Immigrant Strategies to Improve Work and Achieve Income Security

In Brief Three, we look at the strategies that immigrants use to improve their work experiences and reduce the precariousness of their jobs. We also consider whether such strategies can help to reduce poverty. We build on what we learned in Brief Two in which we studied some of the causes of precarious employment, as measured by the Index of Precarious Work (IPW). Here, we aim to understand those factors that helped to bring about a change in precariousness between the early and current work experiences of immigrants. Whose work situations improved? Whose did not? Finally, based on our findings, we outline three implications of this research.

Immigration Policy and the Economic Context

From the mid 1960s through the 1980s, immigration policy in Canada brought diverse streams of newcomers from Southeast Asia, Latin America, Europe, and African countries. Immigrants and refugees who arrived in Canada during this time often worked hard at fairly stable jobs. They could be found in trades, factories, and farming. They could expect to move into better – and often unionized – jobs. They could also expect to see upward mobility in their lifetimes. But the idea that people would move into decent jobs over time rested in part on the structure of the economy and specifically on the availability of fairly decent work. It also rested on government policies designed to extend social welfare to the population. Newcomers and non-immigrants with little education could get stable jobs. Social welfare benefits helped to reduce social and regional inequalities.

Today, Canadian immigration policy is much more targeted. It aims to admit mainly what it deems to be “the best and the brightest.” And yet newcomers have not been faring as well as they once did. Government social programs and the restructuring of work have given rise to a new and less prosperous time. As a result, newcomers to Canada face two specific challenges. First, they suffer from a gap in earnings. Despite the fact that immigration policy selects “the best and the brightest,” immigrants earn less than native-born workers who have similar educations. Racialized immigrants and minorities, in particular, make much less. Second, immigrants often suffer from what is called ‘occupational mismatch.’ In other words, many of those who are picked for their education and professional skills have trouble finding jobs that match their qualifications once they are in Canada.

Governments have been trying to address these challenges. One of the ways to do so is through the funding of programs that aim to help newcomers. Some programs – such as language programs and job search workshops – have been around for some time. In recent years, however, they have been supplemented with newer offerings that are more labour market-oriented. For example, language training has become more occupation-specific. Bridging programs provide the coursework that is needed to “top up” a worker’s international credentials.
Mentoring partnerships match working professionals to newcomers in the same field. Most of these newer initiatives target educated international professionals. These programs represent a targeted policy effort designed to make newcomers job-ready for the Canadian labour market. However, they do not address the structure of the labour markets and do little to alter employer hiring and retention practices.

Given a difficult labour market context, newcomers themselves also employ strategies to find a job and improve their work situation. Sometimes they are able to participate in government-supported programs. As they balance the need to make ends meet with the desire to improve their situation, they may switch jobs, take classes, or take on another job or more hours of work. In this brief we examine the effect of selected strategies used by newcomers, first on whether they can move into less precarious work, and then on whether their strategies reduce poverty.

**Strategies to Reduce Precariousness over Time**

People employ various strategies to improve their work situations. **Strategies** refer to activities that one pursues in order to improve an area of one’s life. For example, an immigrant worker might try to have his or her credentials recognized; take advantage of on the job training; take training or courses outside of work in the hope of moving into a better job; seek employment counseling; draw on social networks to learn about better work opportunities; join a union; or join with other workers in some type of collective action. The strategies which people use to make improvements in the area of work generally depend on a number of factors. These include their financial resources and networks, their family responsibilities, and their ability to access programs and services.

The newcomers we surveyed used a range of strategies to improve their work situations. We have grouped these into two broad categories: “education and training strategies” and “networking and institutional connectedness.”

