

# Refugees and social exclusion: What the literature says

Janet Taylor

## Introduction

Refugees have been the focus of considerable public concern in recent years and of a range of government and community responses. For the Brotherhood of St Laurence our vision of 'an Australia free of poverty' involves ensuring that all people are able to live free of poverty in an inclusive society. This paper looks at the particular situations of refugees in Australia in terms of poverty and social exclusion and raises issues for further research and policy development.

The Brotherhood of St Laurence has carried out research on aspects of poverty and disadvantage in Australia since the 1940s. The Ecumenical Migration Centre (EMC), established in the 1960s to work with newly arrived immigrant and refugee groups, is now part of the Brotherhood. EMC has its own history of direct service provision, research, publication and independent advocacy. Our research has shown both the extreme disadvantage many refugees face or have faced, but also the amazing resilience of many.

The Brotherhood undertook two major studies of children of immigrants and poverty in association with the Bureau of Immigration Research in the early 1990s (Taylor & MacDonald 1992; 1994). These included literature reviews, analysis of national statistics and presentation of the early Life Chances Study data and highlighted high rates of poverty among refugee families. Other Brotherhood research on immigrants and refugees focused on aspects of social exclusion ranging from literacy barriers for women (MacDonald 1993) and youth unemployment (Taylor 1995) to lack of access to health care (Brotherhood of St Laurence 2004). In 1998 EMC produced a special issue of *Migration Action* on 'Poverty in multicultural Australia'. The most recent Brotherhood research specifically on refugee issues was conducted with EMC, and produced the Changing Pressures Bulletin, *Seeking asylum: living with fear, uncertainty and exclusion* (Brotherhood of St Laurence 2002).

The issues of greatest public concern about refugees in Australia in the present decade have been those to do with excluding certain categories of refugees from entering or staying in Australia, in particular the very controversial issues of mandatory detention for asylum seekers (including children); the so-called 'Pacific solution' of detaining some asylum seekers outside Australian territory; and for some of those accepted as refugees, the time-limited Temporary Protection Visa (TPV). These are rightly very prominent concerns as major human rights issues and have been the focus of recent advocacy work by EMC and the Brotherhood among others (for example Leach & Mansouri 2002).

This paper steps back and considers a wider range of issues for the larger numbers of refugees assisted under the Refugee and Humanitarian program. It reviews Australian literature to explore what is known about refugees, poverty and social exclusion and what is distinctive about the refugee situation that can strengthen our understanding of these concepts?

## Refugees in Australia

In the past 50 years, over 620,000 refugees and displaced people have been resettled here (DIMIA 2004), with new arrivals from ever-changing sources. The post-war refugee program (1947 to 1953) brought some 170,000 displaced persons from central and eastern Europe (fleeing fascist and then communist regimes) (Kunz 1971 A46). They were followed by a new wave of refugees from Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. Refugee numbers decreased beside large-scale economic migration in the 1950s, 60s and 70s. Refugee numbers grew again in the late 1970s and 1980s with large numbers of refugees from South East Asia and Latin America. In 1990–91 the main source of refugees and associated settlers to Australia was Vietnam (41 per cent) followed by El Salvador (19 per cent), while two years later the main source was the former Yugoslavia (29 per cent) (Taylor & MacDonald 1994, p.10).

The term refugee is generally used in this paper to refer to those assisted under the Humanitarian program. The situation of asylum seekers, some of whom become recognised as refugees, is also addressed. Some reference is also made to the situation of migrants, a few of whom share similar backgrounds to refugees and some of whom share similar barriers to inclusion.

### **Who is a refugee?**

The 1951 United Nations Convention for Refugees definition is used for determining eligibility for entrance to Australia and other countries (Jupp 2003). The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees website (UNHCR 2004) states:

A refugee is a person who 'owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country...' (The 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.

In Australian research over the years, refugees have often been included within the wider study of immigrants, and have not always been distinguished from voluntary migrants. The most common definition of immigrant, as someone who is born overseas, includes refugees (Williams & Batrouney 1998). This reflects in part the concerns at different times (for example how immigrants [including refugees] are settling in Australia); and in part the availability of statistics that define different groups (birthplace statistics are more readily available than those based on visa category). In general, migrants have been seen as those who freely choose to leave their countries of origin while refugees are forced to flee. While mostly the distinction is clear, in some cases it is not. For example, Steel's (2003) study of one recently arrived ethnic group showed that both refugees (with permanent residence) and migrants showed the same high level of pre-migration trauma and that the migrants from this ethnic group could well be considered to be refugees.

In this paper the term 'refugee' is used generally to refer to people who have arrived in Australia under the Government's Humanitarian Program or have been granted Protection visas after arrival (see below). Refugees are thus distinguished from asylum seekers who are people seeking protection as refugees but who have not yet had their refugee status officially recognised. Refugees are also generally distinguished from those who arrived as independent migrants. However a broader definition of refugees includes all those who have escaped situations of war, persecution and human rights violations.

### **The Humanitarian Program**

Refugees are only a small component of Australia's migration program of which there are two broad streams:

- Independent migrants (selected because of their skills, with their spouses and dependent children) (100,000 to 110,000 per year) (DIMIA 2003)
- Humanitarian (refugees and others with humanitarian needs) (13,000 per annum for 2004/05).

The previous family reunion stream has been reduced and largely incorporated within the above two streams.

People who come under the Australian Government's Humanitarian Program include a large range of visa categories and are entitled to different levels of support accordingly. These are outlined in Table 1.1 in Taylor & Stanovic 'Services and entitlements' in this edition of *Migration Action* (hereafter Table 1.1 in Taylor & Stanovic 2004). The main categories are as follows (DIMIA 2003a):

*The off shore program* (people who are selected overseas to come to Australia). Refugees who come to Australia through the offshore Refugee and Special Humanitarian categories are given permanent visas and have access to government settlement and other support systems.

- *Refugees* – people who are subject to persecution in their home country and have a strong need for resettlement, the majority are referred by UNHRC to Australia and arrive with full assistance from the Australian Government.
- *Special Humanitarian Program (SHP) Entrants* – people who are outside their home country who have experienced gross violation of human rights and who are proposed (sponsored) by someone in Australia who will provide support.

*The on shore program* (people who have arrived in Australia before formally seeking asylum and being accepted as refugees for whom Australia has protection obligations):

- *Permanent Protection Visa (PPV) Holders* – most have spent some time in Australia as ‘asylum seekers on shore’ before getting this visa and so are considered by DIMIA to have less need for settlement services than off shore entrants.
- *Temporary Protection Visa (TPV) Holders* – people who have been recognised as refugees by the Australian Government but instead of permanent residence have been given a limited period of asylum, with limited rights to support services and no family reunion rights.

Until October 1999 nearly all people recognised as refugees by the Australian government were granted permanent residence. Since then some asylum seekers (mostly those arriving by boat) have been granted only temporary protection. Over 8,500 TPVs were issued between 1999 and December 2002 (mostly to Iraqi and Afghan refugees) (O’Kane 2003, p.88). There have also been Temporary Safe Haven Visas which were also used for a program for refugees from Kosovo, East Timor and Ambon in from and a short-lived temporary visa class that was used in the early 1990s and affected, amongst others 1999. Earlier East Timorese refugees and Chinese students were also granted temporary protection.

