

3. Immigration Choices and Satisfaction with Life in Australia

In this section we explore the reasons for migration to Australia, whose decision it was to emigrate, the levels of satisfaction with life in Australia, the main likes and dislikes of migrants about Australia and their intentions to leave. In addition, the LSIA surveys provide scope to look at aspects of economic, social and political conditions that migrants were exposed to in their former country of residence to obtain a picture of possible 'push' factors that resulted in them migrating to Australia. Migrants were asked specific questions about aspects of life in their former country, such as housing, education, jobs, religious and ethnic tolerance etc., and also more general questions about things that they disliked. Of particular interest, their commitment to Australia is assessed through their intentions to apply for citizenship, their reasons for doing so and also for not applying, their response to encouraging others to emigrate from their former country, and their intentions to travel overseas or possibly leave permanently. One of the main objectives is to explore how the responses to these questions vary between the two cohorts of the survey and to establish if the significant differences between migrants according to the type of visa requirements by which they gained entry influence the responses.

3.1 Decision to Migrate to Australia

At the outset it is interesting to see whether the decision to migrate to Australia was significantly different for the two cohorts of respondents and if variations by visa category remained the same. Table 3.1 shows a notable shift to joint decision-making in respect to Primary Applicants and Spouse, increasing from 31 per cent of respondents in Cohort 1 to 47 per cent in Cohort 2. Conversely, the claim of the Primary Applicant that it was his/her idea to immigrate declined from 39 per cent in Cohort 1 to 27 per cent in Cohort 2. Part of this difference could be accounted for by the fact that more Primary Applicants migrated with their spouse in Cohort 2 than in Cohort 1 (47 % compared with 42%).

The pattern among the respective visa categories (also shown in Table 3.1) reflects the overall shift, most notable for the Preferential family/family stream and the Business skills/ENS categories. Independent Primary Applicants remained the most likely to instigate migration

Table 3.1: Person whose Idea it was to Emigrate to Australia, Cohorts1 and 2, by Visa Category (per cent)

	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/ employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Primary Applicant ¹	1	47	62	26	54	53	39
	2	38	50	13	35	33	27
Spouse/partner	1	8	7	30	7	5	20
	2	8	6	25	9	10	17
PA and spouse	1	32	25	35	30	19	31
	2	36	38	55	50	33	47
Other relative	1	12	3	8	+	19	9
	2	17	3	6	+	18	7
Other	1	+	4	1	8	4	2
	2	+	3	1	4	7	2
(Significance) ²		(n.v.)	(***)	(***)	(n.v.)	(***)	(***)

Notes: (1) In Cohort 1, this category includes the response 'you and someone else'.

(2) Pearson Chi-square test, n.s. = not significant, n.v. = not valid, *** = probability < 0.001, + = number of observations very small (n<5).

on an individual basis, although the percentage dropped from 62 per cent of respondents in Cohort 1 to 50 per cent in Cohort 2. It was interesting that half (50%) of the Business skills/ENS migrants in Cohort 2 stated it was a joint decision compared with only 31 per cent in Cohort 1. However, it should be borne in mind that the way in which the question was asked in Cohort 1 was slightly different to that for Cohort 2 as the Primary Applicant was requested to reply 'for you and someone else', therefore it is not strictly comparable.

3.1.1 Reasons for migrating to Australia

The reasons given for migrating to Australia are shown in Table 3.2. Primary Applicants in both cohorts were asked to respond to a list of specified reasons and could indicate more than one reason. It is clear that a higher proportion of respondents in Cohort 2 indicated that Australia represented a better future for the family or favoured other aspects such as lifestyle or climate (over 50% of Primary Applicants gave those reasons). The response 'to join family or friends in Australia' was the next most popular, however the percentage fell from 46 per cent in Cohort 1 to 41 per cent in Cohort 2. This fall may simply reflect the lower percentage of people migrating under the family stream in Cohort 2. 'Better employment opportunities' was not a major motivation in either cohort, being a reason given by some 22 per cent in Cohort 1 and 27 per cent in Cohort 2. Overall, negative aspects of life in the former home country in respect to the social, political and economic conditions, as well as employment, were not signaled as important reasons for migrating. In addition, very few respondents in both cohorts claimed that they migrated to undertake study: arrival to study is clearly much more aligned with long-term temporary migration than with permanent settlement. It is quite apparent that the attraction of Australia and its opportunities, natural attributes and lifestyle, together with family who had already migrated, were the predominant reasons for migration, with the so-called 'push' factors much less important. The overall pattern is similar for both cohorts, though there are significant differences in the precise reasons. Cohort 2 migrants were more likely to nominate the positive attractions of employment, lifestyle and better prospects for family, and less likely to nominate joining family, getting married or escaping hostilities.

Table 3.2: Reasons given by Primary Applicants for Migrating to Australia, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent)

Reasons for migrating to Australia ¹	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Significance ²
Better employment opportunities	22	27	(***)
To join family/relatives in Australia	46	41	(***)
To get married	19	15	(***)
To undertake studies	8	9	(n.s.)
Better future for family in Australia	42	52	(***)
Other aspects, e.g. lifestyle, climate	36	50	(***)
Lack of employment in former country	6	7	(n.s.)
Dislike of economic conditions in former country	13	17	(***)
Dislike of social conditions in former country	14	16	(*)
Escape war or political situation	16	12	(***)
Other	4	8	(***)

Notes: (1) More than one reason could be given.

(2) Pearson Chi-square test, n.s. = not significant, * = probability < 0.05, *** = probability < 0.001.

Table 3.3 shows that there were significant variations between Primary Applicants according to visa category, for both cohorts. The political conditions in the former home country were of prime concern to those in the Humanitarian stream, with the response to ‘better future for the family’ also given high priority, increasing from 46 per cent of Primary Applicants in Cohort 1 to 68 per cent in Cohort 2. Not surprisingly, the majority of Primary Applicants in the Preferential family/family stream category stated that the reason for migrating was to join family in Australia, some 59 per cent for both cohorts. Independent migrants consistently said they were motivated by ‘better employment opportunities’ (38%), but also indicated that a ‘better future for the family’ and other aspects such as lifestyle were important for Cohort 2. This was also the case for the Business skills/ENS, however there was a reduced proportion of them nominating ‘better employment opportunities’ in Cohort 2, a low 21 per cent compared to a relatively high 41 per cent in Cohort 1.

