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Abstract

Asian skilled migrants in Australia have begun to attract attention from researchers due to the recent increase in their numbers as well as their significant socio-economic contribution to the country. Even though research on skilled migrants is on the rise, there is a dearth of studies that focus on Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, despite their large representation. The present study investigates the extent to which Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are socially integrated into the Australian society in terms of language, identity and behaviour, and identifies factors that may contribute to their social integration. This study also investigates the level of life and job satisfaction among the study’s participants.

A cross-sectional survey was carried out to collect data via online and mail surveys and a total of 306 participants were recruited for the study. The results indicate that the majority of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants report being moderately socially integrated into Australian society. Hence the traditional social separation of ethnic migrants in Western host societies was not observed. Participants were more integrated in the language dimension of social integration, followed by the behaviour and identity dimensions. It was also found that expectation to return to the country of birth and years since migration influenced language, identity and behaviour integration.

The majority of the participants were satisfied with their lives in Australia. At the domain level, participants were most satisfied in the ‘safety’ and ‘standard of life’ domains; they were least satisfied in ‘feeling part of the community’ and ‘achievements in life’ domains. It was also found that participants were moderately satisfied with their jobs in Australia.

The findings of this research also indicated that language and identity dimensions of social integration were related to life satisfaction and the identity dimension was related to job satisfaction. Testing of a mediation model demonstrated that language integration mediated between perceived inclusiveness and life satisfaction. Identity integration
mediated between years since migration, expectation to return to country of birth and perceived inclusiveness and life satisfaction.

This study offers empirical evidence that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are socially integrated into Australian society and are satisfied with their lives and jobs in Australia. Because social integration influences life satisfaction and job satisfaction, it is important to continue to introduce and implement policies and frameworks that promote social integration of ethnic skilled migrants in Australia. There is a need to focus on developing and implementing policies that encourage supportive and inclusive behaviours towards skilled migrants at the societal and organisational level.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Chapter Introduction

The present research aims to enhance understanding of social integration, life satisfaction, and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia and to identify the extent to which various factors influence their social integration. This introductory chapter presents the context for the study in nine sections. Section 1.2 presents the background for the research. The focus of the study, including gaps in the literature, is discussed in Section 1.3. Section 1.4 outlines the aims of the research. The Research Questions and Hypotheses are presented in Section 1.5 and the significance of the research is presented in Section 1.6. In Section 1.7, the research methodology for the research is presented in brief. Organisation of the remaining thesis chapters is outlined in Section 1.8. Finally, a chapter summary is provided in Section 1.9.

1.2 Background for the Current Research

The world today is very much characterised by mobility of migrants from non-Western to Western countries (Au et al., 1998; Coleman, Casali & Wampold, 2001; Chiswick & Miller, 2005; Fong & Ooka, 2006; George & Chaze, 2009; Reitz et al., 2009; Sam, 1998). Like other migrant-receiving societies, such as Canada, the US and the UK, Australia has a long history of migration, which ranges from humanitarian migration to skilled and business migration (Chow, 2003; Collins, 2013).

Skilled migration is an important consideration for Australia, as skilled migrants now comprise the majority of new arrivals in the country (Chiswick & Miller, 2002; Department of Immigration and Citizenship of Australia [DIAC, 2012]; Fong & Ooka, 2006; Kostenko, Mark, Xueyan, 2010; Kramar et al., 2011; Murdie & Ghosh, 2010; Syed & Kramar, 2010). The skilled migration program adds significant value to the overall well-being of Australia, bringing positive impacts to social, economic and
political systems alike (Collins, 2013; DIAC, Annual Report, 2010-2011; Hawthorne, 2010). Qualified, experienced and trained migrant professionals are becoming increasingly important drivers of economic growth in host countries, because they are able to help fill the demands in the labour market. In Australia, skilled migrants help to fill chronic skill shortages across different professions and occupations, including in construction, health, engineering and education sectors. Researchers (Sanderson, 2009; Wulff & Dharmalingam, 2008; Ziguras & Fang Law, 2006) suggest that skilled migrants contribute substantially to the economic well-being of a country.

Despite their contribution, for many skilled migrants migration is not necessarily a smooth process. From the migrants’ perspective, migration is not simply a decision to change where they live, but a much more complex process that involves major commitments, challenges and sacrifices (Coleman et al., 2001; Kisselev, Brown & Brown, 2010; Mace et al., 2005; Nayar, 2011). Researchers (Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Coleman, 1995; Coleman et al., 2001) agree that, when an individual migrates to a new country that has a different culture, it can impact their physical and psychological well-being, as well as their sense of emotional stability. Au et al. (1998) show that regardless of the official resettlement support that newcomers receive from the host government and other migrant-supporting institutions, fear, anxiety, helplessness and the desire to return home are some common feelings that migrants may experience during this journey (see also Sam; 1998; Valenta, 2009). Previous studies, such as those of George and Chaze (2009), Lu, Samarathunge and Härtel (2011), Nayar (2011) and Safi (2010), also reveal that many migrants feel emotionally unstable in the new environment due to their minority status, especially during the early stages since arrival. For instance, the following quote illustrates the experiences of a new skilled migrant to Canada (George & Chaze, 2009: p. 274):

I remember there was once last year when I was turned down from another job, I was really, really upset and I called my husband and I started crying on the phone and I told him I am going to take my life because I just feel, I was just depressed, I had never in my life considered things like that, and I told him that am just going to hang myself. What am I doing here […] I have nothing to look forward to […].
Going beyond the aforementioned individual emotions, migration is a major life event that is associated with a number of significant social changes that affect migrants’ attitudes, behaviours and other subjective experiences, such as life and job satisfaction (Foroughi et al., 2001; George & Chaze, 2009; Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Safdar, Lay & Struthers, 2003; Safi, 2010). Despite these challenges, host societies expect skilled migrants to integrate into the socio-economic fabric of the host country and become contributing members (DIAC, 2013, Trends in Migration: Australia 2010). Skilled migrants may also expect to transfer the skills and knowledge that they bring with them immediately to achieve positive outcomes from migration. However, integrating into the host society can be more complex and challenging when there is social distance between migrants’ sending and receiving societies (Barret & Duffy, 2008; Berry, 2001; Chiswick & Miller, 2002). For instance, a study based on Persian migrants in Australia stated that migrants from non-English speaking countries have basic cultural differences from Australians and may suffer when adjusting to their new lives (Foroughi et al., 2001).

Berry (1997) noted that migration does not necessarily result in negative outcomes; in fact, the majority of migrants make positive adjustments as time spent in the host country increases (see also Martinovic, Tubergen & Maas, 2009; Remennick, 2004; Sam, 1998). Furthermore, Mahmud and Scholmerich (2011) have argued that, even though migration is an emotionally stressful journey, the process can expand individuals’ world views, cultural competence and adaptability to different contexts in the long run, leading to higher levels of well-being. After migrating to a new country, some migrants attempt to establish themselves in the new destination by building new relationships with people, institutions and workplaces to recreate feelings of belonging and self-worth (Berry, 2001; Gordon, 1964; Remennick, 2003; Valenta, 2009; Vergunst, 2008). Therefore, when migrants are settling into a new country, building new social contacts and adapting to the practices, beliefs and norms of the new culture are seen as common outcomes (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007). This adaptation of migrants in host societies is identified variously in the literature as acculturation (Berry, 2001; Birman, & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Gordon, 1964), assimilation (Gordon, 1964; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Safda et al., 2003) and social integration (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Eraydin, Tasan-Kok & Vranken, 2010; Reitz et al., 2009). In the present study, the term ‘social
integration’ is used and is defined as ‘the degree of migrants’ adaptation to the mainstream society in terms of host country language, identity and behaviour’. The most commonly identified dimensions which migrants tend to change when adapting to a new country are (a) host language skills, (b) host country identity and (c) their host country behaviour (Adachi, 2011; Au et al., 1998; Birman & Trickett, 2001; Birman, & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010; Vergunst, 2008). Therefore the present study explores social integration in terms of host country language, identity and behaviour dimensions.

Some scholars like Valenta (2009) and Vergunst (2008) argue that these new contacts and the extent to which migrants integrate into the host society form the foundation for a successful life after migration. There is consensus in the literature that well-integrated migrants overcome many of the challenges inherent to migration and contribute to the socio-economic growth of the host society (Amit, 2010b; Au et al., 1998; Lu et al., 2012; Sam, 1998). Scholars also agree that social integration influences other life outcomes, such as life satisfaction (Mahmud & Scholmerich, 2011; Safdar et al., 2003; Sam, 1998; Sharma, 2012; Yoon & Lee, 2010) and job satisfaction (Au et al., 1998; Ea et al., 2008; Lu et al., 2012; Mace et al., 2005).

Since researchers (for example Hughes, 2002; Kwok-bun & Plüss, 2013) have found that unintegrated migrants may create violence and conflict in host countries, successful social integration into the host society can be considered as an important societal goal and a desirable outcome for any multicultural society. Social integration builds mutual acceptance and social cohesion among the society’s people as well as fostering socio-economic growth.

Research on migrants’ social integration is on the increase (Amit, 2010b; Birman, & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Eraydin et al., 2010; Martinovic et al., 2009; Reitz et al., 2009). During the past few years a wave of skilled migration from Asia has constituted the largest influx of migrants into Australian society, with South Asian migrants contributing a considerable percentage of this influx (Collins, 2013; Hugo, 1999; 2004; see Table 1.1).
According to the 2012–2013 Annual Report of the Department of Migration and Boarder Protection, Indians and Sri Lankans were among the 10 major source countries for general skilled migrants in Australia during the last three calendar years. India and Sri Lanka are first and fourth in the list, respectively (see Table 1.1 below). In addition, as recorded in 2011 census data, there were 86,412 Sri Lankans and 295,365 Indians living in Australia. Therefore it can be argued that Indian and Sri Lankan born migrants, including skilled migrants, are significant minority groups in present-day Australia.

Table 1.1 Points-tested skilled migration top 10 nationalities 2010-2011 to 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. India</td>
<td>12 730</td>
<td>17 030</td>
<td>24 810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People's Republic of China</td>
<td>12 160</td>
<td>7 900</td>
<td>8 030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. United Kingdom</td>
<td>8 380</td>
<td>9 820</td>
<td>6 670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sri Lanka</td>
<td>3 240</td>
<td>3 900</td>
<td>3 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Malaysia</td>
<td>3 030</td>
<td>3 620</td>
<td>3 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nepal</td>
<td>1 410</td>
<td>1 270</td>
<td>2 470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. South Africa</td>
<td>2 760</td>
<td>3 020</td>
<td>2 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Philippines</td>
<td>1 750</td>
<td>2 470</td>
<td>2 070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pakistan</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>2 810</td>
<td>2 060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bangladesh</td>
<td>1 240</td>
<td>1 730</td>
<td>1 830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Department of Immigration and Boarder Protection, Annual Report 2012–13, p. 5).

Despite this significant representation of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, less is known about what happens to them after migration. Hence this research aims to fill a gap in the literature by investigating Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ social integration and life and job satisfaction in Australia. The findings of this thesis may contribute to understanding of these skilled migrants’ lives after migration. Further literature on skilled migrants in Australia is discussed in Chapter 2, including (a) the current Australian skilled migration program, (b) economic and social contribution of skilled migrants to Australia and (c) recognition of skilled migrants’ credentials in host societies, including Australia. To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, previous studies have not explored the social integration of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, despite the large representation of this group (see
Table 1.1). Hence this research investigates social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia to fill this gap in the literature.

The section that follows briefly discusses the focus for the study, which is social integration and life and job satisfaction among Indian and Sri Lankan skilled migrants in Australia.

1.3 Focus of the Current Study: Social Integration and Life and Job Satisfaction

The present research has sought to assess social integration and life and job satisfaction of a selected skilled migrant group in Australia and to identify factors that contribute to their level of social integration. This study has also sought to investigate the relationship between social integration and life satisfaction and job satisfaction and has examined mediating pathways from socio-demographic factors via social integration to life and job satisfaction. The following section addresses the importance of studying skilled migrants’ social integration and life and job satisfaction and then outlines the current gaps in related literature.

1.3.1 The importance of migrants’ social integration

Australia is a nation of migrants. The Department of Immigration and Citizenship celebrates this cultural diversity and at the same time points to the striving for a unified and harmonious nation (DIAC, Our Common Bond, 2013, p.3). When individuals from various countries become part of a society, it is vital to have a ‘common bond’ to ensure everyone’s right to live in a peaceful society. Therefore migrant-receiving societies believe social integration is a desirable outcome in that it reflects the degree of cultural acceptance and social cohesion of migrants in host societies (Adachi, 2011; Safdar et al., 2003; Yoon & Lee, 2010).

Migrants’ ability to successfully integrate into the host society is vitally important to the well-being of the host community (Fong & Ooka, 2006; Vergunst, 2008). Host countries invite skilled migrants expecting a contribution to the socio-economic growth of the receiving country (Birrell et al., 2006; Boucher, 2007), but less socially integrated migrants can create problems for the majority population in terms of high
unemployment rates, low income, high dependency on social benefits and violence due to psychological stressors (Kwok-bun & Plüss, 2013). Li (2003) noted that failure to integrate well within the host society may result in excessive costs of migration rather than benefits received by the host country. Furthermore, researchers have pointed out that improved levels of social integration will help to reduce social and political unrest within host societies (Giusta & Kambhampati, 2006; Zhou, 1997).

In addition, the literature suggests that well-integrated migrants adjust well to the lifestyle of the receiving society and thus manage to overcome many of the negative experiences inherent in migration (Amit, 2010a, Au et al., 1998; Lu et al., 2012; Sam, 1998). It is not only the case that host societies believe social integration to be a highly desirable outcome that reflects the existence of social cohesion and cultural acceptance of migrants in such societies, researchers also agree that social integration influences other life outcomes, such as life satisfaction of migrants (Mahmud & Scholmerich, 2011; Safdar et al., 2003; Sam, 1998; Sharma, 2012; Yoon & Lee, 2010), and an association has been found between the social integration and job satisfaction of migrants (Au et al., 1998; Ea et al., 2008, Lu et al., 2012; Mace et al., 2005). Hence, many migrant-receiving countries, such as Australia and Canada, attempt to enhance the level of migrants’ social integration through national-level integration policies (DIAC, Annual Report, 2010–2011).

The benefits of skilled migrants’ social integration are clear. However, despite the significance of migrants’ social integration, few studies have addressed this issue in the current academic literature. In particular, studies that target skilled migrant populations that have recently increased in this country, such as Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants, are limited. In this respect, research that focuses on the social integration of skilled migrants is needed to ensure that the expectations of the national-level skilled migration program are being met. Therefore, given the importance of migrants’ social integration, the current study identifies the extent to which skilled migrants are integrated into Australian society and the association of social integration with the life and job satisfaction of a group of skilled migrants.
1.3.2 Life satisfaction among migrants

People migrate either to escape from undesirable circumstances in their country of birth (COB) or to experience a better life in the host country (Nesdale & Mak, 2000). Therefore many skilled migrants who migrate to Western countries expect better outcomes in their personal lives – primarily better life satisfaction (DIAC, 2012; Sam, 1998). Even though one can reasonably assume that migrants from non-Western countries should be satisfied with their lives in Western host countries, George and Chaze (2009) and Valento (2009) have pointed out that, realistically, in the initial stages it can be challenging for migrants to adapt to a new culture and a new lifestyle (see also Safi, 2010). Furthermore, research findings have shown that, in general, life satisfaction is relatively low among first-generation ethnic migrants in Western countries, due to feelings of loneliness, cultural dissimilarities, language difficulties and basic lifestyle differences (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Reitz et al., 2009; Sabharwal, 2011; Safi, 2010; Verkuyten, 2008). These studies lay the foundation for further examination of life satisfaction in different migrant groups and in different host societies.

Previous studies have primarily focused on first- and second-generation refugee or humanitarian migrant groups in other host societies such as Canada and Norway (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; George & Chaze, 2009; Valento, 2009). More research needs to be conducted targeting life satisfaction of skilled migrants in Australia; in particular, studies that focus on increasingly prevalent groups such as Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are needed because of the limited availability of research that targets these important cohorts.

Therefore, understanding the level of life satisfaction among a minority skilled migrant group is important because researchers have long recognised that employees do not leave their non-work life experiences on the door step but carry them into the workplace and vice versa (Ragins, 2009, p.1). Research findings suggest that an individual’s satisfaction spills over from life to job (Judge & Watanabe, 1993) while others (Drobnick et al., 2010; Sirgy & Wu, 2009) suggest satisfaction spills over from job to life as job is an individual’s main life domain if actively employed. Irrespective of the directionality of this relationship, life satisfaction is important in assessing job satisfaction as life satisfaction of an individual cannot be separated from their job
satisfaction (Ragins, 2009, p.1). Therefore, assessing skilled migrants’ life satisfaction as opposed to job satisfaction only will be more insightful in the present research context.

1.3.3 Job satisfaction among migrants
Working in an unfamiliar environment could directly impact individuals’ job satisfaction (Bhagat, 1983; Giusta & Kambhampati, 2006). Even though job opportunities are one of the primary motives for skilled migrants’ decisions to migrate, little research has been conducted on whether skilled migrants are actually satisfied with their jobs in the new destination (Ahmed, Fazluz & Samaduzzaman 2013; Ea et al., 2008; Itzhaki et al., 2013). Some of the available studies (Moyes et al., 2006a; Sabharwal, 2011; Sanchez & Brock, 1996; Schmidt, 2007) have been based on ethnic minorities in the US and reveal that migrants are less satisfied with certain dimensions of their jobs, such as income, training opportunities, career advancement opportunities and relationship facets, thus showing a low level of overall job satisfaction. Some researchers suggest that certain groups of migrants are satisfied with their jobs in host countries whereas others are less satisfied (Au et al., 1998; Lu et al., 2013; Siow & Ng, 2013; Wang & Sangalang, 2005).

Although skilled migration is a popular means of meeting skill shortages in present-day Australian society, and skilled migrants are expected to contribute to country’s economic growth, there is a dearth in the literature of studies that explore skilled migrants’ job satisfaction (Ahmed et al., 2013). A further issue is mixed findings regarding migrants’ job satisfaction. One of the main purposes of the Australian skilled migration program is to benefit from the skills and knowledge of these migrants in order to achieve improved socio-economic outcomes (Hawthorne, 2002; Wulff & Dharmalingam 2008). Therefore assessment of skilled migrants’ job satisfaction may be one way to evaluate whether the expectations of the skilled migration program have been met.

Furthermore, skilled migrants migrate into a Western country expecting better job opportunities (Choudhry, 2001; George & Chaze, 2009; Malinen & Johnston, 2011), as well as higher life satisfaction (Amit, 2010a; Sam, 1998). Past research has found that life and job satisfaction are positively related but that the strength of the relationship can
vary because of personality and job-related factors (Rice et al., 1980). Thus the present study focuses on assessing the strength of the relationship between job and life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. This approach is thought to be more helpful for researchers and migration policy makers than measuring only job satisfaction of skilled migrants’ because it gives a more detailed picture of how skilled migrants are faring in the host society by going beyond their satisfaction with jobs. For example, level of overall life satisfaction may affect propensity to stay in the host society (Mara & Landesmann, 2013, p.20).

1.3.4 Factors that contribute to social integration of migrants

Migrants’ social integration is influenced by a myriad of socio-demographic factors (Amit, 2010b; Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Lu et al., 2011; Martinovic et al., 2009; Remennick, 2003; Reitz et al., 2009). Migration scholars have identified a number of determinants of successful social integration, but these vary according to host country, study sample (such as refugee migrants or skilled migrants), the purpose of the study and the discipline in which the research is conducted (Berry, 2006; Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007). There is therefore a lack of consistency regarding the factors that affect the social integration of migrants. For instance, Martinovic et al. (2009) found that age at migration, host country language skills, migration motive, home country education and time spent in the host country influenced the social integration of non-Western migrants in the Netherlands, while Remennick (2003) identified that age at migration, level of education, command of host language and having school-aged children enhanced the social integration of Russian Jewish migrants in Israel. In addition, according to an early Canadian study (Goldlust & Richmond, 1974), predictors of social integration include objective factors such as housing, language, education and employment.

In the present study, eight socio-demographic factors were included as predictors of social integration based on a review of the literature (Au et al., 1998; Berry 2001; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Ea et al., 2008; Fong & Ooka, 2006; Lu et al., 2011; 2012; Massey & Akresh, 2006; Martinovic et al., 2009; Miller et al., 2011; Murdie & Ghosh, 2010; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Remennick, 2003; Ryder et al., 2000; Valenta, 2009). These were (a) age at migration, (b) years since migration, (c) English language skills, (d) level of education, (e) pre-migration socio-economic status (SES),
(f) neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants, (g) perceived inclusiveness, and (h) expectation to return to the country of birth. Hereafter in this thesis, these factors are referred to collectively as ‘socio-demographic factors’. (An in-depth review of literature related to these variables is presented in Chapter 3; see especially Table 3.1). To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, the current study is the first to simultaneously examine the influence of all of these variables on social integration within a single study and among Indian and Sri Lankan skilled migrants in Australia. Hence the current research will make a contribution to the literature by identifying the relative importance of various socio-demographic factors to social integration as well as to understanding predictors of social integration among skilled migrants representing a particular ethnic group and in the Australian context.

Socio-demographic factors and migrants’ commitment to integration alone are not adequate to achieve successful social integration; rather, the host society’s positive attitude towards the newcomers is also important for their successful integration (Alpass et al., 2007; Berry, 2001; LaFromboise et al., 1993; Li, 2003; Massey & Akresh, 2006; Mooded, 2003; Safi, 2010; Valenta, 2009). Social integration is a two-way process: migrants need to be committed to adjusting in accordance with the norms of the host country, while the host society needs to accept migrants as a part of it (Rudiger & Spencer, 2003; see also Berry, 2001, where the term ‘acculturation’ was used). Therefore there is a further gap in the prevailing empirical literature, with a need to consider social integration as a two-way process and to examine the contribution of socio-demographic factors and host society acceptance in a single study. Hence the current research explores the influence of socio-demographic factors alongside host country acceptance, which is operationalised as perceived inclusiveness in the present study.

Previous research has identified different factors that can influence life satisfaction (Amit, 2010a; Daig et al., 2009; Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Morrison, Tay & Diener, 2011; Neto & Barros, 2007) and job satisfaction (Greenhaus et al., 1990; Leong, 2001; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Nguyen et al., 2007; Sabharwal, 2011; Valdivia & Flores, 2012) of migrants in different host societies. In exploring the factors that influence life and job satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, the current study
examines mediating pathways between socio-demographic factors and life and job satisfaction via social integration in order to identify whether socio-demographic factors contribute to life and job satisfaction directly, over and above social integration, or indirectly via their effect on social integration.

In summary, the following gaps in the literature on skilled migrants have been identified and provide the basis for the current study.

1. Lack of research on skilled migrants in Australia, especially Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants.

2. Limited studies dealing with social integration and life and job satisfaction among skilled migrants in Australia. In particular, there are only limited studies that have explored social integration in terms of language, identity and behaviour within a single study.

3. Inconsistency in findings in relation to social integration and life and job satisfaction among ethnic migrants in different host societies.

4. A lack of studies that consider the influence of a broad range of socio-demographic factors on social integration. In particular, there is a need to examine the contribution of a range of socio-demographic factors and perceived inclusiveness within a single study.

5. Mixed findings in relation to the association among various socio-demographic factors and social integration; research is needed to assess the relationship among the selected socio-demographic factors and social integration and to explore these associations among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.

6. Examination of social integration and life and job satisfaction of skilled migrants has not been integrated in a single study and there is a need to investigate relationships among these variables.
As discussed in this chapter, host countries invite skilled migrants expecting a contribution to the socio-economic growth of the country. Australia is one of the world’s major recipient nations of skilled migrants. It is evident that Indian and Sri Lankan born skilled migrants are significant minority groups in present-day Australia. Despite the significant representation of these skilled migrants, less is known about what happens to them after migration. Given the importance of understanding the level of social integration, life and job satisfaction among different skilled migrants in Australia, the present study focuses on these three migration outcomes. In addition, the influence of different socio-demographic factors on social integration, and the association between social integration, and life and job satisfaction, are measured to understand the influence of social integration on life and job satisfaction. From the foregoing it emerges that there is a need for further studies addressing social integration and life and job satisfaction of different skilled migrant groups in different host societies. The current research aimed to address these gaps in the literature. Specific aims are set out below.

1.4 Aims of the Research

The aims of the research were to:

1. Ascertain the levels of:
   a. Language, identity and behavioural social integration,
   b. Life satisfaction and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.

2. Examine the relationship between the following socio-demographic factors and social integration: (a) age at migration; (b) years since migration; (c) English language skills; (d) level of education; (e) pre-migration SES; (f) neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants; (g) perceived inclusiveness; and (h) expectation to return to country of birth.

3. Examine the relationship between language, identity and behavioural social integration and life satisfaction and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.
4. Examine the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.

5. Explore potential mediating pathways between socio-demographic factors and life satisfaction and job satisfaction via language, identity and behavioural social integration.

Understanding the factors that contribute to social integration will assist in building models of the social integration for a specific ethnic group and could inform intervention strategies to improve the well-being of these ethnic skilled migrants in Australia. The section that follows outlines the Research Questions and the Hypotheses for the current research.

1.5 Research Questions and Hypotheses

1.5.1 Research questions

In order to achieve the aims of this study, the following Research Questions were developed for investigation:

1. Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia:
   1.1. Socially integrated in terms of language, identity and behaviour?
   1.2. Satisfied with their lives?
   1.3. Satisfied with their jobs?

2. What are the factors that significantly influence Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants:
   2.1. Language, identity and behavioural social integration?
   2.2. Life satisfaction?
   2.3. Job satisfaction?

3. Is there a relationship between:
   3.1. Language, identity and behavioural social integration and life satisfaction and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia?
3.2. Job satisfaction and life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia?

4. Is the relationship between:
   4.1. Socio-demographic factors and life satisfaction mediated by language, identity and behavioural social integration?
   4.2. Socio-demographic factors and job satisfaction mediated by language, identity and behavioural social integration?

Hypotheses developed for the present study are listed in the next section.

1.5.2 Hypotheses
H1: Age at migration is related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia; migrants who were younger at migration show:
   (a) Higher host country identity integration
   (b) Higher host country behaviour integration
   (c) However, age at migration is not expected to be related to host country language integration for this group of migrants.

H2: Years since migration is positively related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia; migrants who have lived in Australia longer show:
   (a) Higher host country language integration
   (b) Higher host country identity integration
   (c) Higher host country behaviour integration.

H3: Host country language proficiency is
   (a) not related to host country identity integration
   (b) positively related to host country behaviour integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.

\[\text{\footnotesize The relationship between host country language proficiency and integration in host country language dimension was not tested since these variables overlap with each other.}\]
H4: Level of education is positively related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Migrants with a higher level of education show
(a) Higher host country language integration
(b) Higher host country identity integration
(c) Higher host country behaviour integration.

H5: Pre-migration SES is positively related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Migrants with higher pre-migration SES show
(a) Higher host country language integration
(b) Higher host country identity integration
(c) Higher host country behaviour integration.

H6: Neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants is inversely related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Migrants who live in ethnic neighbourhoods show
(a) Lower host country language integration
(b) Lower host country identity integration
(c) Lower host country behaviour integration.

H7: Perceived inclusiveness by mainstreamers is positively related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian Skilled migrants in Australia. Migrants with higher perceived inclusiveness show
(a) Higher host country language integration
(b) Higher host country identity integration
(c) Higher host country behaviour integration.

H8: Expectation to return to country of origin is inversely related to social integration. Migrants with a lower expectation to return to country of origin show
(a) Higher host country language integration
(b) Higher host country identity integration
(c) Higher host country behaviour integration.
H9: Social integration is positively related to life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Higher social integration in terms of language, identity and behaviour is associated with higher life satisfaction.

H10: Social integration is positively related to job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Higher social integration in terms of language, identity and behaviour is associated with higher job satisfaction.

H11: Job satisfaction is positively related to life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Higher job satisfaction is associated with higher life satisfaction.

1.6 Significance of the Present Research

The findings from this research may be helpful to organisations such as Multicultural Research Centres that deal with migrants’ social integration in Australia. Furthermore, understanding the level of life satisfaction of a significant group of migrants is an important element for migration policy-makers, since lower life satisfaction can lead to social issues, such as psychological disorders, which may have negative outcomes for Australian society.

It is evident that in the current context all types of Australian organisations, from multinational companies to family businesses, employ skilled migrants from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds (Dagher & D’Netto, 1997; Syed & Kramar, 2010). Hence the findings of this study could assist organisations that employ skilled migrants by adding to understanding of the factors that influence the social integration of skilled migrants. An improved understanding of skilled migrants’ life and job satisfaction allows organisations to more effectively utilise this important segment of the workforce to achieve better organisational performance.

Individuals from developing countries migrate to developed countries with the intention of improving their quality of life and their life satisfaction (Mailmen & Johnston, 2011; Sam, 1998). Nevertheless, there is little or no academic literature available on the life
and job satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants who live in Australia. Therefore the present study aims to provide information about skilled migrants’ lives after migrating in terms of their social integration and life and job satisfaction – information that will be useful to Sri Lankans and Indians who are considering migrating to Australia as skilled migrants.

1.7 Overview of Research Methodology

In order to achieve the aims of this thesis, a cross-sectional survey research design was employed. Snowballing and convenience sampling techniques were adopted to approach potential participants. Only Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants engaged in active employment were included, given that measuring job satisfaction among the participants was one of the aims of the present study. Data were collected via online and hard copy surveys. The survey instrument was published only in English, as it was expected that the target audience, who are skilled migrants, would be capable of completing the survey in the English language. Hypotheses of the present study were tested using correlation analysis and regression analysis. Results were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (version 20). More details on research methods and analysis techniques used in the study are provided in Chapters 4 and 5.

1.8 Organisation of Remaining Chapters

This thesis consists of seven Chapters (see Figure 1.1). The current chapter set out the background, the focus for the thesis, including its aims and Hypotheses, and the significance of the research. Chapter 2 introduces key terminologies used in the current research and presents literature related to migration, social integration, life satisfaction and job satisfaction of migrants in different host societies. The Conceptual Framework for the thesis is presented thereafter. Chapter 3 presents literature related to factors that influence social integration and then develops the Hypotheses for the present study. In Chapter 3 the relationships between social integration and life and job satisfaction and the relationship between life and job satisfaction are also addressed to develop the related Hypotheses.
Chapter 4 outlines the research Methodology. This Chapter explains the cross-sectional survey research design used in the current study. The choice of population and non-probability sampling techniques employed are also explained. Online and mail survey tools used in data collection are outlined next. Details of the research instruments, including their reliability and validity are also presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 5 presents the results of the quantitative data analyses. Descriptive statistics in relation to all the study variables are presented in the preliminary analyses section. The results related to Research Question 1, which is the extent to which Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are socially integrated, satisfied with their lives and satisfied with their jobs are presented in this Chapter. Results of the correlation analysis of the study variables are also presented here. Chapter 6 presents regression analysis results, together with mediated effect results, that address the remaining Research Questions and Hypotheses.

Chapter 7 discusses the findings of the present study. In-depth discussion of the results related to the Research Questions and the Hypotheses tested is presented in this Chapter. Limitations of the present study, suggestions for future studies and the contributions made by the present research findings and the conclusions are included in Chapter 7. Figure 1.1 summarises the structure of the thesis.
1.9 Chapter Summary

This Chapter explained the background of this thesis. Initially, the focus of the present study was explained, and research gaps were identified. The Chapter also outlined the aims, Research Questions and the Hypotheses for this research and explained the significance of the research. The structure of the thesis was also presented.

Australia has a long history of migration. In recent years, Asian skilled migrants have been a popular source of employees for the Australian workplace. Despite a large representation of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrant population in Australia, this group is neglected in the academic literature. Therefore the primary focus of the present research is to explore the extent to which Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are socially integrated into Australian society and to identify the socio-demographic factors that contribute to their social integration in terms of host country language, identity and behaviour. The present study also explores the life and job satisfaction of this group of...
migrants, as there is little evidence on Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ experiences in Australia after migration.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Chapter Introduction

Chapter one set the background for the present research. The aim of this chapter is to review relevant literature and to introduce key terminology used in the current research. Section 2.2 briefly reviews the literature on migration and migrants in Australia in general. Section 2.3 presents literature related to skilled migrants in Australia, including Australia’s skilled migration program and its contribution to the society. Section 2.4 discusses key terminology used in this thesis, including acculturation, assimilation and social integration. Justification for choosing the term social integration in this study is presented in Section 2.5. Section 2.6 reviews literature related to life satisfaction. Top-down and bottom-up approaches to life satisfaction and the differences between life satisfaction as a whole and life satisfaction at domain level are reviewed in this section. Past findings on migrants’ life satisfaction in different host societies are presented in Section 2.7. Section 2.8 discusses relevant job satisfaction literature and findings on skilled migrants’ job satisfaction in different host societies are also presented. Section 2.9 presents the Conceptual Framework for the present research. Finally, the chapter summary is provided in Section 2.10.

