RCIS WORKING PAPERS

Immigrant Settlement and Integration Services and the Role of Nonprofit Service Providers: A Cross-national Perspective on Trends, Issues and Evidence

John Shields, Julie Drolet & Karla Valenzuela

RCIS Working Paper No. 2016/1
February 2016

SERIES EDITOR
John Shields

Ryerson Centre for Immigration & Settlement
Ryerson University
Jorgenson Hall, 620
350 Victoria Street, Toronto, ON M5B2K3

RYERSON CENTRE for Immigration and Settlement

RYERSON UNIVERSITY

RCIS Working Paper

No. 2016/1

Immigrant Settlement and Integration Services and the Role of Nonprofit Providers: A Cross-national Perspective on Trends, Issues and Evidence

John Shields
Ryerson University
Julie Drolet
University of Calgary
Karla Valenzuela
Universidad Iberoamericana

Series Editor: John Shields

ISSN: 1929-9915

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge funding support from a SSHRC Metropolis Major Research Initiative Grant entitled Immigrant Integration and Inclusion: Investigating the Canadian Partnership Model from a Complex-system Perspective. The Principal Investigator on this grant was Dr. Agnes Meinhard, Ryerson University. Lisa Joya (Ryerson University) also acted as a research assistant on the project.

Introduction

The primary purpose of this paper is to offer a relevant comparative context for considering settlement and integration service delivery and the role of nonprofits in working with government as well as the communities they serve in the promotion of immigrant well-being. Settlement and integration services provide various forms of support and assistance to immigrant populations which help newcomers get established in, and meet their core needs/requirements for their adaption into their new homeland, and ultimately to become citizens of that country. Making use of a broad cross-national comparison of experiences, approaches and programming in newcomer settlement, we seek to provide a wider context from which to reflect on the Canadian case.

The Experts Roundtable on Diversity and Integration (Citizenship and Immigration Canada & Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2008) found that many G8 countries are grappling with many of the same issues as those faced by Canada. These include: 1) a lack of common understanding of what is meant by integration; 2) limits to the effectiveness of government interventions; 3) challenges to establishing partnerships that would improve the integration process; and 4) determining how best to involve sectors of civil society, including nonprofit organizations, and ethnic and religious communities, among other issues. Identifying relevant international experiences and approaches to such issues is helpful for better understanding the Canadian immigration experience and for addressing challenges around settlement services and the role of nonprofit actors more generally. This is especially the case given that the Canadian model of settlement services has long generated considerable interest internationally, and has often been seen as a case of best practice, but which has more recently come to be questioned within Canada (Richmond & Shields, 2005). Likewise, multiculturalism as an integration model has come under considerable challenge, especially in Europe, even as it recently celebrated its 40th anniversary in its public policy birthplace in Canada (Silj, 2010; Hyman, Meinhard & Shields, 2011).

Among the key observations revealed by engaging in our comparative scan is the importance of the socio-economic and political context in which immigration and settlement policy and programming rests and that helps shape societal attitudes towards newcomers and immigrant integration. It reminds us that we need to pay particular attention to the political variable in settlement especially in

light of the more recent turn to public sector austerity in the wake of the economic crisis of 2007-08, the challenges associated with very large refugee flows from conflict zones like Syria, and serious security threats in migrant receiving societies connected to migration. This period also indicates that there can be rapid shifts in settlement and integration programming and policy brought on by changing fiscal socio-political environments.

Overall, our cross-national survey has allowed us to explore some broad questions: What can we learn from the experience of other countries? What are the points of convergence and divergence in these cross-national cases? What is the significance for Canada of cross-national findings?

Context, Rationale and Approach

Over the years many immigration scholars, practitioners and policymakers in Canada have been rather myopic regarding the issue of newcomer settlement and integration. This was a consequence of Canada's position as one of the main receiving countries of immigrants and since the 1970s as having a 'best practice' model of settlement and integration services that many saw worthy of emulation. Hence, the perception has often been that Canada was to be 'learned from' and there was little need to look beyond its own immigration experiences. Moreover, when looking more widely, the Canadian policy learning horizon rarely stretched beyond the United States, Australia and New Zealand, other like settler societies. Needless to say this perspective has been far too restrictive and limiting a vantage point from which to consider immigration and settlement policy and practice in Canada.

Drawing from a broad literature review and cross-national survey of settlement and integration this paper seeks to set a contextual and theme oriented assessment of the immigrant settlement landscape and the role of nonprofit agencies in the countries under review. The Canadian case is illuminated by offering vantage points outside of the Canadian context and in doing so brings to the fore not simply policies and practices from elsewhere but also larger structural, political and other factors that more generically work to shape immigration and settlement policy. These are considerations that are only brought fully to light from a cross-national setting.

When attempting to consider settlement and integration services and the role of nonprofit providers in their provision in a broad range of countries a number of challenges become clearly evident. To begin there are considerable gaps in readily accessible information from which to distill a comprehensive comparative picture of settlement and integration service delivery for newcomers even at a basic descriptive level. Moreover, the availability of hard data sources from which to measure different systems of services is highly uneven or in many instances unavailable.

Given the problems of data and information collection the approach adopted in this paper has by necessity been more qualitative in character. Due to data information limitations and the large range of variables that would have been required to consider for meaningful modeling we did not develop hard and distinctive forms of settlement and nonprofit service provider roles. Rather a more flexible qualitative type of assessment and categorization was adopted for analytical purposes.

This work, consequently, is designed to be a critical thematic and issue analysis of immigrant settlement and integration services and their provision through nonprofit providers. The research approach involves a broad international review of academic and grey literature, government documents and relevant websites as the primary method of gathering source material used in our analysis. The data gathered on settlement programs and policies covers the time period in most cases up until 2011. The thirteen countries that were chosen for the cross-national survey were Australia, New Zealand, United States of America, United Kingdom/England, Ireland, Germany, France, The Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Italy and Spain. The Canadian immigration experience also informs our analysis.

As in many comparative analyses we selected our sampling of counties based on the need to examine ‘like countries’. That is to say, we restricted our investigation to developed nations where the flow of migration has been primarily inward in the contemporary time period, the social, economic and political structures are highly developed and liberal democratic. However, even though they share similar socio-economic structures there are many differences between the countries including varying levels and mix of immigrant populations, different political structures (e.g. federal versus unitary), contrasting political histories, and so forth. As developed western nations, however, they share enough features in common to be able to draw meaningful comparisons.

Settlement Services Conceptualized

Settlement services are programs and supports designed to assist immigrants to begin the settlement process and to help them make the necessary adjustments for a life in their host society. The goal of supporting immigrants to make the smooth transitions necessary to be able to more fully participate in the economy and society is commonly articulated in such programs' mandates. Immigrant settlement and integration, and the services that are associated with these goals can be identified in the following way:

Several definitions of settlement and settlement work co-exist in the [nonprofit] sector, such as:

Settlement is a process or a continuum of activities that a new immigrant/refugee goes through upon arrival in a new country. This process includes the following stages:

- Adjustment: acclimatization and getting used to the new culture, language, people and environment or coping with the situation
- Adaptation: learning and managing the situation without a great deal of help
- Integration: actively participating, getting involved and contributing as citizen of a new country.

Integration is defined as the ability to contribute, free of barriers, to every dimension of Canadian [/host society] life, that is, economic, social, cultural and political.

The goal of settlement is for every immigrant to have full freedom of choice regarding her[/his] level of participation in the society. If the immigrant wants to participate actively in the society, there are no systematic barriers preventing her[/him] from doing so, and there are mechanisms in place to positively facilitate this process.

It is generally accepted that the process of settlement and adaption is a two-way process that involves changes in the newcomer and host society (OCASI & COSTI, 1999, Chpt. 2, 1).

Services can be provided directly by governments at various jurisdictional levels and through other public institutions. Services are also commonly offered by nonprofit and for-profit providers often in partnership with government.

Settlement services are about providing various forms of support and assistance to immigrant populations which help newcomers get established in, and meet their core needs/requirements for their integration into their new homeland, and ultimately to become citizens of that country (OCASI, 2012). In this sense settlement is not just about immediate needs but also includes the longer term process of deeper integration of immigrant populations.

Public Policy, Immigrants and Settlement and Integration

The literature makes a distinction between “immigrant policy” and “immigration policy”. The former is used to describe the governmental decisions that concern immigrants that reside in the host country, for example, issues around such areas as affordable housing, access to social services, and employment search. “Immigration policy”, by contrast, refers to the regulation of the flow of people wanting to enter the country (Shpaizman, 2007).

"Immigrant settlement policy" has also been differentiated from "immigration policy". While settlement policy is directly concerned with the policies and processes in which newcomers are welcomed, accommodated and integrated into the mainstream society, immigration policy aims at keeping the border safe from security threats and illegal forms of migration (Schmidt, 2007). Siemiatycki and Triadafilopoulos remind us that settlement policies are more than just administrative decisions, they are also established programs and practices that provide a general reflection of what the society believes should be the place of immigrants in their communities (2010). Moreover, these policies, to use Jeffrey Reitz's (1998) term, point to the warmth of the newcomers' welcome to their new society, and the policies provide something of a blueprint regarding how and by what paths immigrants will be supported in their journey toward accommodation, acceptance and integration.

Government immigrant settlement policies are shaped by the model of integration that is operational within each country. Schmidt outlines, as an example, four dominant modes of immigrant incorporation/integration: segregation, pluralist integration, transnationalism, and assimilation (2007). In Canada's case, which follows a pluralist integration approach, its settlement policies, as is the case in most other jurisdictions, involve formal assistant programs and general policies assisting immigrants. Within the formal programs in Canada, Schmidt (2007) identifies language training, immigrant settlement and adaptation programs (covering the areas of employment, health, culture, and recreational services; information on banking, shopping, household management, and the like; contact information for interpreters or translators, etc.), host programs (volunteer recruiting to provide one-on-one aid to newcomers and their families) and refugee programs and services. The more overarching general policies include, for example, in Canada multiculturalism and anti-racism policies.

Richmond and Shields (2005) identify three broad stages in the settlement process. The first stage is the "initial reception", which involves newcomer orientation information and referral services, language training and short-term shelter. The "intermediate stage" is where appropriate employment and long-term housing, and access to education and social rights are supposed to be secured. The "final stage" involves the period when a deeper sense of attachment and belonging to the host society is meant to occur. During the integration process immigrants often are confronted with structural obstacles such as credential recognition institutional barriers and discrimination. It also needs to be noted that there are very often serious coordination challenges between levels of government and other public and private societal actors during the various phases of the immigrant settlement and integration experience.

While Canada offers a fairly wide range of public supports and programs in immigrant settlement, especially CIC's role in the initial settlement phases, the United States of America provides an example of a very different approach.

Except in the case of recognized refugees the U.S. federal government has few and inconsistent formal settlement policies. Immigration policy is highly skewed toward border security, in particular counter terrorism and securitizing the border against undocumented crossings especially along its southern border (Amin-Khan, 2015). The dominant U.S. approach to settlement is a laissez-faire one, in which immigrants are largely held accountable for their own integration. The settlement programs that do exist are generally provided by community- and faith-based NGOs, sometimes supported with government grants (Schmidt, 2007; Shields & Bauder, 2015, 16). Continued US reliance on family reunification as a basis for immigrant recruitment (Vineberg, 2015, 52) is also reflected in American laissez-faire approach to settlement as family members are expected to be financially responsible for their family members' support.

In terms of access to social benefits and supports, immigrants in the US historically gained this through general welfare policies designed for the general population. Federal American law granted equal access to legal immigrants to a wide range of social policies ranging from Medicare, income security, food stamps, student loans, and such. With regard to Western welfare states the depth of American social supports has long been minimalist, in line with the country's more laissez-faire public philosophy. However, even this support because of welfare reforms and retrenchment in the 1990s has come to be largely cut off to immigrants in the US as the Federal US Government downloaded responsibilities onto state governments and changed eligibility rules which created new lines of separation regarding eligibility to rights and services between citizens and legal immigrants (Fix & Tumlin, 1997, 1). This has very negatively affected immigrants' attempts to adjust and adapt to American society, especially in the context of a lack of more formal publically supported settlement services.

The European Union and Immigration: The Influence of Europeanization on Settlement Services

The countries based in Europe for this study are all part of the European Union (EU) and hence there is a supranational level of governance that must to be considered. The EU has increasingly helped shape national European politics and policy through what has come to be labeled "Europeanization". "Europeanization" [in the field of public policy and programming] covers a wide spectrum from simple co-operation to full integration by government and non-government organizations, with universal or limited memberships, and covering a wide range of activities and policy fields" (Grey & Statham, 2005, 877). Until the end of the 1970's immigration was not a major part of the EU agenda (Carella, Gurrieri & Lorizio, 2007), which was dominated mainly by economic, agriculture and environmental policies. However, since the 1980's immigration began to appear in the EU agenda. The signing of the Amsterdam Treaty (1999), the incorporation of the Schengen agreement, and a common asylum policy brought

immigration issues into greater prominence and allowed for immigration to be "communitarized" (Grey & Statham, 2005).

