

7. Migration Process and Decisions

In this section the migration processes and decisions of the two LSIA cohorts are examined. Only Primary Applicants participated in this area of the LSIA study. Issues of particular interest include whether alternate migration destinations were considered, whether migrants used the information supplied by the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, and what type of information migrants required to assist their migration processes and decisions. Specifically, the aim of this section is to determine whether there are any significant differences in these migration processes and decisions between the two cohorts, and to explore any differences based on visa requirements, gender, region of origin, and level of English proficiency.

7.1 Alternative Migration Destinations

Table 7.1 displays information regarding the percentage of migrants in each cohort who applied to migrate to other countries when they applied to migrate to Australia, viewed by (a) visa category, (b) sex, (c) age, (d) region of birth, and (e) English proficiency. Only two per cent in total of both cohorts reported applying to migrate to other countries, suggesting that Australia was the preferred destination in the vast majority of cases. A slightly higher percentage (4-6 %) of migrants in the Humanitarian and Independent visa categories applied to countries other than Australia. For the Humanitarian migrants, this no doubt results from their strong need to leave their home country. Those from the Preferential family/family stream were the least likely to apply to other countries, which would be expected considering their linkage to Australia as defined by their visa category. Male migrants, and migrants aged 35 to 44 were more likely to apply to migrate to other countries, whereas the older migrants were the least likely to do so. Migrants who spoke both English and other languages well were slightly more likely to apply to migrate to other countries as well as Australia. There was no significant difference between the cohorts on the number who applied to migrate to other countries. However, when disaggregated by sex, age, and English proficiency, some small significant differences between the cohorts emerged. Male Primary Applicants in Cohort 1 were significantly more likely to apply to migrate to other countries than those in Cohort 2. Cohort 1 migrants aged 25-34 were slightly more likely to apply to migrate elsewhere than those in Cohort 2. Cohort 1 migrants who spoke English poorly were significantly more likely to apply to migrate to other countries. There were no significant

differences between the cohorts when each visa category and each region of birth were examined separately.

The small proportion of Independent migrants who applied to other countries is of particular interest. By Cohort 2 this group was very highly educated, mostly had excellent English, were relatively mobile in terms of family ties, and did particularly well in the labour market soon after arrival. In other words, they were the sort of migrants likely to be keenly sought after by countries that welcome migrants.

Table 7.1: Applications to Immigrate to Countries Other Than Australia, Cohorts 1 and 2 by Visa Category, Gender, Age, Region of Birth and English Proficiency (per cent)

Who Applied to Immigrate to Other Countries ²	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Significance ¹
Visa Category			
Concessional family/skilled			
Australian-linked	4	2	n.s.
Independent	6	4	n.s.
Preferential family/family stream	1	+	n.v.
Business skills/employer nomination scheme	2	+	n.v.
Humanitarian	6	5	n.s.
Gender			
Male Primary Applicant	4	2	*
Female Primary Applicant	1	2	n.s.
Age			
15-24	1	+	n.v.
25-34	3	2	*
35-44	5	4	n.s.
45-54	1	2	n.s.
55-64	+	+	n.v.
65+	0	0	-
Region of Birth			
English Speaking Countries	1	+	n.v.
Other European Countries	2	2	n.s.
Asian Countries	3	2	n.s.
Other Countries	4	2	n.s.
English Proficiency			
English only or best	2	2	n.s.
English well/very well and other language	4	3	n.s.
English not well/not at all and other language	2	1	*
Total	2	2	n.s.

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

(2) Questions in this section were asked only of the Primary Applicant (not the migrating unit spouse)

The small number of migrants from Cohorts 1 and 2 who applied to migrate to countries other than Australia were asked to report what other countries they applied to, and then their reason for not immigrating to those other countries. Only brief descriptive information will be provided here for two reasons. First, because the sample numbers are so small (134 in Cohort 1 and 62 in Cohort 2), no conclusions should be drawn from small absolute differences. This prevents meaningful disaggregation of the group by visa category and other variables. Second, we can only be speculative about the findings in this area because not all people who applied to other countries in addition to Australia have been surveyed in LSIA. We only have information from those who applied to Australia and other countries but migrated to Australia. We do not have information on those who applied to Australia and other countries but migrated elsewhere. Thus no conclusions can be made about the attractiveness of Australia as a migration destination in comparison to other countries.