#### *Asylum seekers*

The ‘on shore’ program reflects two categories of people who have come to Australia seeking asylum Those who apply for refugee status after arrival in Australia are called asylum seekers. There are two groups of asylum seekers:

- People who arrive on a valid visa (such as a tourist or student visa) and apply for asylum after arrival. They are mostly granted a bridging visa and can live in the community. At the end of June 2004 there were approximately 2,400 asylum seekers living in the community. Some (on a Bridging Visa A) are eligible to work, and receive Medicare, though asylum seekers who fail to lodge their application within 45 days of arrival are denied permission to work a small proportion; some (2,717 in 2001) receive government support via the Australian Red Cross under the Asylum Seeker Assistance Scheme at a level averaging 89 per cent of Centrelink Special Benefit (well below the poverty line). Once an application is rejected by the Refugee Review Tribunal, an asylum seeker whose applications have been rejected is transferred to a Bridging Visa E which denies and are denied all the above rights and is are effectively destitute (O’Kane 2003, p.62). Those who are granted protection are usually granted permanent protection (PPV). [Table 1.1 in Taylor & Stanovic 2004 outlines access to services for Bridging Visa A and E]
- People who arrive without a valid visa or who are not allowed to pass through immigration control at the point of entry, mostly ‘boat people’, are detained in detention centres in Australia (mandatory detention). Other names the Government has used for these asylum seekers include ‘illegal entrants’ and ‘queue jumpers’. If granted protection they are typically granted only a Temporary Protection Visa (TPV).

A third category of asylum seekers has been created under recent changes by the Howard Government:

- *Secondary movers these are shore’*: people who have moved away from their region of origin and who apply applying for asylum to Australia from outside Australian territory, on ‘excised offshore places’ (e.g. Christmas Island) or from ‘declared countries’ (Nauru and Papua New Guinea) (O’Kane 2003)

The current situation with its diversity of visa categories means that people who have suffered the same levels of persecution in their home countries, but arrive in Australia in different ways, are treated very differently. [see Table 1.1 in Taylor & Stanovic 2004]

Australia's refugee intake, as indicated by the numbers of visas granted under the Humanitarian program, has remained fairly constant throughout the 1990s with annual visa numbers of between 12,000 and 15,000. In 2002–03, 12,525 were listed under the Humanitarian program:

- 4,376 in the Refugee category
- 7,280 in the Special Humanitarian category
- 866 as 'onshore' protection (DIMIA 2004).

By 2002–03 the largest groups of refugees were from the Sudan (31 per cent) and Iraq (25 per cent) and these groups had approximately doubled in size since the previous year, while there had been a drop in numbers from the countries of former Yugoslavia (DIMIA 2003c). The main nationalities for the 'onshore' protection groups were Sri Lanka and China for Permanent Protection visas and, with much larger numbers, Iraq and Afghanistan for TPVs (DIMIA 2004).

Other characteristics of these refugees which are relevant to their settlement needs are available for some 10,000 refugees who were assisted in 2002–03 under the Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy (IHSS) (DIMIA 2003c). The average number of years of education for refugees (over 5 years of age) was 7 years, with the least educated group being from Africa with an average of 6 years of education. At least 42 per cent had poor or no literacy in their own language and 64 per cent stated that they required an English language interpreter. They spoke over 60 languages, with almost half (48 per cent) speaking Arabic. In terms of gender and age, 52 per cent were male 48 per cent female and the average age was 24 years (the median was 21 years). Some 63 per cent of cases assisted included children. Some 15 per cent had lived in refugee camps, most of whom were from Africa. Most of the refugees who had sponsors settled near these, generally in NSW and Victoria, while most of those going to other states were 'unlinked'. Only 6 per cent settled in regional or rural Australia.

The Government has stated that the regional priority for sources of refugees for 2004–05 will continue to be in Africa, followed by the Middle East and South West Asia, reflecting the resettlement policies of the UNHCR (Vanstone 2004).

Given the limited numbers of refugees accepted into Australia it is relevant to note a relatively new aspect of immigration in the large uncapped intake of temporary migrants, many of whom have work rights. The number of temporary migrants at 30 June 2001 was 554,000. These included visitors, students, business migrants, working holiday makers and people on bridging visas (DIMIA 2002, cited by Betts 2003, pp.180–181).

### *Literature on the refugee experience – pre and post-migration*

Kunz (1971) reviewing the literature on post-war migration found little focused on refugees as a category, with the major exception of Jean Martin's study *Refugee settlers* (1965), although there were many studies of particular refugee groups. He identified a preoccupation with immigrants as settlers which led to an underplaying of the importance of pre-migration factors that were so crucial for refugees. He noted then that refugees need to be studied in a framework that is consistent with the refugee phenomenon. One of the differences he identified included the waves of refugee arrivals from scattered places of origin in contrast to the chain migration of many economic migrants.

A key difference between refugees and many other settlers is their experience before arriving in Australia. Many refugees have experienced imprisonment, torture of themselves and their families and murder of family members. Pittaway (1991), for example, found 73 per cent of some 200 refugee women in her study had suffered either medium or high degrees of trauma and torture prior to coming to Australia. This experience of trauma is not always fully recognised in provision of services (particularly mainstream services) to refugees. Torture and trauma counselling was not

developed effectively until the late 1980s (Jupp 2003), but has subsequently been included in the settlement program for refugees, although it is not always readily available.

Other distinctive aspects of refugees' pre-migration experience include: escape rather than planned departure, living in hiding or in refugee camps, with limited access to health or other services, and long waits for acceptance by Australia.

Jupp (2003) notes that, reflecting their pre-migration experience, refugees in most societies, including Australia, do not settle as easily as immigrants selected on family or skill criteria, and that they normally endure longer unemployment and poverty and have a greater degree of psychological damage to recover from. Refugees, particularly survivors of torture and trauma, have been identified as particularly at risk of mental illness but research shows very diverse patterns among different groups of refugees (Jayasuriya et al. 1992) as well as individual resilience.

The post-arrival treatment of asylum seekers in detention in Australia (and in off shore centres) and the effects of the temporary nature of protection on proven refugees are likely to have additional impacts on their later lives in terms of settlement, integration and mental health. Recent research on this is discussed below. The attitudes of the wider community to particular refugee groups, be they welcoming or hostile, also play an important role in settlement. Research into settlement processes also identifies the importance of different stages of settlement.

One aspect of the post-migration experience that can create particular difficulties for some refugees is the hostility between different groups from the same country of origin. Kunz noted that among refugee groups conflicts dominate as 'refugees are not created by the blending forces of common poverty but by the divisive events of politics and war' (Kunz 1971, p.A60). Hostilities may relate to those which led to the refugee situation and to different waves of migration. The differences can be based on factors such as politics, class or religion. A current example is continuing discrimination experienced by some refugees from the Hazara group in their contact with the wider Afghan community in Australia (Mansouri & Bagdas 2002).

## **Refugees and social exclusion in the literature**

Economically a poor person is somebody who has to work very hard to keep up with the daily level, but still he survives. Or, if somebody is a stranger and he hasn't got a social network, no relatives, pretty new in the country, so he is poor. (Ethiopian refugee, Johnson, 2000, p. 11)

This research has included a search for literature concerned with refugees and 'poverty' and 'social exclusion'. While the relationship between poverty and social exclusion can be conceptualised in many ways, for the purposes of this paper poverty can be seen as a key aspect of social exclusion. Under the heading of poverty, low income, unemployment, income support and expenditure are discussed below.

While poverty is a key aspect of social exclusion, there are a range of other dimensions that are relevant for considering the situation of refugees.

Some aspects of social exclusion which face refugees are not generally experienced by the rest of the community. First is the dimension of physical exclusion from Australia and Australian society, often in the name of 'border protection'. Some refugees seeking asylum have been physically removed as they approached Australia, others have been detained, sometimes for years, in detention centres in remote areas. The Federal Government has argued that those being excluded are not legitimate refugees, however as some 90 per cent of unauthorised boat arrivals who arrived between 1999–2002 have subsequently been accepted as refugees (RCOA 2003), this argument seems flawed.

