

KEY RESEARCH QUESTIONS FOR A LONGITUDINAL SURVEY OF REFUGEES AND OTHER HUMANITARIAN MIGRANTS

Siew-Ean Khoo

Australian Demographic and Social Research Institute

The Australian National University

January 2012

Introduction

An important objective of Australia's immigration policy is to assist in the resettlement of refugees and others in humanitarian need as part of its international obligations as a signatory of the 1951 United Nations Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol. Australia has a long history of offering resettlement to refugees and other humanitarian migrants and ranks among the top three resettlement countries in the world, along with Canada and the United States of America (Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2010).

To better understand the factors that lead to refugees' successful settlement in Australia and to build the evidence base for development of improved policies and programs to assist their resettlement process, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) is planning a longitudinal survey of refugees and other humanitarian migrants to be conducted from 2012 to 2017. As part of the survey development process, the Department has commissioned this discussion paper to review the different conceptual frameworks for measuring successful settlement of migrants, to review previous research on the factors that are associated with successful settlement of refugees, and to identify the key research questions that should be addressed in the longitudinal survey.

Concepts of successful settlement of immigrants

The concept of what constitutes successful settlement of immigrants is of particular interest and importance to a country of settler migration such as Australia. Australia's immigration policy has always emphasized permanent settlement of migrants leading to

citizenship, although temporary migration has become an increasingly important component in recent years. Besides its responsibility for managing the entry of people to Australia, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship is also concerned with the settlement of migrants and refugees after their arrival in Australia and provides a range of support services to assist with this process.

There have been studies in Australia and other countries of immigration that have attempted to examine the concept of successful settlement of immigrants. In 2000, the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA) commissioned a study to develop a set of indicators to measure settlement success (Khoo and McDonald 2001). The indicators were to be developed based primarily on data from the first Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (LSIA1). The study also called for development of a set of benchmarks for comparison with the indicators.

The Department's Settlement Services guide at the time had a definition of successful settlement of immigrants as their achieving "active economic and social participation in Australian society as self-reliant and valued members (DIMA 2000:9). The study used this definition as a starting point to explore further the meaning of successful settlement and chose to relate it to the concept of well-being promoted by welfare economist Amartya Sen (1982:334) that included the importance of human functioning or having the capability to function. Based on the two criteria of well-being and participation, the proposed framework for measuring successful settlement has four dimensions: social participation, economic participation, economic well-being and physical well-being. A number of indicators were developed for each dimension using data from LSIA1, the population census and other data sets (Khoo and McDonald 2001). The indicators include English language proficiency, participation in education by immigrant youth, Australian citizenship, labour force participation, income, home ownership, and physical and mental health status. Statistical modeling was carried out to examine how the four dimensions were related and their relative importance as measures of positive immigrant settlement outcomes. The findings suggest that the four dimensions are closely related and together formed an interlinked system.

Earlier studies of how well immigrants are settling in Australia have also considered a number of indicators of social and economic adjustment such as labour force participation, employment and unemployment rates, occupational status, income, home ownership, English language proficiency and citizenship (Wooden et al. 1994). Consequently there have been many studies on how immigrants fare in relation to these measures of settlement (see below on review of previous studies) although the studies have not gone the next step to define what constitutes successful settlement.

A study by Canadian researchers (Neuwirth et al. 1989) also suggests examining immigrant settlement outcomes in terms of multiple dimensions or spheres of social life. These include linguistic, economic, occupational, social and cultural adaptation and physical and mental health. The study also suggests that longitudinal survey data be used to develop indicators to measure immigrant settlement outcomes in each of these areas.

More recently, Laurence Lester has written a PhD thesis at Flinders University on measuring and modeling labour market success and successful settlement of immigrants using data from LSIA1 and LSIA2 (Lester 2008; 2009). His model is based on four indicators selected from LSIA data: satisfaction with life in Australia, mental health, decision to immigrate was right, and would encourage others to migrate to Australia. He considers labour market success as only one of several factors that contribute to immigrant settlement success since not all immigrants seek to enter the labour market.

The definition of successful settlement of immigrants also depends on the conceptual and policy framework relating to immigrant settlement. Different conceptual approaches and terminology have been used at various times and in different countries. Up until the 1960s in settler migration countries, immigrants were expected to assimilate to the host society. According to the *assimilation* framework that prevailed in the past, assimilation to the receiving society would be considered successful settlement and the question would be on how assimilation is measured. Intermarriage was one of the indicators that sociologists and demographers used as a measure of assimilation. For many countries in Europe that are

now facing the issues of immigration and ethnic minorities, the focus is on *integration* and there has been much discussion about the concept of integration and how to measure it. In the United States, the focus is no longer on assimilation but their *incorporation* into US society. Incorporation is a more general concept referring to “the broader processes by which new groups establish relationships with host societies” (Bean and Stevens 2003: 95). In today’s multicultural context in Australia, according to DIAC’s website, migrants are expected to settle and “*settlement* is the process of adjustment (migrants) experience as (they) become established and independent in Australia.” The reference to becoming independent is similar to the notion in the settlement policy statement of previous years of migrants being self-reliant as a measure of settlement success. Although the terminology used in different places has been different, it is interesting to note that studies in Europe, the United States and Australia that have attempted to measure these concepts have produced some similar outcomes.