**Education and training strategies**

Education and training strategies can be roughly divided into three groups. We looked at:

- Individual strategies (based on one’s own financial resources): education in Canada, continuing education and/or courses for certification
- Government strategies (government-funded programs, usually delivered by not for profit community agencies): English as a Second Language courses, occupation-specific language courses, job search workshops (including resume clinics, interview techniques, and skills self-assessment), employment counseling
- Employer strategies (employer-driven initiatives): on the job training, workplace language classes

**Networking and institutional connectedness**

Networking and institutional connectedness refers to a person’s use of social networks. It also refers to a person’s contact (or familiarity) with services, organizations, and institutions. We looked at:

- The use of employment agencies and personal networks to find better work
- The use of networks beyond one’s immediate social circle (bridging ties)
- Self-employment
- Volunteering (in faith-based organizations, community organizations, etc.)
Incidence of various strategies

We found that immigrants use a variety of strategies to improve their work situation. Here are some of our findings:

- 59% of survey respondents had received on the job training in their current jobs. Of those with a second job, 45% had on the job training in that job. Of those working a third job, 37% had on the job training in that job. Of the total sample, 67% (or 203 people) had on the job training in any one of their current job(s). Of these, 47% were men and 53% were women.

- 47% of respondents had attended a resume clinic.

- 47% of respondents had taken ESL or Business English courses – or both. This finding varied widely by region of origin. Only 24% of the Caribbean sample had taken some kind of English training course in Canada compared to 70% of Latin Americans. (The Caribbean respondents surveyed were from the English-speaking Caribbean.)

- 40% of respondents said that they had tried different forms of networking to change jobs. These included the use of employment agencies, Web searches, and personal networks.

- 36% of respondents said that they volunteer on a regular basis.

- 26% of respondents said that they had tried to go into business for themselves. This included 23% of those from the Caribbean and 29% of those from Latin American countries. More men (35%) than women (18%) had tried self-employment. Other research suggests that workers who are precariously employed may try to be self-employed as a survival strategy.

- Only 18% of the total sample said that they used the experience they acquired on a job as a strategy to improve their work situation.

People in low-paying jobs with little chance for improvement have other strategies, too. They may work more hours for the same employer, or they may work multiple jobs. They may also join income pooling and savings schemes. Seventeen percent of our sample stated that they participated in an informal rotating credit group to save money.

How Well Did the Strategies Work?

Now that we understand the various strategies that workers use to improve their work situations and incomes, we can explore how well the strategies work. Specifically, we can find out if the strategies that people put into place led to a change. More specifically, we can ask if there was a reduction—or an increase—in the Index of Precarious Work (IPW) between the jobs they found during their first year of work in Canada and their current job or jobs. (For people holding
more than one job at the time of the survey, we used the average of their current IPWs). A reduction in the IPW between the two time periods would be an improvement. It would mean that the workers found more decent work. It would also mean, in light of the results found in Brief One, that the workers improved their well being. We used regression analysis to identify strategies that had a statistically significant effect on a variable measuring change in the IPW. (Details of the logistic regression results can be found in the Appendix at the end of this Brief.)

One of the ‘individual strategies’ – the use of continuing education and/or courses to obtain certificates – proved to be significant and positive. We found that those who invested in continuing education were more likely to experience an improvement in their IPW compared to those who did not.

On the job training was significant as well. Those who had on the job training were more likely to experience an improvement in IPW compared to those who did not.

People who went into business for themselves, however, experienced an increase in precariousness in their jobs: their situation became more precarious. But it is unclear why this is the case. Self-employment may lead to precariousness. Or people in a precarious position may just be more likely to pursue self-employment. Either way, going into business for oneself does not reduce precarity.

None of the rest of the strategies was significant. The number of years of schooling in Canada did not lead to a reduction in a worker’s IPW. The use of programs funded by the government, such as ESL and job search workshops, had no impact either. That is, they were not associated with a reduction in respondents’ precariousness over time. A person’s education prior to coming to Canada also made no difference. In other words, more schooling had no effect on the quality of a person’s job. Furthermore, neither did the amount of time a newcomer had spent in Canada, nor the newcomer’s legal status.

In contrast, a person’s sex and region of origin did play a role in the quality of work he or she found over time. Compared to men and Latin Americans, respectively, women and people from the Caribbean were less likely to move into decent, less precarious work over time. Language competence in English did play a role in reducing precariousness. Given that taking ESL and Business English did not lead to an improvement in reducing job precariousness, this language competence may be present upon arrival in Canada, or acquired through means other than language training courses.