Other dimensions of social exclusion faced by refugees include those to do with lack of citizenship, with lack of English, and with the experience of racism and discrimination.

A further dimension is the exclusion from entitlements associated with particular visa categories for refugees and asylum seekers [see Table 1.1 in Taylor & Stanovic 2004]. These prohibit or limit access not only to employment, health services, housing, education and income support, but also to settlement services and even to family reunion. The temporary nature of some of these visas means people spend their lives waiting, in fear of being sent back against their will.

White (2004) operationalises the concept of social exclusion in reference to refugees and asylum seekers in Australia and the UK uses Burchardt's model of the dimensions of social exclusion: consumption (social security, housing, health and settlement support), production (employment, training and job skills and education), political engagement and social interaction (family reunion, cultural and language barriers, harassment and victimisation, geography and travel). This paper covers a number of these aspects.

Another framework of social exclusion which seems of relevance for this paper is that of de Hann and Maxwell (1998, cited in Jones & Smyth 1999) which identifies the three arenas of social exclusion as: rights, resources and relationships. [For further discussion of frameworks of social exclusion see article by Ramburuth and Stanovic in this edition of *Migration Action*].

## **Refugees and poverty in Australia**

While poverty is a debated term, in this paper we are referring to poverty in terms of insufficient resources, primarily income, to provide what is seen as an adequate standard of living. In Australian society low income is a key indicator of poverty. In a society where most income is provided by paid employment, and the social security system is seen as providing a 'safety net', the issues of unemployment and low wages are closely associated with poverty as are the issues of eligibility for and adequacy of social security or welfare payments. In addition to low incomes many refugees face high expenditure, in relationship to both settlement costs and to costs of sponsoring or supporting others.

The majority of refugees arriving in Australia are poor in terms of income and assets. They face many of the same day to day issues as other people living in poverty, but with an underlay of their pre-migration experiences and overlay of additional expenses and of policies which exclude a subset of them from income support and employment assistance.

A quick web search for refugees, poverty and Australia gives a picture of concern about refugees coming to Australia from a background of poverty. More detailed literature searches reveal little recent focus on the experience of poverty by refugees within Australia, apart from some relevant material within the wider literature on immigration.

However submissions to the 2003 Senate Poverty Inquiry (SCARC 2004) emphasised the following as important poverty-related issues for refugees and migrants:

- lack of access to benefits or services for asylum seekers
- issues for TPV holders including poverty as a result of difficulties in finding work without access to services (including lack of access to Newstart Allowance, language and job seeker programs)
- the two-year waiting period for migrants (skilled and family stream) for social security income support payments
- the risk of long-term unemployment for migrants and refugees.

While poverty may have been part of their lives in their countries of origin for some refugees, others have come from educated and economically comfortable backgrounds. The condition of becoming a refugee is likely to be associated with poverty for many, as they leave job, family and friends behind and experience the limbo of refugee camps and then the costs of resettlement. Nonetheless there are numerous stories of resilience. These include some of the post-war refugees who arrived in Australia with only a suitcase in their hand and made good – including those who became very wealthy.

*Income poverty*

The first major studies of poverty in Australia in the late 1960s and early 1970s found higher rates of income poverty among people from a non-English speaking birthplace (NESB) compared with the general population, findings confirmed in the 1980s (Johnson 1991). Rates varied considerably for different birthplace groups, with high rates found both among some refugee groups and some migrant groups. Rates of poverty were generally high for recent arrivals.

Various studies in the early 1990s found refugees were the most disadvantaged of immigrant entrants to Australia, and the most likely to fall below the poverty line (Williams & Batrouney 1998). Studies of communities with large numbers of refugees such as the Indochinese and some African groups showed high levels of unemployment and of use of welfare benefits (Williams & Batrouney 1998). A study of the Kurdish community found 85 per cent surveyed claimed their incomes were inadequate or barely adequate (Batrouney 1995).

Table 1 illustrates the extent of low income for people from key refugee source countries in 2001. It shows that in Australia low income is partly associated with country of birth. People born overseas in the main English-speaking birthplaces have, on average, higher incomes than people born in Australia, while people born in non-English speaking countries have lower incomes on average. This group includes both migrants and refugees. However people from countries which are the source of large numbers of recent refugees show very low incomes: for example, the average weekly income for those born in Somalia was \$258, only 53 per cent of the average weekly income for the population as a whole (\$484).

**Table 1: Weekly individual income by country of birth – 2001 Census Australia**

<i>Country of birth</i>	<i>Average weekly income \$</i>	<i>% of average weekly income for total population</i>
<i>Main birthplace groups</i>		
Australia	491	101.4
Other main English-speaking countries (US, UK, NZ, Ireland South Africa)	549	113.4
Other (most non-English speaking)	420	86.8
<i>Selected birthplaces with high numbers of refugees</i>		
Sudan	345	71.3
Somalia	258	53.3
Iraq	307	64.4
Afghanistan	290	59.9
<b>Total population</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: ABS Census 2001 (commissioned data)

*Employment and low income*

Refugees have higher unemployment rates, lower earning and occupational attainment than other immigrants (Williams & Batrouney 1998). Lack of English, recency of arrival, lack of required skills and non-transferability of qualifications and racism all create barriers to employment. Particular refugee experiences add additional barriers, such as unpreparedness for departure, experience of torture or trauma, disruption to education in refugee camps, grief and loss of loved ones and mental health issues. TPV holders face additional barriers, including lack of access to settlement services, intensive employment assistance and English classes and the temporary nature of their visa, which prevents reunification with immediate family.

Statistics showing employment by immigration visa category are limited. The most recent available Australian Bureau of Statistics figures (ABS 1999, p.8) show an unemployment rate among refugees as 15.8 per cent for the principal applicant and 26.8 for their partners in November 1999 compared to an unemployment rate of 6.7 for the general population (ABS 1999a, p.16).

New refugee arrivals are very vulnerable to long-term unemployment. The DIMIA Longitudinal Study of Immigrants to Australia found major differences in unemployment rates according to visa category (DIMIA 2003a). For example, in its more recent cohort (1999–2000), 6 months after arrival unemployment rates were:

- 8 per cent of the Business Skills migrants
- 22 per cent of the Skilled Australia Sponsored
- 71 per cent of the Humanitarian entrants.

Unemployment rates fell over time, but even 18 months after arrival the rates were:

- nil for the Business Skills migrants
- 6 per cent for the Skilled Australia Sponsored group
- 43 per cent of the Humanitarian entrants.

English language proficiency was crucial with 26 per cent of those (including skilled migrants) who spoke English 'not well' unemployed 18 months after arrival (DIMIA 2003a).

For particular birthplace groups unemployment is very high. For example, in 2001 when the labour force participation rate for the total Australian population aged 15 and over was 63.0 per cent and the unemployment rate was 7.4 per cent, the corresponding rates for Iraq-born people were: labour force participation 45.5 per cent and unemployment 34.2 per cent. For people born in Afghanistan the participation rate was 44.1 per cent and the unemployment rate 28.1 per cent (DIMIA 2004b).

Low wages are another cause of poverty for refugees. If they find work it is often low paid, for similar reasons to their high rates of unemployment (level of English, waiting for recognition of qualifications, no opportunities for local work experience). In rural areas this includes seasonal work such as fruit picking. Asylum seekers with no official work rights may face gross exploitation by unscrupulous employers.

