

SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION OF IMMIGRANTS IN AUSTRALIA

Siew-Ean Khoo and Jeromey Temple
Australian Demographic and Social Research Institute
The Australian National University

Paper for presentation at the session on Integration Processes of Migrants, European Population Conference, Barcelona, 11 July 2008

Introduction

Immigrants' participation in social and community groups and activities has the potential to contribute to developing friendships and a shared sense of community between migrants and local residents, thereby contributing to their social integration and social cohesion in multicultural societies. The concept of social cohesion derives from the work of Durkhiem and has been defined as "the interdependence between members of a society, shared loyalties, and solidarity" (according to Jenson 1998 as quoted in Berger-Schmitt 2000: 3). It has been suggested that social cohesion is a characteristic and an important element in the building of strong communities (Stone and Hughes 2002). In a recent paper, European sociologist Regina Berger-Schmitt (2000) has referred to various descriptions of social cohesion as reflecting the strength of social relations, shared values and a sense of common identity and belonging to the same community. Recent conceptualization about social cohesion in western societies suggests that social cohesion can be considered to have five dimensions: *belonging* – shared values, identity, commitment; *inclusion* – equal opportunities for access; *participation* – engagement in structures and systems; *recognition* – respect and tolerance; and *legitimacy* – pluralism (Berger-Schmitt and Noll 2000; Berger-Schmitt 2000). Participation in social and community groups and activities by people of different ethnic backgrounds can contribute to some of these dimensions of social cohesion.

As a country of immigration and one of the traditional settler societies, Australia has one of the highest percentages of foreign-born residents, with the 2006 census showing that 22 per cent of the population was born overseas, coming from some 240 different countries, and another 18 per cent were Australian-born with at least one overseas-born parent (the second generation). With such a diverse immigrant population, there is much interest among policy makers and in the community in promoting social inclusion and social cohesion. Successful settlement of immigrants is an important issue and government assistance is provided to new immigrants in learning English so they can participate fully in social and economic activities in the community.

There have been many studies and a vast literature showing the importance of English language proficiency, level of education and occupational skills on the economic participation of immigrants in Australia (eg. Chiswick and Miller 2002; Richardson et al. 2001; Vandenheuvel and Wooden 1999; 2000; Williams et al. 1997; Wooden 1994). However, there has been little research on immigrants' social participation because of the unavailability of data on measures of social participation. A recent paper has looked at the participation in community activities of recently arrived immigrants by level of education (Khoo 2007). This has shown that more educated immigrants are more likely to engage with their local community than less educated migrants. Migrants with post-school qualifications were more likely to attend activities organized by their local school and community while those with lower education seemed more likely to isolate themselves from their local community. The paper did not compare immigrants with native-born Australians because the data were collected in a survey of only recently arrived migrants.

In 2006 the General Social Survey collected nationally representative data on social and community involvement of immigrants and the Australian-born population, enabling a comparison of these two population groups. This paper is based on this new dataset and examines immigrants' social and community participation in a range of social and community activities and in comparison with the Australian-born adult population. The

implications of the findings in relation to the various dimensions of social cohesion and the social integration of immigrants in Australian society are discussed.

Data and method

The 2006 General Social Survey (GSS) was conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). It collected information from 13,375 households throughout Australia. Information was obtained from one person aged 18 years and over in each household, selected randomly. Interviews were conducted by experienced ABS interviewers. Bilingual interviewers were used where the respondent might have difficulty with the English language. The response rate was 86.5 per cent of households contacted.

The information collected from each person interviewed included their active involvement with a range of social and community groups and their participation in civic and community activities. These questions on social and community participation were part of a series of questions designed to measure social capital, defined as “networks, together with shared norms, values and understandings which facilitate cooperation within and among groups” (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2007: 7). The questions included whether the person had attended a community event in the last 6 months and whether he/she had been actively involved in the last 12 months in (1) social or support groups such as sports and recreation, arts and crafts, religious or ethnic groups; (2) community groups such as service clubs, welfare organizations, emergency services, parenting and health support groups; and (3) civic organizations such as trade union, professional organization, political party, human rights group, environmental or animal welfare group or tenants association. Information was also collected for the first time in a social survey on the migration visa category of all immigrants who arrived after 1985.