Europeanization influences political decision-making concerning immigration and thus affects the role that nonprofit organizations have in settlement services within EU member states. Nonprofit organizations involved in settlement services must deal not only with public bodies in their national jurisdictions but in many instances also with EU institutions, which have worked to bring a measure of common approaches and practices to many policies. This, for instance, has had important consequences for the administration of many of the programs delivered by nonprofit providers encouraging the adoption of more managerial, business-like approaches to their practices (Carella, Gurrieri & Lorizio, 2007).

The ability of nonprofits to engage with EU politics is related to pre-existing ties to national policy, economic resources, transnational partnerships with other NGOs, and potential linkages of local migrants' needs to the needs of migrants in other EU countries, usually linked to broader issues such as human rights and welfare. The main sources of support which nonprofits in the settlement field receive are overwhelmingly from their respective nation-states, over EU institutions. However, some nonprofits, particularly transnational NGOs, will sometimes attempt to influence internal immigration policies and politics at the EU level, particularly when anti-immigration political opinion is on the increase in the national sphere. The bigger EU arena is also often utilized by the NGO community as a way of building connections and political and public support for addressing common issues and problems facing immigrant communities within Europe (Grey & Statham, 2005).

According to many European NGOs, there is an interesting contrast between the Europeanization of the asylum policy and immigration policy, at least up until the economic crisis of 2008 and more recently the European refugee crisis. While the asylum policy is projected to become more restrictive (especially in the context of migration security concerns), the latter will potentially become more open due to labour market needs of many European countries due to such factors as rapidly aging workforces. Overall, according to Grey and Statham (2005) European NGOs have lowered their expectations for the EU as they perceive national governments as having a greater influence in immigration policy over a much weaker presence of the EU, especially in a more highly politicized anti-immigration environment (see: Biswas, 2011); a situation once again magnified by the refugee crisis.

Some Underlying Trends Influencing Immigration and Settlement Policy: A Shifting Political and Socio-economic Context

A number of underlying trends that are connected to bigger forces that have been shaping immigrant related public policies but which, of course, play

themselves out in particular places and with respect to various immigration regimes somewhat differently can be identified. In all policy areas and jurisdictions neoliberal ideas have influenced policymaking and program design, although in some places more deeply than others (Shpaizman, 2007; Evans, Richmond & Shields, 2005; Barrass & Shields, 2015). The areas of immigration, newcomer settlement and integration and citizenship have been no exception. Change in the immigration policy and program fields have largely been reshaped with the aims of: 1) holding immigrants and their families themselves more responsible and accountable for their own settlement and integration (Root, et al., 2014); 2) devolving settlement services to sub-national jurisdictions and nonprofit organizations; 3) restructuring national welfare states to reduce services and often restricting or excluding newcomer access; 4) generally tightening rules around migrant access to countries; and 5) a renewed focus on security and immigrant racialization (Anderson, 2014; Amin-Khan, 2015; Hannan, 2015, Sharma, 2015). There are, of course, variations to these trends found in select countries covered in our cross-national scan.

These policy and program shifts have taken place in many of the countries under study, in the context of a considerably more hostile political and social environment for immigrants (Bauder & Shields, 2015; Sutherland & Malmstrom, 2012; Kretsedemas, 2012 & 2015; Bauder, 2011; Cochrane & Nevitte, 2007). The rise of extreme right-wing anti-immigrant political parties and movements, some of which have been brought into coalition governments, are having a significant impact on settlement and integration policies and programs (Biswas, 2011; Traynor, 2015). One of the targets in Europe has been multiculturalism. For example, in Germany, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands prominent declarations by their governments of the so-called failure of 'multiculturalism' and the need to rethink immigration and integration policies have been made, signaling important changes in the direction of immigration policy (Boyes, 2010; Collet, 2011b, 19; on the crisis of multiculturalism also see: Lentin & Titley, 2011, 11-48). Yet while turning away past integration policies these countries have failed to identify a new coherent approach to integration (Collett, 2011a, 21).

The economic crisis of 2008, moreover, has had particularly harmful impacts on newcomer populations, resulting in considerable economic dislocation and high unemployment. In Spain, for example, where the economic crisis has been particularly deep, by 2010 immigrant unemployment exceeded 30%. Immigrants in Ireland, Sweden and the United States of America have also been particularly negatively impacted by joblessness (OECD, 2012: 100). Many other European countries have also seen immigrant unemployment increase significantly, especially among male workers (Collett, 2011a: 4-5). Corresponding state fiscal restraint has resulted in deeper cuts in a number of countries to integration programs at a time when such services are most in need by immigrant populations (Collet, 2011b; Pagliaro & Mahoney, 2011). Due to various factors, consequently, the policy, socio-economic and political landscape for immigrants and their integration has been changing and in most jurisdictions it has become

far more challenging for immigrant populations. In short, the warmth of the welcome for newcomer populations has cooled considerably in recent years.

A certain duality has emerged. As noted, on the one hand, there are continuing issues associated with difficulties with immigrant economic integration, challenges around social cohesion, and managing an altered political environment which has become more hostile to past immigration policy and toward some newcomer groups (in particular Muslim populations). Yet at the same time immigration has been identified as being extremely important for labour market and demographic stability, to improve national competitiveness (because of strong human capital assets immigrants bring) and for the immigrants' tax contributions to society (helping to sustain the generational social security contract which is under threat because of rapidly aging populations in many countries) (Fargues, Demetrios, Papademetriou, Giambattista, & Sumption, 2011).

Some General Trends Impacting Immigrant Settlement and Integration

An Increasing Role for Nonprofit Organizations

There is a general trend toward an increasing role of non-state actors, but most particularly nonprofit organizations, in providing settlement services and with respect to immigrant integration. One prominent manifestation of this at a grander scale has been British Conservative Prime Minister Cameron's call for a shift away from the big state to the 'Big Society' as a solution to many of the policy challenges facing society (Ishkanian & Szreter, 2012; Norman, 2010). The desire of governments to shift responsibilities for and solutions to pressing societal problems and wicked policy issues onto civil society is increasing (Joy & Shields, 2013).

It is important to be reminded, however, that civil society involvement in meeting immigrant needs is not a new phenomenon. As far back as the end of the 1800s in the pre-welfare state period, for example, the nonprofit settlement house movement arose first in Britain and spread quickly to the United States and Canada as well as to continental Europe and even Japan to address the issue of poverty and urban integration of migrating populations (immigrant and rural populations, including in the US black migration to northern cities from the rural south). Settlement houses' work was centred on community-based health care, employment services, language training, and educational/cultural activities aimed at integration and inclusion. A community-building orientation was very much part of the larger progressive political movement of reform in North America and beyond. Many of these organizations are still very active today (United Neighborhood Houses, n.d.; Friedman & Friedman, 2006; International Federation of Settlements and Neighbourhood Centres, 2005; Fabricant & Fisher, 2002; Lasch-Quinn, 1993). This work was done in this early period without government involvement or state financial support. Hence, it is important to note that civil society organizations have been very actively involved in settlement at a cross-national scale for a very long time. What needs to be

considered today, however, (see below) is the changing relationship which has evolved between government and nonprofit service providers in the post-Keynesian neoliberal era.

The level and extent of the role of nonprofit settlement service provision varies considerably by country. Nations with a history of large in-migration (Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the USA) have had a large and extensive role for nonprofits over many years in settlement service provision. However, among these countries the state's role vis á vis nonprofits has varied. At one end in the contemporary period is English Canada where a private-public partnership model characteristic of Canadian settlement services and multiculturalism policy was designed to make immigrants themselves responsible (with government support) for "a portion of their own integration" (Bloemraad, 2006, 244). And, as Howard Duncan has observed it provided "a signal to the population at large that there is this trust between the government and the newcomer organizations and the newcomers themselves" (as quoted in Bloemraad, 2006, 244-245). A former senior provincial immigration policy official has suggested that the very existence of government sponsored settlement programs, beyond their actual use, sends a message to newcomers that they are welcome in Canada (Shields' Interview with Senior Provincial Government Official, 2012).

At the other end of the government support spectrum is the USA where a philosophy of sink or swim has tended to dominate. It is telling that no government institution in America is responsible for immigrant integration and support funds that do flow to nonprofit organizations for such purposes are both unstable and considerably lower than in the Canadian case (Fix, Zimmerman & Passel, 2001). To a considerable extent the settlement needs and integration into the American 'melting pot' has been deemed the private responsibility of immigrants themselves and their families. When additional supports are needed the nonprofit effort of civil society is seen as the most appropriate source of relief (Bloemraad, 2006). In each of these cases citizenship for newcomers is the ultimate goal of the integrative role of 'settlement services/supports' but with very different philosophies directing state involvement and governments' role.

In European countries the state has historically been more directly active in the actual delivery of immigrant services but these have often been less associated with integrative citizenship goals. Also there is a need to consider the place of the services of the larger welfare state in addressing immigrant support needs, especially in the context of a generally weakened welfare support structure. The settlement and integrative role of whole of government activities is generally ignored yet critical to immigrant success. While there is a need for lead government department(s) in promoting settlement, all departments and levels of government need to be involved in designing programs and policies that are sensitive to newcomer needs (Vineberg, 2012, 66).

In all countries the type of support for newcomers has also varied depending on immigrant class. Refugees in contrast to family or economic class immigrants have tended to enjoy higher levels of state support for settlement. The central focus of our study is, however, on non-refugee immigrants.

Neoliberalism and the Movement to Market-based Settlement Service Provision – The Construction of the One Dimensional Immigrant

As a policy orientation, Nihei (2010) notes that neoliberalism is based on belief in the value of the free movement and accumulation of capital, minimal state intervention in the private sphere of markets and individual rights, and a restructuring of the public domain with the aim of shrinking the state and undoing the Keynesian logic embedded in government after the Second World War (Evans & Shields, 2010; Shields & Evans, 1998). Neoliberalism came to be the hegemonic policy paradigm in industrialized countries in the 1980's, when policy trends such as the retreat from government planning in favour of more purely based market economies, privatization of services, and a constraint on social and economic rights began to be embraced (Burke, Mooers & Shields, 2000). One of the salient aspects in state restructuring is the hollowing out of the welfare state (Jessop, 2002) and the devolution of many of its support and service functions from the central government to sub-national jurisdictions and the nonprofit sector (Shields, 2014). Lester Salamon writes about this process as the 'nonprofitization of the welfare state' (2015a). These developments have had major implications for immigrants in the global north.

One development influenced by neoliberal thinking was the creation of new immigration categories. While immigration policy has always had strong economic drivers, in the era of neoliberal globalization there was a more explicit move to capture different forms of economic migration, drawn particularly from the developing world. This is reflected in Canada's creation of the business class immigrant (Arat-Koç, 1999), or the labour market immigrant with a focus skilled migrants in Sweden (Swedish Migration Board, 2011), and the widespread use of newcomers designed to occupy the lower layers of the service economy in global cities – often in the form of 'guest workers' (temporary migrants) and 'illegal' migrants (Hannan, Bauder & Shields, 2016; Sassen, 1999; Sassen, 1998). There has been particularly intense competition between many developed countries to bring in immigrants with high human capital and those with entrepreneurial skills and investment capital (Duncan, 2012; OECD, 2008). One overriding goal has been to match classes of immigration more closely to the new highly bifurcated labour market and economy.

As well, highly educated, skilled and business class immigrants were considered on a number of fronts to be "ideal" immigrants: newcomers who could readily contribute economically to the country without the receiving state having to heavily invest in settlement as they are considered to be 'labour market/economy ready'. Such immigrants are also considered to be 'ideal immigrants' in the sense

that they are viewed as easier to adapt and integrate into their new country (Duncan, 2012, 9) with the necessity of investment in settlement being minimized. This shift has allowed support for settlement and integration to move slowly away from the responsibility of the host country onto immigrant newcomers themselves. Additionally, social welfare policy increasingly requires newcomers to be autonomous, responsible, hard working, and to avoid dependency on the state (Trudeau, 2008; Root, et al., 2014; Murphy Kilbride, 2014, 329-330).

This approach promotes the idea that if immigrants fail to integrate, it is their own fault. It also directs attention away from the fact that newcomers have been actively contributing to the development of their settlement countries without at the same time benefiting in many instances from the same entitlements as citizens. As Grey and Statham (2005) observe, integration is realistically not a “two-way” street, but a “one-way” street, as it focuses only on the immigrants’ ‘successful integration’ (which often gets narrowly defined as: are they employed and hence not reliant on public support), while disregarding their broader needs and without considering the adaptations that are necessary on the part of the host society as well. Moreover, even immigrants with high human capital have had difficulty finding appropriate levels of employment in host societies. The pressure from governments to "focus on short-term labour market integration risks undermining broader social integration" (Aliweiwi & Laforest, 2009, 138). It also fails to recognize the contributions which immigrants make in the longer term as they become more integrated into the labour market (even if their jobs do not fully match their skill assets) becoming positive tax contributors and actively adding to the social and cultural fabric of their new societies.

The neoliberal emphasis on a one dimensional focus on the economic aspect of integration is problematic. As noted by Aliweiwi and Laforest in the Canadian case:

> Immigration is a pathway to citizenship. Supporting diversity, however, means more than simply facilitating economic integration. It also involves supporting social integration and fostering a sense of belonging. Where the Conservative [neoliberal] agenda falls short is in failing to acknowledge the importance of social and political integration alongside economic integration (2009, 151).