### *Welfare payments*

The Australian social security system is generally seen as providing a 'safety net' for all those who cannot earn sufficient income from employment. However many of those reliant solely on Centrelink social security payments find the payments are inadequate to cover the necessities of life. Reliance on social security payments is itself an indicator of low income. Studies (Taylor & MacDonald 1992, 1994) found NESB families over-represented among those receiving unemployment benefits, disability pensions and sickness allowance. Birthplace groups with high proportions of social security recipients included those with many refugee arrivals (Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Lebanon).

While standard social security payments, such as Newstart Allowance, provide only a very low income, the following people are not entitled to even these:

- migrants and their families in their first two years of settlement
- refugees with TPVs
- asylum seekers [for details see Table 1.1 in Taylor & Stanovic 2004].

Refugees with TPVs (and some recent migrants) in particular hardship are eligible for Special Benefit. This is paid at the same level as Newstart Allowance, but with tighter payment criteria and stricter income testing than other payments. Special Benefit is withdrawn on a dollar for dollar basis for any earned income. Marston (2003) notes some issues of Special Benefit for holders of TPVs: recipients risk being breached (cut off from payment) for failure to meet obligations due to unstable housing, movement to country areas which may be seen as low employment areas, and the need to inform Centrelink of any paid employment. Special Benefit review forms which have to be



returned regularly in order to keep the benefit are available only in English. Marston queries the morality of subjecting people already suffering so much disadvantage to a punitive and penalty driven income support system (a question that could also well be asked of some Centrelink activity tests within the wider Australian community).

Asylum seekers on bridging visas have no access to Centrelink payments, although some (Bridging visa A) have access to the even lower Asylum Seeker Assistance Scheme payment (after waiting 6 months for a decision from DIMIA), but even this is lost if Refugee Review Tribunal decisions are appealed (O’Kane 2003). Asylum seekers who do not lodge a protection claim within 45 days of arrival (a stipulation many do not know about) or who are appealing a decision on their case beyond the Refugee Review Tribunal do not qualify for even this limited income support, employment rights or housing support (Bridging Visa E). The policy of denial of a ‘safety net’ is used as a disincentive for refugees arriving as onshore asylum seekers and for appealing DIMIA decisions.

Migrants coming to Australia (as opposed to refugees and their families) are precluded from most social security support and Austudy for the first two years of residence and are seen as the responsibility of their sponsors. When employment or sponsorship breaks down, the impact of this denial of income support has been described as terrible, with agencies reporting people experiencing major physical and mental health problems; homelessness, workplace exploitation and family breakdown (Mitchell 1998).

### *Expenditure*

While poverty studies often focus on income, a related issue is expenditure. The 1970s Poverty Inquiry (Martin 1975) identified expenditures to which immigrants were particularly subject, including the need to repay debts to relatives and friends for travel money, sending remittances to family members in their home country and the costs of setting up a new household, all in the context of less access to sources of community support and of language barriers to communication. Such costs remain issues for new arrivals including those accepted as refugees (O’Kane 2003). In addition refugees often face large costs involved in sponsoring family members, including travel costs and support on arrival. Airfares may be many thousands of dollars. These are costs not only for individuals but also for the newly emerging refugee communities.

Many asylum seekers not only have no access to Centrelink payments but also have considerable legal costs in Australia. Those not granted asylum may even be charged by the Government for their stay in mandatory detention.

## **Other aspects of social exclusion**

### *Policies of social inclusion*

Over the decades, Australia has had a variety of policy approaches aimed at including immigrants and refugees in Australian society. Over the years these have moved from policies of assimilation and integration to multiculturalism and associated policies for the provision of settlement services for new arrivals.

The post-second world war policy was to ‘assimilate’ refugees into Australian society, with the idea that the ‘New Australians’ would disappear into the general population. This policy was replaced by one of ‘integration’ (1964–73) in which immigrant groups become part of society without necessarily losing their separate identity. A new policy of multiculturalism commenced around 1973 including notions of maintaining cultural identity and celebrating diversity within the Australian context. At the same time the longstanding ‘White Australia’ policy was dismantled (Williams & Batrouney 1998).

The Howard Government in 1996 initially moved away from a focus on multiculturalism. The initial aim was to reduce overall immigrant intake (although this has increased again in more recent years) and to reduce the welfare costs of the program (Betts 2003). This involved increased

emphasis on skilled migrants and a decrease on family reunions. However some commitment to multiculturalism remains, as is evidenced in the recent statement:

Australian multiculturalism means that as a nation we recognise, accept, respect and celebrate our cultural diversity. It is about and for all Australians and embraces the heritage of Indigenous Australians, early European settlement, our Australian-grown customs and those of the diverse range of migrants now coming to this country. Multiculturalism is inclusive and therefore a unifying force in our developing nationhood and evolving identity. (DIMIA 2004a)

[Multiculturalism is discussed further elsewhere in this issue]

### *Settlement policies and services*

Refugees frequently have acute settlement problems on arrival because of lack of resources and of family support (Jupp 2003). The Australian Government provides a range of settlement services to address these [see Table 1.1 in Taylor & Stanovic 2004]. The overall objective is that 'services assist migrants to participate equitably in Australian society as soon as possible' (DIMIA 2003b, p.1). The Government recognises the special needs of refugees in settlement by providing services under the Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy (IHSS), including torture and trauma counselling, for recent arrivals. However refugees granted TPVs have been denied much of this support.

What constitutes successful settlement? The DIMIA Longitudinal Study used as indicators of settlement: levels of unemployment, workforce participation, receiving earned income, level of income, residing in public housing, physical and mental health (DIMIA 2003b). The findings show outcomes for Humanitarian entrants (including refugees) were poorer than for other migrants and that their outcomes worsened over the 1990s, including lower levels of income and employment, and increased health problems and psychological distress. The DIMIA review (2003b) suggests this reflects differences in countries of origin. However an alternative explanation of the data could be the decreased availability of post-arrival services.

While at some stages Australia's settlement services were seen as leading international practice for migrants including refugees, they have been reduced and refocused since the early 1990s, for example with the selling off of the migrant hostels that provided on-arrival accommodation and associated services, the limitations of access to English language programs, introduction of fees for some formerly free English classes and cost recovery for interpreting services. In 1993 the Labor government denied access to unemployment and sickness benefit to newly arrived immigrants (excluding refugees) for their first 6 months in Australia and this was extended to two years by the Howard Government. The 1993 changes also saw English classes limited to 510 hours per person for newly arrived immigrants (previously AMEP had provided tuition for both newly arrived and longer term immigrants without restrictions on time) (Rebikoff 1993). [The limitation of 510 hours of federally funded English tuition within the first five years is currently being relaxed to some extent for refugees who are entitled to it.]

Batrouney (1998) notes that the effects of economic rationalism with a focus on smaller government, user fees and cost recovery have been seen to lead to a less generous and welcoming immigration policy. Subsequently a 'bureaucratic rationalism' has led to increasingly tighter bureaucratic controls on refugees and increasing numbers of bureaucratic justifications for excluding people.

Under the Howard Government, DIMIA has evolved from an organisation providing direct services to one managing the delivery of services by other departments and non-government agencies. The appropriateness of competitive contracts in this context has been questioned (Wong 2003). The focus of these services has increasingly been on recent arrivals.

A extensive review of settlement services (DIMIA 2003b) has advocated for targeting DIMIA settlement services to:

- permanent residents who have arrived in the previous five years as Humanitarian entrants and family stream migrants with low English proficiency
- communities which are receiving significant numbers of new arrivals
- small and emerging communities
- those in regional areas.

While the above groups all have special needs, there is a question of what other refugees with special needs are excluded from the services, for example, TPV holders and longer term refugees.