A Council of Europe report on the measurement and indicators of integration proposed four key dimensions of integration – economic, social, cultural and political – with indicators that “highlight important areas of public activity where integration could be assessed (employment, education, etc.)” (Council of Europe 1997, cited in Ager and Strang 2004: 3). The United Kingdom Home Office also commissioned a study to investigate the different concepts of integration. The study conducted by Ager and Strang (2004) decided that integration was a “complex concept” and chose not to define it, quoting Castles et al. (2001):

There is no single, generally accepted definition, theory or model of immigrant and refugee integration. The concept continues to be controversial and hotly debated.

Instead they sought to identify the “key factors that appear to contribute to the process of integration for refugees in the UK” and “to suggest a set of indicators that could be used to assess how far refugee integration for both individuals and communities has been achieved” (Ager and Strang 2004: 2). Based on their framework of indicators, they suggested a “working definition” that is based on achieving outcomes in employment,

housing, education and health that are equivalent to those achieved within the wider host communities, community participation and citizenship (Ager and Strang 2004: 9). It is interesting that there are significant similarities between this study of the indicators of integration and our study of settlement indicators (Khoo and McDonald 2001). Both studies also stressed that the domains are inter-linked and one is not more important than any other. In a recent study of refugee integration also commissioned by the UK Home Office, refugee integration is also considered “in terms of the English language skills, employment and housing of new refugees” (Cebulla et al. 2010).

In the United States, a major study by Bean and Brown (2007) is examining the dimensions of incorporation using a number of indicators based on a large empirical study of intergenerational mobility of immigrants and their children in Los Angeles. Their study has identified four broad incorporation domains based on the research literature and that have emerged from their analysis of multiple indicators of the concept. These domains are economic, spatial, sociocultural and political.

The meaning of successful settlement may also differ between migrants themselves and the receiving country and society. A good example of these different perspectives comes from the recent study of settlement outcomes of new arrivals (Australian Survey Research Group 2010). The study says that humanitarian entrants themselves think “settling well” to mean “living comfortably in Australia” and that it is different from how DIAC defines successful settlement which is in relation to social and economic participation and well being. The humanitarian migrants are looking at successful settlement from their own individual or personal perspective. It is understandable that humanitarian entrants may regard successful settlement as personal happiness and community connectedness in the country of resettlement, considering that their fear of persecution in their own country is the main reason for their migration.

In a study of the resettlement experiences of refugees in Australia, Colic-Peisker and Tilbury (2003: 62) have defined resettlement as “a process during which a refugee, having arrived in a place of permanent asylum, gradually re-establishes the feeling of control over

his/her life and develops a feeling that life is “back to normal”. They consider the refugees’ own subjective feelings that their life is “back to normal” as the measure of resettlement success, but also suggest that “normal life” may mean different things to different people.

Notions of successful settlement may also be different for different types of migrants. The value-expectancy model of migration decision-making (De Jong and Fawcett 1981; Fawcett 1986) suggests that migrants’ expectations in relation to their migration decisions are likely to vary with type of migrant. Refugees are likely to have different expectations from skilled migrants in relation to their migration decision and, consequently, their settlement outcomes. For individual migrants, settlement success is likely to be correlated with the achievement of their migration goals and pre-migration expectations. The measurement of settlement success from such a perspective would be based on information about the individual’s reasons for migration, migration goals and expectations and whether they have been met. From this perspective, immigrants’ satisfaction with different aspects of their life in Australia may be considered good proxy measures of successful settlement. The findings of the Australian Survey Research Group (2010) study in relation to refugees’ perception of settling well can be seen to be consistent with this perspective.

Obviously migrants’ perception of their own settlement experiences matters as it will affect their life satisfaction and residence intentions. However, it is a personal perspective, and as such it is likely to differ in some ways from the broader social, community and government policy perspectives of the receiving country and society.

It is equally important to consider successful settlement from the broader policy perspective and expectations of the country of settlement, or resettlement in the case of refugees. This is particularly relevant in a country of settler migration such as Australia, where immigrants are expected to settle permanently and become citizens and the government provides services to new migrants to assist with their settlement. The services are usually provided with the objective of achieving outcomes that can be considered to contribute to successful settlement. DIAC’s definition of successful settlement is based on

a policy and community perspective and views migrants' successful settlement in relation to the community and society of which the migrant is now a member.

From Australia's perspective as a settler migration country, the most basic measure of immigrant settlement success may be that migrants settle permanently and become citizens, that they become *established* and do not return home or emigrate to another country. The earliest studies of immigrant adjustment in Australia were prompted by concerns of settler loss among British immigrants in the early 1960s and had focused on why migrants were not settling successfully and were returning home (Appleyard 1962a; 1962b). However, permanent settlement as a measure of settlement success may be less applicable to refugee and other humanitarian migrants who do not have the option of returning home or few resources to re-migrate to a third country, and family migrants who may not also have the option because of family ties.

