most logical explanation of this otherwise mystifying outcome. Secondly, we have seen much higher ratios of multi-family immigrant households in Toronto and Vancouver than Montréal (unfortunately, LSIC asks respondents to specify their family income but not their household income so we cannot explore the significance of this tendency further). Thirdly, the much lower cost of renting a home in Montréal provides less of an incentive for immigrants to purchase housing. Fourthly, at the same time, the lower purchase price probably suggests to immigrants that housing is a less valuable investment in Montréal. Finally, zoning practices and the built environment may also have an impact. Basement suites are popular among immigrant home owners in both Toronto and Vancouver as a means to pay part of their mortgage (hence the widely used term “mortgage helper”). With a much lower proportion of single-detached houses in its housing stock, the opportunity for this type of leveraged financing is lower in Montréal.

Additional insights into the acquisition of home ownership across the three centres can be seen when the data are disaggregated by ethno-cultural group (Table 23; index values are relative to the total home ownership rate for each centre). Again, Montréal proves highly distinctive, with a much higher rate of ownership for immigrants of European heritage than for any other group (though it is worth noting that the category “other Visible Minority” is highly varied). This outcome contrasts sharply with the corresponding situation in Toronto and Vancouver, where European-origin immigrants are less likely to own homes than their Visible Minority counterparts. In Montréal, the ratio of family income for this group is 1.33 times higher than the average for immigrants for a whole (W3); in fact, it has the highest level of income, by far, of any ethno-cultural category (figures from LSIC but not included in tables for this report). European-origin immigrants also have higher incomes than other groups in Toronto and Vancouver (ratios of 1.17 and 1.42 compared with the average for all immigrants). However, there is a much higher propensity for non-European immigrant groups to form multi-family households in Toronto and Vancouver. We also speculate that the transfer of wealth of non-European immigrant groups has been much higher in Toronto and Vancouver than Montréal.

In Toronto, apart from the amorphous and small “Other Visible Minority” group, Indo-Canadians and, surprisingly, Black-Canadians, report the highest rates of home ownership. The former outcome is likely related to the high propensity for Indo-Canadians to opt for multi-family households (e.g., their average household size in Toronto was 4.2 persons in W3). We do not have a logical explanation for the latter statistic and need to probe LSIC further to gather a better understanding (since the level of family income of this group is a little less than the average for all immigrants, and their household size is also slightly smaller than average). In Vancouver, respondents from Eastern Asian origins are the most likely to own a home, in keeping with the large number of business immigrants in that category. The level of home ownership for immigrants from the Philippines and Western Asia in Vancouver is also noteworthy.

Crowding

As we have suggested earlier in this report, high rates of home ownership are often associated with crowding. This is generally *not* the case for the Other Economic group, which appears to have sufficient capital to purchase adequate homes. In Montréal, the number of respondents in this group who were living in crowded conditions was too small to be reported here, and it was a relatively modest 10 percent in both Toronto and Vancouver (Table 24; note that the table includes both owners and tenants). Crowding was also not a particularly prevalent issue for Skilled Workers, at least in Toronto and Montréal. As we have seen, in the former case, income levels for this group are well above average, while housing costs for the latter are below average. In Montréal, even Family-Class immigrants and Refugees are not especially prone to live in crowded housing. Other groups are not so fortunate, however. Respondents arriving as Refugees in Toronto and Vancouver – who are overwhelmingly in rental housing – experience high rates of crowding. In this case, incomes are insufficient for adequate housing, especially given the expensive rent levels in both metropolitan areas. On the other hand, respondents arriving as Family-Class immigrants in the same cities – who mainly live in owned dwellings – also tend to be in crowded circumstances. This, we believe, is the result of a combination of: a strong desire for ownership; high purchase prices; and the resolution of

these realities through multi-family household strategies.

Again, some of the subtleties of the situation can be seen when we reclassify the data according to population group (Table 25). Immigrants of European origin consistently have the lowest rates of crowding. Rates for members of Visible Minority groups are twice as high or more. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the group with the highest propensity to live in crowded dwellings are those of South Asian descent, closely followed by West Asians (outside Vancouver). In the former case, we see the results of multi-family households, and in the latter, the results of low income. While there are a few exceptions, it is interesting to note that rates of crowding do not vary a great deal across metropolitan areas for each population group.

Affordability for tenant families

We turn, finally, to examine the issue of affordability for tenants at the metropolitan scale. Earlier, we saw that there was a remarkable drop in the proportion of households spending most of their income on housing, from 55 percent of the total in the first wave, to 16 by the third. Given the considerable differences in rent prices across the three centres, it is somewhat surprising to see fairly consistent affordability dynamics across them (Table 26). By the third wave of LSIC, there were only three percentage points separating Montréal from Toronto and Vancouver in category of those spending more than half of their income on rent, with newcomers in Montréal experiencing the most difficulty on this measure of affordability.

Refugees in Montréal face a cost-price squeeze in the rental market, with nearly half paying more than 30 percent of their income on rent (combining the two categories of Table 27). But the situation is even worse for those in the more expensive markets of Toronto and Vancouver, where 68 and 57 percent of the Refugee respondents face this challenge, four years after landing in Canada. Around 40 percent of those who arrived through the Skilled Worker program also face unaffordable rent levels, across all three centres, as do Family-Class immigrants in Montréal and Toronto. Vancouver is somewhat exceptional in this respect, with a higher proportion of Family-Class immigrants in the more comfortable situation of paying less than 30 percent of their household income for rent. Conversely, the opposite is true for the relatively small number of Other Economic immigrants in Vancouver who have not purchased a home. In fact, they face the most pressing cost-price squeeze of any group identified in this study, with 73 percent in the 30 and 50 percent plus income categories. While this situation is far from optimal, we suspect that many of the respondents in this category would have access to savings and are not at immediate risk of homelessness (though some no doubt would be).

Metropolitan variations: Summary and analysis

We stated these working hypotheses at the outset of this report:

- The experience of immigrants in the housing markets of MTV will vary, with more crowding and affordability problems in Toronto and Vancouver given their higher-priced markets.
- Immigrants have a large impact on the rental markets of MTV (based on the number of units rented) but a small one on the real estate (home ownership) market.

We certainly found the first part of the initial hypothesis to be correct and emphasize the variegation of housing markets in the three main centres of immigrant settlement in Canada. As noted earlier, it is largely inappropriate to think that there is a single housing market across the country and equally inadvisable to assume that immigrants face the same housing challenges in Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver. However, our results that address the second half of this hypothesis were not quite so clear.

Montréal has the most affordable housing market. But the immigrants who gravitate to Montréal tend to bring very little capital with them and the opportunities for participation in the labour market and robust earnings are much weaker in Montréal than the other two metropolitan areas. So there is a kind of alignment in the Montréal market, with lower ability to pay and lower levels of rent, and lower housing purchase prices as well. Few can or do take advantage of this purchase price discount (compared with Toronto and Vancouver), and most newcomers remain in the rental market through their first four years of settlement. Relatively few live in single, detached houses and various forms of apartments are the norm. With the exception of refugees, crowding is relatively rare in Montréal. Nevertheless, immigrants who are tenants in Montréal (which is some 78 percent of the total surveyed population) face serious affordability challenges. The Montréal story in a nutshell appears to be: immigrants rent apartments that are generally adequate in size, but pay a high ratio of their income to do so. The story for the Other Economic group in Montréal is much more fortunate than the average (but it is a small group), while Refugees experience the greatest problems. From a policy perspective, the most significant issue to address in Montréal is economic opportunity (i.e., the problem is not so much the supply of housing but the income level of immigrant families).

