

2: Settlement patterns and experiences

This chapter summarises broad historical characteristics and patterns of migrant population and settlement in Australia including some snapshots for States and Territories. Data from the 2001 (ABS 2002d) and, to a limited extent, the 1996 (ABS 1997) Census of Population and Housing were referenced, including Confidentialised Unit Record File (CURF) micro data samples (ABS 2002c). Where relevant census data were not available, *Atlas of the Australian People* (1999) provided reliable and comprehensive information, if somewhat dated. In addition, migrant settler arrival statistics produced by DIMA were sourced. Results from the Longitudinal Surveys of Immigrants to Australia (LSIAs) were used as the basis for providing further insights into recent settlement perceptions and experiences of immigrants and for reviewing migrant satisfaction with life in Australia. The chapter concludes with a synoptic view of recent settlement experiences.

2.1 Patterns of migrant settlement in Australia

Ethnicity of the Australian population based on estimates of ancestry is indicated in Table 2.1. Given the sustained nature of European immigration to Australia in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, it is not surprising that Europeans, along with Australians, dominate the ancestry profile. Although Asian regions figure prominently in the current intake of migrants, these regions have had relatively little impact to date on the overall ancestry of the population. That may of course change because Australia has been characterised by relatively high levels of inter-marriage between migrants and the Australia-born.

Table 2.1: Ancestry by global region (per cent)

	<i>Percentage</i>
Australia	30.0
North-West Europe	44.6
Southern and Eastern Europe	9.5
North Africa and the Middle East	1.6
South-East Asia	1.8
North-East Asia	2.8
South and Central Asia	1.3
Americas	0.6
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.5
Oceania	1.3
Not stated	6.0

Source: 2001 Census (1% CURF)⁴

⁴ Detailed cross-tabulations of birthplace against social indicator variables, as used in the *Atlas of the Australian People – 1996 Census*, are not available for the 2001 Census for the population as a whole. However, cross-tabulations can be generated from the one percent sample of the population contained in the Confidentialised Unit Record File (CURF) produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

At the time of the 2001 Census, around one-quarter of Australia's population was born overseas (refer to Table 2.2). One million-plus migrants who had been born in the UK dominated the overseas born, accounting for 5.5 per cent of the national population. The next most prominent birthplace group was the New Zealand-born with over 350 000 (1.9% of Australia's population). Of course, New Zealanders are excluded from Australia's migrant Programme. Italy topped the list of non-English-speaking countries, accounting for just over one per cent of the population. All other birthplace groups accounted for less than one per cent, with notable source countries including Viet Nam, China, Greece, Germany and the Philippines.

Table 2.2: Birthplace of top ten source countries for the overseas born – 2001 Census

<i>Country</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
Australia	13 629 685	72.6
UK	1 036 245	5.5
New Zealand	355 765	1.9
Italy	218 718	1.2
Viet Nam	154 831	0.8
China (excluding SARs and Taiwan)	142 780	0.8
Greece	116 431	0.6
Germany	108 220	0.6
Philippines	103 942	0.6
India	95 452	0.5
Netherlands	83 324	0.4
Total for top ten countries	2 415 708	12.9

Source: 2001 Census (1% CURF)

Just over half of the 2001 population had both parents born in Australia (Table 2.3). Conversely, over 40 per cent of those providing information on the birthplace of parents had at least one parent born overseas. This, together with the range of source countries, reflects the multicultural and cosmopolitan nature of the Australian population.

Table 2.3: Birthplace of parents (per cent)

	<i>Percentage</i>
Both parents born in Australia	53.7
Father only born overseas	6.7
Mother only born overseas	4.4
Both parents born overseas	29.0
Not stated	6.2

Source: 2001 Census (1% CURF)

The composition of Australia's migrant intake has changed over time in terms of source countries. Before 1986, North-Western Europeans (including persons from the UK) were most prominent, accounting for almost half (44%) of all arrivals (Table 2.4). This share had dropped to 17 per cent by 2001 (up slightly from around 15% in the previous two years).

Much of the change in migrant intake had of course occurred by the late 1980s. Arrivals from North-West Europe had dropped to 19 per cent of the total by that time and settlers from Southern and Eastern Europe were down to 7 per cent (from 26% pre-1986); by 2001, their representation had further declined to only 4 per cent of total migrant intakes. Conversely, the Oceania-born (including New Zealanders) had risen to 17 per cent (from 7%) and migrants from North-East Asia already accounted for 14 per cent (up from only 2%). This was to increase to a high point of 16 per cent of the total intake in 1997 before declining slightly to 14 per cent in 2001. Southern and Central Asia also became a more prominent source country (up from 3% pre-1986 to 10% in 2001). South-East Asia accounted for a greater proportion of migrants in the late 1980s (22% in comparison with 8% prior to 1986) than in 2001 (17%).