The reasons for migrating were significantly different between male and female Primary Applicants, with females much more likely to give family reasons and males more inclined to state employment or better opportunities. Of interest here, is the similarity between cohorts, which is important in comparing the responses for Primary Applicants.

Table 3.3: Reasons given by Primary Applicant for Immigrating to Australia, Cohorts 1 and Cohort 2, by Visa Category (per cent)¹

	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/ employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Better employment opportunities	1	36	39	15	41	20	22
	2	43	38	19	21	25	27
Join family/relatives in Australia	1	56	10	59	9	38	46
	2	44	9	59	9	37	41
To get married	1	1	3	31	+	+	19
	2	+	1	27	+	+	15
To undertake studies	1	10	12	7	4	9	8
	2	10	16	6	5	12	9
Better future for family in Australia	1	69	56	31	53	48	42
	2	69	61	40	73	68	52
Other aspects, eg. lifestyle climate	1	53	66	25	61	29	36
	2	58	71	39	72	34	50
Lack of employment in former country	1	9	7	5	4	8	6
	2	7	7	6	+	20	7
Dislike of economic conditions in former country	1	24	25	7	10	18	13
	2	24	25	11	14	27	17
Dislike of social conditions in former country	1	20	23	8	20	24	14
	2	22	20	9	30	29	16
Escape war or political situation	1	14	12	6	8	67	16
	2	11	8	7	11	67	12
Other	1	3	7	3	12	5	4
	2	5	10	8	10	7	8

Notes: (1) More than one reason could be given

(2) + = number of observations very small (n<5).

3.1.2 *Opinions Regarding Former Country of Residence*

The migrant opinions regarding their former country of residence (Table 3.4) reflect the responses to the question on the specified reasons for immigration discussed above. Overall, only a small percentage was dissatisfied with life in their former home country. Indeed two-thirds of respondents in Cohort 2 were satisfied with their former life, which represented a small increase on Cohort 1. Some 18 per cent were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Migrants in the Humanitarian stream were the only ones to show any significant levels of dissatisfaction with life in their country of origin, while those in the business stream were the least likely to be dissatisfied. These patterns were consistent for Cohorts 1 and 2. It is clear from this information that most migrants come to Australia as an active choice rather than because their circumstances at home are bleak. It is encouraging for Australia that people who feel that they have satisfactory options nonetheless choose to migrate here.

A series of specific questions were asked of migrants about their circumstances and perceptions of living in their former country of residence to establish whether there were factors that are more likely to give rise to migration. These were more specific than their expressed reasons for immigration discussed above.

When asked specifically about educational opportunities in the former country of residence, Table 3.4 shows that the majority thought that they were generally good with over one-quarter indicating that they were excellent. Only one-fifth of respondents in Cohort 2 responded negatively, which was slightly less than those in Cohort 1. Migrants in the Humanitarian stream were the most likely to consider educational opportunities to be poor, with those in the Independent and Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked streams the least likely to do so. One significant change between the two cohorts relates to the Business skills/ENS stream, with a smaller proportion in Cohort 2 indicating excellent educational opportunities and a higher representation expressing concern about poor educational opportunities.

Table 3.4: Migrant Satisfaction with Life and Opinions regarding education and crime in their Former Country of Residence by Visa Category, Cohorts 1 and 2, (per cent)

Opinions regarding former country of residence	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
<i>Satisfaction with life</i>							
Very satisfied	1	15	13	28	25	14	21
	2	18	19	30	15	12	23
Satisfied	1	45	48	42	49	18	40
	2	52	47	45	46	19	44
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	25	23	18	15	14	19
	2	21	19	16	25	15	18
Dissatisfied	1	13	13	10	10	28	14
	2	7	12	7	13	28	11
Very dissatisfied	1	2	3		+	27	7
	2	2	3	2	+	26	5
(Significance)		(**)	(***)	(***)	(n.v.)	(n.s.)	(***)
<i>Educational opportunities</i>							
Excellent	1	27	31	24	37	19	26
	2	29	33	29	22	20	29
Good	1	58	53	54	47	43	52
	2	55	53	50	53	40	51
Poor	1	15	16	22	16	38	23
	2	16	14	21	26	40	20
(Significance)		(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(***)	(***)	(n.s.)	(***)
<i>Crime</i>							
A lot	1	50	49	46	44	55	48
	2	45	40	40	51	53	43
Not a lot but more than a little	1	24	28	26	30	14	24
	2	32	32	30	29	18	30
Little	1	26	24	28	26	31	27
	2	23	28	30	20	29	28
(Significance) ¹		(**)	(***)	(***)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(***)

Note: (1) Pearson Chi-square test, n.s. = not significant, ** = probability < 0.01, *** = probability < 0.001.

Migrants were also queried about crime in the former country of residence. It is clear that the reported high incidence tended to be a concern for both cohorts, although slightly less so for Cohort 2. Migrants in the Independent category in Cohort 2 were found to differ the most with a lower percentage in Cohort 2 reporting concern about a high incidence of crime, 40 per cent compared with 49 per cent in Cohort 1. By contrast, Business skills/ENS migrants were the only group to report an increased concern about the incidence of crime in Cohort 2 (51%) compared to their counterparts in Cohort 1 (44%).

When asked about religious tolerance in their former country (Table 3.5), a high percentage in both cohorts reported that it was considerable, 45 per cent in Cohort 1 and 46 per cent in Cohort 2. The Humanitarian stream, however, was much more likely to feel that there was basically little tolerance of different religions, which was consistent for both cohorts.

Migrants were asked about contact between people from different countries and cultures in their former country of residence. Their responses were reasonably evenly divided between a 'lot' and a 'little', reflecting the very diverse countries of birth of the migrants. The Business skills/ENS stream indicated the most perceived contact between different countries in line with their wide networks and experience, and the Humanitarian stream the least.