Toronto has the most punishing housing market for tenants and purchase prices that are far above the national average (though not as high as those of Vancouver). On the other hand, Toronto appears to have offered the newcomers the best economic opportunities of the three centres. While earnings in Toronto lagged behind the national average in the first wave of the survey, they escalated steadily and were substantially above the national average by the end of the survey, and the highest of the three centres. Newcomers also adjust to the Toronto housing market through combining forces into larger households. Approximately half of the LSIC respondent population lives in apartments, and half in houses (detached and non-detached combined). Members of Visible Minority groups, most notably newcomers from South Asia, are at the forefront of the trend towards purchasing housing. While this issue is not covered in this report, our work elsewhere demonstrates that this process is closely interconnected with the trajectory of suburbanization of Visible Minority groups in Toronto (and Vancouver as well; Hiebert *et al* 2007). This quick acquisition of home ownership may be an astute long-term investment, but comes with short-term costs. We have not examined the relationship between mortgage payments and income in this study, but expect that many of the newcomers who purchased homes in their earlier years are financially stretched. What we can see in these data is a strong relationship between the group with the highest tendency to purchase housing and crowded living circumstances. Turning to tenants, we were surprised that the rent/income ratio was actually slightly better in Toronto than the other two cities. This reflects the relatively strong economic outcomes associated with newcomers in that centre, and suggests that there will be a continuing trend towards home ownership in the future (i.e., a lower

rent/income ratio means that households may be able to accumulate savings towards a down-payment for a home).

The situation in Vancouver is in many ways similar to that of Toronto, but with a few distinctions. The rental market in Vancouver is slightly cheaper than that of Toronto, but income levels for immigrant families are lower so issues of affordability loom large. Remarkably, although house prices are much higher in Vancouver than anywhere else, including Toronto, some 55 percent of newcomers have managed to purchase a home in the four years covered by LSIC. As in Toronto, we see that this process is often facilitated through a multi-family strategy, and is associated with crowded dwellings. However, the particularly large number of business-class immigrants in Vancouver means that many families purchase housing using transferred capital, despite low (in many cases, very low) earnings and aggregate family income. Whether this strategy is sustainable in the long run (i.e., continuing transfer of capital to sustain housing costs) is open to question. Of course, a more positive scenario could develop, and these newcomers could establish businesses or find well-remunerated work in the coming years. In Vancouver, as in Montréal and Toronto, Refugees face especially troubling challenges of overcrowding (mainly in rental units) and affordability. There is one glimmer of hope, though: we were astonished to find that, in Canada's most expensive housing market, 17 percent of refugee respondents had become home owners in their initial four years in Canada.

Given these complexities, the first hypothesis cannot be seen as fully valid. Newcomers to Montréal may enjoy lower rents and purchase prices, but their level of income is considerably lower than their counterparts in Vancouver and, especially, Toronto. With the notable exception of Refugees, crowding may not be as serious a problem in Montréal, but housing affordability most certainly is. The situation of newcomers in Vancouver could be seen as quite counter-intuitive, given the modest income levels there coupled with high housing process, and yet the high level of home ownership. These data clearly reveal that income is not the only factor enabling home ownership.

Our second hypothesis is also challenged by LSIC data. The impact of newcomers on the rental markets of Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver is no doubt rapid and profound, given the scale of immigrant settlement in these centres and the fact that so many rent dwellings very soon after arrival. But LSIC suggests that there is a major impact on the real estate purchase market as well. While this impact may not be so dramatic in Montréal, fully half of LSIC respondents in Toronto and Vancouver were home owners within just four years.

Discussion and synthesis: Housing and the settlement process

We begin this section by considering what we have learned about the changing housing circumstances of the admission categories, and follow this with a similar discussion based on cultural groups. We turn then to the longitudinal analysis to set this larger discussion of admission and cultural differences into perspective.

A little more than one-quarter of the LSIC respondents were associated with the Family Class. Above all, members of this class exemplify the chief findings of a prominent school of thought in migration theory writ large: social network theory. According to this approach, family

networks both facilitate the process of migration (cf. the concept of “chain migration”) and also that of settlement in a new society. Early migrants establish pathways for their successors to follow. Newcomers benefit from these pioneering efforts and their search for work and shelter is much easier. The Canadian Family Class program adds an important ingredient to this already potent set of early advantages, requiring that immigrants admitted in this category be actively sponsored (i.e., supported) by a family member. Network theories of migration have also identified an important potential weakness in this apparently positive situation; newcomers may easily become locked into relatively narrow social networks and the initial assistance of their relatives and friends can lead them to reduced socio-economic horizons (e.g., by finding a poorly-paid job quickly, the individual may resist enhanced language training and the possibility of a better job down the road).

To a large degree, the experience of Family Class immigrants surveyed in LSIC matches the expectations of network theory. While they have low incomes upon arrival, respondents in this category are relatively well housed, with a high level of home ownership, a modest level of crowding (a high ratio live in houses as opposed to apartments), and few reported problems finding housing. All of this is associated with a highly distinctive tendency to reside in composite households with (presumably) multiple adults earning incomes. Already impressive, the housing circumstances of this group improved significantly over the 18 months separating the first and second waves of LSIC, on all of the measures considered in this report. However, this trajectory of improvement was not as apparent in the second interval of LSIC as the first, perhaps hinting at the limits of social networks postulated in the theoretical literature. Nevertheless, the aggregate housing situation of Family Class immigrants in LSIC would have to be described as fairly advantageous by the termination of the survey.

Our expectations for newcomers admitted as Skilled Workers should be a mirror image to those of the Family Class. In many ways they are the “pioneers” of network theory discussed in the preceding paragraphs, although not completely so: many Skilled Workers come to join already-existing networks of family and friends, and Canada actually assigns 5 points for those with a relative living in the country. For our purposes, however, the key point is that Skilled Workers are *unsponsored*).

The housing circumstances of respondents associated with the Skilled Worker class were quite modest in W1. Most lived in traditional nuclear families though there was a noticeable number of single-person households as well. The majority found housing in apartments and very few owned homes. Those in apartments dedicated a very high proportion of their income to rent, a point echoed in the high ratio experiencing problems finding housing.

Over the next two waves of the survey, however, it is clear that Skilled Workers experienced the greatest degree of progression in their housing circumstances. The proportion experiencing crowding, affordability problems, and problems finding housing all fell, while the rate of home ownership rose sharply. In fact, the housing conditions (as measured in this report: ownership, crowding, affordability) of Skilled Worker immigrants began to approximate that of the Canadian population overall.