Table 2.4: Birthplace by year of arrival (per cent)

	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996	1991- 1996	1986- 1990	Before 1986
Oceania	18.5	19.9	19.9	19.6	18.4	16.5	13.3	16.5	7.3
North-West Europe	17.0	15.2	15.3	14.3	15.2	14.7	15.1	18.6	44.0
Southern and Eastern Europe	4.4	6.3	7.0	9.5	8.4	10.5	10.7	7.1	25.7
North Africa and Middle East	4.7	5.7	6.4	6.1	6.2	6.3	7.2	5.9	4.5
South-East Asia	17.2	14.8	15.0	16.2	16.0	15.2	20.6	22.2	7.7
North-East Asia	14.2	15.0	15.0	14.3	16.3	18.9	14.8	13.8	2.4
Southern and Central Asia	9.9	10.0	8.7	7.9	8.0	8.2	9.2	5.8	2.5
Americas	5.9	5.6	4.9	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.7	5.2	3.3
Sub-Saharan Africa	7.7	7.0	7.3	7.3	6.5	4.8	3.8	4.5	2.3
Other	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.3

Source: 2001 Census (1% CURF)

Since the 2001 Census, variations with respect to global regions from which new settlers have been sourced have not varied dramatically (Table 2.5). While the overall mix from Asian regions has remained relatively stable (at around the 40% mark), the mix within these regions has shifted with more migrants from Southern and Central Asia at the expense of migrants of South-East or North-East Asian origin. Other fluctuations have been increases in migrants from the African continent, both from North Africa and the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa, especially in the three years prior to 2005-06 when they represented around 20 per cent of new settlers (from 11.4% in 2001). While there have been no clearly discernable reductions from other major source regions, the proportion from the Americas (never a significant source) have decreased.

Table 2.5: Migrant arrivals by birthplace, 2002-03 to 2005-06 (per cent)

<i>Birthplace</i>	<i>2002-03</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>	<i>2005-06</i>
Oceania	16.5	16.0	17.1	17.3
Europe	21.1	22.7	20.3	23.1
North Africa and Middle East	11.2	10.1	10.5	8.5
Southeast Asia	16.3	15.1	13.7	13.7
Northeast Asia	11.0	11.3	12.7	11.6
Southern and Central Asia	10.7	11.6	12.8	14.3
Americas	2.1	1.8	1.8	3.3
Sub-Saharan Africa	8.9	9.5	9.0	7.6
Not stated/Other	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.6

Source: DIMA Immigration Updates 2002-03 to 2005-06

2.2 Comparisons of migrant settlement by States and Territories

Difficulties in measuring the social costs and benefits of immigration became particularly apparent with respect to Australia's States and Territories (and, for that matter, for even smaller geographical areas such as SLAs) as historical databases have not been structured with these types of interrogation in mind. Furthermore, the LSIA proved inappropriate for teasing out State and Territory variations due to the fact that the underlying numbers were too small for differences of significance to be identifiable. Instead, consideration has been given to proxy variables and to census data.

Social costs and benefits of migrants within States and Territories can to an extent be influenced not only by certain characteristics of migrants, especially visa categories and countries of origin, but also by recency of arrival and by size of the resident immigrant community. For these reasons the nature of the migrant intake in each State and Territory required examination.

The number of migrants in each State and Territory at the 2001 Census for the thirty largest birthplace groups in Australia is presented in Table 2.6. This table also shows average annual rates of change in the size of each birthplace group over the 1996-2001 intercensal period. The extent of State and Territory variations reflects the relative size of different birthplace groups. Clearly, the size of the overall migrant community is much greater in New South Wales and Victoria than in other areas. Of particular interest is the fact that some migrants group are expanding in number while others are contracting.

