

PART II

3: Human Capital

Human capital is a summary term for the investment in education, training and other qualities which increases the worth of individuals to society generally. Although the importance of different levels of human capital is most evident in the labour market, where differences are often reflected in income, the concept has a wider relevance. Investment in the health of an individual has obvious benefits for society at large, not least with respect to welfare payments, as do the skills and talents which individuals are able to bring to bear in the general fields of leisure and recreation.

3.1 Employment, welfare payments, workplace skills and education

Review of the literature and data

Employment and wellbeing

Employment is obviously a key issue in the lives of migrants. Skilled business stream immigrants, for instance, are selected on the basis of the jobs they will do and the investment they will make. Humanitarian stream migrants also need employment in order to establish a life in their adopted land and to reduce their dependency on welfare payments. In this sense, employment is of crucial economic significance to both individuals and society at large.

Employment is important in other ways however. For example, employment helps to give a person identity, social contact (Peters 1995) and a shared sense of belonging. Working hours provide 'shape' to the lives of all Australians in the paid labour force. Employment is a way in which people develop the skills of collaboration and a route to self-development and realisation of personal potential (Maslow 1998). Moreover, contact through employment can help in the social adjustment of migrants in Australia. In this sense, the skills and the prior training of migrants are critical concerns because they influence the work opportunities open to immigrants. Important, too, is any training and skills acquisition undertaken after arrival. These are fundamental components of human capital. Also important is the quality of immigrants' working lives and the satisfaction they derive from employment. Such experiences can also influence the work ethic of future generations.

Welfare payments, risks and recipients

As a result of Australia's migration policies, migrants (taken as a whole) have higher levels of skills and qualifications than the Australia-born population. This positive impact on the economy and on Australia's stock of human capital is well reported (for instance, Garnaut 2002; Garnaut *et al.* 2003). Despite this general recognition, myths have developed and endured with respect to levels of welfare payments paid. For example, there is widespread belief that migrants are uneducated and take the jobs of other Australians or that they live on welfare (C. Richardson 2002). The opposing view is supported by one study (Birrell and Jupp 2000) which found that, overall, overseas-born persons had lower welfare-recipient rates than other Australian residents.

Welfare payments available to migrants are, of course, dictated to a large extent by government policy and, for the past decade, additional limitations have applied. For example, for non-humanitarian migrants, two years must elapse before most social security payments can be accessed (HREOC 2005). In addition, most new immigrants are not eligible for disability or aged pensions until ten years after their arrival in Australia. Nevertheless, higher welfare-recipient rates apply for some migrant groups with low levels of proficiency in English. This probably reflects relatively limited possession of post-school qualifications or work experiences which would allow them to compete for jobs in the Australian labour market (Birrell and Jupp 2000, p. vii).

There is recognition that the two-year waiting period for income support for most migrants could add to risks of poverty and homelessness (Senate Community Affairs Reference Committee (SCARC) 2004). Without provision of appropriate settlement support, work opportunities and educational opportunities for children, immigrants might not be able to fully participate in and to become productive members of Australian society. Furthermore, the SCARC found that failure by skilled migrants to have their qualifications recognised or to have access to Programmes to quickly and inexpensively upgrade qualifications diminished abilities to find work and to acquire higher standards of living.

Historically, high welfare-recipient rates were more likely to be associated with the early periods of settlement; with increased settlement time, welfare levels have been shown to fall significantly (Birrell and Jupp 2000). This is reassuring as one of the long-term concerns about migration expressed in the focus groups centred on the risk of ongoing welfare dependency. While immigrants generally access welfare less than Australia-born residents, welfare use does increase in line with age on arrival in Australia (Birrell and Jupp 2000). Parents accepted under the Family Reunion scheme naturally tend to be older immigrants. Whilst older persons might not be so active in terms of paid employment, the important role that grandparents play in providing emotional family support and unpaid child-care should not be disregarded.

Migrant employment opportunities, qualifications and skills

Employment status and qualifications for major birthplace groups has been influenced not only by age but also by time of arrival in Australia. Some long-established birthplace groups – such as those from Italy, Greece and Malta – have comparatively low levels of tertiary education (Hugo 1999). One reason was due to post-World War II demand by the then buoyant manufacturing sector for unskilled workers. By contrast, high proportions of more recent arrivals, especially from the USA and some Asian countries including Malaysia and India, have university degrees or diplomas. Nevertheless, not all recent migrants are highly qualified; more recently arrived groups from Cambodia, Thailand and Viet Nam have relatively low proportions of migrants with degrees.

Differences in migrant qualifications over time also reflect in part the growing availability of university and college education round the globe (and, for migrants, in Australia after arrival) and the fact that university or college education is much more attainable now than it was for the early settlers after World War II. In part, too, they reflect the fact that selection for migrant entry visas is a competitive process in which those with formal qualifications have better chances of success.

Examination of qualifications and occupational status of migrants is relevant to this discussion because human capital which migrants bring with them or which they subsequently acquire through education and training is commonly measured with respect to its application in the work place. This aspect has been examined more fully in Appendix 3A.1 (with reference to Tables 3A.1.1 and 3A.1.2 and related discussion). It is not surprising that low occupational profiles tend to parallel migrant groups with low levels of university and college education. Notwithstanding this, there appears to be an anomaly in the case of migrants sourced from some countries (such as Viet Nam and, to a lesser extent, North Africa and the Middle East) which had strong representation among both those with high formal qualifications and jobs of low occupational status. This suggests either considerable variability within the category of Viet Nam-born migrants in terms of their labour force experience and lack of career choices or significant under-use of formal qualifications. Whether under-use might be related to lack of recognition of qualifications or language difficulties – or both – can only be speculated upon.

Labour force comparisons

Time of arrival in Australia has also influenced employment status for major birthplace groups. Those who arrived in the early post-war period have aged to the point where high proportions have retired and are therefore out of the labour force. In contrast, some migrant birthplace groups (such as those from Sub-Saharan Africa, the Philippines, the Americas and Southern and Central Asia) have strong representation among the ranks of the employed.

Labour force participation rates according to birthplace are summarised in Table 3.1. ABS (2004c) statistics show that 66 per cent of Australia's migrants⁶ were employed; this rate was similar to that of people born in Australia (64%) (ABS 2006c). Additional statistics and commentary presented in Appendix 3A.1 point to business migrants on temporary visas (83%) and permanent visa holders (79%) having the highest rates of employment and also high participation rates (88% and 82% respectively) (refer to Table 3A.1.3). The labour force participation rate for migrants of 70 per cent was high compared with 58 per cent for all persons born overseas and 65 per cent for the Australia-born. Accordingly, the unemployment rate for migrants was, at 5.6 per cent, higher than for those born in Australia (4.9%). Further data with respect to labour force status for migrants is presented in Appendix 3A.1 (with reference to Tables 3A.1.4 and 3A.1.5).

Table 3.1: Overview of labour force participation rates by birthplace – November 2004

	<i>Persons '000</i>	<i>Participation rate per cent</i>	<i>Per cent employed</i>	<i>Per cent unemployed</i>
Civilian population aged 15 years and over				
Australia-born	15 745.2	67.3	64.0	4.9
All overseas born	2151.0	58.1	55.4	4.7
Migrants (a)	625.3	70.2	66.3	5.6
Other overseas born (b)	1525.7	53.1	50.5	4.3

Notes

(a) People who were born overseas, who arrived in Australia after 1984, were aged 15 years and over on arrival and had obtained permanent Australian resident status prior to or after their arrival.

(b) People who arrived in Australia before 1985; people who arrived after 1984 and were aged less than 15 years on arrival; and people who arrived after 1984 and were aged 15 years and over on arrival and were either temporary residents who had planned to stay in Australia for 12 months or more, or those whose status was not able to be determined.

Source: after ABS (2006c); after DEWR (2005).

Post-settlement occupational status

Many migrants change occupations both on and after arrival in Australia although there seems to have been minimal investigation of the reasons for such changes. In fact, labour force statistics showed that around 40 per cent of employed migrants changed to a different major occupation group by comparison with their first jobs in Australia (ABS 2004c). Males (47%) were more likely to take on a different type of occupation than females (37%) (ABS 2004c: 12-13). This might reflect migrants, particularly bread-winning males, subsequently finding jobs better suited to their qualifications and liking after initial settling-in periods. Alternatively there might be more negative

⁶ When interpreting labour force statistics, a migrant is defined as a person who was born overseas, who arrived in Australia after 1984, was aged 15 years and over on arrival, and had obtained permanent Australian resident status prior to or after their arrival (ABS 2004f: 34)

connotations such as job dissatisfaction or difficulties with adapting to conditions of employment in a new country. Temporary business visa holders (33%) were least likely to change and holders of humanitarian visas (45%) most likely. For many people, changing jobs is associated with uncertainty and stress. Employment status, how migrants handle job changes and whether occupational changes are regarded positively could impact upon not only economic but also social wellbeing of individuals as well as others within affected households.

Results from the LSIA's which have permitted the educational qualifications and work status of more recent migrants to be tracked are explored and discussed in Appendix 3A.1 (with reference to Tables 3A.1.6 to 3A.1.8). In short, recent migrants have increasingly contributed to human capital in Australia by adding significantly to the pool of persons with qualifications. Predictably, not all qualifications held by migrants can be put to most effective use immediately upon arrival in Australia. Nevertheless, the longer migrants were in the workforce, the more, generally speaking, they were able to use their qualifications. This suggests that, with growing familiarity, employee skills could be better matched to workplace tasks.

Migrant workforce characteristics

It is important to note that controls on migrant intakes in the 1980s and 1990s meant that Australia did not develop a multicultural workforce on the same scale as in the USA and European Union (Jupp 2002). As a result, residential differentiation in Australia has not led to the same marked variations in quality of life that are evident in some places overseas.

There is nonetheless a danger of overlooking the divide between those immigrants who do well and those who experience difficulties (Jupp 2001). While members of some Asian groups have fared relatively poorly in labour markets (Hugo 1992; Viviani 1997), this camouflages the fact that many have been highly successful. Indeed, Asian male immigrants have been found overall to occupy positions equal to or even better in status than Australia-born males (Evans 1985). Yet in spite of the obvious success of many immigrants, some researchers (such as Jayasuriya and Kee 1999) have pointed to extremely poor rates of Asian-Australian representation existing in key sectors of the Australian workforce, such as in federal and state public services, university governance, government advisory bodies (including those dealing with Asia-Australia relations), corporate leadership and the media. These differences are apparently not explained simply by degrees of fluency in English.

On balance, little evidence was found in the literature of a migrant labour underclass forming in Australia in spite of recognition that humanitarian migrants have been among the worst affected by economic restructuring, with the added burden of social exclusion resulting through unemployment, welfare

dependency and poverty (Castles *et al.* 1998). Nevertheless, there are indications that overt discrimination has occurred in the labour market (Collins 1991), especially with respect to youth (Burnley 1985) and those from visual ethnic minorities. Lack of fluency in the English language can present as another barrier.

Proficiency in English

One of the keys to the successful adaptation of migrants in Australia is their proficiency in the use of the English language. This influences the degree to which new settlers are able to interact with the host society and to find employment in skilled occupations. Of course, levels of proficiency in English vary significantly according to place of birth. The major birthplace groups with language difficulties (in the sense of not speaking English well if at all) were from various parts of Asia including Viet Nam, China (excluding Taiwan and SARs) and South Korea where around one in three did not speak English well. Migrants from Turkey, the Former Yugoslav Republic (FYR) of Macedonia, Lebanon and Croatia had problems speaking English to even greater degrees. Difficulties with the English language are not however confined to these areas or to recently arrived migrants. In some long-established groups, between one-fifth and one-third of ethnic populations speak English not well if at all; this included migrants from Greece or with Greek ancestry (32%) and Italy or with Italian ancestry (22%). (Refer to Appendix 3A.1, Tables 3A.1.9 and 3A.1.10, for further statistics and discussion).

Linguistic diversity

One aspect of human capital that is difficult to measure is the extent to which migrants bring with them language skills which add not only to Australia's cultural diversity but also to the ability of Australia to interact and trade with other nations. This obviously brings significant social benefit to Australia. Some of the settling-in difficulties for new migrants are also alleviated if they are able to communicate using familiar languages. That one in five Australians has some capacity to speak languages other than English is some indication of this linguistic resource (refer to Table 3A.1.11).

A striking feature of linguistic diversity is the huge range of languages spoken in Australia. Whilst on the one hand this represents a significant addition to Australia's stocks of human capital, on the other hand, educators and trainers are being faced with different and more numerous challenges as a result of greater diversity.

Challenges faced by education systems

English language competence is recognised as a key to socio-economic adjustment in the wider society (Burnley *et al.* 1997). Nonetheless, misgivings about the scale of resources necessary for training for those from non-English speaking backgrounds persist (Iredale 1997; Matthews 1992). This concern extends to the schooling of immigrant children where a number of factors relating to migrant intakes impacts on Australia's education systems. These factors include unplanned-for fluctuations in migration levels; high proportions of refugee and other humanitarian migrants in some areas; greater religious and linguistic diversity within intakes; and broader geographical dispersal of ethnic minority students (Cahill 1996).

Resulting competition for scarce resources has meant that the education outcomes for recent first generation young migrants are sometimes presented as being mixed and uncertain. There are also assertions that English as a Second Language (ESL) Programmes originally provided in the main by the Commonwealth have not been sufficiently supplemented by State government initiatives. This is despite the fact that explicit curricula or curriculum framework documents are in place for second language support in some states including NSW, Victoria and the ACT (ACT Department of Education and Training 2003; OECD 2006).

In spite of these concerns, a recently released OECD (2006) report that examined performances of students with immigrant backgrounds and compared them to those of their 'native' counterparts found that Australia was one of a handful of countries, which included Canada and New Zealand that performed well. Furthermore, the analysis found that background characteristics of students in Australia were more similar whereas in most European countries, immigrant students were from lower socio-economic backgrounds and had parents who were often less well educated than in the rest of the population.

Despite some misgivings, second and, to a lesser extent, third generation immigrant Australians generally do well, as evidenced in the merit lists at the end of secondary education (Khoo *et al.* 2002). Nevertheless, a dichotomy is evident in tertiary education. Although permanent resident students who have English as a second language overall have higher participation rates than English-speaking-background Australians – for Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese speakers, the level of participation is striking – there are some other language groups (including Italian, Macedonian, Turkish, Greek and Croatian speakers) which are underrepresented in universities relative to their population (Dobson *et al.* 1996).

Competition for skilled labour

In more recent times, Australia has developed the business of export education, demonstrated by numbers of temporary entry students. By way of example, overseas students make up over 18 per cent of enrolments in Australian universities (ABC Radio Australia 2005) and during 2004-05, in excess of 225 000 international students were granted visas (DIMA 2006b). There has been increasing emphasis on the skilled stream and on overseas students training at their own expense and, in some cases, subsequently taking out permanent residence (Birrell *et al.* 2005; Garnaut 2002). On the downside, there is an oft-expressed view that many overseas students, particularly ones from Asian countries, are not sufficiently proficient in English to effectively participate in the workforce once they are qualified (Birrell, Hawthorne and Richardson 2006, *The Age* 2006).

Despite these schemes, Australia still experiences shortages of skilled labour. These shortages underscore what appears to be generally widespread support by employers for continuation of existing federal government policies to increase opportunities for people to convert from long-term temporary visas (under which Australia has no obligation to provide jobs or social security) to permanent onshore immigrant status (Jupp 2002; McDonald 2002). Increasingly employers have a global view of labour recruitment, recognising sponsored temporary skilled workers as essential for successful operations (Khoo *et al.* 2004). While there appear to be many advantages for Australia of temporary visa migrants (C. Richardson 2002), little is known of their migration experience or whether training of Australian residents might present a better long-term option.

Immigrants do not take jobs for which people in the Australia-born workforce are qualified. On the contrary, migration helps to alleviate labour shortages but it is not a substitute for natural population increase through births. Fertility and immigration do not have equivalent impacts on long-term population size and age structure (Kippen and McDonald 2004). Competition for immigrants on a global scale, together with an expected shift to lower fertility rates almost everywhere (AIHW 2004), could make recruitment of short and long-term visa entrants in areas of skilled shortages increasingly difficult.

Summary of benefits and costs

Migrants are credited with raising the bar on Australia's per capita reserves of human capital due to overall higher qualifications and greater skills levels at time of arrival than the Australia-born. However this capital might be under-utilised due to potential transferability gaps emerging in the application and recognition of post-migration qualifications.

In addition, superior economic outcomes from migration are claimed on the basis that, due largely to government policies and types of visas issued,

migrants have overall lower welfare recipient rates. This does not apply to some identifiable migrant groups including humanitarian and preferential family entrants and some from non-English speaking backgrounds who experience communications difficulties and thus fair relatively poorly in labour markets. Naturally this leads to claims that education in English and ESL courses are under-resourced.

Of course unplanned-for fluctuations in levels, composition and dispersal of migrants do impact upon the effectiveness of education systems. Unfortunately, immigrant representation and performance in different sectors of society have not been monitored which limits the ability to gauge patterns relating to social impacts as they emerge in the workplace, in education systems, and with respect to welfare payments.

Interpretations of costs and benefits of migration to Australia with respect to work, welfare payments, workplace skills and education are summarised in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Employment, welfare payments, workplace skills and education issues – summary of social costs and benefits of migration

<i>Social benefits</i>	<i>Social costs</i>
Overall, migrants have attained higher education qualifications than the Australia-born prior to migration, thus raising national levels (on a per capita basis) of human capital.	Although well qualified, some migrants are not sufficiently proficient in English to effectively participate in the workforce.
High levels of proficiency in English are demonstrated by many major birthplace groups of migrants.	Some birthplace groups, including in some long-established groups, experience difficulties with the English language.
Linguistic diversity adds not only to Australia's cultural diversity but also to its ability to interact and trade with other nations, with attendant social benefits.	Educators and trainers are faced with different and more numerous challenges as a result of greater cultural and linguistic diversity.
Those parts of Australia that have attracted large numbers of migrants have had their pool of human capital substantially increased.	Those parts of Australia that have attracted large numbers of humanitarian migrants have experienced increased pressures relating to welfare, education and the workforce.
Overall, migrants have lower welfare-recipient rates than the Australia-born.	Some identifiable migrant groups have higher welfare-recipient rates than the Australia-born.
Eligibility periods for welfare payments apply to most migrant groups thus limiting the size of the welfare umbrella.	Waiting periods for independent skilled migrants might not only be slowing down settlement times but might also be adding to risks of poverty and homelessness.
Unskilled migrants were an important source of labour during post-war periods of rapid economic growth.	Large numbers of low-skilled migrants have been affected by economic downturns and reductions in blue collar manufacturing jobs.
As a result of restricted intakes, Australia does not have marked variations in quality of life associated with multicultural workforces on the same scale as, for example, the USA and European Union.	High unemployment has occurred in areas where large numbers of disadvantaged humanitarian and preferential family groups of migrants have settled.
The Family Reunion Scheme has been an important facet of the successful integration of some migrant groups into the workplace and wider community.	Reductions in family reunion categories of visas have limited traditional family support and unpaid child-care especially for 'new' migrants and emerging migrant groups.