When migrants were asked about tolerance in respect to other races and cultures in their former country of residence (Table 3.5), a high percentage reported that this was considerable. However, migrants in the Humanitarian stream were much more likely to indicate low tolerance and also high tolerance, with a lower representation in the middle. This reflects the wide diversity in birthplace countries from which the migrants seeking settlement in Australia come. Generally, Cohort 2 was more likely to report 'some' tolerance with a drop in the percentage responding that there was little tolerance.

In response to the question posed to migrants about whether hard work in the former country was adequately rewarded in monetary terms, we find that generally such toil was seen as moderately or poorly rewarded. However, there was a consistent percentage that indicated work was well rewarded (24%) for both cohorts. Migrants in the Business skills/ENS stream were the most likely to respond that there were appropriate rewards, with the Humanitarian stream the least.

Table 3.5: Migrant Opinions regarding Religious Tolerance and Different Races and Cultures in Former Country of Residence by Visa Category, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent)

Opinions regarding former country of residence	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/ employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
<i>People display a lot of tolerance towards people of other religions</i>							
A lot	1	46	45	45	51	42	45
	2	53	44	48	43	41	46
Some	1	35	36	33	36	21	32
	2	35	38	35	36	26	35
A little	1	20	20	22	13	38	23
	2	12	18	17	21	33	18
(Significance)		(**)	(n.s.)	(***)	(*)	(n.s.)	(***)
<i>People display tolerance towards people of other races, culture, countries</i>							
A lot	1	39	39	40	36	41	39
	2	42	36	42	38	40	40
Some	1	40	40	35	41	27	36
	2	45	47	40	42	27	42
A little	1	21	21	25	23	32	25
	2	13	17	18	21	34	19
(Significance)		(**)	(**)	(***)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(***)
<i>Contact between people from different countries & cultures</i>							
A lot	1	34	32	39	41	29	36
	2	38	37	40	42	35	39
Some	1	33	34	29	34	24	30
	2	42	33	30	38	22	32
A little	1	33	35	32	25	47	35
	2	20	29	30	20	43	49
(Significance) ¹		(***)	(**)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(***)

Note: (1) Pearson Chi-square test, n.s. = not significant, ** = probability < 0.01, *** = probability < 0.001.

This showed little change between the two cohorts, however the Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked and Independent streams in Cohort 2 were more likely to report moderate rewards than was the case in Cohort 1.

Migrants were asked to comment on their standard of living in the 12 months before they left their former country of residence to establish the extent to which they were able to meet basic needs. Table 3.6 shows that some 44 per cent of migrants in Cohort 2 compared to 38 per cent in Cohort 1 indicated that they were more than able to meet all basic needs. The difference was most evident for migrants in the Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked category, where some 42 per cent in Cohort 1 compared to 51 per cent in Cohort 2 claimed that they were more than able to meet needs. By contrast, migrants in the Humanitarian stream showed an increase from 52 per cent in Cohort 1 to a high 62 per cent in Cohort 2 in the proportion claiming that they were *unable* to meet all basic needs in their former country of residence. The significantly higher proportion of Cohort 2 migrants who responded that they were more than able to meet their material needs in their country of origin reinforces earlier information that suggests pull factors of lifestyle and opportunity were of greater importance for Cohort 2.

In responding to the question about the ability of people in the former country of residence to influence government decisions (Table 3.6), the majority claimed that they had little or no influence. This opinion changed only very slightly between the two cohorts, declining from 62 per cent in Cohort 1 to 58 per cent in Cohort 2. It was not surprising to find the Humanitarian stream the most likely to report that there was little hope to influence government, 87 per cent in Cohort 1 and 85 per cent in Cohort 2. It appears that in general migrants were not exposed to political systems in which they felt they could play a part in influencing government: this was especially evident among the Asian-born migrants. Another question attempting to assess feelings about employment in the 12 months before migrants left their former country of residence, clearly shows that only a small percentage actually disliked their jobs with no significant differences between cohorts. Two thirds of Cohort 2 respondents really liked the job they held in their former country of residence. Business migrants liked their former job best and Independent migrants were the least enthusiastic. This supports the response reported earlier that employment was not a dominant reason for migrating to Australia.

Table 3.6: Migrant Opinions regarding Ability to Influence Government, their Standard of Living and Employment in the 12 months before leaving the Former Country of Residence by Visa Category, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent)

Opinions regarding former country of residence	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/ employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
<i>People able to influence government decisions</i>							
To a great extent	1	10	11	12	15	2	10
	2	11	12	13	13	6	12
A moderate extent	1	35	30	31	34	11	28
	2	36	35	29	27	10	30
A little	1	55	59	57	51	87	62
	2	53	53	58	60	85	58
(Significance)		(n.s.)	(**)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(**)	(***)
<i>Standard of living in 12 months before leaving</i>							
More than able to meet all basic needs	1	42	50	39	74	11	38
	2	51	54	38	70	8	44
Able to meet all basic Needs	1	47	43	48	25	38	44
	2	45	41	50	29	31	43
Less than able to meet all basic needs	1	10	17	13	+	52	18
	2	4	6	13	+	62	13
(Significance)		(***)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(n.v.)	(**)	(***)
<i>Employment in last 12 months before leaving</i>							
Loved it, best job ever had	1	27	17	26	30	34	25
	2	23	19	25	36	25	24
Liked it, really good job	1	43	48	46	47	31	44
	2	44	45	46	44	30	44
The job was OK	1	26	30	23	20	23	25
	2	24	30	22	20	22	25
Didn't really care	1	3	3	3	+	7	3
	2	3	4	5	+	9	4
Disliked job	1	1	2	2	+	6	3
	2	1	2	2	+	13	2
(Significance) ¹		(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(n.v.)	(*)	(n.s.)

Note: (1) Pearson Chi-square test, n.s. = not significant, * = probability < 0.05, ** = probability < 0.01, *** = probability < 0.001.

Indeed the high level of satisfaction with the job done prior to immigration is perhaps surprising. A quarter of migrants say that they loved the job they held prior to migration and a further 44 per cent say they really liked their prior job. The group that was least enthusiastic about their prior job was the Independent migrants.