The Other Economic category is much smaller and, as noted earlier, dominated by those who

came to Canada through the business immigration program. For the most part members of this group arrive with financial capital but, as other research has shown (e.g., Hiebert 2002, Ley 2003), their economic integration is actually quite difficult. The initial housing circumstances of the Other Economic group are in keeping with the fact that they transfer a large amount of wealth to Canada. Already at W1 approximately one-third of this group owns a home and few identify problems finding housing. A high proportion live in traditional nuclear families and the predominant dwelling type is the single-detached house. Crowding is relatively rare, though those who have not yet purchased a home pay a very high proportion of their income as rent (not surprising given that this group is expected to start a business or invest in the Canadian economy rather than find work in the regular labour market, so their initial income level is quite low).

Members of this group continued to invest their transferred capital into the real estate market over the next few years, with a jump in home ownership to approximately three-quarters of the group by W3. At the same time, those who did not make this transition tended to experience a high degree of income stress in the rental market.

Finally, we outlined our expectation that Refugees would experience the greatest challenges in the housing market, at the outset of this report. This has proven true. While Refugees, like other newcomers, tend to live in nuclear families, this category includes the highest proportion of lone-parent families, a group that is not generally well-housed in Canada. Virtually none of the Longitudinal Respondents associated with Refugees in the survey were home owners in the first wave of LSIC (or the second). The overwhelming majority lived in apartments in the early phase of the survey. Refugees experienced a high level of crowding in W1 and also considerable affordability problems (though relatively few were registered in the extreme stress category given that they receive social assistance and therefore actually received more income than many other newcomers in the W1 survey).

The housing situation of Refugees improved least of all of the groups surveyed. A substantial number indicated that they had problems finding housing even in the W3 survey; their degree of crowding was worst, and affordability challenges continued to be serious. Refugees, understandably, had the lowest rate of home ownership and the highest tendency to live in apartments.

But the story is not completely depressing for this group. In terms of affordability, the situation for Refugees in W3 actually approximated that of Skilled Workers just two years earlier, in W2. Also, while their rate of ownership continued to be low, it was edging towards 20 percent by the termination of LSIC.

* * *

In the broad scope of the social sciences, race is widely seen as a major social fault line in

Canada in much the same way that class was in the early twentieth century.¹⁵ Scholarship on immigration has also emphasized the salience of race in the process of settlement and integration. We set out in this project with this longstanding understanding in mind, expecting to find clear distinctions between the experience of Whites and *Visible Minorities* in the housing market. We also speculated that there would be significant differences within these categories, but that the major distinction between immigrants from European vs. other backgrounds would be highly relevant. Certainly, White newcomers had the highest family income levels throughout the three waves of the survey (Table 4).

This expectation was valid in many, but not all, respects. The hypothesis of a high degree of differentiation between cultural groups was more consistently true.

We begin by summarizing the gap in the housing situations of White vs. Visible Minority newcomers. The simplest way to do this is to compare the statistics on the “non-Visible Minority” group with the total sampled population. The household composition of White newcomers was not that different from that of Visible Minority groups, taken as a whole. The only categories with noteworthy differences were a higher than average number of childless couples, and a lower proportion of multiple family units among Whites (across the three waves of the survey). In other words, Whites, like all newcomers generally, tended to live in nuclear families but with a smaller number in large, composite households and a larger number in smaller ones. Apart from the relative lack of multiple-family households, these are not sharp differences.

Whites vs. *Visible Minorities* were almost indistinguishable in terms of their dwelling types, with a slightly higher percentage of Whites in single-detached houses (perhaps signifying better housing), but also in low-rise apartments (perhaps signifying worse).

The aggregate home ownership rate also differed little between these broad categories, though Whites enjoyed a small advantage in this respect. Our longitudinal analysis also showed that White respondents were less likely to lose ownership once it had been acquired.

The largest, and surely most important, distinctions between these broad groups could be found in the variables that proxy experience in the housing market (“difficulty”), housing quality, and affordability. In all three cases, newcomers who identified a European origin were in a more favourable situation throughout the three waves of the survey.

There is clear evidence, therefore, of racialized differences in the housing market, but these do not extend to all aspects of housing consumption.

Moreover, our analysis has repeatedly shown substantial differences between Visible Minority groups. The most striking of these are the extraordinary degree of home ownership among

¹⁵ This is not to suggest that race has superseded class as the primary social division in Canadian society. Both are important.

South and Southeast Asian respondents, vs. the highly precarious situation of West Asian (including Arab) and Black respondents in the housing market (compounded by a high incidence of difficulties locating housing for the latter group).

We employed a longitudinal analysis of home ownership to explore two central issues: the *process* of ownership acquisition over time (limited, by necessity, by the relatively short span of LSIC); and the degree of association between ownership acquisition and several sets of variables. In part, the longitudinal analysis enables us to speculate on the relative importance of admission class, Visible Minority status, and other relevant social characteristics in terms of home ownership.

It seems that the two most significant sets of variables that help predict ownership change are admission class (with the highest index values in Table 11), and the various demographic measures used here.¹⁶ The Canadian immigration system is complex and has built classes around different social/economic/political objectives (note especially the profound difference between the humanitarian and economic rationales of the program and their crystallization into the Government Assisted Refugee vs. Skilled Worker classes, for example). We should not be surprised, therefore, that admission class carried great significance through all of the measures of the housing market examined in this report. The rate of ownership change, understandably, varies enormously between admission groups.

Demographic specificities are also deeply embedded in the housing experience. The age/experience cycle is the most evident of these in our analysis, but the size of family is also important and we have, throughout the report, emphasized the prevalence of composite-family household strategies among particular groups of newcomers.

The small number of socio-economic variables included in our analysis were also significant in predicting ownership change, but not as consistently as those just discussed. As would be expected, employment and higher levels of income are both beneficial, but not overwhelmingly so. We speculate that we are missing a critical piece of the socio-economic puzzle that, perhaps, supersedes all others in the early stage of settlement: wealth, especially wealth transferred to Canada.

The other variables explored here were not particularly important. Visible Minority status, at the broad scale of White vs. non-White, hardly registered as a predictor of ownership change (though was marginally important in predicting ownership loss). None of the social capital or attitudinal measures we tested were associated with the housing market, particularly.

¹⁶ Unfortunately we did not conduct an analysis by specific Visible Minority group, given the small size of many groups in the W3 sample, which would have necessitated amalgamating groups into a small number of categories. Nevertheless, we believe that, if there were sufficient data to enable such an analysis, the results would be highly significant (e.g., South Asians vs. West Asians).

Conclusion

Our overall working hypotheses for this study were:

- Immigrants in general continue to experience a progressive housing career, and their housing situation two and four years after landing will be better than it was at 6 months.
- However, the degree of improvement, and the general housing situation, will vary widely between groups.
- Generally, there will be a gap between European-origin and Visible Minority groups. But there will also be substantial differences in the experiences of individual groups in the housing market (e.g., immigrants from India vs. China).
- Refugees experience the most significant problems accessing appropriate and affordable housing.

Our study reveals some of the contours of a highly dynamic engagement of newcomers with the Canadian housing market during the first four years of their settlement. The most significant story is the remarkable improvement in the housing circumstances—by several relevant criteria—over the time period covered by LSIC. The rate of home ownership acquisition was particularly significant and speaks to the impact of immigration in the Canadian housing market. Clearly, there is a impact in housing demand (and, we would speculate, price), given the large and rapid investment on property shown in the data.