The neoliberal approach to public finance of newcomer support and immigrant integration is one that has shifted toward a minimalist orientation and a view of the immigrant as a one dimensional economic object (Root, et al., 2014). Interestingly the idea of immigrant supports as necessary and useful investments in newcomers that will pay off in smoother settlement transitions and better long-term social and economic integration, especially by central governments, has come to be viewed with increasing levels of skepticism. The neoliberal approach, especially in a period of austerity, has become more questioning of the lack of

adequate return on public investment and a concern that over reliance on tax supported programming may even foster newcomer dependency. Neoliberal approaches to immigration it appears have moved to embrace strategies focused on better immigrant pre-selection with great emphasis on host country language knowledge and skill matches to areas of labour market shortages, and the expectation that there be greater self-reliance by newcomers for addressing their own settlement and integration needs. In this scenario the role of public support, especially by the central state, in settlement and integration is downplayed and the place of self-reliance, market based adjustment and independent civic supports are enhanced.

Devolving Responsibility for Settlement Services

Neoliberalism has embraced new ideas about governance, shifting policy paradigms, and questioning of past state centred practices. These are associated with a general trend to shift responsibilities for settlement services downward to lower levels of government and civil society (Evans & Shields, 2014). This has been linked to public administrative business philosophies like New Public Management (NPM) and public policies linked to neoliberalism, privatization and rescaling of social responsibilities downward, with its goals to shrink the state and give greater rein to market forces and civil society actors. The turn to the use of non-state actors (nonprofit and for-profit) in Europe, the Anglo-American democracies and elsewhere is part of a larger set of developments that have been under way for some years centred on breaking down the “monolithic welfare state” and bringing in new mechanisms for publically supported service provision (Eikås & Selle, 2002, 47; Shields, 2002). This is part of a larger privatization movement that has sought “new mechanisms of coordination between the state and private or non-profit providers” (Ascoli & Ranci, 2002, 14). Ascoli and Ranci note that:

> The new models of welfare emerging from this introduction of market mechanisms are ‘mixed’, not just because they involve both public and private or non-profit actors, but also because they include different forms of regulation and coordination between these actors. The main new feature of privatization lies in the pluralization and diversification of the regulatory models and not in the involvement of private and non-profit actors that are traditionally present in the welfare policies of the majority of European countries (Ascoli & Ranci, 2002, 14).

Consequently, when we speak about services provided by the state both to its citizens and to newcomer populations we are addressing the reality of a mixed social economy where publically supported provision is provided and delivered through a changing social mix of state, nonprofit and private market actors guided by distinct regulatory regimes (Henriksen, Smith & Zimmer, (2015).

Hence, driven by the influence of neoliberalism and the 1970´s crisis of social welfare, the turn to privatization became a popular policy movement in the

1980´s and 1990´s (Carella, Gurrieri & Lorizio, 2007; Arat Koç, 1999). "Privatization" has been defined by Savas as "the act of reducing the role of government or increasing the role of the private institutions of society in satisfying people's needs" (Shpaizman, 2007, 4). The settlement service sector has been no exception and has also witnessed a privatization trend, in which sub-national jurisdictions and nonprofit organizations are introduced as "partners" of higher level governments (Siemiatycki & Triadafilopoulos, 2010; Evans & Shields, 2014). Since contemporary immigration is primarily an urban affair, cities and municipalities where most immigrants reside are drawn into settlement service delivery as well. However, upper levels of government often fail to provide local jurisdictions and the civil society with enough funding to match expected settlement outcomes. This places those local jurisdictions with large immigrant populations and an underdeveloped network of nonprofit sector actors at distinct disadvantage (Shpaizman, 2007; Shields, 2014).

Business Approaches to Managing Settlement Service Provision

In order to more fully understand the linkage between neoliberalism and the contemporary place of nonprofit organizations in settlement services for immigrants it is important to identify the regulatory mechanisms used to manage the relationship between the state and nonprofit service providers. Within public administration this relationship has come to be structured by the New Public Management approach. It is an approach that is marked by the attempt to restructure government relationships along private sector market relations. This has led governments to off load service delivery of public goods to third parties (often nonprofits) governed by short term competitive program-based contracts. These contracts are governed by strict accountability rules and regulations that manage how funds are spent and programs delivered (Shields & Evans, 1998; Richmond & Shields, 2004; Richmond & Shields, 2005). Under NPM contracts for program supports are purposefully underfunded, with the idea that the voluntary contributions and charitable support received by nonprofit organizations will fill the gap (Grey & Statham, 2005; Evans, Richmond & Shields, 2005).

At the same time, government funders are able to maintain control of the services imparted and establishes conditions on the funding for the next period of time to those agencies that, according to the market rules, have been efficient and provided good results (Shpaizman, 2007; Donhilow, 2005; Richmond & Shields, 2004; Baines, et. al., 2014). This is a system of regulation which promotes the neoliberal values of competition and business market values in the nonprofit sector.

More recent developments in public administration have seen the emergence of new approaches to management of government and nonprofit relationships, identified as New Public Governance (NPG). While there remains some debate regarding the full nature of this approach and the extent to which it has been adopted in practice, it is clear that it embraces a more cooperative governance approach to its relationships with nonprofit service providers opening up greater

flexibility and sensitivity to the needs of nonprofits. NPG moves away from narrow contract culture and the rigid funding and accountability models NPM has imposed. However, the return to public sector austerity has served to undermine this drive to fostering a more balanced partnership (Salamon & Toepler, 2015; Evans & Shields, 2014; Philips & Smith, 2011, 4-6; 22-29; Osborne, 2010; Baldwin & Black, 2008).

Partnering With Government for Settlement Service Provision

Nonprofits in the settlement service field find themselves in a constant struggle between their accountability to their newcomer clients to represent their interests and deliver quality services versus their accountability to government funders in the context where nonprofits are in a never ending quest to secure the next short-term funding grant their organization depends on for survival. In the world of multiple accountabilities that nonprofit service providers operate in, these organizations are compelled to engage in a continuous balancing act. The granting of public funding usually involves cumbersome managerial and accountancy activities that pull valuable personnel, capital and time resources away from actual program delivery, which often negatively impacts the agency's service outcomes. Furthermore, the public budgets for settlement services, even in countries that rely heavily on immigration, have suffered budget pressures and in some cases significant cuts (Pagliaro & Mahoney, 2011), especially in a period of increasing austerity. These restrictions on settlement agencies' incomes, however, come at a time when needs and demands from newcomer populations have increased, often stretching nonprofit organizational resources to their limits.

The nonprofit sector faces enormous challenges in trying to negotiate its role as the smallest 'partner' of national and sub-national governments. On the one hand there is the danger that nonprofits will simply be incorporated into operating as just another arm of the government, a kind of shadow state, serving to legitimate neoliberal policies within marginalized communities (Donhilow, 2005; Evans, Richmond & Shields, 2005; Evans & Shields, 2010). On the other hand, nonprofits may be placed in a position to take advantage of these partnerships to influence policy change, especially with respect to settlement services, along more progressive avenues (Trudeau, 2008; Evans & Shields, 2014). In order to properly assess the positive and negative currents within such 'partnerships' we need to consider more closely the kind of settlement services provided by nonprofits.

Generally, the nonprofit sector offers services tailored to meet the specific needs and circumstances of newcomers. These include services in areas such as language acquisition, counseling on accessing the job market, credential recognition for internationally trained professionals, housing referral, family counseling, health (including mental health) information and linkages, citizenship tests supports, access to sports and recreation (Chappell, 2011, 339-349; Kostakopoulou, 2010; Siemiatycki & Triadafilopoulos, 2010), system navigation, and community engagement (Trudeau, 2008). Some immigrant-led organizations

serve as mediators with state institutions and provide welcome and support centres (Carella, Gurrieri & Lorizio, 2007). There are some nonprofits that help marginalized immigrant communities by addressing their "practical needs" related to community services such as improving access to libraries, parks, recreational facilities and transit services; enhancing road maintenance; and improving neighborhood safety and police relations (Donhilow, 2005). New Zealand has offered an interesting type of support under its program called Settlement Support New Zealand (New Zealand, nd.), a government-funded initiative designed to help migrants settle in their local communities. It provides migrants and their families with local information, and connects them with services that they may need to support their settlement at a community level. It includes community outreach initiatives.

With regards to the government-nonprofit alliances, these types of partnership have both advantages and disadvantages, although the latter generally seem to outnumber the former. One of the benefits is that the involvement of multiple stakeholders in the decision making of immigrant services can provide for a more flexible program delivery mode (Siemiatycki & Triadafilopoulos, 2010) while offering immigrants greater choices of services offered (Shpaizman, 2007). With the involvement of the public and nonprofit sector in settlement services, immigrants have greater opportunity to access services close to their communities. Theoretically, with multiple nonprofits which have diverse interests and many of which are also ethno-specific agencies engaged in service delivery there is the prospect of a broader reach of the services to the breadth of the immigrant community. As a result, newcomers have a better chance of gaining necessary skills and information needed for settlement, thus enhancing their social capital (Sidhu and Taylor, 2009; Hyman, Meinhard & Shields, 2011).

The involvement of nonprofit organizations in settlement service programming is designed to reduce the size of government bureaucracy involved in the actual provision of community services (Trudeau, 2008). This decreased size of government in service delivery has, according to neoliberal logic, two main purposes: nonprofit agencies are believed to be better positioned to know the needs and to service immigrant clients thus improving efficiency and satisfaction levels (Grey & Statham, 2005), while simultaneously resulting in significant cost savings because of the utilization of a cheaper nonprofit, and often non-unionized, workforce. For example, Italy and Spain in the 2000s managed to save some 3 billion Euros worth of state worker salaries by transferring settlement services to nonprofit providers (Carella, Gurrieri & Lorizio, 2007). Since nonprofit agencies are often rooted in immigrant communities that they serve they are deemed better qualified than the state to provide services to immigrants because they have the organizational skills and connections to communities that allow them to better identify newcomers' needs (Trudeau, 2008; Salamon, 2015b, 14-17).

The difficulties with privatization of settlement services are various, mostly related to nonprofit economic dependency on government funds, which hinders their ability to advocate for the immigrants and implement programs that actually provide effective assistance to the communities they serve. Furthermore, the decentralization of settlement services creates disparities between the services offered to newcomers depending on their place of residence (Arat-Koç, 1999).

Following the market rules, the funding system seeks to transform nonprofit service deliverers into efficient "businesses", promoting competition for insufficient grants. Consequently, pressure is created toward a bureaucratization of nonprofits, in which time- and budget-consuming procedures required for public funding distract the nonprofits from their real purposes (Donhilow, 2005). Contrary to the idea of neoliberalism in which the state interferes as little as possible, scholars have identified a “partial privatization process” (i.e., services that once were government’s responsibilities are being financed by greater ‘private’ funding but are still under tight public regulations) (Shpaizman, 2007).

Settlement services are often regarded as a shared responsibility between the government, the local authorities and the nonprofit providers. However, “the current focus on agency accountability seems intended to protect the funding bureaucrats from allegations of scandal and to deflect public debate away from a consideration of government responsibility for effective settlement services” (Richmond & Shields, 2005, 519). Furthermore, the budget allocated for funding settlement services is often not enough to provide adequate service delivery (Syemiaticky & Triadafilopoulos, 2010).

Considering the current growth in anti-immigrant discourse, the privatization of settlement services can be perceived as a negative incentive for immigration (Grey & Statham, 2005), as it transmits the message that immigrants are not needed. Thus the state is less likely to take on the required responsibility for their settlement and integration needs (Barrass & Shields, 2015).

With respect to activism, the nonprofits’ role of community organizing and advocating for anti-racist and equity policies appears to be restricted by the new funding regime. State funding is generally restricted to government sanctioned services (Cullen, 2009). The governments of industrialized countries have embraced the neoliberal idea that since advocating for immigrants’ rights is not in the interest of all members of the society, there is no reason why taxpayers should subsidize these expenses (Trudeau, 2008; Richmond & Shields, 2008). As a government “partner”, nonprofits are expected to follow, or at least not stray too far from, the current immigration discourse and government regulations, which can undermine nonprofit advocacy role for immigration reforms and work against the expansion of migrant rights. Furthermore, contrary to some pronouncements, the "partnership" between government(s) and nonprofits for settlement service delivery does not in fact grant the nonprofits equal status to negotiate immigration policies and to challenge the status quo (Cullen, 2009;

Donhilow, 2005). These relationships are simply contractual where government holds all the real power and nonprofits become financially dependent and subject to the accountabilities of the state.

Most nonprofit settlement service providers embrace in their mandates a strong ideal of social justice. In the immigration context, this means promoting the respect of human rights, often regardless of the legal immigration status of migrants (Goldring & Landolt, 2013). However, nonprofits that receive public funding are often explicitly told that legal immigration status is an eligibility requirement for services access. This requisite can lead to contradictions that can contravene the commitment of nonprofit profit providers towards some of their clients and which can jeopardize the trust that communities have developed towards the nonprofit agencies. In some cases nonprofit workers are transformed into government agents enforcing state rules and regulations on the immigrant population.