The paper is based on a slightly reduced sample of 13,342 respondents for whom data on birthplace or migrant status are available. Of these, 9,947 were native-born Australians and 3,395 were foreign-born. Multivariate logistic regression analysis is used to compare immigrants’ social and community participation by their visa category and other characteristics such as sex, marital status, level of education, English proficiency,

location of residence, and also to compare immigrants with native-born Australians, controlling for factors such as age, presence of dependent children at home and disability status, that can affect one's capacity to participate in social and community activities. A limitation of the data analysis is that it is not possible to examine immigrants' social and community participation by country or region of origin because of the small sample size.

The focus therefore is on comparison by migration category rather than country or region of origin. Australia's immigration program has three main components: skilled, family reunion and humanitarian migration. New Zealand citizens who do not need a visa to migrate to Australia are usually considered as a fourth category. Australia also receives substantial temporary migrants who are foreign students, young people on working holiday visas and employer-sponsored skilled foreign workers on temporary resident visas. The main migration categories for comparison in this paper are skilled, family reunion, New Zealand citizens and temporary residents. The number of refugee and humanitarian migrants in the GSS sample was unfortunately too small for them to be identified as a separate category for analysis. They have been included in a residual 'Other' category for analysis, which also includes people did not know or were unsure of their visa status.

Immigrants' social and community participation

Table 1 shows the percentage of immigrants and native-born Australians aged 18 and over who participated in various types of social and community groups and activities in 2006. Significant differences are observed among the various migration categories and native-born Australians in the level of participation in most types of social and community groups and activities. The exceptions are participation in welfare organizations, civic organizations, human rights and tenants' groups where any differences among the groups are not statistically significant.

About 60-70 per cent of all migrant groups and native-born Australians attended a community event during the six months before the 2006 GSS. However, family reunion

immigrants have the lowest level of attendance at 59 per cent while skilled immigrants have the highest at 73 per cent, a significant difference.

Over 40 per cent of immigrants from New Zealand participated in sports and physical recreation groups, surpassing native-born Australians. Other immigrants have significantly lower rates of participation in sports and physical recreation activity groups, again with family reunion immigrants having the lowest participation rate at 19 per cent. This is not unexpected as family reunion immigrants are usually spouses and fiancé(e)s (mostly women), dependent children or elderly parents sponsored for migration by their Australian family member, and women and the elderly generally have lower rates of participation in sports activity groups.

Only about 10 per cent of native-born Australians participate in arts and crafts and hobby groups and immigrants have an even lower rate of participation. Immigrants have a higher rate of participation in religious groups, ethnic clubs and multicultural organizations than native-born Australians, with temporary migrants having the highest participation at 30 per cent in religious groups and 15 per cent in ethnic/multicultural organizations. Participation in social clubs is highest among New Zealanders at 27 per cent, which is higher than for native-born Australians. New Zealanders migrating to Australia seem the most physically and socially active of immigrants.

Immigrants have a lower rate of participation than native-born Australians in community support groups such as service clubs, health promotion groups and emergency services. New Zealanders and skilled immigrants have a higher level of involvement in emergency services groups than other immigrants. Skilled immigrants also had a higher rate of involvement in parenting and youth support groups than other migrant groups and native-born Australians. They, together with temporary migrants, are also more likely to be involved in community support groups concerned with education and training.

The level of involvement in civic and political groups is quite low – less than 10 per cent – among both native-born Australians and immigrants. Participation in trade unions and

professional groups is highest among skilled immigrants at 12 per cent, followed by New Zealanders at 10 per cent. Participation in political parties is less than 2 per cent. New Zealanders have the highest involvement in environmental and animal welfare groups at 8 per cent.

Correlates of immigrants' social and community participation

Since immigrants' social and economic participation may be related to their demographic and other characteristics such as age, sex, marital status, age of dependent children at home, location, education, labour force status, disability status and English language proficiency, logistic regression models were run to take account of differences in these characteristics among the immigrant groups that might account for the different levels of participation among the groups. The regression models also show the relation between each immigrant characteristic and immigrants' social and community participation net of the effects of the other characteristics in the models.

Table 2 shows the regression results of immigrants' participation in various social activity groups. The results are presented as odd ratios comparing each category of a variable with the reference category of that variable which has an odds ratio of 1. An odds ratio greater than 1 indicates a greater participation rate compared with the reference category; an odds ratio less than 1 indicates a lower participation rate compared with the reference category.