There have been longstanding policy debates about which services are best provided by services targeted to immigrants (and refugees) and which should be supplied by 'mainstream' services. The DIMIA Review continues to emphasise the importance of mainstream services. However, this assumes adequate resources in terms of interpreters, translations, bilingual staff and cultural understanding which have not been fully evident to date, a particular issue for new and emerging communities.

#### **Settlement services**

Current settlement services funded by the Federal Government through DIMIA include:  
*Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy (IHSS)*

- Services funded under the Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy (IHSS) – provide intensive initial assistance to newly arrived humanitarian entrants (see Table 1.1 in Taylor & Stanovic 2004). The services are delivered through a national network of contractors with assistance from volunteers under the Community Support for Refugees service. IHSS support is normally provided for the first 6 months.

*Longer term settlement services* (for migrants and humanitarian entrants)

- Migrant Resource Centres (MRCs) and Migrant Service Agencies (MSAs)
- The Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) – provides up to 510 hours of English with an additional 100 hours for some refugees
- The Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS) – provides some translation and telephone and on-site interpreting, some free and some user-pays
- The Community Settlement Services Scheme (CSSS) – grants for community organisations and local government to provide information and referral services and 'facilitate community capacity building'.

#### *Outcomes of policies of exclusion*

I don't have Medicare and I am very troubled by health. In January I was very depressed and collapsed while I was crossing the road, and people on the road took me to the hospital and there they gave me saline and a lot of tests ... The hospital sent a bill for \$636 and \$107 for the ambulance. (an asylum seeker from the Middle East, Brotherhood of St Laurence 2002, p.7)

While settlement policies are, in theory, about how to include refugees and migrants into Australian society, there are a range of people excluded both from various settlement services and from mainstream services. Recent research indicates that the outcomes of the current policies for refugees on TPVs and asylum seekers include major mental health problems.

'*The politics of exclusion and denial*' is the title of a recent study of the mental health of asylum seekers in detention centres and on refugees with TPVs (Steel 2003). Steel studied 10 families from one ethnic group in detention centres. They had been in detention for two years. All 19 children reported finding the following 'most distressing': seeing people self harm and make suicide attempts, boredom, isolation and poor food. The study showed a marked increase in psychiatric conditions among both adults and children from the period before detention, in spite of the high level of trauma they were fleeing. All adults were diagnosed with a major depressive disorder and

most with post-traumatic stress disorder. All children had at least one psychiatric disorder and most had multiple disorders.

A related study compared 76 TPV holders with refugees and migrants granted permanent residency from the same ethnic group (Steel 2003). It found that the TPV holders had experienced even greater trauma prior to arrival than other refugees. However, even after controlling for this, they experienced twice the risk of post-traumatic stress disorder as the permanent residents. The temporary nature of the protection status is seen as maintaining the post-traumatic stress reactions and keeping refugees in a state of chronic anticipatory stress. Steel also notes the irony that the current policies led to the more traumatised being more likely to be detained and be given only temporary protection. Taylor (2003) argues that TPVs are not meaningful protection and that the psychosocial harm which temporary status inflicts may in some cases amount to 'cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment' under the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights.

Mansouri & Bagdas (2002) entitled their study of refugees *The politics of social exclusion*. This qualitative study of 15 TPV holders in Victoria and the service providers working with them, emphasises the way TPV holders are excluded in comparison with refugees with Permanent Protection Visas. It also presents accounts of their imprisonment, torture and fear of death in the countries they fled, fearful contact with people smugglers and boat trips, the experience of detention and then (once formally recognised as refugees) their attempts to settle while excluded from assistance with language, social security support, employment services, housing services and very importantly any ability to bring family to Australia or even to visit them.

Other recent studies of the experiences of refugees with TPVs do not necessarily focus explicitly on social exclusion but detail various difficulties of their situations, including a Queensland Government study (Mann 2001 cited in Marston 2003), and Victorian studies by the Victorian Arabic Social Services/Deakin University (Mansouri & Bagdas 2003) and by the Centre of Applied Social Research (Marston 2003; 2003a).

Recent research exploring the situations of young refugees and asylum seekers include : a study of 76 young people examining the continuity of their refugee experience and well being (Brough et al. 2003); and a study of 44 young people seeking asylum in Melbourne (Hazara, Kurdish and Timorese groups) (Mohamed 2003). A study of East Timorese in Sydney (Wise 2003) highlighted the ambivalence of identity based on a desire to return 'home'. The effects of life in detention centres on children and young people is shown in the high incidence of self-harm (WYPIN 2002).

A study of some 225 asylum seekers associated with the Asylum Seeker Project at Melbourne's Hotham Mission identified that overwhelming issues presented by the asylum seekers were a direct result of lack of income, stemming from the denial of work and welfare rights (Mitchell & Kirsner 2003). Lack of income was associated with debt, homelessness, health and nutrition problems, isolation and depression. (It is noted that in response and out of necessity, charities, churches and asylum seeker centres have organised Asylum Seeker Health Networks.)

The impact of restrictions on family reunion is suffered particularly by women. For example, McMichael & Ahmed (2003) studied 42 Somali women in Melbourne, all refugees and all Muslim but with diverse backgrounds, from having lived as nomads to educated city dwellers. They found family separations were a primary source of sadness and anxiety for these women. The women's loneliness and depression centred around a lack of feeling of belonging. This research emphasises that the impact and vicissitudes of family separation need acknowledgment and assistance in resettlement but also in immigration family reunion policy.

Some specific aspects of social exclusion are outlined below.

### *Employment and social exclusion*

Unemployment is a terrible thing. It's better to work. First of all to feel as if you are part of the community, you want to contribute to the community. (Saed from Iraq, in Brotherhood of St Laurence 2002, p.6)

Lack of employment is often seen as a key factor in social exclusion. Some barriers to employment for refugees have been outlined above in relation to poverty including level of English, appropriate skills and qualifications and racism. Lack of networks is another difficulty for newly arrived people finding employment.

Employment for TPV holders is made difficult by the temporary nature of their visa. They (and also newly arrived skilled immigrants in their first two years) are also denied access to Commonwealth Government intensive assistance in finding employment although there are some state initiatives that include TPV holders. However even those refugees with full eligibility to mainstream services may not receive the special attention they need. Job Network providers have the capacity to refer selected refugees to a Migrant Liaison Officer or occupational psychologist. Some specialised services include JPET which assists disadvantaged 15–21 year olds and has a specialist Refugee Pathways Project. The ‘Given the Chance’ pilot program run by the Brotherhood’s Ecumenical Migration Centre in Melbourne, a new non-government pilot program designed to assist refugees into employment with the help of a mentor, is proving successful but needs to be replicated (see Hannan 2004).

### *Language and social exclusion*

I’ve had no English classes ... It is very uncomfortable because I can’t say what I want and when you go to a different country and you can’t speak it makes you feel bad, very bad, very uncomfortable, like you are more down than the other people. (Nina from Eastern Europe, Brotherhood of St Laurence 2002, p. 7)

Without English proficiency, refugees are readily excluded from many aspects of life, including employment, education, access to services and social interaction. The DIMIA Longitudinal Study of immigrants found that English language skill was an important predictor of being employed across all visa groups (Economic Development Council 2002, p.108). Again access to English classes (AMEP) and to translating and interpreting services (TIS) are provided to some refugees (newly arrived Humanitarian entrants) but are withheld from others (TPV holders).

The lack of interpreters is a particular issue for new communities of refugees. The expectation that mainstream services will and can provide interpreting services is often not met.

