

12. Support Services

12.1 Introduction

The process of settlement and assimilation into a foreign country is not an easy one. New migrants are faced with a myriad of problems that the 'average Australian' is unlikely to have to deal with.

There are a number of government and non-government organisations that offer support for new migrants to help ease the difficulties associated with settling in an unfamiliar country. These support services have the potential to play an important role in the successful integration of new migrants into the Australian community. We provide some insight into whether or not they in fact do so.

The following section provides an analysis of the support services used by new migrants to Australia in their first six months after arriving. We look at the type of support that was sought and received, the organisations that provided the support, the frequency with which these organisations were used and the level of quality of the support services used. We compare the results - where we can - between Cohort 1 and Cohort 2.

12.2 Type of Support Received

New migrants need assistance in a number of different areas, some more important than others. The following paragraphs discuss which of these are the most important to new migrants.

The survey asked the Primary Applicants if they had received assistance in each of seventeen different areas. Of these, the most important to migrants across both cohorts were help looking for work, help with financial matters, help learning English, help finding housing and accommodation, and help concerning health services and health insurance.

As the last column in Tables 12.1 and 12.2 report, 46 per cent of migrants in Cohort 1 received help looking for work, while this figure fell for Cohort 2 to 33 per cent. We also saw a decrease in help sought with financial matters, from 34 per cent for Cohort 1 to 21 per cent for Cohort 2. Over 58 per cent of Cohort 1 received help finding housing and

accommodation, while this figure almost halved for Cohort 2 (28%). Help to learn English was also important to migrants with approximately one-third from both cohorts receiving assistance (38% for Cohort 1 and 31% for Cohort 2). When it came to health services and health insurance, 49 per cent of migrants in Cohort 1 received help while the proportion increased for Cohort 2 to 56 per cent.

There was a dramatic fall in the assistance received from social security services between the two cohorts (47% for Cohort 1 and 16% for Cohort 2). This is entirely consistent with earlier evidence, reported in Richardson et al. (2001), that “---the proportion of people whose main source of personal income is government social welfare payments has fallen substantially [across the cohorts]—“ (p.43). The explanation offered in the earlier report for the fall in reliance on social welfare payments was twofold. First, for a variety of reasons (discussed at some length in the report) Cohort 2 migrants had a much higher success rate than their Cohort 1 counterparts in finding employment. The second reason was the substantial change in eligibility rules for access to a range of social welfare payments that occurred in March 1997, ie in the interval between the arrivals of Cohort 1 and of Cohort 2. Cohort 1 migrants were eligible for the full range of social services only 6 months after arrival, though for some benefits they were eligible earlier than that. Cohort 2 migrants faced a much stricter regime. They (excepting always Humanitarian migrants) were not eligible for most benefits for two years after arrival. In practice, it appears that the eligibility restrictions were imposed more strictly on Cohort 2 than on Cohort 1 migrants.

Cohort 2 also made less use of most of the other forms of support than did Cohort 1. Aside from the increase between cohorts in help received with health services and health insurance, we saw a decline in the proportion of migrants who received assistance in all other forms of support listed. This was true across all visa categories and both sexes. The difference between the cohorts was in many cases large, and was statistically significant over the visa categories, gender and in total.

When controlling for sex, Table 12.1, it was interesting to find that male immigrants were more likely to receive assistance. This was true for both cohorts. With the exception of help to learn English, help with interpretation and translation and help with health services and health insurance, a larger proportion of males received assistance in all the other areas of support mentioned.

When the distinction between visa groups was made, Table 12.2, it was not surprising to find that, generally speaking, the Humanitarian visa group received the most assistance. They relied heavily on support from the social security services (86% for Cohort 1 and 64% for Cohort 2) and also received substantial help with learning English (72% for Cohort 1 and 83% for Cohort 2). The Humanitarian group was also the only visa group who required any counselling for trauma or torture. This figure, fortunately, was small with 10 per cent of the migrants in the Humanitarian visa group of Cohort 2 reporting that they had received counselling. We were unable to report a figure for Cohort 1 since this question was not asked of them.