Table 7.2 shows what countries were applied to in addition to Australia. Canada was the most common alternative destination for both cohorts, with 34 per cent of the relevant group from Cohort 1 and 47 per cent of the relevant group from Cohort 2 applying to Canada. The other most common countries were New Zealand and the USA. The 'other countries' category comprised mainly European and Asian countries, with Singapore being the most common of the 'other countries' for Cohort 1 and Spain for Cohort 2. A higher percentage of Cohort 1 migrants applied to 'other countries', and to the USA, whereas a higher percentage of Cohort 2 migrants applied to New Zealand and Canada.

Table 7.3 displays the reasons given by those who applied to countries other than Australia for not immigrating to those other countries. The two most common reasons given for not going to other countries were that their application to another country was not approved, and that their Australian acceptance came first. Cohort 1 reported their application not being approved as a reason for not going to an alternative country at twice the rate of Cohort 2. Cohort 1 were also more likely to cite having family in Australia as a reason for not migrating elsewhere. Cohort 2 on the other hand, much more frequently reported disliking climate in other countries as a reason for not immigrating there. As one would expect, when examining the visa categories, Humanitarian migrants most frequently stated that their application to other countries was not approved, and Concessional family/family skilled migrants were most likely to say they came to Australia because they had more family here.

Table 7.2: Countries Other than Australia Applied to Migrate: Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent)¹

Other Countries Applied to ²	Cohort	Total
USA	1	30
	2	16
Canada	1	34
	2	47
New Zealand	1	23
	2	32
Other	1	24
	2	12

Note: (1) Data in this Table come only from those who had applied to migrate to other countries (n= 134 in Cohort 1; n= 62 in Cohort 2).

(2) This was a multiple response question and thus significance testing was not possible.

Table 7.3: Reasons for Not Immigrating to Other Countries, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent)¹

Reasons for Not Immigrating to Other Countries ²	Cohort	Total
Application elsewhere not approved	1	35
	2	16
More family in Australia	1	15
	2	8
Australian acceptance came first	1	27
	2	24
Qualifications not recognized in other countries	1	1
	2	3
Dislike of social conditions in other countries	1	8
	2	7
Dislike of climate in other countries	1	12
	2	30
Assisted passage not provided to other countries	1	2
	2	0
Other	1	26
	2	34

Note: (1) Data in this Table come only from those who had applied to migrate to other countries (n= 134 in Cohort 1; n= 62 in Cohort 2).

(2) This was a multiple response question and thus significance testing was not possible.

Overall, migrants from Cohorts 1 and 2 were equally likely to apply to migrate to other countries as well as Australia. This suggests that the changes in immigration acceptance policies into Australia have not increased the number of Australian migrants applying to migrate to other countries at the same time as they applied to Australia. In fact, male Primary Applicants, 25-34 year olds, and poor English-speaking migrants from Cohort 1 were more likely to apply to other countries than Cohort 2 migrants with these characteristics.

7.2 Migrants' Use of the Information Supplied by DIMIA

In this section only basic information is provided due to a lack of complete comparability between the questions asked of each cohort. There were also a number of questions in this area, which were asked only of Cohort 2, and thus just the frequency of each response to these questions is presented (in Table 7.4b).

Table 7.4a displays the use and helpfulness of information supplied to migrants before they arrived in Australia for each cohort, broken down by visa category. However, the question asked of each cohort was slightly different – Cohort 1 were asked about receiving the ‘Welcome to Australia’ kit before arrival, and Cohort 2 were asked about receiving the ‘Settlement Information for Migrants to Australia form 994i’ before arrival. Thus these questions are not completely comparable, and caution must be exercised in interpreting these findings. Overall, Cohort 2 was significantly more likely to receive the DIMIA information before arrival than were Cohort 1. The majority of Cohort 2 received the DIMIA information. When looking at each visa category separately, Independent visa group migrants were more likely to receive the DIMIA information before arrival, and Humanitarian migrants the least likely. In contrast, of the migrants who received the DIMIA information, Independent migrants found the information the least helpful, and Humanitarians were the most likely to say the information was very helpful. When comparing the cohorts within each visa category, it was found that in all visa categories except for the Humanitarian group, Cohort 2 migrants were significantly more likely to receive the DIMIA information before arrival than were Cohort 1. Within the Humanitarian group, Cohort 1 was significantly more likely to receive the information than were Cohort 2. Thus within the Humanitarian group, a problem receiving information has developed. Of those who received the DIMIA information before arrival, the majority (over 80 per cent) found the information either helpful or very helpful. Cohort 1 migrants were significantly more likely than those in Cohort 2 to rate the supplied information as very helpful, and Cohort 2 were significantly more likely to rate the information as neither helpful nor unhelpful. This indicates that Cohort 1 were happier with the ‘Welcome to Australia’ kit than Cohort 2 was with the ‘Settlement Information for Migrants to Australia form 994i’. When examining each cohort separately, cohort differences within visa categories were not significant or a comparison was not valid. However, Business

skills/ENS migrants in Cohort 2 appeared to find the DIMIA information more helpful than those in Cohort 1. Within the Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked migrants, Cohort 1 migrants more frequently reported finding the information very helpful.