### *Racism, discrimination and social exclusion*

There is always racism and discrimination for being what I am – an Asian. I get it at school and on public transport. (young SE Asian, Frederico et al 1998, p.35)

Australia commenced its nationhood with the notorious White Australia immigration policy which lasted until the early 1970s. While the officially sanctioned explicit racist policy ended at that time, racism has continued to be apparent in the public discourse. Anti-Asian sentiments of the 1980s and 1990s were replaced or overlaid to some extent by anti-Muslim (non-European) rhetoric and action after the September 11 2001 terrorist attacks on the US and in Bali in 2002.

Racism continues to be an issue of disquiet for some refugee families of Asian background in the Brotherhood’s Life Chances Study, with some parents and their Australian-born children reporting racism in schools (Taylor & Fraser 2003). Racism, including at school, was an issue for young refugees who experienced depression (Brough et al. 2003). That study found racist violence was particularly catastrophic for those who had escaped violence in their past.

Recent refugees and asylum seekers from Afghanistan and Iraq escaping persecution and war have had the added indignity of being associated in the media with terrorists (Mansouri & Bagdas 2002).

### *Location and social exclusion*

The consideration of location of refugees and social exclusion raises the issues of choice of location, of refugees being encouraged to go to rural areas and the wider community's concern about ethnic concentration of particular groups. This is a topic for further research.

Currently the large majority of refugees settle in metropolitan areas. However current policies for both skilled migrants and refugees encourage increased settlement in regional areas. The DIMIA Review of Settlement Services recommends, 'where appropriate', directing refugees to parts of regional Australia in order to address the demand for less skilled labour in regional economies and to assist humanitarian entrants to achieve early employment (DIMIA 2003b, p.9). There have been proposals that up to 45 per cent of new arrivals should be located in regional areas (Withers and Powell cited in Birrell 2003).

A few studies have referred to the issues of refugees in rural areas. Stilwell has carried out an economic analysis of Afghan refugees in Young, NSW (2003), showing considerable economic benefit to the region. In Victoria since 1996 the Goulburn Valley area including Shepparton and Cobram has been the site of settlement of a number of Arabic-speaking migrants and refugees, mainly from Iraq and more recently a number of TPV holders have moved into these communities (Marston 2002). The Building Links Project, undertaken in the Goulburn Valley in 2000–01, sought a strategy for positive settlement in the longer term for the Arabic community (Centrelink 2002).

The issue of concentration in particular urban areas is raised by Carroll (2003) who found 82 per cent of Vietnamese born in Sydney live in 'core areas'. While such concentrations have raised disquiet from some Australians, they have enabled refugees to live in communities where they are comfortable in terms of familiar language and services, when they may feel excluded elsewhere.

### *Housing*

Housing is a key factor in enabling settlement. The need for housing assistance particularly for vulnerable refugee women has been emphasised by various studies (Dunbar 1994; Pittaway 1991). Large refugee families and single people have the most difficulty in finding long-term housing (DIMIA 2003c).

Federal Budget announcements in May 2004 included increased housing assistance for those under the Refugee stream while proposers are expected to provide accommodation for others under the Special Humanitarian Program. TPV holders receive no Federal Government housing assistance for settlement although they can receive state assistance with transitional housing.

Foley & Beer (2003) review the literature on housing needs for refugees in Australia using an explicit framework of social exclusion and are undertaking research into the housing pathways of different categories of refugees (Refugee Program, Special Humanitarian Program entrants and those with TPVs) in Adelaide, Brisbane and Perth. In addition to financial barriers, they identify discrimination, cultural barriers, lack of suitable housing and lack of familiarity with the Australian housing and legal systems as problems.

### *Education*

Education is often seen by refugees as the key to their future settlement and to their or their children's inclusion in the host society. Refugee parents often lack knowledge of the educational system, and young people face pressure to leave school to contribute financially to family and relatives overseas. The Economic Development Council inquiry (2002) also reported lack of educational support for newly arrived young refugees in mainstream schools, lack of access to Adult Migrant Education Services for those under 18, and the impacts of pre-arrival trauma on school performance. Refugees who are TPV holders are often precluded from tertiary education and training because they are required by the Federal Government to pay international student fees up front and are not eligible for HECS. However, some State governments have attempted to

ameliorate the situation by charging local student fees to TPV holders wanting to access TAFE and a few universities have offered to waive fees for TPV holders either systematically or on an individual basis.

#### **Recent Federal Government initiatives**

In the May 2004 Federal Budget, the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs announced an additional \$267.6 million over 4 years to Australian Government agencies to deliver an increased humanitarian program and to expand settlement services. This will be divided between DIMIA and other departments: Family and Community Services (\$13.2m) and Employment Services and Training (\$4.1m). DIMIA allocations include:

- \$71m over 4 years to cover costs associated with the delivery of a larger humanitarian program;
- resources to meet the costs of pre-departure medical checks;
- \$2.5m base for a no-interest loan scheme for SHP airfares;
- increased accommodation assistance for SHP entrants;
- enhanced assistance for linking entrants to mainstream services;
- increased funding to allow young (16–24) humanitarian entrants to be offered up to 400 hours of English tuition, and supplementary instruction for those over 24 years of age;
- funding for an additional 1,300 places within the Language, Literacy and Numeracy Program;
- an additional \$4.9m over 4 years for the Community Settlement Services Scheme;
- funding for the creation of 10 new service outlets to provide Reconnect and JPET services to newly arrived young people;
- \$5.2m over 4 years for the Family Relationships Program;
- \$11.6m over 4 years to expand existing services to established communities with aged care needs;
- \$12.4m over 4 years to improve settlement services in regional areas.

*Prepared by Refugee Council of Australia (RCOA) 2004*

## **Discussion and conclusions**

From Australia's history of accepting refugees and from a glance at the global situation it is clear that refugees will continue to be an important issue for Australia and one that has elements of unpredictability in terms of numbers and sources of refugees. It is essential to learn from our past and current experiences with refugees to inform our ability to respond appropriately in the future. Reviewing the literature outlined above points to a range of issues to be addressed if refugees are to be able to settle as fully included members of Australian society.

### *Refugees, poverty and social exclusion*

While earlier research tended to include refugees within the wider category of migrant instead of looking at their special needs, much of the recent research tends to focus on the inequities of the treatment of TPV holders and asylum seekers and there is little that addresses the issues of refugees with permanent visas.

Strong themes from reviewing the research literature on refugees include the pre-migration experience of torture or trauma, the stresses of settlement, the importance of family reunion, the restriction on participation for various visa categories, and the experience of racism or discrimination.

The Brotherhood's work for an Australia free of poverty is being conceptualised within a social exclusion framework. The degree to which social exclusion frameworks capture the refugee experience is discussed by Ramburuth and Stanovic in this edition of *Migration Action*.

Poverty in terms of inadequate income can be seen as a key aspect of social exclusion, both as cause and effect. The literature reviewed shows newly arrived refugees are very likely to experience income poverty associated with high unemployment, low wages and limited social security payments. Most long-term residents who have to rely solely on social security payments

struggle to make ends meet, yet some categories of refugees (TPV holders, and also skilled migrants in their first two years) have access, at most, only to Special Benefit, with its harsher income tests. Asylum seekers have access to even less. This income poverty is exacerbated by high costs of settlement (rental bonds, furniture etc); various immigration debts, whether to pay people smugglers, legal costs or air transport costs for family reunion; loss of income during uprooting; and for support of relatives overseas.

Those at considerable risk of poverty include:

- all recently arrived refugees (and some newly arrived skilled migrants)
- some long-term refugees, especially those with limited English and low levels of skills.

Those with very high risk of poverty include:

- TPV holders and
- asylum seekers.