Cordero-Guzmán, Martin, Quiroz-Becerra and Theodore (2008) have found that one of the reasons nonprofits decide to form coalitions among themselves has to do with public funding. Organizations often feel that they have a better chance to qualify for funding if they join forces with another organization that offers complementary but different services. Furthermore, they are also able to divide the workload in ways that can give them better economies of scale and improve their ability to compete for government contracts. Richmond and Shields (2005) argue that these partnerships can be distorted, "not true alliances, but rather alternate funding and service delivery relationships, the terms and conditions of which are [ultimately] dictated largely by the terms of funding contract" (518). From the government’s perspective, these alliances can represent an expansion in the client base and an increase in the efficiency of the settlement programs. If the partnering is between a larger and smaller agency, it may also result in a mentoring opportunity for the smaller nonprofit (Cordero-Guzmán, et al., 2008).

The disadvantages of government and nonprofit 'partnerships' identified above indicates that the relationship between voluntary sector actors and government is an inherently unequal one and highly problematic in the following sense: nonprofit service providers need public funding in order to realize their service mandates, however, the granting of government funding oftentimes requires nonprofits to deviate from their original purposes and implement those programs that receive funding from the government but which do not necessarily fully address their clients’ needs. Moreover, grant funding is often insufficient to cover full programming costs with nonprofit agencies expected to cover the difference by 'doing more with less', through donations and volunteering. In this way nonprofit resources can be directed to subsidize government determined settlement programming.

Migrant-led Organizations in the Settlement Service Sector

There appears to be an increase in the number of migrant-led organizations that are involved in settlement services. In this respect, Canada and the United States historically have been the leading countries that have incorporated ethno-specific nonprofit organizations into settlement service delivery. Australia, another settlement society with extensive nonprofit service delivery has been less encouraging of government service partnering with migrant-led organizations (Gebre-Selassie, 2008). More recently, however, the federal and some other Canadian governments have moved away from the use of these kinds of nonprofits in favour of larger generic multi-service nonprofit agencies. Ethno-specific settlement service agencies can play a very important role in enhancing a dialogue between immigrant-led organizations, community members and government officials (Schmidt, 2007). Ethnic organizations can also help to reach vulnerable immigrant groups who are often outside the labour market and isolated in society such as the elderly, women and children (Gelre-Selassie, 2008). Research conducted in Ireland reveals that ethno-specific nonprofit organizations emerged as a result of a lack of response to many newcomers' pressing and immediate needs. They were well positioned to respond because they were very familiar with the communities which they themselves came out of. Because of their membership in these communities they enjoy the support and trust of their immigrant communities (Cullen, 2009).

Led by ethno-specific nonprofits Ireland's civil society has mobilized against anti-immigrant public discourse and policy initiatives, engaged in practice relevant immigrant research, offered courses on immigrants' rights, as well as supported the employment and other rights of migrants. NGOs aim at convincing the governments to consult migrants and thus elaborate policies and programs that fit immigrants' needs (Cullen, 2009). Spain has also had a good reputation for providing welcome and support centres, mediation with state institutions and counseling on accessing the job market provided by immigrant-led organizations (Carella, Gurrieri & Lorizio, 2007). These advances have, however, become strained by the current economic crisis and the rise of anti-immigrant sentiment in many countries.

Clearly, ethno-specific nonprofit service providers can fill an important role in settlement provision. Yet it is the larger more generic nonprofit agencies that tend to have more resources and more public funding for settlement service provision. Furthermore, the competitive funding environment discourages bigger nonprofits from cooperating with emergent migrant-led organizations, or if they do so, to construct 'partnerships' in which smaller ethno-specific agencies come in only in 'junior partner' roles. The larger generic multi-service nonprofits in the settlement sector are also often vulnerable to the criticism that they do not adequately reflect newcomer populations in their own workforces and that those who are employed are not in senior positions with decision-making power (Cullen, 2009).

Lester Salamon has noted that one of the advantages of nonprofit service delivery is the broad range of organizations that can be mobilized for this purpose. This allows nonprofit organizations to shape themselves to meet the specific needs of particular populations of clients thus enhancing the potential reach and effectiveness of the services provided (1995, 38-39). This is a core area of strength of the nonprofit service delivery model contributing to the nonprofit advantage.

Challenges Confronted by Nonprofit Settlement Service Providers: A Summary

Notwithstanding the particularities of each country's nonprofit service providers, the common problems encountered by third sector actors can be grouped in the following broad categories:

Funding

The economic dependency of nonprofit service providers on public funding seems to be the root of many problems faced by nonprofit service providers. The drive for cost-effectiveness and risk management structure the work of nonprofit providers (Sidhu and Taylor, 2009), and complex multi-level government structures make access and accountability for funding more complicated (Schmidt, 2005). One of the most serious difficulties that public funding entails, is the prioritization of tasks required by the government, which do not always match newcomers' needs and compels nonprofits to disregard other important roles, including advocacy and research (Shields, et al., 2015).

The eligibility criteria imposed by public funding requirements oftentimes forbids nonprofits from serving those newcomers who are most in need, in particular migrants with less than full legal status (Trudeau, 2008; Goldring & Landolt, 2013). Furthermore, the nonprofit sector is driven to increase its professional competencies in order to compete more effectively for public funding. This has a tendency to move nonprofit orientation away from its community roots toward business and managerial values that are more tailored to the efficiency and accountability ethics of neoliberal practices (Sidhu & Taylor, 2009; Richmond & Shields, 2004). Additionally, as Richmond and Shields (2005) observe, government funding for settlement services is mainly for the first stages of settlement that concern immediate survival needs, while neglecting other longer term and more imbedded problems in the integration process that are in need of policy and programming attention.

An important phenomenon is observed in the U.K (although it applies to many other countries under study), where it is increasingly assumed on the part of government authorities that immigrants have a negative financial impact on the receiving society. Consequently, newcomers are expected to make ever greater financial contributions toward their settlement costs. The goal is to reduce the

burden on citizen tax payers and to contribute to the alleviation of financial pressure on general public services (Siemiatycki & Triadafilopoulos, 2010). Overall, we are left with a situation where: “Government funding both enables and limits the social services that non-profit organizations provide” (Trudeau, 2008, 2818). One of the roles of nonprofit settlement service providers is to identify and dialogue with government around integration restrictions and problems faced by immigrants so that newcomer needs and legitimate desires can be better addressed.

Accountability
Settlement services are generally regarded as a shared responsibility between central government, sub-national jurisdictions, local authorities and nonprofit providers. However, “the current focus on agency accountability seems intended to protect the funding bureaucrats from allegations of scandal and to deflect public debate away from a consideration of government responsibility for effective settlement services” (Richmond & Shields, 2005: 519). Furthermore, settlement services are very often underfunded making it difficult for nonprofit providers to meet immigrant needs (Siemiatycki & Triadafilopoulos, 2010). Moreover, the accountability rules of government, especially under neoliberal governance, have been used to regulate nonprofit settlement service providers to match state objectives and to operate in a manner that mimics good private sector business practices but which are not necessarily a good match with the cooperative and sharing ethic of the nonprofit sector.

Societal context
In the current setting international migration policies tend to favour sectarianism, xenophobia, anti-immigrant and racialized discourses, which provokes weak public support for the expansion of migrant rights and provokes regressive immigration laws (Feldman, Frese, Ndakengerwa & Nolan, 2005). While the pattern of a more negative policy environment for immigration is highly uneven, the trend in this direction is clear. In this context immigrant centred nonprofits are working in a more difficult set of circumstances. Government resources are generally harder to secure to support settlement, anti-immigration forces have gained influence at the political level and public attitudes towards newcomers are more negative. Aside from attempting to provide direct services to newcomers, nonprofits are also often engaged in various activities aimed at promoting the benefits of immigration and in challenging populist xenophobic attitudes.

Ireland provides a good example that portrays the struggle of nonprofits to fight against immigrant social constructs. Historically, the Irish population has a long emigration history and battle against prejudice and racism that generally has not been translated in the popular Irish context to the situation which many newcomers to Ireland find themselves. Hence, a number of Irish-based nonprofits have utilized this history to re-introduce the image of the exploited Irish emigrant to create public consciousness of the parallel hardships immigrants now face in Ireland and to deconstruct the negative public opinion of immigrants

(Cullen, 2009). In these kinds of creative ways nonprofits have been active in their attempts to counter anti-immigrant forces in their societies.

Lack of outreach and coordination

Immigrants that receive settlement services provided by nonprofit agencies are thought to be somewhat better integrated into the mainstream society and to have acquired social capital assets in contrast to similar immigrants who have not had access to such services. Newcomers who are the most vulnerable with more limited social capital resources are the ones who appear to benefit most. Therefore, there appears to be a strong need for community outreach strategies that enable nonprofit agencies to better serve those immigrants with very limited social resources (Sidhu & Taylor, 2009). Given the limited size and reach of most nonprofit providers, coordinated action and partnering on the part of nonprofits would allow them to better realize this goal. However, as Cullen (2009) argues, the current lack of coordination between nonprofit providers hinders their ability to create and facilitate durable links with immigrant groups. Coordination challenges are created by a variety of factors, including the limited size and resources of nonprofits that are free to devote to such partner building endeavors and the competition between nonprofit agencies promoted by New Public Management funding practices.

De-politicization

Since most nonprofit settlement service providers are dependent on funding “partnerships” with government, their more political roles can often become neutralized. Today, guided by business management philosophies, governments fund programs not organizations, and advocacy in most countries is not funded. Both dependence on state funding and lack of resources for direct advocacy has tended to undermine, or at least mute, the 'voice role' of nonprofits for their immigrant clients. In a climate of funding scarcity and a bias toward professional non-politicized organizations the advocacy role of nonprofit organizations is greatly downplayed (Evans & Shields, 2014). Furthermore, nonprofits are reluctant to bite the funding hand that feeds them. Hence, 'advocacy chill' is part of the working reality of nonprofit settlement service provision. Moreover, the so-called 'partnerships' between government and nonprofits are not true partnerships with equal powers shared between parties. Rather, governments' are engaged in issuing competitive service contracts in which they control all the real power levers. In this context nonprofit agencies are in a less than advantageous position to effectively influence governments regarding immigration policies and programs (Cullen, 2009; Donhilow, 2005), although governments are often reliant on information from nonprofit service providers regarding the impact of their policies and programming on immigrant populations (Evans & Shields, 2014).

Strategies of Nonprofit Settlement Agencies in Overcoming Barriers Imposed by Public Funding

Nonprofit settlement service providers are faced with two main challenges: ensuring government funding and serving, to the best of their abilities, the actual needs of the immigrant population. As discussed above, these two aims are often in tension and one may come to dominate the other. However, nonprofits in the settlement service sector have developed some strategies to assist to better reconcile these tensions.

An effective way of ensuring public funding is by providing positive outcomes. As expressed by Gebre-Selassie, governments are primarily interested in addressing the immigrant settlement and integration issue in an efficient manner (2009). Research in Australia, the U.S. and Ireland has shown that the best way for government to ensure good results (economic efficiency) in the settlement service is by partnering with nonprofits or private agencies (Gebre-Selassie 2008; Sidhu & Taylor 2009; Cullen 2009). Moreover, governments generally prefer to fund a single institution (or a consortia) that can serve multiple aspects of immigrants settlement needs (Sidhu & Taylor 2009). Building nonprofit partnerships based on equality can help build capacities that can address these government requirements.

In the larger context Cullen (2009) has identified three strategies used by the pro-migrant nonprofits in Ireland to ensure that their organizations engage in both effective service delivery but also work to create a better environment for newcomer populations. In reaching these larger goals Cullen identifies: 1) alliance building with like-minded public officials, government institutions and other stakeholders; 2) mobilizing to contest negative stereotypes of immigrants; and, 3) cooperation with transnational NGOs to build international connections and support. Some of the closest allies of the settlement nonprofit sector are trade unions, anti-poverty and women's rights NGOs, and celebrities and former politicians sympathetic with the cause of immigrant rights and well-being. Additionally, as in the case of the Metropolis Project in Canada, the development of partnering relationships between nonprofit organizations and academics has been important in developing grounded research on immigration and settlement to inform policy and facilitate a stronger advocacy role for NGOs (Shields & Evans, 2012; Shields, et al. 2015). In other words, it is important for the settlement sector to look beyond basic service delivery at how immigrants more holistically fit into their societies, and then to work with other groups to address societal challenges faced by immigrant populations.

Cross-National Patterns in the Provision of Key Settlement & Integration Services by Country: A Thirteen Country Overview

(See Tables and bibliographical references in the Appendix)

Key Institutions in Charge of Immigrant Integration and their Formal Partners: Summary
Most of the countries examined have specialized institutions that deal with the integration of immigrants or immigration issues in genera (9 of the 13 countries)l. The rest of the countries (4 countries) have delegated this responsibility to a Ministry of the Interior or to a Department of Labour. (A detailed list of the key institutions in charge of immigrant integration and their formal partners can be found in Table 1 of the Appendix.)