In a paper I wrote last year for DIAC's workshop on "Following Migrants Forward" (Khoo 2010a) and based on the arguments in the preceding discussion of the different perspectives of measuring settlement success of immigrants, I suggest four measures of successful settlement for migrants in Australia: permanent residence and citizenship; proficiency in English; participation in community and society; and satisfaction with life in Australia. For migrants to settle successfully in Australia, the research literature (discussed in the next section) shows that English proficiency is essential. Participation in the community and society is an important element of successful settlement and is implied in settlement policy statements and the various conceptual frameworks of immigrant settlement and integration. Participation in the community can take many forms. It can include participation in the economy and in the work force, but it is not restricted to this. As Lester (2009) points out, not all immigrants migrate with the intention to participate in the labour market. Other avenues of community participation should be included in a consideration of successful settlement. These include participation in any community or social activities that demonstrate linkages to local communities such as playing sports, attending community events and volunteering, and having contacts and friends in the

community and are typical of the social connections referred to in the UK study (Ager and Strang 2004) on the indicators of integration.

A conclusion from this review of studies on measuring the successful settlement of migrants is that the settlement process occurs across a number of dimensions or domains. These include social, economic, political, cultural and health dimensions. As such, immigrants' settlement outcomes need to be examined and measured across these various domains. It is also important in this process to consider both the migrants' and the receiving country's perspectives in relation to achieving successful settlement.

Previous research on the settlement experiences of refugees and other humanitarian migrants in Australia

Most studies based on LSIA1 and LSIA2 have compared the settlement experiences of migrants in the Family, Skilled and Humanitarian visa categories. Refugees and other humanitarian migrants have not been the focus of these studies. Based on the data collected in the surveys, the studies have examined:

- migrants' reasons for migrating to Australia;
- whose idea it was to migrate;
- whether the decision to migrate was the right one;
- housing arrangements;
- assistance received from government and non-government agencies;
- perceptions of life in the former home country and in Australia;
- citizenship intentions and reasons;
- use of qualifications;
- further study in Australia;
- health status and visits to health care providers;
- labour force participation;
- financial assets and transfers including remittances sent and financial help received;
- sponsorship of relatives; and
- return and forward migration intentions.

(see Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs 1997; VandenHeuvel and Wooden 1999; Richardson et al, 2004). The studies show that the labour market outcomes for humanitarian migrants were not as good as those for economic or family migrants. Humanitarian migrants had higher unemployment rates and lower labour force participation rates than other migrants in the early years of settlement (VandenHeuvel and Wooden 1999; Cobb-Clark 2006). While humanitarian migrants' labour force participation rate increased and their unemployment rate decreased with duration of residence, the rates remained higher than those of other migrants. Humanitarians were also less likely than other migrants to say that they were using their qualifications in their work (Vandenheuvel and Wooden 1999). They took the longest time to find their first job (average of 15-17 months), even after controlling for differences in education and English proficiency between them and other migrants (Thapa and Gorgens 2006). However, income data show that humanitarian migrants' situation improved with time relative to other migrants' and the proportion relying on government income support fell during their first three and a half years in Australia (Vandenheuvel and Wooden 1999).

Humanitarian migrants were the most likely to have sponsored a relative for migration during the first few years of settlement, with 15 per cent having sponsored two or more persons to come to Australia by wave 3 of LSIA1 (Vandenheuvel and Wooden 1999: 19). Intention to sponsor and application to sponsor relatives were also highest for humanitarian migrants (Richardson et al. 2004). Humanitarian migrants also indicated higher levels of satisfaction with their life in Australia than other migrants (Vandenheuvel and Wooden 1999: 105-106). As expected, they were the least likely to indicate that they would leave Australia to return home or migrate elsewhere (Richardson et al. 2004). About 25 per cent of humanitarian migrants had sent money overseas within 18 months after arrival; this percentage was similar to that for family reunion and skilled migrants (Richardson et al. 2004: 60).

A comparison of the two humanitarian migrant cohorts in LSIA1 and LSIA2 showed some important differences in their settlement outcomes, even after taking account of differences in their demographic and human capital characteristics. The two cohorts had differed in

their region of origin and religious affiliation, with a higher proportion of humanitarian migrants in LSIA2 coming from Europe and the Middle East while the LSIA1 cohort had a higher proportion from Southeast Asia. A higher proportion of humanitarian migrants in LSIA1 reported good health and were in the labour force than the cohort in LSIA2 (Richardson et al. 2004; Khoo 2010b).