2.2 Migration and Migrants in Australia

2.2.1 Australian migration history

Since the establishment of the Department of Migration and Citizenship Australia in July 1945, over seven million people have been granted visas for permanent migration (DIAC, Annual Report, 2010-2011). As a result, more than 43.1% of the current Australian population was born overseas or has at least one parent who was born overseas (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2013). Furthermore, currently there are 12 million people in the Australian workforce, that is, 26% of the total labour force, who were born overseas (ABS, 2013). Thus, Australia is considered one of the most culturally diverse nations in the world (Ho, 2006; Hugo, 1999; 2004). Researchers
(Jupp, 2002) suggest that skill shortage is the primary reason why Australia accepts skilled migrants, with political reasons being the second major reason. In addition, researchers note that Australians are internationally recognised as friendly, respectful and welcoming people, which may be another reason for the higher rate of migration during recent decades (Chiswick & Miller, 2002; Colic-Peisker, 2011; DIAC, Annual Report, 2012-2013; Foroughi et al., 2001; Hugo, 1999; 2004).

Even though present-day Australia supports multiculturalism (Colic-Peisker, 2011), until the late 1973s policies against non-Europeans (e.g., the ‘White Australia Policy’) existed when accepting migrants into Australia (Colic-Peisker, 2011; Hugo, 2004; Morgan, 2006). Jordan (2006) stated that the sole purpose of establishing the White Australia Policy was to prevent non-European migrants’ entry to Australian territory. The concept of the White Australia Policy related to Australia’s colonial political culture, which assumed non-Europeans to be socially separated, inferior and incapable, and hence unable to integrate into the Australian way of life (Jordan, 2006). Jordan (2006) further explained that 95% of migrants who arrived in Australia during the period of the ‘White Australia Policy’ were from British and Irish backgrounds.

With the end of the White Australia Policy in 1973, which had lasted for over 70 years, a new migration policy of non-discrimination on the grounds of colour, race or nationality was established (Colic-Peisker, 2011; Government of Western Australia, 2012; Iredale et al., 2003). Thus individuals and families from different societies all over the world gained the opportunity to enter Australia on a point allocation system that assessed their capability to qualify for entry. Criteria such as age, education, occupation and health are considered in the point allocation system. These policy changes paved the way for Asian skilled migrants to enter Australia (Colic-Peisker, 2011; Hugo, 1999; 2004; Jordan, 2006). As a result of these policy changes in 2011-2012, the Indian sub-continent has provided 24% and North Asia 25% of the migrants to Australia. Possibly for that reason Australia’s migration discourse has named this period the Asian Century in migration (DIAC, Australia’ Migration Trends, 2011-2012). Australia’s popular migration categories are discussed in the next section.
2.2.2 Prominent migrant categories in Australia

Individuals who move across borders are identified in many different ways, including migrants, expatriates, travellers, international students and so on. During recent decades, Australia has been a popular destination, particularly for (a) skilled migrants, (b) family migrants, (c) humanitarian migrants, and (d) for international students (DIAC, Annual Report, 2012-2013).

Section 2.3 of this chapter exclusively discusses skilled migrants, who are the cohort for the present study. After skilled migrants, family migrants are the second largest migrant category in Australia (DIAC, Annual Report, 2012-2013). Family reunion is one of the major objectives of the Australian migration program. Until recent years, Australia’s family migrants outnumbered skilled migrants (DIAC, Annual Report, 2010-2011). In 2012-2013, a total of 60,185 visas were granted under the family migration category. Partners, children, parents and other close relatives (e.g., sisters, brothers) of Australian citizens are able to apply for visas under this category (DIAC, Annual Report, 2013). The UK, India, China, Thailand and Philippines are Australia’s major family migrant source countries. Women dominate men in this category (Government of Western Australia, 2012).

Humanitarian migrants are the next most prominent category in the Australian migration program. In 2012-13, a total of 20,019 humanitarian visas were granted to people from various countries, including Iraq, Burma, Afghanistan, Bhutan, Sri Lanka and Congo (DIAC, Annual Report, 2012-2013). While family and humanitarian migrant categories remain valid, in recent years the numbers have been capped by the government to manage and control this migration flow (Government of Western Australia, 2012).

In addition, Australia has been a major educational provider for international students (Hawthorne, 2012; Gribble & Blackmore, 2012). In 2012-2013, 259,278 student visas were granted for students from countries around the world, including China, India, South Korea, Vietnam and Brazil (DIAC, Annual Report, 2013). Hawthorne (2010) found that international students who completed their studies in Australia have been a major source of skilled migration.
2.3 Skilled Migrants

In the past, people migrated for environmental reasons, such as extreme weather conditions or due to political issues in their country of birth (Colic-Peisker, 2011; Hughes, 2002, p. 1). However, nowadays people migrate to Western countries primarily for economic reasons. On the other hand, due to skill shortages, an ageing population and decreasing fertility rates, developed countries in the Western world now invite skilled migrants to facilitate their economic growth (Ariss et al., 2012). Therefore, in recent years many migrant-receiving countries, including Canada and Australia, have given preference to the skilled migrant category within their migration programs (Boucher, 2007; Colic-Peisker, 2011; Ho, 2006; Hugo, 1999; 2004; Lee, 2013). Researchers also agree that skilled migrants contribute to the economic growth of host societies with their high levels of human capital\(^2\) (Bahn, 2014; Chow, 2003; Ho, 2006; Hughes, 2002, p. 2). Emphasising the important contribution made by skilled migrants, Groutsis and Arnold (2012) reveal that 50% of medical practitioners working in Australia have been trained overseas, primarily in the UK, India, New Zealand and South Africa. Thus, in the present-day global economy, the skilled stream of migrants is considered a vital economic resource (Mullings, 2011; Picot et al., 2008; Qureshi et al., 2013).

Skilled migrants differ from other migrant categories in various ways. Skilled migrants can be defined as migrants who are selected on the basis of their qualifications, occupational skills, outstanding talent or business skills, age, English language ability and family relationships (DIAC, 2012). They have a recognised qualification, possess extensive work experience in a given field, they gain access to a position in the labour market that represents their skills and qualifications, and they mostly work within the profession for which they have been trained (DIAC, 2013; Hawthorne, 2010; Hughes, 2002). In addition, skilled migrants intend to live in the host country permanently or extend their stay for a longer period than temporary migrants (Fossland, 2013; Groutsis & Arnold, 2012; Roberts, 2011). It is also stated by Hughes (2002) and Qureshi et al. (2013) that permanent skilled migrants intend to fulfil their labour market aspirations or educational aspirations in order to achieve better standards of life after migrating.

---

\(^2\) Human Capital: knowledge of the English language, level of education, work experience and job related skills are generally considered as human capital (Renaud & Cayn, 2007).
Currently, Canada, New Zealand, the UK and Australia are the main skilled migrant receiving countries. As Boucher (2007) stated, all of these countries use point allocation systems in selecting their stream of skilled migrants. Even though these countries compete with each other when acquiring skilled migrants, each of them has diverse motivations within their skilled migration program (Birrell et al., 2006; Boucher, 2007). Meeting skill shortage is one common objective of all four countries; however, in particular, Australia and Canada place a great emphasis on migrants’ ability to contribute to the country’s economic success (Birrell et al., 2006: p. 128).

2.3.1 Skilled migrants in Australia

Australia is one of the world’s major recipient nations of skilled migrants (Berry, 2010; Islam & Fausten, 2008, p. 66). Since 1998, the skilled stream has been the primary pathway for migrants who come to Australia (DIAC, Trends in Migration: Australia, 2010-2011). Further evidence suggests that in the past six decades the Australian migration plan has allocated more places to skilled migrants, expecting to fill existing skill shortages and to achieve a sustainable economic boom in the country (Bahn, 2014; Boucher, 2007; Colic-Peisker, 2011; Collins, 2013; Hawthorne, 2012; Ho, 2006; Hugo, 2004; Parliament of Australia, 2013). Thus, a substantial percentage of the total migration program is represented by the skilled migration category. Statistical evidence shows that in 2012-2013 the skilled stream represented 67.9% (128,973 migrants) of the total migration program (DIAC, Migration Program Report, 2012-2013).

i) Australian skilled migration program

The Australian government introduced a Skill Occupancy List (SOL)\(^3\) to achieve the ‘greatest economic gains’ from the migration program (Parliament of Australia, 2013). According to the key selection criteria in 2011, skilled migrants can be defined as migrants who are selected on the basis of their occupation skills, outstanding talent or business skills, age, English language ability and family relationships (DIAC, Annual Report, 2011-2012). In 2011-2012, Department of Immigration Australia statistics reported the top five occupations of the primary applicants in the skilled stream as accountant, cook, software and applications programmer, software engineer, and

\(^3\) Skill Occupancy List: the Australian Government provides nominations to potential skilled migrants with skills in demand who can make a contribution to Australia’s economy (DIAC, New Skilled Visa and Point Test Arrangements, 2012).
developer programmer. The five major source countries in 2012-2013 were India, the People’s Republic of China, the UK, Sri Lanka and Malaysia (DIMIA, Annual Report, 2012-2013). At the time of data collection for the present research in 2011, the Australian skilled migration program had four visa categories: (a) General skilled migration, (b) Employer nomination, (c) Business skilled migration, and (d) Distinguished talents (DIMIA, New Skilled Visa and Point Test Arrangements, 2012). These categories and recent changes to the skilled migration program in Australia are outlined below.

(i) General skilled migration - Even though there are a range of visa options under this category, the ‘skilled independent’ and ‘skilled sponsored’ categories were the most popular. Under the skilled independent category migrants need to achieve a minimum number of points to be eligible to apply for the Australian skilled migration program. These points are allocated based on their age, English language ability, nominated occupation, qualifications (earned in Australia or overseas) and work experience (Australian or overseas). In addition, the skilled sponsored category requires an Australian relative (e.g., sister, brother, niece, nephew, uncle, aunt) to sponsor migrants.

(ii) Employer nomination - Australian employers can sponsor employees from overseas to fill skill vacancies in their businesses on a permanent basis.

(iii) Business skill migration - Successful business people from overseas are encouraged to permanently settle in Australia under this category.

(iv) Distinguished talents - A small number of distinguished individuals, such as sports people, musicians, artists and designers whose talents are recognised internationally, are encouraged to settle permanently in Australia under this category. (DIAC, Annual Report, 2011-2012)

It should be noted that with effect from January 2013 Australia has introduced the ‘SkillSelect System’ (Parliament of Australia, 2012). The ‘SkillSelect System’ was introduced as a result of continuing debate on ‘inferior’ employment outcomes, such as
high unemployment among skilled migrants, and alarming labour market trend, such as displacement and early retirement of skilled migrants from non-English speaking countries (DIAC, Professionals & other skilled migrants, 2013; Hawthorne, 2002, p. 55). Thus, the ‘SkillSelect system’ has been specially designed to attract migrants with unique skills or outstanding capabilities who can contribute to the growth of the national economy (DIAC, Migrant economic outcomes & contributions, 2013). According to the new system, the Department of Immigration Australia does not accept new applications for skilled sponsored, skilled independent and skilled regional sponsored visas. Instead, the interested applicants are required to submit an expression of interest and receive an invitation from the Australian Government in order to lodge an application for a skilled migrant visa (DIAC, Professionals & other skilled migrants, 2013). This helps the government to choose the most suitable applicants based on the economic needs of the country, stipulating when they have to apply and what numbers the government needs. In addition, employers are able to view details of potential skilled workers and make contact with them; thus employers are benefiting from the program as they are able to easily identify potential skilled workers with the essential skills and attributes they need (DIAC, SkillSelect, 2013).

Regional development is another expected benefit from the ‘SkillSelect’ program. For instance, recently the Australian government introduced various visa categories (e.g., the subclass 187 visa category) that expect skilled migrants to settle in regional Australia to boost the population and economy in those areas (DIAC, Annual Report 2012; Wulff & Dharmalingam, 2008). Recent study findings have revealed that skilled migrants are entering high-skilled jobs in regional Australia and working towards the country’s regional development (Massey & Parr, 2012; Wulff & Dharmalingam, 2008). The following section further discusses the economic and social contribution of skilled migrants in Australia.

**ii) The economic and social contribution of skilled migrants to Australia**

Australia’s national multicultural and diversity policy states that successfully settled and integrated migrants add substantial value to the country (DIAC, Migrant economic outcomes & contributions, 2013). Skilled migrants are expected to quickly begin to contribute to the Australian economy (DIAC, Migrant economic outcomes &...
contributions, 2013.). For this reason, Australia mainly focuses on migrants’ ability to contribute to the country’s economic success when selecting its skilled migrants (Birrell et al., 2006; Boucher, 2007; Colic-Peisker, 2011; Ho, 2006; Hugo, 1999; 2004; Kukoc, 2012). A snapshot of skilled migrants’ contribution to Australia’s economy is discussed here.

Statistical evidence from the Australian government reveals that ‘employer-sponsored skilled migrants’ have outperformed other skill categories in achieving the ‘greatest economic gains’ in Australia, as they have quickly become active in the labour market (DIAC, Migrants Economic Outcomes and Contributions, 2011a). For instance, the unemployment rate in the employer-sponsored category was as low as 0.3%, compared to a 5.8% overall unemployment rate among skilled migrants. In 2013, the overall unemployment rate among Sri Lankan and Indian migrants were five percent and six percent, respectively while the national unemployment rate stood at 5.8 percent (DIAC, 2013a and 2013b).

It is also interesting to note that skilled migrants’ income is above the average Australian income; notably, employer-sponsored skilled migrants’ average annual income is around $100,000, compared to the $69,000 average full-time adult wage in Australia (DIAC, Migrants Economic Outcomes and Contributions, 2011a). In addition, statistics of first-generation migrants’ net income in the Commonwealth budget show a substantial positive contribution. In 2009-2010, 168,000 permanent skilled migrants contributed approximately $880 million during their first year of arrival (DIAC, Migrants Economic Outcomes and Contributions, 2011a). These results also ensure a substantial contribution to Australia’s tax base, which in turn contributes to the country’s development (Kukoc, 2012).

Likewise, it is evident that regional Australia is also currently benefiting from recently introduced regional skilled migration programs in many ways, including higher labour market participation and the boom in the mining sector (Wulff & Dharmalingam, 2008). Further to that, Taylor et al. (2014) suggested that 60% of skilled migrants gained employment soon after they arrived in regional Australia. Health care, social assistance, mining and food industries are the main benefiting industries from regional skilled
migration programs. Business skilled migrants contribute to Australia by initially investing their money (at least $5 million) in businesses in Australia (DIAC, Business Migration, 2014). These skilled migrants contribute to Australia by generating employment, increasing the production of Australian goods and services and developing links with international markets.

Apart from the above economic contributions, young skilled migrants (most skilled migrants are between 20 and 40 years of age at the time of application) contribute socially by remaining active in the workforce for longer periods and ensuring lower health and pension-related costs. For example, Kukoc (2012, p. 11) pointed out that in 2012 skilled migrants were least dependent on social security and government welfare facilities (Kukoc, 2012, p. 11). The following quote from Kukoc (2012) further illustrates skilled migrants’ contribution to Australia’s economy and to society.

Certainly on historical experience skilled migrants must be making a positive economic contribution to Australia […] skilled migration has a direct effect on the three key factors which can impact economic growth ‘population’, ‘participation’ and ‘productivity’. (Kukoc, 2012, p. 5)

It has been demonstrated that skilled migrants add a substantial value to the country’s socio-economic growth. On the other hand, numerous studies have argued that once migrated, skilled migrants are not always accepted and absorbed into the host society and into its labour market with their existing credentials (Ho, 2006; Neto & Barros, 2007; Valenta, 2009). The next paragraph discusses issues that migrants face in relation to their foreign credentials.

2.3.2 Skilled migrants and their foreign credentials

Despite the economic value and contribution of skilled migrants discussed above, it is argued that some skilled migrants find it challenging to transfer their credentials (qualifications and work experience) to the host country’s labour market soon after migrating (Bahn, 2014; Ho, 2006; Neto & Barros, 2007; Selvarajah 2004, Somerville & Walsworth, 2009; Syed & Kramar, 2010; Syed & Murray, 2009; Valenta, 2009). Some skilled migrants tend to experience deteriorating economic outcomes such as higher
rates of unemployment, low initial wages and low earnings throughout their employment in countries such as Canada and the US (Qureshi et al., 2013; Somerville & Walsworth, 2009). Cobb-Clark (2000) and Lee (2013) revealed that skilled migrants from non-English speaking countries experience more hardships than migrants from English-speaking countries in the Australian labour market. Researchers opine that this situation comes about as a result of discounted recognition for foreign credentials (Amit, 2012b; Somerville & Walsworth, 2009; Syed & Murray, 2009).

Somerville and Walsworth (2009) argued that, even though skilled migrants are considered an economic resource in host societies such as Canada and the US, the likelihood of finding a suitable job can be low for some migrants (see also Chowhan et al., 2012). Furthermore, Somerville and Walsworth (2009) have identified that Canadian skilled migrants are frustrated with the labour market reality in Canada due to unmet and overly optimistic expectations. For instance, Chowhan et al. (2012) pointed out that in Canada 46% of new skilled migrants have reported difficulty in finding a job and they reported that they are less likely to be called for interviews, mainly due to non-recognition of their foreign credentials (George & Chaze, 2009; Hawthorne, 2010; Somerville & Walsworth, 2009).

In addition, Ho (2006) revealed that Asian skilled migrant women also suffer particularly from non-recognition of their overseas qualifications and work experience in host societies (see also Pío, 2010). As a result, some skilled migrants make an effort to localise their qualifications by completing ‘bridging courses’ in host country educational institutions in order to meet the host country labour market requirements (George & Chaze, 2009; Groutsis & Arnold, 2012; Ho, 2006; Qureshi et al., 2013). Likewise, scholars have acknowledged that some Australian skilled migrants do not find employment in the same field as their education and skills (Chiswick et al., 2005; Hawthorne, 1994, Ho, 2006). For instance, Groutsis and Arnold (2012) pointed out that South African-trained medical practitioners have to either have their qualifications reassessed in Australia, or engage in supervised practice with some restrictions, or in some cases medical practitioners with decades of experience have to practise in rural Australia for a minimum of ten years. These examples evidence the fact that some skilled migrant groups face difficulties when integrating into the host societies and
workplaces and these are likely to impact on their satisfaction with migration outcomes and job satisfaction in particular.

Hawthorne (2010) found that, regardless of ethnic background, Australian employers prefer to employ skilled migrants who were former international students who had studied in Australia. That is mainly because Australian qualifications make it easier for international students to integrate into the labour market (see also Parasnis et al., 2008). Furthermore, Hawthorne (2010) found that skilled migrants who have studied in Australia are more likely to be professionally employed in their own field than ‘off shore’ migrants. However, in contrast to Hawthorne’s (2010) findings, Parasnis et al. (2008) found no advantage in having Australian qualifications for labour market integration among their study participants. Parasnis et al. (2008) found that factors such as level of education, labour market experience, marital status, country of birth and years since arrival are more likely to impact migrants’ labour market integration in Australia than where they receive their qualifications. On the basis of their research findings they concluded that, when other elements of human capital such as English language and work experience play a substantial role, Australian qualifications may not be an important determinant when integrating into the Australian labour market (Parasnis et al., 2008).

It can be said that migrants’ experiences with acceptance of foreign credentials can be different based on the country in which they settle and where they migrate from (Ho, 2006; Qureshi et al., 2013). Groutsis and Arnold (2012) found that recently medical practitioners from South Africa have been able to successfully transfer their skills within Australia after re-qualifying according to the Australian requirements. Parr and Guo (2005) also found that there has been an upward mobility in the occupational structure of Asian-Australian skilled migrants in recent years, indicating positive results of ethnic diversity practices in Australian organisations.

In summarising the section regarding skilled migrants, it can be said that migrants contribute to the Australian economy and society in different ways, including injection of skilled labour, high labour market participation, low unemployment rates, fiscal contribution, increased productivity through innovation and business information,
enhanced trade links with international markets and the potential to develop regional Australia (Government of Western Australia: 2012; Ho, 2006). Therefore the skilled migrant category can be considered an important segment of the Australian economy and society. Studies that focus on skilled migrants are on the increase (Boucher, 2007; Hawthorn, 2002; 2010; Ho, 2006; Islam & Fausten, 2008; Massey & Parr, 2012; Roberts, 2011; Wulff & Dharmalingam, 2008; Ziguras & Fang Law, 2006). Nevertheless, there remains a lack of studies that focus on particular ethnic groups of skilled migrants and their migration outcomes such as social integration and life and job satisfaction.

The next section of this chapter explores theoretical concepts that are relevant to acculturation, assimilation and social integration that have been used by researchers to explain migrants’ adaptation in different host societies.

2.4 Acculturation, Assimilation and Social Integration

The adaptation of migrants to host societies has evoked considerable interest in the current migration literature. Due to the complexity of the process, different studies have used different terminologies to explain the extent to which migrants have become a part of the host society. These terminologies include ‘acculturation’ (Berry, 2001; Birman, & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Gordon, 1964; Mahmud & Scholmerich, 2011; Miller & Kerlow-Myers, 2009; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Safdar et al., 2003; Sam & Berry, 2010), ‘assimilation’ (Gordon, 1964; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Safdar et al., 2003; Sakamoto et al., 2008; Sam & Berry, 2010), and ‘social integration’ (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007, Eraydin et al., 2010; Martinovic et al., 2009; Reitz et al., 2009; Remennick, 2003, 2004; Stark & Jakubek, 2013; Valento, 2009; Wu et al., 2012). Due to the interchangeable usage (Garrido et al., 2012; Selvarajah, 2004; Stark & Jakubek, 2013) of such terms within migration literature, the following section provides a brief overview of these terminologies and discusses the similarities and differences among them in order to understand their appropriateness for use in the present study.
2.4.1 Acculturation

The acculturation process is one of the most researched areas in the migration literature (Au et al., 1998; Berry & Sam, 1997; Berry, 2001; Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Coleman et al., 2001; Ea et al., 2008; Lu et al., 2011; Remennick, 1999; Safdar et al., 2003; Sakamoto, 2007). Acculturation is primarily described as “a process that entails contact between two cultural groups, which results in numerous cultural changes in both parties” (Arends-to’th & Van de Vijver, 2003; Redfield, Linton & Herskovits, 1936, as cited in Berry, 2001, p. 616). Therefore, acculturation is identified as a bidirectional process. That is, changes occur within both the groups in contact (Berry 2001; Sayegh & Lasry, 1993). Berry (2001; 2006) argued that, even though contact experiences change migrants’ and mainstreamers’ behaviours, there is a greater impact on migrants (see also, Arends-to’th, & Van de Vijver, 2003). Perhaps for this reason, some studies such as Berry (2001) and Remennick (2003) have described acculturation mainly in relation to migrants.

Mendoze (1989) has defined acculturation as the process of ethnic minorities integrating into mainstream society (as cited in Sanchez & Brock, 1996). Similarly, acculturation has been also defined by Abraido-Lanza (2004) as the process by which migrants adapt their attitudes, values, customs, beliefs and behaviours to a new culture. Berry et al. (2006) offered a similar definition, describing acculturation as “an accumulative social learning process through which ethnic minority individuals adapt to the dominant culture and the corresponding changes in their beliefs, values, and behaviours that result from their exposure to the host culture and its members” (as cited in Kumar & Nevid, 2010, p. 275). When all these definitions of acculturation are taken into account, similarities in these definitions are clear: acculturation is a process that changes migrants’ attitudes, values, customs, beliefs and behaviours in accordance with the host culture.

Gordon (1964) proposed two types of acculturation. These are ‘behavioural acculturation’ and ‘structural acculturation’ (as cited in Selverajah, 2004). ‘Behavioural acculturation’ refers to changes in the cultural patterns of migrants in accordance with the host society, including languages, interests, daily living habits, food and entertainment choices of migrants (Kim, 2006; Miller, 2010). ‘Structural acculturation’
refers to migrants’ becoming members of social clubs in the host society (Selverajah, 2004). The focus of the present study is on social integration in terms of language, identity and behaviour dimensions. This may be more closely linked with ‘behavioural acculturation’ introduced by Gordon (1964), because changes among first-generation ethnic migrants can be expected mainly in ‘behavioural’ realms rather than ‘structural’ realms when adapting into the host society (Kim, 2006).

Acculturation involves alterations in the migrants’ sense of self-identity (Garrido et al., 2012; Ryder et al., 2000; Worrell & Gardner-Kitt, 2006). These alterations are discussed using two predominant models. These are the unidimensional model and the bidimensional model (Berry, 2006; Ryder et al., 2000; Sakamoto, 2007). In the historical unidimensional model, acculturated individuals are placed on different identities that range from exclusively heritage culture to exclusively mainstream culture (Ryder et al., 2000, p. 49). For instance, according to this model, heritage and mainstream cultures are mutually exclusive and competing with each other (Sayegh & Lasry, 1993). Suinn-Lew’s Asian Self Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA Scale, Suinn et al., 1992), an often-used scale in acculturation studies, assumes a ‘unidimensional’ construct that ranges from highly traditional through bicultural competence\(^4\) to highly assimilated (for instance, one of the items in the scale that tests language skills, ranging from heritage culture to mainstream culture, is ‘what language can you speak: Asian only; Asian and English equally; English only?’). However, the unidimensional model did not have a way to distinguish migrants who are strongly bicultural from those who are strongly identified with either culture. Therefore, as a critique of this unidimensional model, the bidimensional model was proposed (Ryder et al., 2000).

The bidimensional model assumes heritage and mainstream cultures are free to vary independently and migrants are capable of having multiple cultural identities (Ryder et

---

\(^4\) Bicultural competence: the ability of an individual to live within two cultures either by being of mixed racial heritage or born in one culture and raised in a second. Acquisition of bicultural competence involves several behavioural changes, such as a shift in cognitive and perceptual processes, acquisition of new languages and relationships, etc. Literature related to bicultural competency suggests that minority individuals with weaker personal identity may suffer from various psychological disorders in bicultural situations. LaFromboise et al. (1993) suggested that individuals who need to successfully manage bicultural competency are required to develop knowledge of cultural beliefs and values, positive attitudes toward both majority and minority groups, bicultural efficacy, communication ability, role repertoire and a sense of being grounded (LaFromboise et al., 1993).
al., 2000). Therefore, the bidimensional model posits that individuals are able to maintain their own cultural identification and behaviours while developing mainstream cultural identification and behaviours simultaneously (Berry, 2006; Sakamoto, 2007; Sayegh & Lasry, 1993). Thus, LaFromboise et al. (1993) claimed acculturated individuals perceive themselves as members of an ethnic group, as well as members of mainstream society, depending on the situation (see also Remennick, 2004). However, past research findings (Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Remennick, 2003; Saghafi et al., 2012; Sakamoto, 2007; Sam, 1998) suggest that first-generation ethnic migrants are more likely to maintain their own culture at a high level while adding host country cultural dimensions. Therefore, it is sensible to assess the extent to which migrants are integrated into the host society rather than the extent of their integration into the culture of their country of origin. Hence the current study focused on skilled migrants’ integration into the host country only. Furthermore with the introduction of the bidimensional model previous research has measured migrants’ acculturation into the host culture and to their own country of origin culture as two independent variables and measuring migrant’ acculturation to new and old culture independently has received theoretical support (Birman & Tyler, 1994; Birman, 2006; Birman et al., 2014; Ryder et al., 2000).

Berry (1990; 1997) introduced a framework for acculturation. Berry’s acculturation framework (Berry, 1990; 2001) consists of four main strategies that migrants are likely to use in acclimatising to a new society. These are: (a) assimilation strategy, whereby individuals adopt the culture of the dominant society while giving up their own culture entirely; (b) integration strategy, whereby migrants show interest in maintaining their own cultural heritage while adopting elements of the host culture; (c) separation strategy, which is the complete opposite strategy of assimilation, where migrants tend to maintain a minimum level of contact with the host society; and (d) marginalisation strategy, where there is a little possibility or interest in one’s own cultural maintenance and little interest in having contact with other ethnic groups in the society (Berry, 1990; 2001; Eshel & Rosenthal-Sokolov, 2000; Remennick, 2003). Even though this acculturation framework has been used in many studies (including Au et al., 1998; Berry et al., 2006; Lu et al., 2011; 2012), the present study did not use this framework, since this study explores the absolute level of social integration among migrants, not the
integration strategy that migrants are likely to use when adapting into the host society. However, drawing on Berry’s (1990) acculturation framework, some scholars use the term assimilation to describe high integration into the host society and marginalisation to describe low integration into the host society (Eshel & Rosenthal-Sokolov, 2000; Remennick, 2003). Therefore, the present study refers to literature that used Berry’s acculturation framework when appropriate.

2.4.2 Assimilation

In addition to the term acculturation, assimilation is also used by many scholars to describe migrants’ adaptation into the host society (Gordon, 1964; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Safdar et al., 2003). Assimilation represents complete change in minorities, shifting from their old culture and way of life to the new culture and new way of life (Berry, 1990; Eshel & Rosenthal-Sokolov, 2000; Remennick, 2003, 2004; Safdar et al., 2003). In addition, assimilation expects migrants to abandon their own traditional values and practices in order to adapt to the values and norms of the majority culture (Berry, 1990; 2006 Remennick, 2003; Sakamoto, 2007). Therefore, researchers believe that assimilation results in greater socio-cultural changes within migrants (Eshel & Rosenthal-Sokolov, 2000; Safdar et al., 2003; Sakamoto, 2007). Earlier studies (Gordon, 1964) on assimilation pointed out that assimilating into the host culture is desirable and unavoidable for migrants over a span of a few generations. However, with the significant increase in the number of migrants from non-English speaking background in Australia, Barda (2006) argued that nowadays assimilation is far from the reality. Therefore, in a host society with policies of multiculturalism, assimilation of first-generation migrants is debatable. For this reason, the present study has omitted this concept.

2.4.3 Acculturation and assimilation revisited

Even though acculturation is one of most cited constructs in migration-related literature, it has also attracted criticism (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Hunt, Schneider & Comer, 2004; Kunst & Sam, 2013; Miller, 2010; Sakamoto, 2007; Sayegh & Lasry, 1993; Stuart & Ward, 2011). The broadness and vagueness of the construct is one such criticism (Kunst & Sam, 2013). Hunt et al. (2004) pointed out that due to insufficient conceptualisation and lack of clarity in definition, the concept of acculturation has been ambiguous and
inconsistent. As suggested by Ryder et al. (2000), it is evident that researchers at times refer acculturation as a bidirectional construct but at other times it has been related only to migrants.

Also, in light of the available literature, it can be argued that, even though the bidimensional model was proposed as a critique of the unidimensional model of acculturation, the bidimensional model is not without its limitations. In particular, the applicability of the bidimensional model in terms of four acculturation strategies suggested in Berry’s acculturation framework is now uncertain. Studies have empirically supported that the preferred acculturation strategy is integration (Berry, 2006; 2010; Kunst & Sam, 2013; Sakamoto, 2007); the ‘separation’ strategy also seems to be relevant to a certain extent (Lu et al., 2011; 2012; 2013). However, nowadays assimilation and marginalisation strategies are far from the reality; furthermore, no studies have suggested ‘marginalisation’ as the preferred strategy (Berry, 2010; Kunst & Sam, 2013). Moving forward from known to unknown, if integration is the preferred strategy, then the next question is to what extent are migrants integrated into the host society and what is the preferred ‘level’ of integration among different groups of migrants, from ‘highly integrated’ through ‘moderately integrated’ to ‘low integrated’ into the host society. Therefore, identifying the extent to which skilled migrants are integrated into the host society is a main focus of this study.