3.1.3 Housing of Migrant Households in Former Country of Residence

In relation to the housing conditions of Primary Applicants in the former country of residence, Table 3.7 (a) shows that the most common form of housing was a separate house, some 43 per cent of Cohort 1 and 39 per cent of Cohort 2. However, a surprisingly high percentage of respondents (24% of Cohort 1 and 28% of Cohort 2) lived in flats in blocks of three or more storeys, a situation quite different to Australia. There were some notable differences between the visa categories in respect to high-rise living, and also significant cohort differences. Independent migrants were most likely to live in flats in blocks of three or more storeys, 35 per cent in Cohort 1 compared with 31 per cent in Cohort 2, with Business skills/ENS migrants showing a significant decline from 29 per cent in Cohort 1 to a low 18 per cent in Cohort 2. This no doubt reflects the changes in the birthplace composition of the two cohorts with fewer business migrants emigrating from Hong Kong where high-rise is the most common form of housing.

In relation to housing tenure (Table 3.7 (b)), there was a significantly greater level of home ownership in the former country of residence for Primary Applicants in Cohort 2 (35% compared with 29% in Cohort 1). However, it was interesting that a high percentage of respondents in both cohorts had lived rent-free with family or other relatives in their former countries – 35 per cent in Cohort 1 and 30 per cent in Cohort 2. This no doubt reflects the young age structure of migrants, but it is in part a function of family members migrating as Primary Applicants to join a family member already in Australia (often a spouse). It was particularly predominant for Primary Applicants entering as Preferential family/family stream. The Humanitarian stream showed the biggest difference between cohorts in housing tenure. There was a notable shift away from home ownership and towards renting, between Cohort 1 and Cohort 2. Thirty-four per cent of Primary Applicants in Cohort 2 were renting

Table 3.7a: Housing of Migrant Households in Former Country of Residence, Cohorts 1 and 2 by Visa Category (per cent)¹

Dwelling Type	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Separate house	1	39	31	44	45	53	43
	2	37	37	38	61	43	39
Semi-detached house	1	23	20	19	18	12	19
	2	28	19	16	14	12	18
1 or 2 storey flat	1	8	10	11	5	8	10
	2	10	8	13	5	11	11
3 or more storey flat	1	27	35	22	29	19	24
	2	23	31	30	18	15	28
Other	1	3	3	4	4	8	4
	2	2	5	3	3	19	5
(Significance) ²		(n.s.)	(*)	(***)	(*)	(***)	(**)

Note: (1) These are responses given by the Primary Applicants only

(2) Pearson Chi-square test, n.s. = not significant, * = probability < 0.05, ** = probability < 0.01, *** = probability < 0.001.

Table 3.7b: Housing of Migrant Households in Former Country of Residence, Cohorts 1 and 2 by Visa Category (per cent)¹

Housing arrangements	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/ employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Own or paying off	1	42	27	25	62	35	29
	2	43	34	30	82	25	35
Renting privately	1	17	23	18	19	11	18
	2	23	22	20	8	34	21
Rent from government	1	7	7	8	3	11	8
	2	2	5	4	+	5	4
Rent free family/other	1	24	29	40	10	35	35
	2	24	27	37	6	20	30
Other	1	10	14	8	6	8	9
	2	8	12	10	4	16	10

(Significance) ²	(*)	(*)	(***)	(n.v.)	(***)	(***)
-----------------------------	-----	-----	-------	--------	-------	-------

Note: (1) These are responses given by the Primary Applicants only.

(2) Pearson Chi-square test, n.v. = not valid, * = probability < 0.05, *** = probability < 0.001.

Table 3.7c: Housing of Migrant Households in Former Country of Residence, Cohorts 1 and 2 by Visa Category (per cent)¹

Standard of current housing ¹	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/ employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Good	1	60	62	58	74	40	57
	2	74	67	57	87	32	61
Moderate	1	33	31	32	23	37	32
	2	24	30	37	13	30	32
Poor	1	7	8	9	3	23	11
	2	3	3	6	+	39	7
(Significance) ²		(***)	(***)	(***)	(n.v.)	(***)	(***)

Note: (1) These are responses given by the Primary Applicants only.

(2) Pearson Chi-square test, n.v. = not valid, *** = probability < 0.001.

Table 3.7d: Housing of Migrant Households in Former Country of Residence, Cohorts 1 and 2 by Visa Category (per cent)¹

No. of persons lived in dwelling ²	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/ employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
One	1	4	8	8	7	3	7
	2	5	6	7	4	3	6
Two	1	13	19	19	17	7	17
	2	15	22	23	12	5	20
Three	1	22	21	18	14	10	18
	2	29	25	16	10	14	19
Four	1	28	23	18	27	22	20
	2	25	27	20	23	25	22
Five	1	13	13	13	16	17	13
	2	11	9	14	17	18	13

Six or more	1	20	16	25	20	41	25
	2	15	12	21	33	34	20
(Significance) ³		(n.s.)	(**)	(***)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(***)

Notes: (1) These are responses given by the Primary Applicants only

(2) This may not necessarily be persons in household.

(3) Pearson Chi-square test, n.s. = not significant, * = probability < 0.05, ** = probability < 0.01 *** = probability < 0.001,

+ = small number of observations (n<5).

privately compared with only 11 per cent of in Cohort 1. There was also a notable decline in rent-free family accommodation for the Humanitarian stream, a fall from 35 per cent in Cohort 1 to 20 per cent in Cohort 2.

The majority of respondents thought that the quality of housing in the former country of residence was good, rising from 57 per cent in Cohort 1 to 61 per cent in Cohort 2 (Table 3.7 (c)). The number of persons who lived in the dwelling of Primary Applicants in the former home country (Table 3.7 (d)), tends to reflect the cohort differences in respect to living arrangements. A significant decline in households of six or more persons is evident in the table, declining from 25 per cent of respondents in Cohort 1 to 20 per cent in Cohort 2. This was matched with an increase in two and three-person households for migrants in Cohort 2. The most substantial change was apparent for Preferential family/family stream migrants. However it should be noted that Business skills/ENS migrants in Cohort 2 were much more likely to have previously resided in households of six or more (33%) than was the case in Cohort 1 where only 16 per cent did so.