Of course this favourable outcome was not universally experienced, and a number of newcomers continued to struggle with problems of affordability, crowding, and difficulties finding housing even in the third wave of the survey. Regrettably, there are several groups who feel the impact of these problems more consistently than others, notably Refugees, and immigrants identifying as Black, Arab, and West Asian.

In general, the hypotheses that structured our analysis were valid. The progressive housing career identified at the first wave of the survey continued for a large number of immigrants through the second and third waves. As expected, though, the degree of improvement in housing circumstances continued to vary a great deal by group, a fact that was associated with the broad distinction between European and Visible Minority newcomers, but also more complex than such a simple categorization could ever capture. The situation of Refugees is worthy of particular attention given the information available in LSIC. There are some hints that this group, too, will see a marked improvement in its housing situation, but the larger story is one of difficulty, lack of affordability, and (at least by the simple measure of crowding) inadequate housing for this group.

References

- Carter, Tom (2005) "The Influence of Immigration on Global City Housing Markets: The Canadian Perspective." *Urban Policy and Research* 23(3): 265-286.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC] (2006) *Facts and Figures*. Ottawa: CIC.
- Danso, Ransford and Miriam Grant (2000) "Access to housing as an adaptive strategy for immigrant groups: Africans in Calgary." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 32(3): 19-43.
- Engeland, John, Roger Lewis and Janet Che (2005) *Evolving housing conditions in Canada's Census Metropolitan Areas, 1991 – 2001: Trends and conditions in Census Metropolitan Areas*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada/ Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
- Haan, Michael (2005) "The Decline of the Immigrant Homeownership Advantage: Life-Cycle, Declining Fortunes and Changing Housing Careers in Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver, 1981-2001." *Urban Studies* 42(12): 2191-2212.
- Haan, Michael (2007) "The Homeownership Hierarchies of Canada and the United States: The Housing Patterns of White and Non-White Immigrants of the Past Thirty Years." *International Migration Review* 41(2): 433-465.
- Hiebert, Daniel (2002) "The spatial limits of entrepreneurship: Business immigrants in Canada". *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 93:173–90.
- Hiebert, Daniel, Silvia D'Addario, and Kathy Sherrell (2005) *The profile of absolute and relative homelessness among immigrants, refugees, and refugee claimants in the GVRD*. Vancouver: Mosaic.
- Hiebert, Daniel (2006) *Beyond the polemics: The economic outcomes of Canadian immigration*. RIIM Working Paper 2006-15.
- Hiebert, Daniel, Annick Germain, Robert Murdie, Valerie Preston, Jean Renaud, Damaris Rose, Elvin Wyly, Virginie Ferreira, Pablo Mendez, and Ann Marie Murnaghan (2006) *The Housing Situation and Needs of Recent Immigrants in the Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver CMAs : An Overview*. Metropolis British Columbia, Working Paper #08-01.
- Hiebert, Daniel, Nadine Schuurman, and Heather Smith (2007) *Multiculturalism "on the ground": The social geography of immigrant and visible minority populations in Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver, projected to 2107*. Metropolis British Columbia, Working Paper #07-12.
- Ley, David (2003) "Seeking *Homo Economicus*: The Canadian State and the Strange Story of the Business Immigration Program" *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 93(2): 426 – 441.

Mendez, Pablo, Daniel Hiebert, and Elvin Wyly. 2006. "Landing at Home: Insights on Immigration and Metropolitan Housing Markets from the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada" *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 15 (2006) 82-104.

Murdie, Robert and Carlos Teixeira (2003) "Towards a comfortable neighbourhood and appropriate housing: immigrant experiences in Toronto." In P. Anisef and M. Lamphier (eds.) *The World in a City*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Statistics Canada. 2006. *About the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada*. Publication 89-614-XIE.

TABLES

Table 1: The Canadian housing market, 2001-2005

		Canada	Montreal	Toronto	Vancouver
2001	Avg MLS sale price (\$000)	172	126	252	286
	Rental vacancy rate (%)	1.7	0.6	0.9	1.0
	Avg 2-bedroom rent (\$)	672	529	1,027	919
2005	Avg MLS sale price (\$000)	249	204	336	426
	Rental vacancy rate (%)	2.8	2.0	3.8	1.4
	Avg 2-bedroom rent (\$)	732	616	1,052	1,004
2001-05	Change in MLS price (%)	44.8	61.9	33.3	49.0
	Change in rent (%)	8.9	16.4	2.4	9.2

Source: CMHC Housing Market Indicators (2007).

TABLE 2: COMPARISON OF LSIC RESULTS WITH RELEVANT CENSUS STATISTICS

	2001 CENSUS, HOUSEHOLDS					LSIC
	Total population	All immigrants	Immigrated 1991 - 2001	Immigrated 1991-1995	Immigrated 1996-2001	W3 Individuals
Number						
Total	11,279,330	2,450,660	551,070	291,355	259,720	
Rented - total	3,868,110	830,430	325,250	146,605	178,645	
30%+ household income	1,531,605	356,440	144,100	56,725	87,370	
50%+ household income	735,275	173,540	80,785	28,655	52,130	
Owned - total	7,411,215	1,620,225	225,820	144,745	81,070	
30%+ household income	1,188,465	349,280	85,415	49,295	36,120	
50%+ household income	457,815	138,730	40,310	21,565	18,740	
Percent						
Owners	65.7	66.1	41.0	49.7	31.2	51.8
Tenants	34.3	33.9	59.0	50.3	68.8	48.2
Paying <30% on rent	60.4	57.1	55.7	61.3	51.1	60.7
Paying 30%+ on rent	39.6	42.9	44.3	38.7	48.9	39.3
30-50%	20.6	22.0	19.5	19.1	19.7	22.9
50%+	19.0	20.9	24.8	19.5	29.2	16.4

Source: Metropolis Core Tables.

Table 3: Basic demographic and economic characteristics, by admission class, W1-W3, Canada

		Number	Avg HH size	Pct employed	Avg emp \$ (family)	Avg tot \$ (family)
Total	W1	156,150	3.6	45.3	15,880	18,192
	W2	156,450	3.6	58.9	40,610	43,385
	W3	155,050	3.7	68.3	48,979	53,157
Family	W1	42,450	4.0	41.2	23,058	24,818
	W2	42,500	4.1	50.0	45,748	49,701
	W3	42,350	4.1	55.6	48,330	52,828
Skilled	W1	94,300	3.3	51.3	12,752	15,870
	W2	94,450	3.3	65.2	40,646	42,658
	W3	93,250	3.4	75.9	51,751	55,899
Other Ec	W1	9,700	4.0	28.7	13,492	20,020
	W2	9,800	4.0	50.8	30,452	41,395
	W3	9,800	3.9	61.9	37,971	47,259
Refugee	W1	9,750	4.4	22.1	9,589	10,945
	W2	9,750	4.3	45.1	21,324	26,049
	W3	9,650	4.3	56.3	29,972	33,735

Notes for Tables 3 and 4:

Number: indicates the population estimate based on the sample of respondents interviewed, as specified for the Average household size question. The number would be different for the other three columns in each row of the table. For example the number answering the employment question was not the same as that answering the total family income question.