On the other hand, as mentioned above, when migrants have little interest in maintaining their own cultural heritage and seek more interaction with dominant cultures, the assimilation strategy is viable (Berry, 1990; Remennick, 2003, 2009; Safdar et al., 2003). However, studies such as Sakamoto (2007) state that assimilation is not completely achievable for first-generation ethnic migrants in multicultural societies, mainly because nowadays migrants are structurally allowed to maintain their own ‘cultural heritage’ (Barda, 2006, p.6; Coleman et al., 2001; Eshel & Rosenthal-Sokolov, 2000; Lu et al., 2011; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Safi, 2010). For instance, Sakamoto’s study of Asian migrants in North America (2007) suggests that the idea of complete assimilation of migrants is no longer valid for a number of different reasons. Some of

---

3 This study was conducted with Mainland Chinese skilled migrants to Canada. Specific demographic characteristics were a high level of education, diverse professions such as IT, engineering, management, university professors etc., employment, and between four and ten years’ duration living in Canada. (These demographics were somewhat similar to the present study sample, with the exception of ethnicity.)
these reasons are: the unbridgeable socio-cultural gap between migrants sending and receiving societies, host country policies of multiculturalism, and technological and communication improvements that enable continued connections with family members in host and home countries (see also Amit, 2010b; Li, 2003; Remennick, 2003; 2004; Sakamoto, 2007; Sanderson, 2009). In addition, many other migration scholars (Coleman et al., 2001; Fanning, Haase & O’Boyle, 2011; Li, 2003; Remennick, 2003; Sakamoto, 2007) also agree that the basic differences between ethnic groups do not completely go away even after a few generations.

Li (2003) stated that, under multiculturalism ideologies, the goal of migrant-receiving societies is to facilitate migrants’ social integration. However, in the case of countries with relatively smaller migrant groups, migrants can be forced to assimilate into the host society, mainly due to a lack of government policies such as those of multiculturalism (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007). Similarly, Sayegh and Lasry (1993) pointed out that assimilation is appropriate when migrants who come from similar religious, cultural or value systems are accepted into the host society as they are more ready to accept values and beliefs of the host society. However none of these exceptions are valid in relation to the present study participants. For these reasons, assimilation is considered a less appropriate construct for the present study.

Even though acculturation, assimilation and social integration are used interchangeably (Garrido et al., 2012; Selvarajah, 2004; Stark & Jakubek, 2013), and refer to the incorporation of migrants into the host society, in agreement with the above criticisms with regard to the terms acculturation and assimilation, in the present study the term social integration is used. Nevertheless, in the present study, literature on acculturation and assimilation is reviewed when researchers refer to migrants’ adaptation into the host society. Social integration and its appropriateness for the present study are discussed next.

2.4.4 Social integration
The term social integration is used when exploring whether migrant groups become a part of the receiving society or remain distinct from the receiving society (Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Remennick, 2003). Host societies expect migrants who come from
different societies to share the same concepts of the host society, feel that they belong to the society and follow common rules, even though they eat different food and have different beliefs and interests (Adachi, 2011). Adachi (2011) further suggested that social integration is the social glue that keeps migrants from different backgrounds together for the stability of host societies. In line with the same notion, traditional migrant-receiving societies such as Canada, the UK and the US, consider social integration as a method of including migrants into the host society (Adachi, 2011; Bosswick & Heckmann, 2006; Remennick, 2004; 2009).

Remennick (2004, p. 436) stated that social integration is a process by which migrants add new layers to their ethnic identity related to country of origin lifestyles as a result of adapting to the host society. Remennick (2004) further explained “integration as an instrumental response to the demands by the host society, becoming functional, finding ways to make a decent living and achieving some upward social mobility” (p. 436). In line with the same notion, Stark and Jakubek (2013) also viewed social integration as acquisition of destination-specific human capital and blending into the host society. In light of these definitions, it can be argued that social integration adds new skills and knowledge to migrants to enable successfully incorporation into the host society.

Stark and Jakubek (2013) also view social integration as a revision of migrants’ own identities and, as a result of successful social integration, migrants gradually tend to see themselves as a part of the mainstream society and cease to perceive themselves as migrants. By linking social integration and acculturation, Garrido et al. (2012) described social integration as a process of acculturation that deals with multidimensional phenomena which change in migrants’ attitudes, values, behaviours or identity when interacting with mainstreamers. This is the same as acculturation, as defined in Section 2.4.1 in this thesis. However, theories of integration argue that the extent to which migrants integrate into the host society is an individual choice and depends on their expectations, preferences, skills and opportunities in the host society (Birman et al., 2014; Coleman, 1995b; Lafromboise et al., 1993). According to some scholars (Hughes, 2002; Qureshi et al., 2013), ethnic skilled migrants expect to achieve higher standards of life, better job opportunities and the like in Western societies. Therefore, Safdar et al. (2003) took the view that every individual integrates into a new society at a different
rate and level of motivation. Even though social integration is viewed as optional for migrants, Adachi (2011) argued that, from a multicultural host society’s perspective, social integration is an urgent issue that needs to be addressed; failing to integrate can harm the social unity of such host societies (see also Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007).

The most commonly identified dimensions which migrants tend to change when adapting to a new country are (a) host language skills, (b) host country identity and (c) their host country behaviour (Adachi, 2011; Amit, 2012; Au et al., 1998; Birman & Trickett, 2001; Birman, & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010; Garrido et al., 2012; Safdar et al., 2003; Suinn et al., 1987; Vergunst, 2008). However, few studies have explored migrants’ integration in terms of these three dimensions within the same study (Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Ho & Birman, 2010). Hence the present study explores these dimensions of social integration, namely, language, identity and behaviour (see Figure 2.1). Drawing from the relevant theoretical concepts discussed above, for the purpose of the present study, social integration is defined as ‘the degree of migrants’ adaptation to the mainstream society in terms of host country language, identity and behaviour’.

![Figure 2.1 Dimensions of social integration measured in the present study](image)

2.4.5 Social integration: language, identity and behaviour dimensions
Migrants’ integration in a host society occurs in a number of different behavioural and value domains, including language, identity and behaviour (Birman & Trickett, 2001; Dustmann, 1996; Ho & Birman, 2010; Kim & Omizo, 2010; Kumar & Nevid, 2010; Phinney, 1992; Saghafi et al., 2012; Suinn et al., 1992). Therefore, the present study assessed skilled migrants’ social integration using the Language, Identity and Behaviour
Acculturation Scale/LIB Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001), which consists of three subscales (Language, Identity and Behaviour). In addition, many other integration scales, including the Acculturation Scale for South East Asians (Anderson et al., 1993), Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (Chung et al., 2004), and Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation (Suinn, Ahuna & Khoo, 1992), have included all or some of these dimensions when measuring migrants’ adaptation to a host society. However, the decision was made to employ the present LIB Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001) because of its high reliability scores and appropriateness of items in the scale to the present study cohort. For instance, items in the scale are easy to understand, can be related to these migrants’ daily lives in Australia and cover a range of different perspectives across three distinct dimensions (multidimensional) to capture migrants’ integration in language, identity and behaviour dimensions (Birman & Trickett, 2001; Birman, 2006). (Refer to Appendix A to see the items in the LIB Scale). The following section analyses each of these dimensions separately.

i) Language
Chiswick and Miller (1999) considered language a primary element of social integration (see also Chiswick & Miller, 2002; Kisselev et al., 2010; Kogan, 2010). Kisselev et al. (2010) posit that migration is a challenging process that involves several tasks, ranging from practical (how to take a bus), to social (making new friends) to economic (finding a new job) challenges. Therefore, the ability to integrate well in terms of host country language is considered one of the most important factors to overcome these challenges. Low language integration can lead to negative life outcomes, such as difficulty finding employment, inability to establish new contacts in the host society and psychological distress (Aycan & Berry, 1996; Chiswick & Miller, 2002). Therefore, language is an important dimension of integration that can determine the success of other dimensions of integration, such as social and economic integration. Thus, many researchers (Anderson et al., 1993; Birman & Trickett, 2001; Chung, Kim & Abreu, 2004; Suinn, Ahuna & Khoo, 1992) have included language integration in their scales or, at least, researchers have measured language integration separately in their studies (Chiswick & Miller, 2001; 2002; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Lu et al., 2012; Remennick, 2003, 2004; Valenta, 2009). Therefore language is included as an important dimension of integration in the present study.
ii) Identity

Identity involves the individual’s self-perception of their cultural character (Worrell & Gardner-Kitt, 2006). The migration literature describes two dimensions of identity: ethnic identity and host country identity (Remennick, 2003; Safdar et al., 2003). Ethnic identity describes one’s self-concept related to sense of belonging, familiarity and positive attitude towards one’s own ethnic group (Phinney & Ong, 2007; Schwartz et al., 2012; Worrell & Gardner-Kitt, 2006), and, on the other hand, in the present study the host country identity refers to the extent to which migrants feel a sense of belonging, familiarity and attachment to the host culture (Schwartz et al., 2012; Worrell & Gardner-Kitt, 2006). Migrants’ level of host-country identity reflects the extent to which they are integrated into a host society (Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Sakamoto, 2007). Therefore host country identity was included as a measure when exploring the level of social integration into the host society in the present study (Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007).

The Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (Chung et al., 2004), Internal-External Ethnic Identity Measure (Kwan & Sodowsky, 1997), Language Identity and Behaviour Scale and Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992) are some examples of identity measures. Researchers (Amit, 2012; Saghafi et al., 2012; Sam, 1998; Schwartz et al., 2012) agree that some migrant groups prefer to retain their own ethnic identity, while others have relatively less preference for maintaining their own identity; thus levels of own- and host-country identity can vary among individuals and among groups. The present study assesses the extent to which Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are integrated in the host country identity dimension, because this study is interested in assessing the extent to which migrants integrate their identity into the host country culture, not to the country of origin. The LIB scale employed in the present study measured host country identity in terms of (a) the extent to which migrants feel positive about being an Australian and (b) the extent to which migrants consider themselves as Australian (Trickett & Birman, 2005).

iii) Behaviour

Change of behaviour in accordance with host country norms and values is one of the prominent dimensions that has been used to assess the extent to which migrants are
integrated into the new society (Kim & Omizo, 2010; Saghafi et al., 2012). Researchers have revealed that some individuals tend to completely change their behaviour, from the old cultural way to the new, whereas for others only a negligible change occurs in their behaviour after migrating (Kim & Omizo, 2010; Saghafi et al., 2012; Worrell & Gardner-Kitt, 2006). Food consumption, media consumption, entertainment and friendships are some of the behavioural realms that have often been researched in previous studies (Kim & Omizo, 2010). Birman et al. (2014) suggested that migrants who change their food and media consumption from their own culture to the host culture show more integration with the host society than their counterparts. Thus the present study seeks to assess the extent to which skilled migrants engage in behaviours related to host society culture (e.g., language use, media consumption, grocery habits, food consumption, music and entertainment preferences and habits).

Research findings suggest that generation (first generation and second generation, for example) influences the level of host-country behaviour acquisition; for instance, the second generation is faster to behaviourally integrate in comparison with the first generation (Birman, 2006; Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Schwartz et al., 2012). In addition, Kim et al. (1999) suggested behavioural changes occur faster than other types of changes in migrants, such as value changes. Given the importance of the behavioural dimension in integration, most of the integration scales have included this component. Some examples of these scales include the Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (Chung et al., 2004), the Behavioural Acculturation and Value Acculturation Scale (Szapocznik et al., 1978), the Cuban Behavioural Identity Questionnaire (Garcia & Lega, 1979) and the Language, Identity and Behaviour Acculturation Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001). Given the significance of measuring behavioural changes of migrants when integrating into the society, the present study assesses the extent to which participants are behaviourally integrated into the host society, in terms of media, food and entertainment consumption and other behavioural realms, such as visiting English-speaking doctors and socialising with Australian friends.
2.5 Justification for use of ‘Social Integration’ in the Present Study Context

The terms ‘social integration’, ‘assimilation’ and ‘acculturation’ are often used interchangeably in the migration discourse (Kwok-bun & Plüss, 2013; Remennick, 2003, 2004). As discussed in the above section, when comparing definitions of ‘acculturation’ and ‘social integration’, it can be argued that these two constructs are similar to a great extent as both refer to the way migrants blend into host societies and assess the changes in migrants’ values, attitudes, behaviours and identity in accordance with the host society. However, drawing from the related acculturation and social integration literature, the present study focuses on the term ‘social integration’, since it is more appropriate to the purpose of the present study for the following reasons:

1. Even though acculturation at times refers to the process of ethnic minorities integrating into mainstream society, it is also identified as a bidirectional construct, although use of the construct in this way is inconsistent (Hunt et al., 2004). However, social integration is consistently referred to as the degree of migrants’ blending into the host society (Stark & Jakubek, 2013), which is the focus of the present study.

2. Even though acculturation and social integration are very closely discussed in recent migration literature, the former is most often used as a bidimensional construct (acculturating to the host country and acculturating to the country of birth (Berry, 1990; Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Ho & Birman, 2010; Kisselev et al., 2010; Lu et al., 2011; Paterson & Hakim-Larson, 2012; Zea et al., 2003). The objective of the present study is to explore the extent to which migrants are integrated into the host society, without taking into consideration the level of acculturation into the country of birth. Thus social integration is more appropriate in the present study.

3. Assimilation is a long-term process; it might take a few generations to be assimilated into a host culture (Sakamoto, 2007). As the cohort for the present study is first-generation migrants, assimilation is a less relevant construct for it. A common characteristic in multicultural societies is that people of different ethnic groups are structurally allowed to continue their own original cultural
values, beliefs and social norms while adapting to the new way of life in the host country (Safdar et al., 2003). Therefore social integration is more realistic than assimilation, as assimilation expects migrants to fully integrate into the host society.

4. ‘Social integration’ is a more widely used term among migration policy makers, the media and the general public than ‘assimilation’ and ‘acculturation’ (Bosswick & Heckmann, 2006). Therefore use of the term ‘social integration’ seems more appropriate than ‘assimilation’ and ‘acculturation’ in making the results of the study accessible to relevant stakeholders.

In summarising this section, it can be stated that the terms ‘acculturation’, ‘assimilation’ and ‘social integration’ have been used interchangeably in the previous literature when describing migrants’ adaptation in host societies. The review of the literature reveals that all these terms refer to the degree of changes in migrants’ language, attitudes, values, customs, beliefs, identity and behaviours. However, there are some clear differences in terms of their scope and the depth; acculturation is bidirectional, and assimilation is a complete shift from the old culture to the new culture. Therefore social integration, which refers to the extent to which migrants blend into the host society, is considered appropriate terminology for the present study for reasons such as the cohort being first-generation migrants and Australia being a society that encourages multiculturalism. However, because of the interchangeable use of the terms ‘acculturation’, ‘assimilation’ and ‘social integration’, the decision to use ‘social integration’ in the present study will not have an impact on the comparability of the current study findings with past studies that have used ‘acculturation’ and ‘assimilation’, because previous studies on acculturation include migrants’ adaptation to the host culture in much the same way that ‘social integration’ is defined in the present study (Abraido-Lanza, 2004; Berry et al., 2006; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Sakamoto, 2007) and previous studies have also measured migrants’ adaptation in a host society in terms of some or all combinations of language, identity and behaviour dimensions (Birman & Trickett, 2001; Dustmann, 1996; Ho & Birman, 2010; Kim & Omizo, 2010; Saghafi et al., 2012).
Given that this research aims to examine level of life satisfaction among the participants and the link between social integration and life satisfaction, the next section reviews life satisfaction-related literature, and, in particular, methods of measuring life satisfaction, approaches to understanding life satisfaction, and migrants’ life satisfaction in various host societies.

2.6 Life Satisfaction

Individuals’ life satisfaction can be affected by the decision to migrate permanently (Amit, 2010a; Mara & Landesmann, 2013). There are therefore several studies that have examined life satisfaction of migrants in different host societies (Amit, 2010a; Daig et al., 2009; Diener, Oishi & Lucus, 2003; Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Verkuyten, 2008). However, these report mixed findings in relation to life satisfaction across different migrant groups (Amit, 2010a; Neto & Barros, 2007; Sam, 1998; Verkuyten, 2008). Thus the present research focuses on assessing life satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, a distinct group that has been given less attention in the literature.

Life satisfaction is a psychological construct that has received considerable research attention as an indicator of well-being (Cummins & Nistico, 2002; Daig et al., 2009; Neto & Barros, 2007; Safi, 2010; Sam 1998). Often life satisfaction is used synonymously with well-being (Daig et al., 2009). Possibly for that reason, life satisfaction has been used to measure individuals’ well-being in many societies (Amit, 2010a; Daig et al., 2009; Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Neto & Barros, 2007). Life satisfaction is defined as an overall assessment of an individual’s quality of life according to his or her own personal judgement or criteria (Daig, 2009; Diener, 1984; Shin & Johnson, 1978). Life satisfaction is comparative (Diener et al., 2003). Thus individuals tend to compare the present status of affairs with (a) their set goals, (b) past experiences (c) future expectations or (d) others’ achievements (Clark et al., 2008; Diener et al., 2003). In the context of migration, individuals tend to compare their life satisfaction with life prior to migration, co-ethnics, other groups of migrants and mainstreamers (Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Vohra & Adair, 2000). Perhaps for that reason results related to migrants’ life satisfaction are mixed. The focus of the present
study is to examine the level of life satisfaction at overall and facet levels. Hence the present study does not have a reference point for comparison; however, results of this study can be compared with prevailing research findings related to life satisfaction of migrants.

Life satisfaction can be assessed at ‘global’ level or at ‘domain’ level. The next section discusses the measurement of levels of life satisfaction.

2.6.1 Levels of measurement: ‘global vs. domain-specific satisfaction with life’

Individuals tend to evaluate their ‘satisfaction with life as a whole’ or with specific domains in life (Rojas, 2006; Wills, 2009; Wu & Yao, 2007). Thus measurement of life satisfaction has been divided into two levels: at global (or overall life satisfaction) and at ‘domain’ level. Life satisfaction at ‘global’ level refers to ‘an overall assessment of feelings and attitudes about one’s life at a particular point in time ranging from positive to negative’ (Daig et al., 2009, p. 669-670). Domain-specific life satisfaction refers to how people feel about different domains of their life, such as ‘marriage’, ‘health’, ‘achievements’, ‘relationships’ and ‘safety’ (Albert, Labs & Trommsdorff, 2010; Foroughi et al., 2001; González et al., 2010; Paiva et al., 2009; Verkuyten, 2008; Wu & Yao, 2007). Diener (1985) argued that, in order to assess one’s own judgment about their life satisfaction, satisfaction with life as a whole should be measured. However, more recently, Gilman et al. (2008) showed that domain-level satisfaction is more closely attached to daily life experiences of people, and thus domain-level life satisfaction is more closely associated with global life (dis)satisfaction. Therefore researchers (Cummins, 2006; González et al., 2010; Rojas, 2006) tend to assess satisfaction in different domains of life.

Rojas (2006) found that people who were satisfied with one domain tend to be satisfied with other domains and people who were dissatisfied with one domain tend also to be dissatisfied with other domains. Even though all the domain-level satisfactions can be positively correlated with overall life satisfaction, not all domains contribute equally to global life satisfaction (González et al., 2010). While global life satisfaction and domain-specific life satisfaction are two different phenomena, many researchers have argued that overall life satisfaction can be understood through domain life satisfaction.
and vice versa (Heller et al., 2004; Rojas, 2006; Verkuyten, 2008; Yoon & Lee, 2010). There are two approaches to understanding the relationship between global and domain-level satisfaction with life (Diener et al., 2003; Wu & Yao, 2007). These are ‘bottom-up’ and ‘top-down’ approaches and these are discussed in the following section.

2.6.2 Approaches to understand life satisfaction: ‘Top-down’ vs. ‘bottom-up’

There is a consensus in the literature in regard to the relationship between one’s global level of life satisfaction and satisfaction in different domains of life. Global-level life satisfaction can be understood through the ‘top-down’ approach and domain-specific satisfaction can be understood through the ‘bottom-up’ approach (Wu & Yao, 2007).

In understanding the relationship between ‘global’- and ‘domain’-level life satisfaction, the ‘top-down’ approach suggests that different domains of satisfaction can be influenced by an individual’s overall level of life satisfaction (Albert et al., 2010; González et al., 2010; Heller et al., 2004). Thus, how people feel about their lives in general may influence their domain-level satisfaction. The ‘top-down’ approach was introduced by Diener (1984), who designed the five-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (e.g., ‘In most ways my life is close to my ideal’, ‘I am satisfied with my life, the conditions of my life are excellent’, ‘So far I have gotten the important things I want in life’, ‘If I could live my life over I would change almost nothing’) to capture global satisfaction with one’s life (see also Wills, 2009). Within this approach, when measuring life satisfaction, respondents are asked to evaluate their life satisfaction as a whole (Wu & Yao, 2007). Nevertheless this approach cannot provide an understanding of specific domain-level contribution to one’s overall life satisfaction (Wills, 2009). Therefore the ‘bottom-up’ approach was introduced (Cummins, 2006).

The ‘bottom-up’ approach argues that individuals’ overall life satisfaction depends on their satisfaction in many important areas or domains of their life (Rojas, 2006; Wu & Yao, 2007). According to this viewpoint, each domain of an individual’s life contributes to overall life satisfaction (Cummins, 2006; Wills, 2009). In other words, satisfaction or dissatisfaction in different domains may spill over into their overall life satisfaction (Andrew & Withey, 1976; Cummins, 1996; Diener et al., 2003; González et al., 2010; Heller et al., 2004; Rojas, 2006). This approach is considered the first deconstruction of
measurement of life satisfaction (Cummins, 2006). Researchers measure individuals’ life satisfaction in various life domains, asking respondents to evaluate their life satisfaction in specific domains, and then these domain-level scores are aggregated to indicate overall life satisfaction. The advantage of using this approach is that researchers are able to assess the contribution of each domain to overall life satisfaction (Wu & Yao, 2007).

González et al. (2010) posit that the ‘bottom-up’ approach to measuring life satisfaction has been the prevailing tendency for many years. This view is shared by other researchers in the field in accepting the fact that satisfaction with domains of life contributes to general life satisfaction (González et al., 2010; Heller et al., 2004; Paiva et al., 2009; Wills, 2009; Wu & Yao, 2007). However, both approaches have found empirical support over time (Albert et al., 2010; Heller et al., 2004). Therefore the present study explores ‘satisfaction with life as a whole’ as well as ‘domain-level satisfaction’ of the study participants in order to better understand skilled migrants’ life satisfaction in Australia.

With acceptance of the notion that ‘overall life satisfaction can be understood as a result of satisfaction in the domains of life’, researchers from time to time have identified different domains as important for assessing overall life satisfaction. However, these domains depend on the researcher’s objectives (Rojas, 2006; Wu & Yao, 2007). For instance, Argyle emphasised (a) money, (b) level of education, (c) health, (d) employment, (e) community relationships and (f) housing as important domains when analysing one’s overall life satisfaction (Argyle, 2001). In their study, Heady and Wearing (1992) concluded that domains such as (a) marriage, (b) work, (c) quality of living, (d) friendships, (e) health and (f) sex life are important to an individual’s overall life satisfaction.

Cummins (2006) introduced eight domains that can lead to assessment of ‘global’ life satisfaction: (a) standard of living, (b) health, (c) achievements in life, (d) personal relationships, (e) safety, (f) sense of community, (g) future security and (h) spirituality

---

6 The Eight Domains Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006) is an extension of the previous version of the PWI (Cummins, 2003), which consisted of seven life domains. Spirituality was the newly added domain.
of life (Cummins & Lau, 2003, Cummins, 2006). These domains were derived after conducting a large number of Australian studies and with cross-cultural justification. In the present study this classification has been used to measure participants’ life satisfaction, because domains such as health, personal relationships, community feeling, and achievements are generally considered important life domains by several researchers (Cummins, 2006; Rojas, 2006; Wu & Yao, 2007), and these domains were thought to be important for assessing ethnic migrants’ life satisfaction (Wu & Yao, 2007).

Pan et al. (2008) argued that the way in which people describe meaning of life is significantly associated with their life satisfaction, in much the same way that other researchers such as Wills (2009) and Wu and Yao (2007) have conceptualised the ‘bottom-up’ approach to life satisfaction through different domains. From this perspective, researchers have tried to identify the meaning of life in cross-cultural studies (Pan et al., 2008). Besides the universally accepted domains such as ‘achievements’ and ‘self-acceptance’ in defining the meaning of life, culturally specific elements such as ‘spirituality’ can also be included (Baessler et al., 2003; Hofstede, 1980; Wills, 2009). Pan et al. (2008) found that the most important sources of meaning in life for Australians are personal relationships, leisure activities, personal growth and meeting basic needs. In contrast, Chinese people define their personal meaning of life as involving family, self-development and living with nature (Pan et al., 2008). In the present study, the specific domain-level contribution to overall life satisfaction is also explored as the contribution a domain provides to overall life satisfaction can differ from one individual to another as well as from one society to another, because life satisfaction represents different meanings for different cultural groups in different societies (Diener & Diener, 1995; Morrison et al., 2011; Pan et al., 2008).

2.6.3 Life satisfaction of people in individualistic and collectivist societies

Morrison et al. (2011) suggested that the country where people live impacts life satisfaction. This is not only because people in different societies perceive life satisfaction in different ways but also job opportunities, quality of health care and social crimes that people may experience can also be different. These things may affect life satisfaction (Diener & Diener, 1995; Morrison et al., 2011). Therefore this section
briefly explores how people in different societies, such as collectivist and individualistic societies, view life satisfaction. This was thought to be appropriate because the participants in the present study came from a collectivist society to an individualist society. The review of the literature on life satisfaction among people in different societies may assist in comparing the present study findings with previous studies in order to identify some commonalities and differences with regard to Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants and other migrant groups.

It is well-established that life satisfaction for people in individualistic societies is higher than for people in collectivist societies (Diener, 1996; 2003; Cummins, 2006). People in individualistic societies tend to view ‘self’ as independent and separate from others, and also value personal autonomy and self-esteem (Diener & Diener 1995; Morrison et al., 2011; Pan et al., 2008). Individualistic cultures predominantly construct their self-concept and govern their behaviour based on their own personal values, traits, motives abilities and achievements (Kuppens & Diener, 2008). Wirtz et al. (2009) further pointed out that ‘being able to achieve and celebrate one’s success is a major source of Westerners’ self-esteem, leading to higher life satisfaction’ (p. 1169).

On the other hand, people in Asian cultures (considered to be collectivist societies) view themselves as interdependent; thus they are mostly involved in group relationships and emphasise fulfilling obligations. Social organisations such as family, religious groups, schools and clubs therefore play an important role in their lives. For that reason, Kuppens and Diener (2008) emphasised that personal relationships are important in developing the ‘self-construct’ of people in collectivist nations. Kwan, Bond and Singelis (1997) found that among their Chinese immigrant sample in America the association between personal relationships and overall life satisfaction was high. The ‘personal relationship’ domain is one of the domains included in the Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006) that was employed to measure life satisfaction among the present study participants. Therefore, in the present study, the contribution of the personal relationship domain to overall life satisfaction is assessed.

The relationship between ‘self’ and life satisfaction is perhaps stronger in individualist countries than collectivist countries because for non-Westerners life satisfaction is more
focused on social matters, whereas for Westerners life satisfaction is more of a personal achievement (Diener & Diener 1995; Morrison et al., 2011). For instance, Oishi et al. (1999) revealed that for people in poorer countries who face difficulties in basic need fulfilment (such as housing, physiological and safety needs that reflect standards of living), physiological and social matters are more important when predicting their life satisfaction than for people in wealthy Western nations. When people’s lower-level needs are met, life satisfaction is better predicted from higher-level needs such as socialising, esteem and actualising; this is the case with people in Western societies (Oishi et al., 1999).

The Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006) is used in the current study to measure life satisfaction and consists of domains such as ‘standard of living’, ‘achievements in life’, ‘personal relationships’, ‘feeling part of community’, ‘health’ and ‘safety’, amongst others. As discussed in the preceding paragraph, these domains contribute distinctly to overall life satisfaction of individuals in different societies, and thus it will be of interest to uncover the contribution of each of these domains to overall life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants, who have come from collectivist countries to an individualistic one, for the purpose of comparing the present findings with previous studies. Therefore the present study assesses the contribution of each domain to Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ overall life satisfaction.

2.7 Migration and Life Satisfaction

Studies involving well-being in the context of migration have been a recent trend in the migration-related literature. Life satisfaction of migrants has been researched from multiple perspectives, including general well-being, overall life satisfaction, and satisfaction with life in different domains (Amit, 2010a; Daig et al., 2009; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Foroughi et al., 2001; Giusta & Kambhampati, 2006; Massey & Akresh, 2006; Neto & Barros, 2007; Sam, 1998; Sharma, 2012; Verkuyten, 2008). Even though achieving a higher level of life satisfaction is one expected motive for many people’s migration decision, researchers have found mixed results in relation to life satisfaction of ethnic minorities in Western societies (Choudhry, 2001; Fanning et al., 2011; Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Reitz et al., 2009; Sabharwal, 2011; Safi, 2010; Sam, 1998;
Verkuyten, 2008). It is evident that subjective factors such as ethnic group identity, personal values, individuals’ expectations prior to migration, the country to which people migrate, existing social norms in the new environment, and so on may impact migrants’ life satisfaction, together with demographic variables, including age, years since migration, level of education, language skills and pre-migration SES (Behtoui, 2007; 2008; Neto & Barros, 2007; Sam, 1998; Verkuyten, 2008). Therefore it can be argued that, even though experiencing a higher level of life satisfaction is an expected outcome of migration, because of the influence of a variety of factors migrants’ life satisfaction can be enhanced or detracted from as a result of their migration decision (Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Verkuyten, 2008). Past research findings on migrants’ life satisfaction in different migrant-receiving societies and factors that may influence their life satisfaction are discussed next.

Maintaining a high level of life satisfaction among ethnic migrant groups is vital for the overall well-being of any host society (Fugl-Meyer et al., 2002). The claim that high levels of life satisfaction among migrants can lead to a ‘good life’ and a ‘good society’ has received empirical support (Behtoui, 2007; Diener et al., 2003; Fugl-Meyer et al., 2002). For instance, Swedish-based research findings revealed that, ten years ago, Swedish society was composed of happier citizens (Behtoui, 2007; 2008); however, recent comparative results using the same research method have shown that first-generation ethnic migrants’ life satisfaction is lower than that of their Swedish-raised counterparts. As a result, Behtoui (2007; 2008) concluded that ethnic migrants’ low level of life satisfaction has negatively contributed to current low life satisfaction levels of Swedish citizens. The present study explores life satisfaction levels of a large skilled migrant community in Australia.

While numbers of studies are still limited, researchers suggest that there is relatively less life satisfaction among ethnic migrants in Western societies (Choudhry, 2001; Pio, 2010; Safi, 2010; Verkuyten, 2008; Wirtz et al., 2009). Early research findings (Thomas & Hughes, 1986) show that, in the United States, subjective well-being of African-Americans is significantly and consistently lower than that of ‘White Americans’ due to lower socio-economic status and other demographic factors including social stigmatisation (as cited Safi, 2010). Similarly, based on a national survey conducted in
the Netherlands by the Central Bureau of Statistics in 2005, Verkuyten (2008) has identified that overall life satisfaction of ‘Turkish Dutch’ minorities is significantly lower than their ‘Dutch native’ counterparts. Lower income, lower education, poorer health, settlement issues, high level of perceived discrimination and social rejection were identified as factors that lower these migrants’ life satisfaction (Verkuyten, 2008). In addition, Safi (2010) found that, in general, migrants from 13 countries (including migrants from Africa, Asia and Turkey) to Europe are less satisfied with their lives when compared to their mainstream counterparts. Identified reasons were the high level of social discrimination and the low level of socio-economic achievements in labour and housing markets.

Contrary to the negative life satisfaction experiences of migrants in the different host societies discussed above, Neto and Barros’s (2007) study has found evidence for positive life satisfaction among Portuguese immigrant families in Switzerland. Neto and Barros’s (2007) findings are consistent with previous work by Berry (1999) and Sam (1998) in relation to life satisfaction of adolescent migrants. Findings of those latter studies suggested that adolescent migrants in Norway and Canada are fairly satisfied with their lives and adapt rather well into the host society (Neto & Barros, 2007; Sam, 1998). Neto and Barros (2007) and Sam (1998) found that personal and behavioural factors (such as self-esteem, mastery, perceived discrimination and intercultural contacts) are more relevant to life satisfaction among adolescent migrants than demographic factors. Furthermore, Sam (1998) found that, even though ‘ethnicity’ influences life satisfaction, it was not a significant factor in influencing life satisfaction among their study participants.