The results reported above are for those respondents who actually received help. There remains a proportion of the migrating population who may have sought help and not received it or may have needed help but did not know where to find it. We are unable to establish a figure for this sub-group for Cohort 1 since they were simply asked if they had received support or not. In Cohort 2 the percentage of migrants who required assistance yet did not receive it, for whatever reason, ranged from 11 per cent for help looking for work to less than one per cent for torture and trauma counselling.

Table 12.1: Percentage of Primary Applicants who Received Support, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Sex

Type of Support	Cohort	Male	Female	Total
Looking for work	1	53	37	46
	2	37	29	33
Financial matters	1	37	30	34
	2	24	18	21
Taxation	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	37	32	35
Housing/accommodation	1	63	53	58
	2	32	23	28
Education and training	1	24	21	23
	2	15	19	17
Qualifications recognition	1	13	8	11
	2	10	10	10
Learning English	1	36	40	38
	2	27	35	31
Interpreting	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	13	14	13
Translate written documents	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	9	8	9
Interpreting and translating	1	26	27	27
	2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Finding out about immigration/sponsorship	1	9	9	9
	2	3	4	3
Legal advice	1	10	8	9
	2	5	4	5
Social security services	1	52	42	47
	2	17	14	16
Health services/health insurance	1	49	49	49
	2	56	56	56
Child minding	1	7	7	7
	2	4	4	4
Aged care	1	10	1	1
	2	+	+	+
Torture/trauma counselling	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	10	1	1
Other	1	42	37	40
	2	3	3	3
Significance ¹		***	***	***

Notes: (1) Pearson Chi-square test, *** = probability <0.001, + = number of observations very small (n<5)

(2) Cohort 1: n = 5497, Cohort 2: n = 3205, Total n = 8702

Table 12.2: Percentage of Primary Applicants who Received Support, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Visa Category

Type Of Support	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Looking for work	1	66	56	39	25	53 (413)	46 (2511)
	2	54	34	33	7	20 (48)	33 (1061)
Financial matters	1	41	41	26	33	51 (398)	34 (1845)
	2	31	26	16	32	15 (37)	21 (667)
Taxation	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	50	38	32	45	17 (40)	35 (1111)
Housing/accommodation	1	66	64	51	61	78 (607)	58 (3202)
	2	36	31	21	32	47 (112)	28 (888)
Education & training	1	33	26	19	25	28 (217)	23 (1248)
	2	23	19	14	22	24 (56)	17 (546)
Qualifications recognition	1	22	18	7	9	11 (89)	11 (576)
	2	17	19	6	6	6 (13)	10 (318)
Learning English	1	30	17	37	18	72 (561)	38 (2068)
	2	14	9	37	25	83 (198)	31 (982)
Interpreting	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	3	1	16	10	48 (115)	13 (420)
Translate written documents	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	5	3	9	8	27 (64)	9 (274)
Interpreting & translating	1	22	12	25	15	58 (450)	27 (1468)
	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Finding out about immigration/ sponsorship	1	6	5	10	7	11 (89)	9 (502)
	2	2	2	4	4	4 (10)	3 (96)
Legal advice	1	12	7	8	12	16 (125)	9 (507)
	2	5	6	2	23	+	5 (145)
Social security services	1	60	48	37	26	86 (669)	47 (2594)
	2	19	12	11	5	64 (152)	16 (497)
Health services/health insurance	1	54	50	46	46	59 (456)	49 (2685)
	2	57	53	54	55	73 (174)	56 (1784)
Child minding	1	12	8	5	11	11 (83)	7 (389)
	2	7	7	2	5	5 (11)	4 (136)

Table 12.2 cont:

Type Of Support	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian- linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Aged care	1	+	1	1	+	2	1
	2	+	+	+	+	+	+
Torture/trauma counselling	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	+	+	+	+	10	1
Other	1	44	45	36	48	42	40
	2	5	+	4	5	2	3

Notes: (1) Pearson Chi-square test, *** = probability <0.001, + = number of observations very small (n<5)

(2) Cohort 1 n = 5497, Cohort 2 n = 3205, Total n = 8702

12.3 The Organisations that are Most Commonly Used

We now move onto a discussion of which organisations are most commonly utilised by migrants when seeking assistance. The questionnaire provided a total of thirteen different organisations over the two cohorts and asked the respondents to answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to whether they had received help from each of the organisations.