Table 2.6: Major migrant birthplace groups, by States/Territories – 2001 Census

	NSW		Qld		SA		Tas		VIC		WA		ACT		NT	
	No. 2001	% pa change 1996-2001	No. 2001	% pa change 1996-2001	No. 2001	% pa change 1996-2001	No. 2001	% pa change 1996-2001	No. 2001	% pa change 1996-2001	No. 2001	% pa change 1996-2001	No. 2001	% pa change 1996-2001	No. 2001	% pa change 1996-2001
Canada	9295	1.8	6036	1.8	1591	0.6	510	1.8	5333	2.4	3481	1.4	773	-0.3	266	-0.6
China (ex Taiwan)	85452	6.1	8848	4.2	3598	3.5	464	3.3	36 786	6.1	5246	3.0	2029	4.5	350	1.0
Croatia	18 425	1.4	3635	4.6	3595	4.7	294	0.6	18 981	1.6	5197	5.1	1715	-1.0	67	2.3
Egypt	17 376	-0.4	1511	0.9	1085	-0.4	78	-0.2	11 596	-0.7	1509	-0.2	225	-2.3	52	3.1
Fiji	27 137	4.0	7574	4.7	809	0.1	262	-2.5	7127	3.8	635	0.6	551	1.3	166	3.1
France	6472	2.3	3240	1.3	1126	1.1	169	0.2	3992	1.1	1645	1.0	430	0.4	194	-1.6
Germany	31 680	-0.5	19 115	0.7	12 827	-0.1	1963	-0.8	29 227	-0.7	9940	0.0	2496	-1.0	971	0.3
Greece	36 864	-2.1	3979	-1.4	11 704	-1.5	587	-1.2	57 766	-1.3	3164	-1.6	1277	-1.8	1089	0.0
Hong Kong	37 614	-0.7	6646	-0.2	1801	-1.3	264	-3.6	16 005	0.5	3558	0.2	988	-2.6	245	-0.1
India	37 889	6.4	7182	4.5	3695	1.6	523	0.5	30 716	5.3	13 127	0.7	1817	2.7	500	0.9
Indonesia	21 038	3.9	4639	0.8	1279	-0.7	179	-2.2	11 003	-1.9	7678	5.3	600	-1.8	731	-11.4
Ireland	17 731	0.1	6914	-0.2	3306	-1.7	613	0.4	11 683	-0.7	8960	-0.9	701	-1.6	326	-2.2
Italy	60 628	-1.7	15 197	-1.3	25 047	-1.6	1132	-1.6	90 788	-1.7	23 062	-1.6	2345	-1.8	519	-1.6
Korea	27 987	5.5	4064	9.1	904	3.1	293	7.3	3530	8.0	1401	2.2	642	3.1	78	6.4
Lebanon	53 285	0.4	1122	0.1	1477	-0.3	49	-6.8	14 168	0.3	855	0.5	376	-1.0	17	-6.4
Macedonia	19 062	0.5	808	6.5	442	-1.1	24	-1.5	19 560	0.6	3250	0.9	365	-0.7	16	-7.7
Malaysia	21 063	0.6	8007	1.1	4162	-0.1	715	0.4	24 747	1.4	17 414	0.1	1591	1.1	604	-2.7
Malta	18 422	-1.8	2821	0.3	1803	-1.6	100	-1.8	22 456	-1.5	1006	-1.6	339	-0.7	51	-2.4
Netherlands	20 293	-1.1	15 288	0.0	8417	-1.4	2587	-1.5	24 302	-1.5	10 497	-0.9	1383	-1.2	554	-1.8
New Zealand	105 976	4.0	127 344	5.2	10 946	2.6	3624	0.2	55 461	5.9	45 004	3.1	3949	2.2	3438	0.6
Philippines	52 272	2.1	15 368	3.3	4513	2.6	770	2.6	22 472	2.3	5384	2.6	1405	3.0	1755	0.4
Poland	16 890	-2.2	5226	-0.8	6954	-2.8	861	-3.8	20 414	-2.3	6417	-1.6	1235	-2.2	111	2.4
Singapore	8478	3.2	4512	4.8	1379	3.6	257	-3.5	7615	3.2	10 255	1.7	700	0.9	228	-2.7
South Africa	28 685	7.4	14 353	13.5	3111	9.3	922	5.3	15 692	6.7	15 433	8.8	906	5.3	320	12.8
Sri Lanka	16 901	3.7	3965	2.4	1123	-0.5	187	0.2	26 654	2.6	2958	2.0	1403	2.4	270	-2.6
Turkey	12 149	0.7	921	1.3	591	1.2	40	-0.5	15 220	0.5	730	2.0	143	-0.1	27	5.7
UK	275 568	-0.9	177 856	0.2	125 986	-1.2	21 810	-1.0	209 080	-0.9	201 932	-0.3	17 223	-1.5	6729	-2.2
USA	19307	2.0	9997	1.8	3016	-1.0	939	1.3	11 281	1.7	6059	1.8	1877	1.0	1218	4.3
Vietnam	63025	0.6	11 619	1.1	10 472	-0.3	157	-4.5	56 664	0.5	10 124	0.1	2211	-0.3	558	1.6
Yugoslavia	19716	-1.1	5522	-0.2	4270	0.1	313	0.1	19 644	-0.1	4590	-1.7	1188	3.2	122	-4.0

Source: 1996 and 2001 Censuses. The data relate to usual place of residence in the community profile except for Yugoslavia where the absence of data meant that time series files had to be used.

The birthplace groups that are most evidently declining are similar to those identified in the national overview. It should be noted however that the pattern of decline is by no means uniform across all States and Territories. Indeed, there is significant variation for some groups (for example those born in Indonesia, Lebanon and Viet Nam). Queensland stands out against the general trend with increases in some groups which are declining elsewhere (for example those born in the UK, Malta, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia and Egypt). This is undoubtedly due to internal migration within Australia on the part of established migrants who are participating in the overall trend of northwards migration along Australia's east coast. This means, of course, that aged migrants might be increasing in number in Queensland at a greater rate than elsewhere; this could have implications for aged care services. Furthermore, the birthplace groups which are in decline are often those which are relatively large in number, with substantial second and third generation representatives. Care of the aged might therefore be born, in part at least, by some of those relatives.

