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ABSTRACT

This article assesses the economic role of refugee settlers in Australia. Refugee-humanitarian labour force participation rates are lower than for other migrant groups or the Australia-born. However, their labour market performance converges toward that of the Australia-born over time. Moreover, the second generation performs at a higher level. There are a number of significant impediments to participation including language, education, structural disadvantage and discrimination. Indeed, there is evidence of a significant refugee gap which can only be explained by discrimination. It is shown that refugees represent a significant stock of human capital that is not being fully realized. They suffer more than other groups through non-recognition and there is substantial “brain waste” with negative results for the economy and the migrants themselves. Finally, it is shown that refugee-humanitarian settlers show greater propensity to form their own business than other migrants and that risk-taking, entrepreneurialism and an ability to identify and take advantage of opportunities is a key characteristic of the group.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- The international food security agenda needs to consider the growing challenge of feeding rapidly growing cities with large migrant populations
- The reality of internal and international migration should be mainstreamed into the food security agendas of international organizations and states
- Food security and insecurity should be configured into the global debate on migration and development
- International, regional and municipal policies need to pay particular attention to the food insecurity of migrant populations in the cities of the South

INTRODUCTION

One of the most pervasive distinctions in the contemporary international migration research and policy discourse is between forced and unforced movements. However, although there are important differences at the two extremes, many, perhaps most, migrations contain elements of both choice and compulsion. It may be argued that the choice/forced dimension in migration is better conceptualized as a continuum than a dichotomy (Hugo, 1996). Nevertheless, research on forced migrations, especially refugees, has evolved as a distinctly separate area of research and policy from the rest of migration and there is limited overlap, not only of practitioners but also in the
issues that are considered. This difference is evident in the dominance in mainstream international migration policy and research interest of the economic impact of migrants in destinations and the limited consideration accounted to this dimension in refugee settlement.

From a destination country perspective it is important that the primary reason for accepting migrants forced to leave their homeland should be a humanitarian one. It is, and must continue to be, a part of a nation’s international citizenship responsibilities. However, it is relevant also to consider other dimensions of this movement, especially in a context of “donor fatigue”, protracted refugee situations and the growing reluctance of nations to accept refugee settlers (UNHCR, 2011). Reluctance to increase the intake of refugee settlers is often based on the argument of the substantial “costs” to the host country. Yet the economic costs and benefits of refugee settlement are rarely investigated in the way that is commonplace for mainstream migrant settlement. This article seeks to make a contribution in this area by examining the economic contribution of refugee-humanitarian settlers in Australia – a quintessential immigration country in which half of the population are first or second generation permanent or temporary migrants.

One of the major barriers to assessing the contribution and impact of any category of immigrants is the failure of most data sources to differentiate between visa categories or types of migrants in standard data collections. Accordingly, at the outset, after a brief outline of the scale and nature of refugee-humanitarian settlement in Australia, the methodology used to examine the contribution of refugees in Australia is discussed. The assessment of the economic contribution of humanitarian settlers in Australia is then undertaken using the framework of an Australian government influential report (Swan, 2010) which argues that the key to Australia’s future economic prosperity in the face of an ageing population lies in 3 “Ps” – population, participation and productivity. The performance of refugees in the second and third of these three areas is examined using a range of primary and secondary data sources and some innovative approaches to analysing and interpreting those data.

In assessing the economic contribution of refugee settlers, a key issue relates to the time-scale over which the assessment is made. In Australia this assessment has predominantly been made using a longitudinal survey which has measured economic engagement for a period of up to five years (Cobb-Clark and Khoo, 2006). It is argued here that for refugee settlers it is often necessary to take a longer time perspective in assessing their economic contribution. The fact that by definition refugees arrive at their destination without the resources and preparation that other migrants bring means that they will generally take more time to adjust economically. Indeed, in some cases it is appropriate to take an intergenerational perspective in making such an assessment.

REFUGEE-HUMANITARIAN SETTLEMENT IN AUSTRALIA

Australia is one of the few countries which has maintained a substantial planned immigration programme over the entire postwar period. Since 1978 this programme has had four major components – skilled migration to fill skill shortages in the Australian labour market, family migration allowing family members to join migrants, refugee-humanitarian settlers and an “other” category that is mostly New Zealanders who have virtually automatic access to Australia under a special agreement. The first three components are capped each year by the government (DIAC, 2011a).

Refugee settlement began in Australia in the 1830s but the modern era began with settlement of Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany in 1938. During the postwar period there have been a number of waves from different global hotspots. In recent years the quota of refugee-humanitarian settlers has varied between 14,700 in 1994–95 and 9,900 in 1999–2000. All told, more than 750,000 refugee-humanitarian immigrants have settled in Australia since World War II.

Traditionally, Australian refugee settlers have been selected “offshore” for permanent protection, mostly from refugee camps under UNHCR auspices. In Australia they have access to a range of sup-
port services in the initial years of settlement (DIAC, 2011b). Figure 1 shows, however, that “onshore” refugee settlement has become more significant in the last decade. This has been made up of asylum seekers who arrive in boats on Australia’s northern shores or on planes and who have been assessed as genuine refugees and accepted for settlement after a period of detention (Jupp, 2002).

SOME DATA ISSUES

This article draws on a number of quantitative and qualitative sources. The Australian population census has one of the most comprehensive suites of questions relating to international migration of any country (Hugo, 1994) as well as collecting extensive information on a number of the characteristics of individuals and families (especially relevant for the present study are variables relating to labour force, care and voluntary work, internet connection, education, housing, etc.). However, the census does not include a question which differentiates the types of visa under which migrants arrived in Australia. Hence there is no opportunity in the census to identify the entire stock of refugee-humanitarian settlers and their children, or even a representative sample.