Table 7.4b shows the responses of Cohort 2 migrants to a number of questions about DIMIA supplied information that were asked only of Cohort 2. These questions pertained to whether they had used the DIMIA Internet site and if so, how helpful it was, and if they had received a copy of an information book supplied by a State (regional) office of the Commonwealth government agency, and if so how helpful it was. The percentages in Table 7.4b indicate that Cohort 2 migrants were considerably more likely to report using the Internet than to have received the DIMIA information book supplied by the State Government office (26 per cent versus 17 per cent). Independent visa group migrants were the most frequent users of the DIMIA website, with nearly half of these Cohort 2 migrants reporting using it. In contrast, only two per cent of the Humanitarian Cohort 2 migrants used the DIMIA website, likely due to their lack of access to the Internet. Despite little use of the DIMIA website, Humanitarian migrants were twice as likely as migrants in any of the other visa categories to receive after arrival the DIMIA information book supplied by the state office. Still only 37 per cent of the Humanitarian migrants received this information book, and overall only 17 per cent of all Cohort 2 migrants were supplied with this information, indicating that the large majority are missing out on this source of information.

The 26 per cent of Cohort 2 migrants who used the DIMIA website were then asked to rate the helpfulness of the website. Of these migrants, 84 per cent rated the website as being either helpful or very helpful, and only four per cent found it unhelpful. Thus the DIMIA website appears to be an important source of information for migrants to Australia. When looking at these results for each visa category, it can be seen that Independent and Business skills/ENS migrants found the DIMIA website the most helpful, and Preferential family/family stream migrants found it the least helpful. Of the 17 per cent of the Cohort 2 migrants who were given the State office supplied information book, 87 per cent found it to be helpful or very helpful, and only four per cent deemed it unhelpful. This suggests that for those who received this information book, it was a valuable source of information.

Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked visa category migrants were the most likely to find this information book to be very helpful, and Independent migrants were the least likely to claim the information book was unhelpful. Thus overall, Cohort 2 migrants who used

these two sources of information found it to be helpful. However, the majority of the migrants did not receive or use these sources of information, indicating that it would be worthwhile to promote these information sources more vigorously.

In contrast to the above questions asked of Cohort 2, Cohort 1 were specifically asked about whether they received a 'Welcome to Australia' kit from DIMIA before arriving in Australia, and if they received it, whether it was helpful and what additional information would have been useful to include in the kit. Of Cohort 1, 18 per cent believed that there was other information that should have been provided in the kit. Of those wanting more information in the kit, the topic that the Cohort 1 migrants reported most frequently wanting in the kit was how to get a job and information about social security, with 19 per cent of those wanting extra information in the kit citing this topic. The second most common suggestion was to print the kit in other languages, with 15 per cent mentioning this. Information about health care and Medicare was also frequently mentioned.

In concluding, Cohort 2 migrants were more likely than Cohort 1 migrants to receive DIMIA information before arrival in Australia. Although the majority of the migrants found the information supplied by DIMIA before arrival to be helpful, Cohort 1 were happier with the 'Welcome to Australia' kit than Cohort 2 was with the 'Settlement Information for Migrants to Australia form 994i'. Two other sources of information were available to Cohort 2 migrants that did not exist when Cohort 1 migrated to Australia; the DIMIA website and information supplied after arrival by the State Office of the Department. When Cohort 2 migrants were asked about these sources of information, it became apparent that the majority had not used these sources of information, with a quarter using the Internet site, and only 17 per cent receiving the State Office supplied information. The Humanitarian migrants particularly did not access the DIMIA website, but this was compensated by Humanitarian migrants being the most likely to have received the State Office information. Of those who received these two sources of information, the overwhelming result was that this information was found to be helpful by the vast majority of recipients. Thus increasing the use of the DIMIA website and the DIMIA State office supplied government information should have very worthwhile outcomes.

7.3 The Type of Information Required by Migrants

In the LSIA interview, migrants were asked about the types of information they required before immigrating to Australia, whether the required information was received, the source of the information provided, and how helpful the information provided was. Migrants were specifically asked whether they needed information on job prospects, recognition of qualifications, and educational opportunities for children. Due to the extent of the information collected in this section, tables providing information on these issues disaggregated by region of birth and English proficiency are presented in the Appendix, and will not be discussed in the text.