The regression results show no significant difference by migration category in attendance at community events in the past six months after controlling for immigrants' demographic and other characteristics. However, older immigrants are significantly less likely to attend a community event compared with immigrant youth aged less than 25. Female immigrants are significantly more likely than male immigrants to attend community events. Married immigrants and those with school-aged children are also more likely to attend community events than immigrants with no or pre-school dependent children at home, suggesting that school-aged children encourage such attendance by their immigrant parents. Significantly, immigrants living outside the major cities are

more likely to attend community events than those living in the major cities. Perhaps this is because of fewer competing social activities in smaller cities and regional areas than in the big cities, but it can also indicate a greater sense of community among immigrants living in smaller towns and regional areas. Attendance at a community event is also significantly more likely among immigrants who speak English well, have post-school qualifications and are employed.

The regression models confirm the greater involvement of New Zealanders in sports and physical recreation groups and social clubs and the low participation of family reunion migrants in such social activities. Skilled immigrants, temporary residents and immigrants in the residual 'Other' category, which include humanitarian immigrants, are also more likely to be involved in religious groups, ethnic clubs and multicultural organizations.

Older immigrants are less likely to be involved in sports and physical recreation groups than young immigrants, but they are more likely to be involved in arts, crafts and hobby groups. Female immigrants are less likely to be in sports and physical recreation groups but more likely to be involved in religious, arts, crafts and hobby groups compared with male immigrants. There is no difference by marital status in participation in sports and religious groups and social clubs, but married immigrants are less likely to participate in arts groups and more likely to participate in ethnic/multicultural organizations compared with immigrants who are not married. Having school-aged children is associated with greater involvement in sports/physical recreation groups and religious groups.

Immigrants living in smaller cities were more likely to be involved in sports and physical recreation activities and hobby groups than those living in the big cities, but less likely to be involved in ethnic/multicultural organizations and social clubs.

Immigrants who do not speak English well are less likely to participate in most social activities except religious, ethnic and multicultural groups. This suggests that many immigrants attend religious group activities that are conducted in the ethnic language and that social activities conducted within ethnic and multicultural groups are also usually in

the ethnic language, which would also act to encourage the participation of those immigrants who do not speak English well.

Having a disability does not appear to impact on involvement in most types of social activities except, understandably, sports and physical recreation groups.

The important effect of education on immigrants' social participation is indicated in all the regression models. Immigrants with post-school qualifications are much more likely to participate in the various social activity groups than immigrants without such qualifications. This finding is the same as that found for more recently arrived immigrants noted earlier in the paper (Khoo 2007).

Employment and labour force status has different effects on different types of social activities. Even after controlling for the effect of education, employed immigrants are more likely to be involved in sports groups and social clubs than not employed immigrants. However, immigrants who are not in the labour force are the most likely to be involved in hobby groups. Significantly, immigrants' involvement in religious groups or ethnic/multicultural organizations shows no correlation with their labour force status.

Next we look at the results of regression models on migrants' participation in community support groups (Table 3). There are several similarities with the results on involvement in social activity groups. The importance of English language proficiency and education in encouraging community participation is again evident. Immigrants who speak English well or have post-school qualifications are significantly more likely to be involved in all the community support groups shown than immigrants who do not speak English well or have no post-school qualifications. It is clear that English language proficiency and education give immigrants more confidence to engage with the wider community.

Family reunion immigrants tend to have lower levels of participation in community support groups than other immigrants. Older immigrants also tend to participate less than younger immigrants. However, female immigrants are more likely to be involved in

community support groups, particularly those relating to parenting, children and youth, education and training and social welfare, than male immigrants. Not surprisingly, immigrants with young children are the most likely to be involved in community support groups that are related to parenting and youth while immigrants with school-aged children are the most likely to be involved in community support groups on education and training.

Table 4 presents the results of regression models on immigrants' participation in various types of civic activity groups. The importance of English language proficiency and education in encouraging community participation as measured here is again evident. Immigrants who speak English well and those who have more education are more likely to be involved in all the four types of civic activity groups shown in the table than immigrants who do not speak English well or are less well educated. Being employed is also significantly correlated with more involvement in these activities, indicating the importance of employment in increasing immigrants' social and community participation. The data analyses provide strong empirical evidence that immigrants who are unemployed or not in the labour force also tend to withdraw from participation in civic activities.