While it is not possible in the Australian population census to identify persons who entered Australia under the Humanitarian programme the reality is that the birthplace profile of refugee-humanitarian settlers differs significantly from other immigrants. In 2008–09, for example, the Index of Dissimilarity ($I_D$) between the birthplace composition of the refugee-humanitarian intake and that of all other categories of migrant groups was 74.8. This means that in order for the birthplace distribution of refugee-humanitarian settlers to duplicate that for the rest of the immigrant intake, three quarters of refugee-humanitarian settlers would need to change their birthplace. The pattern is even more striking when the birthplace distribution of refugees is compared to the skilled migrants category. The $I_D$ in 2008–09 was 91.0. This measure definitively establishes that the refugee-humanitarian immigrant population have a quite distinct birthplace distribution which means that it is possible to classify birthplace groups as being predominantly made up of refugee-humanitarian settlers or being predominantly made up of non-humanitarian groups. Moreover, it will be noted that

FIGURE 1
HUMANITARIAN PROGRAM GRANTS BY CATEGORY, 1994-95 TO 2009-10 AND AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PERMANENT ADDITIONS 2000-01 TO 2009-10

Source: Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), 2011b; DIAC, Immigration Update, various issues.
the lowest $I_D$ is with Family Migration (67.0). It is clear that refugee-humanitarian settlers are important sponsors of family migrants. This adds extra support to identifying particular birthplace groups as “refugee-humanitarian” since they include not only the original refugee settlers but also family members who subsequently join them. We strongly argue that this approach provides a robust way of establishing the characteristics of the refugee-humanitarian population.

Accordingly it was decided here to use an approach which recognizes particular birthplace groups as Refugee-Humanitarian Birthplace Groups. The “Refugee-Humanitarian” birthplace group approach is obviously not an ideal way of identifying all persons who have moved to Australia under the humanitarian part of the Australian Immigration programme. It folds together all sub-groups in this programme – onshore, offshore, refugee, humanitarian and protection visa holders. In addition, it excludes groups from countries like China where the great majority of immigrants have arrived under the skilled and family component of the immigration programme. However, the Index of Dissimilarity analysis has definitively and statistically shown that almost all migrants in these “refugee-humanitarian birthplace groups” indeed came to Australia under the humanitarian programme or as family migrants sponsored to come to Australia by relatives who came under the humanitarian programme.

There is unanimity in the migration literature that “immigrant group integration does not cease with the first generation but rather continues through the second and beyond” (Bean and Brown, 2010, 3). Migration analysts have insisted that any comprehensive analysis of the impact of migration needs to go beyond the first generation (Alba and Nee, 2003; Brubaker, 2001). However, one of the important but neglected areas in assessments of the impact and contribution of migration is the impact of the second generation of the children of refugee-humanitarian settlers.

The approach adopted here to identify the second generation is to utilize the ancestry and birthplace of parents questions asked in the 2006 census. All Australia-born persons who indicate that one or both of their parents were born in a foreign country are identified. The ancestry of this group were used to allocate them to one or other of the Refugee-Humanitarian Birthplace Groups.

While 2006 Australian population census data are the main source used in this article a range of other data sources were employed in the larger study on which this is based (Hugo et al., 2011) and are used to inform the findings here. They include:

- A linked data set of 2006 census data on all immigrants who arrived in 2001–06 with the Settlement Data Base of DIAC.
- Settlement Outcomes of New Arrivals (SONA) Study of 8,579 recent arrivals in Australia, about half of whom were humanitarian settlers (Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), 2011b).
- A survey of 649 refugee-humanitarian settlers conducted by the author and his colleagues.
- In-depth interviews with over 70 key stakeholders and refugee community leaders.

ASSESSING THE ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTION

Incorporation of migrants into destination societies and economies has become an area of increasing attention among both policymakers and researchers (Fix, 2007). In Australia this has been an important focus throughout the postwar period (Holton, 1994). Bean and Brown (2010) recognize three major theories of immigrant and ethnic group integration:

1. *The Assimilation Model:* This approach which dominated in Australia during the first half of the post-World War II era involves the convergence of immigrant groups toward the “main-
stream”, majority population. This “melting pot” approach sees “immigrant/ethnic and majority groups becoming more similar over time in their norms, values, behaviours and characteristics … it would expect those immigrants residing the longest in the host society and the members of later generations would show greater similarities to the majority group than immigrants who have been there shorter times” (Bean and Brown, 2010, 6).

2 The Ethnic Disadvantage Model: This theory suggests that lingering discrimination and institutional barriers prevent migrants from achieving upward mobility so that integration remains incomplete.

3 The Segmented Assimilation Model: The idea of this approach brings together elements of both the assimilation and ethnic disadvantage perspectives. It argues that some migrants experience structural barriers which limit their access to employment and other opportunities while others experience upward mobility (Portes, Fernández-Kelly and Haller, 2005). This approach emphasizes multiple pathways to incorporation and the policy emphasis is on identifying the contextual, structural and cultural factors that separate successful incorporation from unsuccessful integration.

The last model recognizes the diversity of experience of migrants and recognizes that neither of the two standard approaches fully depicts the complexity of how groups of migrants adjust to their destination. This seems to be the most appropriate theoretical context for the present study which seeks to assess the economic contribution of humanitarian settlers. The experience of settlers is clearly impacted by a number of elements which will vary between groups of settlers and within those groups. These factors include:

- The human capital of experience and knowledge that the settlers bring with them.
- The economic context at the time of arrival. Canadian research suggest that settlers whose initial arrival is at a time of economic downturn and high unemployment are to some extent “scarred” by this and it remains a barrier throughout their lives, even when economic conditions improve (Martin, 2010).
- The responsiveness of the destination community to the new arrivals.