Job prospect information was the most requested, with over 40 per cent of both cohorts requiring it (see Table 7.6a). This was followed by recognition of qualifications and then educational opportunities for children. There were no differences between cohorts on the percentage requiring information on recognition of qualifications and children's education, but Cohort 1 migrants were significantly more likely to require information on job prospects than were Cohort 2 migrants. One reason is likely to be that a larger number of Cohort 2 migrants (3 percentage points) came to in under the visa category Business skills/ENS. This group already had jobs in Australia organized or intended to start their own business, and thus would be less likely to need job prospect information. Table 7.5 displays the per cent of migrants in each cohort who reported requiring information on other topics in addition to the three previously mentioned. A slightly higher percentage of Cohort 2 migrants reported not needing any other information, compared to Cohort 1 migrants (76% versus 73%, respectively). The most commonly mentioned topics for both cohorts were information on housing availability and affordability, educational institutions, course and fees, employment related information such as wages and starting a business, and information on the health care system. Housing information was the most required topic for both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 migrants. The differences between the cohorts on the topics mentioned were small.

Table 7.4a: Use and Rated Helpfulness of DIMIA Supplied Information, Cohorts 1 and 2 by Visa Category (per cent)

Use and Helpfulness of DIMIA Supplied information ²	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Per cent who Received DIMIA Supplied information before Arrival [#]	1	74	78	58	63	60	63
	2	88	88	75	85	45	79
Significance ¹		***	***	***	***	***	***
Rated Helpfulness of DIMIA information by those who received it: [^]							
Very Helpful	1	34	27	34	28	32	32
	2	25	25	30	26	36	28
Helpful	1	52	57	50	53	53	52
	2	60	55	51	62	53	54
Neither helpful or unhelpful	1	12	14	11	17	9	12
	2	15	18	15	10	8	15
Unhelpful	1	3	3	4	+	7	4
	2	+	3	4	+	+	3
Significance ¹		n.v.	n.s.	n.s.	n.v.	n.v.	***

Note: (1) Pearson Chi-square test, n.v. = test not valid, n.s. = not significant, *** = probability < 0.001, + Number of observations very small (n < 5 in weighted table). For purposes of obtaining a valid Chi-square test, 'don't know' was recoded as missing data.

(2) Questions in this section were asked only of the Primary Applicant (not the migrating unit spouse).

(#) The information supplied by DIMIA differed for each cohort: Cohort 1 were asked about receiving the 'Welcome to Australia' Kit; Cohort 2 were asked about receiving the 'Settlement Information for Migrants to Australia form 994i'.

(^) Percentages based only on those respondents who actually received DIMIA Supplied information before arrival.

Table 7.4b: Frequency of use of DIMIA Supplied Information and its Rated Helpfulness, Cohort 2, by Visa Category

Use of DIMIA Supplied Information²	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Used DIMIA Internet Site	32	48	16	40	2	26
Received copy of State Office supplied DIMIA information book	18	15	15	16	37	17
<i>Rated Helpfulness of DIMIA Internet site by those who used it:[^]</i>						
Very Helpful	28	41	25	38	12	34
Helpful	59	45	53	53	76	50
Neither helpful or unhelpful	11	11	16	7	7	12
Unhelpful	3	3	5	2	5	4
<i>Rated Helpfulness of State Office Supplied DIMIA Information Book by those who received it:[^]</i>						
Very Helpful	43	37	42	34	40	40
Helpful	39	46	48	56	48	47
Neither helpful or unhelpful	14	17	7	3	7	10
Unhelpful	4	0	4	7	6	4

Note: (1) People responding 'don't know' were coded as missing data (n=103)

(2) Questions in this section were asked only of the Primary Applicant (not the migrating unit spouse).

([^]) Percentages based only on those respondents who actually reported accessing this source of information.

Table 7.5: Other Topics for which Migrants Required Information, Cohorts 1 and 2 (per cent)

Other Topics for which Migrants Required Information²	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Taxation/Income Tax system	2	2
Social Life in Australia	1	0
Lifestyle/Way of life	3	2
Living Conditions/standard of living	1	2
Economic situation in Australia/cost of living	3	2
Housing affordability/availability/cost/where to stay	6	4
Employment Opportunities/wages/starting a business	6	4
Qualifications required for work/Recognition of Qualifications	1	1
Educational institutions/systems/courses/school fees	4	3
Weather/Climate	2	1
Health care System/Medicare	3	3
Banking/money transfer/credit facilities	1	2
Legal system/Customs requirements/regulations	1	3
Social Welfare system & services/social security/ retirement	2	2
Drivers license/transport	2	2
Visa Requirements/information for self and family	1	1
Information on Australian Culture/multiculturalism/ wildlife	3	0
Australian Government system/politics	1	0
English classes/learning English	1	0
Other topics	3	7
No other Information Required	73	76

Note: (1) Percentages do not equal 100% because respondents could report requiring information on more than one topic.