Rates of growth within States and Territories of some birthplace groups are very high. The South Africa-born, for instance, grew at an average of over 5 per cent per annum in all regions in the period 1996-2001. Other birthplace groups which have consistent increases in all regions are from New Zealand, China, Korea, the Philippines and India. Furthermore, predominant patterns of growth are apparent for people born in Croatia (except in the ACT), Fiji (except in Tasmania), France (except in the NT), and the USA (except in South Australia). The pattern is certainly geographically uneven. Those from Indonesia, for example, are increasing in NSW, Queensland and Western Australia but declining in Victoria, South Australia, the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) and, especially, the NT.

These geographically uneven patterns have important implications for the delivery of migrant-related services (for example, language services for people from non-English-speaking backgrounds and religious centres for individuals not catered for fully in the host community). Such are the variations between and within States and Territories in this regard that it is not possible to specify which resultant costs or benefits accrue where. This issue should be subjected to detailed local analysis in each region, taking into account results of the 2006 Census when available.

The age profile of migrants clearly has a significant bearing on social interaction. Most obviously, school aged children have to socialise with their peers. Conversely, aged people can (but need not) become isolated, particularly as mobility and motility diminishes. These issues are explored by reference to Table 2.7 and Table 2.8.

As can be seen from Table 2.7, there are high proportions of children from countries with high proportions of more recent arrivals, for example, Thailand, and Bosnia-Herzegovina. In this regard, it is important to note that, in all cases, the percentage of children for almost all birthplace groups was lower than for the Australia-born population. In other words, there appear to be no States or Territories in which the number of migrant children is placing a numerical strain on the school system greater than that created by the Australia-born. They may, of course, create particular demands as in the case of English language training and education in English as a Second Language (ESL), and this may be felt more disproportionately by places of preferred settlement. The community studies certainly raise this as an issue.

Very much the opposite view is shown in Table 2.8 with Western and Eastern European countries having the greater proportion of older people. In this regard, it is important to note that proportions aged 65 and over in these communities were significantly above those for the Australia-born. The only exception to this Europe-dominated profile is a significant aged population in the NT of persons born in China. Except for this and the fact that there are fewer aged persons in the NT overall, there are no major variations in the pattern of aged migrants across the States and Territories. The extent to which aged migrants impose a social cost on Australia is mitigated by the size of the second and subsequent generations in each case, an issue that emerges in various contexts throughout this report.

Development of social capital in the form of linkages between migrant groups and the host community is inevitably influenced by the extent to which people share a common language. This is a major issue considered in some detail in the community studies in Chapters 7 to 11. Given the limited proficiency of the Australia-born in most foreign languages, this means that social capital is influenced considerably by the degree to which migrants speak English. The extent to which English literacy presents a barrier to social interaction can be inferred from Table 2.9 which sets out the proportions of persons in different birthplace groups who either did not speak English at all or did not speak the language well.

Table 2.7: Birthplace groups with highest proportion aged 0-14 years, by States/ Territories (per cent)

<i>ACT</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>WA</i>
Fiji (12.7)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (17.1)	Papua New Guinea (10.9)	Korea (15.4)	Iran (17.2)	Fiji (9.9)	Afghanistan (18.7)	Thailand (19.9)
Philippines (13.1)	Bangladesh (17.8)	Sri Lanka (11.8)	Hong Kong (17.2)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (20.5)	Philippines (10.3)	Bangladesh (19.1)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (21.1)
Thailand (15.1)	Colombia (17.9)	Philippines (13.4)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (18.5)	El Salvador (23.7)	South Africa (11)	Iraq (19.2)	Iraq (22.1)
USA (19.5)	Thailand (18.9)	Thailand (15.8)	El Salvador (20.6)	Thailand (40.7)	New Zealand (11.1)	Thailand (24.9)	El Salvador (23.6)
Korea (24.6)	Afghanistan (19.1)	USA (20.2)	Thailand (22.7)	Korea (40.9)	USA (11.9)	Somalia (30.1)	Korea (24.4)
Australia-born 26.9	26	31.4	25.5	25.0	24.5	26	28.9
Overseas-born 6.4	6.2	6.4	6.5	3.8	4.3	5.1	6.2

Table 2.8: Birthplace groups with highest proportion aged 65+ years, by States/ Territories (per cent)

<i>ACT</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>WA</i>
Scotland (21.6)	Poland (38.7)	India (9.5)	Italy (37.6)	Hungary (38)	Scotland (27.6)	Czechoslovakia (39.7)	Greece (29.5)
Italy (23.5)	Hungary (38.8)	Netherlands (9.9)	Poland (41.5)	Russia (48.3)	Wales (27.9)	Poland (40.8)	Poland (31.7)
Netherlands (23.5)	Ukraine (53.2)	Ireland (11.6)	Russia (57.3)	Lithuania (69.6)	Germany (29)	Ukraine (49.2)	Italy (33.5)
Poland (28.9)	Lithuania (60.2)	Italy (19.1)	Latvia (62.5)	Latvia (69.6)	Italy (35)	Latvia (63.5)	Latvia (66)
Hungary (30.5)	Latvia (61.9)	China (20.4)	Ukraine (66.1)	Ukraine (69.8)	Poland (54.6)	Lithuania (63.7)	Ukraine (75.2)
Australia-born 5.5	11.9	2.6	10.1	11.7	11.4	10.9	8.3
Overseas-born 13	14.7	6.4	15.2	21.4	22.1	16.9	15.1