3.1.4 Prior Time Spent in Australia Before Migration

Migrants were asked questions about any previous visits to Australia before formally migrating, the length of time spent in the country and the type of visa that was used if visits had been made. Table 3.8 shows that 51 per cent of migrants in Cohort 2 spent time in Australia prior to migration, which was significantly more than the 42 per cent of Cohort 1 who had done so. Of particular note, migrants in the Business skills/ENS stream were very much more likely than others to have spent time in Australia, 82 per cent of Cohort 1 and 87 per cent of Cohort 2. It is probably not coincidence that, for Cohort 2, the two groups with the least family connections in Australia—Independent and Business skills/ENS—were the ones that were most likely to have made a visit prior to emigrating (Humanitarian migrants, having little choice, are an exception). The largest difference between the cohorts was evident for migrants in the Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked and Independent categories, increasing to 55 per cent and 60 per cent respectively. Migrants in the Humanitarian stream had virtually no prior experience of Australia, which was consistent for both cohorts.

Table 3.8: Prior time spent in Australia by Migrants and Type of Visa used by Visa Category, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent)

Prior to formally immigrating	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/ employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Spent time in Australia	1	45	47	48	82	6	42
(Significance)	2	55 (***)	60 (***)	47 (n.s.)	87 (n.s.)	+	51 (***)
<i>Type of visa used when last visited</i>							
Student	1	9	20	9	4	+	11
	2	8	31	6	3	+	15
Tourist/visitor	1	82	55	75	75	83	71
	2	71	27	58	63	+	49
Temporary resident	1	4	17	8	14	+	10
	2	2	17	3	8	+	8
Permanent resident/ Settler	1	4	2	4	+	13	4
	2	2	1	1	2	+	1
Other ¹	1	+	7	4	5	+	5
(Significance)	2	17 (***)	25 (***)	33 (***)	25 (n.v.)	+	27 (***)
<i>Time spent on last visit</i>							
Up to 2 months	1	65	50	45	78	32	50
	2	77	53	60	75	+	63
3 to 11 months	1	17	20	32	9	50	27
	2	20	25	39	20	+	28
A year or longer	1	17	30	23	13	18	23
(Significance) ¹	2	3 (***)	22 (*)	+	4 (***)	+	9 (***)

Notes: (1) 'Other' in Cohort 2 includes 'Working Holiday Maker'. This option was not individually specified in Cohort 1.

(2) Pearson Chi-square test, n.s. = not significant, n.v. = not valid, * = probability < 0.05, *** = probability < 0.001, + = number of observations very small (n<5).

Table 3.8 also shows that there was a very substantial difference between cohorts in respect to the types of visa they had used when last visiting Australia. Most migrants had used a tourist/visitor visa. The table suggest that the high 71 per cent with such a visa in Cohort 1 dropped to 49 per cent in Cohort 2. However, this is an artefact resulting from a different classification in Cohort 2 whereby ‘working holiday makers’ were separately identified and included in ‘other’. Migrants in the Independent category were much more likely to formerly have had a student visa, some 20 per cent of respondents in Cohort 1 and 31 per cent in Cohort 2. They were also much more likely to have previously held a temporary resident visa.

The actual time spent in Australia on the last visit was significantly different between the cohorts, with a short time period of up to two months much more prevalent for the second cohort (63 per cent of respondents compared to 50 per cent in Cohort 1). The Independent migrants were much more likely to spend a longer period of time in Australia but showed the least difference between cohorts in this regard. Migrants in Cohort 2 who entered via the Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked and Preferential family/family stream categories demonstrated a significantly higher use of short-term prior visits than was the case for Cohort 1. A high 78 per cent of Business skills/ENS migrants in Cohort 1 and 75 per cent in Cohort 2 had spent up to two months in Australia with only a very small percentage in Cohort 2 spending a year or more in Australia – significantly fewer than the 13 per cent in Cohort 1 who had done so.

3.2 Life in Australia

Soon after arrival, migrants in both cohorts expressed a high level of satisfaction with life in Australia (Table 3.9). For most visa groups and both cohorts, 90 per cent or more said they were either satisfied or very satisfied. The most satisfied of all were the two very different groups – Humanitarian and Business skills/ENS migrants. By a small margin, the least satisfied were the Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked. It may be that, so soon after arrival, migrants are not generally prepared to conclude that they have made a mistake in coming to Australia. But on the face of it, the efforts of the migrants and of their host country are combining to produce very commendable outcomes for the migrants. This is no doubt greatly assisted by the generally high levels of information about Australia that migrants have before arrival. Much of this information is obtained either from family and friends already

resident here, or by visiting Australia for a short period prior to permanent arrival. It is thus very likely to be credible, relevant and reliable.

Table 3.9: Migrant Opinions regarding Satisfaction with Life and Current Main Job in Australia by Visa Category, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent)

Opinions regarding satisfaction with life in Australia	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
<i>Satisfaction with life</i>							
Very satisfied	1	31	29	41	38	47	38
	2	32	38	41	43	39	39
Satisfied	1	54	57	50	52	46	51
	2	53	53	52	54	54	53
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	13	13	8	8	7	9
	2	13	7	7	3	6	7
Dissatisfied	1	2	1	1	2	1	1
	2	2	2	1	+	1	1
(Significance)		(n.s.)	(***)	(n.s.)	(n.v.)	(n.s.)	(**)
<i>Current main job</i>							
Love it, best job ever had	1	9	8	11	25	5	11
	2	10	13	13	25	14	13
Like it, is a really good job	1	37	38	37	56	28	39
	2	37	42	36	49	24	39
The job is OK	1	45	45	38	17	43	40
	2	42	35	39	25	29	37
Don't really care	1	4	4	7	+	21	6
	2	6	7	8	+	+	7
Dislike job	1	4	5	7	+	+	6
	2	5	3	4	+	-	4
(Significance) ¹		(n.s.)	(***)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(***)

Note: (1) Pearson Chi-square test, n.s. = not significant, n.v. = not valid, * = probability < .05, ** = probability < .01, *** = probability < 0.001, + = number of observations very small (n<5).