<p>Most migrants obtaining employment seem to successfully integrate into the Australian workplace.</p>	<p>Long-standing problems associated with integration and employment options could be restricting social mobility for a minority of recently arrived migrant groups.</p>
<p>Members of some migrant groups have been highly successful in labour markets.</p>	<p>Members of some migrant groups have experienced difficulties and thus have fared relatively poorly.</p>
<p>Migrants have expanded the scope and style of expertise and creativity available in the Australian workplace and to industry.</p>	<p>Migrants tend to be underrepresented in many key sectors of the Australian workforce.</p>
<p>There is limited evidence of a migrant labour underclass or ethnic enclaves in Australia.</p>	<p>There are indications that some overt discrimination occurs in the labour market. Risks of separate labour market segments forming for migrants from non-English speaking backgrounds exist, but are not great.</p>
<p>A recent OECD (2006) report pointed to Australia being among a handful of countries with relatively small achievement gaps between immigrant and 'native' students.</p>	<p>Unplanned-for fluctuations in levels, composition and dispersal of migrants may impact adversely upon education systems.</p>
<p>Appreciation of cultural differences in schools lays foundations for wider inter-cultural understanding and tolerance.</p>	<p>Superficial notions of multiculturalism can hamper delivery of accurate information about the social impact of migration in the classroom.</p>
<p>Australia has been successful in attracting highly qualified migrants.</p>	<p>Australia is in strong competition in the global market for skilled labour and loses some through out-migration.</p>
<p>There is seemingly widespread employer support for continuation of policies to increase opportunities for temporary visas and conversion of long-term visas to permanent onshore status.</p>	<p>Little is known of the migration experience of persons granted temporary visas or whether training of Australian residents might present better long-term options.</p>
<p>More recent intakes of skilled migrants have increasingly better qualifications.</p>	<p>Qualifications held by migrants cannot always be most effectively used immediately upon arrival.</p>
<p>Many migrants change occupations after arrival in Australia, perhaps reflecting recognition of, retraining for, or improvement in qualifications.</p>	<p>Qualifications are not always used to best effect; it seems that 'transferability gaps' exist between pre- and post-settlement use of qualifications.</p>
<p>Skill stream migrants have higher rates of employment than the Australia-born.</p>	<p>Unemployment rates are, overall, slightly higher than for the Australia-born. Some birthplace groups have relatively high rates of unemployment.</p>

3.2 Physical and mental health

Review of the literature and data

Importance to Australia of a healthy migrant

A prosperous Australian society requires a stock of people who are capable of economic and social participation. In the first instance, this means people of sound physical and mental health who can contribute their skills to supply market and non-market labour. If migrants suffer from ill health, their contribution to society can be lessened. Moreover, ill health brings with it the cost of health care, much of which is ultimately met by governments through provisions like the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme, safety nets, and the public hospital system. Migrants to Australia have to meet health requirements in order to be eligible for certain visa classes of entry (DIMIA 2006d). These requirements are designed to minimise the burden of planned migration on the health care system, to prevent the spread of contagious diseases, and to protect Australia's record of good health.

Pre-migration screening

Australia is able to control the nature of the migrant intake through the issuing of visas. This provides an opportunity to vet the health status of potential migrants. It might be expected, therefore, that the health status of migrants on arrival places few immediate demands on the health care system. As against this, migration itself is known to be a stressful activity. Stress, in turn, can contribute to ill health and, especially, to psychological distress.

Pre-migration screening appears to ensure that, overall, migrants have better physical health, on arrival and for some years following, than the Australia-born population (Jarasuriya and Kee 1999; Richardson *et al.* 2002; Singh and de Looper 2002). This better health, known as the 'healthy migrant effect' (AIHW 2004:190), is reflected in longer life expectancy, lower death and hospitalisation rates, and a lower prevalence of some lifestyle-related risk factors.

Sub-group variations

While migrants generally have very good health on arrival, there are some variations between visa categories with humanitarian and preferential family visa entrants faring worst (S. Richardson 2002; Richardson *et al.* 2002; Vanden Heuvel and Wooden 1999). These groups, particularly humanitarian migrants, can be exempted from meeting certain health requirements. Of course, sub-group variations in morbidity and mortality due to complex

interactions between social, cultural, environmental, biological and genetic factors are also present within different ethnic groups (Jarasuriya and Kee 1999).

By way of example, mortality rates among migrants from the UK and Ireland are closest to the rates for Australia-born people. In contrast, migrants from Asia have much lower standardised mortality ratios (AIHW 2004:191), specifically for some cancers, respiratory causes and suicide (Singh and de Looper 2002:3). Additionally, migrants born in the UK and Ireland experience higher rates of breast and lung cancer and some migrant groups from Europe, the Pacific Islands and Asia have higher diabetes mortality rates (Singh and de Looper 2002:3-4). Furthermore heart, stroke and vascular diseases are more than twice as likely to be reported by migrants from European countries as by the Australia-born (ABS 2006d). Statistics and discussion relating to selected long-term health conditions experienced by migrants and persons born in Australia are presented in Appendix 3A.2 (with reference to Table 3A.2.1).

Pre-migration screening no doubt contributed to persons born overseas overall having lower rates of core-activity limitations and disabilities than the Australia-born (Table 3A.2.2). Stand out exceptions were those born in the United Kingdom other than England and Scotland (highest rates) and for those born in North-East Asia (lowest rates). Of course, age is a crucial factor with respect to health and many migrants from all parts of the UK have by now lived in Australia for several decades whilst those from some other regions including North-East Asia tend to be comparatively more recent arrivals.

The 'healthy migrant effect' is reflected in lower hospitalisation rates for migrants (Table 3A.2.3). Once again, considerable variations occur according to birthplace. For example, persons born in the Oceania region (excluding Australia, New Zealand and Fiji) had the highest hospitalisation rate of all overseas-born groups in 2004-05 (570.3 per 1 000 population) (AIHW 2006). The single global birthplace region for which migrants had a higher hospitalisation rate in 2004-05 than applied for the Australia-born (352.7) was the Middle East and North Africa (358.2). Hospitalised patients born in China had the lowest rate (203.2), contributing to the lowest regional rate (215.1) for persons from North-East Asia.

Mental health

Although migrants have overall better physical health on arrival than the Australia-born population (Jarasuriya and Kee 1999; Richardson *et al.* 2002; Singh and de Looper 2002), they sometimes exhibit symptoms of significant psychological distress, at about three times the rate of the general Australian population (Jupp 1990; S. Richardson 2002; Vanden Heuvel and Wooden 1999). This is generally related to the stress and disruption of moving, and

leaving friends, family and familiar conditions behind. Thus the act of migration itself can lead to mental health issues. The cost here is born primarily by new settlers themselves and not the destination country. Survey data for recent new settlers found that humanitarian migrants from the Middle East and the Balkans and those who did not speak English well had especially high levels of psychological distress (Richardson *et al.* 2002: 25).

It is not apparent how soon, to what extent, or even if problems of psychological stress are alleviated with length of time in Australia. However, one positive finding in interviews conducted with young refugees in Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth was evidence of resilience amongst participants (Brough *et al.* 2003). At the same time, the authors cautioned that the ability of individuals to negotiate the settlement process could impact on their future mental wellbeing, suggesting a heightened risk of later mental illness.

In this regard, research has pointed to socio-economic status as an important factor. Accordingly, migrants from lower socio-economic backgrounds have higher rates of mental health problems than those from higher socio-economic groups (Krupinski 1967; Minas 1990). For instance, a study of elderly Vietnamese migrants found that the extent of their loneliness and isolation was such that it gave rise to chronic mental health problems (Thomas 1991; Thomas 1999; Thomas and Balnaves 1993).

In spite of these issues, overseas born people are less likely to be hospitalised for a number of mental disorders, including schizophrenia, depressive episodes and sleep disorders (AIHW 2004: 193). Furthermore, at the time of the 2001 National Health Survey (NHS), the prevalence of mental and behavioural problems among the overseas-born was marginally lower to the rate for that of the Australia-born (9.0% and 9.8% respectively) (ABS 2001: 7). However, at this time, it also seems that greater proportions of migrants who spoke languages other than English at home had high (or very high) levels of psychological distress (16.5% compared with 11.9% for migrants who spoke English only and 12.4% for the Australia-born) (ABS 2001). This appears to be at odds with results from the 2002 GSS which pointed to persons born overseas and who were not proficient in English being significantly less likely to say that they had experienced stressors in the preceding 12 months (ABS 2003a).

The most recent NHS survey (ABS 2006d) produced non-comparable albeit interesting results. It showed that overseas-born persons who arrived prior to 1996 (9.8%) or who spoke English as their main language at home (10.0%) were more likely to suffer from mental and behavioural problems than either the Australia-born (8.8%), more recent arrivals (4.6%) or those who mainly spoke other than English at home (7.9%). Persons born in the UK, many of whom would be long-term migrants speaking English at home, also had comparatively high rates (9.5%). Furthermore, there were stand-out results for North Africa and the Middle East and Southern and Eastern Europe with 11.1 per cent and 10.4 per cent of persons born in these regions respectively

having mental and behavioural problems. These results might be associated with humanitarian migrants exiting refugee camps or fleeing from chaos or war.

Obviously, understanding and interpreting factors that might influence the mental health of persons is complex and issues are many and multi-faceted. Further results and discussion relating to mental health issues of migrants are presented in Appendix 3A.2 (refer to Tables 3A.2.4 to 3A.2.7).

Impacts of non-English speaking backgrounds

Barriers to accessing health services for those from non-English speaking backgrounds include language difficulties (particularly with respect to medical terminology); obstacles related to accessing transportation; time constraints (especially for young women in the workforce); and knowledge about health education and prevention of disease. General provisions implemented for the ageing Australian population such as retirement villages, hostels and nursing homes are often not considered viable options for migrant groups, either financially or culturally (Stewart and Bien 2003).

At the time of the 2002 GSS, persons not proficient in English were over two and a half times more likely to rate their health as fair or poor (ABS 2003a) (refer to Table 3A.2.8 in Appendix 3A.2). Respondents were also asked in this survey about core-activity limitations including schooling or employment limitations. Core activity limitations refer to the ability, or rather lack of it, to effectively communicate. In these results (ABS 2003a), persons with low proficiency levels in English presented significant limitations (Table 3A.2.9).

Long-term health conditions – with the exception of diabetes – were generally more likely to be experienced by persons whose main language spoken at home was English (including Australians) (Table 3A.2.10). More recent migrants (those who arrived after 1996) were less likely to have a disability or a long-term health condition. Further results and discussion relating to health according to language spoken are presented in Appendix 3A.2. Clearly ability to effectively communicate in English seemingly has wide-ranging implications with respect to perceptions about health.

More recent studies made of the waves of data from the LSIAs indicate that, as time (up to two years) in Australia elapsed for migrants who did not speak English well, a large decrease occurred in the proportion which said they were in good health (Vanden Heuvel and Wooden 1999; Richardson *et al.* 2002). Yet those migrants with poor English language skills were found to be relatively less likely to have visited health care providers. Seemingly at variance with these findings, humanitarian migrants – who are more likely to have poorer English-speaking skills than other migrant groups – visited doctors at more than double the rate for Primary Applicants from other groups (DIMIA 2005c). The fact that humanitarian migrants have immediate access to

welfare assistance while other visa categories, in general terms, do not (the waiting time is normally two years) might be a contributing factor.

Ageing migrants and health

The 'equalising' effect, whereby migrants and the Australia-born become more similar over time (AIHW 2004: 190; Jarasuriya and Kee 1999), is increasingly evident as many young migrants from the 1950s and 1960s, as well as refugees from the 1970s and 1980s, and migrant family members, reach ages at which they are at greater risk of a range of chronic conditions. Of course, the process of ageing increases the proportion dependent on pensions and savings, at a time when they experience their heaviest lifetime demands for health care services (Jupp 2002). Health deterioration with increasing years of residence in Australia might in part be related to quite large ethnic groups historically having been heavily concentrated in potentially injurious industrial occupations (Jupp 1990). As such, associated health problems are not the direct result of ethnic differences but of the differing occupational experiences of migrants from particular ethnic backgrounds.

Exploration of the health needs of Vietnamese migrant women in Brisbane indicated that the needs of this group (and quite likely other migrant women) are becoming increasingly urgent due not only to the ageing of original immigrant refugees but also to the decreased capacity (and decreased willingness) of children and families to provide support (although the research does not reveal how this compares with the Australia-born). Common problems for these women were associated with culture shock, low self-esteem, lack of friends and relatives, and lack of recognition of professional skills (Stewart and Bien 2003).

Immigrants overall have comparable or somewhat higher levels of doctor consultations than the Australia-born, perhaps suggesting increased health awareness and an emphasis on preventative medicine. Their lower levels of hospitalisation are certainly consistent with their better health status (Mathers 1996). While differences in self-reporting, language limitations and cultural considerations may account for unexplained variations in results, further examination of apparently rapid declines in the health status of some migrants appears warranted. Indeed, people of non-English-speaking background have been identified as a priority population in terms of monitoring the equity objectives of social and health Programmes (Mathers 1996). The decline of migrant health with increasing length of residence might well be an equity issue in itself.

Summary of benefits and costs

The available evidence synthesised in this report suggests that persons born overseas have, on balance, better physical health than the Australia-born. The situation with respect to mental health is less clear. Of course, human health

is multi-faceted and, as might be expected, there are demographic characteristics of some migrant groups which can be identified as suggesting better (or worse) health with respect to specific conditions than other overseas born persons or the Australia-born. Notwithstanding this ability to identify certain population characteristics with respect to various health conditions, no single country can be promoted as most or least desirable for sourcing migrants although proficiency in English recurs as a defining factor for identifying the likelihood of substantially different responses – both positive and negative – to a variety of health conditions.

Thus it seems that, as a result of ‘better’ health, migrant use of health services should be less overall on a per capita basis than for the Australian born. Whether this will be the case as large numbers of migrants from the 1950s and 1960s, as well as refugees from the 1970s and 1980s and immigrant family members subsequently issued with visas, reach ages at which they are at greater risk of a range of chronic conditions needs to be monitored. Of course, the process of ageing increases dependency on pensions and savings at a time when individuals experience heaviest lifetime demands for health care services. Interpretations of costs and benefits of immigration to Australia with respect to physical and mental health are summarised in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Physical and mental health issues – summary of social costs and benefits of migration

<i>Social benefits</i>	<i>Social costs</i>
Overall, migrants have better physical health, on arrival and for some years following, than the Australia-born population.	There is some variation between visa categories, with humanitarian and preferential family visa entrants faring worst.
Overseas-born persons are less likely to be hospitalised for a number of mental disorders, including schizophrenia, depressive episodes and sleep disorders.	Significant psychological distress for migrants – about three times the rate of the general Australian population – is generally related to the stress and disruption of relocation.
The ‘healthy migrant effect’ is reflected in longer life expectancy, lower death and hospitalisation rates, and a lower prevalence of some lifestyle-related risk factors.	The ‘equalising effect’ is reflected in migrants’ health status deteriorating with increasing years of residence.
Higher levels of doctors’ consultations by migrants in comparison with the Australia-born might reflect increased health awareness and an emphasis on preventative medicine.	Immigrants have comparable or somewhat higher levels of doctors’ consultations than the Australia-born, resulting in higher demand rates for some services.
Those immigrants who have applied for or received citizenship report better general health than other migrants.	Migrants who say that they had been satisfied with their lives in their former countries reported poorer general health than other migrants.

3.3 Leisure and recreation

Review of the literature and data

Increased diversity and amenity through immigrants

It is important to consider aspects of life other than those related to the work environment and beyond commitments to personal care in assessing quality of life and, in particular, social impacts of immigration. After all, beyond a certain level (that is, by Australian standards, relatively low), human happiness bears little relationship to income alone (Hamilton and Denniss 2005). Leisure is often a convenient description of those other aspects. Although the view of 'leisure' as 'time left over' after work and other commitments have been met has its critics (Jenkins and Walmsley 2003), it affords a way of conceptualising an area of life in which migrants have made major long-term contributions to Australia in fields covering sport, games, recreation, hobbies, the arts and entertainment (Booth and Tatz 2000; Lynch and Veal 1996).

Migration, for instance, has increased the diversity of leisure pursuits thereby providing greater amenity for society as a whole. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, the emphasis in Australia was on leisure activities that were popular in Britain (sports like rugby, and cricket) but this soon extended to Europe generally (for example, soccer) and, in more recent times, North America (with basketball a prominent example).

A case can be made that, in the last fifty years, migrants have pioneered the scheduling of spectator sport on Sundays. At the same time, they have promoted the rise of sports such as soccer (Warren 2002), increased the popularity of activities like skiing, backgammon, chess and bocce, helped provide a larger audience for classical music and opera than might otherwise have been the case, and created multicultural theatre, film, and dance. By way of example, Edouard Borovansky, a Czech migrant and naturalised Australian was founder of Australia's first major enduring ballet company, the Borovansky Ballet (Potter 2001). One of the first migrant filmmakers to dramatise the migrant experience in Victoria was Giorgio Mangiamele. His work, *Clay*, was the second Australian film invited to screen at the Cannes Film Festival (Australian Centre for the Moving Image 2004). Other migrants who are recognised as having made significant contributions include Santo Cilauro, writer, television presenter and film maker; Vince Colosimo who won an Australian Film Industry Award for Best Supporting Actor in *Lantana*; Daizy Gedeon Mir, journalist and film maker; actors Pia Miranda, Zoe Carrides and Paul Mercurio (also a dancer); and international fashion designer Carla Zampatti. Australian music has been greatly enriched by postwar immigration such as virtuoso guitarist Slava Grigoryan, born in Kazakhstan. A prominent overseas-born singer of contemporary music is Tina Arena. Authors of migrant background including Brian Castro, Fotini Epanomitis and Beth Yahp have added an international dimension to Australian literature.

The impact of immigration on leisure and recreation at the grassroots level are clearly demonstrated in many communities throughout Australia through different types of cultural activities in which people participate. The huge variety in cultural performances that can be witnessed at Harmony Day celebrations across Australia is testament to this. These are presented not only by migrants or persons with migrant heritage but also by Australia-born residents who have been attracted by the richness and vitality offered. In this sense, the social impact of immigration has been overwhelmingly positive. Other aspects of this increasing multiplicity are dealt with more fully in the following chapter dealing with social capital which explores, among other issues, culture and diversity as a result of migration.

There seems to be no doubt that a growing migrant presence over many decades has profoundly influenced what people do in their leisure time – what music they listen to; what films they see; what cultural activities they participate in as performers, artists or audience; what food they eat; what sport they play or watch. In fact, a preparedness of both long-term Australians and recent migrants to accept different values and new ideas might be attributed to ongoing influences introduced through leisure and recreational pastimes that have been both discreetly insinuated or brazenly presented. For example, the 1965 film of Nino Colutta's book *They're a Weird Mob* about an Italian migrant experiencing the strangeness of Australian 'culture' made Australians look at themselves – and migrants – in different ways. Similarly, four decades on, Bollywood film locations in Australia present different images of Australia to Indians to the extent that numbers of visitors – and quite likely migrants – from that country have been significantly boosted in recent years (Vaile 2005).