Other aspects of social exclusion of particular prominence for refugees include:

- physical exclusion (from Australia or in mandatory detention – for asylum seekers before they have been recognised as refugees)
- lack of citizenship rights (hence vulnerability to deportation)
- language barriers
- racism
- visa categories that exclude some groups from services seen as essential for others with similar needs.

Some of these aspects of social exclusion are also experienced by newly arrived migrants as well as refugees and some by some long-term residents including the Aboriginal population.

Family reunion is a central issue for many refugees, although one which perhaps fits less readily in some exclusion frameworks. However a refugee who is not allowed to bring to Australia close family members who are in danger in another country will never feel fully included in this society.

Refugees of course are also subject to standard indicators of social exclusion such as lack of participation in employment, education and social networks. Social networks warrant further exploration as an aspect of the complexity of inclusion or exclusion. For example, a refugee group may form a tight-knit community with little social contact with the wider host society.

### *Settlement and other policies – preventing (or producing) poverty and social exclusion for refugees?*

Settlement policies from assimilation and integration to multiculturalism can be seen as promoting different aspects of social inclusion within Australian society. DIMIA's settlement programs consciously aim to promote social inclusion for refugees and humanitarian entrants by providing initial assistance including accommodation and language classes. The effectiveness of these programs is another issue and the DIMIA Longitudinal Study indicated that there is room for improvement of outcomes.

However, some categories of refugees (in particular TPV holders) are explicitly denied access to settlement assistance and other standard benefits. These policies are clearly those of social exclusion as attested by the number of reports on the situations of these refugees with titles such as *The politics of social exclusion* (Mansouri & Bagdas 2002) and *The politics of exclusion and denial* (Steel 2003).

### *A research agenda*

DIMIA's (2003b) recent review of settlement services recommends that further research be undertaken on:



- the settlement experiences of newly arrived humanitarian entrants against the indicators for successful settlement
- further research around English as a second language (ESL) eligibility and take-up
- research on longer term settlement outcomes of refugees.

This paper confirms the relevance of further research on these topics and suggests that a social exclusion framework could prove valuable in this.

### *Conclusions*

To return to the framework of social exclusion introduced above (de Hann & Maxwell 1998, in Jones & Smyth 1999) which identifies rights, resources and relationships as three arenas of social exclusion, this review of the refugee literature confirms the relevance of these arenas as ways of considering the experience of refugees in Australia. These highlight:

*Rights:* the selective and deliberate policies of social exclusion in terms of the lack of rights of some refugees and asylum seekers to federally funded settlement support, family reunion, employment and, for some asylum seekers, even basic income. Mandatory detention can also be seen as a deprivation of human rights.

*Resources:* the continuing evidence of high rates of income poverty for recent refugees associated with inadequate income support, high unemployment or low wage work and with high expenditure. Many refugees are arriving as part of new and emerging communities characterised by lack of resources. For those with limited English and education, social exclusion because of lack of resources may continue for many years.

*Relationships:* two very different aspects of relationships are identified as key factors in the exclusion or inclusion of refugees in Australia – the negative impact of the experience of racism and victimisation and the positive impacts of family reunion in enabling refugees to settle.

Among many challenges, two priorities emerge from the research:

Australia needs to be able to make much more rapid decisions about whom to include and whom to exclude. This is essential to remove the devastating mental health effects of years of waiting for decisions (either imprisoned in detention centres or with no rights in the community) so that those seeking asylum are able to progress their lives. Similarly the temporary nature of some protection visas should be urgently reviewed to prevent ‘chronic anticipatory stress’ blighting the lives of many with TPVs.

Secondly, for Australia to be an inclusive society it is necessary to recognise the communication needs of refugees and to be generous in resourcing these. Refugees need accessible and affordable English tuition and interpreting and translation services to enable employment, education, use of services and social contact.

Meeting the challenges of providing a society which can be inclusive of refugees remains a central task in working towards an Australia free of poverty.

### **Note:**

Janet Taylor is the Research Coordinator at the Brotherhood of St Laurence, Melbourne. She first undertook research with the EMC in the 1970s and with the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs in the 1980s, and her publications include *Children of immigrants: Issues of poverty and disadvantage* (1992). Her current projects include the longitudinal Life Chances of Children Study and a study of refugee settlement in regional Victoria.

*A short-term study of regional settlement and social inclusion is underway looking at the pros and cons of settlement in regional Australia for refugees. This considers two refugee groups, the Iraqis and Sudanese and issues of their settlement in selected areas of regional Victoria. It is planned to publish the results in the next edition of Migration Action. For further information contact the author, Janet Taylor.*

### Abbreviations and acronyms

ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
DIMIA	Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs
EMC	Ecumenical Migration Centre
IHSS	Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy
TPV	Temporary Protection Visa
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

### References

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 1999 *Labour force status and other characteristics of migrants*, Australia, cat. no. 6250.0, Canberra, viewed 22 Jan 2004, <<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats>>.

Batrouney, T 1995, *Kurdish immigration and settlement in Australia*, Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research, AGPS, Canberra.

Batrouney, T 1998, 'Australia's immigration policies: a loss of consensus', *NIRA Review*, Winter, National Institute for Research Advancement, Tokyo, pp.11–15.

Betts, K 2003, Immigration policy under the Howard Government, *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, vol.38, no.2, pp.169–192.

Birrell, B 2003, 'Redistributing migrants: the Labor agenda', *People and Place*, vol.11, no.4, pp.15–26

Brotherhood of St Laurence, 2002, 'Seeking asylum: living with fear, uncertainty and exclusion', *Changing Pressures*, no.11, November, Brotherhood of St Laurence, Melbourne.

Brotherhood of St Laurence, 2004, 'Seeing clearly: access to affordable eye care for low-income Victorians', *Changing Pressures*, no. 13, June, Brotherhood of St Laurence, Melbourne.

Brough, M, Gorman, D, Ramirez, E & Westoby, P 2003, Young refugees talk about well-being, *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, vol.38, no.2, pp.193–208.

Carroll, L 2003, 'Mobility of the Vietnamese-born in Sydney: a re-assessment after the 2001 census', *People and Place*, vol 11, no. 2, pp.50–64.

Centrelink 2002, *Building links report: exploring multicultural settlement in the Goulburn Valley*, Building Links Reference Group, Commonwealth of Australia (no place of publication given).

Crisp, J 2003 A new asylum paradigm? Globalisation, migration, and the uncertain future of the international refugee regime. Working Paper no. 100, UNHRC, viewed 20 January 2004, <<http://www.unhcr.ch>>.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) 2003, Fact sheet 4 More than fifty years of post-war migration, viewed 20 Jan 2004 <<http://www.immi.gov.au>>

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) 2003a, Fact sheet 14 Migrant labour market outcomes, viewed 20 January 2004, <<http://www.immi.gov.au>>.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) 2003b, *Report of the Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants*, May, DIMIA, Canberra..

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) 2003c, *Australia's support for Humanitarian Entrants*, November, DIMIA, Canberra. viewed 22 April 2004 <[www.immi.gov.au/search\\_for/publications/ashe.pdf](http://www.immi.gov.au/search_for/publications/ashe.pdf)>

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) 2004, Fact sheet 60 Australia's refugee and humanitarian program, viewed 20 January 2004, <<http://www.immi.gov.au>>.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) 2004a, What is Australian multiculturalism? (one page information sheet).

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) 2004b, 'Community Information Summary', viewed 23 August 2004, <<http://www.immi.gov.au/statistics/infosummary/textversion/afghanistan.htm>>.