New Zealanders are the most likely of all immigrants to participate in civic organizations and environmental/animal welfare groups. Family reunion and temporary migrants are less likely to participate in these community groups than other migrants. Older or unmarried immigrants are much more likely to participate in tenants groups than younger or married immigrants while female immigrants are much less likely to be involved in trade unions or professional organizations than male immigrants. Immigrants living outside the major cities are more likely to be involved in environmental and animal welfare groups than immigrants living in the major cities, probably because they have closer contact with the natural environment.

Table 5 shows the results of regression models on three summary measures of social and community participation: whether the individual has been involved in *any* social,

community support or civic/political group in the 12 months before the survey. These results confirm the more active social and community participation of immigrants from New Zealand compared with other immigrants. They also confirm that family reunion immigrants are the least likely to be active in social, community and civic groups. They also provide strong evidence of the importance of English language proficiency in immigrants' social and community participation: immigrants who cannot speak English well are significantly less likely to participate in any social, community support or civic activities. The results also show the strong positive correlation between immigrants' educational attainment and their involvement in any social, community support or civic activity groups. Immigrants with tertiary education are twice as likely as immigrants with no qualifications to be active in any social, community support or civic activity group.

Immigrants' labour force status is not correlated with their social and community participation after taking into account their education and English language proficiency. The lower participation in civic and political groups of immigrants who are not employed may be due to the presence of foreign students included as long-term residents in the survey sample.

The correlations between immigrants' demographic characteristics and their social and community participation are mixed. There are differences between female and male and young and older immigrants in the type of activities in which they are likely to participate. Immigrant youth are more likely to be involved in social and community support groups but less likely to be involved in civic or political groups than older immigrants. Female immigrants are also more likely to be active in social and community support groups but less likely to be involved in civic or political groups than male immigrants. Immigrants living outside the major cities are more active in community support and civic activity groups than immigrants living in the large cities, giving support to the view that people living in small towns and regional areas have a greater sense of community than people living in the big cities. Immigrants with school-aged children are

more likely than immigrants without to be active in community support groups since these groups included those concerned with children, parenting and education.

Immigrants compared with the Australian-born population

Having identified the immigrant characteristics that are associated with their social and community participation, we turn next to examine the question of whether immigrants have similar levels of involvement in social and community activities as native-born Australians, after taking account of any differences in demographic and human capital characteristics between them. Table 6 shows the logistic regression results comparing immigrants' and Australians' social and community participation after controlling for their demographic and human capital characteristics.

The findings show that there is no significant difference in attendance at community events between immigrants and native-born Australians, with the exception of family reunion immigrants, who have a significantly lower rate of attendance. After controlling for differences in demographic and other characteristics, there is also no difference between New Zealanders and the Australian-born in participation in sports and physical recreation groups, but all other permanent immigrants have significantly lower levels of participation. There is also no significant difference between New Zealanders and Australians in participation in most of the other social activity, community and civic groups shown in Table 6, except ethnic/multicultural groups and social clubs where New Zealanders have higher rates of participation and education and training support community groups where they have a lower rate of participation.

Other immigrants participate to a lesser extent than native-born Australians in most social, community support and civic groups examined, except in religious, ethnic and multicultural groups, where they have significantly higher rates of participation than Australians. Participation in religious groups involves mainly interaction with people of similar religious beliefs. Similarly, participation in ethnic/multicultural clubs and organizations involves interaction with mostly co-ethnics or other migrants since less than 3 per cent of native-born Australians participate in ethnic/multicultural clubs (Table

1). Thus immigrants' participation in religious and ethnic/multicultural groups is unlikely to involve interaction with the broader community. The lower participation of immigrants in social and community activities compared with native-born Australians, even after taking account of possible language barriers, indicate that there is scope for immigrants to engage more widely with their local community.

Conclusions

This paper has examined the participation of immigrants in various social, community and civic activity groups and compared it with that of native-born Australians. This is the first such study for Australia and it provides important empirical evidence of the level of immigrants' social participation in comparison with that of the native-born population. This knowledge is important in assessing the implications of immigration for social cohesion in a multicultural society such as Australia's.

The evidence is clear that migrants' social and community participation, as measured across a wide range of social and community activities, is related to their English language proficiency and level of education. Previous studies have demonstrated the importance of English language proficiency and level of education in immigrants' labour market outcomes and economic participation in Australia (see earlier references). This paper has demonstrated that ability to speak English well and having post-school qualifications are also just as important in immigrants' social and community participation. Clearly, English language proficiency and education are associated with greater confidence among immigrants to engage with the wider community. This engagement is important in facilitating a sense of community and belonging, thus contributing to immigrants' social inclusion and integration. Conversely, immigrants lacking English language skills are more likely to isolate themselves from the wider community, instead preferring to interact with people of similar ethnic or religious background through participation in ethnic/multicultural clubs or religious groups.