It can be argued that differences in life satisfaction among migrants in different studies (Neto & Barros, 20007; Verkuyten, 2008) may be because of the generational effect (first and second generation). In support of the same notion, Verkuyten (2008) found that being a first-generation migrant is itself a reason for less life satisfaction in host societies. For instance, Verkuyten (2008) further suggested that first-generation ethnic migrants in Western society can be less satisfied due to challenges they face after migration, such as language barriers and sense of belonging to the host society, which do not exist for the second generation of migrants. Therefore the generational effect
needs to be considered when generalising the findings related to migrants’ life satisfaction. In the present study the generational effect on life satisfaction is not directly discussed; however, ‘age at migration’ may provide some meaningful evidence with regard to the generational effect on life satisfaction among Indian and Sri Lankan skilled migrants.

A study of Indian educated migrants in Canada (Vohra & Adair, 2000) revealed that these migrants were more satisfied with their lives in Canada when compared to their lives in India. Demographic factors, including ‘level of education’, ‘socio-economic status’ in India or in Canada, and ‘migration status’ did not significantly influence their life satisfaction; however, ‘perceived discrimination’ and ‘expectations at the time of migration’ were related to their life satisfaction (Vohra & Adair, 2000). As life satisfaction is comparative, it is possible to argue that, even though migrants are less satisfied in their lives when compared to mainstreamers, they may be more satisfied with their lives after migration when compared to their lives before migration (Vohra & Adair, 2000).

Researchers have identified some common reasons for low levels of life satisfaction among ethnic minorities living in different host societies. Specifically, migrants from backgrounds culturally distinct to the host culture report themselves to be less satisfied than migrants from backgrounds culturally more similar to that of the host country (Choudhry, 2001). Due to cultural differences, ethnic minority migrants seem to be more psychologically distressed and have reported lower levels of life satisfaction (Choudhry, 2001; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Martinovic et al., 2009). Further research findings, such as those of Choudhry (2001), suggest that feelings of social isolation, loneliness and cultural barriers can lead to mental health problems and thereby negatively affect the life satisfaction of ethnic minorities. Furthermore, Dalgard and Thapa (2007) argued that high levels of psychological distress among non-Western migrants could be attributed to those migrants coming from countries with higher rates of psychological stress. Dalgard and Thapa (2007) further explained that these ethnic migrants continued to follow similar sets of values, beliefs and behaviours even after migrating to a developed country, and that these may negatively influence their life satisfaction (See also Pio, 2010). According to Veenhoven (1988), ‘poor vocational
assimilation’ and ‘fewer opportunities to choose their life style’ are the main reasons why first-generation migrants report lower levels of life satisfaction. In addition, Safi (2010) and Verkuyten (2008) found that being a first-generation ethnic minority migrant itself reduces life satisfaction in the majority of European countries due to the adaptation and belonging issues faced by these migrants. More details on the influence of social integration on life satisfaction are discussed in the Hypotheses development chapter (Chapter 3).

Verkuyten (2008) argued that ethnic migrant groups can be devalued in certain societies and can become a target of ‘ethnic discrimination’ in some host societies. Thus the country to which individuals migrate is an important factor when assessing migrants’ life satisfaction (Chiswick & Miller, 2005; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Foroughi et al., 2001; Safi, 2010; Verkuyten, 2008). Safi (2010) suggested that migrants to Sweden and Switzerland were more satisfied with their lives than migrants to France and Portugal. In addition, Foroughi et al. (2001, p.156) stated that people who migrate to Australia are ‘fortunate’, because Australia is a migrant-friendly county and Australians’ general attitude towards migrants is ‘accepting’. Lu et al. (2011) support the view that the Australian population is favourably disposed towards migrants who are committed to contributing to Australia’s growth. Furthermore, Colic-Peisker (2011) argued that Australia is identified as a stable and violence-free country, regardless of the diverse socio-cultural backgrounds of its population. Even though the current study does not compare life satisfaction among migrants in different host societies, its findings can be compared with other Australian-based studies to explore whether Sri Lankan and Indian migrants in Australia share the same view about their life satisfaction in Australia.

As discussed in the preceding paragraphs, it is evident that many of the previous studies have used life satisfaction as a global-level measure and compared present life satisfaction either with life satisfaction before migration or with level of life satisfaction of mainstreamers. However, it is also important to understand migrants’ life satisfaction in relation to different domains, since this can provide further understanding. The present study explores ‘satisfaction with life as a whole’ as well as ‘domain level’ satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.
To summarise the life satisfaction section, life satisfaction is defined as an overall assessment of an individual’s quality of life based on an individual’s own expectations of their life. Life satisfaction can be measured at ‘global’ level and at ‘domain’ level. There are two approaches to understanding life satisfaction. The ‘top-down’ approach explains that an individual’s overall life satisfaction spills over into domain level satisfaction and the ‘bottom-up’ approach explains that overall life satisfaction depends on satisfaction in many important areas or domains of one’s life. Past research findings showed that the majority of ethnic minority groups were less satisfied in various Western host societies. Low income levels, low level of education, poor health, questions of acceptance of migrants by the majority population, perceived discrimination attached to strong ethnic identity and social stigma are some possible reasons for their lower life satisfaction (Pio, 2010; Verkuyten, 2008). As pointed out, the relationship between life satisfaction and other factors such as ethnicity, the country to which people migrate and the migration category (e.g., skilled migrants, refugee migrants, first-generation migrants, adolescents and parents) is complex, and thus the results cannot be generalised. Therefore the present study attempts to explore the life satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia to contribute to extant knowledge.

Literature related to job satisfaction is reviewed in the next section; in particular, an overview of job satisfaction, approaches used to measure job satisfaction and job satisfaction experiences of migrants’ in different host societies are reviewed.

2.8 Job Satisfaction

Organisational diversity studies have shown that ethnic minorities are a fast-growing segment in organisations in multicultural societies (Sanchez & Brock 1996; Mor Barak 2000; Enchaughtegui-de-Jesus et al., 2006; Schmidt, 2009; Syed & Kramar 2010). As noted earlier in this thesis, researchers (Alpass et al., 2007; DIAC, Annual Report, 2010-11; Eraydin et al., 2010; Malinen & Johnston, 2011; Sakamoto, Wei & Truong, 2008) suggest that skilled migrants have been able to contribute to the economic well-being of host societies. However, after migrating to a new country, skilled migrants may not be able to contribute to their fullest potential if they fail to find employment that is
suitable to their skill level and in the right working environment. In addition, findings of previous studies (Leong, 2001; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Nguyen et al., 2007; Valdivia & Flores, 2012) have consistently shown that ethnic migrants experience prejudice in the workplace. Therefore one possible way to identify workplace-related issues faced by ethnic skilled migrants in Western societies is by assessing their level of job satisfaction. Thus the present study aims to explore job satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants.

Ahmed et al. (2013) proposed that studying migrants’ job satisfaction is important for three reasons. First, skilled migrants deserve to be treated with fairness and respect. Their study argued that job satisfaction is a reflection of how fairly migrants are being treated in the workplace. Second, they suggested that job satisfaction is a reflection of employees’ emotional well-being and psychological health. Third, they considered job satisfaction as a tool to diagnose potential ‘trouble spots’ within an organisation. Job satisfaction can be utilised to make important decisions in relation to skilled migrants and their contribution to the host society (Ahmed et al., 2013, p.65). Therefore researchers cannot afford to ignore measurement of skilled migrants’ job satisfaction, since it may be an indication of the extent to which skilled migrants have been able to meet Australia’s economic expectations of the skilled migration program. In addition, measuring job satisfaction may help skilled migrants themselves to reflect on their jobs after migrating (Dagher & D’Netto 1997; Lu et al., 2011; Syed & Kramar 2010).

Job satisfaction is a heavily researched area within management and organisational psychology (Chang et al., 2010; Fahr, 2011; Mohr & Zoghi, 2008; Mudor & Tooksoon, 2011; Perdue, Reardon & Peterson, 2007; Piccolo et al., 2005; Rehman & Waheed, 2011; Senter et al., 2010; Spector et al., 2002; Spector et al., 2004; Weiss, 2002). This interest in conducting job satisfaction research has not been limited to academic researchers; contemporary managers in many organisations use job satisfaction surveys as a powerful tool to gather information to manage, motivate, train and retain their diverse workforce (Enchaugui-de-Jesus et al., 2006; Nurullah, 2010; Roelen et al., 2008). In line with the same notion, some studies (Enchaugui-de-Jesus et al., 2006; Perdue et al., 2007) have shown that assessing job satisfaction has become a relatively common practice in organisations, as top management are more interested than ever
before in the physical and psychological well-being of their employees. That may be because job satisfaction is associated with directly and indirectly identifiable costs, such as higher rate of absenteeism, replacing employees and re-training new ones (Hausknecht, Hiller & Vance, 2008; Helliwell & Huang, 2010; Smyth, Zhai & Li, 2009; Zaccaro et al., 1991).

Several research findings on employees’ job satisfaction (Ahmed et al., 2011; Chang et al., 2010; Nurullah, 2010) have shown that satisfied employees are more efficient in their jobs than dissatisfied employees. Having a satisfied workforce ensures less employee turnover, lower costs related to recruitment and selection, lower training and development costs and it also minimises productivity losses (Ahmed et al., 2011; Behtoui, 2008; Bowran & Todd, 1999; Chang et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2011; Rehman & Waheed, 2011). Moreover, researchers argue that employees who are satisfied at work not only share their positive feelings among team members and provide a high-quality support network to their co-workers, but also provide a sense of belonging which can reduce the work stress of their co-workers (Dineen et al., 2007; Hausknecht et al., 2008; Perdue et al., 2007). In light of these findings, it can be argued that job satisfaction is an important phenomenon in contemporary organisations. However, not many studies have focused on the job satisfaction of skilled migrants, despite their large representation in Australian organisations. Thus the present study explores the job satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Job satisfaction can be measured as overall job satisfaction and at facet level. The following section differentiates overall and facet-level job satisfaction.

### 2.8.1 Overall job satisfaction and facet-level job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a multidimensional concept influenced by personality traits (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge et al., 2010; Roelen et al., 2008), autonomy, task identity, task variety, salary, feedback, career opportunities, supervisor recognition, working conditions, organisational culture, cohesion with co-workers and the like (Ahmed et al., 2011; Bruk-Lee et al., 2009; Johnson & Holdaway, 1994; Judge et al., 2010; Roelen et al., 2008). Job satisfaction can be measured as overall job satisfaction as well as satisfaction with different facets of a job, such as pay, benefits, promotion, supervisor, and work conditions (Edwards et al., 2008; Skalli, Theodossiou & Vasileiou, 2008).
Overall job satisfaction refers to how people feel about their job in general (Oishi et al., 1999). It reflects the combination of partial satisfactions related to various facets of a job (Skalli et al., 2008, p.1906). Therefore overall job satisfaction is viewed as a weighted outcome of each facet of one’s job (Skalli et al., 2008). On the other hand, facet satisfaction refers to ‘affective reaction to particular dimensions of the job such as pay, supervision and opportunities for promotion’ (Lawler, 1973, p. 64).

Researchers (Edwards et al., 2008; Johnson & Holdaway, 1994; Weiss, 2002) argue that it is important to recognise and differentiate overall job satisfaction from facet-level job satisfaction. Overall job satisfaction is determined by a combination of individuals’ affective reactions to the various facets of their job (Johnson & Holdaway, 1994; Skalli et al., 2008). Therefore it can be suggested that individuals may not make a judgement about their job as a whole; rather it is a combination of different levels of satisfaction derived from different components of a job. Facet satisfaction was developed from Lawler’s work (Johnson & Holdaway, 1994; Lawler, 1973). Past research findings demonstrate that employees who are highly satisfied with a few facets of a job may not be satisfied with some other facets of a job; as a result, one’s overall job satisfaction can be negatively typified (Oshagbemi et al., 1997; Roelen et al., 2008). The current research measures overall as well as facet-level job satisfaction, because measuring job satisfaction at both the levels is more meaningful in identifying potential problem areas for decision makers such as supervisors who manage skilled migrant employees in Australian organisations.

When assessing facet-level job satisfaction, there is no ‘gold standard’ that indicates which facets of the job should be included in an effective job satisfaction scale. Thus, different scholars and practitioners measure different dimensions of a job to explore the satisfaction of their study participants, depending on the purpose, content and context of their study. However, when understanding what causes employees to be satisfied or not with a job, the ‘nature of the job’ (or ‘work itself’) such as job challenges, autonomy, variety and scope of the job are of interest to organisational practitioners (Rogelberg et al., 2010). According to Roelen et al. (2008) satisfaction with the ‘nature of the job’ has been the interest of Human Resources practitioners for a while, as they might believe work content can be changed in order to meet employees’ skills and competencies.
Therefore it is possible to note that factors such as scope of the job and autonomy add a
significant contribution to an individual’s overall job satisfaction when compared to
other facets.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997) that was employed in the current study
contains the ‘nature of work’ facet. In addition to ‘nature of work’, other facets, such as
pay, benefits, supervisor/co-worker support, and rules and regulations, play an
important role in job satisfaction measures, because managers can influence their
employees’ job satisfaction by adjusting these variables according to the expectation of
their employees (Perdue et al., 2007; Takase, Maude & Manias, 2005). Therefore job
satisfaction scales, such as the McClosky/Mueller Satisfaction Scale (Mueller,
McCloskey, 1990), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967), and
the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969), have included many of
these facets when measuring facet-level job satisfaction. The Job Satisfaction Survey
(1997) employed in the present study consisted of nine different facets: (a) pay, (b)
promotion, (c) supervision, (d) fringe benefits, (e) contingent rewards (performance-
based rewards), (f) operating procedure (required rules and procedures), (g) co-workers,
h) nature of work and (i) communication. Since this scale covers several facets of job
satisfaction, the current study findings may provide a detailed understanding of Sri
Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ job satisfaction.

Past research findings related to job satisfaction of ethnic migrants in different host
societies are discussed in the next section.

2.8.2 Migration and job satisfaction
Reviewing the literature on ethnic migrants’ job satisfaction in the present study is vital
for two reasons. First, it allows understanding of the nature of job satisfaction of
migrants in different host societies (e.g., are they satisfied with their jobs? what are the
facets that they are satisfied with/ not satisfied with?), and, second, it sets the
background to compare and contrast the present study findings with prior research. Thus
this section reviews the prevailing literature on ethnic migrants’ ‘overall’ and ‘facet’-
level job satisfaction. Although the number of studies on migrants’ job satisfaction is
limited, some of the available studies have analysed ‘facet-level job satisfaction’ among
different migrant groups, as well as overall job satisfaction (Chiswick & Miller, 2008; Fahr, 2011; Greenhaus et al., 1990; Johnson & Holdaway, 1994). These earlier studies have found mixed results in relation to migrants’ job satisfaction. For instance, a few researchers (Ahmed et al., 2013; Chan & Qiu, 2011; Georgellis & Lange, 2007; Malinen & Johnston, 2011; Parr & Guo 2005) have found that migrant workers are satisfied with their jobs, whereas others have found they are unhappy about certain facets of their jobs (Greenhaus et al., 1990; Sabharwal, 2011; Siow & Ng, 2013). Further details are discussed below.

Researchers (Behtoui, 2008; Greenhaus et al., 1990; Sabharwal, 2011) who have found ethnic migrants are less satisfied with their jobs have revealed that ‘ethnic minority status’ itself influences overall job satisfaction. It is suggested that migrants (black managers) in the US experience less discretion and influence over ‘organisational decision-making’ as a result of their out-group membership, leading to lower overall job satisfaction. Similarly, Swedish research (Behtoui, 2008) has found that due to social stigma and discrimination issues, many migrant employees experience exclusion from the labour market when compared to mainstreamers and engage in low-status jobs, with lower wages and poor working conditions. As a result, these migrant employees have reported lower job satisfaction.

‘Income’ level plays an important role in migrants’ lives. Thus ‘income’ is another facet in which researchers have shown interest when studying migrants’ job satisfaction (Li, 2000; Drever & Hoffmeister, 2008; Green, 1999). Studies (Aguilera, 2003; Chiswick, 1978; Chowhan et al., 2012; Drever & Hoffmeister, 2008; Green, 1999; Syed & Kramar, 2010) on how fairly migrant employees are treated with regard to earnings have consistently suggested that mainstreamers’ earnings are significantly higher than those of migrant employees with similar levels of qualifications and work experience. As a result of their lower level of comparative income, migrant employees have expressed a lower level of job satisfaction on the ‘income’ facet. Notably such studies have not looked exclusively at skilled migrants.

Among skilled workers, Schmidt (2009) found that black certified public accountants reported greater dissatisfaction with their jobs than white certified public accountants in
the US. It was shown that lower levels of discretion led to overall job dissatisfaction for this ethnic minority group (Schmidt, 2009). Schmidt (2009), who focused on ‘job training satisfaction’ among migrants and non-migrants in the US, revealed that migrant (black and Hispanic) employees have difficulty with participation in training and development programs when compared to white employees. Meanwhile, a positive relationship between ‘job training satisfaction’ and overall job satisfaction is revealed in many research findings (e.g., Georgellis & Lange, 2007; Lowery, Simon & Kiberley, 2002 as cited in Schmidt, 2009; Mudor & Tooksoon, 2011; Schmidt, 2007).

On the other hand, most skilled migrant employees have positive work experiences in the country of birth before they migrate (Aycan & Berry, 1996; Berman, 1985; Giusta & Kambhampati, 2006). Ethnic minority employees who experience a greater loss in their ‘employment status’ (i.e., when compared to the ‘employment status’ in the country of birth before migrating) report lower satisfaction with their jobs in the host society (Aycan & Berry, 1996; Giusta & Kambhampati, 2006). This is mainly because they have identified themselves as less accomplished in their career since migrating. In addition, Siow and Ng (2013) found that migrant nurses in their study were less satisfied than non-migrant nurses for reasons such as ‘difficulty in accepting cultural differences’ and ‘unfulfilled high expectations in the new environment’ (p. 134). The current study participants were asked to compare their present level of job satisfaction with the last job held in the country of birth in order to understand participants’ comparative job satisfaction in the host society.

In contrast to the negative feelings for job satisfaction among migrant employees discussed in this section, some migrant groups are satisfied with their jobs in some host societies. For instance, Malinen and Johnston (2011) have revealed that educated migrants to New Zealand from various countries have reported relatively higher job satisfaction, primarily due to a lower level of ‘work–life conflicts’. In addition, Berman (1985) suggested that North American-educated migrant employees in Israel were likely to find work in their chosen careers after migrating to Israel; as a result, they were satisfied with the positive job outcomes resulting from the ‘work itself” facet of the job.

---

7 Hispanic: the largest and fastest growing ethnic minority group in the US (Moyes et al., 2006a). “Hispanic refers to a diversity of ethnic–cultural groups, including Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, South or Central-American” (Stephens, Stein & Landrine, 2010, p. 377).
Job satisfaction in Berman’s study was measured through four different elements: intrinsic (interesting work, accomplishments recognised, autonomy and opportunity to contribute), extrinsic-materials (security, income, promotion), extrinsic-conditions (physical conditions and efficiency), and extrinsic-social (relationship with co-workers). As with Berman’s (1985) study findings, when the facet-level contribution to the overall job satisfaction is considered, context facets (e.g., income, promotion) rather than the content facets (e.g., interesting work, autonomy and opportunity to contribute) are more likely to be problematic. As the Job Satisfaction Scale (Spector, 1997) that is used in the present study consists of nine facets, the present study’s findings can be compared with Berman’s.

In summarising the job satisfaction section, it can be said that job satisfaction among migrants can vary depending upon facets that have been included in the job satisfaction scale, sample group, country of birth and the host country, as well as other individual factors such as attitudes and personal values of migrant employees. Some studies found that migrant employees are less satisfied with several facets of their jobs, for reasons such as less authority in organisational decision-making, fewer training opportunities, social stigma, discrimination and lower earnings, leading to less overall job dissatisfaction. Other studies have found that some migrants are satisfied with their jobs due to a supportive work environment. Therefore migrants’ job satisfaction findings cannot be generalised, and rather more studies like the present study need to be conducted that focus on different migrant samples in different host societies.

2.9 Conceptual Framework for the Present Study

Based on the review of the literature and identified research gaps, the current research aims to explore the Conceptual Framework presented in Figure 2.2, in order to understand the level of social integration and life and job satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia and to identify the factors that may influence their social integration. According to Birman and Trickett (2001), social integration (termed ‘acculturation’ in their study) can be divided into three elements: language, identity and behaviour. Even though migrants’ social integration can primarily be understood in terms of these three dimensions (Birman & Trickett, 2001; Dustmann, 1996; Ho &
Birman, 2010; Kim & Omizo, 2010; Kumar & Nevid, 2010; Phinney, 1992; Saghafi et al., 2012; Suinn et al., 1992), it is rarely assessed in these three dimensions in relation to skilled migrants. Thus in the present study social integration was examined in its language, identity and behaviour components.

Researchers argue that migrants’ social integration is influenced by various socio-demographic factors, including age at migration, English language skills, years since migration, level of education, perceived inclusiveness, and so forth (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Lu et al., 2012; Martinovic et al., 2009; Miller et al., 2011; Mokounkolo & Taillardier-Schhmitt, 2012; Remennick, 2003; 2004). However, previous studies have found mixed results in relation to the association between these factors and social integration. For instance, Au et al. (1998) found that level of education was positively related to social integration, whereas other researchers (George & Chaze, 2009; Lu et al., 2012; Massey & Parr, 2012) found that level of education is unrelated to social integration. Due to such contradictory results found in previous studies, the current research examined the association between eight factors and social integration. The relationships between socio-demographic factors variables and social integration are elaborated in the next chapter.
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Figure 2.2 Conceptual framework
The ‘bottom-up approach’ to measuring life satisfaction has received considerable attention in the recent literature (Cummins, 2006; Rojas, 2006; Wills, 2009; Wu & Yao, 2007), due to its ability to identify individuals’ satisfaction in different life domains and the relative contribution of each domain to overall life satisfaction. Therefore the current study explores participants’ life satisfaction at ‘global’ and ‘domain’ levels.

Likewise, individuals can be satisfied with some facets of a job, but not with others. Therefore understanding migrants’ job satisfaction at facet level may helpful for contemporary managers to identity potential ‘trouble spots’ in relation to their migrant employees (Ahmed et al., 2013; Oshagbemi et al., 1997; Roelen et al., 2008). Thus the aim of the present study was to assess job satisfaction at facet level and global level.

In regard to whether migrants’ social integration is related to life and job satisfaction, to date researchers have found mixed results (Marsiglia et al., 2013). For instance, Amit (2010a) found a positive relationship between social integration and life satisfaction, but Mahmud and Schölmerich (2011) found a negative relationship between these variables. Furthermore, the magnitude of the relationship between social integration and life and job satisfaction may vary based on ethnic group, host country, migration category and expectation of migration. Thus the association between social integration and life and job satisfaction was explored in relation to this sample group, which represents a distinct ethnic group in Australia in one migration category.

As discussed in the next chapter, in the present study social integration on its language, identity and behaviour dimensions of integration was hypothesised to mediate the relationship between socio-demographic variables and life and job satisfaction.

2.10 Chapter Summary

Chapter 2 reviewed the literature related to migration, skilled migrants and their contribution to host countries. Then key terminologies used in the present study such as acculturation, assimilation and social integration were described and differences among these variables were also identified; justification for using social integration in the
present study was then presented. Before developing the conceptual framework for the present study, the literature related to life and job satisfaction of migrants was reviewed.

The current Australian migration policy encourages skilled migrants from all around the world, but Asian skilled migrants have been given prominent attention in this program since the 1990s. Australia is benefiting from the skilled migration program in many ways, by attracting young, skilled labour to meet the nation’s labour market requirements; such participation in the labour market has led to high levels of fiscal contribution and increased productivity. Skilled migration has been a practical solution to Australia’s skill shortage and to balance the ageing population of the country. Nevertheless, skilled migrants face some issues related to non-recognition of foreign credentials and adaptation to the host society.

The adaptation of migrants to host societies has generated considerable interest in the current migration literature. Acculturation, assimilation and social integration are used interchangeably in migrants’ adaptation studies. When comparing definitions of acculturation and social integration, it can be said that these two constructs are similar to a great extent, as both refer to the way that migrants blend into host societies and assess the changes of migrants’ values, attitudes, behaviours and identity according to the host society. However, social integration is consistently concerned with the extent to which migrant groups become a part of the receiving society. Even though social integration is defined and measured in many different ways, in the present study it is defined as the degree of migrants’ adaptation into the mainstream society in terms of host country language, identity and behaviour; thus it is also measured in terms of language, identity and behaviour dimensions in the present study. Previous research has found that first-generation migrants’ level of social integration is lower due to a salient cultural gap between migrant-sending and host societies, multicultural policies in host societies, and the technological advancements in communication channels between country of birth and host country.

Life satisfaction can be measured as ‘satisfaction in life as a whole’ and ‘satisfaction in domains of life’. People who are satisfied in one domain may not necessarily be satisfied in other domains. Two approaches have been used in assessing the relationship
between general life satisfaction and satisfaction in domains of life: the ‘bottom-up’ approach suggests that general life satisfaction can be understood through a combination of different life domains, whereas the ‘top-down’ approach suggests that domains of satisfaction can be influenced by an individual’s general level of life satisfaction. The life satisfaction of migrants affects their own and the host country’s well-being alike. Previous research has often shown ethnic migrants’ life satisfaction in Western societies to be comparatively lower, but these findings cannot be generalised because of the many socio-demographic factors that can influence life satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is considered a global concept (overall job satisfaction), but it is also considered a combination of facets of satisfaction with various dimensions of a job. Level of job satisfaction is considered a crucial skilled migration outcome. There are mixed results on migrants’ job satisfaction. However, most literature suggests that migrants experience some disadvantages and discrimination in host-country labour markets and within organisations because of their ethnic group membership. Some findings, however, suggest that there has been a positive improvement in ethnic discrimination in Western societies, with the implementation of strong multicultural and diversity policies.

The next chapter of this thesis reviews the literature related to factors that contribute to social integration of migrants. Based on the review of the literature, Hypotheses for the current study are developed and presented. In addition, the literature related to the associations between social integration and life satisfaction, social integration and job satisfaction, and life satisfaction and job satisfaction is presented in order to develop relevant Hypotheses.
CHAPTER 3

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT – THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION AND RELATIONSHIPS AMONG SOCIAL INTEGRATION, LIFE SATISFACTION AND JOB SATISFACTION

3.1 Chapter Introduction

The previous chapter reviewed the literature on social integration, life and job satisfaction in general and in relation to migrants in host societies and then the Conceptual Framework for the present study was developed. The purpose of this chapter is twofold: first, to review literature related to factors that influence social integration, and, second, to develop Hypotheses to complement the second aim of the research, which is to identify the variance in social integration explained by (a) age at migration, (b) years since migration, (c) English language skills, (d) level of education, (e) pre-migration SES, (f) neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants, (g) perceived inclusiveness, and (h) expectation to return to the country of birth. Thus Section 3.2 presents the literature related to factors that influence social integration. This chapter also discusses the literature related to the relationship between social integration and life satisfaction in Section 3.3 and the literature related to the relationship between social integration and job satisfaction in Section 3.4. Section 3.5 discusses the relationship between job and life satisfaction. Finally a chapter summary is provided in Section 3.6.

3.2 Factors that Affect Social Integration of Migrants

A number of researchers have sought to identify factors that determine the successful social integration of migrants in the host country (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Lu et al., 2012; Martinovic et al., 2009; Miller et al., 2011; Mokounkolo & Taillandier-Schhmitt, 2012; Remennick, 2003, 2004). However, the combination of variables measured in previous research has varied according to the study sample, the host country, the purpose of the study, and the discipline within which the research was conducted, e.g.,
psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc. (Berry, 2001; Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007). Therefore there is a lack of consistency in the literature regarding what predicts the successful social integration of migrants. However, as summarised and highlighted (in bold) in Table 3.1, a review of the literature suggests that some socio-demographic factors, such as age, age at migration, ethnic identity, host language skills, pre-migration SES, employment, migration purpose, years since migration and neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants, emerge as consistent predictors of social integration of migrants across studies. Psychological factors such as the expectation to return to country of birth (De Bree et al., 2010; King & Mai, 2004) and perceived inclusiveness/discrimination in the host country (Berry, 2001; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Fong & Ooka, 2006; Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Neto & Barros, 2007; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Valenta, 2009) have also been included in migrant social integration research.

As noted previously in the Introduction chapter (Section 1.3), there is a lack of research in relation to social integration among first-generation Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia (see Table 3.1). Therefore the current research explores predictors of social integration in this context, drawing on the variables listed in Table 3.1. It should be noted here that all participants in the current study migrated to Australia as skilled migrants under Australia’s skilled migration program; accordingly, migration purpose was not examined as a separate predictor. Likewise, all participants were employed; accordingly, employment was not included as a predictor. Ethnicity was not included as a predictor because participants in this study are limited to Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants, who share commonalities, such as (a) non-English speaking background; (b) maintaining close ties with country of birth; (c) strong sense of belonging to the country of birth; (d) strong values towards ethno-cultural relationships; (e) high regard for religious beliefs and traditional customs; (f) maintaining multigenerational households; and (g) similar sporting interests, such as supporting cricket teams (Frank, Hofstede & Bond, 1991; Hofstede, 2001). Therefore clear differences between Sri Lankan and Indians are not expected, as they might be if, for instance, we were studying the social integration of Indian sub-continent migrants and European migrants, who are culturally distinct. As shown in Table 3.1, the attitude of the host society is also a prominent variable that predicts social integration. In the
current study, the host society’s attitude towards migrants was captured by migrants’ level of perceived inclusiveness.

As previously explained in Chapter 2 (Section 2.4), researchers have used different terminology when describing migrants’ adaptation to host societies. Hence they have measured social integration in terms of a number of facets, such as host language acquisition, host country identity, changing of behaviour according to the host country, level of social participation in the wider society, social connectedness or successful employment in the host country, or as an overall construct capturing combinations of these facets (Table 3.1 provides more examples). It is evident that migrants gradually develop host language skills and host country identity, and also that they tend to change their behaviour to meet the requirements of a host-country lifestyle when socially integrating into the host society (Birman & Tyler, 1994; Birman et al., 2010; Bisin et al., 2008; Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Miller et al., 2011; Nesdale & Mak, 2000). While these facets of integration have been measured in various studies, as detailed in Section 2.4, with the exception of studies by Dina Birman and colleagues (Birman & Tyler, 1994; Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Birman et al., 2010; Ho & Birman, 2010), migrants’ adaptation has not been generally measured in terms of language, identity and behaviour dimensions within a single study.

Many researchers suggest that migrants’ integration occurs in terms of host language, host country identity and behaviour dimensions (Au et al., 1998; Birman & Trickett, 2001; Birman, & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010; Safdar et al., 2003; Vergunst, 2008). Thus, in the present study, social integration is measured in terms of these three dimensions. Also, as shown in Table 3.1, not many studies have focused on Australian migrants, and, specifically, skilled migrants from the Indian sub-continent. These gaps in the literature set the context for the present study, which aims to identify the factors that significantly contribute to social integration of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia and the relationship of social integration to the important outcomes of life and job satisfaction.

In the following Hypotheses development section, specific literature that has explored the association between the focal socio-demographic variables and social integration is
reviewed. The reasons for selecting the chosen socio-demographic factors and their appropriateness to the present study context are also discussed.