(2) Questions in this section were asked only of the Primary Applicant (not the migrating unit spouse).

Tables 7.6a and 7.6b show the types of information required and received by those requesting it for each cohort, broken down by (a) visa category and (b) gender. By looking at each visa category separately, it can be seen that the Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked migrants required job prospects information the most, and Business skills/ENS migrants required this information the least. This is logical since they were the most likely to have a job lined up. By comparing cohorts, it was found that Cohort 1 migrants from the Independent and Humanitarian visa groups were more likely to require information on job prospects than were those from Cohort 2. The Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked migrants also required information on the recognition of qualifications the most, and those from the Preferential family/family stream needed this information the least. There were no overall differences between cohorts on the need for information of recognition of qualifications. However, within each visa group it was found that Cohort 1 migrants in the Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked, Preferential family/family stream, and Humanitarian visa categories were all significantly more likely to require information on the recognition of qualifications than were

those from these three visa categories in Cohort 2. When asked about the need for information on the educational opportunities for children, Business skills/ENS migrants required this information the most, and Preferential family/family stream required it the least. Of those in the Business skills/ENS group, Cohort 2 migrants were significantly more likely to request this information on children's education. In contrast, Cohort 1 Preferential family/family stream migrants were more likely to require this information than those from this visa group in Cohort 2.

There were some differences between the sexes in the need for these types of information (see Table 7.6b), with male Primary Applicants being more likely to require information on all three topics. Within the male Primary Applicants, Cohort 1 migrants were significantly more likely to require information on job prospects and recognition of qualifications than were Cohort 2 male Primary Applicants. There were no significant differences between cohorts for the female Primary Applicants.

Those migrants who reported requiring information on these topics were then asked to report whether they actually received the information they required. On average 73 per cent of all migrants requiring information reported receiving it, which suggests that the large majority were provided with the information they needed. Information was more likely to be provided on job prospects than on the other topics. Cohort 2 migrants were significantly more likely to receive the required information on job prospects and recognition of qualifications than were those from Cohort 1. There were no differences between cohorts on receiving information on the educational opportunities for children. As seen in Table 7.6a, Business skills/ENS migrants who required job prospect information were the most, and Humanitarian migrants the least, likely to receive it. Cohort 2 Independent and Preferential family/family stream migrants were significantly more likely than those from Cohort 1 to receive the requested information on job prospects. Independent visa category migrants who required recognition of qualifications information received it the most, and Preferential family/family stream migrants who wanted this information received it the least. Cohort 2 Preferential family/family stream migrants were significantly more likely than those in Cohort 1 to receive the required recognition of qualifications information. There were no significant cohort differences on receiving requested information on education for children when broken down by visa category. Business skills/ENS

migrants received this requested information the most. As Table 7.6b shows, for both male and female Primary Applicants, Cohort 2 migrants were significantly more likely than those from Cohort 1 to receive the information they required on both job prospects and on recognition of qualifications. There were no differences between the cohorts on receiving needed information on the educational opportunities for children when broken down by gender. Overall, male Primary Applicants were more likely to receive the required information on all topics than female Primary Applicants.

The topic of job prospects was chosen to illustrate the sources from which migrants received required information, and the helpfulness of the received information. A basic frequency table displaying the sources of required information on other topics (recognition of qualifications, children's educational opportunities) can be found in the Appendix. Tables 7.6c and 7.6d display results on the main sources from which migrants received the information about job prospects that they required, broken down by (c) visa category, and (d) gender (equivalent tables shown by region of birth and English proficiency can be found in the Appendix).