In attempts to assess the success of migrant incorporation in destinations there is little agreement about the spectrum of dimensions which need to be investigated (Hirschman, 2001). Bean and Brown (2010, 13) conceptualize four domains of incorporation which should be considered – economic, sociocultural, spatial and political. In the contemporary Australian context it is important also to consider the Third Intergenerational Report (Swan, 2010) when assessing the economic contribution and potential contribution of different migrant groups in Australia. This series of very influential reports argue that population ageing will impact significantly on Australia’s future economic growth and that there are three “P” processes in which there will need to be achievements to ensure continued economic growth in the face of ageing:

- Population – growth of the workforce age population
- Participation – the extent to which they participate in the workforce
- Productivity – output per worker
- The last two will be considered here.

**PARTICIPATION IN THE WORKFORCE**

Refugee-humanitarian settlers by virtue of the sudden, unplanned and often traumatic circumstances surrounding their migration face greater barriers than other migrants in entering and succeeding in
Language barriers are especially important with 36.5 per cent of first generation refugee-humanitarian settlers rating themselves as not speaking English well or at all at the 2006 census. Table 1 shows that the unemployment rate decreases and labour force participation increases as proficiency in English increases.

Surveys of recently arrived migrants in Australia have all shown that refugee-humanitarian migrants have lower levels of workforce participation and higher levels of unemployment than other categories of migrants (Cobb-Clark and Khoo, 2006). The 2006 matched dataset showed that for refugees the levels were 42.3 per cent and 22.5 per cent respectively while for skilled migrants they were 76.8 and 7.5 per cent and for family migrants 63.8 and 10.4 per cent. Given the range of barriers faced by refugee-humanitarian settlers, these findings are not surprising. However, much of the prevalent stereotyping of refugee-humanitarian settlers as being disengaged from the workforce and heavily dependent upon social security is a function of most studies only examining their initial years in Australia. Accordingly, the approach here is to examine engagement with the labour market.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency in English</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent unemployed</th>
<th>Participation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>195 477</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>181 384</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not well</td>
<td>121 520</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>26 299</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>524 610</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia-born</td>
<td>10 416 233</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), 2011b, 24.

The labour market.
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**FIGURE 2**

AUSTRALIA: REFUGEE-HUMANITARIAN BIRTHPLACE GROUPS, FIRST AND SECOND GENERATION AND AUSTRALIA-BORN LABOUR FORCE STATUS, 2006

Source: ABS 2006 Census.
force across a longer period of residence in Australia and across generations. This is necessary if a comprehensive picture of economic contribution is to be gained.

Figure 2 shows a pattern of first generation refugee-humanitarian settlers who arrived at age 12 or older had lower levels of workforce participation and higher levels of unemployment than their counterparts who arrived as dependent children, the second generation and the Australia-born. Indeed, participation rates are higher for the second generation than for the Australia-born. While there are some variations between birthplace groups the pattern of intergenerational upward mobility and convergence toward and in some cases, beyond the Australian average was consistent (Hugo et al., 2011, Chapter 3). Moreover, there is a strong pattern of increasing workforce participation and decreased unemployment with length of residence in Australia. In 2006 the unemployment rate for humanitarian arrivals that had arrived after 1996 was 11 per cent compared with 8.3 per cent for those who arrived earlier, while the equivalent participation rates were 52 and 57 per cent (Hugo et al., 2011, 117. Data from the ABS monthly labour force surveys shown in Table 2 examine labour force participation of refugee humanitarian migrants over the period since 1993. It is noticeable that the early labour force surveys show much higher levels of participation among humanitarian groups than more recent surveys. On closer examination, however, it will be noted that the most recent surveys only cover a relatively short period of arrival in Australia, whereas the earlier ones included people who arrived over a longer period. Clearly, the longer the period of residence, the higher the level of workforce participation among the humanitarian origin population. When a longer time perspective is taken than the initial period of settlement there is a pattern of convergence towards Australia-born patterns of labour force participation.

The importance of education in labour force outcomes is evident in Figure 3 which shows that for first and second generation and the Australia-born, participation rates increased with education. Moreover, while for each education category rates for the first generation were less than the Australia-born, the second generation had slightly higher rates than the Australia-born. Again, there is evidence of significant intergenerational improvements.

With respect to occupations, the literature indicates that there are two strong characteristics of refugee-humanitarian settlers – occupational segmentation and “occupational skidding” whereby settlers do not have a job commensurate with their education or skill levels. Figure 4 shows the stark contrast between refugees and skilled migrants who arrived in Australia between 2001 and 2006 in their occupations at the time of the 2006 census. The concentration of refugee-humanitarian settlers in low skilled, low status occupations as labourers, machinery operators and drivers and service workers is apparent. These three categories account for 46 per cent compared with 11 per cent of skilled migrants and 17 per cent of the Australia-born population.