Table 3.1 Studies of socio-demographic factors in migrants’ social integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Predictors of integration</th>
<th>Measures of integration</th>
<th>Study Sample</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Berry, 2001</td>
<td>Ethnicity, Language, Contact participation, Cultural maintenance</td>
<td>Overall acculturation</td>
<td>Concept paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude of the receiving society towards newcomers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Birman et al., 1994</td>
<td>Gender, Years since migration</td>
<td>Identity Behaviour</td>
<td>COB: Soviet Jewish Refugees, USA</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Birman et al., 2010</td>
<td>Age, Years since migration, Ethnic identity</td>
<td>Identity aspect of integration</td>
<td>COB: Former Soviet Union (FSU), USA (Educated – Adolescent migrants)</td>
<td>Cross-sectional Survey Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bisin et al., 2008</td>
<td>Age at arrival, Education, Years since arrival, Country of birth</td>
<td>Cultural and religious identity</td>
<td>COB: Various Ethnic minorities, UK</td>
<td>Secondary data – National survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chiswick and Miller, 2001</td>
<td>Language, Country of birth, Age at migration, Years since migration Education</td>
<td>Language aspect of integration</td>
<td>COB: Various, Canada</td>
<td>Census data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Predictors of integration</td>
<td>Measures of integration</td>
<td>Study Sample</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dalgard and Thapa, 2007</td>
<td>Size of the immigrant group community</td>
<td>Overall social integration</td>
<td>COB: Western and non-Western immigrants (Norway, USA, West Europe, Middle East, Africa, Indian subcontinent, Asia)</td>
<td>Survey data – (Secondary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Host Country: Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Social support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attitude of the host society towards newcomers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cultural gap between host society and the migrant group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Damian and Rosenbaum-Tamari, 1999</td>
<td><strong>Period of arrival</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social encounters</strong></td>
<td>COB: FSU</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Social distance</strong></td>
<td>Host Country: Israel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Perceived receptiveness</strong></td>
<td>(Educated migrants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ersanilli and Koopmans, 2010</td>
<td><strong>Citizenship status</strong></td>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>COB Turkey</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Country of birth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td>Host Countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social contacts</strong></td>
<td>Netherlands, France, Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Naturalised and non- naturalised sample)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fong and Ooka, 2006</td>
<td><strong>Age at migration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social participation</strong></td>
<td>COB: Chinese immigrants</td>
<td>Secondary survey data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Host Country: Canada - Toronto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Years since migration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Perceived acceptance by the majority group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Education and English Mainstream perception for Chinese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>George and Chaze, 2009</td>
<td><strong>Social Capital - informal and formal networking</strong></td>
<td><strong>Settlement in terms of Tangible help, information need</strong></td>
<td>COB: South Asian immigrants women</td>
<td>50 in depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Predictors of integration</td>
<td>Measures of integration</td>
<td>Study Sample</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gijsberts and Dagevos, 2007</td>
<td>Ethnic concentration in neighbourhood</td>
<td>Social integration in terms of inter-ethnic contacts, language and attitude</td>
<td>COB: Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, Antilleans and five refugee groups Host Country: Netherlands (Largest immigrants and refugee groups)</td>
<td>Secondary data – Two large scale surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2011</td>
<td>Acculturation attitude Age Education Marital status Years since migration Status (Non ethnic VS ethnic) Country of birth Host country</td>
<td>Socio-economic adjustment (housing and employment)</td>
<td>COB: First-generation FSU and Russian migrants Host Country: Israel and Finland (Educated migrants)</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lance, 2010</td>
<td>Social capital Age Years since migration Language Education Occupational status</td>
<td>Employment and income aspect of integration</td>
<td>COB: Turks, Moroccans, Antilleans and Surinamese Host Country: Netherlands</td>
<td>Cross-sectional Survey Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lu et al., 2011; 2012</td>
<td>Age Gender Education and work experience Age at migration Years since migration Perceived mainstream language proficiency</td>
<td>Overall Acculturation (in terms of strategies- Assimilation, integration, separation and marginalisation)</td>
<td>COB: Chinese immigrants Host Country: Australia (Professional immigrants)</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Martinovic et al., 2009</td>
<td>Ethnicity Age at migration Migration purpose (Study/work) Education Size of own immigrant community Unemployment level in the host country</td>
<td>Overall Social Integration</td>
<td>COB: First-generation Dutch Colonial immigrants Host Country: Netherlands</td>
<td>Pooled cross sectional survey data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Predictors of integration</td>
<td>Measures of integration</td>
<td>Study Sample</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 16 | Miller et al., 2009 | Ethnic neighbourhood concentration  
Age  
Years since migration | Language  
Identity  
Behaviour | COB:  
FSU  
Host Country:  
USA (Diverse immigrant women) | Cross-sectional descriptive design |
| 17 | Mokounkola and Taillandier-Schmitt, 2012 | Gender  
Age  
Country of birth  
Family situation  
Parenthood  
Work or student activity  
Participating in social functions  
Religious practices | Overall socio-cultural acculturative orientation | COB:  
North African immigrants  
Host Country: France | Cross-sectional survey |
| 18 | Murdie and Ghosh, 2010 | Ethnic neighbourhood concentration | Subjective integration  
Functional integration | COB:  
Bangladeshi migrants  
Host Country: Toronto | Secondary data – Canadian census data |
| 19 | Nesdale and Mak (2000) | Ethnicity  
Acceptance of the dominant group  
Acculturation attitude  
Ethnic neighbourhood concentration  
Demographics (age, gender, education etc.) | Identity aspect of integration | COB:  
Various  
Host Country: Australia | Survey data |
| 20 | Remennick, 2003, 2004 | Age at migration  
Ethnicity  
Years since migration  
Education  
Language  
Pre migration resident area  
Cultural consumption  
Living with children under 18  
Successful employment  
Inter-ethnic marriages  
Religiosity | Overall Social Integration | COB:  
First-generation FSU Immigrants  
Host Country: Israel | National Survey Data: Secondary |
| 21 | Safdar et al., 2003 | Bi-cultural competence  
Ethnic identity  
In-group and out group support  
Acculturation attitude | COB:  
Iranian immigrants  
Host Country: Canada - Ontario | Survey data |
3.2.1 Age at migration and social integration

In previous studies (e.g., Fong & Ooka, 2006; Lu et al., 2011), present age and age at migration have been included as two separate variables; in other studies, either one or the other has been included (e.g., Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Martinovic et al., 2009; Nesdale & Mak, 2000). However, in the present study the focus is on age at migration and years since migration, which are expected to correlate with present age, which reflects possible generational differences in the experiences of migrants and is included as a control variable only.

Age at migration can influence the social integration of newcomers (Alpass, 2007; Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Martinovic et al., 2009; Remennick, 2003). Several studies (Alpass, 2007; Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Lu et al., 2012; Martinovic et al., 2009; Remennick 2003, 1999; Sanchez & Brock, 1996) indicate that migrants who arrive at a younger age possess greater adaptability when fitting into the new society than those who arrive at an older age. In the present sample, variation in age of migration can be expected mainly because the migration policy in Australia allows individuals from age 18 to age 50 to apply for a permanent skilled migration visa to Australia, and allocates different numbers of points to different age groups (e.g., 18–24 years, 25 points; 25–32 years, 30 points; 33–39 years, 25 points; 40–44 years, 15 points; 45-50, no points for age; DIAC, Professionals & other skilled migrants, 2013).

The link between age at migration and social integration is discussed through its implications for migrants’ exposure to home culture, social participation, contact development and language acquisition in the host society.
i) Younger migrants and their exposure to home culture

Martinovic et al. (2009) conducted a study to identify the factors that influence social integration of non-Western migrants in the Netherlands. The researchers found that migrants who arrived at younger ages were less socialised into their home cultures by third parties such as parents, extended family members, educational institutions, social functions and media in the country of birth. As a result, at the time of migration, the extent to which they had internalised the social norms and values of the home country was significantly lower. Thus they showed greater capacity to gradually accept the social norms of the host society compared to individuals who had migrated at older ages. Therefore it can be argued that younger migrants tend to socially integrate more, compared to their older counterparts.

ii) Age at migration, social participation and new contact development

Age at migration has also been shown to influence social participation (Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Martinovic et al., 2009). In addition to being less socially oriented in the culture of their country of birth, those who arrive at a younger age are more likely to include locals in their personal networks, as they encounter more opportunities to interact with mainstreamers (Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Fong & Ooka, 2006). Past research findings further reveal that, even though at the entry point there is no perceptible difference between younger and older migrants in networking, age at migration affects the development of inter-ethnic contacts longitudinally, with the younger migrants making inter-ethnic contacts and integrating into the host society at a faster rate than individuals who migrate at older ages (Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Martinovic et al., 2009).

Fong and Ooka (2006), in a study of patterns of social participation of Chinese migrants in Canada, found that exposure to educational institutions and patterns of social behaviour among migrants who arrive at a younger age can positively influence their social interactions with mainstreamers and their participation in informal social activities in the wider society. Supporting the same point, Remennick (2003) found that younger Russian migrants in Israel spent 40% of their free time with Israeli and Russian friends; however, among older migrants the share of host country contacts dropped. Hence it is evident that age at migration affects migrants’ pattern and level of social
participation in the wider society. The association between age at migration and the social participation of migrants has been established in several societies across different migrant groups (Bisin et al., 2008; Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Fong & Ooka, 2006; Jasinska-Lahti et al., 2011; Lance, 2010). However, with respect to skilled migrants in Western societies, this relationship is uncertain, due to a lack of studies in this area (Lu et al., 2011; 2012). Nevertheless, based on the above findings it can be posited that age at migration may inversely impact social integration of skilled migrants.

Since the study participants are first-generation skilled migrants, it is anticipated that some of them obtained their qualifications from other countries, including their country of birth, whereas others acquired qualifications in Australia. It can be argued that individuals who arrived at younger ages (for instance, at an age where studies were still being completed), in comparison with their older counterparts, may have had more opportunities to interact with people from other cultures and mainstreamers at their higher education institutes than migrants who came to Australia at a later stage of their lives. Thus younger migrants are expected to be more integrated in terms of host country language, identity and behaviour for this reason.

iii) Age at migration and host country language acquisition

Age at migration also influences host language acquisition (Chiswick & Miller, 2001). Age at migration affects the efficiency of host-country language learning, as younger migrants possess far greater capacity to learn new languages than older individuals (Chiswick & Miller, 2001); as individuals get older, the brain loses its capacity to adapt to new languages, hence host-language proficiency is likely to decline with age at migration. There is a wealth of literature supporting host-language fluency as an important attribute for interacting with mainstreamers and increasing social participation in the wider society (Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010; Lu et al., 2011; 2012; Remennick, 2003, 2004; Valenta, 2009). However, as English is the second official language in Sri Lanka and India, English is not a completely foreign language for the present study participants (Bernhardt, 2011, p.90). Thus age at migration was not expected to be an important predictor of language integration in the current study (the role of language proficiency in social integration is discussed in more detail in the next section).
From the foregoing discussion it is reasoned that skilled migrants who arrive at a younger age show less exposure to the culture, norms and values of their country of birth and thus have more capacity to absorb host identity, participate more socially in the wider society and develop inter-ethnic contacts at a faster rate. It is expected therefore that skilled migrants who arrived at a younger age will show greater social integration in terms of ‘identity’ and ‘behaviour’. Thus it can be hypothesised that:

**H1: Age at migration is related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia; migrants who were younger at migration show:**

(a) Higher host country identity integration  
(b) Higher host country behaviour integration  
(c) However, age at migration is not expected to be related to host country language integration for this group of migrants.

### 3.2.2 Years since migration and social integration of migrants

Migration is considered a major life-changing event (Foroughi et al., 2001; George & Chaze, 2009; Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Safdar et al., 2003; Safi, 2010). It is especially evident that ethnic migrants in the Western world face ‘culture shock’ in the early stages of arrival and, as a result, take time to expose themselves to the new environment before more comfortably engaging in social interaction in the wider society (Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Kisselev et al., 2010; Murdie & Ghosh, 2010).

There is a wealth of literature (Fong & Ooka, 2003; Gordon, 1964; Green, 1999; Martinovic et al., 2009; Renaud & Cayn, 2007; Remennick, 2003) that suggests that migrants’ level of social integration increases with the duration of their stay in the host society. Fong and Ooka (2003) argued that, although migrants’ level of social integration is not a mere reflection of their length of the stay in the host country, these variables are positively correlated. In particular, Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. (2011) suggested that psychological adaptation of migrants generally stabilises after a few years of migration and is accompanied by an increase in social interactions outside one’s ethnic group. Although researchers agree that social integration and years since migration are positively related, some studies show that certain migrant groups such as refugees find it difficult to narrow the income and social gap, even though they have stayed in the
host country for a longer period of time (Borjas, 1994; Barnes, 2001; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Valenta, 2009; Zhou, 1997). Therefore, the relationship between social integration and years since migration may not be the same for all the categories of migrants. As discussed in the following sections, the relationship between years since migration and social integration may depend on factors such as living in ethnic neighbourhoods, migrants’ attitude towards integration, level of contacts within the host country and co-ethnic migrant group size in the host country (Li, 2007; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Remennick, 2003; Valenta, 2009).

i) Years since migration and social participation

Gordon (1994) considered time spent in the host country a crucial variable in determining the level of social integration of migrant groups. According to him, most ethnic migrants tend to weaken their contacts with co-ethnics and expand their social relationships with mainstreamers the longer they stay in the host country, and this improves their social integration longitudinally. However, more recently Martinovic et al. (2009) argued that, even though the migrants became increasingly socially integrated with time spent in the host country, the pace at which this increase in social integration occurred was rather slow and depended on individual and contextual characteristics (Birnam, 2006). Supporting this notion of slow growth in social interactions with natives, Damian and Rosenbaum-Tamari (1999) found that, even after five years of migration, Former Soviet Union citizens who had migrated to Israel maintained a low level of contact with mainstreamers due to their less favourable attitudes and opinions towards the new social environment and fellow citizens. In addition, it is evident that in Canada, which is similar to Australia in terms of its skilled migration policy, first-generation migrants maintain constant contact with migrants from the same country of birth even longitudinally (Sakamoto, 2007).

As explained in the ‘separation strategy’ in Berry’s acculturation framework (1990) (see Section 2.4.1), some categories of ethnic migrants are inclined to remain locked into their traditional ways of thinking and behaviour and to mix only with members of their own ethnic groups (Borjas, 1994; Barnes, 2001; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Lu et al., 2012, 2013; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Valenta, 2009; Zhou, 1997). Therefore years since migration may not be an influential variable for social integration in the case of every
migrant category. Nevertheless, skilled migrants from ethnic backgrounds may be an exception to this, as they bring relevant knowledge and skills needed to participate in the labour market in the host society and increase social participation in the wider society over a period of time (Amit, 2010b; Borjas, 1994). In addition, skilled migrants tend to increase language integration the longer they stay in the host society (Borjas, 1990; Chiswick & Miller, 2002; Reitz et al., 2009). Therefore years since migration is expected to be positively related to the social integration of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.

ii) Years since migration and migrants’ income

It is evident that, as the length of the stay increases in the host country, skilled migrants start looking for better paid and higher status jobs, because they have gained more experience in the social and institutional dimensions of the host society (Chiswick, 1978; Martinovic et al., 2009). Generally, as soon as migrants arrive in a new country, most tend to accept the first job opportunity available to them, due to reasons such as family strain in the new destination, lack of knowledge and experience of the host country labour market, the host society’s lack of recognition of overseas qualifications earned in developing countries, and so forth (Barrett & Duffy 2008; Chiswick, 1978; Chiswick, Lee & Miller, 2003; Li, 2000; Nakhaie, 2007; Parr & Guo, 2005; Reitz, 2001). This situation may be true especially where Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrant employees are concerned, as they have migrated from a collectivist society that emphasises family commitments (Frank, Hofstede & Bond, 1991; Hofstede, 2001). As time passes, migrant employees accumulate host-country qualifications, work experience and knowledge of the labour market, and tend to perform better in terms of their job, income and other objective dimensions such as housing. Furthermore, the longer migrant employees stay in the host country, the more structurally bound they are to participate in social forums of the new society and in their workplace. As a result, they acquire the skills and confidence required to integrate well into the host society (Borjas, 1994; Gorden, 1964; Sabharwal, 2011).

Some scholars have also suggested that migrant employees’ wage level converges with that of mainstream employees when they stay longer in host country employment, which can positively influence their social integration via successful economic
Therefore it can be argued that, as skilled migrants stay longer in the host country, they are more likely to get better job opportunities and a reasonable income and, as a result, to more readily engage in wider society, rather than separating themselves from the society. In this way, years since migration may positively relate to social integration of skilled migrants.

Age, age at migration and years since migration variables are three variables which overlap to a certain extent, as they reflect migrants’ level of exposure to country of birth and to the host country. Therefore social contacts, social norms and values, and language acquisition may explain the association between these three variables and social integration.

Based on the literature, it is expected that skilled migrants become more socially integrated into the wider society with the time spent in the host society, because they psychologically adapt well to the host country, obtain more opportunities for wider social participation, gather the host-country credentials required to obtain better jobs, increase their income, and gain more opportunities to develop inter-ethnic contacts. Therefore it can be hypothesised that:

**H2: Years since migration is positively related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia; migrants who have lived in Australia longer show:**

(a) Higher host country language integration
(b) Higher host country identity integration
(c) Higher host country behaviour integration.

### 3.2.3 Host country language skills and social integration of migrants

Competence in language of the host country has been identified as a pathway to a better life in the host society in several ways (Amit, 2012; Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010; Lu et al, 2011; Martinovic et al., 2009; Padilla & Perez, 2003; Portes & Rivas, 2011; Remennick, 2003; 2004). For instance, Remennick (2004) examined the association of host language skills and social integration among first-generation former Soviet
migrants in Israel and found that host-country language competency strongly affected
the social integration of the study participants, because (a) it positively impacted
communication within occupational and public realms, and (b) it improved migrants’
cultural and media consumption (e.g., newspapers, magazines, TV channels, shows and
concerts of host country artists; see also Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Chiswick et al.,
2003; Choi & Thomas, 2009; Li, 2007).

The literature related to the association between host-country language skills and social
integration is reviewed under the sub-headings of social relationships, occupational
achievement and host-country naturalisation policies.

i)  *Host-country language skills and social relationships*

Martinovic et al. (2009) found that migrants from Caribbean groups, who are
considered to be more socially integrated than other migrant groups in the Netherlands,
had more exposure to the official language (Dutch) at the time of their arrival and as a
result had greater opportunities to interact with mainstreamers. Valenta (2009), in a
study of the social integration of first-generation of migrants in Norway, also
highlighted the importance of host-language proficiency in building relationships.
Findings revealed that, even though migrants interact with mainstreamers at a personal
level, this interaction can be difficult when there are language barriers. For instance, the
following quote illustrates the perspective of a migrant from Iraq in Norway:

> We socialise with each other. We have invited them to dinner from time to time.
> They are nice, but on the whole, the situations are somehow tense and forced,
> [...] I do not know why … No; [ ] maybe we cannot relax due to language
> problems… Maybe all of us are afraid to do something wrong, to insult each
> other. You never know what they think. (Valenta, 2009, p.187)

It could be argued that migrants shy away from the host society because of language
barriers. This situation in turn could reduce their level of socialisation, and therefore
they may develop a sense of rejection (or isolation) in the host society (Valenta, 2009).
This can adversely impact the migrants’ social integration in the host society. These
findings therefore indicate that language skills and associated networking behaviours
facilitate an easier transition into the mainstream way of life and promote a higher level of social integration (Au et al., 1998; Ea et al., 2008; Remennick, 2002).

In addition, other findings have revealed that verbal communication is important for social mobility in the wider society, as it enhances the ability to include locals in informal networks (Remennick, 2004). Supporting the same notion, the ability to speak fluently in the host language was found to be a more significant predictor of social integration than reading and writing (Remennick, 2004). Host-language learning is also associated with a shift in media usage from co-ethnic to mainstream and this is reflected in better social integration in terms of host-country behaviour (Martinovic et al., 2009; Remennick, 2004).

\[\text{ii) Host-language skills and occupational achievements}\]

A strong link has also been established between host-country language proficiency and the occupational achievements of migrants (Green, 1999; Nakhaie, 2007; Remennick, 2004). Asukura (2008) found that Japanese Brazilian visiting migrants with better host-language skills often got jobs in a better working environment and in reputable organisations, and in turn got access to wider social community. It is also suggested that migrants with better host-language skills are more often included in organisational informal social groups (Asukura, 2008). Furthermore, they seem to gradually include co-workers from other ethnic groups and the majority group in their own personal networks (Mor Barak, 2000; Syed & Kramar, 2010). Therefore it can be said that employees with high language skills tend to increasingly absorb the values and lifestyle of the majority group in the host society through new interpersonal connections. Therefore migrants who are proficient in host language may integrate well into the host society. Syed and Kramar (2010) suggested that this feeling of social inclusion assists migrant employees in enhancing their level of self-belonging in the new destination. These findings are relevant to the present study, which focuses specifically on skilled migrant employees.

\[\text{iii) The impact of host-country language skills on naturalisation}\]

In some migrant-receiving societies, such as France, host language proficiency is identified as a socio-cultural requirement for obtaining citizenship. A study of socio-
cultural integration and naturalisation of migrants in the Netherlands, France and Germany (Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010) found that insufficient host-country language proficiency impacted the social and economic independence of migrants. For instance, low host-country language proficiency was identified as a threat to national cohesion where members of the host society tended to exclude migrants from their social network. Therefore insufficient host-language proficiency affects the social integration of migrants by way of social exclusion. As a traditional migrant-receiving country, France strongly promotes sufficient French language skills as a determinant of first-generation migrants’ successful social integration. This is also reflected in the country’s naturalisation policies, which indicate that naturalisation is possible only for migrants with good French language skills. To this end, since 2005, French proficiency tests have been conducted by the Assimilation Evaluation Office to determine language proficiency before migrants are granted citizenship (see also Weil & Spire, 2006, cited in Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010).

In contrast to France, under the ‘common bond’ concept, the Australian citizenship test is designed to assess whether migrants have an adequate knowledge of Australia and the responsibilities and privileges of an Australian citizen (DIAC, Australian Citizenship, our common bond, 2013). Therefore, when granting citizenship to Australian migrants, the citizenship test mainly assesses migrants’ knowledge about the country’s democratic beliefs, rights and liberties and government and the law in Australia, and there is no separate English test (DIAC, Migrant economic outcomes & contributions, 2013). While the test is conducted in the English language, the practice test is available in 37 community languages under the ‘common bond’ concept and it is stated that only a basic knowledge of English is required to pass the Australian citizenship test (DIAC, Australian Citizenship, our common bond, 2013). Therefore it can be argued that English proficiency is not a major concern in offering Australian citizenship, so that host-country language skills may be a less important predictor of social integration in Australian society in particular.

iv) Impact of country of birth on host-language acquisition

Chiswick and Miller (1999; 2001; 2008) conducted a series of studies on migrants’ language acquisition and integration based on a number of migrant-receiving societies
such as Canada, Europe and Australia. Their findings pointed out that country of birth influenced host-language acquisition (see also Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010). For instance, one of their studies was based on secondary data on Australian migrants and revealed that migrants from countries that have strong English-language influences (e.g., North Europe, South Asian regions that had British influence in the past, the Philippines) are more efficient in language acquisition in Australia (Chiswick & Miller, 1999). They further suggested that some mother tongues are more linguistically close to English, thus providing an advantage in language acquisition and integration into the host society. The influence of language skills on the integration of Indian and Sri Lankan migrants, who also come from regions that have British influence (Bernhardt, 2011, p.90), is yet to be explored. Bernhardt has further suggested that ‘today English is spoken by more people in India than in any other country’ (Bernhardt, 2011, p.90). Therefore English is not a complete foreign language to skilled migrants from Sri Lanka and India.

v) Australian skilled migrants' English language requirement

The current research focuses on skilled migrants. The minimum English language proficiency requirement to be eligible as an Australian skilled migrant applicant varies depending on occupation category (DIAC, Professionals & other skilled migrants, 2013). A score of six out of eight in each of the four components (speaking, reading, writing, listening) in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) is the minimum requirement (DIAC, Professionals & other skilled migrants, 2013). Therefore little variability is expected in first-generation skilled migrants’ level of English language proficiency. This leads to the assumption that English language proficiency may not be a significant determinant of social integration within this study sample, as it consists of skilled migrants coming from regions that have a high competence in the English language.

Even though several scholars argue that language is an important determinant of social integration, for the following reasons English language proficiency may not be an influencing variable in social integration of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Australia is a multicultural society that promotes cultural diversity and allows migrants to use other languages through their naturalisation policies; skilled migrants
are expected to already have high English language proficiency; English is not a complete foreign language to Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants. However, better host-country language proficiency may influence migrants’ behaviour in areas such as host-country media consumption, participating in social events in wider society, and the like. Therefore in the present study it is hypothesised that:

\( H3: \text{Host country language proficiency is} \quad ^8:\)

\( (a) \) not related to host country identity integration
\( (b) \) positively related to host country behaviour integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.

3.2.4 Level of education and social integration of migrants

Most studies on migrants’ social integration are in agreement that there is an association between migrants’ level of education and social integration (Fong & Ooka, 2006; Helliwell, 2003; Nauck, 2001; Pham & Harris, 2001; Remennick, 2004; Selvarajah, 2003). For instance, Remennick (2003) used level of education and found that education was a main contributor to success in the host society in an educated migrant sample. Furthermore, a study based on secondary longitudinal data suggested that pre-migration level of education was a significant predictor of the social integration of Quebecois skilled migrants in Canada (Renaud & Cayn, 2007). Level of education can create more opportunities for incorporating into the host society and reduce social discrimination. This is discussed in more detail below.

\( i) \) Level of education and job opportunities in host societies

It is argued that migrants with higher levels of formal education have a wider range of job opportunities from which to choose; thus the likelihood of being in a higher level of employment increases with level of education (Asukura, 2008; Barrett & Duffy 2008; Martinovic et al., 2009; Nakhaie, 2007; Nurullah, 2010). Migrants with lower levels of skills and qualifications have poorer work conditions and restricted job opportunities, as they are often compelled to take on opportunities with little or no preference. Specifically, Au et al. (1998) pointed out that migrants with lower levels of education

\(^8\) The relationship between host country language proficiency and integration in host country language dimension was not tested since these variables overlap with each other.
have traditionally settled in low-paid occupations and ethnic economies in Canada (see also Enchautegui-de-Jesus et al., 2006; Hou, 2009). Therefore it could be argued that migrants with lower educational backgrounds, who often tend to work within ethnic economies, get less exposure to the wider society, which affects their social integration negatively. In contrast, educated migrants get more opportunities to interact with a wider community through wider-spread job opportunities.

### ii) Level of education and social discrimination in host societies

Studies in organisational psychology have revealed that migrants’ level of education impacts organisational discrimination in multicultural societies (Asakuara et al., 2008; Syed & Kramar, 2010): the higher the level of education, the lower the level of organisational discrimination (Asakuara et al., 2008; Kwok-bun & Plüss, 2013). As a result, it can be expected that employees with higher formal qualifications are less discriminated against and are more included in the organisational informal network when compared to less educated migrants (Asakuara et al., 2008). For instance, Kwok-bun and Plüss (2013) stated that highly educated migrants experience less discrimination than unskilled and less educated migrants in American society (p. 52). It can be argued that the feeling of inclusion may positively influence the formation of host country identity among educated migrants. Therefore migrants who arrive with lower levels of formal education are more likely to be disadvantaged in social integration as compared to their more educated counterparts (Sam, 1998; Zhou, 1997, cited in Fong & Ooka, 2006). However, these experiences may differ based on factors such as the host society’s attitude towards migrants and the quality of education in the home country (Kwok-bun & Plüss, 2013; Rudiger & Spencer, 2003).

### iii) Level of education and social integration

It is also believed that highly educated migrants have more open-minded views on life and a preference for maintaining contact with highly educated people in the wider society who share similar world views (Martinovic et al., 2009). At the same time, highly educated migrants get more exposure to mainstreamers at educational institutions and workplaces, which positively influences host-language acquisition and learning of norms and values of the host country, thus benefiting the social integration process in terms of language, identity and behaviour dimensions (Chiswick & Miller, 2002;
Martinovic et al., 2009). As argued by Berry et al. (1986; cited in Au et al., 1998), migrants with a higher educational background perceive social integration as a challenging opportunity in the new society rather than an unpleasant or stressful experience, and make themselves available for other opportunities in the host society, such as participating in local community events (see also Pham & Harris, 2001).

Renaud and Cayn, (2007) showed that Canadian migration policy has changed to improve social integration, and level of education is now considered one of the primary criteria in assessing migrants’ capability to integrate in Canada, thus demonstrating a strong link between level of education and migrants’ integration at national policy level. Therefore it is important to explore such linkages between education level and social integration in specific groups of skilled migrants in Australia in order to make possible comparisons based on different host societies. Based on the above findings, a positive relationship might be expected between level of education and social integration of skilled migrants in Australia. Furthermore, based on the criteria discussed above (where a higher level of education is associated with better job opportunities and a lower level of discrimination), migrants with a higher level of education may tend to use the host language quite often and may change their behaviour according to the host country’s ways due to the structural requirements of the society. For instance, ‘high skilled’ migrant medical doctors are expected to attend social and professional gatherings organised by their professional bodies in the host society (Groutsis & Arnold, 2012). Therefore they may integrate in terms of language, identity and behaviour dimensions more than less educated migrants.

Notably, however, job markets in Western societies do not always readily accept formal qualifications earned from non-Western societies at the initial stage of migration (Chiswick et al., 2003; George & Chaze, 2009; Li, 2000; Reitz, 2001; Nakhaie, 2007; Parr & Guo, 2005). For instance, the following quote from an Indian migrant in Canada reveals the experience in the job market:

I just thought that I will be OK. I was a family counsellor in India and I did not know the scope over here right? I just thought…I will get a job because I am from social work background…but when I came here I knew…it you have to have
(Canadian) experience, and you have to have Canadian education …. (George & Chaze, 2009, p. 272)

Therefore it could also be argued that, even though formal qualifications are recognised at the point of granting the migration visa, the level of recognition attributed by employers in the job market is uncertain, which may have implications for social integration. Negative recognition may impact migrants’ level of social integration via poor labour market integration. The participants in the present study came from non-Western societies and may have earned their qualifications in their own countries; it is unknown whether their level of education is an influential determinant in their social integration in Australia.

Although researchers have revealed a positive relationship between level of education and social integration, there are some exceptions (Kumar & Nevid, 2010; Lu et al., 2011; Massey & Parr, 2012). For instance, Lu et al. (2012) found that there was no significant relationship between level of education and acculturation among a Chinese professional migrant sample in Australia. Massey and Parr (2012) also stated that in regional Australia highly educated skilled migrants did not get many advantages in the social integration process, as the benefits of a high level of education were cancelled out by a lack of networking opportunities, language difficulties and social discrimination.

Furthermore, even though skilled migrants are required to meet some basic criteria in relation to their formal education when entering the host country, there can be variation in individuals’ formal education levels. For instance, according to the current Australian skilled migration point allocation system, applicants with doctorate-level qualifications are assigned 20 points, whereas applicants with diploma-level qualifications are assigned 10 points. Therefore it can be argued that qualifications of Australian skilled migrants vary from doctoral level to diploma level (DIAC, Professionals & other skilled migrants, 2013). Due to the mixed nature of the findings in previous research, variations in the level of education in the current sample and limited research focusing on Australian skilled migrants, this variable was thought to be appropriate for inclusion in the present study. It is expected that the more highly educated migrants (among the skilled migrants) get more opportunities to socially integrate because of positive labour
market experiences, professional networks, positive attitudes towards social integration and less discrimination. Thus it was hypothesised that

**H4: Level of education is positively related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Migrants with a higher level of education show:**

(a) **Higher host country language integration**
(b) **Higher host country identity integration**
(c) **Higher host country behaviour integration.**

### 3.2.5 Pre-migration socio-economic status and social integration

Pre-migration socio-economic status (SES) is a multi-dimensional concept that covers elements related to education, income, occupation and wealth (Marks et al., 2000). Therefore past studies have used different measures to assess socio-economic status of individuals. For instance, pre-migration SES has been measured in terms of level of education or years of education (Ceballo & Hurd, 2008; Gutierrez, Sameroff & Karrer, 1988; Jiménez et al., 2012; Li, 2006; Riosmena & Dennis, 2012; Tauriac & Liem, 2012), household income (Bisin et al., 2008; Ceballo & Hurd, 2008; Jiménez et al., 2012; Li, 2006), occupation or parents’ occupation (Gutierrez et al, 1988; Li, 2006) and pre-migration town of residence (Remennick, 2004). Researchers suggest that pre-migration SES is an important variable when assessing migrants’ success in the host country (De la Cruz, Padilla & Agustin, 2000, cited in Ea et al., 2008; Li, 2007; Nakhaie, 2007).

**i) Pre-migration SES and social integration**

Recently, Riosmena and Dennis (2012) revealed that Mexican migrants with higher pre-migration SES (measured in terms of income and education) experienced smoother adaptation into American mainstream society due to the more favourable level of acceptance that they experienced from mainstreamers. The authors further asserted that measuring pre-migration SES of migrants is as important as measuring health conditions before migration, in terms of its contribution to social integration. Another study of Mexican-American women (Fitzgerald, 2010) found an association between pre-migration SES (measured by income and education) and acculturation, which was measured in terms of language proficiency and social interactions. Based on these
examples, it can be said that pre-migration SES is an important variable when assessing migrants’ integration into the host society.