Table 7.6a: Types of Information Required and Type of Information Provided to those Requesting it, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Visa Category (per cent)²

	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian- linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
<i>Per cent who required information on:</i>							
(a) Job Prospects	1	63	63	34	26	51	43
	2	61	54	33	36	26	41
Significance ¹		n.s.	***	n.s.	n.s.	***	*
(b) Recognition of Qualifications	1	66	63	21	26	26	33
	2	57	59	18	24	12	32
Significance ¹		*	n.s.	**	n.s.	***	n.s.
(c) Child's Educational Opportunities	1	35	23	15	42	33	21
	2	31	25	12	58	33	21
Significance ¹		n.s.	n.s.	**	**	n.s.	n.s.
<i>Per cent given information out of those who required it[^]</i>							
(a) Job Prospects	1	76	75	66	78	68	70
	2	82	84	77	86	71	80
Significance ¹		n.s.	***	***	n.s.	n.s.	***
(b) Recognition of Qualifications	1	82	88	48	75	59	69
	2	86	88	57	70	63	77
Significance ¹		n.s.	n.s.	**	n.s.	n.s.	***
(c) Educational Opportunities for Children	1	71	66	68	82	72	70
	2	72	70	67	81	74	72
Significance ¹		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

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

(2) Questions in this section were asked only of the Primary Applicant (not the migrating unit spouse).

(^) Percentages based only on those respondents who actually reported requiring information about each topic.

Table 7.6b: Types of Information Required and Type of Information Provided to those Requesting it, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Gender (per cent)²

	Cohort	Male Primary Applicant	Female Primary Applicant	Total
<i>Required Information on:</i>				
(a) Job Prospects	1	51	36	43
	2	46	35	41
Significance ¹		**	n.s.	*
(b) Recognition of Qualifications	1	39	26	33
	2	36	27	32
Significance ¹		*	n.s.	n.s.
(c) Educational Opportunities for Children	1	22	20	21
	2	23	20	21
Significance ¹		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
<i>Per cent given information out of those who required it[^]</i>				
(a) Job Prospects	1	72	67	70
	2	83	77	80
Significance ¹		***	***	***
(b) Recognition of Qualifications	1	74	59	69
	2	82	70	77
Significance ¹		***	***	***
(c) Educational Opportunities for Children	1	72	67	70
	2	73	70	72
Significance ¹		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

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

(2) Questions in this section were asked only of the Primary Applicant (not the migrating unit spouse).

(^) Percentages based only on those respondents who actually reported requiring information about each topic.

Overall, the main source of received information on job prospects was friends or relatives who either live in Australia or had visited Australia, with about one-half of Cohort 1 and one-third of Cohort 2 reporting this as their main source of information on jobs. In Cohort 1 Australian Government Departments were the third most common source of job prospect information, following friends/relatives and sponsors/employers. In Cohort 2, Australian Government Departments were also the third most common source of job prospect information, following friends/relatives, and the use of the 'General Internet' (part of the 'other' category), which 18 per cent of all respondents reported as being their main source of job information. Cohort 1 were significantly more likely to receive information on jobs from family/friends and sponsors/employers than were Cohort 2, and Cohort 2 migrants were significantly more likely than Cohort 1 migrants to get job prospect information from other sources (such as the 'General Internet'). The high use of sources in the 'other' category by Cohort 2 suggests that job prospect information became available from a wider variety of sources (especially the Internet) by the time Cohort 2 migrated. There were few differences between the cohorts on their use of Australian Government Departments as a source of information on jobs.

Table 7.6c shows that migrants from different visa categories had different primary sources of job prospect information – Independent migrants were the most frequent users of other sources, and Preferential family/family stream migrants were the most frequent users of sponsors and employers as information sources. Note that sponsors include family members already in Australia, as well as a relatively small number of employers. Humanitarian migrants were the most frequent users of Australian Government Departments and friends/relatives sources. When we look at the differences between cohorts for each visa category separately, it can be seen that Cohort 1 migrants in the Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked, Independent, and Preferential family/family stream visa categories were significantly more likely than those in Cohort 2 to state friends/family as their main source of information on job prospects.

In these same visa categories Cohort 2 migrants were significantly more likely than Cohort 1 migrants to use other sources of information, such as the media and educational institutions. Cohort 2 migrants in the Business skills/ENS and Humanitarian visa groups do seem to have used Australian Government Departments sources more than those from Cohort 1, but the statistical significance of this could not be tested.

Table 7.6d shows cohort differences in the sources of job prospect information for each gender separately. Male and female Primary Applicants tended to equally use Australian Government Departments as a source of job prospect information. However, male Primary Applicants were more frequent users of friends/family and of other sources than were female Primary Applicants, and female Primary Applicants were more frequent users of sponsors/employers as a source of information. Both male and female Primary Applicants in Cohort 1 were more likely to use sponsor/employers and friends/family as their main source of information on job prospects, and were less likely to use other sources than those in Cohort 2.