Of course, constantly improving and affordable telecommunications methods and international travel are external factors which are also influencing Australians' attitudes about global trends and events. The extent to which different types of exposure influence behaviour and acceptance is not readily determined. However, without first-hand experiences and contacts as a result of Australia's systematic intake of new migrants, acceptance most likely would not have been so widespread or have achieved the same momentum. The preparedness of Australians everywhere to embrace soccer during the 2006 World Cup is a case in point.

As activities in the creative arts as well as those relating to leisure pastimes and sport have become more diverse, Australians have achieved greater international recognition and success than ever before and, most likely as part of this process, become less insular. Indeed, the migrant influence on what people do in their leisure time is intuitively significant. Nevertheless, an examination of levels of representation of migrants and those with migrant heritage in cultural, leisure and sporting activities points to some interesting distinctions.

Migrant involvement in cultural, leisure and sporting activities

In this regard, children with other than an English-speaking heritage are apparently significantly less likely to participate in a range of sporting and leisure activities by comparison with the Australia-born or those born in main English-speaking countries (ABS 2003e). Instead they tended to favour more 'cultural', passive or individual activity types such as playing musical instruments, reading, watching television or using the internet. (Refer to Appendix 3A.3, Tables 3A.3.1 to 3A.3.4, for data and further discussion.) Whether the ABS survey results reflect influences of religious or cultural preferences, strictures or taboos, language-related barriers, preference for other less traditionally 'Australian' types of activities not readily identified by the survey, or constraints on leisure time can only be speculated upon. However, the results do suggest a divide in types of activities pursued by children with a non-English speaking heritage and other children living in Australia.

With respect to adults, the most recent ABS survey of attendance levels at cultural venues and events (ABS 2002a) indicates that those with a non-English speaking heritage generally had consistently lower attendance levels than other adult Australians (refer to Table 3A.3.5). The exception was with respect to venues and events where enjoyment or appreciation was not dependent on proficiency in any particular language. This included botanic gardens, classical music concerts and dance performances. Furthermore, those from non-English speaking backgrounds were least likely to have had outings to at least one venue in the 12 months preceding the survey. These results are important as they reinforce perceptions about limitations in cultural experiences available in Australia to persons not proficient in English. No doubt this impacts in a negative sense upon quality of life.

Similar but more pronounced patterns were evident for attendances by adults at spectator sports (ABS 2003c) (Table 3A.2.6). Lifetime or at least long-term affiliations and loyalties attributed to supporters who attend large drawcard events such as various codes of football possibly influenced results. Many traditional Australian sporting events might not have appeal to those born overseas, particularly if sporting cultures and languages are also significantly different.

Use of public space and places

Some sporting and leisure activities preferred by migrant groups pose challenges about the use of public space in Australian settings. For example, draughts, chess, bocce, callisthenics, vovinam and some other martial arts, badminton and volleyball are popular outdoor pastimes or commonly practiced health pursuits in many European or Asian cities. These usually take place in informal public settings such as in parks and on footpaths. Traditional sporting fields in Australia are often bare of trees due to the nature of sporting activities

that usually take place, with limited areas that provide shade and shelter. Thus they are often not conducive to new types of activities (Watson and McGillivray 1994). In addition, local government regulations and wider community attitudes often preclude or discourage these types of activities from occurring in public spaces.

While these types of outdoor pursuits do not require specific facilities as such, others do. In this regard, it is important to recognise that community cinemas, clubs and churches are recognised as important in the settling in process for different migrant groups (Armstrong 1994; Mosely 1997). Leisure activities or church organisations, rather than work associations, provide many migrants with not only their social outlets but also educational and support networks.

Barriers to sporting participation by immigrants

Historically sport has been predominantly a male preserve not only in Australia but also in most of the cultures of many of Australia's post-war immigrants. Females have been shown to be consistently less likely to participate in or attend sporting activities than males. Interestingly, males living in Australia with other than an English-speaking heritage have been shown to be consistently less likely participate in sporting activities than females born in the main English-speaking countries (including Australia) (ABS 2003b, 2004e). Furthermore, with respect to children, similar patterns applied according to gender when birthplace of parents was also considered. (These issues are discussed in more detail in Appendix 3A.3 with reference to Tables 3A.3.2, 3A.3.6 and 3A.3.7).

For significant numbers of migrant women and children, strictures against participation in sport and some leisure activities have been especially strong (Mosely et al. 1997). Some females with migrant heritage, therefore, confront problems of access including religious and cultural restrictions that are additional to those encountered by most Australian women. In addition to gender differences, other barriers to participation by women from some migrant backgrounds include not knowing others, inappropriate facilities and Programmes, language difficulties, family responsibilities, and negative school sports experiences (Taylor and Toohey 1997).

Summary of costs and benefits

There seems to be no doubt that Australia has benefited from the more diverse range of leisure, sporting and recreational opportunities and activities that are available as a result of accepting continual waves of migrants from a range of source countries and cultures. This has helped to enrich the lives of all Australians and, concomitantly, the country's image has been positively enhanced globally.

Not only has migration provided a greater range of activities but the critical mass of migrants has also ensured their continuation through support of many important cultural institutions without which the activities quite possibly would not have otherwise endured. Furthermore, migrants have challenged the way public space and places have traditionally been used and in the process helped to give a new look and manner of use to many public settings. Thus in a variety of ways, migrant involvement in and introduction of leisure and recreational activities has meant Australians have become conducive to change, a seemingly crucial factor in contemporary global society.

Interpretations of costs and benefits of immigration to Australia with respect to leisure and recreation are summarised in Tables 3.4.

Table 3.4: Leisure and recreation issues – summary of social costs and benefits of migration

<i>Social benefits</i>	<i>Social costs</i>
Migration has increased the diversity of recreational and leisure pursuits and thereby provided greater amenity for society as a whole.	Maintenance of ethnic identities has been linked with fostering cultural practices which, in the eyes of some, challenge Australian culture.
As activities have become more diverse, Australians have achieved greater international recognition and success than ever before and, most likely as part of this process, become less insular.	As activities and the cultural heritage of participants become more diverse, greater ranges of facilities require resourcing and culture-specific management.
Migrants have provided proportionately larger audiences than the Australia-born for classical music and opera, helping to maintain the viability of various performance companies. They have also created multicultural theatre, film, and dance.	Some sporting and leisure activities challenge generally accepted Australian norms about the use of public space.
Migrant support of and demand for venues such as art galleries, museums and libraries have increased functioning capabilities.	Participation levels in sport, cultural and leisure activities have been especially low for significant numbers of migrants from non-English speaking backgrounds.

3.4 Overall assessment

Assessing the social impact of migration for Australia through an exploration of aspects of human capital has been a multi-faceted and challenging task given the lack of compatible quantitative data sets. Nevertheless, the available evidence overwhelmingly supports the view that migrants have made and continue to make positive contributions to Australia's stock of human capital. These outcomes can be attributed in the main to Australia's policies on immigration which have in both historical and contemporary times been successful in attracting highly qualified migrants with essentially good health.

The migrant presence has introduced different types of sporting, cultural and leisure pursuits traditionally practiced in the source countries to Australia. This has increased, for all Australians, the range and viability of available recreational activities and the manner in which such activities can be accessed or practised.

Employment status, education, language skills, health and time available for recreation and leisure are interlinked as fundamental components of human wellbeing. An increase in Australia's overall stocks of human capital has also meant that migrants themselves have benefited from the migration experience.

While most migrants entering Australia are skilled, some humanitarian or preferential family groups are from disadvantaged backgrounds and, upon arrival in Australia, can lack education and English language skills. However, most have proven over time to be able to acquire qualifications and to do well. Furthermore, they are generally ambitious for their children to achieve and to have better opportunities in life.

Governments at all levels and society at large eventually bear any extra burdens of increased costs for welfare and other intervention services, for health care, and for loss of productive members of society and forgone opportunities if migrant workers with qualifications are unable to use their skills in the Australian working environment. Thus it is in the best interests of not only migrants but also the host community to maximise opportunities and facilitate environments in which persons can thrive. While good use is made in Australia of migrants' human capital, some factors which apparently extend adjustment time have received attention in the literature. These include problems associated with overseas qualifications being recognised or under-utilised in the workplace due to potential transferability gaps.

There seems to be no doubt that Australia's stock of human capital has gained from migration and that migrants themselves have also reaped benefits. An increasingly globalised society especially with respect to labour has Australia competing with other traditional migrant destination countries for skilled migrants. The ability to attract migrants will probably be influenced by their perceptions about Australian society in general and the ease with which settlement and social integration can be accomplished. These aspects are explored in the next chapter through an examination of social capital.

4: Social Capital

The idea of social capital is highly relevant to an examination of the social impacts of immigration. 'Social capital' refers to the relations of trust, co-operation and mutual aid that are fostered by 'norms and networks of civic engagement' and which provide the vital underpinnings of effective government, productive economies, productive diversity, healthy populations and socially cohesive communities (Putnam 2000). One of the crucial characteristics of social capital is its transferability. Social capital is deemed to be transferable to the extent that the networks, norms and trust built on the basis of one common purpose can be used for another. Another feature of social capital is that it can generate unintended effects. This is called an externality. These third party effects can be positive when the social connectedness generated by one activity can make other social interactions easier. They can also be negative when social divisiveness and an erosion of social capital can lead to friction within a community. Above all, the impact of social capital has a distinct spatial field of operation, with the intensity of the effect tapering away as distance from the activity in question increases (Pinch 1985).

These two elements of social capital – its transferability and externality effect – make the prospect of increasing social capital an attractive idea for policy-makers (see Productivity Commission 2003). The concept of social capital suggests that there may be some public benefit to be derived from formal and informal volunteering in sports, arts, education, youth groups, church organisations, and emergency services even where these activities do not substitute directly for government provision. These forms of public association encourage civic engagement. Any form of civic engagement fosters more civic engagement. As a result, tiny investments can build up a significant stock of social capital (Putnam 2000). Perhaps the single greatest benefit of immigration is that it modifies existing social capital and encourages the continual evaluation of established norms and relationships, usually to our considerable benefit. In short immigration accelerates the churning of social capital in ways described below.

4.1 Culture and diversity

Review of the literature and data

Positive aspects of cultural diversity

Cultural diversity is highly valued for a variety of reasons. As is the case with genetic diversity, societies with greater cultural diversity stand a better chance of successfully adapting to the rapidly changing environment of this increasingly globalised world. Consequently, celebrating cultural diversity has become an important theme in contemporary Australian society.

The presence of cultural diversity can, under the right circumstances, reduce insularity, foster bridging social capital and promote social tolerance. These qualities are fundamental not only to GDP such as through growth of tourism and export education but also to Australia's standing and future in a global democratic world that values cultural diversity and nations that foster tolerance and understanding.

Australia's multicultural policy

Australia's policy of multiculturalism helps to provide the right sort of environment in which such diversity can flourish. The main elements of this policy are directed towards encouraging all Australians to have an overriding loyalty to Australia and its people, and to respect the basic structures and principles underwriting its democratic society; that is, its Constitution, Parliamentary democracy, freedom of speech and religion, English as the national language, the rule of law, acceptance and equality (DIMIA 2003d). Thus it involves recognition and acceptance of reciprocal responsibilities and privileges by all Australians.

Multicultural policy is structured round a framework that aims to maximise the social, cultural and economic benefits that become available as a result of its cultural diversity through migration. The four principles that underpin the policy and provide this framework encompass responsibilities, respect, fairness and benefits of and for all persons.

Australia's multicultural policy is generally well regarded in that most Australians think that immigration has been beneficial and embrace cultural diversity as a routine part of their civic and social lives (Poynting et al. 2004). In return for this support, Australia gains not only cosmopolitan attitudes and experiences but also benefits from diverse inputs – from bilingual skills, cultural 'know-how' and contacts facilitating international trade, entrepreneurial

activities, and technological and artistic creativity – which help to enrich Australian life and enhance its positive image globally (Jupp 2001).

The policy of multiculturalism also aims to actively promote good community relations and social cohesion among Australians. To this end, the Federal Government has designed and implemented a Living in Harmony Programme. Through this Programme, Australian values and ways to promote mutual respect, understanding and acceptance are emphasised. The Programme appears to have general community support as is evidenced by the level and variety of involvement on Harmony Day, an annual event when successful aspects of Australia's cultural diversity are celebrated in a myriad of ways throughout Australia. In addition, a range of Programmes has been constructed at State and local government level which promote social cohesion and awareness of the positive aspects of cultural diversity.

Aspects of multiculturalism

There can however be problems with the manner in which cultural diversity is practised and perceived. First, diversity can be viewed simply in terms of distinctive features like festivals, food, music, dance and alternative health care with migration having dramatically affected the availability of a wide range of different skills, business types, cultural activities, and goods and services. Some people see manifestations of these elements as important indicators of acceptance and racial tolerance while critics decry the superficial ways in which they can be used to define the extent of a multicultural society (Thompson 2005). Nevertheless, 'even if the [perceived benefits of] new cultures are simply 'new cuisine', their significance should not be underestimated' (Goot and Watson 2005:186).

While there are expectations that migrants will represent their culture through these symbols in a manner that 'fits in' with the Australian way of life (Murphy and Watson 1997), many migrants feel at least partly defined by them rather than by other aspects of life (Zevallos 2005). These types of labelling can have the concomitant effect of weakening messages about what it means to be a migrant Australian. Despite this, celebration and enrichment of daily lives, for example through harmony days, music and food, provide vehicles for positive cultural interactions which in turn can open individuals to appreciating and understanding ethnic differences (Thompson 2005).

Secondly, urban planning systems at the local government level have been criticised for sometimes not adequately embracing cultural diversity, especially in relation to the creation of a sense of belonging to neighbourhoods (Thompson 2003). For example, there is a particular problem with some groups' requirements for places of worship. Approvals for social and sporting clubs and also semi-private spaces for engaging in specific cultural practices can also create controversy (Watson and McGillivray 1994). These planning issues are important because multiculturalism must be translated into practice

in everyday life in specific (often suburban or regional) locations (Armstrong 1994).

A third problem that is sometimes presented is with respect to childcare. Shortage of culturally appropriate childcare provision can mean that women with young children cannot attend English language classes (Burnley et al. 1997). While a variety of course structures and options are offered (such as part-time evening courses or learning English at home), these do not necessarily present solutions to the issue of childcare. Humanitarian and family reunion migrants who have limited resources can also face barriers to attending language classes when they are juggling multiple casual part-time jobs, perhaps also with childcare commitments.

Racism and prejudices

Some Australians still have assimilationist notions and a preference for European migrants over those of Asian and Middle-Eastern appearance (Jupp 2002). The media can play a significant role in fostering acceptance or, alternatively, intolerance of new arrivals.

Strong anti-Muslim and anti-Arab sentiments have, quite likely, been generated by geopolitical events, international media coverage, and local concerns which have heightened levels of 'Islamaphobia' (Dunn et al. 2004). However, a further dilemma is posed by Islamic fundamentalism. The Federal government's multicultural policy has been presented as a response to the challenges, as well as the opportunities, of Australia's cultural diversity. Criticism has been directed towards the reluctance of others, including leaders associated with some ethnic organisations, to publicly acknowledge the undesirable side of diversity, denying and suppressing rather than addressing criticisms (Lopez 2005). Consequently, some consider that ground has been surrendered to critics of multiculturalism who attempt to point to evidence that it is not working.

Inter-ethnic tensions

The issue of racism is not a trivial one. It exists at all levels of society (Ang et al. 2002) and has done for some time (HREOC 1991). Competition over urban resources, such as employment, education and housing, has been implicated in fuelling racism and inter-ethnic tensions (Dunn and McDonald 2001).

The preparedness of individuals to express racist sentiment has been linked to levels of education attained and other socio-economic characteristics of individuals. In particular, Australia-born elderly people without tertiary education are thought to more commonly have these attitudes (Dunn et al. 2004). Notwithstanding this, migrants who live in more affluent areas or who

are seen as making valuable contributions to Australian society – through providing employment opportunities or having financial and human capital – are more likely to be respected than those who are regarded as the ‘takers’ of jobs and welfare support (Cunneen et al. 1997).

Attitudes to migration and cultural diversity

Even though a majority of all migrant groups – and particularly people from non-English-speaking backgrounds – live in large cities, there is little evidence of urban-rural variations in acceptance of cultural diversity (Ang et al. 2002; Dunn and McDonald 2001). However, as the community studies undertaken for this project illustrate, many people, especially those living in essentially homogenous communities in regional areas, have minimal exposure to migrants from varying ethnic backgrounds. Residents of such communities are generally dependent on media reports rather than personal experiences for formulating views on migrants and immigration.

In response, specific Programmes to facilitate social cohesion have sometimes been put in place to encourage acceptance of migrants in regional areas. For example, in 2006, the City of Ballarat, through its Migrant Attraction and Retention Population Strategy Steering Committee, launched a Multicultural Ambassador Programme. This was aimed at fostering social acceptance of migrants by having migrant ambassadors talk to community organisations such as service clubs, schools, senior citizens and youth groups (Shields 2006). Interestingly, this Programme very specifically targeted acceptance and welcoming of skilled migrants and their families, perhaps in itself an indication of differentiations that have been made in some parts of Australian society.

There is evidence of widespread acceptance of the policy of multiculturalism in Australia. Nevertheless consistent expressions of negative attitudes towards some ethnic groups persist (Jarasuriya and Kee 1999). Further extensive research needs to be conducted to better understand attitudes of the Australian population to culturally diverse communities. Affirmative actions by civic and community leaders as well as private and public organisations and individuals are thought by some to be critical to promoting, and in some instances restoring, a more socially cohesive understanding of cultural diversity in Australia.