Bourdieu and Passerson (1977, cited in Li, 2007) found that individuals with higher pre-migration SES (measured by parents’ education) behaved differently to their counterparts by socialising through highbrow cultural activities, such as frequent visits to theatres, movies, and museums that promote an intercultural climate. From another perspective, Bisin et al. (2008) suggested that migrants’ pre-migration SES may lead to different attitudes towards integration. For example, they found that UK migrants’ pre-migration SES affected their social integration, such that the speed of socio-cultural integration of Muslim participants was lower than that of non-Muslim participants because of their predominant socio-economic characteristics, which included a lower level of education and higher unemployment rates prior to migration. Notably, strong religious identity and cultural attitudes were also explanatory variables for socio-cultural integration in Bisin et al.’s study. Thus pre-migration SES may influence host country identity formation. In addition, it is evident that ‘pre-migration SES’ influences the fluency of English language and source of education of migrants (Li, 2007). Li (2007) further argued that individuals with wealthier family backgrounds can afford to access facilities such as internationally recognised forms of education offered in the English language in the host country, which may have positive influence when integrating into the host society.

Further research findings have revealed that pre-migration SES may influence characteristics such as dress sense and basic norms and values of migrants when integrating into a host society (Pio, 2010). For example, early migration study findings in Australia indicated that Persian migrants are disadvantaged in the social integration process, as most of them reported lower pre-migration SES and their female ‘dress sense’ and their basic values are quite different from that of other (native) Australians (Cummins, 1996; Foroughi et al., 2001). These distinct identity and behavioural characteristics, which are intertwined with pre-migration SES, may also impact migrants’ social integration in the new environment (Nesdale & Mak, 2000). Therefore, it can be argued that pre-migration SES may impact migrants’ social integration, as it
determines their exposure to the host culture, attitudes, the level of social acceptance and other behaviours in the host society.

**ii) Pre-migration SES and social relationships**

The quality of support that new migrants receive from formal or informal networks may depend on their pre-migration SES: migrants with higher pre-migration SES have access to people with higher standing in their community, who can be helpful when adapting to a new environment (Connor & Massey, 2010; Nakhaie, 2007). For instance, Nakhaie (2007) found that individuals with better pre-migration SES often have access to people with better social capital (measured in terms of associational participation, family contacts, religious participation, ethnic-based network) and human capital resources (measured in terms of years of education and host country credentials). Therefore researchers (Behtoui, 2008; Connor & Massey, 2010; Fong & Ooka, 2006; Nakhaie, 2007) have suggested that pre-migration SES may impact formation of social capital in the host country to, in turn, influence migrants’ social integration. Furthermore, Nakhaie (2007) suggested three reasons why social capital can be an important resource for migrants’ social integration: (a) possession of social capital can help migrants to overcome labour market discrimination; (b) social capital can substitute or add value when migrants’ credentials are not recognised in the host country labour market; and (c) social capital can help with initial access to the job market and other resources in the host country (see also George & Chaze, 2009).

Furthermore, George and Chaze (2009) suggested that the informal relationships in which migrants are entrenched can impact every dimension of their adaptation, including their first job, housing, formal social networking and so forth, especially for migrants of non-English speaking backgrounds. These social resources have been shown to positively facilitate their lives in the host destination (see also Lance, 2010; Li, 2007; Remennick, 2003). Therefore it can be argued that migrants with higher pre-migration SES are likely to have better social capital resources and more opportunities to integrate well into the host society than their lower SES counterparts.

---

9 Nakhaie (2007) has defined social capital as ‘social relationships from which one can potentially access scarce resources’.
iii) Pre-migration SES of the current study participants

The findings of the above studies highlight that researchers use level of income, education, occupation, or combinations of these dimensions to measure pre-migration SES. In the current study, level of education was used as a separate variable that may contribute to social integration. Although some variability in income is expected among the present study’s participants (for instance, according to 2011 Australian census data, 10% of Sri Lankan and Indian migrants have $0 household income [no income] and 10% have income of over $104,000), in the present study, income-related data were not collected, as a high percentage of missing data can be expected in a convenience sample. Remennick’s (2004) study, which focused on Russian migrants in Israel, found that city of origin, as a measure of one’s level of pre-migration SES, had a positive influence on upward social mobility and social integration in the host society. Migrants who came from the largest metropolitan areas were more integrated than their counterparts who came from rural cities, thereby supporting the importance of pre-migration SES for migrants’ integration (Remennick, 2004). In the current study, pre-migration SES is operationalised as the ‘town of residence before migration to Australia’, and the reasons for selecting this variable to measure pre-migration SES in the present study are discussed below.

It is argued that migrants who grew up in an urban city may have social values, norms, attitudes and levels of exposure to ‘highbrow’ culture that may fit well into a Western society, and they may therefore find it easier to grasp the host country’s way of life (Bourdieu & Passerson, 1977). In addition, even though English is the second official language in Sri Lanka and in India, families with higher SES, who may live in metropolitan cities, tend to use English more often in their day-to-day lives than people in rural cities (Bernhardt, 2011, p. 90). Furthermore, programs in private schools and private higher education institutes located in urban cities are taught in English, and only individuals with higher socio-economic backgrounds can afford to access these facilities. For instance, the Sri Lankan Institute of Information Technology (SLIT), located in the capital city of Sri Lanka, offers a bachelor’s degree in Information Technology accredited by Curtin University, Australia, and an Electronic Engineering degree accredited by Sheffield Hallam University, UK (SLIT, 2013). When individuals who are former students of these educational institutions migrate to Western countries,
they may find it easier to transfer their skills into the host societies. Due to this relatively smoother transition from home country to host society, these migrants encounter less acculturation stresses and less culture shock; therefore they can integrate well into the host country in terms of language, identity and behavioural dimensions (Li, 2007).

On the other hand, both India and Sri Lanka are countries that experience a high level of disparity in income and other socio-economic dimensions (Bandyopadhyay, 2011; Naranpanawa & Bandara 2012). For instance, India is the tenth richest country in the world, yet is home to the largest number of poor people in the world (Bandyopadhyay, 2011). Therefore a certain amount of disparity is expected in the pre-migration SES of the present study participants. Town of residence anticipates some differences in individual characteristics, such as attitudes towards integrating into the host society, norms and values towards behavioural dimensions of the host country and ability to build social capital (Bisin et al., 2008). For these reasons, town of residence before migration (i.e., highly rural to highly metropolitan) was used to operationalise participants’ pre-migration SES.

From the foregoing discussion it can be posited that pre-migration SES influences social capital formation, socialising experience, labour market access and personal values, attitudes and identity, which may in turn affect their level of social integration in the host country (Drever & Hoffmeister, 2008; Li, 2007; Remennick, 2003). Therefore in the present study sample pre-migration SES is considered to be an influential variable, and a positive association among pre-migration SES and integration is anticipated:

**H5: Pre-migration SES is positively related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Migrants with higher pre-migration SES show:**

(a) Higher host country language integration

(b) Higher host country identity integration

(c) Higher host country behaviour integration.
3.2.6 Neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants and social integration of migrants

i) Formation of ethnic neighbourhoods in host societies

Martinovic et al. (2009) suggest that individuals have a natural and intrinsic tendency to interact with culturally similar co-ethnics; therefore ethnic neighbourhoods are often created in traditional migrant-receiving societies. Thus ethnic economies (i.e., business owners and employees who are co-ethnics) and ethnic enclaves (i.e., residential areas or workplaces with high ethnic concentration) are common characteristics within these societies (Hou, 2009; John, Alba & McNulty, 1994; Logan et al., 2002). ‘Little Italies’ and ‘Chinatowns’ are two examples (Au et al., 1998; Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Murdie & Ghosh, 2010). These ‘ethnic enclaves’ and ‘ethnic economies’ serve the domestic needs of co-ethnics, including food, cleaning, child care, children’s education and so forth (Au et al., 1998; George & Chaze, 2009; Hou, 2009).

It is worth identifying, from the findings of earlier research, a few major reasons why ethnic neighbourhoods are created. Primarily, living in ethnic neighbourhoods helps migrants to find an affordable and safe place to live and a job, thereby reducing the psychological and material costs associated with early stages of migration (Logan et al., 2002; Zhou, 1997). Secondly, ethnic neighbourhoods are identified as safe destinations that preserve the original lifestyle and cultural identity of migrants (Li, 2003; Murdie & Ghosh, 2010). Also, living in ethnic neighbourhoods is believed to be an effective coping strategy when faced with issues related to discrimination in the new society (George & Chaze, 2009; Reinsch, 2001; Valenta, 2009). It is also established that, in multicultural societies such as Canada, first-generation ethnic migrants (especially refugee migrants) more often live in segregated neighbourhoods due to low levels of income and also to protect their original cultural identity (Fitzgerald, 2010). Therefore co-ethnics who live in ethnic neighbourhoods encourage new migrants to settle in ethnic neighbourhoods, as they view it as a protective strategy (Valenta, 2009). Hence it can be argued that some migrants tend to live within ethnic neighbourhoods due to the aforementioned encouragements.

According to the literature, neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants is a common feature among migrants to Canada from the Indian sub-continent (George &
Chaze, 2009; Murdie & Ghosh, 2010). Even though there are not many empirical studies on this, ethnic segregation may be anticipated among the present study sample for following reasons: (a) participants are first-generation ethnic migrants; (b) they participate in the same religious events in Australia (e.g., according to 2011 Census data, 51% of this population are attached to Hinduism, 34% to Christianity and 11% to Buddhism); (c) they belong to similar professional associations, such as those related to Certified Public Accountants (most of the skilled migrants from Sri Lanka and India represent only a few professions: e.g., 25% are from the areas of business and accounting, marketing and human resources, 26% from ICT, and 15% from engineering and science); and (d) they studied at similar higher educational institutions in Sri Lanka and India. Thus it is probable that an ethnic neighbourhood concentration of these migrants in Australia exists. The association between living in ethnic neighbourhoods and social integration is discussed below through its influence on social interactions in the wider society and at the workplace.

ii) Influence of ethnic neighbourhoods and social interactions in the wider community

As discussed above, living in ethnic neighbourhoods could play a positive role in easing migrants’ initial culture shock. This is particularly true for migrants whose customs and languages set them apart from mainstreamers (George & Chaze, 2009; Logan et al., 2002). It is evident that migrants who live in ethnic neighbourhoods are inclined to continue their own cultural identity, as reflected through their dress sense, language, values and beliefs, including religious beliefs (Au et al., 1998; Bisin et al., 2008; Logan et al., 2002). This strong own-cultural identity is viewed as a hindrance to migrants’ successful social integration. A Canadian study (Li, 2003) revealed that the long-term restriction of migrants to ethnic neighbourhoods limited their social learning pertaining to the receiving society and discouraged migrants’ full participation in the society (for instance, they tended to participate in home-country socio-cultural activities rather than host-country socio-cultural activities). This situation in turn negatively affected the social integration of these migrants.

Consistent with Li’s work cited above, Gijsberts and Dagevos (2007) identified a range of negative effects of ethnic concentration on the social integration of migrants in the
Netherlands. Specifically, they found that: (a) ethnic concentration diminished social contact between migrants and indigenous Dutch people; (b) ethnic migrants had less opportunity to speak the host language; (c) the large concentration of minorities was perceived as a threat by mainstreamers, so that negative attitudes towards minorities were generated; and, finally, (d) failing to establish inter-ethnic contacts was considered a situation that created social distance between these groups and led to a low level of social integration (see also Murdie & Ghosh 2010). Showing an association between ethnic segregation and social integration, the authors further explained that Canadian migrants who move outwards spatially continue to adapt to a new lifestyle in the host society (e.g., in relation to behavioural dimensions such as participating in socio-cultural activities in the host country) and integrate well socially and culturally in the new destination (Li, 2003; Murdie & Ghosh, 2010). These examples clearly evidence the fact that ethnic concentration in host societies diminishes social participation of migrants.

**iii) Co-ethnic concentration at workplaces**

Co-ethnic concentration at workplaces is a common characteristic within migrant societies and this also leads to lower levels of social participation in the workplace (Au et al., 1998). For instance, a study on Chinese migrants’ social integration reported that in New York City most Chinese migrants worked in restaurants (in China Town), in the garment industry or in small businesses or family businesses, catering mainly to a Chinese clientele who speak their own language (Ong & Umemoto, 1994). This suggests that ethnic segregation negatively affected migrants’ social integration due to limited association with mainstreamers, less opportunity to speak the host language and less exposure to the host country’s way of life. A similar study conducted on Chinese restaurant workers within American society identified that city restaurant workers who were not ethnically segregated were more socially integrated into American society than China Town restaurant workers who were ethnically segregated (Au et al., 1998). These results also suggest an association between neighbourhood concentration (in terms of ethnic economies) and social integration (language and behaviour dimensions).

A problematic side of ethnic neighbourhoods is that strong group concentration can threaten the social security and social cohesion of migrants in receiving societies.
(Adachi, 2011; Chiswick & Miller, 2001). In public and political debates, ethnically concentrated neighbourhoods in traditional migrant-receiving societies are identified as a barrier to social cohesion (Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Martinovic et al., 2009; Mendez, 2009; Murdie & Ghosh, 2010). As a result, negative attitudes towards migrants may cause social distance between migrants and mainstreamers and negatively affect their successful social integration (Mendez, 2009).

iv) Neighbourhood co-ethnic concentration among present study participants

Ethnic concentration is likely among first-generation migrants in Western migrant-receiving societies (Au et al., 1998; George & Chaze, 2009), and therefore among the present study participants for the reasons discussed above. However, in the present study context, alongside ethnic concentration, for the following reasons, it is expected that some skilled migrants may reside in non-segregated neighbourhoods as well: (a) highly skilled migrants can afford to live in higher SES suburbs, in contrast to refugee migrants who are concentrated in areas with a lower-SES profile; (b) government policies on regional development in Australia that encourage new migrants to move into low-populated suburbs may reduce neighbourhood concentration in states such as New South Wales and Victoria; (c) the negative influence of public media discourages ethnic neighbourhoods; (d) there is less trust in co-ethnic social networks; and (e) there is resistance to ethnic segregation. Therefore the current study anticipates variability in terms of where Sri Lankan and Indian migrants live in Australia. However, as there is a lack of research targeting Sri Lankan and Indian migrants as a group, their patterns of neighbourhood ethnic concentration are still unknown, and the current study is therefore unique in its exploration of this important variable.

In accordance with the above research evidence, living in ethnic neighbourhoods can negatively influence the social integration of migrants because of fewer opportunities to use the host language, fewer social contacts with wider society, a low level of participation in host country socio-cultural activities, the maintenance of a high level of ethnic identity and mainstreamers’ negative attitudes towards ethnic neighbourhoods. Therefore it can be hypothesised that
H6: Neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants is inversely related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Migrants who live in ethnic neighbourhoods show:

(a) Lower host country language integration
(b) Lower host country identity integration
(c) Lower host country behaviour integration.

3.2.7 Perceived inclusiveness and social integration of migrants

Social integration of migrants is the outcome of a two-way process. That is, from the migrants’ perspective adaptation is required, and from the host country perspective acceptance is required (Berry, 2001; Martinivic et al., 2009; Nesdale & Mak, 2000). Absence of either would not only result in incomplete social integration of migrants, but also migrants could potentially face social and psychological problems such as social exclusion, distress, less tolerance towards cultural differences and social safety issues (Alpass et al., 2007; Eshel & Rosenthal-Sokolov, 2000; Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007). For this reason, this section discusses migrants’ perceived inclusiveness (or perceived level of discrimination) as a psychological variable that is likely to affect their social integration.

i) Impact of mainstreamers attitudes towards migrants on migrants’ social integration

Perceived level of discrimination represents an individual’s perception that selective and differential treatment is occurring because of the individual’s ethnic group membership (Mirage, 1994, cited in Ensher et al., 2001). Successful social integration assumes mutual acceptance and inclusion of migrants and host society members interacting in the society. It is evident that the more open and inclusive the attitudes of the host society, the more favourable are the conditions for mutual acceptance and tolerance towards migrant groups (Behtoui & Neergaard, 2009; Eshel & Rosenthal-Sokolov, 2000; Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Nesdale & Mak, 2000). Positive attitudes on the part of majority members encourage greater involvement of migrants in the wider society, in turn leading to better social integration. For instance, Nesdale and Mak (2000) conducted a study based on a number of migrants from different countries (Vietnam, China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Sri Lanka and New Zealand) to Australia and revealed that
the extent to which migrants feel accepted and welcomed as new members of the society was a major determinant that contributed to their host country adaptation. Based on these findings it can be argued that perceived inclusiveness may be an important factor in determining migrants’ successful social integration in the host society (see also Neto & Barros, 2007, Valenta, 2009). Ethnic discrimination and its impact on migrants’ social integration are further discussed below.

ii) Ethnic discrimination in migrant-receiving societies

Ethnic discrimination and negative attitudes towards migrants have been identified as common barriers in migrants’ social integration in many traditional migrant-receiving countries such as Canada, the US and the UK. Discrimination may be due to cultural differences, physical stigma or a combination of these two factors (LaFromboise et al., 1993; Malinen & Johnston, 2011; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Neto & Barros, 2007; Safi, 2010; Sanchez & Brock, 1996; Verkuyten, 2008). Specifically, Malinen and Johnston (2011) suggest that migrants from North and Southeast Asia face more discrimination in New Zealand than migrants from other parts of the world. Ethnic discrimination can cause social exclusion of migrants, a situation which is further explained in the literature: as a result of social exclusion, some migrant groups are viewed as structurally and socially superior to other groups, and natural favouritism emerges for some groups over other groups (Asakura et al., 2008).

Valenta (2009) revealed that perceived inclusiveness (or perceived discrimination) of migrants may depend on three things: (a) the host government’s policies towards migrants; (b) society’s attitudes and prejudices about migrants; and (c) qualities inherent in the migrant community itself, such as their attitude towards identity re-production, maintaining ethnic ties, daily life patterns and the like. The same research findings revealed that these factors in turn influence the level of social networking and social preferences of migrants (Valenta, 2009). In support of the same notion, Fong and Ooka (2006) found that Chinese migrants (all migrant categories were included in their study) in Canada reported being less likely to participate in social events in the host country when they felt they were being discriminated against. This in turn negatively influenced their level of social integration (see also Neto & Barros, 2007; Safi, 2010). However,
Valenta (2009) argued that social discrimination towards migrants may vary according to the host country.

As mentioned earlier, Nesdale and Mak (2000) suggested that Australia is generally considered a migrant-friendly country and Australians are more ready to accept migrants who are willing to live according to the standards and values of the country. Therefore it can be argued that especially skilled migrants may be less discriminated against in Australian society and in Australian workplaces due to their unique characteristics such as their good language skills and high level of education. This sense of inclusion may positively influence skilled migrants’ social participation in the wider society.

Notably, variables such as the size of the migrant group can influence mainstreamers’ attitudes towards that group (Behtoui & Neergaard, 2009; Martinovic et al., 2009). According to some research findings (Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Quillian, 1995), the larger the ethnic minority group, the more mainstreamers may perceive a threat to their own well-being when both groups have to compete for scarce resources. As a result of this perceived ethnic threat, mainstreamers may develop negative attitudes towards ethnic minorities and may not be willing to include migrants as part of their society, resulting in social distance between mainstreamers and migrants. In this respect, it can be argued that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia may be perceived as a threat by mainstreamers, especially in the competitive job market (e.g., according to 2012 DIMIA Country Profiles, 290,000 Indian- and Sri Lankan-born people were working in Australia in that year), the housing market and their children’s school environment, due to migrants’ large group representation in some parts of the country (for instance, according to 2011 Census data, 42% of Sri Lankan and Indian children go to schools in Victoria, 32% to schools in New South Wales and approximately 10% in Queensland and Western Australia). This large representation of migrants may be considered a threat by mainstreamers and may result in social distance between migrants and mainstreamers that leads to a negative state of perceived inclusiveness.

Even though the literature suggests ethnic minorities are discriminated against in social and work environments in Western host societies, there is greater scope for further
studies to explore the influence of perceived discrimination on the social integration of ethnic skilled migrants from different ethnic backgrounds that have a larger group representation in a multicultural society. Therefore the present study takes into account migrants’ perceived inclusiveness as an important psychological variable that may affect the social integration of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.

Based on the evidence, it can be suggested that, when migrants feel more included in the host society, they tend to participate in social activities of the wider society, may obtain more opportunities to build contacts with the host community, develop positive attitudes towards the country, and hence socially integrate more into the host society. Therefore it is hypothesised that

\[ H7: \text{Perceived inclusiveness by mainstreamers is positively related to social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian Skilled migrants in Australia. Migrants with higher perceived inclusiveness show:} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
(a) & \text{Higher host country language integration} \\
(b) & \text{Higher host country identity integration} \\
(c) & \text{Higher host country behaviour integration.}
\end{align*} \]

3.2.8 Expectation to return to country of birth and social integration

Individuals may migrate to escape from unpleasant circumstances such as war crimes in the country of birth, or to experience comparatively superior circumstances in the host country, such as economic and social benefits that can be available in host societies (De Haas & Fokkema, 2011; Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Silbereisen, 2008). Nevertheless, both forced migrants (humanitarian) and voluntary migrants often consider returning to their country of birth to be the end of the migration journey (Marta Bivand & Oeppen, 2013). Recently, researchers have found that the expectation to leave the host country is an option that educated migrants may consider more often than refugee migrants (Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Marta Bivand & Oeppen, 2013). For instance, Marta Bivand and Oeppen, (2013), referring to refugee migrants, stated that ‘in the case of forced migration, the inability to return safely is part of the defining characteristic’ (p. 274).
Even though returning home is an option for the skilled migrant group and the number of migrants doing so has increased, studies related to non-Western skilled migrants returning home are limited (Labrianidis & Lyberaki, 2004). Some studies (Arguin, 2010; Brenick & Silbereisen, 2012; Silbereisen; 2008; Tsuda, 2010) have been conducted targeting diaspora migrants returning home. These previous studies have looked at return migration policies, post-return experiences (De Bree et al., 2010; Tsuda, 2010), or reasons for leaving the host society (Arguin, 2010; Brenick & Silbereisen, 2012). However, fewer studies have looked at the relationship between social integration and expectation to return to country of birth. Therefore the current research expects to fill this gap in the literature.

Irrespective of the migrant category, homesickness, long-term unemployment, ethnic discrimination in the host society, financial hardship, feeling excluded, strong cultural orientation towards the country of birth and implementation of attractive return migration strategies by the migrant-sending societies (e.g., ending wars, economic expansion) are reasons for increased return migration (Arguin, 2010; Brenick & Silbereisen, 2012; DIAC, Emigration from Australia, 2013; King & Mai, 2004; Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Tsuda, 2010). It can be argued that ethnic migrants who can be encouraged to return to their country of birth for these reasons put in the least effort to develop host country language, host identity and behavioural dimensions and integrate into the host society, believing it is not necessary and feeling there is no rationale for socially integrating into the host country when there is no intention to live there permanently (De Haas & Fokkema, 2011). For instance, De Haas and Fokkema (2011) stated that “migrants who already intend to return will feel less compelled to integrate into destination societies and will have stronger motivations to maintain social and economic ties with country of birth to prepare and facilitate their return” (p. 757).

However, the situation of ethnic skilled migrants living in Western societies is unknown. Therefore the link between expectation to return to country of birth and social integration is explored in the present study.

i) The impact of transnational activities on social integration

Recent research (Arguin, 2010; De Haas & Fokkema, 2011; Tsuda, 2010) found that migrants who have the intention of returning to their country of birth engage in
activities such as constant contact with friends and relatives in the country of birth while living in the host country. For instance, De Bree et al. (2010) found that Moroccan migrants in the Netherlands who had the intention to return to their country of birth were more involved in transnational activities, and this had a negative impact on their level of social integration. Arguin (2010) revealed that migrants with greater desire to maintain their original ethnic identity tend to visit their co-ethnic friends and relatives in the host society more often, which may in turn limit the contacts with the host community. Similarly, Silbereisen (2008) found that higher levels of co-ethnic contact maintained by migrants negatively impacted their level of social integration and were positively related to their decision to leave the host country on a permanent basis. De Haas and Fokkema’s (2011) study found that the less integrated migrants tended to leave the host country by showing a strong negative relationship between the variables based on their African migrants sample in Spain and Italy. From this evidence, it can be argued that first-generation migrants who expect to leave the host country (George & Chaze, 2009) may have less desire to integrate into the host society and maintain high levels of transactional activities. The effect of expectation to return to their country of birth may be seen in all three dimensions of integration considered in the present study; language, host country identity and behaviour.

In contrast, Haug (2008) found that Italian migrants in Germany who had high expectation to leave the host country tended to build more contacts in the host country. Similarly, Marta Bivand and Oeppen (2013) found a positive relationship between transnational activities and social integration of Afghan refugee migrants living in the US. These mixed findings suggest the existence of a relationship between transnational activities and integration is not always negative, but the relationship may depend on the cultural values and practices that ethnic migrant groups would like to maintain (Brenick & Silbereisen, 2012; Tsuda, 2010).

ii) **Expectation to return to their country of birth (COB) among current study participants**

To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, no studies have been conducted investigating the relationship between skilled migrants’ expectation to return to the country to birth and social integration; therefore the present study includes this as a variable that may
potentially influence ethnic skilled migrants’ social integration. In addition to the aforementioned reasons for migrants leaving host societies, this is an appropriate variable to take into account in the present study context for two reasons. Firstly, first-generation skilled migrants’ extended families live in their country of birth (Amit, 2010b; Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Sakamoto, 2007; Sanderson, 2009); therefore migrants who seek to reunite with their families tend to leave host societies (see also De Haas & Fokkema, 2011). Secondly, Sri Lankan citizens are allowed to maintain dual citizenship (Colombo Page, 2013; The High Commission of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka Canberra, Australia, 2013), while Indians who have Australian citizenship can also obtain an ‘Overseas Citizen of India Certificate’, which provides the option to live in India for the long term (Australian High Commission India, 2013). According to these two countries’ legal systems, Sri Lankan and Indian citizens who are also Australian citizens have the option to go back to and settle in their country of birth. Thus it is worth including this as a factor that might potentially influence their social integration.

In support of the same argument, current statistics from the Australian government state that 25% of Sri Lankan migrants intend to leave Australia on a permanent basis. In 2011, 12,243 permanent migrants left Australia, of whom 37% were professionals (e.g., accountants and managers; DIAC, Country Profile, Sri Lanka, 2013); 39% of Indian permanent migrants intend to leave Australia, and in 2011-12, a total of 1007 left the country permanently (DIAC, Country Profile, India, 2013). Thus the expectation to return to country of birth is a feasible option for the participants in the present study, and this can therefore be considered as an important variable that may affect social integration in this study context.

Based on the above literature it can be stated that, when migrants intend to go back to the country of birth, they maintain close contact with co-ethnics, limiting association with mainstreamers, and have less motivation to integrate into the country in terms of language, identity and behavioural dimensions. Therefore it is hypothesised that
H8: Expectation to return to country of origin is inversely related to social integration. Migrants with a lower expectation to return to country of origin show:

(a) Higher host country language integration
(b) Higher host country identity integration
(c) Higher host country behaviour integration.

Having reviewed the literature related to the association between socio-demographic factors and social integration, the next section reviews the literature related to the association between social integration and life satisfaction and job satisfaction in order to develop the relevant Hypotheses.

3.3 The Association between Social Integration and Life Satisfaction among Migrants

Social integration has been identified as a predictor of life satisfaction by several researchers (Amit, 2010a; Gonidakis et al., 2011; Madianos et al., 2008; Sam, 1998). Extensive research has examined the relationship between migrants’ social integration and life satisfaction in different forms, including studies of social integration and well-being (Riosmena & Dennis, 2012; Sharma, 2012), acculturation and life satisfaction (Birman et al., 2014; Kisselev et al., 2010; Mahmud & Schölmerich, 2011; Sam, 1998), and acculturation and stress as an indicator of life satisfaction (Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Madianos, 1984). These research findings have identified mixed results in relation to the association between social integration and life satisfaction (Marsiglia et al., 2013). For instance, some studies suggest that higher social integration is associated with higher life satisfaction (Amit, 2010a; Ea et al., 2008; Neto, 1995; Neto & Barros, 2007; Safi, 2010; Verkuyten, 2008), while other studies (Birman et al., 2014; Madianos, 1984, cited in Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Mahmud & Schölmerich, 2011; Sam, 1998) have shown the opposite. These findings are discussed below in detail.

Researchers including Giusta and Kambhamapati (2006), Haasen et al. (2008), and Paterson and Hakim-Larson (2012) have found a positive relationship between social integration and life satisfaction among their study participants. Haasen et al. (2008)
found a positive relationship between social integration and subjective well-being (which includes life satisfaction as a component) among Latin American migrants living in Spain, a group that is at risk of social exclusion. Mahmud and Schölmerich (2011) found a significant and positive correlation between host country acculturation and life satisfaction among temporary migrants from 24 countries in Germany. Furthermore, various women migrants, settled in the UK (legally, illegally, or on an economic or political refugee basis), have described successful social integration into the host society as a factor leading to better life satisfaction (Giusta & Kambhamapati, 2006). Likewise, Safi (2010) identified social integration as a factor that led to low life satisfaction among migrants in 13 European countries.

Scholars (Berry, 1996; Crockett et al., 2007; Pan et al., 2008; Sam, 1998) argue that the relationship between social integration and life satisfaction is affected by migrants’ acculturation stress. A wealth of literature (Alpass et al., 2007; Berry, 1996; Neto, 1995; Neto & Barros, 2007; Nayar, 2011; Sam, 1998) suggests that individuals who find it hard to socially integrate into the host society experience a high level of acculturation stress. Migrants who experience acculturation stress may experience depressive symptoms, which may in turn lead to lower life satisfaction (Crockett et al., 2007; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Gonidakis et al., 2011; Haasen, Demiralay & Reimer, 2008; Safi, 2010; Verkuyten, 2008). Likewise, the feelings of social isolation, loneliness and cultural barriers that may arise as a result of less social integration can also lead to mental health problems and thereby negatively affect life satisfaction of ethnic minorities (Choudhry, 2001; Crockett et al., 2007). In support of this argument, Gonidakis et al. (2011) pointed out that less socially integrated foreign migrants in Athens showed more depressive symptoms and reported negative perceptions of their lives.

Nevertheless, a few studies have identified that well-integrated migrants show higher psychological distress, leading to lower life satisfaction. For instance, Dalgard and Thapa (2007) found that integrated non-Western migrant women in Norway had lower

10 Acculturation stress: acculturation stress is a negative emotional state that occurs when migrants experience problems in their adaptation process. These problems may be due to incongruent cultural values, language difficulties and discrimination in the host societies (Crockett et al., 2007).
life satisfaction; however, the relationship was the opposite for men (see also Sam, 1998). Dalgard and Thapa (2007) suggested that this may be because the traditional social roles of women who come from non-Western countries are more challenged by the social integration process in a Western country than those of men. Similarly, a study of Greek migrants in New York found that the more socially integrated (i.e., ‘Americanised’) the migrants were, the more psychologically depressed they were; such migrants also reported lower life satisfaction (Madianos, 1984, cited in Dalgard & Thapa, 2007). Stephens et al. (2010) also have found that less integrated migrants are more satisfied in their lives in the US than are highly integrated migrants. They further suggested that the negative effect of social integration on life satisfaction is small but significant (Stephens et al., 2010). Furthermore, Paterson and Hakim-Larson (2012) found that migrants (Arab youth migrants in Canada) who were less integrated into the Canadian society were more satisfied with their lives, mainly because this positively influenced family life satisfaction.

In contrast to the above studies, Marsiglia et al. (2013) revealed that migrants who were highly integrated into the host society and migrants who were separated from the host society both show lower life satisfaction. According to their study findings, migrants with a moderate level of social integration are the most satisfied in their lives (Marsiglia et al., 2013). In line with the same findings, Birman et al. (2014) found (based on a Russian refugee migrant sample in the US) that social integration into US society and maintenance of Russian cultural aspects contribute to life satisfaction in different ways. High level of integration into American society contributed to life satisfaction, as it positively affected occupational success, and maintenance of Russian culture contributed to life satisfaction, as it reduced distress because of co-ethnic support.