Again there is some evidence of improvement over time. Although each wave of refugees differs in composition according to ethnicity, religion, skill profile etc., Figure 5 shows that the proportion of refugees with degrees in professional occupations increases with the length of time they have

| TABLE 2 |
| AUSTRALIA: LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES FOR IMMIGRANTS BY VISA CATEGORY, 1970–2007 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Humanitarian</th>
<th>All Settlers</th>
<th>Temporary Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrived 1997-2007</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrived 1984-2004</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrived before 1999</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrived 1970-96</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrived 1970-93</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS, Workforce Survey, various issues.
been in Australia. It also will be noted in the diagram that in the case of each vintage of refugees (Kunz, 1975) the second generation has a higher proportion of those with degrees working in professional occupations. Nevertheless, in the case of both groups there is still evidence of a “refugee
gap” with proportions in professional occupations still being lower than for the Australia-born in all cases. The intergenerational differences are striking for some refugee birthplace groups. Table 3 contrasts the percentage of first and second generation workers in different refugee-humanitarian birthplace groups who were employed in professional occupations at the 2006 census.

One area of participation where refugee-humanitarian birthplace group levels are higher than for the Australia-born is in the area of education. The proportion of both refugee birthplace groups (first and second generation) and recent refugee arrivals who are aged between 15 and 24 and are attending an educational institution is higher than for the Australia-born and other recently arrived migrants (Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), 2011b, 33; Hugo et al., 2011). The DIAC Settlement Outcomes of New Arrivals Study of 2009 found that 40.4 per cent of recently arrived refugees were in some form of study at the time of interview compared with 10.7 per cent of family migrants and 13.9 per cent of skilled migrants (Hugo et al., 2011, 122).

**PRODUCTIVITY**

The Intergenerational Report (Swan, 2010) identifies improvements in productivity as the major way in which Australia can cancel out the effects of ageing to continue to increase GDP; and challenging targets of a 1.5 per cent increase per annum in productivity have been set (DIAC, 2011c). One of the major ways in which output per worker can be enhanced is through enhancing the skill level of the workforce. The evidence presented here suggests that the potential contribution of refugee-humanitarian settlers toward this productivity improvement is being diluted by a significant
“brain waste” effect whereby their occupations often do not reflect their levels of skill, education, training and experience. Refugee-humanitarian settlers are often stereotyped in Australia as having low levels of education and training but Figure 6 shows that a significant proportion have post-school education and training although the proportion is lower than for other migrants.

The “refugee gap” is evident in Table 4 which compares the unemployment and labour force participation rates of first and second generation refugee-humanitarian settlers and the Australia-born controlled for level of post-school education. A consistent pattern is in evidence with participation rates significantly lower and unemployment rates higher for first generation settlers than for the Australia-born. It is also evident, however, that the second generation refugee-humanitarian group have higher workforce participation than the Australia-born for each post-school education level. They do, however, have higher levels of unemployment than the Australia-born. Hence the significant intergenerational improvement pattern is again in evidence.

Further, indication of brain waste among the refugee-humanitarian settler workforce is presented in Table 5. This compares the proportion in lower skill, low status, low pay occupations in differ-
ent post-school education categories. A striking pattern is in evidence with, for example, the proportion of the first generation with a bachelor degree in unskilled work being quadruple that for the Australia-born. Similar differences are evident in other education categories. The difference is not as great when compared with the total overseas-born population but it is still significant. Again, intergenerational mobility is apparent, with second generation refugee-humanitarian birthplace workers with post-school education having lower proportions in low skill occupations than not only their first generation but also the Australia-born population.

The obverse pattern is evident in Table 6 which indicates the proportion of refugee-humanitarian birthplace groups with post-school education who were in high status, high skill, highly paid occupations at the 2006 population census. In all cases the first generation have substantially lower representation than the Australia-born and, in most cases, the total overseas-born population. It is

---

**TABLE 4**

**AUSTRALIA: FIRST AND SECOND GENERATION REFUGEE-HUMANITARIAN BIRTHPLACE GROUPS AND AUSTRALIA-BORN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE AND LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>LFPR</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>LFPR</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>LFPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Higher Diploma/Certificate</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Qualification</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS 2006 Census.

**TABLE 5**

**AUSTRALIA: FIRST AND SECOND GENERATION REFUGEE-HUMANITARIAN BIRTHPLACE GROUPS, AUSTRALIA-BORN AND OVERSEAS-BORN PER CENT IN LABOURER AND MACHINERY OPERATOR OCCUPATIONS BY POST-SCHOOL EDUCATION, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postgraduate Degree Level</th>
<th>Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate Level</th>
<th>Bachelor Degree Level</th>
<th>Advanced Diploma and Diploma Certificate Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Generation, Refugee-Humanitarian Birthplace Groups</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Generation, Refugee-Humanitarian Birthplace Groups</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia Born</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Born</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS 2006 Census.
interesting, however, that in contrast to the pattern in Table 5 second generation refugee-humanitarian groups have a lower (albeit slightly) proportion in high status occupations than the Australia-born. This may indicate that the “refugee gap” in the higher levels of the labour market is transmitted from the first to the second generation, although it is much less marked.

It is clear, then, that there is strong evidence that the potential for refugee-humanitarian settlers to contribute to improving productivity in the Australian economy is not being fully realized. The reasons for this “refugee gap” emerged strongly in the qualitative and survey work undertaken as part of this study and are well documented in the Australian refugee literature (RCOA, 2010; Colic-Peisker and Tilbury, 2007). They include significant structural disadvantages in the workplace and discrimination on the basis of race, religion and ethnic origin.

Unlike business and family migrants, refugees pre-migration experience prevents them from doing research into Australia’s labour market before they arrive. Many refugees have lived in camps for prolonged periods, while others have had little or limited time to plan their journey. Consequently they are at a disadvantage from other migrants because they have not had the resources or opportunity to scope the labour market or prepare for transitioning into it.