With regards to partnerships, the general trend is that national and local governments are engaged in partnering with nonprofit service providers and private organizations to various degrees in the counties surveyed. In some countries (4), educational institutions such as community colleges and private language schools are also important stakeholders in immigrant integration. Given the emphasis that the western industrial societies place on economic and labour market integration Departments of Labour are commonly included in settlement schemes. (See Table 1)

Main Areas of Immigrant Integration: Summary
Findings clearly reveal that labour market attachment and language acquisition are core areas of settlement and integration programming for all of the countries under review. In fact, employment programs are the most numerous in our surveyed countries. These countries have developed a range of employment programs to address immigrant employment issues and needs, specializing in connecting newcomers with the local labour market. Nonprofit delivered programming are centred on increasing the capability of the immigrant workforce through training and development and actively connecting newcomers with employers. Nonprofit providers offer programs tailored to give counseling on career planning; job-find, resume writing and interview skills courses; workshops that would benefit the educational experience of immigrant youth; acquisition of technical language for certain professions; mentoring and short-term work placement programs; work permit workshops; career and employment personal development plans; inter-cultural awareness training; credential recognition information sessions; among others.

Most countries have mandatory language acquisition programmes, which are often offered through nonprofit organizations that receive funding from the government. Some countries, such as Germany and France, have detailed course curricula that nonprofit providers are required to follow. Other countries are more flexible about the content of their language acquisition programs. These

courses are usually offered free of charge or, in some cases, only a small payment is required. There has been some movement in countries like the Netherlands, however, to impose more substantive user fees to access language programming as well as the displacement of nonprofit with private for-profit language providers. The movement toward fee for service language courses and a more market-based delivery system is centred on the belief among some policymakers that if newcomers have to pay out of their own pockets for language services, they will take the instruction much more seriously, work harder and more efficiently at it. The end result, according to this position consequently, will be improved language acquisition (Shields, 2010). Newcomer success in language acquisition is, of course, critical in immigrants gaining citizenship in most countries, hence, language services rest at the very core of settlement services.

Education was also a key factor for most of the states analyzed, focusing on the enrollment of children with immigrant background in the school system. Another area of integration that has some prominence is civic integration. In fact, all of the countries that offer mandatory introductory programs (4) consider that civic integration is important in the overall settlement process. Furthermore, countries like the United States and Italy that do not have introductory programs, also identify civic integration as an important aspect to integration.

In terms of housing, only 4 countries considered it a priority for re-settlement and most of them leave this task to nonprofit service providers with no predetermined ground rules. Only Denmark and Sweden have programs tailored specifically for refugees, moreover, they are particularly concerned with the location of settlement, directing newcomers to relocate in the geographical areas where their skills are most needed. (See Table 2) With the mass arrival of refugees into Europe more recently, many governments have become overwhelmed by settlement demands, hence, civil society organizations have been mobilized to help address refugee settlement needs.

Introductory Immigrant Integration Courses: Summary

Four countries (Germany, France, The Netherlands, and the Flanders region of Belgium) offer introductory courses that are mandatory for all newcomers. For all the countries that offer introductory programs, the main areas that these programs focus on are: civic integration, language acquisition and career counseling or training. Only four countries do not offer introductory courses at all (New Zealand, Spain, Italy, and the United States). Moreover, some countries such as Sweden, Ireland, and England have special programs exclusively for refugees. In the countries where these programs are voluntary, they usually consist of general societal orientation, personalized plans and referrals to specialized settlement agencies or nonprofit service providers. (See Table 3)

The Role of Sub-national Jurisdictions in Immigration: Summary
Four countries have moved forcefully in a direction of decentralization by making local authorities an important partner of integration, although Sweden is officially going through a centralization phase. Still, most countries rely heavily on the services of municipalities and states/regional governments to deliver social services tailored to the local immigrant community's needs. Most central governments offer grants for the implementation of settlement services at the local level, and sub-national jurisdictions form partnerships with private stakeholders for the delivery of some services, especially language courses. Furthermore, the central governments of countries like those in England and New Zealand offer support for local authorities in the form of counseling and strategies to deliver better services and to assist in the managing of budgets. The survey clearly reveals that subnational institutions are playing important roles in immigrant settlement and integration. (See Table 4)

Personalized Settlement Plans: Summary
Seven countries have special programs tailored to the immigrant's needs, whether within the framework of the introductory program or through programs offered at the local level. This situation generally results in more nonprofit service providers participating in the settlement process, and thus the number of institutions involved in integration increases, as well as the human resources available and the variety of programs. (See Table 5)

Pre-arrival Courses: Summary
Strikingly only 2 of the 13 countries surveyed had pre-arrival courses available for newcomers. (See Table 6) The Canadian Government has recently placed a priority on pre-arrival services for migrants to Canada as an innovation to enhance the effectiveness of settlement integration programming, particularly related to the labour maket.

Settlement Integration Plans and/or Strategies: Summary
This section refers to the efforts of some central governments to outline their national integration strategies in an official document. This document usually identifies in a unified manner all the settlement programs offered, stakeholders involved, and responsibilities of various government institutions for immigration settlement and integration programming and policy. This is indicative of a directed government effort to systematically identify and outline a whole of government approach to immigrant integration. Five countries have developed such public documents. (See Table 7)

Integration through Sports: Summary
Even though only 5 countries formally employ sports as a significant means of integration, it appears that this domain is becoming more important to immigrant settlement and integration initiatives. Sports centred programming recognizes the value of targeting children as a strategy for longer term newcomer integration success. While integration through sports programming is primarily aimed at

children there is also beneficial effects for parents since they are able to interact with non-immigrant parents during sports practices and matches. Such programming opens up the space for newcomer children and parents to mix and mingle with local residents. This can play an important role in building networks, connections and social capital. Australia seems to be a leading other countries in terms of using sports as an integrative tool. (See Table 8)

Mandatory Integration Contracts: Summary
With regards to the mandatory integration contracts with newcomers, they are only applied in France and the Flemish region of Belgium. (See Table 9)

Special Courses for Women and Children: Summary
Seven countries offer integration courses tailored to meet the specific needs of women and children. Germany stands out in this category as it, for example, offers courses for women to overcome the barriers that may keep them from joining integration courses. Furthermore, some countries offer day care services to facilitate the enrollment of women in language and other integration courses. England, Denmark, and New Zealand are particularly committed to providing equal opportunities for the education of children with immigrant backgrounds. (See Table 10)

Involvement of Nonprofit Service Providers
Our cross-national scan reveals that all countries to various degrees make use of the services of nonprofit providers in immigrant settlement and integration programming. Nonprofit service providers allow for greater immigrant accessibility to settlement programming and add variety to integration services. Generally, the nonprofit sector offers services tailored to the individual circumstances of newcomers, as well as wide ranging programs spanning the areas of sports and leisure activities, language acquisition, citizenship test courses, community outreach, statistical data gathering, counseling on labour market inclusion, housing and employment, among others. With regards to introductory courses, especially in the area of language instruction, national and/or sub-national governments generally subcontract the delivery of many of these services to nonprofit organizations and public educational institutions.

Conclusions: Cross-National Learning

While Canada has been rightfully viewed as a country with a long and successful history of immigrant integration and as a leader in the employment of nonprofit providers in settlement and integration services, there is still much to be learned from the experiences of other jurisdictions. Identifying underlying trends influencing immigration and settlement/integration is important because Canada is part of the larger migration system and is invariably affected by these same forces. This study points to common challenges and opportunities that face nonprofit providers in a world of greater austerity and where market-led rationality

continues to play a dominant role in the future of publically supported services to immigrants and others in society. Many of the specific issues experienced in the Canadian case are also evident in the countries considered in this cross-national comparison reinforcing their importance.

This cross-national survey points to the relevance of the broader environment in shaping immigration policy and practice along with societal attitudes towards newcomers. Deep and extended economic problems, the arrival of large numbers of refugees escaping conflict zones, and security concerns in many countries have worked to create more hostile social and political spaces for newcomer populations. It serves to remind us of the central place that politics plays in settlement and integration policy and how greater attention needs to be directed toward the salience of political variables, both domestic and international, in the policy process.

In the case of much of Europe, governments have moved away from more comprehensive policy models of immigrant integration, as in the case of multiculturalism. A new policy approach has taken hold with a more pragmatic focus placed on the integration fundamentals of language, employment and education, but also with a much greater emphasis, promoted by neoliberal thinking, on the role of self-help. “In this environment, immigrants will be expected to do more, in return for continued residence status” (Collett, 2011a, 21). However, the move to more value charged policymaking risks losing sight of the value of evidence informed decision making. Having evidence guide decision makers as to what actually works in terms of settlement and integration policy and how much newcomers can realistically be expected to financially and materially contribute to their own settlement is necessary for long term integration success in societies that will be considerably more diverse in the future (Collett, 2011a, 21).

It is important to remember that meaningful integration is a two-way street. The reality is that "the best settlement program will fail in the absence of a welcoming community" (Vineberg, 2012, 65). In the case of Canada "[t]his is a lesson that … has been learned, and then forgotten, only to rediscover again, several times through its history" (Vineberg, 2012, 65). In the European case the dangers posed by the rise of anti-immigrant sentiments and policies are clear. The very act of government support for settlement and integration programs is important symbolically as it sends a message to society and immigrants themselves that newcomers are indeed welcome (Shields’ Interview with a Senior Provincial Government Official, 2012). Given the demographic reality of rapidly aging populations and the importance of international labour markets to the skill enhancement of domestic labour markets, immigration in all countries under study has an important place in all their policy futures. Narrow and short sighted political considerations should not be allowed to dominate the longer term interests of these societies.

Our research shows that there has been expansion in the involvement of nonprofit agencies among the countries and sectors examined in the delivery of publically supported services. However, both inside and outside of Canada the concern has been expressed that the relationship between government and nonprofit service delivery agencies has been too much of a top down, one-directional process. This can lead to elements of dysfunction, hindering the effectiveness and the longer term sustainability of the service delivery function of nonprofit agencies. Government funders need to open up an ongoing dialogue with nonprofit service providers to discuss new approaches to managing the relationship between them. This discussion should be informed by the New Public Governance (NPG) approach to managing the relationship between the state and nonprofits which speaks to the need to shift to horizontal accountability and co-governance and more generally more meaningful, collaborative and equitable relationships while moving away from narrow and rigid command and control, rule compliant structures. More constructive ways to manage and finance government-nonprofit partnerships (approaches that place them on a more equal footing) need to be found (see Shields, 2014). Nonprofit program provision is now an essential part of the settlement system; making the system one that works for everyone is important.

Settlement and integration services provided by nonprofit providers should not be viewed narrowly but need to embrace a more holistic approach. Nonprofit organizations support their communities in a host of ways including 'giving voice' to clients and immigrant communities. The advocacy role of nonprofits, as part of their civic society connections, is vitally important for the two-way street interaction of settlement to function properly (Evans & Shields, 2014). The contracting relationship that nonprofit service providers have with government should not be allowed to negate this important nonprofit function.

In terms of settlement services, a number of countries have developed specialized services for women and other especially vulnerable newcomers. Additionally, the place of sports programs for youth is also noteworthy. Given the particular challenges these groups of newcomers confront in the integration process, it is important that these unique service needs are recognized and addressed in programming. In Canada, for example, the labour market outcomes of newcomer women are generally far worse at all levels than for men (Shields, et al., 2010). Such targeted programming is often most effectively done by more specialized nonprofit bodies like ethno-specific agencies. Hence program financing by government to nonprofit agencies should embrace an approach that recognizes the contribution of a large range of nonprofit service providers, including larger multi-service agencies as well as smaller ethno-specific ones. The value of the nonprofit sector as a service provider is its capacity to address both more generic as well as more particular needs. It is this flexibility in range and method of delivery that is one of the valuable assets of nonprofit service provision. In designing programs and establishing criteria for agency funding, the needs of particularly vulnerable newcomer groups and the role of nonprofit

agencies specially placed to address these needs should be identified and resourced.

Another cross-national development worthy of note has been the overall movement toward the decentralization of settlement services to lower levels of government. The value of this movement has been that settlement programing delivered closer to where the services are actually used, tend to make for more connected and better programing. Because the vast bulk of settlement services are provided by local nonprofit agencies and other local bodies, having funding and accountability relationships between bodies more closely geographically located is generally more advantageous for fostering close connections between funder, providers and clients. Decision makers are in a more strategic position to effectively monitor settlement developments on the ground and foster close working relationships with providers (Shields' Interview with Senior Provincial Government Official and Provincial Nonprofit Settlement Service Provider, 2012). Of course, one down side of settlement devolution has been the tendency to offload costs downward as well. While the cross-national pattern has been to decentralization, more recently the Federal Canadian Government under the Conservatives moved in the opposite direction to 'repatriate settlement service funding' back to Ottawa. This development appeared to be motivated more for political reasons that for effective settlement policy considerations. With the election of a new Liberal Government in 2015 we will see if this centralization impulse is reversed.

Both in reviewing the literature on settlement services among OECD countries as well as the literature regarding Canadian cross sector service delivery partnerships, it is evident that services are often delivered in isolation from other supports and services provided to newcomers. The impact on services delivered by one program offered by a nonprofit provider is very often directly affected by changes to other programs supported by government (such as educational and health bodies and the overarching position of the array of supports available through national welfare states), yet these are oftentimes not properly understood and assessed in a holistic fashion by government. Government should adopt, as Robert Vineberg has argued, a 'whole of government' approach to nonprofit service programming (2012). The state should explicitly monitor policy and programming changes across policy silos and across levels of government so it is able to readily assess the larger impacts that changes to one set of programs may have upon others and hence be positioned to modify programming and supports to address change.