Based on the above findings, the direction of the relationship between social integration and life satisfaction cannot be clearly established. The inconsistency of the results may be due to different dimensions that have been used in social integration measures. Thus the present study attempts to re-examine this relationship and focuses on an ethnic skilled migrant group in Australia by employing social integration at language, identity and behaviour dimension level. It should also be noted that existing findings are largely based on temporary, youth or less educated migrants in the European or the American
context, and there is an absence of academic literature that describes the relationship between social integration and life satisfaction among skilled migrants in other Western contexts, such as Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Nevertheless, based on the past research it can be assumed that social integration may be positively associated with life satisfaction of skilled migrants, as skilled migrants are less likely to be distressed by the distance from their own culture, because they migrate to a Western country with the intention of socially integrating into the host country for work purposes (Birman et al., 2014; Ea et al., 2008). The relationship among social integration in language, identity and behaviour dimensions and life satisfaction is discussed in the next section.

### 3.3.1 Host country language, identity and behaviour and life satisfaction

#### i) Language integration and life satisfaction

It is evident that people who are more proficient in host country language are also more integrated in other areas, including economic and labour market integration, and generally show higher life satisfaction in the host society (Amit, 2010a; Borjas, 1990; Mahmud & Schölmerich, 2011; Massey & Parr, 2012). For instance, Amit’s (2010a) study on factors that influence migrants’ life satisfaction revealed that highly skilled Western migrants in Israel who were more proficient in the host society language were more satisfied with their lives, largely because they perceived themselves as being able to utilise their skills and contribute to Israeli society. Language integration is relevant to the present study participants, because skilled migrants are enthusiastic about transferring their skills and knowledge in order to enjoy a greater sense of achievement in their lives, which may lead to a higher level of life satisfaction (Al Ariss & Syed, 2011; Amit, 2010a; Hawthorne, 2002). Massey and Parr (2012) stated that migrants to Australia with high English-language proficiency benefit more and are less discriminated against in the labour market than their less proficient counterparts, and are thus happier with their lives. Likewise, Mahmud and Schölmerich (2011) revealed similar findings in relation to temporary migrants from 24 different countries in Germany. Therefore higher host country language skills may positively relate to migrants’ life satisfaction.
ii) Identity integration and life satisfaction

To date, results have been mixed regarding the relationship between migrants’ host-country identity and life satisfaction (Birman et al., 2014; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Sam, 1998; Verkuyten, 2008). Some studies have suggested that migrants who demonstrate less host-country identification experience more discrimination and social exclusion, leading to lower life satisfaction (Asakura et al., 2008; Eshel & Rosenthal-Sokolov, 2000; Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Safi, 2010; Verkuyten, 2008). In particular, this experience may be more relevant to ethnic migrant groups living in Western societies, who suffer from comparatively higher ethnic discrimination (LaFromboise et al., 1993; Malinen & Johnston, 2011; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Verkuyten, 2008). For instance, Verkuyten (2008) found Turkish-Dutch migrants in Netherlands with less host-country identity were less satisfied with their lives due to higher perceived discrimination. Amit (2010b) found a positive relationship between perceived host-country identity and life satisfaction among their educated Former Soviet Union and Western migrant sample in Israel. Furthermore, Paterson and Hakim-Larson (2012) found that Canadian identity was important for life satisfaction among Arab youth migrants.

In an earlier study, Sam (1998) found that the association between host-country identity and life satisfaction was positive for a Turkish adolescent group in Norway, but for Pakistanis and Vietnamese adolescent groups, ethnic identity was more important to life satisfaction than host-country identity. Based on the study findings, Sam (1998) argued that Turks in Norway may identify themselves as Europeans, thus host-country identity is important for their life satisfaction, whereas Pakistanis and Vietnamese – who are Asians – may perceive themselves more as belonging to an ethnic group; thus ethnic group identity influences their perception regarding their life satisfaction. In light of Sam’s (1998) argument, one could infer that a positive relationship may not exist between host-country identity and life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian first-generation migrants. However, a recent study by Birman et al. (2014) found that ethnic identity and host-country identity contributed to life satisfaction of migrants differently. According to Birman et al. (2014), host-country identity positively influenced life satisfaction via occupation success and less discrimination, whereas ethnic identity positively influenced life satisfaction via co-ethnic social support (Birman et al., 2014). Birman et al. (2014) further argued that, for migrants who are working in owned
businesses that are supported by co-ethnics, ethnic identity may be important. Host-
country identity may be more influential to a skilled migrant group who also can be
employed in occupations other than owned businesses. Nesdale and Mak’s study (2000)
shows that Australians are more ready to accept migrants who are willing to live
according to Australian values. Skilled migrants, being an educated group of migrants,
may perceive developing an Australian identity as a positive and desirable outcome,
which may positively influence their life satisfaction.

iii) Behaviour integration and life satisfaction

The extent to which migrants are behaving according to the host-country way is an
indicator of their social integration (Haasen et al., 2008; Martinovic et al., 2009;
Stephens et al., 2010). Researchers (Birman et al., 2014; Mahmud & Schölmerich,
2011; Martinovic et al., 2009) have emphasised the importance of exploring host-
country behaviour (e.g., creating friendships, media consumption, music, entertainment
and food consumption) when studying the relationship between migrants’ social
integration and life satisfaction.

Valento’s (2009) study of social integration among first-generation Croatian, Bosnian
and Iraqi migrants in Norway found that a majority of participants perceived having
Norwegian friends and acquaintances as central to achieving a sense of belonging in the
host society, and thus they tended to build contacts with people from the host country.
Participants believed that Norwegian friends and acquaintances influenced their
capacity to behave according to Norwegian social norms and practices, participate in
Norwegian social events and consume host-country media and entertainment.
Furthermore, other researchers have also stated that building relationships with the
dominant group in the host society helps migrants to enhance their sense of belonging in
the host society, thereby enhancing life satisfaction (Martinovic et al., 2009; Phinney,
1991; Verkuyten, 2008).

Based on the above discussion, it is reasonable to argue that skilled migrants who feel
socially integrated (language, identity and behaviour dimensions) may experience
positive feelings about their lives in the host country for the following reasons:
feelings of successful social integration into the host society may ensure a sense of
achievement in terms of friendships and host country cultural aspects, a sense of belongingness, higher self-esteem for being able to utilise their skills and capabilities, less perceived discrimination and lower psychological distress due to less acculturation stress. Those positive experiences may lead to higher life satisfaction. Hence it can be argued that social integration can positively influence the life satisfaction of skilled migrants. Therefore it can be hypothesised that

\[
H9: \text{Social integration is positively related to life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Higher social integration in terms of language, identity and behaviour is associated with higher life satisfaction.}
\]

3.4 The Association between Social Integration and Job Satisfaction among Migrants

In an era characterised by a continuing trend of global migration, job satisfaction among skilled migrants is an important research subject. Several researchers agree that migrants’ participation in every aspect of a society, including productive employment, is influenced by the extent to which they are integrated into the new society (Aycan & Berry, 1996; Eraydin, Tasan-Kok & Vranken, 2010; Tharmaseelan, Inkson & Carr, 2012). In particular, Nguyen et al. (2007) emphasised the importance of considering variables such as social integration when assessing migrants’ job satisfaction in host societies (see also Ea et al., 2008; Leong, 2001; Miller & Kerlow-Myers, 2009; Tharmaseelan et al., 2012; Valdivia & Flores, 2012). Even though some research findings are available in relation to the association between migrants’ host country adaptation and job satisfaction (Ea et al., 2008; Leong, 2001; Nguyen et al., 2007), the current study is unique, in that it examines the relationship between social integration (in terms of language, identity and behaviour) and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants. Related studies in the past were based on other migrants groups (skilled and refugee migrants) in other migrant-receiving societies, such as Asian migrants in the US (Ea et al., 2008; Leong, 2001; Nguyen et al., 2007), Canada (Aycan & Berry, 1996; Birman et al., 2014) and New Zealand (Tharmaseelan et al., 2012). The following sections discuss the literature addressing the association between social integration and job satisfaction.
Studies (Berry, 1990; 2001; 2003; Leong, 2001; Lu et al., 2012; Mace et al., 2005) have found that social integration positively influences migrants’ job satisfaction (Ea et al., 2008; Lu et al., 2013; Leong, 2001; Mace et al., 2005; Tharmaseelan et al., 2012). For instance, recently Lu et al. (2013) identified that Chinese professional migrants in Australia are less socially integrated into Australian society and show low job satisfaction; thus a positive relationship between social integration and job satisfaction is expected. Furthermore, findings of several studies (Withers & Snowball, 2003; Daniel, Chamberlain & Gordon, 2001; Magnusdottir, 2005, cited in Ea et al., 2008) on migrant nurses’ host country adaptation and job satisfaction have revealed that registered nurses who were less socially integrated into the host society showed less job satisfaction than their more integrated counterparts. For instance, Ea et al. (2008) revealed a positive correlation between social integration and job satisfaction among Filipino nurses in the US. According to Ea et al. (2008), less integrated migrants experience significant challenges and obstacles, including language barriers, changes in their professional roles and responsibilities, changes in personal and work routines, and feelings of strangeness and discrepancies between personal and social values in the workplace, leading to low job satisfaction. Likewise, Leong (2001) also found that Asian Americans’ (mainly Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Asian Indian) host country adaptation and job satisfaction were positively related.

Furthermore, some researchers (Mace et al., 2005; Malinen & Johnston, 2011; Tharmaseelan et al., 2012) have found a positive relationship between social integration and job satisfaction among migrants in New Zealand. In particular, Tharmaseelan et al. (2012) found that social integration was an important post-migration outcome that was associated with career satisfaction among individuals who migrated from Sri Lanka to New Zealand. Tharmaseelan et al.’s (2012) findings are relevant in the present study context, because New Zealand is similar to Australia in its criteria for selecting skilled migrants (Boucher, 2007).

The relationship between social integration in its language, identity and behaviour dimensions and job satisfaction is discussed next.
3.4.1 Host country language, identity and behaviour and job satisfaction

i) Language integration and job satisfaction
Migrant workers who are more integrated in terms of host country language show higher job satisfaction (Au et al., 1998; Behtoui, 2008; Valdivia & Flores, 2012; Woo, 2000). Valdivia and Flores (2012) found that Latino-American workers who reported better English-language skills showed more satisfaction, as this enhanced their communication with supervisors and co-workers and their inclusion at the different social forums at workplace (Behtoui, 2008). The study further pointed out that migrants who were not integrated in terms of language tended to maintain a distance between themselves and mainstreamers and felt more isolated in the work environment, leading to lower overall job satisfaction in the US (see also Au et al., 1998). It has also been revealed that Asian migrants who are less integrated in terms of language experience show slower career progression than their more integrated counterparts, and thus show lower job satisfaction (Woo, 2000). In addition, Mace et al. (2005) found that migrants with better language skills secured better positions in organisations, and this positively contributed to their job satisfaction in the long run. Therefore it can be argued that migrants who are more integrated in the host country language dimension are likely to be more satisfied in their jobs, as they are able to find better jobs, maintain closer relationships with supervisors and co-workers and actively participate in social forums at their workplaces.

ii) Identity integration and job satisfaction
Managers in Western host societies perceive that migrant employees who are less socially integrated into the host society are inclined to maintain their own cultural values and beliefs (Leong, 2001; Valdivia & Flores, 2012). As a result, Leong (2001) pointed out that Asian-American migrants with lower host-country identity have been discriminated against in preference for well-integrated migrants whose attitudes and behaviours are more similar to those of European-American managers and thus the former are at a greater risk of experiencing occupational stress and strain. In support of the same contention, Valdivia and Flores (2012) revealed that migrants who described their identity similarly to mainstreamers were less discriminated against in the workplace. The main reason identified was that more integrated migrants are more
comfortable in developing work relationships and maintaining informal networks than less integrated migrants, who tend to maintain more distance with their work colleagues (Nguyen et al., 2007; Valdivia & Flores, 2012). Migrant employees with less host-country identity report unhappiness with aspects of their jobs, such as co-worker and supervisor relationships and perceived inclusiveness; this is in turn associated with lower job satisfaction (Leong, 2001; Lu et al., 2012; Schmidt, 2009; Valdivia & Flores, 2012).

### iii) Behaviours integration and job satisfaction

Researchers (Birman et al., 2014; Green, 1999; Leong, 2001; Mace et al., 2005; Valdivia & Flores, 2012) have suggested that migrant employees who are able to successfully blend in with other workers (e.g., socialising with co-workers) are stereotyped as good workers and have been identified as more productive in achieving task efficiency than their less integrated counterparts. As a result, managers tend to rate the performance of better integrated employees who behave according to host country norms and values more highly than less integrated migrants. Birman et al. (2014) further suggested that knowledge and understanding of host country behaviour is an important personal resource that can lead to job satisfaction among migrants. The results of Birman et al.’s (2014) study identified a significant and positive relationship between the extent to which Former Soviet Union refugee migrants are behaviourally integrated into American society and their level of job satisfaction. Birman et al. (2014) measured participants’ behaviour in terms of media, entertainment, and music and food consumption in America, similarly to the present study, which measured behaviour integration among the current study participants in this way. Lu et al. (2012) found that Chinese professional migrants who were less integrated were less satisfied with their jobs in Australia (they included behaviour measures such as relationship development with Australians, knowing how to work with Australians and helping each other). Likewise, Ea et al. (2008) found that the association between host country behavioural integration and job satisfaction was positive among Former Soviet Union migrants in Israel and Filipino registered nurses in the US.

In summary, migrants who are more integrated (in language, identity and behaviour dimensions) are likely to feel more included in their work environment. High social
integration may assist willingness to socialise with members outside their co-ethnic groups, building of closer contacts with managers and co-workers, securing better jobs in the job market and performing job tasks more comfortably and efficiently and ensuring less discrimination. Furthermore, particularly for skilled migrants, integrating into the host country could be a factor that increases their job satisfaction, because they have to build work relationships with mainstreamers, use host-country language and adapt their work behaviours in line with mainstreamers more readily than other categories of migrants, who may not be very enthusiastic about their jobs in host societies. Therefore it can be hypothesised that

*H10: Social integration is positively related to job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Higher social integration in terms of language, identity and behaviour is associated with higher job satisfaction.*

### 3.5 Relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction

The relationship between job and life satisfaction has been a subject of many studies in psychology, sociology, management and other disciplines for several years (Tait et al., 1989). Two main issues in which researchers have been interested are (a) the extent to which job and life satisfaction are related (or the magnitude of the relationship), and (b) the directionality of the relationship. Researchers (Drobnick et al., 2010, Sirgy & Wu, 2009) have identified job satisfaction as an intervening variable (or as a life domain) when measuring individuals’ life satisfaction according to the ‘bottom-up’ approach. They argue that the dominant direction from job to life satisfaction, because a job is a vital element in person’s life (Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Near et al., 1978; 1980; Tait et al., 1989). Nevertheless, some research findings suggest that the relationship between job and life satisfaction is ‘top-down’, from life satisfaction to job satisfaction (Judge & Watanabe, 1993). Even though the directionality of the relationship between job and life satisfaction is still unresolved, researchers agree that there is a moderate positive and reciprocal relationship between life and job satisfaction (Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Rice et al., 1980). The present study focuses on assessing the strength of the relationship between job and life satisfaction in the sample group.
The results of previous studies are inconsistent and do not suggest any firm conclusions regarding the strength of this relationship. Some studies suggest that job satisfaction adds modest value to life satisfaction and others suggest it adds significant value to overall life satisfaction (Rice et al., 1980). Rice et al. (1980) revealed that the magnitude of the job and life satisfaction relationship is complicated due to many job and personality-related factors; correlations between life and job satisfaction can therefore vary between coefficients of .05 and .65. Findings on the relationship between job and life satisfaction in cross-cultural studies have revealed that there is a positive relationship between the two variables, irrespective of cultural differences (Drobnick et al., 2010; Engle & Prince, 2011; Oishi et al., 1999). Furthermore, the results of Drobnick et al. (2010) demonstrated that employees who perceive their work as dull and boring tend to show lower life satisfaction in any cultural setting.

The present study participants are skilled migrants migrating into a Western country and are likely to be expecting better job opportunities (Choudhry, 2001; George & Chaze, 2009; Malinen & Johnston, 2011), as well higher life satisfaction (Amit, 2010a; Sam, 1998). Having a high level of job satisfaction may ensure a sense of achievement after migrating that may positively spill over into their life satisfaction. However, regardless of the direction of the relationship a significant and positive association between life and job satisfaction is expected in the present study. Therefore it can be hypothesised that

\[ H11: \text{Job satisfaction is positively related to life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Higher job satisfaction is associated with higher life satisfaction.} \]

### 3.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature to develop Hypotheses to operationalise the second aim of this research. Initially literature related to the factors (a) age at migration, (b) year since migration, (c) English language skills, (d) level of education, (e) pre-migration SES, (f) neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants, (g) perceived inclusiveness and (h) expectation to return to the country of birth and social integration
was reviewed. Based on the literature review and taking into consideration the special characteristics of the Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, Hypotheses for the present study were developed. Then literature related to social integration and life satisfaction and social integration and job satisfaction and life satisfaction and job satisfaction was reviewed and related Hypotheses were developed.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODS

4.1 Chapter Introduction

The present chapter describes how this study was conducted to achieve the aims and test the Hypotheses developed in the previous chapter. First, the research design employed in this study is outlined in Section 4.2. The choice of population and sampling framework are outlined thereafter in Section 4.3. Next, details of the survey instruments are presented in Section 4.4, along with their respective scoring, and information regarding validity and reliability. Section 4.5 outlines the data collection procedure, and finally a chapter summary is presented in Section 4.6.

4.2 Research Design

The present research aims to enhance understanding of the level of social integration and life and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia and to identify the extent to which various socio-demographic factors influence their social integration. This research also intends to identify the association between social integration and life and job satisfaction and the association between life and job satisfaction. In achieving these objectives, a survey research design and quantitative methods were employed. Further details of the research design are discussed below.

4.2.1 Survey design

Data were collected using a survey research design. Surveys are the most frequently used data collection technique in the social sciences and other applied fields such as business research (Bryman & Bell, 2003; Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005; Neumen, 2006). Survey research design refers to a broad data collection technique that includes questionnaires and interviews (George et al., 2005). However, the present research employed only questionnaires. Of several time series designs, including longitudinal research design, the present study used a cross-sectional research design (correlational
survey). Cross-sectional studies collect and analyse data at one particular point in time, commonly referred as taking a ‘snapshot’ (Suresh et al., 2012).

There are a number of reasons why surveys were thought to be an appropriate method for the present research. Firstly, the Research Questions tested were statistical in nature. It is widely accepted that surveys produce information that is inherently statistical in nature (Groves, 1996, p. 389, as cited in Nueman 2006). For instance, most researchers use scales and indices to gather systematic quantitative data on participants’ attitudes, opinions, or other subjective and behavioural dimensions of their lives. Also, as Nueman (2003) and Quinlan (2011) pointed out, in general surveys are the most appropriate data collection method for studies on respondents’ real-life situations. Furthermore, Nueman (2003) argued that surveys are appropriate for Research Questions that deal with self-reported beliefs and behaviours, as participants can share first-hand information about their daily lives without depending on an interviewer’s interpretations. This study assessed participants’ perceptions regarding their social integration and life and job satisfaction. In addition, Bryman and Bell (2003) also recommended that surveys are appropriate when researchers measure many variables and test multiple Hypotheses in a single study. As pointed out in Chapter 1, several variables, including personal and organisational demographic data, social integration, life satisfaction and job satisfaction of the participants, were included in the present research, and thus multiple Hypotheses were tested (Bryman & Bell, 2003; Neuman, 2003; Quinlan, 2011). Therefore a survey was thought to be appropriate for this study.

Researchers suggest that of survey methods cross-sectional surveys are the most commonly used survey method due to their advantages, such as low cost and quick response speed. Specifically, by employing a cross-sectional survey design, it is possible to identify logical associations (e.g., correlations) between study variables at a given time by using statistical techniques. For instance, using multivariate analysis techniques, the association between one variable and another can be tested. The Institute for Work and Health (IWH, 2013) also suggested cross-sectional survey data is appropriate for mediator effect analysis. However, a cross-sectional design is not without its limitations. The most common limitation is that everything measured is related to one point of time. Therefore, in using cross-sectional data it is not possible to
come to conclusions about cause and effect relationships or the sequence of events over a period of time, as the research does not consider what happens before and after the snapshot is taken (Schwartz et al., 2012).

It is also said that this method is subject to selection and measurement bias (IWH, 2013). Therefore researchers need to be cautious when selecting samples, and they are required to select larger samples and collect data without big time lapses. For instance, in order to minimise the impact of limitations, researchers suggest that cross-sectional surveys need a larger sample (IWH, 2013). Hence in the present study a relatively large sample was recruited. Furthermore, research findings suggest that, in order to obtain more meaningful results, data need to be collected more or less simultaneously (without leaving the survey open for a longer period) to ensure the reliability of research findings (Bryman & Bell, 2003; Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005). Therefore, in the present study, all the data were collected without a big time lapse (Field, 2009; Pallant 2007). The research design is largely dependent on the nature of the Research Questions set out in the study. Therefore, due to the nature of the Research Questions and the Hypotheses tested and the type of analytical techniques employed, in the present study a cross-sectional survey was thought to be the most appropriate data collection technique.

4.2.2 On-line and mail survey modes in data collection
A mixed mode data collection technique was employed in the present study. This included on-line surveys and mail surveys. Dillman et al. (2009), and Shih and Fan (2008; 2009) suggested that achieving a high response rate in a survey is important for reasons such as (a) avoiding non-response bias, (b) improving the coverage, and (c) improving the quality of research findings, for instance, to improve the generalizability of findings. On the other hand, it has been long recognised that preferences for survey modes differ, depending on the demographic characteristics of potential respondents, such as age, education, professional background and the level of exposure to the internet (Dillman et al., 2009; Shih & Fan, 2008). As a result, researchers nowadays tend to implement mixed-mode surveys (Bethlehem, 2008; Bryman, Becker & Sempik, 2008; Dillman et al., 2009; Heerwegh & Loosveldt, 2008). According to Shih and Fan (2008, 2009), internet based on-line surveys and traditional mail surveys are the two most commonly used modes of the options available. Therefore, with the intention of
covering different age groups and variability in other demographic characteristics, the present research used on-line and mail survey modes.

i) Justification for using an on-line survey in the present study

It is evident that data collection is a time-consuming, complex and costly process (Bethlehem, 2008; Urlacher, 2010). However, advances in information technology have assisted 21st century researchers to collect data using web/internet/e-mail based surveys (Couper et al., 1998; Dillman, 2000; Shih & Fan, 2009). As a result, in the past few decades there has been an increase in the number of researchers using on-line surveys in a variety of fields such as sociology, medicine, management and education (Bethlehem, 2008; Fong & Ooka 2006; Frippiat & Marquis, 2010; Lance, 2010; Martinovic, et al., 2009; Remennick, 2003; Schafer & Dillman, 1998; Shih & Fan, 2009).

There were several reasons as to why this on-line technique was chosen in the present study. Predominantly, this was to source a cross-section of skilled migrants located in different regions in Australia. Time efficiency was another reason for choosing on-line surveys: researchers are able to work on other tasks while the data collection is in progress (Andrews, Nonnecke, & Preece, 2003; Llieva, Baron, & Healey, 2002). Furthermore, as Frippiat and Marquis (2010) pointed out, on-line responses can be transmitted into many different data analysis formats, so researchers can run preliminary analyses with available data while waiting for the required number of responses to conduct the final data analysis. Cost was another factor that justified on-line data collection. When compared to the traditional hard copy method, which involves many associated production costs, on-line modes are considerably low cost (Manfreda et al., 2008; Shih & Fan, 2009). At the same time, Shih and Fan (2009) have found that the quality of the responses of on-line surveys is far better than traditional face-to-face or telephone data collection methods, possibly because respondents can choose their own words and own time to complete the surveys, rather than depending on the researcher (Frippiat & Marquis, 2010; Neuman, 2003; Smyth et al., 2009; Urlacher, 2010).

ii) Limitations of on-line surveys and adjustments undertaken to compensate

As indicated in the previous section, there are many advantages of using on-line surveys. However, one of the major concerns of using on-line surveys is the low
response rate, mainly due to the activity of direct marketers with junk/spam e-mail surveys, which can result in participants ignoring more genuine surveys (Dillman, 2000; Manfreda et al., 2008; Shih & Fan, 2008; 2009). Manfreda et al. (2008) described limited IT literacy, non-availability of monetary incentives for web surveys, security and privacy concerns as some of the other reasons for low popularity of on-line surveys. However, research related to survey response rates has produced inconsistent results and suggests that the rate of response can be affected by many different characteristics of respondents, such as their age, level of education, level of computer literacy, social status of the participants, etc. (Frippiat & Marquis, 2010; Metha & Sivadas, 1995; Shih & Fan, 2008, 2009; Smith 1997). As suggested by Shih and Fan (2009), in order to achieve the required number of responses, in the present study the following techniques were adopted: (a) personalising the greetings in the invitation to participate by e-mail; (b) sending reminders at two different stages of time; (c) careful selection of the participant sources; (d) accessing a larger number of potential participants; and (e) diversifying the source of participants. According to Bethlehem (2008), one of the other concerns about on-line surveys is under-coverage of participants, which occurs when the target population does not have internet access. However, use of mail surveys can be useful in order to approach potential participants with low comfort with IT skills and people who are missed from the e-mail lists. Hence, as a means of achieving a higher response rate, the traditional mail survey mode was also adopted in the present study to help compensate for possible limitations of on-line surveys (Manfreda et al., 2008; Shih & Fan, 2009).

4.3 Sampling Framework

4.3.1 Participant selection criteria

Individuals were eligible to participate in this study if they were Sri Lankan or Indian first-generation skilled migrants in Australia. According to Australian migration policy, there were four skilled migrant categories in 2011 when the data were collected. These were: (a) general skilled migrants, (b) employer nomination, (c) business skilled migrants, and (d) distinguished talents (DIAC, Annual Report 2009-2010, 2012). Hence participants from all of these sub-categories were included in this study. Additionally,

---

11 First-generation migrants are defined as migrants who were born outside of the host country (Smith, 2003).
as one of the aims of the research was to measure the level of job satisfaction of participants, potential participants needed to be actively engaged in the workforce full-time, part-time or on a casual basis at the time of the data collection.

### 4.3.2 Sampling methods

The appropriateness of the sampling technique adopted has an important bearing on several dimensions of the data collection. The quality of the data, sample representativeness, response rate and sincerity of the responses may be affected by the sampling technique (Bethlehem, 2008; Quinlan, 2011). Non-probability sampling techniques, such as snowball sampling and convenience sampling, are popular in applied social research, as it is often not practical and feasible to do random sampling (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005; Quinlan, 2011; Streeton, Cooke & Campbell, 2004). Hence, in the present study, snowball sampling and convenience sampling techniques were adopted. Snowball sampling was used predominantly, given that researchers (Ayoku & Kgomotso, 2007; Streeton et al., 2004) have found that this technique is appropriate when activities of a specific ethnic group are being examined and when there is no publicly available list of affiliates from the target group that could be drawn on for sampling purposes. Snowball sampling is developed through a process of referring the survey to one participant, who then refers it to another and so on, which works as a chain (Streeton et al., 2004; Quinlan, 2011). The snowball technique is effective when the researcher is certain about the social context of the research and the inclusion criteria, and it is a cost-effective and efficient way of sourcing a diverse group of participants (Bethlehem, 2007). Furthermore, this technique helps to treat one of the main weaknesses of on-line surveys: the self-selection\(^{12}\) of participants, which can bias the survey results. Therefore the snowball technique was considered to be an appropriate sampling technique for the present research.

The other technique used was convenience sampling. Convenience sampling “involves drawing samples that are easily accessible and willing to participate in a study” (Teddie & Yu, 2007, p.78). Even though convenience sampling and snowball sampling were used in conjunction with one another, convenience sampling was used predominantly to distribute the hard copies of the survey. Distributing the surveys at shopping malls, Sri

---

\(^{12}\) Self-selection surveys: these are the surveys that are simply put on the web; respondents who happen to have internet access decide to participate into the survey (Bethlehem, 2008).
Lankan and Indian grocery shops, Sri Lankan and Indian temples, and to Sri Lankan and Indian parents at schools were the primary approaches used to reach potential participants for the study via this sampling technique.

4.3.3 Participants’ demographic background

i) Personal demographics

The total sample of 306 participants (see Table 4.1) consisted of 187 (61%) male and 119 (39%) female participants. The Sri Lankan representation for the study was more than double the Indian representation (70% Sri Lankans and 30% Indians). When considering residential status, Australian citizens (60%) outnumbered permanent residents (39%) and bridging visa participants (1%). Approximately 90% of the sample was married or married with children; 10% reported being single. Statistics on family status at migration showed that 33% of the sample had arrived as singles, with approximately 27% and 37%, respectively, arriving with a spouse or arriving with a spouse and children. The majority of the sample (40%) had been living in Australia for 5-10 years, while 32% had been living in Australia for less than five years, and 13% between 11-15 years. Very small percentages had been living in Australia for longer than 20 years. More than half of the participants had achieved their highest qualification in their country of birth; 47% had completed their highest qualification in Australia. Better quality of life was the main reason for migration (51%), followed by higher studies (16%). Better future for children and better job opportunities were other prominent reasons for migration. Notably, over three quarters of the sample represented the State of Victoria (78%); New South Wales (11%), Western Australia (4%) and Queensland (2.5%) captured the second, third and fourth positions, respectively, in terms of sample contribution. The Australian Capital Territory and South Australia contributed less than 6% in total.
Table 4.1 Summary of demographic background of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa Category</td>
<td>Australian Citizen</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridging Visa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present marital status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married with Children</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response/Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With parents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With spouse</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With spouse and children</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since arrival</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 15 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 – 20 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>Secondary or equivalent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma level</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree/ equivalent, professional</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate level</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification attained in country</td>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic variable</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for migration</td>
<td>Lack of security in COB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor quality of life in COB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher studies</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better job opportunities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better quality of life</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better future for children</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisational**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation before migration</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>21.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technician and trade worker</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community and personal services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical and Administrative</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machine Operators and drivers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current occupation</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technician and trade worker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community and personal services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical and Administrative</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machine Operators and drivers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career changed</td>
<td>Negative shift</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive shift</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response*</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of satisfaction</td>
<td>As satisfied</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less satisfied</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More satisfied</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Most participants had not changed their career after migration; this was an optional question.
ii) Organisational demographics

A total of 45% of the sample had occupied professional careers before migration, while 21% had managerial, clerical or administration-related careers before migration. Other careers before migration represented less than 3% in total. In the current occupation category, professional was the highest represented category, and clerical and administration and managerial were the next prominent occupations. The remaining career groups showed fairly low representation. Managerial careers were less likely following migration, though 73% of respondents who reported career shifts after migration had positive career shifts and only 27% negative career shifts. A total of 144 participants did not answer the question related to career change, suggesting no career changes since migration. When the present level of career satisfaction was compared with the last job held before migration, 42% of participants were ‘as satisfied’ with their present career status, 35% reported being ‘more satisfied’, and only a smaller percentage (23%) reported being ‘less satisfied’ in their career after migration (see summary of the demographic statistics in Table 4.1).

4.4 Measures

Questions were selected to capture the predictor variables, such as (a) age at migration, (b) years since migration, (c) host-country language skills, (d) level of education, (e) pre-migration SES, (f) neighbourhood concentration of ethnic migrants (g) perceived inclusiveness, and (h) expectation to return to the country of birth, and outcome variables, such as (a) social integration in language, identity and behaviour subscale level and (b) life satisfaction and (c) job satisfaction.

4.4.1 Overview of survey content

The survey used in the current research consisted of four main sections (see Appendix A). These are: (a) demographic information, (b) life satisfaction (c) job satisfaction and (d) social integration. Details of each section are summarised in Table 4.2. A number of publicly available survey instruments were used in the present survey, including (a) the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997), (b) the Language, Identity and Behavioural Acculturation Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001), and (c) the Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006). These survey instruments were selected on the basis that they have
been widely used in related research, are well-established and are reliable and valid. Minor modifications to item wording were made where necessary to make the measures relevant to Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in the Australian context. Relevant modifications are described in detail in the next section.

Table 4.2 Summary of research instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Scale range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I-(a)</td>
<td>Personal demographics</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>14 (1-14)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I-(b)</td>
<td>Organisational demographics</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>6 (15-20)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>Robert Cummins Personal Well-being Index (Adult) – 2006 (PWI-A 2006)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 - 10 (completely dissatisfied to completely satisfied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Paul E Spector Job satisfaction Scale (JSS – 1997)</td>
<td>36 (and 3 independent items were included here to measure ‘perceived inclusiveness’).</td>
<td>1-6 (disagree very much to agree very much)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV (a)</td>
<td>Social integration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-10 (highly unlikely to highly likely)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV (b)</td>
<td>Social integration</td>
<td>Birman and Trickett The Language, Identity and Behavioural Acculturation Scale – (LIB – 2001) (Modified)</td>
<td>22 (Australian) (Australian) Item one in the language scale that measured language ability, was not included in the subscale.</td>
<td>1-7 (not at all to very much)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the personal and organisational demographic questions used in the survey were drawn from previous surveys, such as the Australian Census Questionnaire, 2006, and the Ruppin Index, 2010 (an index of migrants’ social integration in Israel; questions were adapted for the Australian context).