Of the LSIA migrants who received information about job prospects, the vast majority reported evaluating the provided information as helpful or very helpful (82% of Cohort 1 and 77% of Cohort 2). Cohort 1 migrants were significantly more likely than Cohort 2 migrants to evaluate the job prospects information provided as very helpful (25% versus 20%), and correspondingly, Cohort 2 migrants were significantly more likely than Cohort 1 migrants to evaluate the information provided as unhelpful, although only small numbers did so (6% and 3% respectively). Thus overall, Cohort 1 migrants were happier with the information they received on job prospects than were Cohort 2 migrants. Table 7.6e shows the rated helpfulness of the job prospects information for each Cohort broken down by visa category. Migrants entering Australia on Business skills/ENS visas were the most likely to report finding the job prospects information received as very helpful, whereas Independent visa category migrants reported the information as being neutral or unhelpful the most. In the Independent and Preferential family/family stream visa categories, compared to Cohort 2, Cohort 1 migrants were significantly more likely to report finding the information provided on job prospects very helpful, and were significantly less likely to report the information as being unhelpful. There were no differences between cohorts within the other three visa categories. Table 7.6f displays the rated helpfulness of the job prospects information for both cohorts separately for each

gender. Male Primary Applicants were more likely than female Primary Applicants to report that the job prospects information provided was very helpful. Male Primary Applicants from Cohort 2 were significantly more likely than those in Cohort 1 to report finding the information provided unhelpful although the absolute numbers were small – only six per cent. There were no differences between cohorts in the female Primary Applicants.

Overall, of the three nominated information topics, job prospect information was the most requested. Cohort 1 was more likely to require job prospect information than Cohort 2, and understandably, Business skills/ENS migrants requested job prospect information the least out of the visa categories. Of other topics, housing information was the most commonly requested in both cohorts. The vast majority of migrants requiring information reported receiving it. Information on job prospects was more likely to be received than information on other topics. Cohort 2 migrants were more likely to receive the required information on job prospects and recognition of qualifications than were those from Cohort 1. Out of the visa categories, Humanitarian migrants who wanted job prospect information received it the least. Male Primary Applicants were more likely than female Primary Applicants to receive the required information on all topics. With regard to job prospects in particular, the main source of job information was friends or relatives. Australian Government Departments were the third most common source of this information. There were few differences between the cohorts on their use of Australian Government Departments as a source of information on jobs. Cohort 1 were more likely to receive information on jobs from family/friends and sponsors/employers than were Cohort 2. The majority of migrants found the information from the main source helpful, Cohort 1 significantly more so than Cohort 2. The development of informative web sites is generating a new and useful additional source of information for prospective migrants.

Table 7.6c: Main Source from which Migrants Received Required Information on Job Prospects, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Visa Category (per cent)

Sources of Received Information ⁶	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Sponsor/Employer	1	20	4	29	21	15	18
	2	16	1	24	+	+	13
Friends/relatives in Australia or who have visited Australia	1	49	56	43	40	61	50
	2	34	33	32	42	65	34
Australian Government Department ¹	1	17	17	13	13	19	15
	2	16	20	14	19	25	17
Other ^{2,3}	1	14	23	16	26	5	16
	2	34	46	31	34	+	36
Significance ⁴		***	***	***	n.v.	n.v.	***

Note: (1) 'Australian Government Department' includes Federal Government Department, State Government Department, 'Welcome to Australia' kit and other information, and DIMIA web pages.

(2) 'Other' includes those in Cohort 2 who marked 'General Internet' as well as 'other', because 'General Internet' was not an option in Cohort 1. Of Cohort 2 migrants responding 'other', 18 of the 36% reported General Internet as the 'other' source information used, i.e., general internet accounted for half of all the responses in 'other' for Cohort 2.

(3) 'Other' for both cohorts contains the original 'other' section plus 'Community/Religious Organisations', 'Media', 'Migration/Travel Agents', 'Educational Institution', 'Trade Unions', 'Banks/Financial Institutions', and 'Refugee Agency', because the percentage reporting these sources was very small.

(4) Pearson Chi-square test, n.v. = test not valid, n.s. = not significant, * = probability < 0.05, *** = probability < 0.001, + Number of observations very small (n < 5 in weighted table).

(5) Percentages based only on those respondents who actually received information about 'Job Prospects'.