Dunbar, S 1994, *Housing a refugee women research report*, Springvale Community Aid and Advice Bureau, Melbourne.

Economic Development Committee 2002, *Inquiry into the incidence of youth unemployment in Victoria*, Parliament of Victoria, Government Printer for the State of Victoria.

- Foley, P & Beer, A 2003, *Housing need and provision for recently arrived refugees in Australia*, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, viewed 7 January 2004, <[http://www.ahuri.edu.au/attachments/40048\\_pp\\_refugees.pdf](http://www.ahuri.edu.au/attachments/40048_pp_refugees.pdf)>.
- Frederico, M Cooper, B & Picton, C 1998, 'Poverty and homelessness among young people from Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam', *Migration Action*, vol.20, no.3, pp.33–6.
- Hannan, A 2004, 'The place of targeted labour market programs for refugees', *Migration Action*, vol.24, no.1, pp.26–32.
- Jayasuriya, L, Sang, D & Fielding, A 1992, *Ethnicity, immigration and mental illness: a critical review of Australian research*, Bureau of Immigration Research, AGPS, Canberra.
- Johnson, D 1991, *The measurement and extent of poverty among immigrants*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Johnson, J 2000, *The invisible Australians: community understandings of poverty*, Brotherhood of St Laurence, Melbourne.
- Jones, R & McAllister, I 1991, *Migrant unemployment and labour market programs*, Bureau of Immigration Research, AGPS, Canberra.
- Jupp, J, McRobbie, A & York, B 1991, *Settlement needs of small newly arrived ethnic groups*, Bureau of Immigration Research, AGPS, Canberra.
- Jupp, J 2003, There has to be a better way: a long-term refugee strategy, *Arena*, no 65, Blue book no. 5, pp.BB1–BB12.
- Kunz, E 1971, 'Refugees and Eastern Europeans in Australia', in C Price (ed), *Australian immigration: a bibliography and digest*, no.2 (1970), Australian National University, Canberra.
- Leach, M & Mansouri, F (eds) 2003, *Critical perspectives on refugee policy in Australia*, proceedings of the Refugee Rights Symposium, 5 December 2002, Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University, Geelong.
- MacDonald, H 1993, *Write me in: literacy barriers to women's employment and job promotion*, Women's Bureau, Department of Employment, Education and Training, AGPS, Canberra.
- Mansouri, F & Bagdas, M 2002, *Politics of social exclusion: refugees on Temporary Protection Visa in Victoria*, Deakin University, Geelong.
- Marston, G 2003, 'The not-so-Special Benefit and non-Mutual Obligation' in M Leach, M & F Mansouri (eds), *Critical perspectives on refugee policy in Australia*, proceedings of the Refugee Rights Symposium, 5 December 2002, Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University, Geelong.
- Marston, G 2003a, *Temporary protection, permanent uncertainty: the experience of refugees living on temporary protection visas*, Centre for Applied Social Research, RMIT University, Melbourne
- Martin, J 1965, *Refugee settlers*, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Martin, J 1975, 'The economic condition of migrants', in Commission of Inquiry into Poverty, *Welfare of Migrants*, Research Report, AGPS, Canberra.
- McMichael, C & Ahmed, M 2003, 'Family separation: Somali women in Melbourne', in M Leach, M & F Mansouri (eds), *Critical perspectives on refugee policy in Australia*, proceedings of the Refugee Rights Symposium, 5 December 2002, Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University, Geelong.
- Mitchell, G & Kirsner, S 2003, 'Welfare issues and immigration outcomes: asylum seekers living in Australia on Bridging Visa E', *Migration Action*, vol.25, no.3, pp.20–24.
- Mitchell, M 1998, 'The two year waiting period for newly arrived migrants', *Migration Action*, vol.20, no.3, pp.8–10.
- Mohamed, S 2003, 'All I ask for is protection: young people seeking asylum in Australia' in M Leach, M & F Mansouri (eds), *Critical perspectives on refugee policy in Australia*, proceedings of the Refugee Rights Symposium, 5 December 2002, Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University, Geelong.
- O'Kane, M 2003, *Refugee and asylum seeker issues in Australia*, Ecumenical Migration Centre, Brotherhood of St Laurence, Fitzroy, Vic.
- Pittaway, E 1991, *Refugee women – still at risk in Australia*, Bureau of Immigration Research, AGPS, Canberra.
- Rebikoff, V 1993, 'The federal election and Australia's ethnic communities', *Migration Action*, vol.XV, no.1, pp.20–3.

Refugee Council of Australia (RCOA) 2003, Asylum Statistics, viewed 20 January 2004, <[http://www.refugeecouncil.org.au/html/facts\\_and\\_stats/stats.html](http://www.refugeecouncil.org.au/html/facts_and_stats/stats.html)>.

Refugee Council of Australia (RCOA) 2004, *2004–2005 Federal Budget summary of refugee related issues*, RCOA, Sydney (unpublished).

Senate Community Affairs References Committee (SCARC) 2004, *A hand up not a hand out: renewing the fight against poverty*, Report on poverty and financial hardship, SCARC, Canberra.

Steel, S 2003, 'The politics of exclusion and denial: the mental health costs of Australia's refugee policy', paper presented at the 38<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, 12–15 May, Hobart.

Stilwell, F 2003, 'The economic impact of Afghan refugees in Young, NSW', Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Sydney, NSW

Taylor, J 1995, *Employment barriers for second generation young people of non-English speaking background*, Report to the Victorian Department of Business and Employment.

Taylor, J & MacDonald, H 1992, *Children of immigrants: issues of poverty and disadvantage*, Bureau of Immigration Research, AGPS, Canberra.

Taylor, J & MacDonald, H 1994, *Disadvantage and children of immigrants: a longitudinal study*, Bureau of Immigration and Population Research, AGPS, Canberra.

Taylor, J & Fraser, A 2003, *Eleven plus: life chances and family income*, Brotherhood of St Laurence, Melbourne.

Taylor, J & Stanovic, D 2004, 'Services and entitlements: Refugees, migrants and asylum seekers', *Migration Action*, vol.XXVI, no.2.

Taylor, S 2003, 'The importance of permanence in the (meaningful) protection of refugees', paper presented at 28<sup>th</sup> International Congress on Law and Mental Health, 2 October.

UNHCR 2003, *Refugees by numbers 2003*, Publications, viewed 20 January 2004, <<http://www.unhcr.ch>>

UNHCR 2004, *Basic facts, Who is a refugee?*, viewed 20 January 2004, <<http://www.unhcr.ch>>.

Vanstone, A 2004, Border control pays: Australia to accept more refugees, Media Release 23 March, Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, Canberra.

Webster, A 2003, Who are Victoria's new and emerging communities? Unpublished paper, Ecumenical Migration Centre, Melbourne.

Western Young People's Independent Network (WYPIN) & Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace Melbourne, *'Damaging kids': Children in DIMIA Detention Centres*, CCJDP Occasional Paper no. 12, Melbourne.

White, M 2004, Asylum policy in the UK and Australia: a pathway to social exclusion?, *Migration Action*, vol.XXIV, no.1, pp 4–14.

Williams, L & Batrouney T 1998, 'Immigrants and poverty' in R Fincher & J Nieuwenhuysen (eds), *Australian poverty then and now*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.

Wise, A 2003, 'Embodying exile: protest, performance, trauma and effect in the formation of East Timorese refugee identities', in M Leach, M & F Mansouri (eds), *Critical perspectives on refugee policy in Australia*, proceedings of the Refugee Rights Symposium, 5 December 2002, Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University, Geelong.

Wong, L 2003, 'Immigrants, the contract state and rights', *Just Policy*, no.29, pp.47–56.