As Tables 12.3 and 12.4 show the most commonly used organisation by far was Medicare. More than 85 per cent of Cohort 2 used Medicare in their first six months in Australia. A figure for Cohort 1 is unavailable, as this option was not provided in the questionnaire for Cohort 1. The other more frequently used services were the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA), Centrelink, Employment Agencies (available for Cohort 2 only), The Australian Tax Office (ATO) (available for Cohort 2 only), and the Department for Education, Science and Training/Commonwealth Employment Services (DEST/CES) (available for Cohort 1 only).

DIMIA was used by 24 per cent of Cohort 1. This number fell slightly for Cohort 2 to 20 per cent. More than half of Cohort 1 required the services of Centrelink; the figure for Cohort 2 was slightly lower at 42 per cent. Employment Agencies were used by almost one-fifth while the ATO was used by 55 per cent of the migrating population of Cohort 2. DEST/CES provided services to 54 per cent of Cohort 1.

Overall, it is clear that the most widely used services are those provided by the core Commonwealth Government agencies—Medicare, employment services, Centrelink, the Australian Tax Office and the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs. While they may be of great value to individual migrants, community services such as religious and ethnic groups, and the embassies of the former countries of residence, were used by small numbers of people.

In general, there was no real difference between the sexes in which organisation they went to for assistance, Table 12.3, although the percentage for males was marginally higher for almost all of the organisations listed. The most noticeable difference between the genders was the Centrelink figures for Cohort 1: 62 per cent of males received help from Centrelink while the figure was only 45 per cent for females.

When we controlled for visa category, Table 12.4, we found a more interesting story to tell. Welfare, employment and training related organisations like Centrelink and DEST/CES were more likely to be used by people who migrated under less economic visa categories, while those who migrated under more economic visa groups were more likely to use income related organisations like the ATO. Take for example the two visa categories that represent the ends of the spectrum, Business skills/ENS being the most economic visa class and Humanitarian being the least economic class. Centrelink was used by 26 per cent of migrants in the Business skills/ENS visa group for Cohort 1. This figure decreased to 12 per cent in Cohort 2. Compare this with the figures for the Humanitarian visa class, where 96 per cent of Cohort 1 received help from Centrelink and this increased to 97 per cent for Cohort 2. The story was much the same for DEST/CES. Eighty-four per cent of Humanitarian migrants received help from DEST/CES while a mere 14 per cent of the Business skills/ENS group used its services. Contrast this to the numbers for the ATO. Sixty four per cent of the Business skills/ENS used the services of the ATO while a much smaller fraction of Humanitarian visa class received help from the ATO (29 %).

In sum, for those organisations where comparisons between the two cohorts was possible, we found that there was a decline in the percentage of migrants who received assistance from the different organisations between Cohort 1 and Cohort 2. This was true for both men and women, and with the exception of the Humanitarian visa class was also true across the visa categories. This change was significant in total, across gender and for the Independent and Preferential family/family stream visa categories.

Table 12.3: Support Services Used by Primary Applicants, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Sex (per cent)

Type of Support	Cohort	Male	Female	Total
Ethnic Club	1	7	6	6
	2	2	1	1
Ethnic Welfare Agency	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	1	< 0.5	1
Religious Org./Voluntary Welfare Agency	1	6	4	5
	2	2	1	1
Migrant Resource Centre	1	8	6	7
	2	6	5	5
DIMIA	1	25	23	24
	2	20	19	20
Centrelink	1	62	45	54
	2	45	39	42
Employment Agency	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	22	18	20
Medicare	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	85	86	85
Embassy Of Former Country of Residence	1	3	4	4
	2	3	2	2
Torture/Trauma Counsel Services	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	1	< 0.5	1
Australian Taxation Office	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	60	50	55
DEST/CES	1	61	47	54
	2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Government Agency	1	20	20	20
	2	10	8	9
Significance ¹		***	***	***