Table 2.9: Proportion of birthplace groups who speak English not well or not at all, by States/ Territories (per cent)

<i>ACT</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>WA</i>
Serbia-Montenegro (21.3)	Laos (36.5)	Thailand (20.4)	Laos (38.2)	Greece (32.3)	Italy (11)	Ukraine (35.9)	Vietnam (42)
Korea (23.8)	Korea (39.1)	Indonesia (28.3)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (38.5)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (40.5)	Poland (14.6)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (36.8)	China (43.3)
Vietnam (28.5)	Vietnam (44.5)	Greece (32.9)	Vietnam (42.2)	China (40.8)	Hong Kong (17.8)	China (43.9)	Iraq (43.6)
China (31)	China (46.2)	Vietnam (36.1)	Cambodia (54.8)	Vietnam (41.8)	Greece (19.2)	Vietnam (45.6)	Singapore (47.3)
Bosnia-Herzegovina (36.6)	Cambodia (49.4)	China (45.6)	Yugoslavia (57)	Cambodia (47.1)	China (28.4)	Cambodia (47.8)	Cambodia (51.5)
Australia-born 0.5	0.8	7.3	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.8	0.6
Overseas-born 7.2	13.8	6.9	5.4	8.8	3.1	15	5.7

Source: Atlas of the Australian People (1999).

Note: (a) Migrants from the UK and most other places in the British Commonwealth predictably experience few problems with English; thus the "lowest" category has been omitted from this table.

As can be seen, new and emerging migrant groups (for example those born in Cambodia, China and Viet Nam) but also some long established ones (for example persons from Greece) have the highest proportions of poor English speakers. The proportion of these birthplace groups with English language difficulties is much lower in Tasmania and, to a lesser extent, in the ACT and NT. Elsewhere, few geographical variations are apparent at the State level although other facets of this research identified locations within regions where costs associated with migrant language problems for both individuals and the wider community appear significant.

Social capital includes not just linkages between migrants and the host community; it also includes intra-migrant community links. There is minimal data available to measure such links although the community studies conducted for this project provide valuable data on this aspect of social capital. Some indication of the balance of a community can however be derived from an examination of the sex ratio. An unbalanced sex ratio (many more males or females) can suggest social strain or difficulties. This might apply, for example, within emerging ethnic groups where different roles are traditionally assumed by different genders. For example, cooking and housekeeping might not be living strategies understood or acceptable to some male immigrants and thus single men could find themselves severely disadvantaged in their day-to-day living. Similarly, the size of the second generation of migrant groups can provide an indication of the support network available to migrants.

Geographical variations in the sex ratio are explored in Table 2.10. This shows considerable imbalance for some birthplace groups in all States and Territories. The most female dominated group is the Philippines-born. The Thailand-born and Japanese migrant groups are also strongly female dominant. No simple pattern is apparent for male dominated groups in that no fewer than 24 countries are mentioned in the highest ranked birthplace groups in Table 2.10. The most male dominated profiles tend to be among refugee groups from the world's trouble spots (for example the Balkans and the Middle East). It is also interesting that Tasmania and the NT have more extreme levels of male domination than other States and Territories.

Table 2.9: Sex ratio of birthplace groups by States/Territories (males: 100 females)

ACT	NSW	NT	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA
Lowest							
Philippines (48.3)	Philippines (63.7)	Thailand (36.3)	Philippines (33)	Philippines (39.3)	Philippines (19.8)	Philippines (56.6)	Philippines (35.2)
Japan (61.7)	Thailand (65.6)	Philippines (41.5)	Thailand (50.1)	Japan (56.7)	Fiji (69.7)	Japan (67.1)	Thailand (45.6)
Thailand (66.5)	Japan (66.7)	China (72.5)	Japan (65.3)	Korea (61.8)	Papua New Guinea (80)	Thailand (69.2)	Japan (60.2)
Korea (81)	Russia (68.4)	Malaysia (79.6)	Russia (67.3)	Russia (66.5)	China (84.3)	Finland (77.7)	Taiwan (65.9)
Poland (83.9)	Peru (74.6)	Papua New Guinea (81.8)	Chile (84.9)	Fiji (81.9)	Singapore (85)	Russia (78)	Korea (80.9)
Highest							
France (110.0)	Switzerland (122.6)	Netherlands (127.8)	Austria (129.9)	Croatia (118.7)	Northern Ireland (117.3)	Switzerland (116)	Switzerland (122.5)
Macedonia (111.9)	Czech Republic (125.3)	Ireland (128.3)	Czechoslovakia (134.7)	Slovenia (119.2)	Greece (127.1)	Iran (117.6)	USA (122.7)
Lebanon (116.2)	Denmark (133)	Germany (147.5)	Croatia (136.4)	Czechoslovakia (119.4)	Austria (147.7)	Somalia (120.5)	Turkey (124)
Italy (119.6)	West Bank-Gaza Strip (145.9)	Greece (156.1)	Czech Republic (137.9)	Czech Republic (126.3)	Italy (149.1)	Pakistan (133.5)	Iran (126.3)
Serbia-Montenegro (121.2)	Bangladesh (150.2)	Italy (201)	Hungary (146.3)	Hungary (126.4)	Yugoslavia (184.3)	Iraq (144.8)	Iraq (170.1)
Australia-born 97.9	97	107.3	98.7	96.7	96.3	96.1	99.5
Overseas-born 97.4	100.1	104.8	102.6	98.1	102.3	101	99.9