There is a very small difference apparent between the cohorts when migrants were asked about how satisfied they were with life in Australia. The majority (51% in Cohort 1 and 53% in Cohort 2) responded that they were satisfied, with over one-third in both cohorts indicating that they were *very* satisfied. There was a significant difference between the cohorts of Independent migrants with 29 per cent of them very satisfied in Cohort 1 increasing to 38 per cent in Cohort 2. However, this was still below the high level of satisfaction expressed in Cohort 2 by Preferential family/family stream entrants (41%) and Business skills/ENS migrants (43%), which had remained relatively consistent over cohorts. It is interesting that the higher levels of employment and income that were achieved by Cohort 2 do not translate directly into reported higher levels of satisfaction.

Migrants were asked about their current main job in Australia and there is a slight increase in the very positive response, with 11 per cent of Cohort 1 expressing that they ‘loved it’ and it was the best that they ever had, rising to 13 per cent in Cohort 2. Some 39 per cent of both cohorts thought that their jobs were really good with a slight decrease in the percentage of migrants reporting that it was ‘okay’. The main significant difference was shown for Independent migrants, with only eight per cent in Cohort 1 indicating that they ‘loved’ their jobs compared to 13 per cent in Cohort 2: the per cent who disliked their job fell commensurately. However, Business skills/ENS migrants remained by far the predominant group expressing strong positive views on their jobs, which is no doubt a function of the type of employment that they are likely to be engaged in. It is interesting to contrast the responses to current jobs in Australia with the migrants’ feelings expressed about the jobs they left in their former country of residence (see Table 3.6). It is clear that they were much less likely to say that their current job was the best job they ever had and more likely to say that it was a good job – which was consistent for both cohorts.

The intentions of migrants to apply for Australian citizenship (Table 3.10) provided further support to the overall levels of satisfaction expressed by respondents with life in Australia, with 80 per cent of migrants in Cohort 1 and 78 per cent in Cohort 2 intending to do so. Almost all the migrants in the Humanitarian stream intended to apply for citizenship with the Business skills/ENS migrants the least likely to do so – only 67 per cent in Cohort 1 dropping to 64 per cent in Cohort 2. They and the Independent migrants were also the most unsure. This probably reflects the fact that these two groups have more choices available to them than many other migrants.

When asked specifically about whether the decision to migrate was the right one, also shown in Table 3.10, both cohorts responded very positively, indeed over 90 per cent said it was. The Independent migrants had the biggest increase in those believing their decision was the right one, increasing from 83 per cent in Cohort 1 to 92 per cent in Cohort 2: however this was still lower than the Business skills/ENS and Humanitarian streams. An additional question relating to whether they would encourage others to migrate to Australia showed that Cohort 2 was more likely to say 'yes' – some 77 per cent compared with 73 per cent for Cohort 1. Moreover, migrants who entered Australia in the Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked category were more likely in Cohort 2 (85%) to encourage others than was the case in Cohort 1 (76%). Similarly, the Independent and Business skills/ENS migrants were more positive in Cohort 2, while Preferential family/family stream entrants remained the least likely to say 'yes', 76 per cent in Cohort 1 and 69 per cent in Cohort 2.

Migrants were asked their main reasons for wanting to become an Australian citizen and Table 3.11 shows that the main reason for both Cohorts was that they wanted to stay in Australia permanently (48% in Cohort 1 and 47% in Cohort 2). There was a large increase in the percentage of respondents who gave the reason that they liked Australia and had a 'better life here', a small eight per cent in Cohort 1 increased to 34 per cent in Cohort 2. Similarly, the statement 'to bring children up here' was more popular amongst Cohort 2 migrants, 27 per cent compared to only nine per cent of respondents in Cohort 1.

Responses such as 'an Australian spouse or other family here' was also more frequently selected in Cohort 2. Job opportunities were not very important for either cohort, though there was an increase from five per cent of respondents in Cohort 1 to 14 per cent in Cohort 2. Commitment and safety issues also increased in popularity between the two cohorts but the relative response remained small.

Table 3.10: Migrant Intentions to Apply for Australian Citizenship, the decision to migrate and willingness to encourage others to emigrate by Visa Category, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent)

Opinions regarding satisfaction with life in Australia	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
<i>Intend applying for Australian citizenship</i>							
Yes	1	85	78	76	67	97	80
	2	87	81	73	64	98	78
No	1	4	3	8	9	0	5
	2	3	6	10	6	+	7
Not sure/don't know	1	12	18	16	24	3	14
	2	11	13	17	31	6	15
(Significance)		(n.s.)	(***)	(**)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(**)
<i>Decision to migrate the right one</i>							
Yes	1	89	88	92	89	95	91
	2	86	92	93	94	97	92
No	1	1	1	1	+	1	1
	2	2	1	1	+	+	1
Not sure/don't know	1	10	11	7	10	4	8
	2	12	7	7	6	3	7
(Significance)		(n.s.)	(***)	(n.s.)	(n.v.)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)
<i>Encourage others to emigrate to Australia</i>							
Yes	1	76	75	67	73	85	73
	2	85	80	69	81	87	77
No	1	9	9	16	7	6	12
	2	6	7	13	7	4	9
Not sure/don't know	1	16	17	16	20	9	15
	2	9	12	19	12	9	14
(Significance) ¹		(***)	(**)	(***)	(*)	(n.s.)	(***)

Note: (1) Pearson Chi-square test, n.s. = not significant, n.v. = not valid, * = probability < 0.05, ** = probability < 0.01, *** = probability < 0.001, + = number of observations very small (n<5).

Table 3.11: Main Reasons given by Migrants for wanting to be an Australian Citizen (per cent of those intending to apply who gave reason)¹

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
To stay here permanently	48	47
I like/love Australia/better life here	8	34
To bring children up here	9	27
Belong to/feel Australian	31	23
Spouse is Australian/family here	6	19
To have all the rights of an Australian	18	18
Feel safer in Australia/more secure	3	15
Job opportunities	5	14
A natural step/commitment to country	7	13
Feel safer on Australian passport	8	8
Easier to travel on return visits to former country	9	8
To be able to vote	10	7

Note: (1) More than one reason could be given.