An indication of changing attitudes to immigration and multiculturalism over recent years can be gauged from the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA) in addition to Australian Election Studies (1996, 1998 and 2001) and the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) data for Australia for 1995 (Gibson et al. 2004). Community attitudes towards culture and diversity issues as they relate to migrants and migration policies are summarised in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Culture and diversity issues – summary of overall social impacts of migration for Australia

	2003 opinions compared with 1995/1996	2003 qualifications
Levels of support for increased immigration	Higher levels	26% say increase 38% say decrease
Agree have to share Australian customs and traditions to be fully Australian	About the same	42% affirmative
Agree ethnic minorities should be given government assistance to preserve their customs and traditions	Unchanged	16% affirmative
Agree groups should maintain distinct traditions and customs	Slightly higher	16% affirmative
Agree groups should adapt and blend into the larger society	About the same	71% affirmative
Agree that immigration opens Australia to new ideas and cultures	Lower levels	74% affirmative
Agree that migrants take job away from people who were born in Australia	Substantially lower	25% affirmative
Agree that migrants increase crime rates	Substantially lower	34% affirmative
What it takes to be truly Australian		
Speak English	About the same	92% affirmative
Feel Australian	About the same	91% affirmative
Have Australian citizenship	About the same	89% affirmative
Respect Australian political institutions/law	About the same	89% affirmative
Life mostly in Australia	About the same	68% affirmative
Born in Australia	About the same	58% affirmative
Be Christian	About the same	39% affirmative

Source: after Goot and Watson (2005)

Generalisations that can be construed from the summarised results suggest that attitudes to migration are sensitive to topical issues, global events and economic conditions (Goot and Watson 2005). There has been, for example, a turnaround in public opinion about attitudes to immigration since 1995, when support was low. At that time, only 11 per cent thought that immigration should be increased and almost 60 per cent thought it should be reduced; one-third said that intakes should be reduced 'a lot' (Goot and Watson 2005). (Refer to Table 4A.1.1 in Appendix 4A.1.) A changing trend which first became apparent in 2001 was confirmed by the AuSSA 2005 results: while 38 per cent still wanted immigration cut, a substantial proportion (over one-quarter) now wanted it increased.

This recognition appears to be tempered by divided views on whether acculturation means assimilation to the dominant host culture (refer to Table 4A.1.2). Roughly the same proportion of people (42%) agreed (or strongly agreed) in 2003 as in 1995 (41%) that it was impossible for people who did not share customs and traditions to become fully Australian. However, most Australians believed that some form of cultural adaptation was desirable and support for ethnic distinctiveness was low. The idea that ethnic minorities

should be given government assistance to preserve their customs and traditions was widely rejected: only 16 per cent gave their support, unchanged from 1995. When asked to decide whether it was better for society if different racial and ethnic groups maintained their distinct customs and traditions or, alternatively, that these groups adapt and blend into the larger society, just over 70 percent opted for adapting and blending in both 1995 and 2003.

In spite of these reservations, some kinds of cultural differences were welcomed with a large majority of Australians agreeing that there were positive impacts from immigration (Table 4A.1.3). This included a majority-held view that migrants make Australia open to new ideas and cultures. However, the proportion that recognised greater diversity in ideas and culture as a result of migration has gradually declined from 86 per cent in 1995 to 74 per cent in 2003. Over time, people have apparently come to accept many aspects of diversity as a result of migration as the norm.

Attitudes on the impact of migrants on the economy, on employment opportunities and on crime rates have shifted in a generally positive direction since 1995 (Table 4A.1.3). In 1996, 1998 and 2001, about half the respondents agreed that migrants were generally good for the economy; this had increased to over two-thirds (69%) by 2003. There has also been substantial movement in viewpoints about whether migrants took jobs away from people born in Australia. Negative views have declined since 1996 when 40 per cent thought jobs were taken away, to 25 per cent in 2003. Different patterns again are presented on whether migrants increase crime. In 1996, over half (51%) thought that they did increase crime; this had dropped to about one-third (34%) of respondents by 2003.

There have been only generally small shifts in viewpoints about what constitutes being 'truly Australian' in the years since the 1995 ISSP (Table 4A.1.4). These include speaking English, feeling Australian (difficult to quantify), having Australian citizenship and respecting Australia's political institutions and laws. About two-thirds of respondents also thought it important to have lived mostly in Australia and over one half thought one had to be born there. Around one-third thought to be 'truly Australian', one had to be Christian.

According to Goot and Watson (2005:183), attitudes to migration are shaped according to a person's level of education and political affiliation and by views about welfare, the death penalty and the economy. Consequently, support for or against 'nativism' – that is, the belief that to be 'truly Australian' one has to be born here, lived here and have Australian ancestors – may differentiate attitudes to immigration much better than dissimilarities in feelings about national pride.

Results from the LSIA's

In addition to these views of what Australians think about migration, the LSIA's have provided some important measures of how Australia is perceived by more recent migrants. In interview sessions subsequent to the initial one, migrants were asked for their impressions of selected aspects of Australian life. These results are presented and discussed in Appendix 4A.1. In general, very positive views were expressed about life in Australia, in comparison with their former countries of residence. Levels of religious tolerance, contact between and tolerance towards people with different racial or cultural backgrounds or nationalities, and greater ability to influence government decisions were perceived very favourably. These outcomes are worthy of consideration because at the heart of any consideration of social capital is the question of how well Australia is currently accommodating different ethnic groups and categories of visa entrants.

Summary of benefits and costs

Most Australians think that immigration has been beneficial and embrace cultural diversity as a routine part of their civic and social lives. There is general realisation that Australia gains not only cosmopolitan attitudes and experiences but also benefits immensely from diverse inputs which help to enrich Australian life and enhance its positive image globally. Consequently, places and people throughout Australia appear vitalised by the juxtaposition of different languages and cultures.

Over the past decade, opposition to immigration appears to have fallen and beliefs about the social impact of migrants as a result of cultural diversity have become more positive. Nevertheless, views about multiculturalism remain mixed. Furthermore, due to the increasing cultural and religious diversity of the Australian population, the extent and intensity of identified problems could be exacerbated. This is one of the scenarios considered in Chapter 8.

Interpretations of costs and benefits of migration with respect to culture and diversity which have been identified and discussed in the review of literature and data are summarised in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Culture and diversity issues – summary of perceived social costs and benefits of migration

Social benefits	Social costs
Australia gains not only cosmopolitan attitudes and experiences but also benefits from diverse inputs which help to enrich Australian life and enhance its positive image globally.	Less support for ethnic diversity per se may occur through fear that this leads to communities being divided along ethnic lines
Places and people throughout Australia are vitalised by the juxtaposition of different languages and cultures.	There can be difficulties with the manner in which multiculturalism is practised and perceived at grass roots level.
There are examples of strong local leadership and urban planning embracing cultural diversity and putting it into practice.	The urban planning system at local government level sometimes does not adequately embrace cultural diversity, especially in relation to the creation of a sense of belonging to neighbourhoods.
The majority of migrants speak English and make it a priority to learn to do so upon arrival.	Barriers to attending English language classes can be faced by women (due to cultural restraints) and humanitarian and family reunion migrants (due to limited resources).
Most Australians understand and value cultural diversity.	Some Australians still have assimilationist notions and a preference for European migrants over those of Asian and Middle-Eastern appearance.
There are high levels of inter-faith and religious tolerance in Australia.	A dilemma is posed by Islamic fundamentalism and the way it is represented in Australia.
Migrants providing employment opportunities or having financial and human capital are readily accepted in Australian society.	Competition over urban resources, such as employment, education and housing, can fuel racism and inter-ethnic tensions, and build resentment toward new and emerging migrant communities.
Over the past decade, opposition to immigration has fallen and beliefs about how migrants affect the economy, jobs and society have become more positive.	Views held in Australian society about migration and multiculturalism remain mixed.

4.2 Community life and civil society

Review of the literature and data

Bridging and bonding social capital

The notion of community is very important in human affairs. Communities can be nurturing and supportive of their members, thereby enhancing quality of life. They can however be inward looking and can serve to work against the cohesiveness of society as a whole. Hence it is important to distinguish between ‘bonding’ and ‘bridging’ social capital. Bridging capital fosters bonds between different social groups whereas bonding capital fosters cohesion among a particular social group. Too much bonding capital can foster communities that are insular, racially intolerant, resistant to social change and unwelcoming of outsiders and newcomers, who may, as a result, be subject to social exclusion. Too little bridging capital across different ethnic groups can foster low trust communities which become adversely affected by suspicion, fear and insularity (Putnam 2000).⁷

Consequently, the middle ground between the formal structure – including government, political processes, the legal framework, markets for product and labour, and welfare – and the core environment of immediate and extended family and friends needs to be considered. This includes the realm of civil institutions and associations in which much bridging social capital is created and invested. Such non-government civil organisations are an important instrument in the effective governance of society. The migrant contribution to the development community life and civil society in Australia has been substantial.

Ethnic media and organisations

Ethnic media and ethno-specific organisations in Australia (such as the Italian Club) play crucial roles in the community life of migrants thereby promoting both bridging and bonding capital with members of diverse community groups. For instance, ethno-specific media outlets currently provide radio Programmes in around 80 languages, television in 48 languages and newspapers in 30 languages (Clyne and Grey 2004). Special Broadcasting Service (SBS) Radio (launched in 1975) and SBS Television (from 1980) not only serve the special needs of people speaking languages other than English but are also charged

⁷ It is also important to note that the nature of community has changed greatly over time, from tightly-knit, geographically-bound rural society, to the agglomeration of large numbers of people in high density industrialised cities (Walmsley 1988). Change continues today with the rise of telecommunications (Walmsley 2000), increasing real incomes and improved mobility all suggesting the possible emergence of ‘community without propinquity’ (McIntosh 2004).

with being generalist broadcasters. These organisations also help to inform other Australians about migrant issues. In these ways, Australia's current multicultural policy which promotes acceptance and respect between Australians of all cultural and religious backgrounds (DIMA 2003d) receives widespread support.

Although ethno-specific media agencies are important elements of the social glue for migrant diasporas, demands placed on new migrants in terms of social adjustment and work are such that there can be minimal time remaining for community commitments. Against this, mutual support to be derived from community organisations can serve to encourage migrant participation.

One obvious key to community participation is the ability to communicate. Lack of proficiency in English imposes restrictions with respect to involvement in the wider community and presents as a barrier to the promotion of bridging social capital. Another important aspect is the gendered nature of community involvement. Cultural, religious and personal beliefs can sometimes inhibit women from interacting in many aspects of Australian life, thus limiting various types of activities to private homes. For many migrant women, especially those from non-English-speaking backgrounds, the home can be very important, particularly as a means of maintaining links with the past (Thompson 1994) and in terms of both fostering pride through home ownership and the provision of private space in which to be oneself (Watson and McGillivray 1994). Away from the home, community life can be inhibited by lack of informal public meeting places for migrants more comfortable with street life than mall shopping.

Of course, a shared ethnicity or religion does not of its own accord create a community. Age, gender, religion, generational differences and other social divisions, such as socio-economic status, divide migrant communities, like any other. All communities can be nurturing and supportive of their members, thereby enhancing quality of life. They can however be inward looking and can serve to work against the cohesiveness of society as a whole, contributing to negative social capital and perhaps reinforcement of the marginal status of some ethnic or religious groups (Ponyting et al. 2004).⁸ Thus while images of a homogeneous ethnic identity for a community can be used positively, this can also work against acceptance by the wider community.

⁸ For instance it is not uncommon for ethnic and religious leaders to disavow adverse or delinquent behaviour associated with some ethnic gangs or individuals, potentially sustaining in the wider public's mind a link between that ethnic group or religion and persons involved in criminal behaviour (Poynting *et al.* 2004).

Migrants and volunteering

The way people respond to a given situation largely depends on the quality of social capital in a particular community. Individuals and institutions often provide social capital in the form of cultural and voluntary support to migrants in areas of ethnic concentration (Burnley 2003a). For instance, some established and second-generation migrants participate in voluntary capacities by providing community support for new migrants. Others play key roles in helping refugees to develop social networks and to feel part of the broader community. First, second and third generation migrants are also to be found as volunteers in a range of broad-based community organisations such as service clubs. Some of the most obvious migrant contributions to civil society are to be seen through religious organisations though this can create controversy. For example, anti-mosque politics and conflicts over citizenship are a continuing feature of Australian urban politics (Dunn 2003).

Volunteering is widely recognized as contributing to stocks of social capital because undertaking such work is regarded as a measure of people's concerns for others (ABS 2006a). Where only one indicator can be used to gauge current stocks of this capital, voluntary work is often selected. Volunteering can be either through time or money given to formal organisation (formal volunteering) or time to help or assist family, friends and neighbours (informal volunteering).

Taking part as volunteers also present opportunities for people to become active in new communities. The 2002 GSS (ABS 2003a) found that one in three persons born in the main English-speaking countries (including Australia) undertook voluntary work. For those born in other than main English speaking countries, about one in four who was proficient in spoken English said they had volunteered. Only about one in ten migrants not proficient in spoken English had volunteered. Of course, different acculturation with respect to doing volunteer work – and also interpretation of what might constitute volunteer work – may influence participation levels and results but fluency in the English language appears to be a factor determining participation in such activities.

The ABS collects information on volunteering through two other vehicles – the Voluntary Work Survey (VWS) and the Time Use Survey (TUS). The most recently conducted VWS (in 2000) sought to find out about formal volunteering activities over the preceding year; the TUS (last conducted in 1997) collected both formal and informal time spent on any given day. An analysis of the VWS shows that those born in Australia were more likely than migrants to volunteer time through formal organisations. This was compounded for those groups who spoke languages other than English at home. Analysis of the TUS shows that well established migrants – those who had arrived in Australia prior to 1982 – spent more time in informal voluntary activities such as helping neighbours or friends than people born in Australia. It seems that volunteering

informal help and assistance is the main way by which migrants contribute substantial stocks of social capital.

Other community support issues

An additional measure with respect to community support that was surveyed in the 2002 GSS was the ability of individuals to ask others outside their own household for small favours and for help in times of crises. Overall, people were substantially more likely in times of crises to rely on the informal support networks of family members or friends than on formal support such as that offered through community, charity or religious organisations, or health, legal or financial professionals (ABS 2006a: 29). Moreover, a comparatively high proportion of the adult population born in countries where English was not the main language felt unable to ask for small favours or to obtain support in a time of crisis, particularly if they were not proficient in English. For example, 95 per cent of persons born in Australia felt able to ask for small favours whereas only 81 per cent of overseas-born adults not proficient in English felt that they could do so.

These generally accepted norms of civil society in times of crises were not regarded as valid options for a comparatively large proportion of people from non-English speaking backgrounds. Whether recent migrants have similar levels of reluctance towards seeking assistance from more formal community organisations can be gleaned from the LSIAs. Thus these results have been referenced to further inform aspects of community support sought by migrants.

Results from the LSIAs pointed to only minimal contact between migrants and ethnic clubs or various welfare agencies prior to their arrival in Australia. (Refer to Tables 4.2.1 and 4.2.3 in Appendix 4A.2 which discusses data tables referenced in this section.) After arrival, new migrants apparently drew more on informal social links with relatives (in about two out of three cases) and friends (the main source of help for 40% of primary applicants) already resident in Australia (Tables 4.2.2 and 4.2.4) than on formal organisations. Humanitarian migrants used formal organisations the most although still only to a level that involved about one in eight migrants (Table 4A.2.5). The limited extent to which ethnic and community organisations seemingly provided help after arrival suggests low measures of social capital in the middle ground between formal government structures and the core environment of family and friends. However, these results were not fully supported by the community studies which indicated formal organisations, many of which would be providing Commonwealth-funded services, played substantial roles in settlement and support for many migrants.

Multicultural policies and migrant settlement

Often civil organisations that help new migrants settle in Australia have developed with government funding and support. An example is to be seen in the recently designed and implemented Settlement Grants Programme (DIMA 2006a). This programme, which commenced in July 2006, combined the funding previously made available to the Community Settlement Services Scheme and to Migrant Resource Centres and Migrant Service Agencies. The Settlement Grants Programme provides organisations with funding to provide settlement services to recently arrived humanitarian entrants, family stream migrants who have low English proficiency and the dependants of skilled migrants in rural and regional areas who have low English proficiency for up to five years after arrival.

Such Programmes have been designed to provide migrants with service coordination, information and referral services, and to facilitate community capacity building. When effective, they have been beneficial and represent a valuable resource. However, there has also been criticism about the cost of such services and the divisiveness of some centres which have been seen as promoting cultural differences at the expense of focusing on the settling of new arrivals (DIMA 2003b; Jupp 2002). It is too early to assess the effectiveness of the new programme which has been formulated around needs-based settlement planning.

The Commonwealth, which has the portfolio responsibility for migration into Australia, has supplied the following advice about its settlement services and policies:

The Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy (IHSS) provides initial, intensive settlement assistance for humanitarian entrants in the first six months after arrival. This support can be extended to 12 months where needed. Entrant's needs are assessed and addressed through an integrated case management approach. Services provided through the IHSS include: Initial information and orientation assistance; assistance in finding accommodation; a package of goods to help humanitarian entrants establish a household; information and assistance to access services and become part of the local community; and short term torture and trauma counselling.

English language tuition is provided under the Adult Migrant English Programme (AMEP) for migrants and humanitarian entrants who do not have functional English. Refugee and humanitarian entrants under the age of 25 years with low levels of schooling are eligible for up to 910 hours of English language tuition and those over the age of 25 years are eligible for up to 610 hours of tuition. Other migrants are eligible for up to 510 hours of tuition.

The Australian Government also provides other targeted English language Programmes through the Department of Education, Science and Training

(DEST) and State/Territory Governments. DEST has two employment related English language Programmes for adults and provides intensive English language tuition to eligible newly-arrived students through the English as a Second Language – New Arrivals Programme (DIAC advice, April 2007).

Importantly, given that the settlement phrase is the one associated with most of the social costs of migration into Australia, the Commonwealth commences its integration support off-shore through the provision of the Australian Cultural Orientation (AUSCO) Programme. It is available to all refugee and special humanitarian entrants over five years of age. This programme was introduced for refugee and special humanitarian programme entrants in 2003 and has since expanded globally to four regions – Africa, South Asia, South East Asia and the Middle East. AUSCO is the beginning of the settlement process. In 2005, DIMA developed and trialled a pilot children's programme in Thailand and a pre-literate programme in Tehran. A review of the curricula is currently underway and this will ensure it will meet the needs of each specific location. These Programmes are being introduced globally to all locations with significant numbers of child and pre-literate applicants (DIAC advice, April 2007).

Social cohesion issues

The existence of migrants and migrant organisations can of course prompt opposition and be a focus for criticism. Therefore, reactions within the majority population should also be considered. Resistance to policies of cultural diversity is, for some Australians, a reflection of the history of the nation's migration profile before its 'White Australia' policy was abandoned in the early 1970s (Jupp 2002). Belief in assimilation, as it was then practised, means that tolerance and understanding of different cultures was sometimes limited (as it was among some of the Queensland Focus Groups). The issue of some long-time Australians finding difficulty in adapting to the changing social complexion of their neighbourhood is however not primarily an immigration problem. Residential gentrification, which has proceeded rapidly over the last 25 years mainly through well-off baby boomers entering into property markets that were once working class neighbourhoods (as in Sydney's inner eastern and western suburbs and Brisbane's south west suburbs), is a case in point.

Widely differing opinions about immigration intake and a culturally diverse society were demonstrated in Australia in the mid 1990s as the views of the One Nation Party received widespread media attention. In fact, ethnic differences are sometimes seen as a threat to national unity in many of the traditional settlement countries for migrants. The rioting and civil unrest experienced in France in the latter part of 2005 were apparently triggered by racial inequities but perhaps also in response to that nation's high unemployment levels. In Australia, opposition to immigration has been shown to correlate strongly with increasing unemployment levels (McAllister 1993; Goot 2000). It has been repeatedly demonstrated that 'popular support for

values like tolerance and equality of opportunity is easier to garner when economic times are good than when they are bad' (Jones 1996:25).