Notes: (1) Pearson Chi-square test, *** = probability <0.001, + = number of observations very small (n<5)

Table 12.4: Support Services Used by Primary Applicants, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Visa Category (per cent)

Type Of Support	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian- linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Ethnic Club	1	6	4	6	6	12	6
	2	+	1	1	+	3	1
Ethnic Welfare Agency	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	+	+	< 0.5	+	3	1
Religious Org./Voluntary Welfare Agency	1	4	7	2	+	15	5
	2	2	1	< 0.5	+	6	1
Migrant Resource Centre	1	10	10	5	5	9	7
	2	7	7	3	3	13	5
DIMIA	1	18	19	24	22	32	24
	2	14	18	20	17	31	20
Centrelink	1	68	57	42	26	96	54
	2	63	41	35	12	97	42
Employment Agency	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	38	27	17	3	7	20
Medicare	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	92	87	83	83	91	85
Embassy Of Former Country of Residence	1	3	3	5	8	1	4
	2	+	2	3	5	+	2
Torture/Trauma Counsel Services	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	+	+	+	+	8	1
Australian Taxation Office	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2	75	63	50	64	29	55
DEST/CES	1	74	62	45	14	84	54
	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Government Agency	1	20	22	20	32	17	20
	2	14	11	6	11	13	9
Significance ¹		n.s.	***	***	n.s.	n.s.	***

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

12.4 Frequency of Use

For this sub-section we only looked at those organisations from which more than ten per cent of migrants received assistance. These organisations include DIMIA, Centrelink, Employment Agencies, Medicare, ATO, and DEST/CES.

The original questionnaire divided the frequencies into daily, weekly, fortnightly, monthly, and less than once a month. However, this division made the number of observations in each category too small to make any meaningful comparisons. This problem was exacerbated when any division was made by sex or across the different visa categories. To remedy this problem we aggregated the observations for all the frequencies that were once a month or more and did the analysis using two different frequencies: once a month or more and less than once a month.

Our analysis presented in Table 12.5 shows that the services of DIMIA, Medicare, and the ATO were, on average, used less than once a month. In contrast, Centrelink, Employment Agencies and DEST/CES were, on average, used more than once a month. We also found that in total, both DIMIA and Centrelink were being used less frequently in Cohort 2: this was also true across the sexes and the different visa categories. This fall in the frequency of use was statistically significant in total, for men and women and for the Independent and Preferential family/family stream visa categories.

What was more interesting was that when the dissection between visa class was made the numbers suggested that not only are those who migrate under less economic visa classes (e.g. Humanitarian) more likely to use the welfare, employment and training related organisations but a greater proportion of them also use them more frequently. The reverse is true for those making up the more economic visa groups.

Table 12.6 enables us to compare the results for the two extreme visa groups, Humanitarian and Business skills/ENS. As an example, we will look at the Cohort 2 results in relation to the frequency of use of Centrelink. Consider firstly the Business skills/ENS category. A trivial number of the people making up this particular visa class used Centrelink once a month or more and nine per cent used Centrelink less than once a month. For the Humanitarian class, we find that 66 per cent of the migrants in this category used Centrelink

once a month or more and 31 per cent used it less than once a month. Altogether, 97 per cent of the Humanitarian visa category used Centrelink, the majority using it frequently. This is in striking contrast to the results obtained for the Business skills/ENS visa group. While the Humanitarian immigrants are an extreme case, they illustrate a more general pattern that the more economic migrants tend to make less frequent use of the main services. The two visa categories in Cohort 2 that made the least use of the main services were Business skills/ENS and Preferential family/family stream.

Finally we note that, where comparisons can be made across the cohorts, people in the visa categories of Independent and Preferential family/family stream used support services significantly less frequently if they were in Cohort 2.