The lower rate of participation in social and community support groups of immigrants (other than New Zealanders) compared to the Australian-born population, suggests that

there is scope for immigrants to be more involved in their community and increase their interaction with other Australians through participation in various social and community activities. This interaction is likely to contribute to stronger social relations between immigrants and the Australian-born population, thus enhancing the five dimensions of social cohesion mentioned earlier in the paper.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2007. *General Social Survey: User Guide*. Canberra.
- Berger-Schmitt, R., 2000. "Social cohesion as an aspect of the quality of societies: concept and measurement." EuReporting Working Paper No. 14. Centre for Survey Research and Methodology, Mannheim.
- Berger-Schmitt, R. and Noll, H. H., 2000. "Conceptual framework and structure of a European system of social indicators". EuReporting Working Paper No. 9, Centre for Survey Research and Methodology, Mannheim.
- Chiswick, B. and Miller, P.W., 2002. "Immigrant earnings: Language skills, linguistic concentrations and the business cycle," *Journal of Population Economics*, 15 (1): 31-57.
- Khoo, S.E., 2007. "Educational attainments, inter-ethnic marriage and social cohesion," in J. Jupp and J. Nieuwenhuysen with E. Dawson (eds.), *Social Cohesion in Australia*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 10, pp. 114-127
- Richardson, S., Robertson, F. and Ilsley, D., 2001. *The Labour Force Experience of New Migrants*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.
- Stone, W. and Hughes, J., 2002. "Understanding community strengths," *Family Matters*, no. 61 (Autumn), pp. 62-67.
- Vandenheuvel, A. and Wooden, M., 1999. *New Settlers Have Their Say: How Immigrants Fare Over the Early Years of Settlement*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.
- _____, 2000. "Immigrants' labour market experiences during the early settlement years." *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 26 (1): 59-69.
- Williams, L., Murphy, J and Brooks, C., 1997. *Initial Labour Market Experiences of Immigrants*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.
- Wooden, M., 1994. "The labour market experiences of immigrants," in Wooden, M. Holton, R, Hugo, G and Sloan, J. (eds.), *Australian Immigration: A Survey of the Issues*. 2nd edition, AGPS, Canberra.

Table 1. Social and community participation, native-born Australians compared with migrants by migration category

	Australian born	NZ citizen	Migrated before 1986	Migrant - Skill	Migrant - Family	Migrant - Other	Temporary resident	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Attended community event***	67.4	70.4	60.3	72.5	58.7	65.3	69.5	66.2
Involvement in social activity groups								
Sports/physical recreation***	37.1	43.4	25.7	31.6	19.0	28.8	35.6	34.6
Arts/heritage***	11.1	8.2	8.9	8.4	8.3	5.5	7.6	10.4
Religious group***	16.6	18.4	21.0	28.3	23.6	28.1	29.7	18.2
Crafts/hobby group***	10.2	6.1	8.3	7.7	4.9	6.6	4.2	9.5
Ethnic/multicultural organisation***	2.5	9.2	9.8	12.0	12.2	12.8	15.3	4.6
Social clubs***	21.8	27.0	16.7	17.6	11.9	14.2	15.3	20.5
Involvement in community support groups								
Service clubs***	6.3	4.6	5.5	2.8	1.8	4.4	3.4	5.9
Welfare organisation	7.4	4.6	6.3	7.1	6.7	5.5	5.9	7.1
Parenting/children/youth***	9.4	12.8	4.9	13.0	8.3	8.0	9.3	8.8
Education & training***	14.8	13.3	8.4	15.6	10.1	17.5	21.2	13.8
Health promotion***	8.0	6.6	6.2	5.9	3.4	5.1	5.1	7.4
Emergency services***	3.7	3.1	2.3	2.8	0.9	1.1	2.5	3.3
Involvement in civic and political groups								
Trade unions/prof organisation***	8.7	9.7	6.3	12.0	5.2	6.6	1.7	8.3
Political party*	2.0	1.0	1.7	1.3	0.3	0.4	0	1.8
Civic organisation	3.6	5.1	3.0	3.6	1.5	2.9	3.4	3.5
Environment/animal welfare***	6.5	7.7	5.3	4.1	2.8	3.3	1.7	6.1
Human rights	2.4	2.6	2.4	1.3	2.1	2.9	0.9	2.3
Tenants' groups	4.9	4.1	5.7	4.9	2.8	2.9	4.2	4.9
Number of respondents	9947	196	2121	392	327	241	118	13,342
%	74.5	1.5	15.9	2.9	2.5	1.8	0.9	100.0

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 chi-square test

Source: 2006 GSS Basic Confidentialised Unit Record File.