The widening gap in Australia between rich and poor could again see minority groups such as migrants scapegoated – as when Pauline Hanson challenged migrant intake levels, especially of Asians – upon a return to harsher economic times. In this context, it should be noted that ethnic and racial prejudices have generally not been used to provoke political disputes or point scoring. In fact, in the decades following World War II, there has been a generally recognised bipartisan convention between Australia's two major political parties that supports continuing immigration and endorses a policy of multiculturalism (Jones 1996; Betts 2000; Lopez 2000).

The critical issue with respect to levels of satisfaction seems to be the question of being heard. The Australia-born who think that they are not being heard can be vocal in opposing immigration, just as migrants afraid of not being heard might be predisposed to join migrant organisations (Hage 1998). The powerful majority in society often stress the social obligations (rather than the rights) of minority groups. Thus some migrants can find it difficult to gain acceptance in civil society, generating concerns that their legitimate and important agendas are not receiving attention (Jupp 2002). This can make migrants less inclined to participate in more mainstream civil society. Other factors serve to reinforce this view, not least of which can be more immediate requirements associated with settling in processes.

Lack of proficiency in English can also discourage those from non-English-speaking backgrounds from engaging in civil society. Unfamiliarity with the Australian political system or uncertainty about how they might be treated – especially for refugees and asylum seekers who have fled chaos and persecution – could be daunting. Of course, this does not mean that migrants are unwilling to express views about topical issues including, for example, Australia's policies as they relate to multiculturalism. Indeed, some research shows that migrants are less prepared than Australia-born citizens to support a multicultural policy if it means retaining cultures of origin in preference to integration into Australia (Betts 2005b).

National identity and citizenship

Ethnic differences can also sometimes be seen as a threat to national identity and thus civil society. Although differences of opinion obviously exist, the general view has been that very few people are extreme enough to disrupt Australia's social cohesion or sense of national pride and identity (Castles et al. 1998). Of course, some recent global and local examples of terrorism and civil unrest have caused a rethink of this philosophy. Nevertheless, the majority of Australians recognise that national identity is not assigned at birth, or the preserve of the Australia-born. This creates the capacity for Australia to be a truly culturally diverse society where being Australian is:

... an emergent and constantly evolving sense... including a commitment to basic social institutions such as parliamentary democracy, the rule of law and equality before the law, freedom of the individual, freedom of speech, religious and other forms of tolerance (for example, a “fair go”), and equality of opportunity (Jones 1996:25).

Of particular relevance with respect to national identity and community life is the issue of citizenship. At the time of the 2001 Census, almost three-quarters of people born overseas who had been resident in Australia for two years or more were Australian citizens (ABS 2006c) (refer to Appendix 4A.2, Table 4A.2.6). Most recent migrants either intend to or, indeed, have become Australian citizens. Those within the humanitarian stream seem more willing in this respect despite outward signs of hardship (S. Richardson 2002). Recently arrived skill stream and independent migrants are less likely to feel committed, possibly reflecting the fact that they have more life choices available (Richardson et al. 2002).

Generally speaking, persons from the main English-speaking countries are less likely to take up citizenship whereas those from Asian countries, especially where the main languages spoken are other than English, are more likely to do so. More specifically, people most likely to become Australian citizens have been those born in the Philippines, Viet Nam or China. Unstable or changing political and socio-economic conditions in these countries may have influenced desires for Australian citizenship (ABS 2006c). In contrast, take-up rates by those born in the UK and New Zealand have been much lower although they were the two largest groups granted Australian citizenship in 2003-04 (Appendix 4A.2, Table 4A.2.7). Other residents who were granted citizenship in that year were likely to have come from Asian countries. Statistics for citizenship take-up reflect the immigration levels for countries such as China, South Africa, India and the Philippines which were in the top ten birthplace groups of overseas-born people arriving in Australia in the intercensal period to 2001.

Australia, unlike some host countries, has made it relatively easy for migrants to become citizens and actively encourages them to do so. Perhaps, for this reason, there is scepticism about the value of using the take-up of citizenship as an indicator of commitment to Australia (Cope et al. 1991). Of course, changing criteria for citizenship (such as the mandatory four-year resident period proposed for introduction after 1 July 2007) could alter these perceptions in the future. Nevertheless, integration by migrants into Australian society is regarded by many as inevitable (Hage 1998), with the speed and extent to which this happens being largely determined by the effectiveness of social institutions, community life and civil society.

Summary of benefits and costs

Ethnic organisations can provide important support for migrants – particularly in the earlier periods of settlement – and quite likely encourage participation in community life and civil society within the broader community. The community studies provide detail about concrete examples of how multiculturalism grows social capital in this way. Immediate requirements associated with settling, such as finding employment and suitable accommodation, can take priority over building links with the wider community, especially for new and emergent migrant communities preoccupied with finding work, learning English and settling into a new country. However, lack of proficiency in English sometimes restricts involvement. Further barriers to participations can be different and seemingly non-compromising features of the cultural, social and physical Australian environment by comparison with countries of origin. These also have the potential to influence the reality of or perceptions about social cohesion.

Existence of ethnic organisations can prompt opposition and be a focus for criticism as they were in some of the focus groups. While images of homogeneous ethnic community identities are often used positively, they can also work against building bridging capital and acceptance by the wider community. Ethnic differences are sometimes seen as a threat to national identity and thus the issue of citizenship is particularly relevant with respect to civil society and community life in a multicultural Australia.

Interpretations of costs and benefits of migration to Australia with respect to community life and civil society which have been identified and discussed in the review of literature and data are summarised in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Community life and civil society issues – summary of social costs and benefits of migration

Social benefits	Social costs
Ethnic media and ethno-specific organisations help Australians to redefine themselves as citizens of a multicultural and multilingual local and global society by recognising difference, valuing cultural and linguistic diversity, and providing outlets for broad cross sections of voices, views and visions of the world.	Existence of migrants and migrant organisations can prompt opposition and be a focus for criticism. Some Australians have expressed concerns about the viability of social cohesion under the current policy of multiculturalism.
Mutual support derived from community organisations encourages migrant participation.	Demands placed on new migrants in terms of social adjustment and employment is such that there can be little time remaining for building community networks.
Informal networks between established and new migrant communities provide a wealth of support for each other	Community life can be inhibited by lack of informal public meeting places for migrants more comfortable with street life than mall shopping.
Communities with a strong multicultural presence and avenues for cultivating bridging capital can be nurturing and supportive of their members, thereby enhancing quality of life for all who live in them.	Overly cohesive and insular migrant communities can be inward looking and can serve to work against the cohesiveness of society as a whole, contributing to negative social capital and perhaps reinforcement of the marginal status of some ethnic or religious groups. The same can be said for overly cohesive host communities.
Individuals and institutions often provide social capital in the form of cultural and voluntary support to migrants in areas of ethnic concentration.	Cultural, religious and personal beliefs can sometimes inhibit new migrant women from interacting in many aspects of Australian life, thus limiting various types of activities to private homes.
Volunteering informal help and assistance is the main way by which migrants contribute substantial stocks of social capital.	Migrants born in other than the main English speaking countries and, even more so, persons not proficient in English are significantly less likely than others to do formal volunteer work.
Some of the most obvious migrant contributions to civil society are to be seen through religious or faith based organisations	Politics and conflicts over religious views are a continuing feature of Australian politics and an impetus for much contemporary controversy.

Civil organisations developed with government support provide migrants with service coordination, information and referral services and facilitate community capacity building.	Some migrant civil centres are seen to have been costly and also divisive thus promoting cultural differences at the expense of focusing on the settling of new arrivals.
Bipartisanship by major political parties on most matters relating to immigration reduces the impact of the 'race card' in Australian culture and promotes a socially cohesive multicultural society	The widening gap in Australia between rich and poor could see minority groups such as humanitarian entrants scapegoated upon a return to harsher economic times.
Many migrants are willing to express views about topical issues including, for example, Australia's policies as they relate to multiculturalism.	Migrants can find it difficult to gain acceptance in civil society with one result being that their legitimate and important agendas are not heard. This can make migrants less inclined to participate in civil society.
The majority of Australians recognise that national identity is not assigned at birth. This is the cornerstone foundation of a mature and socially cohesive multicultural society.	Ethnic differences, mostly associated with new and emergent migrant communities, can sometimes be seen as a threat to national identity and thus civil society.
Very few people are extreme enough to disrupt Australia's social cohesion or sense of national pride and identity	Some recent global and local examples of terrorism and civil unrest have caused a rethink of the level of social cohesion in Australia.
Maintaining strong links with migrants' homelands has been made easier in recent decades.	Maintaining strong links with migrants' homelands can unsettle the development of a sense of connectedness to Australian national identity
Australia makes it relatively easy for migrants to become citizens and actively encourages them to do so. Most migrants eventually come to identify as Australian.	Australians who think that they are not being heard can be more inclined to be vocal in opposing immigration.
Most recent migrants, especially those from non English-speaking countries, either intend to or, indeed, have become Australian citizens.	Dual citizens could experience conflicting loyalties if the interests of foreign states are not necessarily congruent with Australia's interests.

4.3 Social networks and neighbourhoods

Review of the literature and data

Residential differentiation in Australian cities

Most migrants to Australia settle in cities, the capitals accounting for more than four out of five new settlers in the last fifty years (ABS 2004d). The residents of cities are not uniformly distributed. Rather they tend to cluster in areas on the basis of income and wealth, age and life cycle, occupation, lifestyle and ethnicity. Patterns of concentration among different ethnic communities have been evident for a long time in Australia's capitals (Burnley et al. 1997; Jarasuriya and Kee 1999). This process of residential differentiation is entirely normal and reflects the existence of diverse housing opportunities in a society where people's needs, aspirations and interests vary (Forster 2004). They are also consistent with patterns in other immigrant settler societies such as the UK, USA and Canada. In spite of these similarities, Australian cities are among the least segregated in the English-speaking world and are characterised by their degree of ethno-cultural mix rather than segregation (Poulsen et al. 2004; Waitt et al. 2000).

From the host community as well as the migrant perspectives, residential clustering has several advantages: it facilitates adjustment to a new country; it enables arrivals to overcome initial language problems by relying on the translation skills of nearby compatriots; it provides efficiencies in forms of institutional and mutual support during the stressful adjustment phase of migration; and it provides a way of preserving culture through such things as food outlets, religious facilities and social clubs (Burnley 2000; Dunn 1993). Proximity fosters interaction. Thus neighbourhoods with a marked migrant presence can become important in the socialisation of migrant children, the provision of friendship, support, employment contacts and services. This all helps to build social capital and minimise the uncertainty and fear which can characterise settlement in a new land (Walmsley 1988).

There are other benefits to migrants who are able to identify with neighbourhoods. Public celebration of cultural differences can provide a sense of belonging, adding balance to contradictory feelings of exclusion because they do not visually appear to be Australian (Zevallos 2005). The neighbourhood may be particularly important for women – especially for those without paid work – because it can represent public territory around the home and be the area in which significant and meaningful relationships can be formed (Thompson 1994).

Attractive features of clustering may even stimulate migrants who have settled elsewhere to make deliberate choices to relocate to the places of concentration in order to access the support they provide, particularly in times of personal or economic adversity (Birrell 1993). In some localities, this has

led to even greater commercial and cultural vibrancy and tourism (Jupp et al. 1990), commonly referred to as productive diversity. Such areas are likely to be long-lasting features of the social geography of Australian cities and regions rather than temporary phenomena (Dunn 1993). In this way, living in residential concentrations can represent a zone of transition for some and end stages for others (Jupp et al. 1990). Thus there is continual movement of people into and out of areas (Carroll 2003; Viviani 1996; Wilson 1990).

Consequently residential clustering facilitates cultural identification and the fostering of diversity. Herein though lays a potential problem. It can be argued that humans have an innate need to feel a sense of belonging to place. As a result, places have meaning to people. If sufficient similar people bond to a certain place, then those people and that place become identified with each other in the public mind (Walmsley 1988). In this way, the preconditions for stereotyping can be met. Stereotyping can be positive or negative. The positive features of a place (for example the food, smells and bustle of a Chinatown) or the visibly different features, for example the prominence of adolescent males in street life (often labelled gangs), can be highlighted (see Poynting et al. 2004).

When individuals do not have direct experiences of a place or people, they can become reliant on images created by the media, particularly distorted ones. Sensationalist treatment of gangs can, for instance, lead to negative images which bear little resemblance to reality. In the absence of direct experience, media-based images become powerful. In this situation, there is inevitably tension between reality and image and the possibility of negative stereotyping is high. This can damage social cohesion and encourage racist attitudes in others. More recent migrant groups are often easily targeted because of distinctive physical appearances. As a result, they can become scapegoats of cultural intolerance (Dunn et al. 2004; Jarasuriya and Kee 1999). Promoting cross-cultural experiences can help to counteract these tendencies thereby building bridging capital which in turn reduces the potential for stereotyping to be effective.

Diversity in inter-ethnic relationships

Inasmuch as residential lifestyles are exemplified by ethnic diversity, so are interpersonal relationships. Australia is now recognised as having one of the highest incidences of inter-ethnic marriages and relationships in the world.

Inter-marriage is regarded as the crucial measure of social cohesion (Murphy and Watson 1997). Although rates of inter-marriage have been comparatively low for first generation migrants and vary sharply among the second generation, by the third generation most people have married outside their own ancestry groups (Khoo 2004). Specifically, in the case of persons of Southern and Western European ancestry, by the third generation, 80 per cent or more had spouses of different ancestry. Of particular interest is the

fact that most second or third generation persons reporting Southern or Western European, Middle Eastern or Asian ancestry who had intermarried had spouses who were of Australian or English-speaking ancestries.

With high degrees of intermixing and intermarriage it seems unlikely that single-ethnic communities will self-perpetuate across generations (Birrell and Betts 2001). It is of course too early to discern whether this high degree of social integration with Australian society by the third generation will be a continuing feature among more recent immigrant groups. However, people reporting Indian and Chinese ancestry show similar patterns to the Greeks: strong in-marriage in the second generation followed by strong out-marriage in the third-plus generations (Khoo 2004: 35).

Diversity of family life

Comparing family life of migrants with that of the Australia-born is difficult due to limited availability of statistics. Fertility is, however, an exception. Fertility is considered important for Australia's population growth and prosperity. In this sense the fertility rates of migrants is of significance to Australian society.

Nearly one quarter of births in Australia are registered to women born overseas; this level has remained constant since the early 1990s. In 2004, overseas-born women, with a Total Fertility Rate (TFR) of 1.767, were slightly more fertile than the Australia-born (TFR of 1.750) (ABS 2005b). The age at which births occurred varied substantially by country of birth of the mother and can be further influenced by age of the mother on arrival in Australia (ABS 2002b). Childbearing ages tend to be younger and more concentrated where TFRs for countries-of-birth are high. In 2004 for example, the three countries of birth with highest the TFRs also had the lowest median age ranges of mothers. Furthermore, countries-of-birth with high TFRs in Australia are generally ones where the main language spoken is not English. (Refer to Appendix 4A.3 and Table 4A.3.1 and Table 4A.3.2 for additional statistics and discussion).

In addition to having slightly higher fertility rates than mothers born in Australia, recent migrants are also less likely to be divorced. Furthermore, they marry earlier and live in non-family households more so than the Australia-born and longer standing migrants (Hugo 2004). These factors point to living arrangements among recent migrants producing patterns of increasing diversity.

Social network and interactions

Social networks and interactions include cross-cultural experiences with other areas in large cities. The arrival of migrants over several decades has therefore resulted in complex and overlapping ethnic communities with subsequent commercial and residential occupancies generating enhanced cultural diversity (Ang et al. 2002; Burnley 2000; Burnley et al. 1997; Collins et al. 2000; Johnston et al. 2001; Jupp et al. 1990; Waitt et al. 2000). There is little evidence of single-ethnic concentrations of migrant communities forming. However, with continuing migrant intakes and some evidence of a widening economic divide, some have questioned whether patterns of urban heterogeneity will continue (Healy and Birrell 2003).

As well as considering the social networking of migrants which is facilitated by proximity, it is important to reflect on the impact of migrant concentration on longer-term residents of affected areas. Those who remain in situ can face challenges resulting from the influx of migrant groups. For instance some elderly Australia-born residents can have trouble adapting to the changing face of their neighbourhoods and can experience significant discomfort with the scale and types of change (Wise 2004). Interestingly it is the most visually distinctive features of culturally diverse neighbourhoods, such as non-English signage and symbols, which attract most complaints (Forster 1995).

Relevance of family and friendship networks

Migrants often have fairly intricate family and friendship networks which have been developed over time within their homelands as well as in countries of settlement (Burnley 2003a). These have at times stimulated successful chain migration, including family reunion. However, in spite of family and friendship networks offering social, practical and psychological support, elderly migrants from non-English-speaking backgrounds can suffer from social isolation (Thomas and Balnaves 1993). In addition, changes in family structures, increased family mobility, and acculturation to the Australian way of life can gradually erode traditional family networks and weaken senses of familial responsibility. This in turn can undermine time-honoured patterns of family care and deepen intergenerational conflicts among new settlers (Vo-Thanh-Xuan and Liampoutong 2003).

Contact with family and friends was used in the GSS as an indicator of social integration. In 2002, the proportion of adults born overseas that had contact with family and friends in the previous week was only marginally lower than for persons born in Australia (ABS 2003a). Of course, the form of contact may well be significantly different especially with respect to contact with family members and friends who did not migrate. In this respect, how and where contact was made are relevant factors with respect to exploration of social integration.

Social integration can be inhibited by lack of mobility and hence access to transport is very important for belonging and human wellbeing. Furthermore, passing driver's licence tests and finding out about alternative transport options – including being able to interpret public transport timetables and travel routes – have added complexities for integration into the wider community for those not proficient in English. Accordingly, such persons have greater difficulty in getting about. Research has shown that persons without motor vehicles (or access to one) generally have very small neighbourhood areas by comparison with others (McIntosh 2004). In addition, they are less likely to have outings for what many regard as normal activities such as eating out, participating in recreational activities or attending sporting or cultural events. Results previously discussed have highlighted comparatively low participation and attendance rates with respect to sport and physical activities by persons not born in the main English-speaking countries. Lack of access to transport is quite likely an influential factor.

In this regard, the GSS found that the most common form of support given to relatives who did not live in the same household was with respect to transport, largely through providing lifts and lending cars (ABS 2006a: 31). English proficiency (or lack of it) has little to do with the likelihood of such assistance being provided (ABS 2003a). Nevertheless, migrants not proficient in spoken English were significantly less likely than all persons living in Australia to have access to motor vehicles (ownerships rates were 54% and 85% respectively) (Table 4A.3.3). Furthermore, they were greater than three times more likely to not be able to get, or at least often had difficulty in getting, to places where they needed to go. These factors further highlight the importance of being able to effectively communicate in English for what are regarded as normal aspects of daily living that help promote quality of life.