Source: *Atlas of the Australian People* (1999).

The figures represent the male population divided by the female population.

Table 2.10: Size of the first generation relative to the second generation by States/ Territories

ACT	NSW	NT	Qld	SA	TAS	Vic	WA
Lowest							
Netherlands (0.5)	Scotland (0.5)	Netherlands (0.5)	Ireland (0.4)	Ireland (0.6)	Ireland (0.4)	Ireland (0.5)	Malta (0.5)
Malta (0.5)	Ireland (0.6)	Italy (0.5)	Malta (0.4)	Malta (0.6)	Netherlands (0.6)	Scotland (0.6)	Greece (0.6)
Scotland (0.6)	Netherlands (0.6)	Ireland (0.5)	Scotland (0.5)	Netherlands (0.7)	Italy (0.6)	Netherlands (0.6)	Netherlands (0.6)
Italy (0.6)	Malta (0.6)	Scotland 90.5)	Greece (0.5)	Italy (0.7)	Scotland (0.6)	England (0.7)	Italy (0.6)
	Wales (0.7)	England (0.7)	Italy (0.5)	Scotland (0.7)	Greece (0.6)	Malta (0.7)	Ukraine (0.7)
Highest							
Sri Lanka (2.9)	Afghanistan (4.8)	Sri Lanka (2.2)	Japan (3.4)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (4.7)	Philippines (1.7)	Afghanistan (5.1)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (5.8)
Thailand (3)	Bangladesh (5.7)	USA (2.4)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (5.1)	Thailand (6)	Malaysia (1.9)	Somalia (5.2)	Brunei (5.9)
Vietnam (3.4)	Korea (6.7)	Thailand (2.6)	El Salvador (6.3)	Iran (6.3)	Hong Kong 1.9)	Korea (6)	Korea (6)
Korea (6.4)	Taiwan (9.2)	Vietnam (2.8)	Korea (11.8)	El Salvador (9.4)	Singapore (2)	Taiwan (7.1)	El Salvador (7.3)
	Sri Lanka (36.8)	Indonesia (17.3)	Taiwan (16.9)	Korea (11)	Papua New Guinea (2)	Bangladesh (8.9)	Taiwan (9)

Source: *Atlas of the Australian People* (1999). The figures indicate the size of the first generation divided by the size of the second generation.

The size of the first generation of each overseas birthplace group relative to its second generation is presented in Table 2.11. This provides a measure of the extent of 'the migrant community', not just numbers born overseas, hence indicating the extent to which individuals might be able to draw on compatible ethnic resources in coping with challenges of life in Australia. Thus a low score in Table 2.11 indicates a group where the second generation is comparatively large and where there are potentially many resources upon which to draw. Conversely, a high score indicates a situation where migrants have relatively limited resources within their own ethnic community in Australia. This is obviously the situation with emerging migrant communities, those arriving in relatively substantial numbers from areas with no prior history of major migration flows to Australia. Clearly, the differences in size between generations are relatively low in Tasmania, the ACT and the NT (with the exception of the Indonesia-born). In NSW and Victoria, the first generation is relatively large, compared to the second generation, for those born in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Korea and Taiwan but elsewhere no clear pattern is discernable.

Table 2.11: Settler Arrivals by State/Territory, 2002-03 to 2005-06

	2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
NSW	30 631	40.1	34 375	37.5	37 900	38.0	38 168	35.8
Vic	19 793	25.9	24 376	26.6	26 389	26.5	27 826	26.1
Qld	9633	12.6	12 344	13.5	12 962	13.0	14 059	13.2
SA	3282	4.3	4 373	4.8	5874	5.9	8571	8.0
WA	11 064	14.5	13 980	15.3	14 181	14.2	15 210	14.3
Tas	675	0.9	762	0.8	823	0.8	776	0.7
NT	428	0.6	494	0.5	516	0.5	655	0.6
ACT	806	1.1	912	1.0	1065	1.1	1226	1.2
Other	5	0.0	3	0.0	2	0.0	4	0.0
Australia	76 317	100	91 619	100	99 712	100	106 495	100