In Brief Two, we saw that factors such as household size and the presence of children under the age of 12 had an impact on the precariousness of a person’s job. However, these factors did not have an impact on reducing...
IPWs or moving into more decent work over time. A person’s schooling in his or her home country continues to have little effect on improving the quality of his or her jobs in Canada. In general, we found that only a few factors are associated with a change between a person’s early work and his or her current job. As it turns out, a very narrow range of strategies can improve the quality of an immigrant’s job.

**Strategies to Reduce Low Income**

While many people experience both, there is a difference between working precariously and living in poverty. So far, we have looked at strategies that individuals use to decrease the precariousness of their work. Here, we focus on strategies that people use to try to get themselves out of poverty. We examine the relationship between strategies and whether a respondent’s household income fell above or below the **Low Income Measure (LIM)**. The LIM is defined as half the median family income, adjusted for the family size. Table 2 (in the Appendix) provides the results of the regression model.

According to our research, people engage in a wide variety of strategies to reduce poverty and increase income. However, most of the strategies which people use to get jobs and improve work conditions do not reduce poverty. Our findings echo those of other researchers.

Our work shows that families with children (aged 12 and under) are more likely to be poor. In terms of strategies, attending a resume clinic makes a difference. However, we were surprised to find that those who took the clinic were more likely to be poor, not less. Again, the causal link is not clear. It may be that those who are poor are steered toward taking the clinic, rather than that taking the clinic leads to poverty. Further research, with a larger sample, can clarify these processes.

One of our important findings is that the precariousness of a person’s early work and the change in the quality of his or her work over time (measured by a change in IPW) both matter. People whose early jobs were precarious are more likely to live in poverty. People whose jobs grow less precarious are more likely to rise above the LIM.

We also found that ‘intensifying’ one’s work does make a difference. Not surprisingly, we found that the more hours a person worked, the lower the probability that he or she would be poor. We also found that job tenure was significant. People who had been in a current job longer were less likely to fall below the LIM.

But sometimes a strategy may improve one aspect of well being at the cost of another. For example, staying in a job may reduce poverty, but it may also reduce one’s ability to find

---

**Box Three**

**Strategies for reducing poverty**

What strategies work to get above the poverty line (LIM)?
- Working more hours
- Longer job tenure in one’s current job
- People whose work became less precarious between their early and current jobs

Who is more likely to experience poverty?
- Households with children 12 and under
- Newcomers who attend resume clinics
- Those with precarious jobs in their first year of work in Canada

What strategies and characteristics do not get people out of poverty?
- Years of schooling in home country
- Continuing education in Canada
- On the job training
- Taking ESL or Business English classes
- Shift to permanent immigration status
- Longer time in Canada
- Sending remittances back home
another, better job. Job tenure did not have an impact on reducing the IPW over time, although it was associated with being above poverty. Working more hours can raise income, but it can also have a negative impact on health and other aspects of wellbeing. More importantly, strategies that aim to improve work may or may not help people to get out of poverty. And those strategies that aim to help people to get out of poverty may not improve the quality of their jobs.

In conclusion, human capital strategies do not help immigrants to make more money and move out of poverty. We found that education and training strategies did not have an impact on whether a newcomer was above or below the LIM. Networking and institutional connectedness strategies did not play much of a role either. For the most part, we found that strategies to reduce poverty were not effective.

Implications of this Research

We found that two education and training strategies help to reduce precarious work for immigrants. These are (1) continuing education and/or courses for certification and (2) on the job training. In this section, we offer some suggestions based on these findings.

First, the pursuit of continuing education and/or courses for certification is an “individual strategy”. In other words, it costs money to access courses. As a result, only those with personal resources can better take advantage of these opportunities. Because this strategy can reduce precarious work, we suggest that new measures are needed to support individuals to pursue continuing education. The measures could take the form of bursaries and other kinds of support for newcomers. Given the research results profiled in Brief Two, which show the impact of early work on future experiences, it is crucial to focus on continuing education in the early years after an immigrant’s arrival in Canada.