Table 2. Logistic regression results (odds ratios) of migrants' social and community participation

Migrant characteristic	Involvement in social activity group in past 12 months						
	Attended community event in past 6 months	Sport/phys. recreation	Arts/ heritage	Religious groups	Ethnic/multi-cultural clubs	Social clubs	Crafts/ hobby groups
Migration status							
Arrived before 1986	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
New Zealanders	1.166	1.380 *	1.013	0.930	1.044	1.856 ***	0.889
Long-term residents	1.141	0.776	0.873	1.834 **	1.624	0.961	0.691
Permanent migrants - skill	1.133	0.687 ***	0.611 **	1.532 ***	1.227	1.057	0.833
Permanent migrants - family	0.728	0.438 ***	0.948	1.094	1.214	0.772	0.634
Other/Not known	0.891	0.689 **	0.596 *	1.571 ***	1.380	0.863	0.927
Age							
18-24	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
25-34	0.514 ***	0.681 *	1.004	0.632 **	0.642	1.021	2.230
35-44	0.594 ***	0.565 ***	1.378	0.774	0.695	0.863	3.042 *
45-54	0.519 ***	0.380 ***	1.375	0.980	0.801	1.043	2.812 *
55+	0.486 ***	0.338 ***	1.496	1.111	0.962	1.153	3.167 *
Sex							
Male	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Female	1.582 ***	0.672 ***	1.409 **	1.495 ***	1.076	1.013	2.416 ***
Marital status							
Married	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Not married	0.804 ***	0.882	1.401 **	0.929	0.790 *	1.004	0.827
Dependents at home							
None	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Aged 0-4 years	1.007	0.886	0.765	1.299 *	0.985	1.075	1.065
Aged 5-14 years	1.417 ***	1.349 ***	1.235	1.397 ***	0.946	0.840	1.093
Aged 15-24 years	1.245	0.638	-	0.721	-	0.424	-
Location							
Major cities	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Inner regional	1.558 ***	1.266 **	1.141	0.83	0.464 ***	0.722 **	1.499 **
Other	1.217 *	1.091	1.033	0.786 *	1.295 **	1.101	1.118
English proficiency							
Well	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Not well	0.545 ***	0.288 ***	0.107 ***	1.223	1.856 ***	0.380 ***	0.374 ***
Disability							
None	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Some, no restriction	1.166	0.921	0.863	0.966	1.035	1.096	1.272
Restricted	0.855	0.533 ***	1.034	1.161	0.874	0.965	0.882
Education							
No post-school qualifications	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Certificate	1.242 **	1.177	1.162	0.852	1.050	1.567 ***	0.909
Advanced diploma/Degree	1.839 ***	1.674 ***	4.183 ***	1.191 *	1.456 ***	1.117	2.219 ***
Labour force status							
Employed	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Unemployed	0.541 ***	0.773	0.310 *	0.907	1.141	0.646	1.113
Not in labour force	0.706 ***	0.760 **	0.831	1.104	1.050	0.690 ***	1.481 **
Log likelihood chi2	268.7	328.9	178.9	95.0	56.5	87.3	119.1
DF	23	23	22	23	22	23	22
Number of migrants	3395	3395	3378	3395	3378	3395	3378

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: 2006 GSS Basic Confidentialised Unit Record File.