Table 12.5: Frequency of Use of Support Services, by Primary Applicants for Organisations used by more than 10% of the population, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Sex (per cent)

Type of Support	Frequency	Cohort	Male	Female	Total
DIMIA	Once a Month or More	1	5	3	4
		2	2	2	2
Centrelink	Less than Once a Month	1	20	20	20
		2	18	18	18
	Once a Month or More	1	38	24	31
		2	23	14	18
Employment Agency	Less than Once a Month	1	24	22	23
		2	23	26	24
	Once a Month or More	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	15	10	12
Medicare	Less than Once a Month	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	7	8	8
	Once a Month or More	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	5	5	5
Australian Taxation Office	Less than Once a Month	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	80	81	80
	Once a Month or More	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	1	1	1
DEST/CES	Less than Once a Month	1	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	58	49	54
	Once a Month or More	1	36	22	29
		2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Significance ¹	Less than Once a Month	1	25	25	25
		2	n/a	n/a	n/a

Notes: (1) Pearson Chi-square test, *** = probability <0.001, + = number of observations very small (n < 5)

Table 12.6: Frequency of Use of Support Services by Primary Applicants for Organisations used by more than 10% of the population, Cohorts 1 and 2, by Visa Category (per cent)

Type Of Support	Frequency	Cohort	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
DIMIA	Once a Month or More	1	2	3	3	3	10	4
		2	+	2	1	+	9	2
	Less than Once a Month	1	16	17	21	19	23	20
		2	13	17	19	16	22	18
Centrelink	Once a Month or More	1	41	33	18	5	83	31
		2	24	15	14	+	66	18
	Less than Once a Month	1	28	24	24	22	14	23
		2	39	25	21	9	31	24
Employment Agency	Once a Month or More	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	22	17	11	+	4	12
	Less than Once a Month	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	16	10	6	+	3	8
Medicare	Once a Month or More	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	6	7	4	5	7	5
	Less than Once a Month	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	86	81	79	78	84	80
Australian Taxation Office	Once a Month or More	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	+	2	1	+	+	1
	Less than Once a Month	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		2	74	61	49	61	29	54
DEST/CES	Once a Month or More	1	43	33	22	3	54	29
		2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Less than Once a Month	1	30	29	23	10	30	25
		2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Significance ¹			n.s.	***	***	n.s.	n.s.	***

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

12.5 Satisfaction with the Help Received

Another point of interest is the level of quality of the services provided. The best indicator of 'quality of service' is the level of satisfaction displayed by the recipients of this service. The survey went on to ask the respondents whether they were satisfied with the assistance that they had received. The analysis in this part will only look at the answers given by the Primary Applicants of Cohort 2. This question was not asked for the majority of the organisations listed in the Cohort 1 questionnaire. Furthermore, for the few organisations where this question was asked, the organisations were not directly comparable to those in the Cohort 2 questionnaire.

Most migrants were satisfied with the assistance they received from the different organisations listed in the questionnaire. As can be seen from Table 12.7, the fraction of satisfied respondents ranged from just over three-quarters for the employment agencies to 100 per cent for the torture/trauma counsel services. For the majority of other organisations, the percentage satisfied was in the high eighties to low nineties.

There was little difference between the sexes, except where the absolute number of respondents was small. Distinction across the visa categories provided a similar story, once again the migrants were most satisfied with the torture/trauma counsel services and least satisfied with the services provided by the employment agencies (see Table 12.8).