Summary of benefits and costs

Social interaction between family, friends and neighbours enables new migrants to develop a sense of place and belonging. These phenomena are central to engendering identity as Australians, feelings of citizenship, and comfort rather than alienation and anxiety in neighbourhood living. Residential concentration of persons of the same ethnicity can be important in the socialisation of migrant children, the provision of friendship and support, employment contacts and services. These features of clustering may attract other migrants to relocate to the places of concentration in order to access the support they provide.

Interpretations of costs and benefits of immigration to Australia with respect to social networks and neighbourhoods which have been identified and discussed in the review of literature and data are summarised in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Social network and neighbourhood issues– summary of social costs and benefits of migration

Social benefits	Social costs
Residential clusterings of migrant groups provide friendship, support, employment contacts and services to new migrants thus contributing to their sense of belonging and ameliorating the uncertainty and fear which can characterise resettlement.	Even some long-term migrants can experience feelings of exclusion.
Clustering may encourage migrants who have settled elsewhere to make deliberate choices to relocate to the places of concentration.	Some Australia-born residents can have trouble adapting to the changing face of their neighbourhoods and can experience significant discomfort with the scale and types of change brought about by migrant concentrations.
Australian cities are among the least segregated in the English-speaking world and are characterised by their degree of ethno-cultural mix rather than segregation.	There is a view – generally regarded as unlikely – that patterns of urban heterogeneity might not continue; instead, concentrations of single-ethnic groups could emerge in some socio-economically deprived sections of cities.
Residential clustering can facilitate cultural identification, thereby highlighting the positive features of ethnic groups and their cultural diversity.	In the absence of first-hand experience, the possibility of negative stereotyping of ethnic groups through media reporting is high. This can damage social cohesion and cultivate racist attitudes.
With high degrees of intermixing and intermarriage, it seems unlikely that single-ethnic communities will self-perpetuate across generations.	Whether high levels of social integration through marriage will be a continuing feature among some more recent migrant groups for religious and cultural reasons cannot be discerned at this stage.
Successful chain migration, including in the form of family reunion, has occurred through maintenance of family and friendship networks within countries of birth.	Migrants, especially those from non-English-speaking backgrounds, can suffer from social isolation.
The most common form of support given to relatives not living in the same household is with respect to transport, largely through providing lifts and lending cars. English proficiency (or lack of it) has little to do with the likelihood of such assistance being.	A comparatively high proportion of people not proficient in English have difficulty getting about due to problems associated with transport availability and use.
Ethnic groups can be stereotyped in positive ways, for example through food and cultural diversity.	Ethnic groups can be stereotyped in negative ways, for example through prominence of young people of certain physical appearances in 'gangs'.

4.4 Crime and justice

Review of the literature and data

Popular misconceptions

One concern that reportedly accompanies a large migrant intake is that it affords opportunities for people linked to overseas-based organised crime (for example Mafia and Asian crime syndicates) to enter Australia. Crime, drugs, anti-social behaviour, unemployment (especially for youth), culture clash, crowding, and, more recently, radical Islam and sympathy and support for global terrorism, have been among the dimensions of fear associated publicly with these suburbs (Collins et al. 2000).

Time and again, research has shown the extent and nature of these subjects of popular fear to be without foundation (Lee, 2007; Marshall 1997; Eastaerl 1994; Mukherjee 1999a; Poynting et al. 2004). Statistical studies of crime and ethnicity go a long way towards demonstrating this but apparently fail to displace popular conceptions largely because of the power of media images. Several studies have indicated widespread belief in an unrealistically high level of crime (of various types), particularly in notorious neighbourhoods as depicted by the popular media, yet at the same time showing that most people feel quite safe in their own familiar neighbourhoods (Poynting et al. 2004). Nevertheless, recent research has provided additional insights which link levels of proficiency in English with the extent to which people feel safe in their own homes after dark.

Victims and migrant status

Limited data on country of birth for crime victims are collected by the ABS national crime victim survey for the offences of robbery and assault. From what can be sourced, it appears that people born in Australia are slightly over represented as victims of crime (refer to Appendix 4A.4, Table 4A.4.1). Given that around 23 per cent of the population is born overseas, both overseas born males and female are under-represented as victims of crime according to this survey. Interestingly, females born overseas are about half as likely as females born in Australia to be victims of robbery, and possibly about 25 per cent less likely to be victims of assault. However, data on robbery need to be interpreted with caution given a high relative standard error of such national surveys.

Other research has produced the contradictory view that, if anything, people from visible ethnic minorities have been disproportionately the victims of crime, including hate crimes (Mukherjee 1999a), many of which would be unreported. Hate crimes are sometimes associated with racism and prejudice

and can be manifested as vilification, harassment, vandalism and assault against individuals solely on the basis of ethnic origins (HREOC 1991). These types of racially motivated crime are felt and experienced both by the individual and by the ethnic group to which individuals belong (Cunneen et al. 1997). Thus not only can a whole ethnic group become sullied by crimes committed by an individual but all migrants who have a particular birthplace, language or religion can also feel maligned by hate crimes carried out against one of them. This can be damaging to social cohesion and feelings of wellbeing and belonging.

State and Territory police forces are, under current policies, encouraged to regard hate crime seriously (Cunneen et al. 1997). Law enforcement officers in Australia – in Canada and the United Kingdom as well – are supported by legislation to cover most acts of racial vilification committed by private citizens with the substantial motivation for such legislation provided by the rise of extremist vilification campaigns by organised racist groups.

Migrant status and feelings of security

Taken overall, persons born overseas have similar feelings about levels of safety when home alone after dark as the Australia-born (Table 4A.4.2). Capital cities – which are where migrants are more likely to live – have higher proportions of people feeling unsafe than other locations within States and Territories (ABS 2006e). This factor possibly accounts for the slightly higher proportion that indicated feeling unsafe if not very unsafe.

The extent to which people felt unsafe alone at home after dark was also probed in the 2002 GSS (ABS 2003a) (Table 4A.4.3). These results showed that persons born overseas who were not proficient in spoken English were more than twice as likely to feel unsafe as people born in the main English-speaking countries (including Australia). Furthermore, they were over 60 per cent more likely to feel that way than persons born in other countries but who spoke English well. The same survey found that overseas-born people not proficient in spoken English were least likely to have had negative experiences as victims of physical or threatened violence or actual or attempted break-ins in the preceding 12 months. Hence, according to this survey, for those born overseas, their fear of crime is misaligned with their incidence of victimisation.

Further to this, the Australian component of the International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS) found that people of Middle-Eastern and Vietnamese backgrounds have higher levels of fear for their safety than other persons in Australia (Johnston 2005:5). Women from these visible ethnic minorities in particular held serious concerns for their public safety. While these findings may appear at odds with the actual risk of victimisation, the mismatch between perception and reality of risk is a common one (Weatherburn, Matka

and Lind 1996). It may reveal more about a person's sense of security and vulnerability than patterns of crime.

Problems with data collection

It is difficult to gain a proper appreciation of the extent to which migrants are implicated in criminal activities due to limitations and dissimilarities in data collected by States and Territories in Australia (Mukherjee 1999c). All new migrants undergo character and police checks before gaining entry; hence policies are in place to screen out migrants with a criminal background from entering Australia. The National Prison Census shows that a higher proportion of the Australia-born population is in prison than those born elsewhere (Mukherjee and Graycar 1997; Mukherjee 1999a). Of course, available data for the Australia-born are distorted by the extremely high rates of imprisonment for Indigenous Australians – around 20 times the national average. However, while it is true that migrants in general have lower rates of incarceration than the Australian norm, some groups have recorded high crime rates (Cope et al. 1991; Mukherjee 1999c). Many offences are related to drug importation and hence those in jail are not Australian nationals and under domestic law will be deported upon the completion of their prison sentences.

Many problems with the manner in which crime statistics are collected lead to major difficulties in officially refuting some of the images portrayed of migrants and crime. Unreported or undetected crimes are examples. Imprisonment rates do not capture the length of sentences and therefore do not reflect the severity of sentences or the attitude of judges on sentencing policy (Jarasuriya and Kee 1999; Mukherjee 1999a). Not surprisingly, there have been calls for the collection of accurate data at several stages of the criminal justice process (Collins et al. 2000; Mukherjee 1999a). It is only when such data are available that any more accurate picture of the relationships between migration and crime can be more accurately presented.

Impact of media reports

While some migrants are of course involved in criminal activity, media and public images have exaggerated the extent of this involvement (Easteal 1994; Poynting et al. 2004). Distorted media reports of criminal activities originating from secret societies, organised groups and, more recently, youth gangs, have fuelled popular myths. Crimes committed by an individual or group of individuals can come to be seen as the fault of an entire migrant population (Poynting et al. 2004). While the formation of, for example, a specialised crime squad in NSW to investigate organised crime represents an essential pooling of knowledge and language skills, this can also create exaggerated impressions of high crime rates among certain ethnic groups (Jarasuriya and Kee 1999).

Ethnic youth and juvenile justice

The identification of gangs is sometimes conflated with ethnic groups of young people which the media, in turn, readily over-sensationalise (White et al. 1999). Gang membership does not cause delinquency but it can be a risk factor. A team of researchers from Victoria estimate that less than a quarter of youth gangs were involved in trouble making (White et al. 1999).

Over-reactions to gang behaviour can at times escalate delinquent behaviour by pushing gang members to the margins and policing their behaviour in such a way as to criminalise their petty delinquencies. White argues that effective intervention strategies to curtail undesirable gang behaviour associated with ethnic youth need to be diverse, culturally relevant, community-oriented and focused on prevention (White 2002: 5). In 2001, the NSW Government, for instance, announced a package of legislative measures designed to combat gang-related crime in NSW associated loosely with ethnic youths (Lousic 2002). These social responses have attracted their supporters and critics.

When youths from non-English speaking backgrounds are drawn into the juvenile justice system, it tends to be for committing street offences. A 1995 inquiry in NSW, for example, found that police attitudes towards Arabic-speaking youth in particular were characterised by police stereotyping them as members of gangs with no respect for police (Cunneen et al. 1997). Of course, many types of offences are not explained solely by ethnicity, given that the youths in question have high levels of unemployment irrespective of birthplace (Hazlehurst 1987). In fact, it has been acknowledged for some time that factors other than ethnic origins are strongly correlated with crime (Cope et al. 1991; Weatherburn 2004; Mukherjee 1999a). Socio-economic and demographic characteristics are likely to affect crime rates of a particular neighbourhood (Mukherjee 1999c). However these socio-economic factors can be displaced by an overly simplistic focus on race or ethnicity as the sole cause of crime (Collins et al. 2000).

LSIA-sourced perceptions of crime levels also suggested that crime is related to socio-economic profile of neighbourhoods in which migrants lived rather than their migrant status per se in that humanitarian migrants were significantly more likely to think there was more crime than skilled business entrants. Perceptions about what constitutes a lot of crime would be based largely on previous experiences prior to settlement in Australia, as well place of residence upon arrival given the wide variation in crime rates across urban and rural communities (Hogg and Carrington, 2006). (Refer to Appendix 4A.4 for further discussion about recent migrant perceptions about crime which have been sourced from LSIA results.)

Language and communication difficulties for migrants from ethnic minorities are potential biases affecting arrest and sentencing (Jarasuriya and Kee 1999). Language difficulties, the lack of properly trained translators and low

representations of Australians from some minority ethnic groups in the police service have been identified as factors that affect the low-level of interaction between police and some ethnic groups (Cunneen et al. 1997). Furthermore, the language used in discussing and reporting crime can be strongly racialised with the media centrally involved in shaping perceptions. In constructing particular ways of seeing ethnicity and crime, media representations can blame a culture for what are often complex social phenomena (Collins et al. 2000).

Summary of benefits and costs

Interpretations of costs and benefits of immigration to Australia with respect to crime and justice are summarised in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Crime and justice issues – summary review of social costs and benefits of migration

Social benefits	Social costs
Studies of crime and ethnicity contradict the popular fear that links visible ethnic minorities with crime and terrorism.	Many problems with the manner in which crime statistics are collected lead to major difficulties in officially refuting some of the false images portrayed linking migrants with crime.
All new migrants undergo character and police checks before gaining entry screening out criminals from entering Australia through the planned migration scheme.	Large migrant intakes are accompanied by popular misconceptions amounting to fear or anxiety that people linked to overseas-based organised crime or terrorism or other types of 'undesirables' will be able to enter Australia.
Migrants in general have lower rates of incarceration and victimisation than the Australian norm.	While some migrants are involved in criminal activity, media and public images have exaggerated the extent of this involvement.
Evidence suggests the people born overseas are less involved in crime than Australian born. (with the exception of driving offences among new arrivals).	Crimes committed by an individual or group of individuals can come to be seen as the fault of an entire migrant population eroding social harmony and cohesiveness.

4.5 Overall assessment

Over the past decade, social capital has received increasing attention by government policy makers, by researchers and in the literature. Because social capital is transferable within and between communities and can generate positive – and negative – effects, public and private benefits – and costs – can be derived from its nourishment. As has been demonstrated, there is wealth of literature discussing various aspects of social capital as it relates to migrants and the communities within which they are active. Unfortunately, social capital is difficult to measure and consequently quantitative data sets have proved to be more elusive. Nevertheless, the framework established for this project has enabled informed discussion. Furthermore, quantitative results that are available point to migrants in general and Australian society as a whole increasingly being generators and benefactors of positive elements of social capital although the results are to some extent mixed.

In this chapter, social capital as a result of migration has been investigated through an examination of culture and diversity; community life and civil society; social networks and neighbourhoods; and crime and justice. There seems to be no doubt that Government policies of multiculturalism have encouraged the right sort of environment for cultural diversity to be generally not only accepted but also enthusiastically embraced by migrants and host communities alike. This does not mean that tensions do not exist and that racism and prejudices are not experienced at times but there seems to be wide-ranging acceptance within Australian society of tolerance for all aspects of life that might be different to what individuals regard as their norm. Indeed, attitudes to migration and cultural diversity appear to be more positive than a decade ago although survey results suggest that such attitudes are sensitive to topical issues, global events and economic conditions.

The extent of migrant involvement in community life, civil society, social networks and neighbourhoods is, in many instances, similar to that of the Australia-born although there appear to be distinct differences in the way this might be manifested, particularly for persons without an English-speaking heritage. The manner in which people volunteer help to others is a case in point, with migrants from different cultural backgrounds or speaking languages other than English more inclined to be involved in an informal sense than through formal associations or organisations. In fact, offering support to new migrants from compatible ethnic groups in a myriad of ways appears to be a crucial component of the settlement process and for integration by individuals into Australian society. Accordingly, small numbers of migrants from ethnic groups new to Australia can be faced with additional and unforeseen hurdles – and opportunities – which can have ramifications for the host communities as well as the individual.

An outstanding characteristic of Australian cities by comparison with those in other migrant destination countries is the limited extent of residential differentiation exemplified by ethnic diversity in suburbs that attract migrants.

Households and families are also highly diversified as a result of inter-ethnic marriages. These are potential features that encourage most migrants to embrace Australian society and its political and cultural norms and, through participation in various aspects of community life, to enhance stocks of social capital. Of course, there are always exceptions and unfortunately media attention can result in public misconceptions about migrant status and crime. Such misconceptions damage individuals, the ethnic communities to which they belong and the host communities, thus undermining social capital. Addressing recognised problems with data collection could help to overcome some costs associated with social capital and also promote the huge range of benefits as a result of immigration both for individuals and for Australia.

5: Produced and Financial Capital – Productive Diversity

The human capital and the social capital that migrants either bring with them or develop once in Australia also contributes to the growth of produced and financial capital. Housing is one very obvious example. Housing provides much more than immediate shelter for a person. On top of this, the presence of migrants creates demands for physical and social infrastructure, sometimes provided by the public sector, sometimes by the migrants themselves. Similarly, migrants often invest in new business, thereby contributing to the rich tapestry of the productive diversity of Australian life. It is clear that migrants from other cultures offer special talents in economic relations with their country of origin. They have linguistic skills, knowledge of cultural sensitivities, market intelligence and the networks of associates to take advantage of business opportunities that might otherwise be lost (Jupp 2001). Immigrants have contributed significantly to the Australian economy in this respect.

5.1 Housing

Review of the literature and data

Housing as a key to human wellbeing

Housing is a fundamental human need. Although, financially, the cost of housing is a major drain on family budgets, housing is much more than an economic asset that provides shelter. It is also an outlet for personal identity and an opportunity, relative to the surrounding neighbourhood, for social belonging. Furthermore, the neighbourhood in which housing is located can serve as a unit for the provision of facilities which contribute to quality of life (for example, open space and community centres).

Traditionally, housing tenure has been thought of in terms of ‘the housing ladder’ whereby households move ‘upwards’ from renting to ownership. Such ownership conveys certain advantages on individuals: it is a major form of wealth creation; it is a symbol of attainment; and it affords a means of self expression (owned homes being more easily altered and decorated than rented homes). Satisfactory housing is therefore a key contributor to social wellbeing.

Levels of home ownership by different migrant groups

One major way in which migrants contribute to Australia's stock of produced and financial capital is through investment in housing. Thus the extent of owner-occupied housing (including housing which is being purchased) by persons born overseas documents a measure of this form of capital. Long-established European migrant groups such as those born in Italy and Greece have very high levels of home-ownership (93% and 90% for Italian and Greek immigrants respectively) (2001 Census; 1% CURF). So too do migrants from most other South and South-Eastern European countries and North-Western Europe including England, with between 76 and 79 per cent with housing tenure. (Refer to Table 5A.1.1 in Appendix 5A.1 which presents data tables for results referenced in this section.)

All these levels are above the national average of 71 per cent for Australia (Hugo 1999). In contrast, some birthplace groups including those from China (excluding Taiwan), Vietnam and the Philippines have levels that are on a par or just below the Australian national average; others have below-average levels. The latter group includes migrants from North-East Asia (excluding China), from South and Central Asia, and from North Africa and the Middle East (between 61% and 63% with home-ownership). Only one in two settlers from Oceania including New Zealand have housing tenure. Very low levels of home ownership are associated with some Pacific Island groups (such as Cook Islanders, Western Samoans and Tongan immigrants) and with refugee groups (for example, those from El Salvador and Iraq) (Hugo 1999).

These differences are significant because of the recognised role that housing plays in Australian society and in human wellbeing. In this sense, it is important to note that a majority of migrants in all global regional birthplace groups are owner-occupiers or owner-purchasers. This means that a majority of migrants are on the main track to wealth creation. However, differences between birthplace groups in the level of home owning and buying reflect differences in levels of produced and financial capital which may become more pronounced if home ownership as a form of capital gain increasingly becomes favoured over other forms.

Home ownership in Australian States and Territories

Home-ownership in Australia according to global region of birth exhibits a very uniform pattern across all States and Territories (Table 5A.1.2). Even in expensive real estate markets like Sydney, migrants have high levels of ownership. By overall national standards, the overseas-born have relatively low levels of home ownership in the NT. However, migrant ownership in this area is still well above the level found among the Australia-born in the NT, a region recognised for its itinerant workforce.