Table 3. Logistic regression results (odds ratios) of migrants' participation in community support groups

Migrant characteristic	Involvement in community support groups in last 12 months				
	Service clubs	Welfare organisation	Education & training	Parenting & youth	Health promotion
Migration status					
Arrived before 1986	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
New Zealanders	1.142	0.803	0.923	1.491	1.161
Long-term residents	0.948	0.973	1.667 *	0.935	0.836
Permanent migrants - skill	0.573	1.163	0.809	1.245	0.811
Permanent migrants - family	0.514	1.076	0.642 **	0.817	0.525 *
Other/Not known	1.119	0.774	1.141	0.876	0.870
Age					
18-24	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
25-34	0.836	0.700	0.547 **	0.478 **	1.115
35-44	0.730	0.529 *	0.609 *	0.684	0.956
45-54	0.990	0.748	0.577 *	0.632	1.194
55+	1.932	0.695	0.280 ***	0.408 **	1.076
Sex					
Male	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Female	0.811	1.842 ***	1.701 ***	2.200 ***	1.172
Marital status					
Married	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Not married	0.791	1.225	0.948	0.777	1.086
Dependents at home					
None	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Aged 0-4 years	0.754	0.758	0.946	5.108 ***	1.024
Aged 5-14 years	1.096	0.956	3.485 ***	2.556 ***	1.037
Aged 15-24 years	0.519	0.449	1.490	0.382	0.863
Location					
Major cities	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Inner regional	1.328	1.372	1.272	0.801	1.108
Other	1.294	1.418 *	1.222	1.16	1.242
English proficiency					
Well	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Not well	0.276 **	0.553	0.309 ***	0.373 **	0.459 *
Disability					
None	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Some, no restriction	1.006	1.132	0.840	0.806	1.280
Restricted	0.866	1.318	0.833	0.886	1.423 *
Education					
No post-school qualifications	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Certificate	1.310	1.454 *	1.063	1.564 *	0.568 **
Advanced diploma/Degree	1.531 **	1.989 ***	2.821 ***	2.246 ***	1.698 ***
Labour force status					
Employed	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Unemployed	0.225	1.712	1.987	0.836	0.473
Not in labour force	0.740	1.163	0.940	0.804	0.966
Log likelihood chi2	61.2	57.6	341.500	322.5	41.2
DF	23	23	23	23	23
Number of migrants	3395	3395	3395	3395	3395

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: 2006 GSS Basic Confidentialised Unit Record File.

Table 4. Logistic regression results (odds ratios) of migrants' participation in civic organisations

Migrant characteristic	Involvement in civic organisations in last 12 months			
	Trade union/ prof. organisation	Civic org- anisation	Environment/ animals	Tenants' group
Migration status				
Arrived before 1986	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
New Zealanders	1.283	2.085 *	1.427	1.022
Long-term residents	0.208 **	1.296	0.271 *	1.129
Permanent migrants - skill	1.230	1.031	0.488 **	0.896
Permanent migrants - family	0.837	0.631	0.487 *	0.753
Other/Not known	0.990	0.958	0.574	0.757
Age				
18-24	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
25-34	1.275	0.899	0.766	1.988
35-44	1.505	1.170	1.046	1.908
45-54	1.632	1.209	0.919	2.944 *
55+	1.421	1.771	0.876	5.255 ***
Sex				
Male	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Female	0.493 ***	0.782	1.273	0.992
Marital status				
Married	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Not married	0.103	0.820	1.047	1.396 *
Dependents at home				
None	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Aged 0-4 years	1.192	0.695	0.825	1.051
Aged 5-14 years	0.839	1.763 **	0.882	0.636
Aged 15-24 years	0.947	0.162 **	-	0.248 **
Location				
Major cities	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Inner regional	1.198	1.162	1.953 ***	0.845
Other	1.072	1.925 ***	1.560 **	0.999
English proficiency				
Well	1.000	1.000	-	1.000
Not well	0.201 **	0.450	-	0.093 **
Disability				
None	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Some, no restriction	1.143	1.067	1.030	1.125
Restricted	1.335	0.950	1.223	1.418
Education				
No post-school qualifications	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Certificate	2.123 ***	1.353	1.198	1.215
Advanced diploma/Degree	2.114 ***	2.097 ***	3.127 ***	1.961 ***
Labour force status				
Employed	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Unemployed	0.290 **	0.668	0.517	0.645
Not in labour force	0.118 ***	0.951	0.534 ***	0.373 ***
Log likelihood chi2	231.8	41.5	81	94.9
DF	23	23	21	23
Number of migrants	3395	3395	3106	3395

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: 2006 GSS Basic Confidentialised Unit Record File.