In a study based on qualitative research methods, Colic-Peisker and Tilbury (2003) observed that some refugees had a more active approach to resettlement while others had a passive approach. They identified two groups of refugees with an active resettlement style – “achievers” and “consumers” – and two groups with a passive resettlement style – “endurers” and “victims”- and noted the characteristics of these four groups. They observed that both the refugees’ own resources (human and social capital) and resettlement support services affected the “choice” of an active or passive approach to resettlement and that the active approach was more successful in achieving social and emotional well-being. They also observed that stable housing, employment, a regular income, family reunion, a sense of community and language skills were some of the factors that were important in helping refugees re-establish what they considered “a normal life”.

Another study based on interviews with service providers indicated that refugees had the greatest need for assistance during the first three months of resettlement, particularly with housing, learning English and looking for work (Waxman 1998). The study also indicated that refugees’ awareness of services varied by their visa subclass, English language proficiency and how well established their ethnic community was.

The most recent studies of refugees and other humanitarian entrants are those on the contributions of first and second humanitarian entrants (Hugo 2011) and the settlement outcomes of new arrivals (Australian Survey Research Group 2010). Both studies were commissioned by DIAC. While the study of new arrivals focused on humanitarian entrants who were granted visas in the five years preceding the survey, the study on the contributions of first and second generation humanitarian entrants took a longer perspective, using the 2006 census data to examine the workforce participation and wider

contributions to the Australian economy and community of migrants from countries that had been the sources of humanitarian migration in the past 50 years (Hugo 2011).

The Australian Survey Research Group (2010) study collected information on humanitarian migrants' settlement experiences in the first five years in Australia relating to learning English, participation in education and the labour force, housing, health, use of government services and connections to the community. One of the key findings of the study was that humanitarian migrants settled in regional areas had more positive outcomes relating to employment, housing and health than those settled in metropolitan areas, but state of residence appeared to have little overall impact. The authors of the study stated that it was not possible to ascertain the reasons for the better outcomes of regionally settled humanitarian migrants although they suggested that selection criteria might have been contributing factors (Australian Survey Research Group 2010: 56).

The Hugo (2010) study suggested that while humanitarian migrants might experience more difficulties during the early years of settlement, there was evidence of economic and social adjustment with longer duration of residence as well as significant contribution to the wider society and economy. There was also evidence that some groups had remained in low skilled and low income occupations. Qualitative data collected as part of the study suggested the importance of ethnic networks in assisting with settlement and in providing linkages to the community.

A review of the literature on the economic, social and civic contributions of refugees commissioned by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship and carried out by the Refugee Council of Australia (2010) as part of the research project to examine the contributions of first and second generation humanitarian migrants has indicated that refugees' settlement experiences are diverse but that having community support and access to training, English classes and mentoring can contribute to successful settlement in the long term. The literature review also finds that refugees make an important economic contribution in regional Australia.

Factors affecting the settlement outcomes of refugees and other humanitarian migrants

Data from LSIA1 and LSIA2 have also been used in studies to identify the factors affecting the settlement outcomes of new migrants in Australia. Settlement outcomes as indicated by measures of social and economic participation and well-being have been found to be related to migrants' age, sex, country of origin and visa category. The studies have also shown the importance of human capital characteristics such as English language proficiency and education in contributing to positive social and economic outcomes (Cobb-Clark and Khoo 2006; Khoo and McDonald 2001). The importance of English language proficiency in assisting with refugees' resettlement is also highlighted in qualitative research (Colic-Peisker and Tilbury 2003; Waxman 1998).

LSIA1 and LSIA2 data have been used to examine the influence of health on the economic participation of humanitarian migrants in the first few years of resettlement (Khoo 2010b). The data show that, as expected, refugees and other humanitarian migrants with poor physical health are less likely to be in the work force. Male migrants who report poor health, a long-term health condition or poorer mental health are significantly less likely to be working. Health has a weaker effect on the economic participation of female humanitarian migrants. A significant factor in female humanitarian migrants' labour force participation is the number of children. Women with three or more children are much less likely to be in the work force than women with fewer or no children. English language proficiency is an important factor in the economic participation of both male and female humanitarian migrants.

The recent study by Hugo (2011) of refugees and other humanitarian migrants also identified English language ability as an especially important barrier to their labour market participation. Lack of recognition of qualifications also hindered the use of these migrants' skills. As in other studies, the study also shows that increased duration of residence is associated with higher labour force participation and decreased unemployment rates.

The recent longitudinal survey of new refugees in the UK also found the following factors to influence refugee integration: country of origin, duration of residence, English language

skills, age and sex, health, previous education and employment, and family and friends (Cebulla et al. 2010).

Research and information gaps

The review of previous studies has identified some research gaps in studies of refugee and humanitarian migrants' settlement outcomes. Most studies have focused on how migrants' individual characteristics are related to their settlement outcomes. Less is known about how the family and broader social and community contexts may also affect settlement outcomes. In the case of refugee and other humanitarian migrants, this also includes the migration process and pathways to resettlement in Australia.

Most studies of humanitarian migrants in Australia have also not differentiated between the different visa subclasses within the Humanitarian visa program. This is because in surveys such as LSIA1 and LSIA2 and other sample surveys of the Australian population, the number of humanitarian migrants is usually quite small. The different Humanitarian visa subclasses reflect some of the different pathways to resettlement in Australia and can be an important factor in understanding settlement outcomes.