Some ethnic groups in NSW and Victoria have lower levels of owner occupation than in other states. At a time when public housing is increasingly becoming welfare housing, many of these groups are trapped long-term in the private rental market. Decreasing home affordability might mean that these groups are denied a route to wealth creation followed by earlier migration streams.

Meeting the housing needs of migrants

It is difficult to assess the degree to which housing needs of migrants are met. Recent LSIA data provide some insights and suggest that migrants find housing quality generally quite satisfactory, according to both Australian standards and migrant expectations (Richardson *et al.* 2002). Nevertheless, because types and standard of housing are largely income-dependent, there are discernable socio-economic differences in levels of satisfaction.

Highly skilled migrants who earn high incomes might readily become owner-occupiers, perhaps in affluent suburbs (Burnley 2005). By contrast, humanitarian entrants, including those with TPVs, fare less well. Because it is hard for them to find employment, they are more likely to have low incomes and housing which is of poor quality, poorly located relative to needs, insecure (or perceived as being insecure), small and relatively expensive (DIMIA 2003b; Ley *et al.* 2000; S. Richardson 2002; Vanden Heuvel and Wooden 1999). They are also less able to draw on the support of family members than family reunion migrants.

An AHURI survey of Adelaide, Perth and Brisbane found that, even after several years in Australia, refugees were unlikely to have achieved public rental housing or satisfactory private rental accommodation let alone home purchase (Beer and Foley 2003). Some independent migrants outside the skill streams also have difficulty with housing, are more likely to be renting and have a relatively high level of dissatisfaction with housing quality (Richardson *et al.* 2002).

Potential for housing stress for recent migrants

The vast majority of new migrants stay with Australian residents immediately upon arrival before moving out, when circumstances permit, to privately rent and, when possible, to become owner-occupiers (DIMIA 2003b) (Table 5A.1.3). Public rental housing represents a small but much sought-after part of the housing stock but waiting lists are long and most migrants' aspirations are therefore unlikely to be met from this housing stock in the short term (Beer and Foley 2003; Burnley *et al.* 1997).

Housing affordability in real terms has fallen over the past 30 years and owner-occupation has become even more difficult for first-home buyers in Australia in the past decade (Burnley 2005). Because it is taking longer for disadvantaged immigrants to enter the owner-buyer markets than a generation or so earlier, a rising proportion occupy public housing or private rented accommodation for longer (Hassell and Hugo 1996). Lack of access to priority public housing might be causing severe housing stress for some recently arrived humanitarian entrants (Waxman 1999). Low-income refugees who might have inadequate knowledge of the housing market and tenancy laws are at risk of becoming homeless (Beer and Foley 2003).

Housing wealth variability within ethnic groups

There is no significant evidence of racially exclusionary policies being practised in housing markets or of segregation (as opposed to residential differentiation) of urban areas along ethnic lines (Johnston *et al.* 2001). In terms of housing wealth, considerable contrasts occur *within* migrant groups. These are often greater than *between* migrant groups or between immigrants and long-time Australians (Burnley 2005).

The location of public accommodation and of sponsors has significantly influenced initial and secondary housing locations (Waxman 1999). For example, some migrant groups tend to concentrate in the west and southwest of Sydney because these suburbs were close to the reception centres through which most refugees passed, notably in Cabramatta (Burnley 1985). When it was time to move from migrant hostels, proximate relocation was generally sought due to familiarity with the area and a community presence, as well as the existence of an already established network, places of worship, family members, employment opportunities and friends. Later preferential family migrants often settled close to kin who sponsored them (Waitt *et al.* 2000).

Migrant preferences for housing types

It is interesting to look at migrant preferences for housing type. Immigrants have historically demonstrated preferences for detached housing, avoiding higher density development, although some recent arrivals (especially refugees) have settled in medium density developments on an interim basis (Burnley *et al.* 1997). More recently, many middle- to higher-income households in Sydney, particularly those from Asia, have shown preferences for modern apartments and medium-density living (Burnley 2005). For a variety of reasons, migrants have demonstrated greater tolerance for medium density housing than the Australia-born and many have made significant use of dual-occupancy provisions to accommodate relatives near to the family home.

A newer phenomenon impacting upon the low to middle-priced apartment sector of Sydney's private rental housing markets might be short-term visa holders (excluding TPVs) (Burnley 2005). These migrants are thought to favour rental accommodation in the inner eastern suburbs and northern beaches and thus would not directly compete with humanitarian entrants and those with TPVs looking to rent in cheaper localities.

Discrimination and the housing market

In spite of exclusionary practices apparently being minimal, discrimination against some migrant groups can sometimes be an underlying barrier to finding somewhere to live. For example, a pilot client survey commissioned by DIMIA in 2002 of recently arrived migrants, service providers and others found evidence that Serbian refugees, as white Europeans, were favoured over African families (DIMIA 2003b: 78).

A further problem in regional as well as urban areas can be that the Australian norm with respect to housing style may not be suited to all migrant groups. For instance, houses to accommodate large and extended families are either very expensive in the private rental market or non-existent in public housing (DIMIA 2003b). With respect to interior form, lifestyle preferences and cultural traditions can define the acceptability of housing. Needs of migrant families can include providing suitable places of worship, appropriately sitting and orientating doors, facilitating traditional methods of food preparation, arranging rooms to reflect cultural attitudes, and issues associated with cleanliness and hygiene (Watson and McGillivray 1994). However there is not much evidence yet of change in the way that planning and housing policies operate to accommodate these needs.

Potential impact of ethnic concentrations on housing markets

Low- and moderate-income non-English-speaking overseas arrivals continue to settle disproportionately in core regions, potentially leading to depressed housing markets as other buyers are discouraged from moving to the same localities (Carroll 2003). Whether this could lead to the formation of ghettos in the future, notably in areas settled by refugees in public housing, has been the subject of speculation (Jupp *et al.* 1990). Talk about ghettos in Australia, the reality of which has previously been disproved by well-documented evidence (Viviani 1996), may only serve to further disadvantage and marginalise immigrants and slow their economic and social adjustment.

An alternative scenario is that some migrants may become established within core regions through choice – either in the home-ownership or private-rental sectors of the market – in order to sustain their ethnic identity. However many others wishing to live close to their compatriots and to community institutions may find that proximity is not feasible because of the relative immobility of already established members. Moreover, where concentrations of particular ethnic groups are established in the owner-occupier market, they may become long-lived because of reluctance to sell and move to areas where there is less concentration according to ethnicity (Johnston *et al.* 2001). This can serve to drive up prices in sought-after areas.

Overall impact of migrant demand on housing prices

Historically high rates of home ownership among migrants have been interpreted in terms of the cultural value placed on ‘home’ and as a symbol of economic independence and family security (Ley *et al.* 2000; Thompson 1994). Overall migrant demand for housing has often been claimed to increase house prices, especially in metropolitan markets, notably Sydney (Burnley *et al.* 1997). According to this view, continued immigration will create further demand and fuel concurrent house price increases.

An alternative perspective, based on projected Australian household numbers, is that future growth in the number of households in cities such as Sydney will be driven primarily by the (unstoppable) ageing of its population. Thus, migration might have relatively little influence on household numbers and therefore housing demand (McDonald and Temple 2003). This view is contested by some (for example, Birrell and Healy 2003; Curnow 2004) who maintain that immigration will increasingly be an important factor shaping growth in demand for housing because the numbers of people aged in their twenties would stabilise in the absence of immigration, thereby improving housing affordability.

Summary of benefits and costs

Migrants have historically demonstrated preferences for home ownership and detached housing and have thus benefited from this form of wealth creation, social belonging and improved quality of life. This pattern might be changing in Australian cities with increasing numbers of humanitarian entrants tending to occupy public housing or private rented accommodation for long periods and short-term skilled visa holders favouring higher density good quality rental accommodation.

It is difficult to assess the degree to which housing needs of migrants are met. Low- and moderate-income non-English-speaking migrants are settling disproportionately in core regions, potentially leading to depressed housing markets in those areas. Whether this could lead to the formation of ghettos in the future is the subject of speculation. Talk about ghettos in Australia may only serve to further disadvantage and marginalise some immigrant groups and slow their economic and social adjustment.

Interpretations of social costs and benefits of immigration to Australia with respect to housing and with reference to the literature are summarised in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Housing issues – summary of social costs and benefits

<i>Social benefits</i>	<i>Social costs</i>
Historically, investment in housing by migrants has contributed to Australia's stock of produced and financial capital (and thus social capital also through generating a sense of belonging).	Some argue that capital tied up in producing housing – and associated infrastructure – as a result of high immigration levels is responsible for supply constraints on capital for the provisioning or upgrading of some other types of essential infrastructure and services.
More recent migrants find housing quality generally quite satisfactory, according to both Australian standards and migrant expectations.	Most refugees are unlikely to achieve public rental housing or satisfactory private rental accommodation after several years in Australia, let alone home purchase.
Highly skilled migrants have the potential to readily become owner-occupiers, in affluent suburbs too.	Humanitarian entrants are less able to draw on the support of family members with respect to housing than family reunion migrants or more established migrant communities with an inter-generational presence in Australia.
Over time differences between migrant and Australia-born in housing ownership converge.	High demand for public rental housing means that most disadvantaged migrants (and, quite likely, Australia-born disadvantaged persons as well) are unlikely have access to this form of housing stock in the short term. This can lead to resentments between low-socio economic residents and newly arrived migrants.
Low- and moderate-income non-English-speaking migrants continue to settle disproportionately in the same localities in order to sustain their ethnic identity. This is an efficient and cost effective way of building bonding capital among migrant communities.	Low- and moderate-income non-English-speaking migrants continue to settle disproportionately in the same localities in order to sustain their ethnic identity. Too much bonding capital can reduce the possibility of bridging capital emerging between new and emergent migrant communities and host communities.
Continued immigration might create further housing demand and fuel concurrent house price increases. This is beneficial to those already in the housing market.	Continued immigration might create further housing demand and fuel concurrent house price increases. This adversely affects those entering the housing market.

5.2 Infrastructure

Review of the literature and data

Population pressures on infrastructure and services

Any population increase places pressure on resources (Burnley et al. 1997). Immigration needs to be considered in the context of general population trends. The impact of immigration therefore can be perceived as adding to the overall pressure on infrastructure and the provision of services. In addition, the presence of migrants stimulates the need for particular ethno-specific resources (for example, places of worship for religions not previously well-represented in Australia). As against this, any increase in population could potentially lead to economies of scale in service provision (Garnaut 2002).

Impact of migration on urban resources

Overseas immigration to Australia has focused largely on metropolitan areas. Over 80 per cent of arrivals since 1945 have settled in capital cities, disproportionately in Sydney and Melbourne (Forster 2004). More recent arrivals have settled in cities to an even greater degree. The Atlas of the Australian People – 1996 Census shows that, for many birthplace groups, the concentration is well over 90 per cent in capital cities. Business migrants are clearly likely to locate in business centres. Family reunion migrants are likely to locate close to relatives, thereby enhancing metropolitan dominance. Humanitarian migrants, particularly those with no recognised qualifications, are likely to gravitate to the largest labour markets.

In addition to these permanent increases in predominantly urban populations, student visa holders in Australia at the end of June 2006 were expected to total around 208 000 persons (DIMA 2006a: 76). This represents an increase of 50 per cent in persons on student visas in the five years since 2000-01. The majority of students are here for higher education and post-graduate research. Most institutions offering university education are located in metropolitan cities and hence Australia's role in this respect also has substantial impacts on urban and educational infrastructure. Furthermore, Humanitarian migrants mainly settle in major cities. Programme numbers for this visa category in 2005-06 were around 14 000, representing a modest increase of about 1 000 persons on previous year figures.

There are various temporary (non-permanent) visa categories including the skilled visa class such as Temporary Business Visas (subclass 457 visas). In 2005-06, 457 visas were granted to some 39 800 primary applicants (DIMA 2006a:13). This represented an increase of around 42 per cent on the previous year. A 2005 report looking at the employment and migration

outcomes of 457 visa holders (Khoo, McDonald and Hugo 2005) showed that, at that time, about two-thirds of these temporary migrants were married or had partners and most (93%) were accompanied to Australia by their partners. About one in four had children with them in Australia. If this same pattern is applied, Australia's population is increased by more than double the number of 457 primary applicants when partners and children are also in the reckoning. In 2005-06, some 13 300 subclass 457 visa holders (around one in three) applied for permanent residence (DIMA 2006e: 85).

Sydney has been the main centre of settlement in recent years with the NSW State Government claiming that it caters for about 40 per cent of arrivals. This has fuelled metropolitan growth to some extent (Garnaut et al. 2003). Assessing the social impact of immigration with respect to pressure on that city's resources is not simple. Recent migrants have tended to settle in 'middle distance' suburbs, thereby transforming these areas, just as early post-war arrivals did much to alter inner suburbs with (then) declining populations. In this way, contemporary migration is contributing in positive ways to the transformation of areas of Australian cities which are in need of renewal (Randolph 2002).

Potential policies for coping with population pressures

Concentration of migrants in some areas leads to area-specific demands (as demonstrated in the case of public and privately-rented housing) but such concentration can also give impetus to the provisioning or strengthening of additional services because of increasing demands for physical and social infrastructure (Garnaut 2002). While controlling immigration by itself will not halt increased demand for the provision of infrastructure and services, lower levels of inflow into major cities such as Sydney could provide breathing space while effective 'catch-up' policies are implemented to overcome any shortfall in investment over the years.

Population growth in major cities and resultant infrastructure demands could perhaps also be indirectly limited through behaviour modification. This could involve a combination of pricing, policy and education aimed at achieving sustainable cities, thereby avoiding any need to alter immigration levels (Burnley et al. 1997). Some people, for instance, might move to cheaper localities or places where choices are less constrained. This scenario proposes that such policies might also limit the attractiveness of Australia and its capital cities for immigrants.

The notion that immigrants should be encouraged to move to smaller cities and to populate rural and remote regions is of course not new (see Borrie 1975). It is however a suggestion that flies in the face of apparent preferences because, as in other societies, immigrants to Australia have continued to favour major cities, especially Sydney and Melbourne (Jupp 2002). Recent schemes which have been aimed at attracting location-specific nominations

for migration within the skill stream – RSMS and SDAS – have been met with limited success (DIMIA 2005a; 2005b).

Provisioning capacities as a result of migration

There is no reason why migration should be construed as creating unmanageable demands with respect to infrastructure provisioning, particularly when there is general recognition that immigration creates economic benefits exceeding costs at the national level (Burnley et al. 1997; Econtech 2004; Garnaut et al. 2003). Immigration numbers have been highest when the Australian economy is growing strongly. At these times, it is argued, there should be capacity to finance the provisioning of the urban infrastructure even if this means additional allocations from the Commonwealth in areas of migrant concentrations (Burnley et al. 1997). Consequently, it is not valid to suggest (as some do, according to Burnley et. al.) that capital tied up in producing housing – and associated infrastructure – for migrants as a result of high intake levels is responsible for supply constraints on capital for the provisioning or upgrading of some other types of essential infrastructure and services.

Importance of planning migration levels

Timely provision of urban infrastructure requires, of course, high-quality population forecasts. For this to happen, State Governments need reliable information from the Commonwealth on proposed future immigration levels as well as on birthplace and language groups (Burnley et al. 1997). The historically fluctuating nature of immigration suggests this is difficult to provide. The configuration of the humanitarian stream of migrants is particularly difficult to predict, although this stream is considerably smaller than the skilled migration stream of migrants to Australia.

The hard ‘coal face’ of local government

Local government is where multiculturalism really bites. Demands for culturally appropriate services in areas of concentrated ethnic populations exert financial pressures. Not only do migrants create substantial demands for such services, they also suffer when there are inadequacies in supply. A national survey of Australian local government regarding multicultural policy found that, while some celebrated and responded to cultural diversity, as many again refused to recognise the extent of ethnic heterogeneity, often constructing minorities as a problematic ‘Other’ (Thompson et al. 1998). Thus there is a view that local government has often coped ineffectively with migrants’ needs – despite being the level of government closest to the people – with regular occurrences of what can be perceived as discriminatory and unjust practices.

Stretched resources could mean that community relations policies in some areas are not accorded a high priority and thus are poorly developed. While it is this level of government that attracts most criticism with respect to migrant services, changes are deemed necessary at all levels of government to ensure fair provisioning and to afford people from different cultural backgrounds the opportunity to participate in the process of governance (Thompson and Dunn 2002).

Importance of planning and infrastructure provision

It is a myth that migration leads to overcrowding in urban areas. The problem is inadequate planning or insufficient infrastructure provision or, most likely, a combination of both (C. Richardson 2002). Of particular concern are planning practices (including 'giving in' to resident pressure groups) that discourage types of infrastructure – such as places for worship – or uses – particularly senior citizens' clubs – that clash with existing urban form or traditional treatment of public space (Murphy and Watson 1997).

It is misguided however to be too critical of planning. Sometimes the outcome of 'light' planning is fascinating. Some of the most culturally distinctive and vibrant areas of Sydney have been relatively unplanned (Hawkins and Gibson 1994). For example, waves of new migrant groups in Marrickville and Cabramatta have tended to reinforce existing land use patterns while using them in their own distinctive ways, providing active street life with strong links to the local community.

Resourcing infrastructure and services

It is also important to note that pressures on city infrastructure can change because of shifts in immigration policy from permanent to temporary migrants (brought in for particular jobs, many of which are city-based) (McDonald 2004). This can be handled but it is important that the system of fiscal federalism takes stock of where the demand lies when it is transferring money from the Commonwealth to the States. It is also important that local government is adequately resourced to meet its 'coalface' obligations (Armstrong 1994; Thompson and Dunn 2002).

Summary of benefits and costs

The historically fluctuating nature of immigration has been blamed for pressures on physical infrastructure and social services in some predominantly urban areas. Shifts in migration policy that become reflected in changing numbers, skills levels, and composition of migrant – permanent and temporary – do create varying demands on infrastructure and shortfalls in services in migrant settlement areas. However, they can also result in economies of scale and can be catalysts for urban renewal. Migrants themselves generally bear the brunt of inadequacies in supply of services and poor implementation of access and equity policies.

Interpretations of social costs and benefits of immigration to Australia with respect to infrastructure and the literature are summarised in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2: Infrastructure issues – summary of social costs and benefits

Social benefits	Social costs
Increases in population through migration could potentially lead to economies of scale in service provision.	The impact of immigration can be perceived as adding to the overall pressure on infrastructure and the provision of services.
Migration contributes to the transformation of areas of Australian cities which are in need of renewal.	Pressures on city infrastructure and services can change because of shifts in migration policy from permanent to temporary migrants.
Migrants stimulate the need for particular ethno-specific resources.	Not only do migrants create substantial demands for services at the local government level, they also suffer when there are inadequacies in supply.
Immigrants to Australia continue to favour major cities.	Inadequate or inappropriate planning or insufficient infrastructure provision (or both) to cope with migration-induced population growth has contributed to various types of pressures in urban areas.
Immigrants might be encouraged to move to smaller cities and to populate rural and remote regions.	The historically fluctuating nature of immigration illustrates the difficulty of providing high quality population forecasts (source countries and numbers) to facilitate planning.
Because migration levels are highest when the Australian economy is strong, there should at those times be capacity to finance additional urban infrastructure and services.	Capital tied up in producing housing and associated infrastructure as a result of high migration levels might induce supply constraints on capital for the provision of other much needed infrastructure and services.