For the migrants not intending to apply for Australian citizenship, Table 3.12 shows that the overwhelming reason was that they wished to retain the citizenship of their former country, 49 per cent in Cohort 1 increasing to 54 per cent in Cohort 2. Similarly, a desire to retain their current passport received a relatively high response, 20 per cent in Cohort 1 and 32 per cent in Cohort 2. Others thought that citizenship was not really necessary, and only a small percentage had yet to make up their minds whether they would stay permanently in Australia.

When asked specifically about whether they intended to leave Australia permanently, in Cohort 1 it was clear that those migrants in the Independent and Business skills/ENS streams were most likely to indicate that they may emigrate, although the relative percentage was a small six per cent and seven per cent respectively. However, a high percentage of both groups stated that they were unsure – 29 per cent of Independent migrants and 27 per cent of Business skills/ENS migrants.

Unfortunately, in Cohort 2 there was no equivalent question and it was not possible to track settler loss through the respective waves of the survey as only data from the first wave have been made available to-date. However, when asked about overseas trips and intentions to leave, Cohort 2 respondents appeared at the time of first interview to have few intentions to leave, with Business skills/ENS migrants by far the most likely to have already undertaken an overseas trip, and all other groups, with the exception of the Humanitarian group, likely to consider a trip in the next year.

Table 3.12: Main Reasons given by Migrants for Not Wanting to Apply for Australian Citizenship (per cent of those not intending to apply who gave reason)¹

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Want to retain citizenship of former country	49	54
Want to retain my current passport	20	32
Don't think it's really necessary	9	19
Don't know whether will stay permanently in Australia	12	10
Haven't thought much about it/too early to decide	5	12
Could lose financial/other assistance from former country	7	5
Family/friends still overseas	4	10

Note: (1) More than one reason could be given.

3.2.1 Likes and Dislikes Expressed about Australia and Former Country of Residence

When asked very generally about what they liked and disliked about their former country of residence some very clear trends emerge which are roughly the same for both cohorts. This was an open response rather than pre-determined as was the case with respect to reasons for migration and other specified comments about aspects of life in the former country of residence etc. An open response was requested to the question 'What things did you like most about your former home country?' with a similar question about what they disliked the most, which was repeated for their current likes and dislikes in Australia. Respondents could give up to 5 answers in Cohort 1 and up to 7 answers in Cohort 2. Such questions, while much better at elucidating the feelings of immigrants, posed some difficulties in comparing the responses of the two cohorts. Therefore, the wide range of responses that were given had to be aggregated into broad categories that were seen to be representative of comments made by both cohorts of respondents. Table 3.14 shows that over 80 per cent of migrants in both cohorts stated that family and friends were among the things they liked about the former country of residence. Also liked were the culture and the natural environment of home. Education and employment were nominated by a quarter of both cohorts as aspects of their former country that they liked.

Table 3.13: Overseas Visits Considered by Cohort 2 Migrants and Intentions of Cohort 1 Migrants to leave Australia Permanently

	Concessional family/skilled Australian- linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/ employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
<i>Consider leaving Australia Permanently</i>						
Cohort 1						
No	77	65	75	66	80	73
Yes	4	6	4	7	5	5
Not sure/don't know	20	29	21	27	15	22
<i>Consider Overseas Trips</i>						
Cohort 2						
Already made a trip	7	13	6	45	1	11
Consider a trip	27	26	29	28	8	26
Consider leaving	1	0	0	0	0	0
Don't intend to leave	66	60	65	27	91	63

Table 3.14: What Migrants Liked about their Former Country of Residence, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent of people who nominated this response)

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Family/relatives	41	59
Friends/social life	42	22
Culture/food/language etc.	31	40
Climate/country-side	26	30
Education/Employment	26	24
Birthplace/home	24	20
Former country attributes	24	10
Lifestyle	17	24
Other/don't know	7	2
Liked everything	5	2
Liked nothing	4	3

Notes: (1) Responses have been grouped into general categories to establish comparability between Cohorts 1 & 2

(2) Responses have been grouped together for multiple response analysis - up to 5 responses could be given in Cohort 1, and up to 7 responses in Cohort 2 could be given (causing the total percentage of cases to be more than 100 per cent).

What migrants most disliked about the former country of residence (shown in Table 3.15), was predominantly the pollution and overcrowding (34% for Cohort 1 and 39% for Cohort 2) followed by the political system (24% of Cohort 1 and 23% of Cohort 2). Cohort 2 was particularly concerned about crime/vandalism/terrorism—much more so than Cohort 1. Poverty, the economy and a poor standard of living were given a lesser priority, with little difference evident between the two cohorts.

As one would expect, the responses relating to the political system and pollution/overcrowding varied considerably by birthplace region with Asian-born migrants predominantly expressing these dislikes, while the United Kingdom-born very strongly expressed a dislike of climate (46% in Cohort 2 compared to 38% in Cohort 1). This clear pattern of difference by birthplace region was not so evident for migrants in respect to what they liked most about their former country of residence. The fact that they missed family and ‘home’ was widespread despite regional differences although this was more strongly expressed by migrants in Cohort 2.

In considering the responses of migrants to their likes and dislikes about Australia, it is interesting that Table 3.16 clearly shows that the non-material attributes such as being quiet and peaceful, friendly and with a good climate and lifestyle, were the attributes most frequently nominated, especially in the case of Cohort 1. While these attributes are still highly favoured by Cohort 2, they were less enthusiastic about the environment and services and facilities and more favourably disposed to the quiet and peace and the education/employment attributes of Australia. Lifestyle, social aspects and better opportunities are also given higher precedence in Cohort 2, while living costs and political freedom are less subscribed than in the first cohort. It is interesting to note that while 40-50 per cent of migrants said they migrated to Australia because they believed it held a better future for their families (see Table 3.2), only 9-16 per cent nominated better opportunities as one of the things they liked about Australia (soon after arrival).