References

Aliweiwi, J., & Laforest, R. (2009). Citizenship, immigration and the conservative agenda. In R. Laforest (Ed.), *The new federal policy agenda and the*

voluntary sector: On the cutting edge (pp. 137-153). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Amin-Khan, T. (2015). Security and Its Impact on Migrants and Refugees. In H. Bauder & J. Shields (Eds.), *Immigrant Experiences in North America: Understanding Settlement and Integration in North America* (pp. 118-143). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Anderson. B. (2013). *Us and Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arat-Koç, S. (1999). Neo-liberalism, state restructuring and immigration: Changes in Canadian policies in the 1990's. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 34(2), 31-56.

Ascoli, U., & Ranci, C. (2002). The context of new social policies in Europe. In U. Ascoli, & C. Ranzi (Eds.), *Dilemmas of the welfare mix: The new structures of welfare in an era of privatization* (pp.1-24). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Baines, D., Campey, J., Cunningham I., & Shields, J. (2014). Not Profiting from Precarity: The Work of Nonprofit Service Delivery and the Creation of Precariousness. *Just Labour: A Canadian Journal of Work and Society*, Vol. 22, Autumn, 74-93.

Baldwin, R. & Black, J. 2008. Really Responsive Regulation. *Modern Law Review*, 71(1), 59-94.

Barrass, S., & Shields, J. (2015). "Immigration Policy in an Age of Crisis & Austerity: Politics and the Neoliberalization of Immigration Policy", *International Conference on Public Policy 2015,* Catholic University of Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy 1 July - 3 July.

Bauder, H. (2011). *Immigration Dialectic: Imagining Community, Economy, and Nation.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bauder, H., & Shields, J. eds. (2015). *Immigrant Experiences in North America: Understanding Settlement and Integration in North America.* Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Berinstein, C., McDonald, J., Nyers, P., Wright, C., & Zerehi, S. S. (2006). *Access not fear: Non-status immigrants & city services (Preliminary Report).* Retrieved from https://we.riseup.net/assets/17034/Access%20Not%20Fear%20Report%20(Feb% 202006).pdf

Biswas, K. (2011, June). Eyes to the far right. *New Internationalist*, 443, 14-20.

Bloemraad, I. (2006). *Becoming a citizen: Incorporating immigrants in the United States and Canada.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boyes, R. (2010, October). Germany's age of anxiety. *Foreign Policy,* 181. Retrieved from http://foreignpolicy.com/2010/10/22/germanys-age-of-anxiety/

Burke, M., Mooers, C. & Shields, J. (eds.) (2000). *Restructuring and Resistance: Canadian Public Policy in an Age of Global Capitalism.* Halifax: Fernwood.

Canada Press, The. (2015.) Trudeau's welcoming of refugees making international headlines. *Global News*, December 12. Retrieved from http://globalnews.ca/news/2397754/trudeaus-welcoming-of-refugees-making-international-headlines/

Carella, M., Gurrieri, A. R., & Lorizio, M. (2007). The role of non-profit organisations in migration policies: Spain and Italy compared. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36(6), 914-931.

Caulford, P., & Vail, Y. (2006). Providing healthcare to medically uninsured immigrants and refugees. *Canadian Medical Association Journal,* 174(9), 1253-1254.

Chappell, R. (2010). *Social welfare in Canadian society.* (4th ed.). Toronto: Nelson.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada & Federal Ministry of the Interior. (2008). *Second G8 experts roundtable on diversity and integration.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/docl_9151_296310931.pdf

Cochrane, C. & Nevitte, N. (2007). Support for Far Right Anti-immigration Political Parties in Advanced Industrial States, 1980-2005. *General Conference of the European Consortium for Political Research*. University of Pisa. Pisa, Italy, September 6-8.

Collet, E. (2011a). Immigrant integration during the recession: Effects, policies, and policies in Europe. In V. Dzihic, & T. Schmidinger (Eds.), *Looming Shadows: Migration and Integration at a Time of Upheaval, European and American Perspectives* (pp.1-21). Washington, D.C: Center for Transatlantic Relations.

Collet, E. (2011b). *Immigrant integration in Europe in a time of austerity*. London, UK: Migration Policy Institute.

Cordero-Guzmán, H., Martin, N., Quiroz-Becerra, V. & Theodor, N. (2008). Voting with their feet: Non-profit organizations and immigrant mobilization. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(4), 598-617.

Cullen, P.P. (2009). Irish pro-migrant nongovernmental organizations and the politics of immigration. *Voluntas: International Journal Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 20(2), 99-128.

Delcker, J. (2015). Merkel: Welcoming refugees 'right thing to do'. *Politico*, Nov. 13 Retrieved from http://www.politico.eu/article/merkel-welcoming-refugees-right-thing-to-do/

Donhilow, R. (2005). Caught in the middle: The state, ngos, and the limits to grassroots organizing along the US-Mexico border. *Antipode*, 37(3), 558-580.

Duncan, N. T. (2012). *Immigration Policymaking in the Global Era.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Eikås, M., & Selle, P. (2002). A contract culture even in Scandinavia". In U. Ascoli & C. Ranci (Eds.), *Dilemmas of the welfare mix: The new structures of welfare in an Era of Privatization* (pp. 47-75). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Evans, B., & Shields, J. (2014). Nonprofit Engagement with Provincial Policy Officials: The Case of Canadian Immigrant Settlement Services and NGO Policy Voice. *Policy and Society*, Vol. 33, No. 2, 117-127.

Evans, B., & Shields, J. (2010). The Third Sector and the Provision of Public Good: Partnerships, Contracting and the Neo-liberal State. In C. Dunn, (Ed.), *The Handbook of Canadian Public Administration, 2nd edition* (pp. 305-318). Oxford University Press, Toronto, 2010.

Evans, B., Richmond, T., & Shields, J. (2005). Structuring neoliberal governance: The nonprofit sector, emerging new modes of control and the marketisation of service delivery. *Policy and Society,* 24(1), 73-97.

Fabricant, M.B., & Fisher, R. (2002). *Settlement houses under siege: The struggle to sustain community organizations in New York City*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fargues, P., Papademetriou, D. G., Salinari, G., & Sumption, M. (2011). *Shared challenges and opportunities for EU and US immigration policymakers.* Retrieved from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/US-EUimmigrationsystems-finalreport.pdf

Federal Office for Migration and Refugees. (2007). *The national integration plan.* Retrieved from http://www.bundesregierung.de/nn_245708/Content/EN/StatischeSeiten/Schwerpunkte/Integration/kasten1-der-nationale-integrationsplan.html

Feldman, A., Frese, C., Ndakengerwa, D.L., & Nolan, A. (2005). *Diversity, civil society and social change in Ireland*. Dublin: University College Dublin.

Fix, M. E., & Tumlin, K. C. (1997). Welfare reform and the devolution of immigrant policy. Series A, *New Federalism: Issues and Options for States*, Number A-15. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/publications/307045.html

Fix, M., Zimmerman, W., & Passel, J. (2001). *The integration of immigrant families in the United States*. United States: The Urban Institute.

Frideres, J. (2008). Creating an inclusive society: Promoting social integration in Canada. In J. Biles, M. Burstein & J. Frideres, *Immigration and integration in Canada in the twenty-first century* (pp. 77-102). Kingston, ON: Queen´s University Press.

Friedman, M., & Friedman, B. (2006). *Settlement houses: Improving the social welfare of America's immigrants.* New York: Rosen.

Gebre-Selassie, H. (2008). *Integration strategies of migrants and refugees*. The Winston Churchill Memorial Trust of Australia. Retrieved from http://www.att.org.au/pdf/Report%20-%20integration%20strategies%20of%20migrant%20and%20refugees%20-%201.1.pdf

Goldring, L., & Landolt, P. (2013). *Producing and Negotiating Non-citizenship: Precarious Legal Status in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Grbic, D. (2010). Social and cultural meanings of tolerance: Immigration, incorporation and identity in Aotearoa, New Zealand. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(1), 125-148.

Grey, E., & Statham, P. (2005). Becoming European? The transformation of the British pro-migrant NGO sector in response to Europeanization", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43(4), 877-898.

Hannan, C. (2015). Illegalized Migrants. In H. Bauder & J. Shields (Eds.), *Immigrant Experiences in North America: Understanding Settlement and Integration in North Americ*a (pp. 144-163). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Hannan, C. Bauder, B., & Shields, J. (2016). 'Illegalized' Workers and the Struggle for a Living Wage. *Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research,* Vol. 27.

Henriksen, L. S., Smith, R. S., & Zimmer, A. (2015). Welfare Mix and Hybridity. Flexible Adjustments to Changed Environments. Introduction to the Special Issue. *Voluntas,* 26, 1591-1600.

Hyman, I., Meinhard, A., & Shields, J. (2011). *The role of multiculturalism policy in addressing social inclusion processes in Canada*. Edmonton: Canadian Multicultural Educational Foundation.

International Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centres (IFS). (2005). *Building inclusive communities*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: IFS.

Ishkanian, A., & Szreter, S. eds. (2012). *The big society debate: A new agenda for social welfare?* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Jessop, B. (2002). *The future of the capitalist state*. Oxford: Polity.

Joy, M. & Shields, J. (2013). Social Impact Bonds: The Next Phase of Third Sector Marketization? *Canadian Journal of Nonprofit and Social Economy Research*, Autumn, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 39-55.

Kostakopoulou, D. (2010). Matters of control: Integration tests, naturalisation reform and probationary citizenship in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*, 36(5), 829-846.

Kretsedemas, P. (2015). The Transformation of US Immigration Policy. In H. Bauder & J. Shields (Eds.), *Immigrant Experiences in North America: Understanding Settlement and Integration in North America* (pp. 60-92). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Kretsedemas, P. (2012). *The immigration Crucible: Transforming Race, nation, and the limits of law.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Lasch-Quinn, E. (1993). *Black neighbors: Race and the limits of reform in the American settlement house movement, 1890-1945*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Lentin, A., & Titley, G. (2011). *The crisis of multiculturalism: Racism in a neoliberal age.* London: Zed Books.

Menz, G. (2010). Stopping, shaping, and moulding Europe: Two-level games, non-state actors and the Europeanization of migration policies. *Journal of Common Market Studies,* 49(2), 437-462.

Murphy Kilbride, K., ed. (2014). *Immigrant Integration: Research Implications for Future Policy.* Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.

New Zealand, Government of. (2012). *Settlement support New Zealand*. Retrieved from http://www.ssnz.govt.nz/

Nihei, N. (2010). Reconsideration of the problem of complicity between volunteering activities and neoliberalism. *International Journal of Japanese Sociology*, 19(1), 112-124.

Norman, J. (2010). *The big society: The anatomy of the new politics.* Buckingham, UK: University of Buckingham Press.

Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI). (2012). *Making Ontario Home: A Study of Settlement and Integration Services for Immigrants and Refugees.* Retrieved from http://www.ocasi.org/downloads/OCASI_MOH_ENGLISH.pdf

Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI) & COSTI. (1999). *The development of service and sectoral standards for the immigrant services sector: Discussion document*. Retrieved from http://ceris.metropolis.net/Virtual%20Library/other/holder1/cover.html

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2012). *Settling In: OECD indicators of immigrant integration 2012*. Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2008). *The global competition for talent: Mobility of the highly skilled.* Paris: OECD.

Osborne, Stephen P. ed. (2010). *The New Public Governance: Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance.* London: Routledge.

Pagliaro, J., & Mahoney, J. (2011, February 4). Funding cuts threaten immigrant agencies. *The Globe and Mail.* Retrieved from http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/ontario-hit-hard-by-federal-cuts-to-immigrant-settlement-centres/article1848219/

Phillips, S., & Smith, S. R. (2011). Between governance and regulation: Evolving government-Third Sector relationships. In S. Phillips S. R. Smith (Eds), *Governance and regulation in the Third Sector: International perspectives* (1-36). New York: Routledge.

Reitz, J. G. (1998). *Warmth of the welcome: The social causes of economic success for immigrants in different nations and cities.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Richmond, T., & Shields, J. (2004). NGO restructuring: Constraints and consequences. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, (53), 53-68.

Richmond, T., & Shields, J. (2005). NGO-government relations and immigrant services: Contradictions and challenges. *Journal of International Migration and Integration,* 6(3-4), 513-526.

Root, J., Gates-Gasse, E., Shields. J., & Bauder, H. (2014). *Discounting Immigrant Families: Neoliberalism and the Framing of Canadian Immigration Policy Change*. RCIS Working Paper, No. 2014/7.

Salamon, L.M. (2015a). Introduction: The Nonprofitization of the Welfare State. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations,* Vol. 26, No. 6, December, 2147-2154.

Salamon, L. M. (2015b). *The Resilient Sector Revisited: The New Challenge of Nonprofit America,* Second edition. Washington: The Brookings Institution.

Salamon, L. M. (1995). *Partners in public service: Government-nonprofit relations in the modern welfare state.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Salamon, L.M., & Toepler, S. (2015). Government-Nonprofit Cooperation: Anomoly or Necessity? *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations,* Vol. 26, No. 6, December, 2155-2177.

Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and its discontents.* New York: New Press.

Sassen, S. (1999). *Guests and aliens.* New York: New Press.

Schmidt, R. (2007). Comparing federal government immigrant settlement policies in Canada and the United States. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 37(1), 103-120.

Sharma, N. (2015). Immigration Status and the Legalization of Inequality. In H. Bauder & J. Shields (Eds.), *Immigrant Experiences in North America: Understanding Settlement and Integration in North America* (pp. 204-222). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Shields, J. (2014). Constructing and 'Liberating' Temporariness in the Canadian Nonprofit Sector: Neoliberalism and Nonprofit Service Providers. In R.

Latham, V. Preston & L. Vosko (Eds.), *Liberating Temporariness? Migration, Work and Citizenship in an Age of Insecurity* (pp. 255-281). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Shields, J. (2010). Personal notes taken at the settlement services field trip, *15th International Metropolis Conference - Justice and Migration: Paradoxes of Belonging,* The Hague, October 4-8, 2010.

Shields, J. (2002). Capturing Civil Society: The Third Sector in the Shadow of the State. *The SRC Sarwan Shahota Lecture.* Toronto: Ryerson University, February 21. Retrieved from http://www.ryerson.ca/ORS/research/profiles/Shields.htm

Shields, J., & Bauder, H. (2015). Understanding Immigration, Settlement, and Integration in North America. In H. Bauder & J. Shields (Eds.), *Immigrant Experiences in North America: Understanding Settlement and Integration in North America* (pp. 11-33). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Shields, J., & Evans, B. (2012). Building a Policy-Oriented Research Partnership for Knowledge Mobilization and Knowledge Transfer: The Case of the Canadian Metropolis Project. *Administrative Sciences*, 2, 250-272.

Shields, J., & Evans, B. M. (1998). *Shrinking the state: Globalization and public administration 'reform'*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Shields, J., Preston, V., Richmond, T., Sorano, Y., Gasse-Gates, E., Douglas, D., Campey, J., & Johnston, L. (2015). Knowledge Mobilization/Transfer and Immigration Policy: Forging Space for NGOs – The Case of CERIS – The Ontario Metropolis Centre. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, Vol. 16, No. 2, May, 265-278.

Shields, J., Lemoine, M., Phan, M., Kelly, P., Lo, L., Preston, V., Tufts, S. (2010). Do Immigrant Class and Gender Affect Labour Market Outcomes for Immigrants?. *TIEDI Analytical Report*, No. 2, January (Toronto: Toronto Immigrant Employment Data Initiative, York University). Retrieved from http://www.yorku.ca/tiedi/doc/AnalyticalReport2.pdf

Shpaizman, I. (2007). The influence of neo – liberal ideas and political conflict on the privatization process of immigrant policy: A comparison of Israel, Canada and the Netherlands. Retrieved from https://www.appam.org/conferences/international/.../359.1.do

Sidhu,R. K., & Taylor, S. (2009). The trials and tribulations of partnerships in refugee settlement services in Australia. *Journal of Education Policy.* 24(6), 655-672.

Siemiatycki, M., & Triadafilopoulos, T. (2010). *International perspectives on immigrant service provision.* Mowat Centre for Policy Innovation. School of Public Policy and Governance. University of Toronto. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Silj, A. (Ed.). (2010). *European multiculturalism revisited*. London: Zed.

Sutherland, P. D., & Malmstrom, . (2012). Europe's Immigration Challenge. *The Guardian,* July 24.

Swedish Migration Board. (2011). *Residence permits granted 2011*. Retrieved from http://www.migrationsverket.se/download/18.46b604a812cbcdd7dba800027744/Beviljade+uppehållstillstånd+och+registrerade+uppehållsrätter+2011+-+Residence+permits+granted+2011.pdf

Traynor, I. (2015). Europe dices with nationalism, *The Guardian Weekly*, December 11-17, 1, 7.

Trudeau, D. (2008). Junior partner or empowered community? The role of non-profit social service providers amidst state restructuring in the US. *Journal of Urban Studies*, 45(13), 2805-2827.

United Neighborhood Houses. (n.d.). *Settlement House History*. Retrieved from http://www.unhny.org/about/history

Vineberg, R. (2015). Two Centuries of Immigration to North America. In H. Bauder & J. Shields (Eds.), *Immigrant Experiences in North America: Understanding Settlement and Integration in North America* (pp. 34-59). Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Vineberg, R. (2012). *Responding to immigrants' settlement needs: The Canadian experience.* New York: Springer.

Appendix

Table 1
Key Institutions in Charge of Immigrant Integration and their Formal Partners

COUNTRY	KEY INSTITUTION(S)	PARTNERS
Germany	Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007)	-Federal, state, and local governments -Commissioner for Repatriate Affairs and National Minorities -Religious organizations -Trade unions -Employer's associations -Voluntary welfare organizations (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007)
France	Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Joint Development, through the French Office for Immigration and Integration (OFII, n.d.).	-National Employment Agency -NGOs (OFII, n.d.).
Italy	Ministry of the Interior (Ministry of the Interior, n.d).	-Italian Broadcasting Corporation -Ministry of Education -Cooperatives (Ministry of the Interior, n.d).
Spain	Ministry of Labour (Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, 2007).	-Centres for the Temporary Stay of Immigrants Reception -Centres for Refugees -Red Cross -Comisión Española de Ayuda al Refugiado -NGOs (Secretaría General de Presupuestos y Gastos, n.d.).

COUNTRY	**KEY INSTITUTION(S)**	**PARTNERS**
Belgium	The Ministry of the Interior through its Office for Foreigners (CoCof, n.d.)	-Centre for Chance Equality and Fight against Racism -CoCof (Commission Communautaire Française) (CoCof, n.d)
United States	No official institution. However, the Office of Citizenship, a part of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, develops and promotes educational products and resources used for immigrant integration and civic education for naturalization (USCIS, 2010).	-NGOs -Government institutions that fund integration programs.
The Netherlands	The Immigration and Naturalization Service (IND) is in charge of the immigration policies in The Netherlands on behalf of the Ministry of Security and Justice (Ministry of Justice, 2004).	-The Dutch Council for Refugees -Centre for Work and Income -NGOs (Ministry of Justice, 2004).
New Zealand	Department of Labour through Immigration New Zealand (Department of Labour, 2011).	-NGOs -Ministry of Education -Trietary Education Commission -Local Councils -Career Service -Migrant-led organizations -The Refugee Services -Housing New Zealand (Department of Labour, 2010a)

COUNTRY	KEY INSTITUTION(S)	PARTNERS
Denmark	The Integration Department of the Ministry for Refugees, Immigration, Integration, and Foreign Affairs (Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, 2009).	-Municipalities -NGOs (Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, 2009).
Sweden	The Swedish National Migration Board and the Swedish Employment Office Swedish Public Employment Service (n.d.)	-Municipalities -Swedish Labour Market Board -Employment Service -NGOs (Swedish Public Employment Service, n.d.a.; Swedish Public Employment Service, n.d.c. &Wiesbrock, 2011)
Ireland	Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration (Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration, 2011a)	-Local authorities -National Sporting Organizations -Faith-based groups -NGOs -Vocational Education Committees -National Training and Employment Authority -Local Employment Service (Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration, 2011b; Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration, 2011c; Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration, 2011d; Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration, 2011e)
England	-Home Office -UK Border Agency (Equality and Human Rights Commission, n.d.)	-Equality and Human Rights Commission -Job Centre Plus Centres -NGOs -Timebank -British Council (Equality and Human Rights Commission, n.d. & British Council, n.d.)

COUNTRY	**KEY INSTITUTION(S)**	**PARTNERS**
Australia	Department of Immigration and Citizenship (Department of Immigration and Citizenship, n.d.a.)	-Technical and Further Education Institutes -Public colleges -NGOs -MTC Training Solutions -Nortec Employment and Training

Table 2
Main Areas of Immigrant Integration

Germany	Language, education, labour market integration, social integration, civic integration (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007)
France	Language support, labour market integration, civic integration
Italy	Education; Civic integration; employment
Spain	Reception, education, employment, housing, social, services, health, children and youth, job equity, women, participation, public awareness, co-development (Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, 2007).
Belgium	Credential recognition, labour market integration, education, language, civic integration
United States	Language, naturalization, labour market integration, and civic integration
The Netherlands	Language, civic integration, labour market integration
New Zealand	Labour market, social work, language courses, health promotion, family life, housing, education (Department of Justice, 2007).
Denmark	Labour market, language instruction, employment, education, health, housing
Sweden	Housing, schooling, labour market, education, language instruction (Wiesbrock, 2011).
Ireland	Language instruction, labour market integration, civic instruction
England	Language acquisition, labour market integration, education
Australia	Language acquisition, labour market integration

Table 3
Introductory Immigration Integration Courses

COUNTRY	MANDATORY/VOLUNTARY	COURSE CONTENTS	COURSE PROVIDERS
Germany	Mandatory (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007)	Language and orientation -Politics in a democracy -History and responsibility -People and society (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007)	Private and public institutions sub-contracted and approved by the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007)
France	Mandatory (OFII, n.d.).	-Civic and Language training -One information session (OFII, n.d.).	-Private language schools, social services organizations, and professional development organizations subcontracted by the government (OFII, n.d & Yoffe, 2010).
Italy	No introductory courses	----	-----
Spain	No introductory courses	----	-----
Belgium	Walloon-Voluntary (CESifo, 2009). Flanders-Mandatory (CESifo, 2009 & Pelfrene, Doyen, & Hellemans, n.d.).	Walloon- language and literacy courses as well as social, cultural and civic formation. Flanders-training and educational program or career counseling course (CESifo, 2009).	Walloon and Flanders-regional centres subsidized by local governments (CESifo, 2009 & Pelfrene, Doyen, & Hellemans, n.d.).
USA	No introductory courses	----	----

COUNTRY	MANDATORY/VOLUNTARY	COURSE CONTENTS	COURSE PROVIDERS
The Netherlands	Mandatory (Ministry of Justice, 2004).	-Educational Section: Dutch as a Second Language, Social Orientation, and Vocational Orientation. -General Program Coaching -Social Counseling (Ministry of Justice, 2004).	-Public education institutions for adult education. -Private companies (ALTE, n.d.).
New Zealand	No introductory courses	-----	-----
Denmark	Voluntary (Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, 2009).	-Language Instruction -Employment-oriented training (Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, 2009).	Municipalities (Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, 2009).
Sweden	Voluntary (Swedish Public Employment Service, 2010).	Immigrants: Tailored to the immigrant's needs. For refugees, there is a special program that consists of: -Introductory meeting -Continued meeting: employment and educational credentials assessment -A plan for the future (Swedish Public Employment Service, 2010).	-Immigrants: Public Employment Services. -Refugee program: the Public Employment Services collaborates with the Swedish Migration Board (Swedish Public Employment Service, 2010).

COUNTRY	MANDATORY/VOLUNTARY	COURSE CONTENTS	COURSE PROVIDERS
Ireland	Voluntary	Refugees are offered the 'Adult Refugee Program', which consists of: -Language acquisition -Labour Market Integration -General Knowledge about Ireland (Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration, 2011c).	Vocational Education Committees (Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration, 2011c).
England	Voluntary (U.K. Border Agency, n.d.).	Exclusively for refugees: 1.-Advice Support Services concerning housing, education, access to benefits 2.-Employment advice (U.K. Border Agency, n.d.).	The Border Agency has contracted the following institutions: -British Refugee Council -Metropolitan Support Trust -North of England Refugee Service -Refugee Action -Multicultural Resource Centre -Scottish Refugee Council -Leeds City Council (U.K. Border Agency, n.d.).

COUNTRY	MANDATORY/VOLUNTARY	COURSE CONTENTS	COURSE PROVIDERS
Australia	Voluntary (Navitas, n.d.).	-Reception and initial orientation -Information about service providers -Trauma counseling -Housing Assistance -Referral to community-based organizations (Navitas, n.d.).	-Service for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture and Trauma Survivors -Resolve -FM -ALC -Mission Australia (Navitas, n.d.).

Table 4
The Role of Sub-national Jurisdictions in Immigration

Germany	Local governments implement their own integration programs aside from the mandatory integration program which is offered at the federal level (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007).
France	-Housing, and youth integration are important aspects of immigrant integration in the local sphere. -Immigrant-led organizations and schools are important partners of local governments. -Although most integration policies are nationwide, there are some programs coordinated with local authorities. -The Social Financing Fund is an important financing tool for integration programs at the local levels (Houle, 2000, p.11). -Municipalities are helpful in coordinating local services for the implementation of nationwide programs. -Local jurisdictions tend to follow a more pluralistic model that the national scheme.
Italy	-A lot of support from local governments. -Local governments run the Territorial Councils for Immigration and the Single Desk for Immigrants (Ministry of the Interior, n.d).
Spain	-Local governments receive subsidies for the implementation of immigrant reception programs. -Some regions have implemented their own integration plans. Immigrant Reception and Integration Support Fund is the financial tool for local integration (Bonino, 2003 & Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, 2007).