Second, on the job training had a positive impact on those who responded to our survey. In light of this finding, we suggest that all employers be encouraged to offer on the job training and apprenticeships, and that such training models be expanded as well. More research on this topic is necessary to figure out which types of training are the most effective. Employers should also be encouraged to change their hiring practices so as to reduce many of the barriers experienced by newcomers.

The role of government-funded programs for newcomers in helping newcomers move into less precarious work deserves more attention. We suggest that federal and provincial governments evaluate and strengthen educational and training-related initiatives. (The move toward more occupation-specific language training and bridging programs may help to make government initiatives more effective. But these were not yet in place at the time of our survey in 2005.) We support recent initiatives by the three levels of government to integrate job training with other settlement services.

Settlement policies need to acknowledge the limitations of a labour market dominated by precarious jobs. In light of ongoing fluctuations in our economy and labour markets, devoting more resources to lifelong learning initiatives would benefit immigrants, employers, and the

In their own words

Friends hooked me up with jobs and I didn’t really go in search of them. And I took whatever I got, because I didn’t have any other options really. I didn’t know about these other places out there, help centers or whatever you call it.

I go to night school. I try to move out of this cleaning factory situation. So I work during the day and then evening I go to night school to do accounting.
population as a whole. To support lifelong learning and capacity building, policy makers in several related areas, including employment and economic policy, can work with other stakeholders to develop effective interventions to improve on the job training and support continuing education and credential recognition for broader skill levels and occupations. Job readiness programs should be redefined to take into account these broader issues. Settlement strategies should shift to a model of broader capacity building and community development, where job readiness includes knowledge about worker rights, information about employment standards, and other elements of capacity building for informed civic engagement as well as work.

Finally, poverty reduction advocacy initiatives need continued support and analysis. These initiatives need to consider the specific challenges faced by newcomers, who do not necessarily qualify for available social services. Effective and coordinated policies and programs from several arenas, including those working on immigrant settlement and employment, poverty reduction, worker’s rights, and occupational health can open opportunities for newcomers so that they may enjoy greater well-being, income security and decent jobs. This kind of coordination can ensure that income security will not have to come at the expense of better jobs or improved wellbeing, and that everyone can make a living from decent work.

Resources

Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives
http://www.policyalternatives.ca/

Canadian Council on Social Development
http://www.ccsd.ca/home.htm

Community Legal Education Ontario
http://www.cleo.on.ca/

www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75f0002m/75f0002m2004011-eng.pdf

Good Jobs for All Coalition
http://www.goodjobsforall.ca/

Labour Education Centre
http://www.laboureducation.org/

Appendix

Variable Definitions Regression Tables

Dependent Variables:

Change from early work IPW to current work IPW (average): Calculates the difference between a person’s early work IPW and their current work IPW average using standardized IPW measures with a range of zero to one. The measure of current work IPW is an average IPW score for up to three jobs held by the respondent at the time of the interview.

The Low Income Measure (LIM): The LIM is a poverty threshold measure. It is defined as half the median family income, with income adjusted for family size. The LIM is the most frequently used measure internationally, particularly when making comparisons between countries. The LIM dummy variable has two categories ordered as: (1) above the LIM, which means the respondent lives above the poverty threshold; and, (2) below the LIM, which means the respondent lives in poverty. Below the LIM is the higher ordered category.
**Independent Variables:**

**Individual and Human Capital**

**Sex:** Man (1), Woman (2)

**Age:** Age of respondent for the year of the interview, 2005

**Region of origin:** (1) Latin America, includes Dominican Republic and Cuba, but not Brazil, (2) English-speaking Caribbean

**Years of education in home country:** A continuous count of total number of years of education in country of origin

**English competence rating:** A scale constructed based on self reported competence with writing business letter, filling out government forms and/or a job application, and making a verbal complaint or request

**Household**

**Total household size:** Sum of all family members residing in the household at the time of the interview

**Presence of children 12 and under:** A dummy variable that identifies whether any children under the age of 12 reside in the household