Work experience is the main need identified by refugees according to key informants specializing in the refugee employment sector. Employers do not want to take on the perceived risks associated with employing refugees and humanitarian arrivals who have not had work experience in Australia. Unpaid work experience attracts occupational health and safety costs. A key consequence of the factors cited above is that humanitarian entrants engage with low skilled and low paying jobs that usually involve hard labour and long hours.

Employer discrimination was cited as a key obstacle to accessing employment in the first instance. Employers are often unaware of (a) the distinction between refugees and other migrant streams and related to this, the specific needs that the former may require with regards to maintaining employment (b) the skills and knowledge refugees may have acquired outside Australia. For some employers, there is a common perception that refugees lack awareness about workplace culture and practices and are therefore more difficult to employ. Mature refugees face a double disadvantage. Key informants working in the refugee sector and specializing in employment pointed out that in

| TABLE 6 |
| AUSTRALIA: FIRST AND SECOND GENERATION REFUGEE-HUMANITARIAN BIRTHPLACE GROUPS, AUSTRALIA-BORN AND OVERSEAS-BORN PER CENT IN MANAGERIAL AND PROFESSIONAL OCCUPATIONS BY POST-SCHOOL EDUCATION, 2006 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postgraduate Degree Level</th>
<th>Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate Level</th>
<th>Bachelor Degree Level</th>
<th>Advanced Diploma and Diploma Certificate Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Generation, Refugee Humanitarian Birthplace Groups</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Generation, Refugee Humanitarian Birthplace Groups</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia Born</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Born</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS 2006 Census.
many cases there needs to be more emphasis on educating employers rather than skilling migrants. Australian employers need to be made aware that migrants and refugees bring in a diverse and valuable range of skills that can generate innovative practices and knowledge within the workplace.

The Joint Standing Committee on Migration (2006) emphasized that humanitarian entrants may face some skills recognition difficulties not faced by entrants under other migration schemes due to a range of complex personal circumstances. For example, humanitarian entrants are more likely to arrive without documentary evidence of their qualifications. While refugees qualifications are recorded in the humanitarian interview, this data gets lost in the system and currently there is no way of documenting refugees skills and qualifications once they arrive in Australia. Key informants from MRCs and settlement agencies similarly observed that clients identified the skills recognition process in Australia as too time-consuming, expensive and complex to navigate, therefore cementing their decision not to engage with this pathway.

In 2006, the Joint Standing Committee on Migration released its “Negotiating the Maze” report which examined the structural barriers that hamper the efficient recognition of skills of those trained overseas. With regards to refugees the Committee was advised that “the cost of getting qualifications recognized is a significant impost for all of these groups but for Refugee and Humanitarian Entrants, these costs can constitute a major barrier”; in addition they were informed that:

Recognition of qualifications is only the first step for many migrants and refugees with trades’ qualifications. The next step for many trades is to satisfy the appropriate licensing and registration to practice their trade in Australia. Meeting licensing and registration requirement also incurs significant costs. For example, the cost of recognition of qualifications and meeting licensing and registration requirements for electricians is over $1000 (Joint Standing Committee on Migration, 2006, 259).

Even if they did have access to financial resources, many key informants noted that the system and procedures for skills recognition is particularly complex and difficult to negotiate. Consequently many humanitarian entrants who come in with skills or high levels of education take a step back within their careers or find work that is very different from what they have been trained in within their country of origin.

Many refugees have little or no access to social or family networks resulting in less support and assistance than other migrants have. Existing community networks play a critical role in facilitating first jobs. Several key informants observed that refugee communities are often concentrated in specific sectors. In NSW, for example, some African communities are increasingly engaged in the security industry; Iraqis and Afghans are more likely to move into trade and Nepalese and Burmese into taxi driving. In most scenarios once a refugee/humanitarian entrant is accepted for work within factories etc., if they prove themselves within the first few weeks as reliable and hard-working, this is an opening for others within the community to access employment at that site. Networking through word of mouth within the refugee community is a key source of employment opportunities but is also welcomed by employers keen to meet labour shortages.

At the same time, Colic-Peisker and Tilbury (2006) have identified that lack of mainstream networks and the influence of “ethnic path integration” – or reliance on bonding networks within ethnic communities – can contribute to directing new arrivals into undesirable employment within secondary labour-market niches. Many of these jobs are characterized by unhealthy work environments, including long hours, relatively high occupational health and safety risks, and limited job security.

A common theme among key informants from both government and non government sectors was the notion of “sacrifice”; this referred to the process where by new humanitarian migrants would work hard in menial and low-skilled jobs in order to ensure their children received tertiary education. It is often through second generation refugees and humanitarian entrants that the extent of economic contribution becomes most marked. Due to the hard work and determination of their par-
ents, the second generation experience post school education and experience greater success in the labour force. Having been socialized in the Australian context, and where provided with opportunities, this generation also engages more with the mainstream community, enabling a higher degree of social and civic contribution.

The SONA (Settlement Outcomes of New Arrivals)\(^5\) study asked a question about satisfaction with employment and Table 7 shows that new humanitarian settlers have a lower proportion who like their work than other migrant groups. This partly reflects the fact that many are unable to obtain work concomitant with their qualifications, especially in the early years of settlement (Colic-Peisker and, 2007). The survey of 649 humanitarian settlers undertaken for this research study found that only 48.1 per cent of working respondents said that their job matched their experience and qualifications (Hugo et al., 2011, 123).