The literature review of the economic, civic and social contributions of refugees and humanitarian entrants that was conducted by the Refugee Council of Australia (2010) notes the relative lack of studies differentiating between refugees and other migrants. It points out that this is unfortunate as refugees have settlement needs that are unique to their experience and status as refugees, and recommends a greater focus on refugees and humanitarian entrants in current and future longitudinal surveys.

The Refugee Council of Australia's literature review also notes the need for longitudinal data and research into the economic progress made by refugees, including the factors contributing to their different labour market outcomes. Their suggestions include the need for more information concerning the refugees' pre-migration work experience, psychosocial factors and the role of local conditions in affecting their economic settlement outcomes (Refugee Council for Australia 2010).

Another information gap identified by the Refugee Council's literature review relates to outcomes of the children of refugees. The review argues that it is important to understand the education and employment outcomes of the children of refugees and whether and how various settlement support services and their parents' migration and settlement experiences affect these outcomes.

In a paper on how to measure successes and failures in the social integration of immigrants, Bijl (2007) suggests that in evaluating the impact of any policy on immigrant integration it is also important to take into account the social and economic contexts, for example changing economic conditions, and the independent effect that they may have on labour market outcomes. This provides support for studies of different migration cohorts in assessing the factors affecting immigrant settlement outcomes, as different cohorts will experience different economic and policy contexts in their period of settlement, as the LSIA1 and LSIA2 cohorts did.

Key research questions relating to understanding the settlement outcomes of refugees and other humanitarian migrants

The previous LSIA's have collected data that have addressed some key research questions on understanding the settlement outcomes of migrants to Australia. The research questions relate to all migrants and remain relevant in the current context in relation to humanitarian migrants. Refugees and humanitarian migrants also have some specific characteristics and migration experiences that should be taken into consideration in research and longitudinal studies to understand their settlement outcomes. As Hugo (2010) points out, refugees have greater vulnerability than other migrants because they have been forced to leave their country, they may have experienced trauma and they may have less human capital, family and financial resources than other migrants. They are likely to be more reliant on government and community support services in their settlement process and the issue of whether mainstream services meet their settlement needs or whether special services need to be developed for them is of policy importance (Hugo 2010).

The preceding discussions have identified some of the issues and questions that are particularly important to the settlement experiences of refugees and other humanitarian migrants and where data are needed. These include the role of pre-migration experiences, the pathway to resettlement, family situation and resources, networks, health, regional location of settlement, settlement support services and other government services and programs. Since the primary objective of the proposed longitudinal survey is to understand better the factors that aid in refugees' successful settlement so as to build the evidence base for development of improved settlement policies and programs, it is suggested that data collection in the proposed longitudinal survey should focus on the following three sets of key research questions.

The first set of questions concerns *humanitarian migrants' settlement outcomes in relation to their English language proficiency, housing situation, labour force participation, use of qualifications, income, health, community engagement, citizenship and level of satisfaction with life in Australia*. These are the main outcome indicators in the social, economic, health and political dimensions of settlement identified in the various conceptual frameworks on measuring the successful settlement of migrants, and particularly in relation to refugees and humanitarian migrants. The specific research questions are:

- How do these measures of settlement outcomes change for refugees and humanitarian migrants during the first few years of their settlement and with increased duration of residence in Australia?
- What are the factors that are associated with positive or negative changes in these measures during the settlement period? The factors that should be examined include:
 - migrants' demographic, social and economic characteristics and health status, including age, sex, marital status, country of birth, religion, English language proficiency, education, qualifications, occupational skills, pre-migration employment history, physical and mental health;
 - migrants' residential location, particularly between capital city and regional area;

- family situation and resources;
- social and ethnic networks and engagement with the community;
- linkages to the country of origin;
- pre-migration experiences including employment experience in country of origin;
- the migration process: the context and reasons for migration, offshore/onshore visa application, visa subclass, time spent in refugee camp and/or detention and country of location, time spent in transit countries;
- frequency and duration of use of community and government resources: specific settlement support programs for humanitarian migrants available through the Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy, other settlement services such as the Adult Migrant English Program and Translating and Interpreting Services, mainstream government programs (Medicare and Centrelink), and migrant resource centres;
- prevailing economic and labour market conditions.

The second set of questions relates to *access and use of government and non-government support services and government welfare benefits and their effectiveness in contributing to humanitarian migrants' successful settlement*. The specific research questions are:

- Which humanitarian migrants are more likely to access government and non-government support services and government welfare benefits?
- Which types of services and benefits do they access and use?
- At which times after arrival do they access these services, for how long or how frequently do they use them?
- Do their access and use of these services change during the period of settlement and in what ways?
- Which patterns of use of these services are associated with improved outcomes during the observed settlement period?
- What is the level of use that is associated with a significant improvement in the various measures of outcomes?