**Total remittances sent in last 12 months:** A sum of all remittances sent for the year before the interview date

**Sent remittances in last twelve months:** A dummy variable that identifies whether the respondent had sent any remittances, of any amount, to anyone in the last twelve months

**Contextual and Policy Factors**

**Years in Canada:** Number of years living in Canada since immigration. Does not include pre-settlement visits

**Immigration status at entry:** Three category variable includes: 1) Permanent resident; 2) Work authorization (e.g. refugee claimant, temporary worker visa, live-in-caregiver, international student); 3) No work authorization

**Education and Training Strategies**

**Individual**

**Total years of education in Canada:** A continuous count of total number of years of education since immigrating

**Continuing education and/or courses for certification:** A composite dummy variable based on a yes response to either of the following questions: 1) Have you completed any certificate courses and/or continuing education courses outside of work? or 2) have you tried to have your degree or professional credentials recognized in Canada?

**Government**

**English as a second language and/or Business English:** A composite dummy variable based on a yes response to either of the following questions: 1) Have you ever done a course in Business English? Or 2) have you ever taken ESL or ESD (i.e. Canadian English) courses?

**Resume clinic:** A dummy variable based on the question: Have you attended a resume clinic or other workshops at community centres, HRSDC?

**Employer**

**On the job training:** A dummy variable based on the question: Have you received any on the job training with this employer?

**Networking and Institutional Connectedness**

**Volunteer work in last 12 months:** A dummy variable where yes (1) means respondent had undertaken volunteer work on a regular basis in the twelve months preceding the interview and no (0) that the respondent has not done volunteer work.
**Bridging Ties, Networking beyond your immediate social circle:** A count variable constructed based on the sum of counts (0-1) on four indicators of social relations beyond respondents immediate circle including: 1) does not work predominantly with co-nationals and/or co-ethnics; 2) is on a first-name basis with at least one neighbor; 3) has friends of different nationalities; 4) knows and trusts a social worker or counselor at a community organization.

**Networking to change jobs:** Open question so that the strategy “networking to change jobs” is only captured if identified it as one of the strategies they used to improve work.

**Ever go into business for your self:** In a section of the survey an open discussion about strategies to change work the respondent is asked: *Did you ever go into business for yourself?*

**Work with co-nationals and/or co-ethnics:** A dummy yes-no variable that whether the respondent works mainly with co-ethnics and/or co-nationals. The survey question is: *In the course of your work, would you say you mainly deal with other people from the Caribbean / Latin America?*

**Labour Market Incorporation**

**Unemployment rate for year of arrival:** Refers to the number of unemployed persons expressed as a percentage of the active labour force. The unemployment rate was calculated for the year of the survey (2005) for the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA). For more information see Statistics Canada, *Historical labour Force Review, 2002,* Catalogue no. 71F0004XCB.

**Total number of regular and occasional jobs:** Survey captures up to three regular jobs and the total number of occasional jobs in last twelve months.

**Job Tenure for primary occupation:** The period of time (in weeks) that the respondent has been working / an employee at their current primary job.

**Total number of hours worked per week:** A sum of hours worked per week at all regular jobs, including up to three jobs.

**Occupation:** Five occupational categories collapsed from NOCS coding.

**Early work IPW:** Early work is defined as the respondents first year of work in Canada. The early work Index of Precarious Work (IPW) is standardized and ranges from zero to one, where zero means an absence of indicators of precarious work and one is the presence of all indicators of precarious work. The IPW for early work has six indicators including: Not unionized, no contract (verbal, short-term), terms of employment (day labour, home-based, seasonal, temp agency, unpaid family worker, part-timer, short-term contract, self-employed), predictability of schedule (can never plan schedule in advance), basis of pay (piece-work, for the job or contract), paid in cash.