Average household size: includes all persons in a household, which may contain one or more economic family(ies).

Percent employed: is based on those longitudinal respondents 18 years or older who are not in school (i.e., this measure is based on individuals). It is an average figure for both men and women, combined.

Average employment earnings: includes all members of an economic family who are employed. The earnings may be derived from one or more job(s).

Figures for average employment earnings and total family income for Wave 1 refer to the period between landing and the day the survey was taken, so are for approximately 6 months. Figures for W2 and W3 are for one year.

Average total income: includes all members of an economic family. Note that there is no simple way in LSIC to determine the average income or households, which would be larger than that of economic families, especially for those groups with large numbers of multiple-family households.

Table 4: Basic demographic and economic characteristics, by Visible Minority group, W1-W3, Canada

		Number	Avg HH size	Pct employed	Avg emp \$ (family)	Avg tot \$ (family)
Total	W1	155,200	3.6	45.5	15,850	18,218
	W2	155,500	3.6	59.0	40,642	43,392
	W3	154,050	3.7	68.4	49,049	53,169
E Asian	W1	40,250	3.2	36.8	12,300	13,942
	W2	40,250	3.2	51.1	33,543	35,244
	W3	39,850	3.3	64.5	43,790	46,278
S Asian	W1	40,500	4.2	53.6	16,913	18,853
	W2	40,600	4.2	61.5	42,575	45,881
	W3	40,400	4.3	68.1	49,984	55,811
Black	W1	7,550	3.7	45.0	14,822	16,036
	W2	7,550	3.5	64.2	35,559	38,584
	W3	7,550	3.6	72.8	41,041	43,901
Filipino	W1	11,450	4.3	67.7	16,112	17,989
	W2	11,450	4.1	77.7	45,081	48,658
	W3	11,300	4.1	83.4	54,114	58,962
Arab	W1	9,650	3.4	26.4	13,058	14,282
	W2	9,650	3.5	39.4	29,490	29,897
	W3	9,600	3.7	53.9	38,657	40,270
W Asian	W1	7,750	4.2	23.9	13,650	21,915
	W2	7,750	4.3	46.5	28,336	41,468
	W3	7,650	4.2	55.5	35,904	40,083
Other VM	W1	6,300	3.4	42.5	15,643	23,369
	W2	6,300	3.5	59.1	41,618	44,906
	W3	6,200	3.5	70.1	47,709	51,725
Non-VM	W1	31,800	3.1	49.8	19,293	23,323
	W2	31,950	3.1	67.0	50,526	53,979
	W3	31,450	3.2	74.3	59,888	65,677

Table 5: Household structure, by admission class (W1, W2, W3)

		Total	One-family household, married couples with children*	One-family household, childless married couple*	One-family household, lone-parent*	One-person household*	One-family household, with unrelated persons*	Multifamily household*
Family	W1	44,150	22.1	25.4	4.9	4.3	9.9	33.4
	W2	43,150	31.6	17.5	4.3	3.9	13.8	28.6
	W3	42,600	35.6	14.2	4.2	5.2	13.4	27.5
Skilled Workers	W1	99,010	57.3	17.4	1.8	11.7	3.9	7.8
	W2	96,800	64.7	15.8	2.5	9.1	5.9	2
	W3	94,550	71.5	12.4	2.6	7.1	4.3	2.1
Other Economic	W1	10,460	79	5.3	4.3	2.8	3.7	5
	W2	10,200	76.5	4.4	4.9	3.9	6.4	3.4
	W3	9,850	75.1	5.6	4.1	4.6	6.1	4.1
Refugees	W1	9,820	58.4	3.9	11.9	6.3	7.3	12.2
	W2	9,800	61.2	5.1	10.7	6.1	14.3	3.1
	W3	9,750	60.5	4.6	11.3	7.7	11.8	4.1
Total	W1	163,440	49.3	18	3.4	8.8	5.7	14.8
	W2	159,950	56.3	14.9	3.6	7.3	8.6	9.4
	W3	156,750	61.3	12	3.7	6.4	7.3	9.3

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.422 (P< 0.001), W2: 0.436 (P< 0.001), W3: 0.424 (P< 0.001)

*column percentages

Note: married couples include persons in common-law marriages.

Totals do not match due to rounding and non-response.

Table 6: Household structure, by visible minority group (W1, W2, W3)

		One-family household, married couple with children*	One-family household, childless married couple*	One-family household, lone-parent*	One-person household*	One-family household, with unrelated persons*	Multifamily household*	Total
South Asian	W1	45.3	13.5	2.4	6.3	6.5	26.1	42,200
	W2	55.1	9.8	2.2	4.2	9.4	19.3	41,800
	W3	59.3	8.2	1.8	2.6	8.4	19.6	40,650
East Asian	W1	52.6	21.2	2.6	8.6	4.5	10.4	44,100
	W2	58	18.4	3.5	7	6.5	6.7	41,650
	W3	64.3	13.4	3.5	6.3	5.3	7.2	40,300
West Asian (INCL Arab)	W1	54.6	14.9	4.9	10.9	4	10.6	17,300
	W2	62.3	10.3	5.4	8.6	8.6	4.9	17,500
	W3	69.2	8.1	5.8	8.1	5.5	3.7	17,350
Black	W1	40.5	13.1	10.1	11.3	8.9	16.1	8400
	W2	46.3	10	11.9	11.3	17.5	3.1	8,000
	W3	47.7	9.3	12.6	11.9	15.2	4	7,550
Other vis.min	W1	45.6	14.2	3.2	7.6	11	18.3	17,250
	W2	54	11.4	3.4	7.1	12.8	11.4	17,600
	W3	58.7	9.3	2.8	7	12.1	9.8	17,800
Non-vis min (White)	W1	51.7	24.2	3.3	11.1	3.3	6.3	33,150
	W2	56.5	22.3	3.1	10	5.2	2.9	32,500
	W3	60.9	19	3.4	8.9	5	3	32,100
Total	W1	49.4	18	3.4	8.8	5.7	14.8	162,350
	W2	56.4	14.8	3.6	7.2	8.5	9.4	159,000
	W3	61.3	11.9	3.7	6.4	7.4	9.3	155,750

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.265 (P< 0.001), W2: 0.290 (P< 0.001), W3: 0.300 (P< 0.001)

*column percentages

Table 7: Dwelling type, by admission class (W1, W2)

		Total	Single detached house	Double	Row or terrace	Duplex	Low-rise apartment (<5 storie) or flat	High-rise apartment (>5 stories)
Family	W1	43,150	42.8	7.9	5.6	4.9	15.5	23.4
	W2	42,550	46.3	6.5	6.7	6.8	13.7	20.0
Skilled Workers	W1	97,100	24.8	5.6	6.6	3.4	23.5	36.0
	W2	95,450	26.3	6.1	8.4	4.1	22.7	32.3
Other Economic	W1	10,300	43.5	7.2	6.3	3.4	12.6	27.1
	W2	10,100	50.2	7.0	8.0	2.0	11.4	21.4
Refugees	W1	9,700	11.9	5.7	6.2	4.1	42.8	29.4
	W2	9,750	13.3	3.6	10.7	4.6	37.2	30.6
Total	W1	160,200	30.1	6.3	6.3	3.8	21.8	31.6
	W2	157,850	32.4	6.1	8.1	4.8	20.4	28.2