A third set of questions relates to *how the settlement outcomes of humanitarian migrants may differ by visa subclass*. Previous studies have not differentiated refugees and humanitarian entrants by their visa subclasses but have examined them as a group. This is mainly because of their small number in surveys. The Humanitarian Program has a number of visa subclasses that are based on different criteria for settlement. These subclasses include Offshore Refugee, Offshore Special Humanitarian Program, Onshore Humanitarian, Onshore Refugee and Women at Risk. The visa subclasses also differ in their migration process and pathways to resettlement. It will be important from both policy and research perspectives to examine and compare the different visa subclasses on their settlement experiences. The specific research questions are:

- Do migrants in the different Humanitarian visa subclasses differ in their settlement outcomes?
- If so, what are the factors that contribute to their different settlement outcomes?
- How does duration of residence affect their settlement outcomes? Do they have different time trajectories to reach a specific level of outcome?
- Do their different pre-migration experiences and pathways to settlement have an effect on their settlement outcomes?
- Do they differ in their access and duration of use of support services during the settlement period? If so, in what ways and is there a differential impact on their settlement outcomes?

To enable meaningful comparisons to be made across the visa subclasses, it will be necessary to have a sufficiently large number of migrants in each visa subclass in the survey sample so that the results of data analysis can be interpreted with an acceptable level of statistical confidence. If the number of migrants in a particular visa subclass is relatively small (eg. the women at risk subclass), it may be necessary to oversample the visa subclass. If oversampling is not a preferred option, another option is to consider a separate survey or study of the group.

Other research questions and issues

In addition to the above key research questions, other research questions and issues that merit consideration in relation to the proposed longitudinal survey and future studies of refugees and other humanitarian migrants include the following:

Groups of research interest

In addition to the different Humanitarian visa subclasses noted above, there are two other groups of humanitarian migrants that are of research and policy interest. These two groups are defined by age and gender:

- The first group is youth, defined as those aged 15-24 or 18-29¹. Some have migrated without family members. It is important to examine their settlement experiences in comparison with those who have migrated with family members. This will assist in the development of programs and services that will be of most benefit to them in their settlement process.
- The second group is women. The existence of the women-at-risk visa subclass enables a comparison of these female migrants with other women who migrate as spouses and secondary migrants. It will be interest to see if and how the settlement outcomes of the two groups differ so that support services can be focused more effectively on assisting with their resettlement.

The issue of regional location of settlement has also been highlighted in discussions on humanitarian migrants' settlement outcomes in Australia, as noted earlier in the paper. Residential location is included as one of the factors to be examined in relation to the first set of research questions about settlement outcomes. Data analysis in relation to the second and third set of research questions should also focus on comparing humanitarian migrants settled in regional areas with those settled in capital cities and other urban areas. The

¹ These two age groups are usually used to define young adulthood in demographic studies. Youth is defined here as young adults rather than children who are usually persons under age 15. The young adult years are times of significant life course transitions such as leaving school, leaving the parental home, entering the labour force and family formation. Being a recently arrived refugee or migrant adjusting to life in a new country adds another dimension to these transitions. In the Australian census, data relating to these transitions are collected for persons aged 15 and over, while some sample surveys (such as the General Social Survey) include only persons aged 18 and over. Age 18 has also been suggested as the lower boundary of young adulthood because it is the legal age for activities such as voting, driving and marriage without parental consent, with age 30 being associated with the end of the young adult years (see Rindfuss 1991).

findings may have important implications for development of improved policies and programs on humanitarian migrants' settlement.

Choice of comparative group

As noted earlier, most studies based on LSIA1 and LSIA2 have compared Humanitarian migrants with Family and Skilled migrants on their settlement outcomes. It has been suggested that the proposed longitudinal survey of refugees include a small group of other migrants for comparison, giving rise to the issue of who is an appropriate comparative or "control" group. Possible groups include non-humanitarian migrants from the same countries or regions of origin. However, the migration process and selection criteria differentiating Humanitarian migration from Family and Skilled migration suggest that there are limitations in comparing Humanitarian migrants' settlement outcomes with those of Family or Skilled migrants. Any comparisons should control statistically for the differences in their demographic, human capital and other characteristics.

The advantage of examining longitudinal data on immigrant settlement outcomes is that settlement outcomes are measured across time and therefore allows for comparisons to be made for each individual by duration of residence. The focus of a longitudinal approach is on comparing each individual's characteristics and circumstances over a period of time to measure changes. The use of a longitudinal approach in examining immigrant settlement outcomes reduces the need for a comparative group.

If there is interest in benchmarking humanitarian migrants' settlement experiences and progress with those of other (non-humanitarian) migrants, consideration can be given to the use of other data sources, such as the Statistical Longitudinal Census Dataset, the General Social Surveys and the Characteristics of Recent Migrants Survey conducted by ABS, which have representative samples of family reunion and economic migrants by duration of residence. These data sets can be used to obtain the settlement outcome indicators for non-humanitarian migrants of the same migration cohort and having the same demographic characteristics. If the interest is to compare with benchmarks based on

the Australian population, the benchmarks can also be obtained from these national sample surveys.