**Change from early work IPW to current work IPW (average):** see above.
The dependent variable is the continuous variable Change in IPW from early to current work (see variable definitions for details). The ordinary least squares regression (OLS) tests the probability that a respondent’s work conditions will become more or less precarious over time. OLS regression measures the strength of the relationship between a predictor variable (e.g. gender, education, etc.) on the outcome variable (i.e. Change in IPW) while controlling for other predictor variables. Categorical and continuous variables are interpreted in different ways but in general a positive sign (+) refers to an improvement in IPW, that is a change towards less precarious work and a negative sign (-) refers to not seeing an improvement in precarity from early to current work. Statistically significant categorical predictors allow for a comparison within the categories of that variable. For example, sex (1=men, 2=women) is statistically significant and the sign (-) negative which means that women do worse than men. Women are less likely to experience an improvement from early to current work IPW. Likewise, Latin Americans are less likely to see an improvement in IPW than Caribbean respondents. Statistically significant continuous predictors (i.e. counts, scales) are interpreted as having a positive or negative impact on change in IPW. For example, for each increase in the English competence rating scale there is a measure of improvement in the IPW from early to current work. If a variable is not significant, it means it has no statistically significant impact on the outcome variable (and the cell is empty).
Table 1. OLS Regression for Change in IPW from Early Work to Current Work Average IPW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Factors</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual and human capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex – reference category is men</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin – reference category is Caribbean</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education in home country</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English competence rating</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total household size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of children 12 and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total remittances sent in last 12 months (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual and Policy Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• From precarious to stable compared to remained stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remained precarious compared to remained stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Training Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years of education in Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education and/or courses for certification</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a second language and/or Business English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job training</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networking and Institutional Connectedness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging Ties: Networking beyond your immediate social circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking to change jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever go into business for your self</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works with co-nationals or co-ethnics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour market incorporation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate for year of arrival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clerical compared to managerial / professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elementary sales &amp; services compared to managerial / professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction &amp; trades compared to managerial / professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Processing &amp; manufacturing compared to managerial / professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 278  
Adjusted R-square = .1649  
✓✓ significance: p ≤ .01 level (highly significant)  
✓ significance: p ≤ .05 level (significant)
Table 2. Logistic Regression for Low Income Measure (LIM)

The dependent variable is the Low Income Measure (LIM) (See variable definitions for details). It has two categories: (1) below the LIM or not in poverty; and, (2) above the LIM or in poverty. Logistic regression estimates the probability that an event will or will not occur based on a given set of independent variables. In this case the logistic regression model estimates the probability that the respondent household falls above or below the LIM. Statistically significant categorical predictors are interpreted in relation to the reference category for each predictor variable where the reference category is the lower ordered category (e.g. 1 = male, 2 = female, the lower ordered category is male). If a categorical predictor is statistically significant and the sign is positive (+) it means that a respondent with this characteristic (e.g. having children under twelve in the household) has a statistically significant likelihood of falling into the "below the LIM" category (i.e. lives in poverty). If the sign is negative (-) then it is the absence of the predictor that will result in a greater likelihood of falling below the LIM because "below the LIM" is the higher ordered category of the dependent variable. Statistically significant continuous predictors (i.e. counts, scales) are interpreted as increasing or decreasing the probability of falling above or below the LIM. If the sign of the predictor is positive (+) the variable increases the likelihood of falling "below the LIM". If it is negative it decreases the likelihood of falling "below the LIM" (e.g. more work hours per week, longer job tenure, and a drop in IPW from early to current work). If a variable is not significant, it means it has not statistically significant effect on the outcome variable.
Table 2. Logistic Regression for Low Income Measure (LIM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Factors</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual and human capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex – reference category is male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin – reference category is Latin American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education in home country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English competence rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total household size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of children 12 and under</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent remittances to family in country of origin in last 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual and Policy Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From precarious to stable compared to remained stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained precarious compared to remained stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Training Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years of education in Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education and/or courses for certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a second language and/or Business English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume clinic</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour market incorporation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate for year of arrival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of regular and occasional jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of work hours per week</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure for primary occupation</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early work IPW</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from early work IPW to average IPW for current work</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 264
Max re-scaled R-square = .3799
√√ significance p ≤ .01 level (highly significant)
√ significance p ≤ .05 level (significant)
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