Table 3.15: What Migrants Disliked about their Former Country of Residence, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent of people who nominated this response)

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Pollution/overcrowded	34	39
Political system	24	23
Poverty, economy	22	19
Lifestyle/social	19	18
Poor standard of living	16	17
Climate	14	17
Crime/vandalism/terrorism	14	25
Poor services, education	11	17
Other	11	10
War	10	6
Nothing	9	7

Notes: (1) Responses have been grouped into general categories to establish comparability between Cohorts 1 & 2
 (2) Responses have been grouped together for multiple response analysis - up to 5 responses could be given in Cohort 1, and up to 9 responses in Cohort 2 could be given (causing the total percentage of cases to be more than 100 per cent).

Table 3.16: What Migrants Liked about Australia, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent of people who nominated this response)

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Country/environment	48	25
Friendly people	36	38
Lifestyle/social	35	48
Services and facilities	32	12
Climate/weather	31	31
Political freedom/no war	28	12
Good living/costs	26	14
Education/employment	24	38
Quiet and peaceful	21	49
Better opportunities	9	16
Family here	5	6
Everything	4	3
Other	4	10

Notes: (1) Responses have been grouped into general categories to establish comparability between Cohorts 1 & 2
 (2) Responses have been grouped together for multiple response analysis - up to 5 responses could be given in Cohort 1, and up to 9 responses in Cohort 2 (causing the total percentage of cases to be more than 100 per cent).

Turning to the dislikes about Australia (Table 3.17) the dominant response was that there were none. This was the view of 37 per cent of Cohort 1 and 29 per cent of Cohort 2. Of the specific dislikes that were nominated, services and facilities, climate, crime and lack of discipline and employment difficulties were the most frequently cited. In each case, though, only 10 to 14 per cent of either cohort disliked these things. Overall, the differences between the cohorts were minor. It is interesting to note that only 3 per cent of migrants said that they disliked racism in Australia and only 3 per cent thought Australians were unfriendly.

**Table 3.17: What Migrants Disliked about Australia, Cohorts 1 and 2
(per cent of people who nominated this response)**

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Nothing	37	29
Climate	14	11
Services and facilities	13	13
Other	11	17
Employment difficulties	11	9
Crime, lack of discipline	8	11
Economy, expensive	7	10
Geographic isolation	6	5
Lifestyle, social	5	10
Language barrier	5	5
People racist	4	3
Politics, government	4	3
People unfriendly	3	2

Notes: (1) Responses have been grouped into general categories to establish comparability between Cohorts 1 & 2
 (2) Responses have been grouped together for multiple response analysis - up to 5 responses could be given in Cohort 1, and up to 6 responses in Cohort 2 (causing the total percentage of cases to be more than 100 per cent).

This general pattern varied by birthplace region, with those migrants from Asia more likely to express there was nothing that they disliked about Australia, particularly those from South-East Asia, with job difficulties also a more common dislike among them. It is interesting that employment and access to services and facilities and even language barriers were not high on the list of major dislikes about Australia as expressed openly by respondents. Such things were also notably not high on the list of dislikes about the former country of residence of migrants. It was clear that family, friends and a former social life were the most favoured things for migrants when asked about their former home country. By contrast, the physical attributes, such as climate, environment and the natural beauty of Australia, together with lifestyle, quiet/peaceful environs and friendly people were the most popular things about Australia. The negative aspects of life in the former home country were much more closely associated with the political system, pollution and overcrowding and climate than with the economy or living standards, which remained very much the same for both cohorts. It is important that we do not pre-judge what drives immigration, or for that matter what underlies emigration from Australia, as employment or economic-led migration does not feature prominently here as a considered response from those interviewed in the LSIA surveys.

3.3 Conclusion

The two cohorts of migrants are remarkably alike in their immigration choices and their stated likes and dislikes about Australia. They are similar also in their opinions about economic, social and political conditions in the former country of residence: at least in so far as the two cohorts were not perceived to be reacting to ‘push’ factors in their decision to emigrate. Cohort 2 was somewhat more likely to cite ‘a better future for the family’ and favourable aspects of Australia such as lifestyle and climate, as reasons for migrating. Family reasons remained very important but a little less so than for Cohort 1. Of particular note, better employment opportunities and economic considerations in general, were given low priority by both cohorts as a major motive for migration. It was interesting that the significant variations according to visa category remained quite consistent across the two cohorts. Most notably, for both cohorts, two thirds of migrants in the Humanitarian stream indicated that their desire to escape hostilities in former countries of residence was a strong motivation for emigration, however in the second cohort migrants were also much more likely to perceive a better future for their families. The other important difference was evident for the Business skills/ENS migrants who were much less likely in Cohort 2 to nominate better employment opportunities as a reason for coming to Australia. We should note here that the composition of the Business skills/ENS group has changed between the two cohorts. Cohort 2 had a distinctly higher proportion of Business skills migrants as distinct from those who came under the employer nomination scheme. Most of the Business skills migrants would expect to be self-employed.

There were similar opinions between the two cohorts regarding the former country of residence, with a very small number of respondents expressing any overt dissatisfaction. Cohort 2 did, however, feel that educational opportunities in their former country were better than that perceived by Cohort 1. The Business skills/ENS stream were the exception. Those in Cohort 2 expressed a heightened concern about the poor educational opportunities in their former country of residence. They also reported an increased concern about the high incidence of crime. Their incomes in the former country of residence were perceived by both cohorts to be sufficient to meet all basic needs, with the exception of the Humanitarian migrants in Cohort 2.

The intention to apply for citizenship was extremely high for both cohorts. This is taken to be a sign of commitment to their new country. The Business skill/ENS stream had the lowest intention to apply for citizenship, although even there two-thirds did intend to apply. The reasons for intending citizenship were consistent across cohorts with the bulk of migrants stating that they wanted to stay in Australia permanently. There was however a significant difference between cohorts with respect to the response 'a better life here' which was expressed more strongly by Cohort 2. The overwhelming reason given by those migrants not applying for citizenship was that they wished to retain the citizenship of their former country. This reason was given more frequently by Cohort 2.

Perhaps the most pleasing result from this section is the high levels of satisfaction that migrants express about their life in Australia. Very few report being dissatisfied. This general contentment is reinforced by the fact that most intend to become citizens and those who do not say it is because they cannot have dual citizenship. Most would also encourage others to migrate as they have done.