Belgium	-All programmes related to education, including language acquisition, are of federal competency and must be financed by the federal government. All courses are organized by regional offices in cooperation with NGOs and professional organizations (Gsir, 2006). -There are 6 regional centres of integration that are subsidized by the local governments and that work together with local authorities and associations to offer services on the fields of health, accommodation, education, socio-economic integration and culture (CESifo, 2009).
USA	Several federal departments provide funding to state governments and NGOs to deliver social services and settlement.
The Netherlands	-The municipalities are responsible for the integration of refugees (ALTE, n.d.). -They are free to determine the allocation of their budgets for integration, and contact the course providers (ALTE, n.d.). -Municipalities form partnerships with private organizations and NGOs in order to provide shelter and housing services for immigrants.
New Zealand	-‘Regional Settlement Strategies’ are local initiatives to create a welcoming environment for immigrants (Department of Labour, 2010a).

Denmark	-Municipalities sign partnership agreements regarding local initiatives implemented between municipalities and other local stakeholders. The Ministry reimburses the municipalities 50% of the expenses for the implementation of language courses, introduction allowances, and the introduction program (Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, 2009). -Municipalities receive advice on integration strategies from Integration Services, the consultancy division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministry of Integration Affairs, 2009).
Sweden	The state is going through a centralization phase, in which municipalities are given less responsibility, but they remain key partners in the reception of newcomers (Wiesbrock, 2011).
Ireland	Municipalities are in charge of distributing funding to local NGOs and private organizations interested in delivering settlement services (Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration, 2011b).
England	-Schools are important partners in local integration programs (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2007). -Local policies in England focus on equality of opportunities and anti-discrimination frameworks (Houle, 2000). -Local governments have an ‘unofficial’ policy of multiculturalism (Houle,2000).
Australia	The Department of Immigration and Citizenship gives community grants to support the settlement services in local governments (Department of Immigration and Citizenship, n.d.b.).

Table 5
Personalized Settlement Plans

Germany	Yes (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007; Migration Work CIC & IMPART, April 2010).
France	Yes (OFII, n.d.).
Italy	No
Spain	No
Belgium	No
United States	No
The Netherlands	Yes (Ministry of Justice, 2004).
New Zealand	No
Denmark	No
Sweden	Yes (Swedish Public Employment Service, 2010).
Ireland	Yes (Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration, 2011c)
England	Yes (Home Office, 2010).
Australia	Yes (Navitas, n.d.).

Table 6
Pre-arrival Courses

Germany	No
France	Yes (civic and language instruction) (OFII, n.d.).
Italy	No
Spain	No
Belgium	No
United States	No
The Netherlands	No
New Zealand	Yes (employment information) (Department of Labour, 2003a).
Denmark	No
Sweden	No
Ireland	No
England	No
Australia	No

Table 7
Settlement/Integration Plans and/or Strategies

Germany	National Integration Program (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007)
France	No
Italy	No
Spain	The Strategic Plan for Citizenship and Integration (Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, 2007).
Belgium	No
USA	No
The Netherlands	No
New Zealand	Our Future Together (Department of Labour, 2003b).
Denmark	A New Chance for Everyone (Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, 2005).
Sweden	No
Ireland	No
England	Equality Strategy (Although not specially for immigrants) (Home Office, 2010).
Australia	No

Table 8
Integration Through Sports

Germany	Yes (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007).
France	No
Italy	No
Spain	No
Belgium	Yes (CoCof, n.d. & Gsir, 2006).
USA	No
The Netherlands	Yes (Florence-Aate & Nelson Mono, 2005).
New Zealand	No
Denmark	Yes (Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, 2009).
Sweden	No
Ireland	Yes (although not specifically for immigrants) (Irish Sports Council, n.d.).
England	Yes (only in certain regions).
Australia	No

Table 9
Mandatory Integration Contracts

Germany	No
France	Yes (OFII, n.d.).
Italy	No
Spain	No
Belgium	Walloon-no Flanders-yes (CoCof, n.d).
USA	No
The Netherlands	No
New Zealand	No
Denmark	No
Sweden	No
Ireland	No
England	No
Australia	No

Table 10
Special Courses for Women and Children

Germany	Yes (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, 2007).
France	Yes (Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Joint Development, 2008).
Italy	No
Spain	Yes (Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, 2007).
Belgium	No
USA	Yes (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2010).
The Netherlands	No
New Zealand	Yes (Department of Labour, 2010b).
Denmark	Yes (Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, 2009).
Sweden	No
Ireland	No
England	Yes (Directgov, 2011).
Australia	No

Appendix References

Australia

Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (n.d.a) *Adult migrant english program.* Retrieved from http://www.immi.gov.au/living-in-australia/help-with-english/amep/learning-english/where.htm

Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (n.d.b). *Support for community services.* Retrieved from http://www.immi.gov.au/about/reports/annual/2006-07/html/outcome2/output2_1_3.htm

Navitas. (n.d.) *Integrated humanitarian settlement strategy.* Retrieved from http://www.navitas.com/settlement_ihss.html

Belgium

CESifo. (2009). *National integraiton programmes for migrants in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, and the Netherlands*. Retrieved from http://www.ifo.de/portal/page/portal/ifoHome/a-winfo/d3iiv/_DICE_division?_id=1&_div=7114193&_cat=c&_action=next&_row=1&_count=21

Commission Communautaire Française, CoCof. (n.d.). *Textes constitutionnels et presentation de l' administration*. Retrieved from http://www.cocof.irisnet.be

Gsir, S. (2006). *Proceedings from: Exposé dans le cadre la journée nationale de la commission fédérale des etrangers (CFE):Quelle intégration? Welche integration?.* Bienne, Belgium.

Pelfrene, E., Doyen, G., & Hellemans, I. (n.d.). *Immigration and migrant integration policies in Flanders* (Belgium). Retrieved from www.uclouvain.be/cps/ucl/doc/demo/documents/Pelfrene(1).pdf

Denmark

Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs. (2005). *A new chance for everyone-the Danish government's integration plan.* Retrieved from www.nyidanmark.dk/NR/rdonlyres/.../a_new_chance_for_everyone.pdf

Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs. (2009). *Integration 2009: Nine focus points.* Retrieved from http://www.nyidanmark.dk/en-us/publications/SearchPublications.htm?searchType=publications

England

British Council. (n.d.). *A to z list of accredited centres: Introduction.* Retrieved from http://www.britishcouncil.org/accreditation-az-list.htm

Directgov. (2011). *Sure start children's centres.* Retrieved from http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/Parents/Preschooldevelopmentandlearning/NurseriesPlaygroupsReceptionClasses/DG_173054

Equality and Human Rights Commission. (n.d.) *About us*. Retrieved from http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/about-us/

Home Office. (2010). *The equality strategy-building a fairer Britain*. London: Government Equalities Office.

UK Border Agency. (n.d.). *Refugee integration and employment service*. Retrieved from http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/workingwithus/workingwithasylum/integration/ries/

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. (2007). *Local integration policies for migrants in Europe.* Retrieved from www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2006/31/en/1/ef0631en.pdf

Houle, R. (2000). *Integration of migrants and refugees in local communities: Problems and policies.* Retrieved from www.ced.uab.es/publicacions/PapersPDF/Text173.pdf

France

Borkert, M., Bosswick, W., Heckmann, F., & Lüken-Klaßen, D. (2007). *Local integration policies for migrants in Europe*. Retrieved from European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions: http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2006/31/en/1/ef0631en.pdf

Houle, R. (2000). *Integration of migrants and refugees in local communities: Problems and policies.* Retrieved from www.ced.uab.es/publicacions/PapersPDF/Text173.pdf

Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Joint Development. (2008). *L'intégraiton des migrants légaux.* Retrieved from http://www.immigration.gouv.fr/spip.php?page=dossiers_them_int&numrubrique=323

Office Française de la Migration et de l'Integration, OFII. (n.d.) *S'intégrer en France*. Retrieved from http://www.ofii.fr/s_integrer_en_france_47/index.html?sub_menu=6

Yoffe, L. (2010). *Linguistic integration of adult migrants in France.* Retrieved from: http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:VHBeNdt0JBIJ:www.waseda.jp/w-com/quotient/publications/pdf/bun36_03.pdf+leo+yoffe+linguistic+integration&cd=1&hl=es&ct=clnk&client=firefox-a&source=www.google.com

Germany

Federal office for Migration and Refugees. (2007). *National integration programme*. Retrieved from www.integration-in-deutschland.de

Migration Work CIC & IMPART (2010, April). *Increasing the Participation of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities in Employment (Baseline Report).* Retrieved from www.impart.eu/.../IMPART%20Baseline%20rpt%20GERMANY.pd

Ireland

Irish Sports Council. (n.d.). *Local sports partnerships.* Retrieved from http://www.irishsportscouncil.ie/Participation/Local_Sports_Partnerships

Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration. (2011a). *Office for the promotion of migrant integration.* Retrieved from http://www.integration.ie/

Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration. (2011b). *Policy of the office for the promotion of migrant integration on funding.* Retrieved from http://www.integration.ie/website/omi/omiwebv6.nsf/page/funding-omipolicy-en

Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration. (2011c). *Adult refugee program*. Retrieved from http://www.integration.ie/website/omi/omiwebv6.nsf/page/managingdiversity-AdultRefugeeProgrammedetails-en

Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration. (2011d). *Training and updating skills*. Retrieved from http://www.integration.ie/website/omi/omiwebv6.nsf/page/infoformigrants-employment-optionsunemployed-en

Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration. (2011e). *Learning English*. Retrieved from http://www.integration.ie/website/omi/omiwebv6.nsf/page/infoformigrants-learningenglish-en

Italy

Ministry of the Interior. (n.d.) *Initiatives related to integration*. Retrieved from: www.interino.it

The Netherlands

Association of Language Testers in Europe, ALTE. (n.d.). *Language and integration Netherlands*. Retrieved from http://www.alte.org/documents/lami-netherlands.pdf

Dutch Council for Refugees (2010). *Summary annual report*. Retrieved from http://www.jaarverslagvluchtelingenwerk.nl/

Florence-Aate, A., & Nelson-Mono, L. (2005). Golden opportunities-reality or myth? Horn of Africa female migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers in the Netherlands. *Community Development Journal*, 40(2), 224-231.

Ministry of Justice. (2004). *Factsheets Wet inburgering nieuwkomers.* Retrieved from http://www.degeschiedenisvaninburgering.nl/service/serv038.html

New Zealand

Department of Labour. (2003a). *Settlement national action plan: New Zealand settlement strategy.* Retrieved from http://www.immigration.govt.nz/settlement/settlementprogrammes/

Department of Labour. (2003b). *Our future together: New Zealand settlement strategy*. Retrieved from http://www.immigration.govt.nz/settlement/settlementprogrammes/

Department of Labour. (2007). *Settlement programmes funded by immigration New Zealand.* Retrieved from http://www.immigration.govt.nz/settlement/settlementprogrammes

Department of Labour (2010a). *Auckland Regional Settlement Strategy 2010-2014*. Retrieved from: http://www.immigration.govt.nz/settlement/regionalstrategies/auckland.htm

Department of Labour. (2010b). *English language tuition services for migrants.* Retrieved from http://www.immigration.govt.nz/community/stream/support/governmentsupport/tuition.htm

Department of Labour. (2011). *Settlement support contacts.* Retrieved from http://www.immigration.govt.nz/settlement/contacts/

Spain

Bonino, C. (2003). *Los planes de las comunidades autónomas para la integración de las personas inmigrantes*. Gaceta Sindical. Reflexión y Debate, 179-208.

Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales. (2007). *Strategic plan for citizenship and integration Spain*. Retrieved from http://www.mtin.es/es/sec_emi/index.htm

Secretaría General de Presupuestos y Gastos. (n.d.) *Programa 231H.* Retrieved from www.sgpg.pap.meh.es/.../N_11_A_R_31_119_1_2_3_1231H_C_1.PDF

Sweden

Swedish Public Employment Service. (n.d.a). *Establishing yourself and working in Sweden.* Retrieved from http://www.arbetsformedlingen.se/Globalmeny/Other-languages/New-in-Sweden/Seeking-asylum.html

Swedish Public Employment Service. (n.d.b.) *Welcome to Sweden and welcome to the Swedish public employment service*. Retrieved from http://www.arbetsformedlingen.se/Globalmeny/Other-languages/New-in-Sweden/We-help-you-find-a-job-in-Sweden.html

Swedish Public Employment Service. (n.d.c.) *Welcome to Sweden and a step-in job.* Retrieved from http://www.arbetsformedlingen.se/Globalmeny/Other-languages/New-in-Sweden/Get-a-step-in-job.html

Swedish Public Employment Service. (2010). *Introduction benefits for new arrivals*. Retrieved from http://www.arbetsformedlingen.se/Globalmeny/Other-languages/New-in-Sweden/We-help-you-find-a-job-in-Sweden.html

Wiesbrock, A. (2011). The integration of immigrants in Sweden: A model for the European Union? *International Migration*, 49(4), 48-66.

United States of America

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. (2010). *USCIS immigrant integration initiatives fact sheet*. Retrieved from http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.5af9bb95919f35e66f614176

543f6d1a/vgnextoid=bd9bef6b56c1b210VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD&vgnextchannel=68439c7755cb9010VgnVCM10000045f3d6a1RCRD

US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Refugee Resettlement. (2010). *Social services*. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/benefits/rss.htm