Source: DIMA Immigration Updates 2002-03 to 2005-06

2.3 Dispersal of recently arrived migrants by States and Territories

New South Wales has been the most preferred state for settlement by persons arriving in Australia under migration Programmes. In 2005-06, over one third (35.8%) intended to settle in that state (Table 2.12). Although the proportions intending to settle there have declined in recent years (down from 40.1% in 2002-03), the actual number has steadily increased due to the overall increases in number of new migrants arriving. In fact, numbers of new migrants initially settling in all States and Territories have increased in each of the last three years with the exception of Tasmania which attracts a comparatively very small

share of new migrants – less than one per cent. Victoria has proved to be the next most popular destination after New South Wales (26.1% in 2005-06), followed by Western Australia (14.3%) and Queensland (13.2%).

Proportions for the different types of eligible visa categories for 2005-06 and the States and Territories in which they initially chose to settle, are shown in Table 2.13. In terms of total number of entrants, independent skilled migrants comprised the largest single eligible category followed closely by family sponsored migrants. Almost 60 per cent of migrant settler arrivals were classified as skilled.

Table 2.12: Visa categories of entrants 2005-06 by States/Territories⁵

<i>Eligibility Category</i>	<i>NSW</i>	<i>Vic</i>	<i>Qld</i>	<i>SA</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>Tas</i>	<i>NT</i>	<i>ACT</i>	<i>Australia</i>
	%								No.
Sponsored	31.4	32.2	13.2	4.0	17.1	0.2	0.4	1.5	15 494
ENS	25.8	12.6	19.1	15.7	19.5	2.5	2.5	2.6	3092
Business	21.8	29.1	14.4	14.3	18.4	0.8	0.2	1.1	4288
Independent	32.8	23.3	13.2	11.7	17.5	0.5	0.4	0.6	36 633
Skilled Total									59 507
Family	43.8	26.5	13.0	4.3	9.7	0.7	0.7	1.4	34 771
Special eligibility	33.7	22.1	14.4	9.6	18.3	1.9	-	-	104
Humanitarian Programme	35.2	28.3	11.8	8.8	11.3	1.7	1.3	1.6	12 113
Total	35.8	26.1	13.2	8.0	14.3	0.7	0.6	1.2	106 495

Source: DIMA 2006g

New South Wales and Victoria together took a majority share of Humanitarian Programme and Special Eligibility entrants (a combined total of around 56% for both types of visas). With respect to other states, similar proportions planned to settle in Queensland (13.2%) and Western Australia (11.3%). Location of settlement of persons entering under the Humanitarian Programme obviously has implications for the nature of the demand for social services, a recurring issue raised in focus groups as a perceived major cost to Australia.

In terms of family-related visas (where relatives might be expected to help in the adjustment process for new arrivals), New South Wales again had the largest share followed by Victoria. In fact, for most visa types, these two states were, not surprisingly, the stand-out destinations. By contrast, migrants entering under the Employer Nomination Scheme (ENS) were more evenly spread with Victoria ranked as the fifth receiver state behind New South Wales, Western Australia, Queensland and South Australia. Demand in Western

⁵ Excluding persons entering through non-program migration and onshore migrants.

Australia and Queensland for employees associated with resources industries might be one reason for this more regular dispersal.

2.4 Migrants' synoptic view of the settlement experience (LSIA)

The social impact of immigration on the migrants themselves is clearly both significant and complex. One way of taking account of this complexity is to examine migrants' own synoptic assessment of whether the decision to migrate was right and whether they would encourage others to migrate. Responses to both these questions can be seen as a 'global' assessment of the success or otherwise of the migration. (A more complex logistic regression analysis of the data is provided in Appendix 2A).

Migrants, both primary applicants and spouses, present an overwhelmingly positive view of their migration decision (Table 2.14). LSIA 2 respondents were marginally more positive than those in LSIA 1. In short, approximately 90 per cent of all survey respondents said that their decision to migrate was right for them. This implies no major adverse social consequences of migration and that, for affected individuals, the process is overwhelmingly positive. Interestingly, the positive view of migration extended across all visa categories (Table 2.15). From LSIA 1, the highest satisfaction rating was for entrants under humanitarian visas. The equivalent visa entrants in LSIA 2 exhibited similarly high levels of satisfaction but in this case business migrants, skilled workers and prospective spouses matched them. This across-the-board rating of migration as 'right' is encouraging and reinforces the fact that, from a migrant's perspective, the benefits of migration far outweigh the costs – a view widely expressed in the focus groups as well.