While refugee-humanitarian settlers’ labour market experience converges toward that of the Australia-born over time, they have experienced greater difficulty than other migrant groups in adjusting economically. This applies not only in Australia but in other countries with substantial immigrant intakes that include refugees, especially in the United States, Canada and Europe. A ubiquitous phenomenon which has been identified in these countries is the “Refugee Gap” (Connor, 2010, 377). Refugee-humanitarian settlers on average have less English language ability, less educational experience, different and less access to family support, poorer mental and physical health; and a high proportion of them live in disadvantaged areas. However, one of the most perplexing issues relates to the fact that once key determinants of disadvantage for all immigrants, such as English language ability, education, work experience etc. are controlled for, refugee-humanitarian settlers still have lower occupational, employment and earnings as well as other outcomes than other migrant and non-migrant groups. A gap remains. Understanding the cause of this is a major gap in our knowledge of migrant adjustment, not only in Australia but elsewhere as well. This is of importance not only to maximize the economic benefits which humanitarian settlers deliver to the country but to give those settlers the same opportunities that other Australians enjoy. The international literature makes clear that refugee-humanitarian settlers face larger obstacles to their economic integration than other immigrant groups (Connor, 2010; Kibria, 1994; Portes and Stepick, 1985; Takeda, 2000; Waxman, 2001; Potocky-Tripodi, 2001, 2003, 2004). Richmond (1988) argues that refugees are conceptually different from other migrants and that they need to be considered differently when examining their economic adaptation.

### A DISTINCTIVE ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTION

One of the most striking images of the economic impact of refugee settlers in Australia has come from Stevenson’s (2005) analysis of the origins of the 2000 *Business Review Weekly* annual richest

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Humanitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like my job</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job is ok but could be better</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t care – it’s just a job</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not like my job</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DIAC.
200 people in Australia. This found that five of Australia’s eight billionaires at that time were people who themselves, or their families, had come to Australia as postwar refugees. Refugees and their descendants accounted for perhaps five per cent of the national population but in 2000 they made up almost two thirds of the nation’s billionaires! This raises the important question of the extent to which refugee-humanitarian settlers in Australia are selectively more entrepreneurial than the Australia-born or of other types of migrants. Do these types of migrants have a greater propensity for risk taking? Are they more likely than other groups to identify emerging opportunities and set up new businesses? Do they have more entrepreneurial flair than others which allows them to identify, and take advantage of, business and economic opportunities?

There is a substantial literature on the relationship between migration and entrepreneurship, e.g. Cassis and Minoglou (Eds), (2005). It is apparent that there are a number of personal attributes which are associated with both processes – a propensity to take risks, to not accept the status quo, to take advantage of opportunities when they arise etc. It is certainly the case that many refugees have these characteristics.

There is a substantial literature investigating the role of immigrant entrepreneurs in Australia (Lampugnani and Holton, 1991; Lever-Tracy et al., 1991; Collins, 1996; Castles et al., 1991). However, these studies have focused on individual birthplace groups. One of the most substantial of these studies was that of Strahan and Williams (1988) which examined the success or failure history of 13,449 small businesses, with 22,034 owners/managers of whom 15.8 and 18.6 per cent respectively were immigrants. They found that migrants had on average less education but more experience than their Australia-born counterparts. Immigrant businesses involved the family more than those of the Australia-born. Immigrants made less use of credit to finance their businesses and although they started off smaller than the Australia-born owned businesses they grew faster and are more profitable. They had a lower failure rate. The study concludes that immigrants are generally more successful in small business than the Australia-born and that immigrant entrepreneurs make an important economic contribution.

While the most high profile success stories among refugee entrepreneurs have been those who have started from nothing but build up substantial business enterprises (Refugee Council of Australia, 2010), the bulk of settlers have small or medium sized, especially small, businesses which the ABS (2002, 1) defines as those employing less than 20 people. ABS (2005) survey data shows that 30 per cent of small businesses in Australia are owned by immigrants – significantly higher than their representation in both the total population and in the workforce.

There have been studies in Australia which have found that refugees have had a greater tendency to be self employed than either the Australia-born or other migrant groups. Stevens (1997) found that wages and salary were the main source of income of only 32 per cent of refugees and more than a fifth (21 per cent) received their main income from their own business. Analysis of the 2006 census data on workforce status (Hugo et al., 2011, 182–183) found that 18 of the 32 birthplace groups had a higher percentage than the Australia-born who were owners/managers. There are some clear patterns, however, in the proportions who are owners/managers with the highest being in the longest and most well established groups as is evident in Table 8. The lowest levels are among the most recently arrived groups, especially those from Africa. These include those born in Burundi (7%), Liberia (6.1), Sierra Leone (3.9) and Sudan (7.7). However, there are exceptions to this. It will be noted that a quarter (25.5%) of Somalis who are in the workforce are owner/managers. This points to the fact that some ethnic groups have developed cultures which are especially encouraging of entrepreneurialism. They have the traditional institutions, experiences and motivations to create new businesses and take particular advantage of employment opportunities. Gujaratis among Indians and Minangkabau from Indonesia are just two examples of ethnic groups who, over centuries, have been highly engaged in trading and business activity across a range of countries that they have migrated to. It is apparent that the Somalis fall into this category.
Despite the Somali example, it is apparent that most of the humanitarian birthplace groups with high proportions of their working population who are owner/managers are those of long standing in Australia, especially those from Eastern Europe (Estonia, Hungary, Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Ukraine). While there are few studies available of these groups during their early days of settlement, it is apparent from the studies that are available that among these groups the overwhelming majority started their careers as employees, often working at a number of jobs to accumulate the capital to establish a business of their own (Martin, 1965; Zubrzycki, 1964; Kunz, 1969, 1975, 1988). The Vietnamese also have an above average proportion of their workers who are owner/managers, yet all the studies of early Vietnamese settlement in Australia indicate that most new arrivals initially worked at waged jobs in order to be able to finance their own business. Iredale and D’Arcy (1992: 19) found that refugee women were more likely to be self-employed than non-refugee women. Lever-Tracy et al. (1991: 85) found that women play a prominent role in businesses run by Asian immigrants.