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.246 (P< 0.001), W2: 0.259 (P< 0.001)

Table 8: Dwelling type, by visible minority group (W1, W2)

		Total	Single detached house	Double	Row or terrace	Duplex	Low-rise apartment (<5 storie) or flat	High-rise apartment (>5 stories)
South Asian	W1	40,950	36.3	9.0	4.8	3.1	10.0	36.8
	W2	41,000	37.9	7.2	6.5	6.6	9.8	32.1
East Asian	W1	43,300	33.9	6.8	8.2	3.5	18.9	28.6
	W2	41,350	32.4	7.4	9.1	3.6	18.9	28.7
West Asian (INCL Arab)	W1	17,150	13.1	5.2	5.2	6.1	35.6	34.7
	W2	17,300	17.9	2.6	8.1	6.6	33.5	31.2
Black	W1	8,250	20.5	6.6	8.4	6.0	34.3	24.1
	W2	7,950	20.8	7.5	11.9	6.3	34.6	18.9
Other vis.min	W1	16,750	33.6	6.0	7.1	3.6	27.4	22.3
	W2	17,350	37.2	7.2	9.2	2.9	22.9	20.6
Non-vis min (White)	W1	32,700	26.7	2.7	5.3	3.7	27.8	33.7
	W2	32,000	33.7	4.1	7.5	3.6	24.2	27.0
Total	W1	159,150	30.1	6.3	6.3	3.8	21.9	31.5
	W2	156,950	32.5	6.1	8.1	4.7	20.5	28.1

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.260 (P< 0.001), W2: 0.239 (P< 0.001)

TABLE 9: TENURE, BY ADMISSION CLASS (W1, W2, W3)

		Own (%)	Rent (%)	Total
Family	W1	37.7	62.3	42,630
	W2	49.1	50.9	40,800
	W3	60.0	39.9	41,250
Skilled Workers	W1	9.6	90.4	98,630
	W2	28.6	71.4	94,850
	W3	49.3	50.7	93,400
Other Economic	W1	37.1	62.9	10,370
	W2	63.1	36.9	9,900
	W3	73.6	26.4	9,650
Refugees	W1	3.1	96.9	9,780
	W2*	x	x	9,600
	W3	19.3	80.7	9,600
Total	W1	18.4	81.6	161,410
	W2	34.4	65.6	155,150
	W3	51.8	48.2	153,900

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.330 (P< 0.001), W3: 0.330 (P< 0.001)

x : Sample size too small for reporting.

* Most Wave 2 Refugees were not homeowners.

"Renters" includes "Other (hotel,motels, etc.)".

Figures exclude immigrants who did not know or did not state tenure status.

TABLE 10: TENURE, BY VISIBLE MINORITY GROUP (W1, W2, W3)

		Owners	Percentage	Tenants	Other	Total
South Asian	W1	8,930	21.5	28,200	4,330	41,460
	W2	15,500	38.5	24,800		40,300
	W3	23,250	58.6	16,450		39,700
East Asian	W1	7,560	17.3	33,250	2,850	43,660
	W2	14,400	35.7	25,900		40,350
	W3	20,400	51.6	19,100		39,500
Filipino	W1	1,900	18.3	7,130	1,350	10,380
	W2	4,000	36.7	6,900		10,900
	W3	6,550	58.7	4,600		11,150
Southeast Asian	W1	510	24.2	1,270	330	2,110
	W2	900	46.2	1,050		1,950
	W3	1,050	52.5	950		2,000
Latin American	W1	770	17.2	3,360	350	4,480
	W2	1,400	33.3	2,800		4,200
	W3	2,300	53.5	1,950		4,300
Black	W1	940	11.4	6,500	790	8,230
	W2	1,900	24.5	5,850		7,750
	W3	2,600	35.9	4,650		7,250
Arab	W1	520	5.4	8,650	490	9,660
	W2	1,250	13.0	8,400		9,650
	W3	2,250	23.4	7,300		9,600
West Asian	W1	860	11.5	6,230	380	7,470
	W2	1,850	24.5	5,700		7,550
	W3	3,050	39.9	4,650		7,650
Non-Visible Minority	W1	7,230	21.9	24,210	1,500	32,940
	W2	12,250	38.3	19,450		32,000
	W3	17,500	55.2	14,200		31,700
Total	W1	29,220	18.2	118,800	12,370	160,390
	W2	53,700	34.7	100,950		154,650
	W3	78,950	51.7	73,900		152,850

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.160 (P< 0.001), W2: 0.146 (P< 0.001), W3: 0.184 (P< 0.001)

Note: totals do not match due to rounding and non-response.

Table 11: Ownership dynamics

	W1 -> W2				W2 -> W3				W3 -> W1,W2 owners			
	W1	group	ownership		W2	group	ownership		W3	group	hip	
	% own	%	% increase	index	% own	%	% increase	index	% own	%	% decline	index
Demographic												
LR 15-24 years old	23.5	16.0	21.5	107	41.6	16.0	16.9	92	52.0			
LR 25-34	11.4	40.1	17.0	85	26.3	40.1	20.6	113	45.1	49.6	3.2	85
LR 35-44	15.8	26.9	24.0	119	37.9	26.9	18.5	101	54.2	33.0	2.9	76
LR 45-54	24.4	9.9	22.2	110	42.8	9.8	16.5	90	56.8	12.1	5.6	148
LR 55-64	52.3	4.1	18.3	91	62.9	4.2	12.6	69	68.9	5.3	11.3	296
LR 65+	60.0	2.9	14.6	73	72.3	3.0	6.5	36	74.5			
HH with children in W1	19.1	61.6	22.4	111	38.9	61.5	19.3	106	55.4	61.5	3.7	96
HH with children W2	18.4	64.6	22.6	112	39.5	64.8	19.4	106	55.8	66.3	3.3	86
HH with children W3					38.3	66.1	20.2	110	56.1	69.3	3.1	82
Multi-family HH W1	41.0	19.2	15.7	78	48.4	19.3	14.5	79	56.6	16.7	11.3	297
Multi-family HH W2	40.1	16.6	21.5	107	58.7	16.7	12.6	69	62.6	13.6	9.4	248
Multi-family HH W3					56.8	15.7	15.5	85	67.7	12.5	6.8	177
Admission class												
Family class	40.2	26.1	17.9	89	52.2	26.4	14.0	77	60.0	20.2	9.1	239
Other economic	36.9	6.4	30.4	151	64.6	6.4	13.0	71	73.6		x	low
Skilled worker	9.8	60.7	21.5	107	29.7	60.5	21.2	116	49.3	68.5	2.3	60
Socio-economic characteristics												
At least some university	14.2	58.6	20.6	102	32.6	58.6	19.8	108	50.5	67.4	3.0	80
Was employed or self-emp W1	17.3	52.2	22.0	110	35.9	52.0	21.0	115	53.7	55.6	4.1	108
W1 family income > \$17,136	24.9	48.4	22.9	114	44.5	48.5	19.0	104	60.3	46.5	4.3	113
W2 family income > \$35,000	22.8	53.9	27.1	135	47.5	54.0	21.7	119	65.9	53.5	3.8	100
Language												
Speaks E/F well	13.8	60.7	20.7	103	31.9	60.7	19.2	105	49.1	62.8	3.2	84
Speaks E/F at home	27.5	19.4	22.8	113	35.5	19.3	15.5	85	50.9	20.3	3.2	83
Visible minority (=yes)												
	18.0	79.3	20.4	101	47.8	79.3	18.7	102	61.0	78.9	4.1	107
Social capital and attitude												
Member of a group/org W1	20.8	23.4	23.1	115	41.6	23.3	17.8	98	57.0	24.0	3.2	83
Satisfied with Canada W1	22.1	72.6	20.7	103	39.9	72.7	17.9	98	54.5	69.9	4.0	104
Ties are important W1	18.2	75.4	20.0	100	35.3	75.4	18.4	101	50.5	75.2	4.1	107
TOTAL POPULATION	19.1		20.1		36.5		18.3		51.8		3.8	