Table 5. Logistic regression results (odds ratios) of migrants' social and community participation

Migrant characteristic	Active in any organisations/groups in the last 12 months		
	Social groups	Community support groups	Civic/political groups
Migration status			
Arrived before 1986	1.000	1.000	1.000
New Zealanders	1.798 ***	1.131	1.594 **
Long-term residents	1.356	1.027	0.671
Permanent migrants - skill	0.940	1.031	0.916
Permanent migrants - family	0.787 *	0.632 ***	0.779
Other/Not known	0.951	0.894	0.952
Age			
18-24	1.000	1.000	1.000
25-34	0.583 ***	0.606 **	1.038
35-44	0.608 **	0.637 **	1.257
45-54	0.666 **	0.632 **	1.457
55+	0.694 *	0.491 ***	1.713 *
Sex			
Male	1.000	1.000	1.000
Female	1.209 **	1.646 ***	0.799 **
Marital status			
Married	1.000	1.000	1.000
Not married	0.900	0.911	1.093
Dependents at home			
None	1.000	1.000	1.000
Aged 0-4	0.905	1.657 ***	1.158
Aged 5-14	1.208 *	1.610 ***	0.868
Aged 15-24	0.829	0.457	0.589
Location			
Major cities	1.000	1.000	1.000
Inner regional	1.066	1.157	1.382 **
Other	1.012	1.545 ***	1.331 **
English proficiency			
Well	1.000	1.000	1.000
Not well	0.749 ***	0.371 ***	0.284 ***
Disability			
None	1.000	1.000	1.000
Some, no restriction	1.036	0.969	1.062
Restricted	0.849 *	1.114	1.428 ***
Education			
No post-school qualifications	1.000	1.000	1.000
Certificate	1.249 **	1.190	1.408 **
Advanced diploma/ Degree	1.800 ***	2.185 ***	2.208 ***
Labour force status			
Employed	1.000	1.000	1.000
Unemployed	0.803	1.147	0.554 **
Not in labour force	0.863	1.042	0.384 ***
Log likelihood chi2	116	286.1	235.3
DF	23	23	23
Number of migrants	3395	3395	3395

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: 2006 GSS Basic Confidentialised Unit Record File.

Table 6. Logistic regression results (odds ratios) comparing migrants' and native-born Australians' social and community participation

Type of participation	Australian-			Migrants			
	born	Migrated<86	NZ'ers	Skilled	Family	Other	Temporary
Attended com.events	1.000	0.957	1.058	0.952	0.660 ***	0.789	0.966
Involvement in social activity groups							
Sport/physical rec.	1.000	0.752 ***	1.133	0.541 ***	0.371 ***	0.589 ***	0.740
Arts/heritage	1.000	0.721 ***	0.817	0.489 ***	0.735	0.484 ***	0.679
Religious group	1.000	1.120 *	1.117	1.544 ***	1.241	1.790 ***	2.146 ***
Ethnic/multicultural	1.000	3.850 ***	3.532 ***	3.670 ***	3.941 ***	4.400 ***	5.170 ***
Crafts/ hobby	1.000	0.710 ***	0.669	0.692 *	0.491 ***	0.704	0.557
Social clubs	1.000	0.732 ***	1.325 *	0.726 **	0.558 ***	0.606 ***	0.675
Involvement in community support groups							
Service clubs	1.000	0.705 ***	0.917	0.453 **	0.395 **	0.887	0.845
Welfare organisation	1.000	0.756 ***	0.728	0.903	0.950	0.707	0.958
Parenting/children	1.000	0.745 **	1.083	0.907	0.578 **	0.649 *	0.690
Education & training	1.000	0.701 ***	0.679 *	0.540 ***	0.490 ***	0.878	1.476
Health promotion	1.000	0.790 **	0.902	0.554 ***	0.388 ***	0.639	0.668
Emergency services	1.000	0.836	0.845	0.746	0.346 *	0.238 **	0.741
Involvement in civic and political groups							
Trade unions/prof org.	1.000	0.797 **	1.076	0.883	0.638 *	0.793	0.158 **
Civic organisation	1.000	0.743 **	1.625	0.699	0.446 *	0.695	1.021
Environment/animal	1.000	0.943	1.295	0.469 ***	0.446 **	0.551 *	0.261 *
Human rights	1.000	1.007	1.152	0.348 **	0.782	1.037	0.313
Tenants' groups	1.000	0.956	0.955	0.739	0.657	0.666	1.043

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Regression models control for all variables in previous tables (age, sex, marital status, dependents at home, location, English proficiency, disability, education and labour force status).

Source: 2006 GSS Basic Confidentialised Unit Record File.