A life course approach

In examining immigrant settlement experience with longitudinal data, it may be instructive to use a life course approach to understand the transitions they experience during the process of settlement. Migrants are usually in the age groups that are associated with life course transitions such as education-to-work, partnering and family formation. Because of the disruptions encountered by refugee and other humanitarian migrants in the processes of their migration and pathway to resettlement, it may be particularly important to observe how these processes interact with other life course transitions in understanding settlement outcomes. Longitudinal survey data have the advantage of enabling such an analytical approach to studying immigrant settlement.

Long-term outcomes

Underpinning the collection of longitudinal data is the key research question: how do immigrant settlement outcomes change with increased duration of residence? Previous LSIAAs have addressed this question but only for the first 2-3 years of settlement and the proposed longitudinal survey of humanitarian migrants will cover the first five years of settlement until the migrants become eligible for Australian citizenship. The settlement process can take a longer time than this for humanitarian migrants. Compared to family reunion and skilled migrants, refugee and other humanitarian migrants are more likely to have poorer health, lower English language proficiency and less financial resources on arrival. They are likely to take a longer time to adjust to their new life in Australia compared to other migrants. Therefore, a longer time perspective is needed to understand their settlement outcomes and the factors that contribute to successful settlement. It is suggested that provision be made in the development and implementation of the proposed longitudinal survey of refugees and other humanitarian migrants for the possibility of revisiting the survey sample more than five years after the first wave of interviews to assess longer term outcomes.

The use of other sources of data to study the longer term settlement outcomes of refugees' and other humanitarian migrants should also be considered. The Statistical Longitudinal Census Dataset (SLCD) obtained from the linkage of records from the Settlement Database with 5 per cent of the 2006 and 2011 census records is a potential data source. Other sample surveys conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, such as the General Social Survey and the Recent Migrants' Characteristics Survey in which humanitarian migrants are separately identified, can also be used to examine longer term outcomes; however they are not longitudinal surveys and the number of humanitarian migrants in the survey sample is relatively small.

Outcomes for children

The review of previous research on refugees and humanitarian migrants has identified a gap in knowledge about the outcomes for their children. While some basic data can be collected on the education and health of children in the proposed longitudinal survey of humanitarian migrants, a separate survey such as the Longitudinal Survey of Australian Children should be considered to obtain more detailed information on educational outcomes and other measures of social adjustment. Such a survey can also be more focused on the issues that may be specifically relevant to children' settlement, such as the dynamics of parenting, intergenerational relationships and the school environment. A longer term perspective, such as ten years after arrival or when the children reach adulthood, is also necessary to assess the education and employment outcomes for children.

Conclusion

The advantages of a longitudinal approach to studying immigrant settlement and particularly humanitarian migrants' settlement have been discussed elsewhere (see Hugo 2010). Longitudinal data also allow events that occur in the lives of individuals to be examined sequentially that can be helpful in assessing cause and effect. The proposed longitudinal survey of refugees should focus on examining the changes that humanitarian migrants are likely to experience in their settlement process and the factors that contribute to these changes, particularly those that are relevant to settlement policy and programs. The key research questions discussed in this paper reflect this focus.

The proposed longitudinal survey will not be able to address all the research and knowledge gaps in humanitarian migrants' settlement outcomes in Australia. As discussed earlier, longer term and children's settlement outcomes may require separate studies. Data from other surveys can be used to address research questions that do not require the use of longitudinal data.

Appendix: Variable list and data items for addressing the key research questions

Key settlement outcome measures:

- English proficiency
- Physical and mental health
- Housing
- Education
- Employment
- Income
- Main source of income
- Use of qualifications
- Community engagement: having contacts and friends in the community; participation in community activities and groups
- Residential intention
- Citizenship
- Life satisfaction

Factors and covariates:

- Demographic and social characteristics: age, sex, marital status, number and age of children, country of birth, ethnicity, religion
- Family and household situation: number and relationship of family members living in the same household; number and relationship of family members living elsewhere in Australia, and frequency and nature of contact with them; family and household income
- Pre-migration experience: family, education and employment history
- Migration process: visa subclass, offshore and onshore visa grants, migration pathways including time spent in refugee camps, in detention and in transit and countries of their location, reasons for migration
- Family, social and ethnic networks
- Residential location: State/territory of residence; regional/capital city location
- Community and neighbourhood characteristics

- Linkages to country of origin: number and relationship of family members in country of origin, frequency of contact with them; support provided (including remittances)
- Frequency and duration of use of specific types of settlement support services and other government and non-government programs and services

References

Ager, A. and A. Strang, 2004. *Indicators of Integration: final report*. London, UK: Home Office.

Appleyard, R., 1962a. "The return migration of United Kingdom migrants from Australia," *Population Studies*, 15: 214-25

Appleyard, R., 1962b. "Determinants of return migration," *Economic Record*, 38: 352-68.