TABLE 12: CROWDING, BY ADMISSION CLASS (W1, W2, W3)

		Total	Crowded (%)
Family	W1	41,000	28.0
	W2	39,700	26.2
	W3	38,400	23.4
Skilled worker	W1	96,450	19.9
	W2	93,750	13.7
	W3	88,300	10.2
Other economic	W1	9,270	20.9
	W2	9150 *	14.5 *
	W3	7,850 *	8.9 *
Refugee	W1	9,690	39.9
	W2	9,550	35.6
	W3	9,200	30.4
Total	W1	156,410	23.4
		151,650	
	W2	*	18.4 *
	W3	143,750 *	15.0 *

Contingency coefficient: W1: 0.129 (P<0.001)

* Imputed

**TABLE 13: CROWDING, BY VISIBLE MINORITY GROUP
(W1, W2, W3)**

		Total	Crowded (%)
East Asian	W1	42,040	23.5
	W2	39,200	15.7
	W3	36,300	10.3
South Asian	W1	40,080	33.4
	W2	39,450	29.0
	W3	37,150	24.4
West Asian (minus Arab)	W1	7,290	32.5
	W2	7,450	33.6
	W3	7,150	28.0
Non-vis min (White)	W1	31,930	9.1
	W2	30,750	5.2
	W3	29,450	4.2
Other vis.min.	W1	34,020	23.2
	W2	33,350	18.4
	W3	32,950	16.1
Total	W1	155,360	23.4
	W2	150,200	18.5
	W3	142,900	15.0

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.195 (P<0.001), W2: 0.221 (P<0.001), W3: 0.216 (P<0.001)

TABLE 14: AFFORDABILITY, BY ADMISSION CLASS (W1, W2, W3), HOUSING COST AS PROPORTION OF FAMILY INCOME (EXCLUDES HOMEOWNERS)

		Less than 30%	30%-49.9%	50.0% and over	Total
Family	W1	49.8	21.8	28.4	23,610
	W2	65.8	22.7	11.8	18,700
	W3	64.9	21.6	13.5	15,950
Skilled Workers	W1	21.0	18.6	60.5	84,690
	W2	49.4	28.9	21.7	63,500
	W3	62.4	21.8	15.8	46,550
Other Economic	W1	23.2	9.7	67.1	5,950
	W2	36.8	28.1	35.1	2,850
	W3	37.5	29.2	33.3	2,400
Refugees	W1	14.8	39.9	45.3	8,900
	W2	32.3	35.3	32.3	8,350
	W3	48.4	30.1	21.6	7,650
Total	W1	26.2	20.3	53.6	123,150
	W2	50.8	28.1	21.1	93,450
	W3	60.7	22.9	16.4	72,450

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.302 (P<0.001), W2: 0.188 (P<0.001), W3: 0.134 (P<0.001)

Figures exclude immigrants who did not know or did not state tenure status. Totals do not match due to rounding and non-response.

The total figures for the other economic category have been adjusted from those calculated in the original procedure to correct for errors introduced in the rounding process

TABLE 15: AFFORDABILITY, BY VISIBLE MINORITY GROUP (W1, W2, W3)

		Total	Paying 30% or more
Total	W1	122,630	90,530
	W2	93,850	46,200
	W3	71,300	27,900
East Asian	W1	34,280	82.4
	W2	23,600	57.8
	W3	18,650	42.1
South Asian	W1	29,710	67.2
	W2	24,200 *	52.7 *
	W3	16,150	34.7
West Asian (minus Arab)	W1	6,210	83.6
	W2	5,150	69.9
	W3	4,400	64.8
Non-vis min (White)	W1	24,430	71.6
	W2	17,950	40.7
	W3	14,050	32.7
Other	W1	28,000	70.1
	W2	22,950 *	38.8*
	W3	18,050	38.8
Total (%)	W1	122,630	73.8
	W2	93,850	49.2
	W3	71,300	39.1

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.143 (P<0.001),
W3: 0.147 (P<0.001)

* Imputed

TABLE 16: EXPERIENCED DIFFICULTY FINDING HOUSING, BY ADMISSION CLASS (W1,W2, W3)

		Difficulty	Total*	%*
Family	W1	2,750	44,150	6.2
	W2	3,150	43,150	7.3
	W3	2,300	42,600	5.4
Skilled workers	W1	38,700	99,010	39.1
	W2	16,000	96,800	16.5
	W3	7,600	94,550	8.0
Other economic	W1	2,550	10,460	24.4
	W2	750	10,200	7.4
	W3	x	9,850	x
Refugees	W1	3,050	9,820	31.1
	W2	2,050	9,800	20.9
	W3	1,300	9,750	13.3
Total	W1	47,100	163,440	28.8
	W2	22,000	159,950	13.8
	W3	11,200	147,000	7.6

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.192 (P<0.001), W2: 0.099 (P<0.001)

* Imputed

Wave 3 totals do not include 'Other Economic' class

TABLE 17: EXPERIENCED DIFFICULTY FINDING HOUSING, BY VISIBLE MINORITY GROUP (W1,W2, W3)

		Difficulty	Total*	%*
South Asian	W1	9,300	42,200	22.0
	W2	3,950	41,800	9.4
	W3	2,200	40,600	5.4
East Asian	W1	13,900	44,050	31.6
	W2	5,650	41,650	13.6
	W3	3,450	40,300	8.6
West Asian (INCL Arab)	W1	4,300	17,400	24.7
	W2	2,550	17,500	14.6
	W3	1,200	17,400	6.9
Black	W1	2,100	8,400	25.0
	W2	2,100	8,000	26.3
	W3	850	7,600	11.2
Other vis.min	W1	7,350	17,200	42.7
	W2	4,250	17,600	24.1
	W3	2,550	17,750	14.4
Non-vis min (White)	W1	9,800	33,200	29.5
	W2	3,400	32,500	10.5
	W3	1,450	32,100	4.5
Total	W1	46,750	162,350	28.8
	W2	21,850	159,000	13.7
	W3	11,750	155,750	7.5

Contingency coefficients: W1: 0.209 (P<0.001), W2: 0.193 (P<0.001), W3: 0.260 (P<0.001)

* Imputed

TABLE 18: BASIC DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS, BY METROPOLITAN AREA, W1-W3

		Number	Avg HH size	Pct employed	Avg emp \$ (family)	Avg tot \$ (family)
Total	W1	155,200	3.6	45.5	15,850	18,218
	W2	155,500	3.6	59.0	40,642	43,392
	W3	154,050	3.7	68.4	49,049	53,169
Montreal	W1	21,050	3.1	32.1	12,591	13,050
	W2	21,250	3.2	44.5	30,737	31,853
	W3	21,100	3.3	58.3	40,138	41,966
Toronto	W1	70,050	3.7	49.5	14,982	16,670
	W2	68,250	3.7	62.3	42,132	45,146
	W3	68,100	3.8	69.7	50,677	54,511
Vancouver	W1	23,550	3.8	37.6	15,817	22,590
	W2	23,450	3.8	56.5	36,054	39,514
	W3	23,250	3.8	65.8	43,522	49,494

Note: contingency coefficients were not calculated for MTV tables since in many cases cell sizes were relatively small.