One important element is that although there is a lack of research on the working backgrounds of humanitarian settlers, it is apparent that many were self-employed business people before they were forced to move. In a study of Humanitarian Settlers in South Australia 12 per cent of all respondents had owned a business prior to their migration. If this is taken as a percentage of those in the workforce, the percentage rises to 19.6 per cent. Moreover, a further 5.2 per cent (8.7 per cent of the labour force) had worked in the family business prior to migration (Hugo et al., 2011). The key message here is that humanitarian settlers have often been entrepreneurs and businesspeople before migration and bring that experience and skills with them.

The development of ethnic businesses by humanitarian settlers can play a positive role in providing an avenue for new arrivals to enter the labour market (Collins, 1996; Castles et al., 1991). However, Colic-Peisker and Tilbury (2006: 219) have argued that: “Ethnic entrepreneurs often consciously employ newly arrived compatriots expecting them to be cheap, flexible and pliable labour.” There is evidence of co-ethnic exploitation in some such areas (Velayutham and Wise, 2010).

In summary, there is a strong case to be made that humanitarian settlers have made, and continue to make, a distinct economic contribution to Australia through their role as entrepreneurs. Migration never involves a representative cross-section of the population at either the origin or the destination. It is always selective of particular groups. One of the most universal of the ways in which migration selects out such groups is that risk takers, entrepreneurs and people who identify and capitalize on opportunities are more likely to move (Wadhwa et al., 2007). This is reflected in the fact that migrants tend to be over-represented among those setting up new business initiatives in destina-

### TABLE 8
**AUSTRALIA: SELECTED REFUGEE-HUMANITARIAN BIRTHPLACE GROUPS: PER CENT OF WORKING POPULATION OWNER/MANAGERS, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia-born</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NES</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

tions. However, the measurement of such characteristics as risk-taking, business acumen and entre-
preneurialism is very difficult, so it cannot be included in immigration programmes such as the
Australian Points Assessment System. Business migration programmes seek to identify and attract
immigrants with these characteristics. However, the Business Migration programme selects potential
immigrants on the basis that they have a substantial amount of capital to invest in Australia. This
means that it selects established businesspeople rather than those who are yet to establish
themselves but are likely to identify new business opportunities. The considerable literature on
Australian immigrant entrepreneurship focuses almost exclusively on migrants who arrived in Aus-
tralia outside the Skilled Migration programme and immigrants who are selected by the Points
Assessment Scheme. The Skilled Migration programme, with its strong stress on formal post-school
qualifications, does not necessarily identify potential migrants with entrepreneurial skills. To some
extent, such potential migrants self-identify by wishing to break away from the status quo and tak-
ing the risk of moving to a new country. There would seem to be a strong case that the refugee-
humanitarian migration programme is more selective of risk-taking entrepreneurial populations than
any of the other major streams of the Australian migration programme (family, skill and New Zea-
land streams). In this sense, then, the humanitarian programme is contributing an important added
economic dimension to the total migration intake of Australia.

Another argument that has been used in relation to the economic contribution of humanitarian
settlers is that they fill particular niches in the Australian labour market that are being eschewed by
Australia-born and other migrant workers. This segmentation of the labour market is often con-
structed in a negative way because it traps them in “the ‘secondary labour market’ comprising low
status and low paid jobs that locals avoid” (Colic-Peisker and Tilbury, 2006, 203).

In Australia the prevailing discourse on labour shortage is almost always couched in terms of
skill shortages, yet it is apparent that there are also shortages in a number of low skilled occupa-
tional areas (e.g. National Farmers’ Federation, 2008). However, the Australian migration pro-
gramme has become increasingly focused on recruitment of settlers who are skilled, as the
government seeks to add to Australia’s bank of human capital. The temporary migration pro-
gramme is even more focused on skill. Australia is piloting an agricultural workers’ scheme which
brings in seasonal workers from the Paci
fi
fi
cic to meet agricultural labour shortages at times of peak
activity (Bedford and Hugo, 2008) but there are very limited opportunities in the Australian immi-
gration programme for bringing in migrants to fill low-skilled jobs. It is apparent that humanitarian
settlers are currently meeting many of these labour shortages in low skill, low status and low paid
occupations which in other countries are met by inflows of unskilled workers. These are often
undocumented flows, as in the case with much Mexican migration to the United States and African
migration to Europe. While there are issues of lack of recognition of skills forcing some humanitar-
ian settlers into working in these low skill areas, this should not divert attention from the fact that
these settlers are currently filling important labour shortages in the Australian economy. It is very
important that humanitarian settlers be accorded protection of all of their rights in these jobs, that
they be given every opportunity to achieve social mobility and that they not be exposed to exploi-
tation. However, it also needs to be recognized that they are taking up jobs that are not being taken
up by Australians and that this is another way in which humanitarian settlers are making a distinc-
tive and important contribution. Having said this, however, it is important also to recognise that
humanitarian settlers must be given every chance to get work commensurate with their skills, edu-
cation and aptitude, if not initially then in the short to medium term.