(6) Questions in this section were asked only of the Primary Applicant (not the migrating unit spouse)

Table 7.6d: Main Source from which Migrants Received Required Information on Job Prospects, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Gender (per cent)

Sources of Received Information ⁶	Cohort	Male Primary Applicant	Female Primary Applicant	Total
Sponsor/Employer	1	15	24	18
	2	9	19	13
Friends/relatives in Australia or who have visited Australia	1	53	45	50
	2	34	35	34
Australian Government Department ¹	1	16	15	15
	2	17	16	17
Other ^{2,3}	1	16	16	16
	2	40	30	36
Significance ⁴		***	***	***

Note: (1) 'Australian Government Department' includes Federal Government Department, State Government Department, 'Welcome to Australia' kit and other information, and DIMIA web pages.

(2) 'Other' includes those in Cohort 2 who marked 'General Internet' as well as 'other', because General Internet was not an option in Cohort 1. General Internet accounts for 18% of the responses in 'other' for Cohort 2.

(3) 'Other' for both cohorts contains the original other section plus 'Community/Religious Organisations', 'Media', 'Migration/Travel Agents', 'Educational Institution', 'Trade Unions', 'Banks/Financial Institutions', and 'Refugee Agency', because the percentage reporting these sources was very small ($n < 5$).

(4) Pearson Chi-square test, n.v. = test not valid, n.s. = not significant, * = probability < 0.05 , *** = probability < 0.001 , + Number of observations very small ($n < 5$ in weighted table).

(5) Percentages based only on those respondents who actually received information about 'Job Prospects'.

(6) Questions in this section were asked only of the Primary Applicant (not the migrating unit spouse)

Table 7.6e: Rated Helpfulness of Information on Job Prospects Received, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Visa Category (per cent)

Helpfulness of job prospect information for those who received it ³	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Very Helpful	1	27	24	25	32	23	25
	2	22	19	19	28	21	20
Helpful	1	52	56	58	51	59	57
	2	57	55	58	57	61	57
Neither helpful or unhelpful	1	18	17	13	14	15	15
	2	13	19	17	12	16	17
Unhelpful	1	3	3	3	+	3	3
	2	8	6	7	+	+	6
Significance ¹		n.s.	*	**	n.s.	n.s.	***

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

(2) Percentages based only on those respondents who actually received information about 'Job Prospects'.

(3) Questions in this section were asked only of the Primary Applicant (not the migrating unit spouse)

Table 7.6f: Rated Helpfulness of Information on Job Prospects Received, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Gender (per cent)

Helpfulness of job prospect information for those who received it ³	Cohort	Male Primary Applicant	Female Primary Applicant	Total
Very Helpful	1	27	22	25
	2	23	16	20
Helpful	1	57	57	57
	2	56	58	57
Neither helpful or unhelpful	1	14	16	15
	2	14	20	17
Unhelpful	1	2	5	3
	2	7	6	6
Significance ¹		***	n.s.	***

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

(2) Percentages based only on those respondents who actually received information about 'Job Prospects'.

(3) Questions in this section were asked only of the Primary Applicant (not the migrating unit spouse).

7.4 Conclusion

This section compared the migration processes and decisions of the two LSIA cohorts. With regard to alternative migration destinations, migrants from Cohorts 1 and 2 were equally likely to apply to migrate to other countries as well as Australia. In fact very few migrants who come to Australia applied to migrate elsewhere. This suggests that the changes in immigration acceptance policies into Australia have not increased the number of Australian migrants who hedge their bets by simultaneously applying to migrate to other countries. Of those who did apply to migrate to countries other than Australia, Canada was the most frequent alternative, followed by New Zealand and the USA. Cohort 1 reported their application not being approved as a reason for not going to an alternative country at twice the rate of Cohort 2.

With respect to the LSIA migrants' use of information supplied by DIMIA, Cohort 2 migrants were more likely than Cohort 1 migrants to receive DIMIA information before arrival in Australia. Although the majority of the migrants found the information supplied by DIMIA before arrival to be helpful, Cohort 1 were happier with the information provided than Cohort 2. In addition to this information, Cohort 2 also had access to the DIMIA website and information

provided after arrival by the State office of the Commonwealth Government. However the majority had not used these sources of information. The overwhelming majority of those who did use these two sources of information found them to be helpful.

In regards to the type of information required by migrants to assist their migration, job prospect information was the most requested. Cohort 1 was more likely to require job prospect information than Cohort 2. The vast majority of migrants requiring information reported receiving it. Cohort 2 migrants were more likely to receive the required information on job prospects and recognition of qualifications than were those from Cohort 1. In regards to job prospects in particular, the main source of received job prospects information was friends or relatives. Australian Government Departments were the third most common source of this information. The majority of migrants found the information from the main source was helpful, Cohort 1 significantly more so than Cohort 2.