Table 2.13: Migrants viewing the migration decision as right (per cent)

	<i>Wave</i>	<i>Primary Applicant</i>	<i>Spouse</i>
LSIA 1	1	91	89
	2	91	87
	3	92	84
LSIA 2	1	95	89
	2	92	89

Source: LSIA

Table 2.14: Views of different visa categories on the decision to migrate being right

<i>Visa Category</i>	<i>Per cent responding 'yes'</i>
LSIA 1 (Wave 3)	
Preferential Family	91
Concessional Family	89
Business Skills and Employer Nomination	91
Independent	91
Humanitarian	96
LSIA 2 (Wave 2)	
Spouse	94
Prospective spouse	96
Parent	92
Other preferential	97
Skilled – sponsor	94
Skilled – employee nominated	96
Business	100
Skilled – independent	96
Refugee	98
Special humanitarian	98

Source: LSIA

The overwhelmingly positive assessment of migration being 'right' for the people involved translates into a predisposition to encourage others to migrate (Table 2.16). However, the proportion of LSIA 1 respondents that felt inclined to encourage others to migrate declined over time. The decline was most marked in the case of spouses of primary migrants (73% to 62% from Wave 1 to Wave 3). The decline in the proportion which would encourage others to migrate, and the fact that these proportions are in any case lower than those who regarded migration as 'right' for themselves, might reflect the reality of migration and adjustment to a new land.

Table 2.15: Migrants who would encourage others to migrate (per cent)

	<i>Primary applicant</i>	<i>Spouse</i>
LSIA 1		
Wave 1	72	73
Wave 2	67	69
Wave 3	66	62
LSIA 2		
Wave 1	75	79
Wave 2	80	80

Source: LSIA

The results also imply recognition of the fact that migration is an individual decision: although satisfied themselves, respondents might be reluctant to encourage others, realising that much depends on individual experiences and coping strategies. The predisposition to encourage others to migrate is more evident from LSIA 2 than in LSIA 1 results. Moreover, this increased during the one-year interval between Waves 1 and 2 to the point where four out of five would encourage others to migrate. This might suggest that the experiences of the second cohort were more positive than those of the first, notwithstanding the fact that all waves showed a very positive view.

Differences were evident between different visa categories in the extent to which migrants would encourage others to migrate (Table 2.17). For LSIA 1, those most inclined to encourage others to migrate were in the group who had entered on humanitarian visas. This group displayed levels that were 25 per cent higher than for other visa categories among which there was minimal difference. This response from humanitarian entrants is perhaps understandable because such migrants are fleeing persecution and hardship.

Table 2.16: Views of different visa categories on encouraging others to migrate

<i>Visa category</i>	<i>Per cent responding 'yes'</i>
LSIA 1 (Wave 3)	
Preferential Family	63
Concessional Family	66
Business	62
Independent	63
Humanitarian	81
LSIA 2 (Wave 2)	
Spouse	74
Prospective spouse	72
Parent	63
Other preferential	81
Skilled – sponsor	85
Skilled – employee nominated	82
Business	89
Skilled – independent	86
Refugee	87
Special humanitarian	86

Source: LSIA

Slightly higher levels of encouragement of others to migrate were evident among refugee and humanitarian entrants in LSIA 2. However, in this case, business and skilled migrants matched the level of encouragement. From the perspective of the host society, this increased level of encouragement is satisfying and suggests a widening recognition, on the part of migrants, that

benefits of migration outweighed costs. It also reflected the fact that migrants in LSIA 2 enjoyed significantly better labour market outcomes compared to LSIA 1. The groups in LSIA 2 least likely to encourage others to migrate were parents, prospective spouses and spouses but, even here, levels of encouragement were much higher than for any group in LSIA 1 excluding humanitarian entrants.

2.5 Conclusions

This chapter has provided a brief introduction to the composition of the population and distribution patterns of migrant groups within Australia. Dominant birthplace groups of new settlers each year are now countries in the Asian regions: they were the source for around 40 per cent of new arrivals in most recent years (about 50% when non-migration settlers such as New Zealanders are discounted). These features, together with the range of source countries, illustrate the multicultural nature of Australia's population.

Of course, patterns and characteristics of migrant population settlement are constantly shifting not only as a result of new settlers arriving with varying levels of qualifications and with different ethnic origins but also through internal migration between the States and Territories as well as within cities, towns and regions of Australia.

Settlement patterns of migrants, particularly more recent ones, obviously have important implications for provision and delivery of infrastructure and services which are of paramount importance not only for migrants but also for the communities in which they live. Analysing statistics at the State and Territory level do not permit appreciation of major distinctions at the local level of suburb or town. Thus it is not possible to identify those smaller geographic areas which are reaping the benefits and/or suffering from resultant costs that are flow-on effects of migration policies. This is an area which requires further analysis and consideration when databases with results with 2006 Census results are being constructed.

Satisfaction with aspects of daily living affects quality of life and thus impacts upon the social wellbeing of individuals and the communities in which they reside. Development of rapport not only between migrants and the host community but also inter- and intra-migrant group connectivity is influenced and facilitated by a number of factors including, for example, compatibility of language, workplace experiences, and qualifications. These elements of human capital and their social impact are explored in the next chapter through an examination of the literature and relevant data.