5.3 New businesses, goods and services

Review of the literature and data

Contributors to productive diversity

Migrants have made major contributions to the Australian economy, not least through setting up businesses (Strahan and Williams 1988). Some of the giants of Australian business arrived as ‘penniless’ migrants. In fact, migrants are over-represented on the BRW ‘rich list’. In 2003, to be listed among the ten wealthiest individuals in Australia required assets valued at \$1,000 million or more. As Stilwell (2004:para 15) pointed out, “the incidence of wealthy people from migrant – mainly European – backgrounds [was notable]. 4 out of the 10 richest Australians in 1993 were migrants, and 5 out of the 10 in 2003”. Clearly, being a migrant is not synonymous with having a poor background and it seems that inheritance and family connections are equally relevant to ‘success’ among migrants as among the Australia-born.

Migrants as small business operators and entrepreneurs

Unfortunately, little is known about the more general and low-key penetration of migrant groups into the Australian economy. An indicator of the social impact of migrants in the retail sector could potentially be gained by looking at their involvement in shop ownership and management, particularly in suburban and non-metropolitan areas, but research into this phenomenon is patchy. This is disappointing because corner stores and other convenience goods outlets, where migrant owners are perceived as being of continued prominence, are pivotal in local communities. They are foci for social interaction, not least because of their lengthy trading hours. Involvement in this form of retailing is therefore a way in which migrants contribute to social networking as well as to business.

It is perhaps not surprising that many pre-war migrants were highly motivated and became successful entrepreneurs. Many were also responsible for chain migration and for providing supportive roles to arriving family members and contacts (Burnley 1985; Collins et al. 1995). There is no doubting the penetration and diversity of migrants in the small business sector of Australia when 30 per cent (or 500 900) of the nation’s small businesses are owned or operated by people who were born overseas (ABS 2005a). Since people born overseas make up about a quarter of the Australian population, it seems that there are more migrant small business operators than one would expect on the basis of population alone.

Another explanation for the continued propensity of immigrants to establish businesses is the existing business migration schemes under which persons

with business skills and capital are allowed to settle (Wooden 1994). Moreover, new migrant arrivals often possess the skills and qualifications to break into higher level jobs and the professional strata of immigrant businesses (Collins et al. 1995).

Many migrant businesses have been shaped by the cultural needs, activities and support of fellow migrants who remain very important to their economic survival. In spite of this, migrant-owned businesses do not represent an alternative to the open economy. They do not operate within enclaves – in the sense that they solely serve the ethnic group of the business owner – unlike in some other countries (for example, the Cuban enclave in Miami in the US) (Collins et al. 1995; Tait et al. 1989).

Other incentives to self-employment include higher levels of social status, personal gratification and improved financial wellbeing by comparison with factory work or the receipt of welfare benefits (Tait et al. 1989). In this regard, it should be noted that, in Australia, immigrants have not received government funding assistance to establish businesses (Zhou and Logan 1989).

It is important to understand that other factors can transform small business from a preferred option to a necessary one for many migrants wanting to work. Opportunities for employment in mainstream labour markets are sometimes blocked, perhaps due to lack of skills, poor fluency in English, or the effects of economic restructuring including retrenchment and the elimination of traditional sites of unskilled employment (Castles 1991; Collins et al. 1995; Covick 1984). If new migrant groups continue to be disadvantaged in the labour market for structural reasons, including ‘institutional racism’ (Jarasuriya and Kee 1999), their dependence upon the ‘informal economy’ for survival could increase and enclave industries might form (Collins et al. 1995).

Recognised work ethics and aspirations

It is also relevant to note different attitudes to work on the part of some migrants. Some migrant groups, for example, aspire to values highly compatible with a strong entrepreneurial spirit, such as loyalty, work ethic, orderliness, responsibility and respect for authority (Jarasuriya and Kee 1999). Important differences also need to be recognised with respect to the integration of work and home. Home industries such as cooking, clothing manufacture, jewellery making and motor vehicle repair can be looked upon as empowering and as an avenue for incubating new businesses (Watson and McGillivray 1994).

Other important elements for success

In Australia, most enterprises operated by immigrants are family-run businesses (Adukari 1999). Family members are often important for their successful operation in part because they are prepared to work long hours and have restricted holidays (Castles 1991; Collins 2002; Tait et al. 1989). Furthermore, housework and care of family – of children and elderly relatives – can be managed conjointly with work in the family business. So, in addition to entrepreneurial flair, other important elements for the successful operation of businesses by immigrants include family support, ethnic group links, patriarchal family structures and religion. On balance, then, the bulk of migrants to Australia contribute substantially to the productive diversity of the nation's financial capital.

Summary of benefits and costs

Migrants have made substantial contributions to the productive diversity of Australia especially through the establishment of businesses. Interpretations of social costs and benefits of immigration to Australia with respect to new businesses, goods and services and with reference to the literature are summarised in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3: New businesses, goods and services issues – summary review of social costs and benefits of migration

Social benefits	Social costs
Migrants have made major contributions to the Australian economy, not least through setting up businesses. They have contributed substantially to Australia's productive diversity.	Opportunities for employment in mainstream labour markets can be blocked, perhaps due to lack of skills, poor fluency in English, or the effects of economic restructuring including retrenchment and the elimination of traditional sites of unskilled employment.
Many pre-war migrants were highly motivated and became successful entrepreneurs.	Opportunities for employment in mainstream labour markets are sometimes blocked, perhaps leading to small business operations by default.
Migrants responsible for chain migration also provide supportive roles to arriving family members and contacts.	Emerging ethnic groups do not have the same level of support as more established ethnic groups.
New migrants often possess skills, qualifications and contacts that can be applied in new or different ways.	If new migrant groups are disadvantaged in the labour market for structural reasons including discrimination, their dependence upon the 'informal economy' for survival might increase and enclave industries might form.
Many migrant businesses cater for the cultural needs and activities of fellow migrants.	Some members of host communities have trouble adapting to the changing face of their neighbourhoods and can experience significant discomfort with the scale and types of change.
Some migrant groups are recognised for loyalty, work ethic, orderliness, responsibility and respect for authority.	Some ethnic groups have been stereotyped in negative ways for high levels of dependency on welfare.
Family support, ethnic group links, patriarchal family structures and religion can be important elements for the successful operation of businesses by immigrants.	Family support, ethnic group links, patriarchal family structures and religion can be important elements for the successful operation of businesses by immigrants.

5.4 Overall assessment

Migrants contribute in positive ways to the productive diversity of Australia through investment in housing, the transformation of urban areas, the creation of new businesses, the supply of products, the provision of new and different skills, and through other types of entrepreneurial activities. They also create demand for a range of goods and services and also infrastructure such as roads, schools and water supplies. For this reason, it is sometimes argued that increased migration levels put pressure on resources and cause shortcomings in infrastructure and services, particularly in Australia's cities which attract the bulk of new migrant settlers. According to this view, continued population increase through migration will cause further housing shortages and resultant price rises.

Herein lies the dilemma. Because intake levels tend to be highest when the Australian economy is growing strongly and also because migrants boost Australia's supplies of human and social capital, it can be argued that increased migration should provide the additional resources needed to prevent shortfalls in existing infrastructure and services. Of course, provisioning for many of these factors may take years to plan and implement. However, intake levels can fluctuate according to a range of parameters and with comparatively short lead times. Furthermore, the ethnic mix can varied substantially, creating new and different types of demands, sometimes in locations without a history of adapting for the types of services that might be required.

What has been suggested is for the various levels of government to ensure that allocations and resources are made available where they are most needed. For this to happen, reliable information on proposed immigration levels as well as on birthplace and language groups would need to be made available in a timely fashion. Of course, the historically fluctuating nature of immigration suggests this can be difficult to provide. How this challenge is responded to will influence the level of benefit from productive diversity afforded by immigration for Australia.

6: Natural Capital

Growing environmental awareness has been one of the hallmarks of Australian society in the last twenty years. Nevertheless, major debates continue about the role of population pressure on the atmosphere, on the hydrological cycle, on soils, vegetation and fauna, and on landforms (especially beaches) (Bridgman *et al.* 1995). Clearly, immigration impacts on the biophysical environment through its contribution to population growth (Cocks 1992; 1996; 1999; Lowe 1996). However impacts are mediated by lifestyle. Consequently not all migrants have the same ecological footprint and nor does footprint impact necessarily remain the same before and after migration. This point was dramatically illustrated in a *Sydney Morning Herald* article (1 August 2005:1) which pointed out: "If everyone lived like they do in Mosman, we would need seven extra earths to cope with them". Mosman is, of course, a wealthy Sydney suburb with high levels of consumption. It is also characterised by relatively low levels of migrants.

6.1 Population impact

Review of the literature

Migration policy and population growth

Because immigration is a major contributor to population growth, intake levels have often been central to discussion about relationships between population size, rates of population growth, environmental quality and sustainable development. Migration has been suggested as a way to avoid population decline and substantial falls in the size of the labour force, with a net intake of around 80 000 suggested by some (Birrell *et al.* 2005; Econtech 2004; Garnaut *et al.* 2003; Glover *et al.* 2001; McDonald and Kippen 1999). It is inappropriate for this report to explore these issues or the potential for immigration intake levels to offset ageing (Dowrick 2002; Garnaut *et al.* 2003) other than to note increasing scepticism about the argument that higher intakes can retard population ageing (McDonald and Kippen 1999; C. Richardson 2002).

Views on migrant intake levels and the environment

Contradictory messages have been received with respect to how people feel and think about migration intake levels and the environment. On the one hand, those involved in the sustainability movements have generally opposed population increase (Jupp 2002). However, this approach made it impossible to defend family reunion and humanitarian intake Programmes without abolishing all other immigration and inadvertently becoming aligned with racially inspired views on immigration. On the other hand, some people who

are concerned about the state of the environment favour immigration (Betts 2004; 2005a).

Characteristics of supporters of migration

Overall trends show that, by 2004, Australians were generally less concerned about immigration levels than at any time since the beginning of the 1990s but patterns based on education and occupational group did not produce uniform results (Betts 2005a). Managers, administrators and professionals, in particular people working in the social professions such as teaching, media, the arts, social work, and religion, were less likely to believe intake levels were too large and more likely to believe they were not large enough. The pro-immigration stance was especially marked for university graduates and indeed the data showed that support for immigration was highest among graduates (Betts 2005a:34-35).

Challenges to notions of national identity

People who acknowledge a strong attachment to Australia demonstrate more cautious approaches to immigration. This might be associated with national identity whereby many Australians have a sense that they belong to and identify with a distinctive national community and are proud to do so. Immigration and multiculturalism are sometimes seen as synonymous and thus potentially challenge some people's notion of community: if migrants do not integrate, some people are concerned that Australia might become divided along ethnic lines (Birrell and Betts 2001).

State and Territory differentiations

Differentiations are also apparent geographically. Among the five mainland states, opposition to immigration has been shown to be highest in New South Wales, especially in the outer Sydney and regional areas, and lowest in Victoria. It was even lower in the Australian Capital Territory. Inner metropolitan areas also tended to score low (Betts 2005a: 37). The media, of course, influence many people's opinions about immigration, population policy and the environment. Ambiguous views in society are understandable given that an analysis of newspaper articles has shown that few Australian journalists make a population-environment connection (Goldie 2002).

6.2 Environmental impact

Review of the literature

Population growth and the natural environment

The impact of population growth on the nation's natural capital is a huge issue which has attracted sustained informed, uninformed and passionate debate. Main areas of concern with respect to increased population levels include pressures that are placed on natural resources and the environment through land degradation, depletion of resources and threats to ecosystems. Some argue that effective environmental policies which might not only repair past environmental damage but also inhibit future degradation are unlikely to be implemented without a smaller population base (Flannery 1995). Therefore, from this perspective, an increase in population as a result of immigration should be discouraged. Limiting immigration, and thus population growth, also reduces the imperative to act with respect to waste production and excessive lifestyles and so, some argue, presents a 'lazy' way to tackle environmental problems (Burnley 2003b).

Another perspective is that national population growth, even with a modestly raised immigration intake, is an extraneous factor with respect to environmental problems. Existing pressures in and around cities and in rural primary production areas demand that environmental and resource management strategies be put firmly in place and consumption and resource use practices be significantly modified (Burnley 2003b). Burnley argues that, provided these occur, increases in population to, say, 26 million by 2050, as projected by the ABS (2000a), would not place unacceptable stresses on the physical environment.

Furthermore, if Australia were to reduce population growth via immigration as a result of agendas determined by environmentalism and nationalist sentiments, the nation could become marginalised in a global sense (Burnley 2003b). This view receives support in a Federal Government report into Australia's carrying capacity which suggested that a smaller population would not reduce land use by agricultural and pastoral industries and thus not impact upon associated environmental degradation (House of Representatives Standing Committee for Long Term Strategies 1994). Other major studies have likewise shown that land degradation is not causally linked to national population growth (Castles et al. 1998; Wooden et al. 1994).

Effect on levels of natural resources

A further area of concern with population growth is depletion of natural resources such as water and non-renewable minerals. Given international

trade and factor substitution possibilities, population growth might be expected to have little impact on depletion rates of most non-renewable resources (Cocks 1996). However, 'common property' resources, such as fisheries and forests and, of course, water, might need careful management to avoid exploitation at unsustainable levels (Castles et al. 1998).

Implications for habitat modification

The potential for increased population levels to endanger ecosystems is an issue because population growth has a clear impact on habitat modification. In addition, lower population levels might marginally reduce efforts required for Australia to meet international commitments on greenhouse emissions. As against this, humans have biodiversity consequences irrespective of where they live so that the net impact from a global as opposed to simply an Australian perspective is far from clear. As a result, migration reduction is probably an inappropriate vehicle for protecting ecosystems if a global perspective is adopted (Castles et al. 1998).

Relevance of migrant settlement patterns

Where immigrants live is critical in terms of their impact on natural capital. Approximately 36 per cent of current migrants settle in Sydney, potentially adding to the air and water pollution problems that derive from that city's location in the Sydney basin. This influx of migrants needs to be set in the context of Sydney's pattern of internal migration because many immigrants have settled in established areas that have been vacated selectively by Australia-born or other immigrants as they move to satisfy housing aspirations appropriate to stage of life cycle (Burnley et al. 1997).

Internal mobility within Australia as a whole has also meant that population growth might have shifted to locations such as Brisbane or Perth (Castles et al. 1998). Thus settlement patterns of immigrants might counter rather than aggravate internal population flows (S. Richardson 2002).

6.3 Sustainability

Review of the literature

Sustainability and urban renewal

Potential problems with issues of sustainability have been flagged for suburbs in major cities that are undergoing renewal. In recent years, many immigrants have moved to these suburbs. The areas in question were initially developed in the decades following World War II. They are now being subjected to major waves of social and physical restructuring (Randolph 2002). In these areas, there are concerns about the older poorer housing as well as the new housing that is replacing it in some places, particularly with respect to the energy efficiency of buildings. The influx of migrants may provide the investment capital necessary for change and appropriate design.

Sustaining urban infrastructure and amenity

Immigration has been singled out as causing problems in cities with respect to infrastructure provision, road congestion, declining urban amenity and pollution (see Burnley et al. 1997). Associated environmental deterioration might in part be dealt with by investment in urban infrastructure such as sewerage treatment works, urban transport and water recycling schemes. To attribute this requirement for investment to immigration is of course harsh because the current state of cities reflects conscious political and economic choices with a result that any decline in amenity should not be ascribed solely to immigration and population growth (Cunneen et al. 1997). The need to apportion blame for social unease, financial hardships and pollution can nevertheless make scapegoating new migrants an attractive option to some.

Immigration impacts in context

Concerns that short-term interests of groups which profit from population growth might be inhibiting honest consideration of long-term realities have led to calls for interdisciplinary empirical research by demographers and sociologists with respect to impacts of population numbers on the natural environment (Betts 2004; Jones 2001). While concern for depreciation of natural capital as a resource is appropriate, it seems unlikely that lower migration intake by itself will address most problems associated with natural capital.

Generalisations are of course clumsy but the major issues regarding impacts on the biophysical environment in Australian cities and regions include the nature of lifestyle and the economic system; the adequacy of policies and management; and the formulation and implementation of remedial Programmes. Immigrants' effects on population growth and the comparative size of their ecological footprints, both before and after migration, are only some of the factors to be considered when addressing these issues.

6.4 Summary of benefits and costs

Interpretations of social costs and benefits of immigration to Australia with respect to natural capital and the literature are summarised in Table 6.1.

6.5 Overall Assessment

Clearly there are differing views with respect to impacts of immigration on population growth, pressure on the environment and sustainability with central issues for discussion varying depending on whether local, national or global viewpoints are addressed. The comparative size of immigrants' ecological footprints after migration is most likely no greater than those of others who comprise the Australia-born population. Lifestyle, internal population migration, economic systems, adequacy of policies and management, and the formulation and implementation of remedial Programmes are among those factors with the potential to influence short- and long-term impacts. With fertility rates in Australia and in all developed countries at lower than replacement levels, intakes through migration are offered as the single option for population maintenance or growth; an imperative for some and an anathema for others.

Table 6.1: Natural capital issues – summary of social costs and benefits of migration

<i>Social benefits</i>	<i>Social costs</i>
Migration has been suggested as a way to avoid population decline.	Family reunion and humanitarian intakes are subject to challenge by environmentalists when there is opposition to population increase.
National population growth through migration is an extraneous factor with respect to environmental problems because land degradation is not causally linked.	Population growth through migration places pressures on natural resources and the environment.
Limiting immigration and thus population growth may in the short term reduce the imperative to tackle environmental problems.	'Common property' resources, such as fisheries and forests and, of course, water, might need careful management to avoid exploitation at unsustainable levels should the intake of migrants increase substantially in the long term.
Given international trade and factor substitution possibilities, population growth might be expected to have little impact on depletion rates of most non-renewable resources	Reduced population growth through reduced immigration could marginalise Australia in a global sense.
Migration reduction is probably an inappropriate vehicle for protecting ecosystems if a global perspective is adopted.	The potential for increased population levels to endanger ecosystems is an issue because population growth has a clear impact on habitat modification.
Settlement patterns of immigrants might counter rather than aggravate inter- and intra-state population movements.	Where immigrants live is critical in terms of their impact on natural capital.
The influx of migrants may provide the investment capital necessary for change and appropriate design.	Potential problems with issues of sustainability have been flagged where there are concentrations of ethnic groups in suburbs undergoing renewal.
It seems unlikely that lower migration intake by itself will address most problems associated with natural capital.	Apportioning blame for environmental deterioration can make scapegoating new migrants an attractive option, and open up new divisions that undermine social cohesion.