Table 12.7: Percentage of Primary Applicants in Cohort 2 Satisfied with Help Received from Support Services Used, by Sex

Satisfied with Service Provided by:	Male	Female	Total
Ethnic Club	87	100	91
Ethnic Welfare Agency	100	83	93
Voluntary Welfare Agency	89	100	92
Migrant Resource Centre	89	92	90
DIMIA	91	82	87
Centrelink	88	84	86
Employment Agency	77	75	76
Medicare	97	94	96
Embassy of Former Country of Residence	98	92	96
Torture/Trauma Counsel Services	100	100	100
Australian Tax Office	98	99	99
Other Government Agency	90	83	87

Table 12.8: Percentage of Primary Applicants in Cohort 2 Satisfied with Help Received from Support Services used, by Visa Category

Satisfaction with Service Provided by:	Concessional family/skilled Australian-linked	Independent	Preferential family/family stream	Business skills/employer nomination scheme	Humanitarian	Total
Ethnic Club	+	+	100	+	100	91
Ethnic Welfare Agency	+	+	100	+	86	93
Voluntary Welfare Agency	75	100	100	+	93	92
Migrant Resource Centre	63	98	96	100	84	90
DIMIA	96	87	84	94	93	87
Centrelink	80	87	85	91	95	86
Employment Agency	73	81	73	+	81	76
Medicare	98	96	94	97	99	96
Embassy of Former Country of Residence	+	100	98	80	+	96
Torture/Trauma Counsel Services	+	+	+	+	100	100
Australian Tax Office	99	99	99	97	99	99
Other Government Agency	91	81	86	85	94	87

Notes: (1) + = number of observations very small ($n < 5$)

12.6 Conclusion

New migrants require assistance in a number of different areas in order to streamline their settlement into a foreign country. Australia offers a commendable range of support services to new migrants. These range from access to standard services provided for all residents, such as Medicare, to specific help to meet individual migrant needs, such as trauma counselling and learning English. Overall, a great deal of use is made of these services. Cohort 2 most frequently sought help for healthcare, finding work, learning English and sorting out their tax. Except for health, their use of support services was in all areas significantly less than was the case for Cohort 1.

Of particular interest was the dramatic fall in the percentage of migrants who received help from social security services. This was brought about both by a reduction in the need for income support and by a change in policy concerning the eligibility of new migrants for assistance from social services between the two cohorts. This was also true for both sexes and across the different visa categories.

Not surprisingly, given the sorts of assistance that was sought, most help came from the large government agencies. Fewer than 10 per cent of migrants made use of services provided by ethnic and not-for-profit welfare services or embassies.

The organisations that were most commonly sought after to provide this assistance were: Medicare, The Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA), Centrelink, Employment Agencies, The Australian Tax Office (ATO), and The Department of Education, Science and Training/Commonwealth Employment Services (DEST/CES).

The welfare and training related organisations like Centrelink and DEST/CES were more likely to be used by people who migrate under less economic visa categories, while those who migrate under more economic visa categories were more likely to use the income related organisations like the ATO.

The extensive use of government agencies and the modest use of tailored not-for-profit services suggests that the publicly provided (or financed) services are doing well in meeting

the practical needs of migrants. It is notable that these needs seem to have been rather less for the later cohort.

For those organisations where comparisons between cohorts were possible we found that there was a decline in the frequency in which these organisations were visited. The evidence also showed that not only are those who migrate under less economic visa classes (e.g. Humanitarian) more likely to use the welfare and training related organisations but a greater proportion of them also use them more frequently. The reverse is true for those making up the more economic visa groups.

Humanitarian migrants are relatively large users of all the main services except those to do with employment, taxation, legal advice and finances. This is not surprising. We know that on first arrival, Humanitarian migrants typically find a much larger than average dissonance between their skills and the ones required in the Australian labour market. Only a small proportion is able to find employment within the first six months of settlement. They do, however, integrate quite successfully into the labour force over the next three years (see Richardson et al, 2001). Thus initially the Humanitarian migrants depend quite heavily on support services to assist them with an income, learning English, finding housing, getting an education, and translation.

It is interesting to note that migrants in the most economic of the visa categories, Business skills/ENS, make quite extensive use of at least some of the support services. These include help with financial matters, taxation, housing, education, health and learning English. This was true for both cohorts.

Finally, we found that in general, the majority of migrants were satisfied with the help that they received. The torture/trauma counselling services recorded the highest proportion of satisfied users while the employment agencies had the lowest proportion of satisfied users. This was true for both sexes and across the visa categories.