TABLE 19: FAMILY INCOME FOR IMMIGRANTS, BY LANDING CLASS AND METROPOLITAN AREA, W1-W3

		Total	Family class	Skilled worker	Other economic	Refugees
Total	W1	156,150	24,818	15,870	20,020	10,945
	W2	156,450	49,701	42,658	41,395	26,049
	W3	155,050	52,828	55,899	47,259	33,735
Montreal	W1	13,050	14,654	12,620	21,806	8,105
	W2	31,853	33,979	30,766	58,328	25,091
	W3	41,966	40,883	42,772	56,820	31,488
Toronto	W1	16,670	24,141	14,170	11,709	12,526
	W2	45,146	53,443	43,051	39,445	28,055
	W3	54,511	53,539	56,716	43,150	36,852
Vancouver	W1	22,590	29,371	20,856	19,441	10,277
	W2	39,514	43,152	40,508	33,171	23,412
	W3	49,494	52,560	52,229	36,460	35,694

TABLE 20: HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE, BY METROPOLITAN AREA, W1-W3

		Total Number	Couple with child(ren) (%)	Couple without children (%)	Lone parent family (%)	Single person (%)	Family and non- family person(s) (%)	Multi-family household (%)
Canada Total	W1	164,200	49	18	3	9	6	15
	W2	160,550	56	15	4	7	9	9
	W3	155,900	62	12	4	6	7	9
Montreal	W1	21,550	44	23	4	16	4	10
	W2	22,000	53	18	5	14	7	4
	W3	21,200	62	13	4	12	6	4
Toronto	W1	73,350	50	17	3	8	6	16
	W2	70,700	58	13	3	6	9	11
	W3	66,300	63	10	3	5	7	11
Vancouver	W1	24,500	56	16	3	6	5	13
	W2	23,950	59	13	4	4	9	11
	W3	23,500	60	11	3	5	8	12

TABLE 21: PERCENTAGE LIVING IN DETACHED HOUSES, DUPLEXES, OR ROW HOUSES, BY CMA AND LANDING CLASS

		Total	Family class	Skilled worker	Other economic	Refugees
Montreal	W1	23.8	36.0	19.2	40.0	25.0
	W2	28.6	35.6	26.3	45.5	25.9
Toronto	W1	43.6	53.6	39.9	53.0	24.5
	W2	48.2	61.7	42.6	62.1	23.5
Vancouver	W1	61.7	79.5	54.0	65.2	26.3
	W2	62.6	81.9	53.1	66.7	38.9

TABLE 22: HOME OWNERSHIP RATES FOR IMMIGRANTS, BY LANDING CLASS AND METROPOLITAN AREA, W1-W3

		Total	Family class	Skilled worker	Other economic	Refugees
Total	W1	18	38	10	37	3
	W2	34	49	29	63	x
	W3	52	60	49	74	19
Montreal	W1	6	15	2	20	x
	W2	11	18	8	36	x
	W3	22	26	21	50	10
Toronto	W1	17	39	8	37	x
	W2	36	51	29	67	10
	W3	55	63	52	78	21
Vancouver	W1	20	34	11	37	x
	W2	37	44	29	63	x
	W3	54	55	50	75	17

Note: Totals do not include refugees when there is no value specified for that group

TABLE 23: HOME OWNERSHIP RATES FOR IMMIGRANTS, BY POPULATION GROUP AND METROPOLITAN AREA, W3

		East Asian	South Asian	Black	Filipino	Arab	West Asian (minus Arab)	Other vis. min.	Non-vis min (White)	Total
Montreal	%	18	18			13		19	34	21
	Index	85	86			62		87	159	
Toronto	%	53	60	56	52	43	41	61	49	55
	Index	97	110	102	95	79	76	111	89	
Vancouver	%	59	49		52		50	38	45	53
	Index	111	92		98		94	72	85	

**TABLE 24: CROWDING RATES FOR IMMIGRANTS, BY ADMISSION CLASS,
POPULATION GROUP AND METROPOLITAN AREA, W3**

	Montreal	Toronto	Vancouver
Admission Class	%	%	%
Family	13	27	36
Skilled worker	13	10	17
Other economic	x	10	10
Refugee	46	40	35
Total	15	16	22
Visible Minority Group			
East Asian	11	9	17
South Asian	33	24	39
Black	18	17	
Filipino		17	23
Arab	18		
West Asian (minus Arab)	37	30	24
Other vis. min.	13	10	17
Non-vis min (White)	6	5	7
Total	15	16	21

**TABLE 25: NON-HOMEOWNERS' PAYMENTS IN RENT, RELATIVE TO TOTAL FAMILY INCOME,
BY METROPOLITAN AREA, W1-W3**

		Number	Up to 30%	30% or more	50% or more
Total	W1	119,100	23	21	55
	W2	93,850	51	28	21
	W3	71,900	61	23	16
Montreal	W1	20,250	25	22	50
	W2	18,200	48	31	21
	W3	16,200	60	21	19
Toronto	W1	61,400	20	18	56
	W2	40,250	48	31	21
	W3	28,900	58	26	16
Vancouver	W1	19,400	23	17	51
	W2	13,000	52	24	24
	W3	10,050	63	22	16

TABLE 26: HIGH RENT/INCOME RATIOS, BY ADMISSION CLASS AND METROPOLITAN AREA, W3

		Family	Skilled workers	Other economic	Refugees	Total
Montreal	Spent between 30% and 49.9% on rent	19	21	x	28	3,400
	Spent more than 50% on rent	16	20	x	20	3,050
Toronto	Spent between 30% and 49.9% on rent	30	24	x	41	7,400
	Spent more than 50% on rent	15	14	x	27	4,250
Vancouver	Spent between 30% and 49.9% on rent	17	22	33	36	2,150
	Spent more than 50% on rent	8	16	40	21	1,600

TABLE 27: HIGH RENT/INCOME RATIOS, BY POPULATION GROUP AND METROPOLITAN AREA, W3

		East Asian	South Asian	Black	Arab	West Asian (minus Arab)	Other vis. min.	Non-vis min (White)	Total
Montreal	Spent 30% or more on rent	48		39	46	59	27	27	41
Toronto	Spent 30% or more on rent	40	40	53		71	37	38	42
Vancouver	Spent 30% or more on rent	53	17				29	40	38