There is a need to recognize that many refugee-humanitarian settlers are arriving in Australia
with skills and that they often suffer from those skills not being recognized by Australian employ-
ers. It is important for both the migrants and the Australian economy that this human capital is not
only recognized but deployed. Notwithstanding this, there are significant numbers of humanitarian
settlers who arrive with low levels of education and the low skill labour market offers the only ave-
nue for upward mobility. There is concern that humanitarian settlers get locked into particular niches in the economy. For example, Colic-Peisker and Tilbury (2006, 221) argue:

> The most vulnerable migrants – refugees and asylum seekers – are especially likely to end up locked in disadvantaged low status and low paying jobs … most mainstream employers outside the identified migrant employment ‘niches’ have little experience with employing ‘visibly different’ recent refugees.

Similar sentiments are voiced by Stevens (1997) and it may be that the underutilization of human capital characteristics of all migrants is more marked for humanitarian settlers. It is argued here that it is crucial to develop better means of allowing humanitarian settlers to fully use their skills in the labour market and to break down the barriers which are preventing that at the moment. However, it is also argued that the participants of this group in low skill jobs are making an important contribution.

One of the particular niches of the labour market that humanitarian settlers have in recent years been absorbed in is in labour markets outside of the capital cities. As yet there is very limited research into the experiences of humanitarian entrants living in regional and rural Australia, although as settlement occurs in those areas more research is emerging (Taylor-Neumann and Balasingam, 2009). Newly arrived migrants tend to settle in metropolitan centres, near family and other supports but increasingly federal government policy has focused on settling newly arrived refugees in regional areas (Sypek et al., 2008).

A key message amongst key informants across Australia was that regional centres offered refugees – both newly arrived, and more established, communities – key opportunities and benefits that were more difficult to find in large urban centres. These included affordable housing; employment opportunities – albeit in low skilled and unpopular jobs; smaller community settings and a farming context which remains appealing for many who have come from rural areas prior to migration.

At the same time, however, regional areas often lack key infrastructure, support networks and settlement services which are pivotal for refugee resettlement. While there are significant refugee communities in regional centres across Australia including Toowoomba, Townsville, Cairns (Queensland), Katanning and Albany (Western Australia), several key informants noted that the issues identified above made it extremely difficult to convince new arrivals to move to such areas. There is concern about regional settlement of humanitarian entrants, since regional areas do not have ready access to intensive services such as torture and trauma counselling and specialized health and education services (Taylor-Neumann and Balasingam, 2009).

There is a new interest in Australia in regional development and the shortage of workers is seen as a major constraint on the development of regional areas. Moreover, mining, tourism, agriculture and agricultural processing are increasingly significant parts of the Australian economy, predominantly based in regional areas, and the development of their potential is threatened by labour shortage. It is apparent that refugee-humanitarian settlers are currently helping meet this demand and that this role could be more important in the future.

**CONCLUSION**

The main justification for countries accepting refugee settlers should always be based on humanitarian concern and nations playing their role as caring and responsible global citizens. However, it should also not be ignored that forced migrants can and do make significant economic contributions to their destination economies. Certainly, there are significant costs incurred in the early years of settlement. The circumstances of their move mean that refugees will not be able to adjust economically and socially as readily as other migrants who have planned their move, have been able to bring resources with them and have not been exposed to violence and trauma. Yet this study has shown...
that over time refugee economic participation in the Australian economy converges toward that of the non-migrant population and by the second generation exceeds it. Moreover, the contribution is in many ways a distinct one which means that the refugee-humanitarian inflow into Australia brings a different and important economic element into the mix of immigrant skills, attributes, abilities and aptitudes. Of course, there are important social and cultural capital contributions as well but it is too often overlooked that there is also a significant economic contribution. However, the existence of “brain waste” and the refugee gap have diluted this economic contribution. From the perspectives of both the migrants themselves and the Australian economy it is crucial to break down the influence of discrimination, structural disadvantage, lack of recognition of qualifications, language barriers and other impediments to refugee settlers being able to fulfil their potential.

Returning to the three theories of immigrant and refugee group assimilation discussed earlier, the evidence presented here would suggest that the segmented assimilationist model is most relevant in the context of Australian humanitarian settlers. These settlers follow a range of pathways to incorporation in the Australian economy and society. There are structural barriers which limit the access of many refugee-humanitarian settlers to employment commensurate with their skills and aptitudes. Despite this there is evidence that many are able to overcome those barriers and are upwardly mobile. Undoubtedly, though, a refugee group remains even after a substantial period of settlement, so that significant numbers are trapped in low income, low status, low skill jobs. This points to the need for policies and programmes which recognize the need to facilitate multiple pathways to incorporation which acknowledge not only the structural and cultural barriers but also the potential of the refugee settlers.

NOTES

1. Since the mid 1990s temporary migration has become very significant comprising mainly students, working holiday makers and skilled workers recruited by Australian employers (457s).
2. The ID can be defined as a quantitative statement of the evenness of the distribution of two sub-populations. The index can be interpreted as the percentage of a particular sub-population which would have to change their place of residence if the distribution of that group between sub-areas of the region under study is to be made exactly the same as that of the other sub-group. An index of 0 would mean that the two sub-populations had exactly the same relative distribution while an index value of 100 represents a complete ‘apartheid’ situation, with no person of one sub-group living in the same sub-area as people of the other sub-group.
3. This has been a consistent pattern over the years. In 2007–08 the ID was 73.9.
4. In 2007–08, 88.3.
5. Settlement Outcomes of New Arrivals study undertaken for the Department of Immigration and Citizenship in 2009. It covered 8,579 new arrivals of whom 4,588 were refugee-humanitarian settlers.
6. In 2010 three of the top 10 are of first or second generation refugee background.
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