Australian Survey Research Group, 2010. *Settlement Outcomes of New Arrivals. Report of findings*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

Bean, F. and S. Brown, 2007. "The nature and structure of immigrant group integration and incorporation: evidence from Los Angeles". Paper presented at the IUSSP International Workshop on Indicators of Integration in Social Statistics, Montreal, Canada.

Bean, F. and G. Stevens, 2003. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bijl, R., 2007. "Evaluating the social integration of immigrants: how to measure successes and failures." Paper presented at the IUSSP International Workshop on Indicators of Integration in Social Statistics, Montreal, December, 2007.

Castles, S., M. Korac, E. Vasta, and S. Vertovec, 2001. *Integration: Mapping the Field*. Report of a project carried out by the University of Oxford Centre for Migration and Policy Research and Refugee Studies Centre. UK: Home Office.

Cebulla, A., M. Daniel and A. Zurawan, 2010. *Spotlight on refugee integration: findings from the Survey of New Refugees in the United Kingdom*. Research Report 37. London, UK: Home Office.

Cobb-Clark, D., 2006. "Selection policy and the labour market outcomes of new immigrants," in D. Cobb-Clark and S.E. Khoo (eds.), *Public Policy and Immigrant Settlement*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, Chapter 2, pp. 27-52.

Cobb-Clark, D. and S.E. Khoo, 2006. "Public policy and immigrant settlement: how much as does immigrant selection matter?" in D. Cobb-Clark and S.E. Khoo (eds.), *Public Policy and Immigrant Settlement*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, Chapter 8, pp. 205-211.

Colic-Peisker, V. and F. Tilbury, 2003. "'Active' and 'passive' resettlement: the influence of support services and refugees' own resources on resettlement style," *International Migration*, 41 (50): 61-92.

De Jong, G. F. and J. T. Fawcett, 1981. "Motivations for migration: An assessment and a value-expectancy research model." In G.F. De Jong and R. Gardner (eds.) *Migration Decision-Making*. New York: Pergamon, pp. 13-58.

Department of Immigration and Citizenship, 2010. *Population Flows, Immigration Aspects, 2008-09 edition*. Canberra.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, 1997. *The Migrant Experience: Wave One, Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia*. Canberra.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, 2000. *Settlement Services Guide*. Canberra.

Fawcett, J.T., 1986. "Migration psychology: new behavioural models." *Population and Environment*, 8 (1-2): 5-14.

Hugo, G., 2010. "How longitudinal surveys will enable us to identify service gaps, develop more effective policies and deliver better services to refugees and other vulnerable

migrants.” Paper presented at the workshop on *Following Migrants Forward*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

Hugo, G., 2011. *Economic, Civic and Social Contributions of First and Second Generation Humanitarian Migrants*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

Khoo, S.E., 2010a. “How longitudinal surveys can be used to better measure how well immigrants are settling in Australia”. Paper presented at the workshop on *Following Migrants Forward*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

Khoo, S.E., 2010b. “Health and Humanitarian migrants’ economic participation”, *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 12: 327-339.

Khoo, S.E. and McDonald, P., 2001. *Settlement Indicators and Benchmarks*. Report to the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, Canberra.

Lester, L. H., 2008. *Measuring, Modelling and Monitoring the Dynamics of Labour Market Success and Successful Settlement of Immigrants to Australia*. National Institute of Labour Studies, Flinders University, Unpublished PhD thesis.

_____, 2009. “A multiple indicators and multiple causes (MIMIC) model of immigrant settlement success.” Paper presented at the XXVI International Population Conference of the IUSSP, Marrakech, October 2009.

Neuwirth, G., Jones, S. and Eyton, J., 1989. “Immigrant settlement indicators: a feasibility study.” *Research Abstract*. Employment and Immigration Canada.

Refugee Council of Australia, 2010. *Economic, Civic and Social Contributions of Refugees and Humanitarian Entrants: A Literature Review*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

Richardson, S. et al., 2004. *The Changing Settlement Experience of New Migrants; Inter-Wave Comparisons of Cohort 1 and 2 of the LSIA*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs.

Rindfuss, R. R., 1991. "The young adult years: diversity, structural change, and fertility." *Demography* 28 (4): 493-512.

Sen, A., 1982. *Choice, Welfare and Measurement*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Thapa, P. J. and T. Gorgens, 2006. "Finding employment after migration: how long does it take?" In D. Cobb-Clark and S.E. Khoo (eds.), *Public Policy and Immigrant Settlement*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, Chapter 3, pp. 53-86.

Vandenheuevel, A. and M. Wooden, 1999. *New Settlers Have Their Say – How immigrants fare over the early years of settlement*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.

Waxman, P., 1998. "Service provision and the needs of newly arrived refugees in Sydney, Australia: a descriptive analysis," *International Migration Review*, 32 (3): 766.

Wooden, M., R. Holton, G. Hugo and J. Sloan, 1994. *Australian Immigration: A Survey of the Issues*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.