4.4.2 Demographic information

Demographic information was gathered using 20 short answer questions. Fourteen were related to personal characteristics (e.g., gender, country of birth, residency status,
migration category, socio-economic background before migration, suburb of residence in Australia, age at migration, number of years since migration, education level, migration status, present marital status, country of birth of spouse and details of children), and six were related to organisational demographics (e.g., last occupation before migration, current occupation, career changes since migration, level of career satisfaction compared to last occupation in country of birth and type of organisation employed at present). Overall, demographic questions consisted of close-ended questions, short answer questions, multiple response questions and open-ended questions. Responding to these questions required ticking, circling or writing short answers.

4.4.3 Reliability and validity of the measures

In order to improve the readability and hence the validity of the survey several steps were followed: (a) readability was assured by conducting a pilot survey and amending the survey accordingly as needed, (b) no personal identification questions were asked, (c) participation was voluntary, and (d) participants could withdraw at any time (see Section 4.5 for Data Collection Procedure for Ethics clearance details of the present study). However, despite all the steps taken, validity of the responses cannot be fully guaranteed. For example, Urlacher (2010) pointed out that self-report questionnaires can contain some response bias, e.g., respondents may rate their level of English language, as ‘Excellent’ when objective measures suggest it is ‘Average’.

Next, each of the scales/measure used in the present study is discussed. Reliability and validity are discussed in relation to each scale.

i) Job satisfaction survey (Spector, 1997)

Job satisfaction scales most often measure an employee’s global attitude towards their job to determine whether or not they are satisfied with their job in general. However, some scales also measure satisfaction with different facets of the job, such as work attributes, rewards and recognition, relationships with other subordinates, and organisational context (Spector, 1997; 2001). The Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997) that was used in the present study measures ‘global’- as well as ‘facet’-level satisfaction. The Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997) is a 36-item, nine-facet scale
that is widely used to assess employees’ attitudes about different dimensions of a job. The nine facets measured in the scale are: (a) pay, (b) promotion, (c) supervision, (d) fringe benefits, (e) contingent rewards (performance based rewards), (f) operating procedure (required rules and procedures), (g) co-workers, (h) nature of work, and (i) communication. Each facet is assessed with four items. Each item is completed using a summated rating scale with six choices per item in a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (‘low’-‘disagree very much’) to 6 (‘high’-‘agree very much’).

Even though the aim of the present study was to analyse job satisfaction at global and facet level, the results were analysed only at global level, as subscales showed reliability scores less than .70 (operating procedure, pay, co-workers) and the subscales were not confirmed by the factor analysis in the present study (see Appendix B for factor analysis results). Global job satisfaction is calculated by summating all the items in the scale. The scores for total job satisfaction based on nine facets can range from 36 to 216 (Spector, 1997). According to Spector (2007), for the 36 items (global job satisfaction) for the four-item subscale, scores of 36 to 108 are ‘dissatisfied’, 144 to 216 ‘satisfied’, and 108 to 144 ‘ambivalent’. Sample items include ‘like the people I work with’ and ‘People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places’. Items in the scale are written in both directions, meaning that 21 out of 36 items are negatively worded (i.e., high scores represent low job satisfaction), and thus these items needed to be reverse-scored before summing to obtain the total job satisfaction score.

The scale was originally developed for the social service sector; however, it has been argued that it can be used for other sectors due to its high level of internal consistency and construct validity (see also Saane et al., 2003). Saane et al. (2003) have stated that the Job Satisfaction Survey has high internal consistency, reliability and validity compared to other job satisfaction questionnaires, including the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). According to Spector (2001), the Job Satisfaction Survey has adequate internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s alpha .91). Similarly, the reliability for global job satisfaction in the present study was Cronbach’s alpha .92.
ii) Perceived inclusiveness
In the present study perceived inclusiveness is defined as the extent to which skilled migrants feel accepted and welcomed as new members of the society by the members of the organisation (Nesdale and Mak, 2000). In order to measure ‘perceived inclusiveness’ in the current sample group, three items were developed. Those items were: (a) ‘I feel isolated at work’, (b) ‘I feel included in social functions at work’, and (c) ‘I feel I am recognised as a valued member of the team’. Response scales were the same as the Job Satisfaction Scale. Therefore each item was completed using a rating scale with six choices per item in a Likert scale ranging from 1 (‘low’-‘disagree very much’) to 6 (high-agree very much). The total scores for summated items range from 3 to 18. Scores of 3 to 9 reflect ‘low inclusiveness’, 12 to 18 reflect ‘high inclusiveness’ and 9 to 12 reflect ‘ambivalence’ in their ‘perceived inclusiveness’. The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) for this scale was = .58. Hence related analyses were interpreted with caution.

iii) Language, Identity and Behavioural Acculturation Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001)
The Language, Identity and Behavioural Acculturation Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001) was used to assess the level of social integration of skilled migrants in Australia. The original scale consists of 54 items measuring the level of Russian and American culture acculturation independently. The items are divided into three subscales which assess language (nine items related to American and nine items related to Russian language), identity (seven items related to American and seven items related to Russian identity) and behaviour (11 items related to American and 11 items related to Russian behaviour) (Birman, 2006). In the present study also the results were analysed at subscale level.

As detailed below, for the purpose of the present study, some of the items in the original scale were slightly modified; some of the items were eliminated and new items were introduced in order for them to be appropriate to the demographics of the current sample group. After introducing the changes (mainly to language subscale), there were 46 items in the Language, Identity and Behaviour Scale in the present study (specific details are given below under each subscale). Sample items include ‘How much do you speak English at home’ and ‘I am proud of being Australian’. Although the original scale
consisted of a four-point Likert scale response format, the present study used a seven-point Likert Scale response format, ranging from 1 (low - not at all) to 7 (high - very much). Social integration results were analysed at subscale level in order to meet the research objectives. Average scores that range from 1 to 7 were used when interpreting the results in the present study. Even though the specific cut-off points are not defined, high scores represent high integration into the host society. According to the scale author (in a personal communication), an average score of 6 and above in the seven-point Likert scale represents very high integration; an average score below 3 represents low integration; scores between 3.5 and 6 indicate average level of integration (‘pers. comm’. in an e-mail dated 5 April 2012; see Appendix C).

In the present study, the Language, Identity, and Behavioural Acculturation Scale measured Language, Identity and Behaviour integration in relation to the Australian context. As explained in Section 2.4, integration in relation to country of birth was not measured, because the present study was interested in measuring social integration of the participants, not the level acculturation to the host country versus country of birth. The main reason for this was that previous research found that (Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Remennick, 2003; Sakamoto, 2007; Sam, 1998) first-generation ethnic migrants maintain their own cultural aspects and thus often show a high level of cultural orientation towards the country of birth. However, different migrants groups adapt differently to the host country and socially integrate differently. Thus what needs to be uncovered from a new study is the extent to which different migrant groups are socially integrated to the host society in terms of language, identity and behaviour dimensions (see Section 2.4.1 for details).

The Language, Identity, and Behavioural Acculturation Scale has been used in many acculturation (adjustment or adaptation) studies to measure acculturation levels of first- and second-generation migrants within different host societies (Birman, 2001; 2006; Birman, Persky & Chan, 2010; Ho & Birman, 2010; Kisselev et al., 2010; Trickett &

---

13 The literature suggested that expansion in number of choice points in a Likert scale systematically increases the scale reliability and the scale sensitivity, and captures small deviations that can be highly meaningful (Cummins & Gullone, 2000)
Birman, 2005). Even though this scale has mainly been used to assess Russian migrants’ level of acculturation, it has also been used in other cross-cultural studies, such as with Asian migrants in the US (Ho & Birman, 2010). Previous research has also shown that the Language, Identity and Behaviour Scale has good overall validity and reliability (Birman, 2006; Kisselev et al., 2010). The individual subscales are described below.

a. Language subscale

The original Language subscale consisted of nine items asking participants to rate their ability to speak and understand English as a measure of language integration in the host society. Sample items from the original subscale include ‘How would you rate your ability to speak English - at work, with friends, on the phone, with strangers and overall’ and ‘How well do you understand English - on TV or at the movies, in newspapers or in magazines, in songs, overall’. However in the present study, the subscale was modified and consisted of three parallel items which measured overall ability to speak and understand English language in different situations. For instance, ‘How do you rate your ability to speak English now?’, ‘How do you rate your ability to speak English in social situations now?’ and ‘How would you rate your ability to understand English now?’. Determining overall ability to speak and understand English was thought to be more appropriate than measuring ability to speak and understand English in nine different situations (e.g., ability to speak English at work, with Australian friends, on the phone, with strangers, overall and the ability to understand English on TV/Movies, in newspapers, in songs and overall). This format also avoided repetition in the scale to make the scale more user-friendly. However, factor analysis for the present study confirmed two items in the behaviour subscale that are related to host country language (‘How much do you speak English at home’ and ‘How much do you speak English with friends’) loaded with the language factor; thus five items were retained in the language subscale (see Appendix B).

Items in the subscale were averaged to range from 1 to 7 when interpreting the results in the present study. In many samples, Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for the language subscale were as reported between .87 and .97 (Birman, & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Kisselev et al., 2010; Trickett & Birman, 2005). Subscale reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) for this study was .80, after introducing changes into the subscale.
b. Identity subscale

The identity subscale consists of seven items. These were replicated from the original subscale with only the names of the countries changed. These items measure the extent to which participants consider themselves as Australian (e.g., ‘I think of myself being Australian’, ‘I think I am a part of Australian culture’) and assess to what extent they feel positive about being an Australian (e.g., ‘I feel good about being Australian’, ‘I am proud of being Australian’). The items thereby assess the extent to which participants are integrated into Australian society through their Australian identity. Items in the subscale were averaged to range from 1 to 7. Previous studies reported adequate levels of internal consistency reliability for the subscales, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranging from .80 to .94 (Birman, 2006; Birman et al., 2010; Ho & Birman, 2010; Kisselev et al., 2010). Subscale reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) for this study was .96.

c. Behaviour subscale

The original version of this subscale consists of 11 items that ask respondents to rate to what extent they engage in behaviours related to host society culture (e.g., language use, media consumption, grocery habits, food consumption, music and entertainment preferences and habits). Birman and Trickett (2001) pointed out that items in the behaviour subscale deal with behavioural competencies and opportunities to engage in cultural activities in the host society. One new item was added (making 12 items in total in the behavioural subscale) for the purpose of the current study: ‘How much do you attend Australian sporting events?’. This item was added on the basis that sporting events are an important dimension of Australian culture. Other sample items in the scale are ‘How much do you read Australian books, newspapers or magazines?’, ‘How much do you eat Australian food?’, ‘How much do you attend to Australian concerts, exhibitions?’, and so on. The scale also measures host country language use as a component of the behaviour (‘How much do you speak English at home?’, ‘How much do you speak English with friends?’). After factor analysis, eight items were retained in this subscale (See Appendix B for details). Items in the subscale were averaged to range from 1 to 7. Previous studies reported adequate levels of internal consistency reliability for this subscale, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranging from .76 to .80 (Birman & Trickett, 2001; Ho & Birman, 2010; Kisselev et al., 2010). Subscale reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) for this study was .82.
iv) Personal Well-being Index (Adult), (Cummins, 2006)

Many researchers, including Diener et al., (2003), have used well-being indices to measure life satisfaction. Hence the Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006) was used to measure life satisfaction among the participants in this study.

The construct of life satisfaction can be either single-itemed, such as ‘how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?’, or multi-faceted, where scale items represent level of life satisfaction in different life domains (Cummins, 2006). In the present study, due to lower reliability of single-item scales, the Personal Well-being Index (2006) was used, because it consists of eight items related to satisfaction with different life domains. Diener et al. (2003) suggested that cross-cultural validity and factor structure are also important elements to be considered when selecting measures of life satisfaction. For example, satisfaction with self is strongly correlated with life satisfaction in individualistic Western countries, whereas satisfaction with self is less correlated with overall life satisfaction in collectivist societies, especially for women (Diener & Diener, 1995). The Personal Well-being Index is a cross-culturally valid instrument that has been tested across over 100 countries, including India (Cummins, 2006; Lau & Cummins, 2005).

The Personal Well-being Index consists of nine items, of which one item represents the first level of deconstruction of the global life satisfaction question, i.e., ‘How satisfied are you with your life as a whole?’, and the remaining eight items correspond to different domains of satisfaction. These domains are (a) standard of living, (b) health condition, (c) achievement in life, (d) relationships, (e) feeling of safety (f) feeling part of the community, (g) future security, and (h) spirituality or religion. These eight domains constitute the minimum number of domains that represent the first-level deconstruction of ‘life as a whole satisfaction’.

The response format for the Personal Well-being Index is an 11-point Likert Scale that ranges from 0 (low completely dissatisfied) to 10 (high - completely satisfied) with a mid-point of neutral (neither satisfied/nor satisfied). The total life satisfaction value derived in the present study was the mean of the means of eight domains (Lau et al., 2005; PWI manual, 2006). According to recent figures, the normative life satisfaction
range for Australians is 73.4 - 76.4; life satisfaction of Western populations ranges from 70 to 80 points, whereas for the Asian population it can be 10 points lower (Cummins, 2006). Therefore, according to the scale author, a mean score of 75 or above is considered to indicate satisfaction with one’s life (Cummins, 2006).

Thomas (2005) suggested that the Personal Well-being Index has convergent validity (correlation of .78) with the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985). The scale also has reported a high level of sensitivity between demographic groups within Australia and overseas, which was one of the major reasons for choosing the PWI in the current study (Cummins, 2006). Previous studies reported adequate levels of internal consistency reliability for the scale, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranging from .70 to .85 within Australia and overseas (Lau & Cummins, 2005; Lau et al., 2005). Scale reliability Cronbach’s alpha for this study was .82.

4.5 Procedure

Data collection for the present study commenced after receiving ethical clearance from the Swinburne University Human Research Ethics Committee on 28 March 2011 (see Appendix D for ethics clearance notification). Participation in the survey was voluntary and return of a completed survey was regarded as implied consent to participate in the study.

The on-line survey was created via Swinburne’s secure online survey platform, Opinio14. The survey was active for a period of four months (June 2011 to October 2011). The survey was published only in the English language (see Appendix A for a copy of the survey). Data collection for the present study was conducted in two stages. A pilot survey was undertaken as the first step and secondly a wider network was contacted after the pilot survey. With the intention of piloting the survey, the first invitation to participate was sent via e-mail to social networks of the researcher (see Appendices E and F). Then 10 participants were contacted two weeks after the initial invitation was sent. The main intention of contacting the 10 participants was to obtain their personal views about the content, length, readability and understandability of the

14 Opinio Program: Opinio is a complete survey software application that enables researchers to produce and publish surveys using a regular web browser (see: www.swinburne.com.au).
survey questions, in order to avoid the risk of participants misunderstanding survey questions (Frippiat & Marquis, 2010). It was confirmed that the questionnaire was ‘user-friendly’. There were no major concerns reported, although some participants commented on the length of the survey. This was not seen to be a major concern, given that the average completion time was around 20 minutes. There were no structural or language issues reported with the survey. Thus, after completing the pilot study successfully, the decision was made to continue with the second step and contact the potential participants in the wider community. These participants in the wider community were initially contacted via e-mail. The e-mail consisted of an invitation to participate, detailed information about the survey, such as participants’ time commitment, use of survey information and the link (URL) to the survey (see Appendices E, F and G).

The researcher was able to access a higher number of potential participants via links and contact details displayed on organisational and institutional websites (e.g., the online survey was sent to office bearers of Indian and Sri Lankan Associations in Australia, such as the Buddhist Society, Victoria, the University of Colombo Alumni society in Australia, and, in addition, the survey was sent individually to contacts displayed on higher education institute websites, such as Monash University and the University of Sydney). The notion of gathering data from a wider-spectrum population was achieved by using this approach. A reminder/thank you e-mail was sent two weeks after the initial invitation e-mail and a second reminder/thank you e-mail was sent two weeks after the first reminder e-mail.

A hard copy/mail version of the survey was used to reach potential participants who did not have access to the on-line survey. An invitation to participate, information sheet and a copy of the survey, along with a pre-paid envelope for returning the survey, were delivered to potential participants (Appendices E, F and G). These traditional mail surveys were distributed at Sri Lankan and Indian grocery shops, religious places (temples, churches), at doctors’ surgeries and at public places, such as shopping centres. At the same time, several bulk distributions were undertaken using the researcher’s social network groups.
4.5.1 Data analysis techniques

The present study assessed several associations between predictor and outcome variables and mediated pathways between predictor variables and outcomes (see Conceptual Framework in Section 2.9). Therefore correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis (hierarchical, single and multiple mediation) were the statistical techniques used in analysing the data. More details on data analysis techniques are presented in Chapter 5.

4.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter explained the research design employed, the sampling framework, survey measures and the data collection procedure of the present study. The current research used a cross-sectional research design and quantitative methods.

Data were collected using a survey administered on-line or in hard copy. Snowball and convenience sampling techniques were employed to reach potential participants. Survey data were collected using publicly available scales such as the Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006) and the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997). The scales showed high internal consistency scores. The next chapter of this thesis presents the analytic approach and results of the study.
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS (PART I)

5.1 Chapter Introduction

Chapter 4 described the research methods employed in this study. Chapter 5 deals with the results and is organised as follows. Section 5.2 presents an overview of the data analysis techniques and the data screening procedure. A statistical comparison between Indian and Sri Lankan groups is provided in Section 5.3. Section 5.4 presents the results related to the first Research Question, ‘Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia socially integrated at language, and identity and behaviour subscale level, satisfied with their lives, and satisfied with their jobs?’ Finally, Section 5.5 provides a chapter summary.

5.2 Overview of Analyses

The present research aims to enhance understanding of the level of social integration and life and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia and to identify the extent to which various socio-demographic factors influence their social integration. Socio-demographic variables (Independent Variables; IVs) assessed were: (a) age at migration, (b) years since migration, (c) English language skills, (d) level of education, (e) pre-migration SES, (f) neighbourhood concentration of ethnic migrants, (g) perceived inclusiveness, and (h) expectation to return to country of birth. Outcome variables (Dependent Variables; DVs) assessed were social integration (at language, identity and behaviour subscale level), life satisfaction and job satisfaction. Statistical analyses were performed on 306 survey data responses to test the Research Questions and Hypotheses outlined in Chapter 1 (see Section 1.5).

Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20. On-line survey data were extracted into SPSS directly from the Opinio program, and hard copy survey data were entered into SPSS manually. The two subgroups of data (on-line, hard copy) were subjected to independent samples t-tests
Level of education differed across the two groups ($t(304) = -4.22, p < .001$), suggesting participants in the on-line version possessed higher qualifications. Years since migration also differed between the two groups ($t(304) = 2.09, p < .05$), suggesting that participants in the hard copy version had been living in Australia for a longer period. Therefore preferences for completing the survey, either on-line or in hard copy, may only have reflected differences in computer literacy due to either education or age. Life satisfaction was slightly higher for participants in the on-line version ($t(304) = -3.71, p < .001$)

The Research Questions and Hypotheses are addressed in three stages: (a) descriptive statistics, (b) correlation analysis, and (c) multiple regression analysis (i.e., hierarchical and mediated regression analysis). During the first stage of the data analysis important descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations (SD), skewness, and kurtosis of IVs and DVs were calculated. The findings for Research Question 1 (Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia: 1.1 Socially integrated at language, identity and behaviour subscale levels; 1.2 Satisfied with their lives, and 1.3 Satisfied with their jobs?) were drawn from the descriptive statistics for relevant scales. For instance, the level of social integration of the participants was reflected in the mean scores for the Language, Identity and Behaviour Acculturation Scale at subscale level (Birman & Trickett, 2001).

At the second stage of the data analysis, correlations between IVs and DVs were carried out. This step was introduced as a data screening strategy before moving on to the multivariate analyses. For instance, the correlations between the socio-demographic variables and social integration were tested and variables that recorded significant correlations with social integration at subscale level were retained in the next stage of analysis, and variables that failed to correlate significantly at this stage were eliminated from the next stage of the analysis, which examined multivariate relationships.

In testing Hypotheses 1 to11 (Research Questions 2 to 4), the main data analytic technique used was multiple regression analysis (hierarchical and mediated regression analysis). Field (2009) and Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggested that multivariate analysis is suitable for a data set that (a) consists of several IVs and several DVs that are
correlated to a certain degree with each other and (b) examines several DVs simultaneously. To test Hypotheses 1 to 8 (the significance of the relationship between socio-demographic variables and language, identity and behaviour integration), linear regression analysis was used. Variables that significantly contributed to determination of language, identity and behaviour integration at this stage were retained to test the mediated effect Research Questions (Research Questions 4.1 and 4.2). Mediated regression analysis was used to determine the indirect effect of socio-demographic variables on life and job satisfaction via language, identity and behaviour integration. In mediated regression analysis, a three-step approach is used to determine mediation: (a) to demonstrate that the initial variable affects the mediator, (b) to demonstrate that the mediator affects the outcome variable, and (c) to demonstrate that the effect of the initial variable on outcome variable is reduced with the introduction of the mediator (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

Prior to the data analysis, the data were screened to ensure that the statistical assumptions underlying the analytic techniques were met. Preliminary screening of the data set and assumption checking for the multivariate analyses are outlined below. An overview of the preliminary analyses, which included data screening for out-of-range values, missing values analysis, checking the dimensionality of scales, reliability analysis, and checking the distribution of variables (skewness, kurtosis, outliers), is provided in the section that follows.

5.2.1 Data screening
The data file was checked for accuracy by conducting frequency analyses on each variable to identify any data entry errors such as invalid or out-of-range values. Accordingly, minor data entry errors and out-of-range values were checked against the hard copy data and corrected. Data screening identified participants who did not meet the sample requirements (i.e., were not skilled migrants and/or were not from Sri Lanka or India) but had participated in the survey. Further inspection revealed one Pakistani participant and 24 non-skilled migrant participants, who were subsequently deleted from the data set.
5.2.2 Missing value analysis

After deletion of ineligible participants, the original data set consisted of 332 cases. However, 13 cases (nine participants who had completed the survey on-line and four who had completed the hard copy version) were eliminated from the data set due to a high overall percentage of missing data (over 25%) (Byrne, 2001; Field, 2009). Of the remaining 319 cases, 12 cases had over 25% of missing data (13-36 items, in a 36-item scale) in the Job Satisfaction Scale, and one case had over 25% missing data (7-12 items, in a 23-item scale) in the Language, Identity and Behaviour Acculturation Scale. These 13 cases were also deleted from the data set, as it was considered invalid to estimate and replace missing values for these cases (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Therefore, the final sample for analysis consisted of 306 cases.

The remaining cases had minimal missing data (missing data < 1%). Therefore, the Expectation-Maximisation algorithm (EM) was used to impute the missing values for these cases, as values were missing at random (MAR), and the use of the EM algorithm was appropriate. In a series of Monte Carlo experiments, researchers found that the EM method of data imputation was far more accurate and consistent in predicting missing value estimates than techniques such as pair wise or list wise deletion (Field, 2009; Schafer & Graham, 2002). After missing data imputation, inversely worded items on the Job Satisfaction Scale and Perceived Inclusiveness Scale were reverse scored to ensure that high scores endorsed high job satisfaction and perceived inclusiveness. The pre-migration SES variable was reverse scored in order to achieve more meaningful interpretation of results (high scores now represent highly metropolitan areas and low scores represent rural areas). In the present study, likelihood of returning to one’s country of birth was assessed using a 0-10 scale (0 being ‘highly unlikely’ and 10 being ‘highly likely’). This variable was also reverse scored to ensure that high scores represented a high level of integration.

5.2.3 Distribution of data

Skewness and kurtosis statistics, as well as histograms and box plots, were generated in order to (a) explore the distribution of data, and (b) identify any univariate and multivariate outliers. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) recommend use of skewness and kurtosis statistics to test departures from normality. The assumption of the normal
distribution was rejected at $p < .001$, $z > +/- 3.29$ (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The $z$ value was computed by dividing the skewness statistic by the standard error. Results indicated that (a) pre-migration SES, (b) English language skills, (c) years since migration and (d) total life satisfaction scores were highly skewed ($z > 3.29$, $p < .001$), hence the assumption of normality was violated for these variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) see Table 5.1 for $z$-values and skewness/kurtosis statistics.

In order to reduce skewness and improve normality, English language skills, pre-migration SES, and life satisfaction were transformed (Fabrigar et al., 1999; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Years since migration was not transformed due to the need to preserve a meaningful metric of the measure (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Pre-migration SES, English language skills and life satisfaction were substantially negatively skewed, and were hence reflected before transformation and re-reflected after transformation in order to preserve the original direction of interpretation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). English language skills and life satisfaction were transformed using square root transformation and pre-migration SES was transformed using a logarithmic transformation. $Z$ values were substantially improved after transformation of data (see Table 5.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Skewness (before)</th>
<th>Z value (before)</th>
<th>Skewness (after)</th>
<th>Z value (after)**</th>
<th>Transformation Technique used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Pre-migration SES</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-8.13</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>Logarithm***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Age at migration*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 English language skills</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>-6.01</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>Square root***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year since migration*</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>-8.36</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>Square root***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These items were not transformed to preserve the original metric of the measure.

**The assumption of the normal distribution was rejected at $p < .001$, $z > +/- 3.29$ (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The $z$ value was computed by dividing the skewness statistic by the standard error. The standard error was 0.139.

***These values were reflected ($K$ – original score, where $K$ is the highest possible score for a given variable +1) before transformation and re-reflected after transformation ($K$ – new score, where $K$ is the highest possible score for a given variable +1).
After transformation, an inspection of \( z \) scores indicated that there were no univariate outliers \((z > 3.29, \ p < .001)\). Multivariate outliers were inspected through the Mahalanobis distance criterion of \( \text{Chi-square} (8) >26.12, \ p < .001 \) (distributed as \( x^2 \) with \( df \) equals to the number of IVs). All the IVs and DVs were subjected to a preliminary regression run for the purpose of multivariate outlier detection. ID number was used as a ‘dummy DV’ for the analysis, as multivariate outlier detection is unaffected by the DV (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The variables imputed to calculate Mahalanobis distance were social integration, life satisfaction, and job satisfaction, age at migration, perceived inclusiveness, English language skills and pre-migration SES. No multivariate outliers were identified within the criterion of \( \alpha = .001 \) for Mahalanobis distance. A comparison of means and 5% trimmed means also suggested that extreme values were not having a major impact on means.

5.2.4 Assumption checking for regression analysis

Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) recommended a sample size of \( 104+m \) \((m = \text{number of independent variables})\) to test the contribution of each predictor in a regression analysis. According to this rule, the present research included a sufficient sample size \((N = 306)\) for multiple regression analyses. There were no more than eight IVs used in the regression analyses at any one time.

Normality and linearity for IVs and DVs were checked. Histograms and box plots indicated a normal distribution for all the IVs and DVs after transformation. Normal probability plots displayed points that lay in a reasonably straight diagonal line from bottom left to top right for all the variables, suggesting no major deviations from normality (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Residual scatter plots revealed roughly rectangular dispersions of residuals, with a concentration of scores along the centre with no systematic patterns such as curvilinear or cubic patterns, suggesting that the assumption of linearity was met (Pallant, 2007; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). There was no evidence of singularity and multicollinearity between the independent variables (correlation between independent variables, \( r < .70 \)) (Pallant, 2007). Also, collinearity statistics for all the IVs indicated VIF values were between \(.10 – 10\), suggesting no multicollinearity (Pallant, 2007). Thus the statistical assumptions of the data set were

\[^\text{15} \text{Klain (2010) suggested that Chi-square statistics can be significant when the sample size is larger.}\]
satisfactorily met for multiple regression analysis. An overview of the preliminary data screening process is outlined in Figure 5.1 below.

Figure 5.1 Summary of preliminary data screening process
5.3 Statistical Comparison of Sri Lankan and Indian Groups

5.3.1 Independent samples t-tests, MANOVA and Mann-Whitney tests

Independent samples t-tests (see Table 5.2) and Mann-Whitney tests (see Table 5.3) and between group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were conducted, as an initial step, to determine whether there were any significant differences between the Sri Lankan and Indian groups on the IVs and DVs.

Table 5.2 Sri Lankan and Indian group comparison-independent samples t-tests results for continuous study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at migration</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived level of inclusion</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language skills</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education*</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year since migration*</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation to return to country of birth</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>64.95</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>63.75</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>147.03</td>
<td>26.61</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>142.14</td>
<td>26.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sri Lanka, \( n = 212 \), and India, \( n = 94 \)

* These represent ordinal variables.
Sri Lankans and Indians are representatives of the ‘South Asian’ social construct (George & Chaze, 2009). Accordingly, data for Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants were pooled in the current research. Notably, Sri Lankan and Indian migrants in Australia share many commonalities, such as (a) non-English speaking background, (b) maintaining close ties with country of birth and ethnic group, (c) strong sense of belonging to the country of birth, (d) strong values towards ethno-cultural relationships, and (e) high regard for religious beliefs and traditional customs (Frank, Hofstede & Bond, 1991; Hofstede, 2001). Furthermore, Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are similar in many other aspects, such as (f) migrating to Australia under the skilled migration category, (g) mainly being represented in accounting, computer and civil engineering skill categories, and (h) choosing to live mainly in the states of Victoria and New South Wales (DIAC, Annual Report, 2011). Due to the commonalities between these two groups, Sri Lankans and Indians were considered as a one group for the purpose of this study.

The results of the t-tests indicated that the socio-demographic variables and life satisfaction and job satisfaction did not significantly differ between the two groups (see Table 5.2 above).

Mann-Whitney test results indicated (Table 5.3) that there were no differences in (a) reason for migration, (b) last occupation held in country of birth, and (c) gender between the Sri Lankan and Indian groups. However, current occupation results indicated a small but significant difference between the groups (the mean rank for the Sri Lankan group was 143.10, and the mean rank for Indian group was 176.96, Mann-Whitney $U = 7758.5$, $z = -3.31$, $p = .001$, indicating that Indian skilled migrants’ current occupation level is significantly higher than Sri Lankans’). At the same time, residency status results indicated a significant difference between the groups, indicating that more Sri Lankans than Indians possess citizenship (see Table 5.3 for further details). Comparisons yielded no significant differences between IVs tested in the present study. Hence, the two groups were treated as a single group for further analyses.
Table 5.3 Sri Lankan and Indian group comparison: Mann-Whitney test results for categorical variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Z score</th>
<th>Significance (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason for migration</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>148.32</td>
<td>153.79</td>
<td>9173.50</td>
<td>-.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Occupation held in COB</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>148.78</td>
<td>164.15</td>
<td>8963.00</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Occupation</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>143.10</td>
<td>176.96</td>
<td>7758.50</td>
<td>-3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency status (Citizen/Permanent resident)</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>162.25</td>
<td>133.77</td>
<td>8109.00</td>
<td>-3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>156.39</td>
<td>145.27</td>
<td>9139.00</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sri Lanka, *n* = 212, and India, *n* = 94

MANOVA was performed to investigate the differences in language, identity and behaviour integration between groups. There was a statistically significant difference between groups on the combined variables, *F* (3, 302) =12.03, *p*<.001; Wilks Lamdba =.89; partial eta squared =.10. When the results for language, identity and behaviour are taken separately, language and identity integration significantly differed between groups. Indians reported slightly higher integration in language [Indian, *M* =5.88, *SD* .95, Sri Lankan *M*=5.28, *SD*=.98], *F* (1, 304) =24.04, *p*<.001 and partial eta squared =.07] and identity [Indian, *M*=4.56, *SD* 1.61, Sri Lankan *M*=3.87, *SD*=1.65], *F* (1, 304) =11.47, *p*<.001 and partial eta squared =.03]. Even though Sri Lankan and Indian groups slightly but significantly differed in language and identity integration, the two groups were treated as a single group due to (a) inadequate sample size in the Indian group16 and (b) commonalities displayed in socio-demographic factors tested in the present study. Although South Asia is identified as a distinct social construct, individuals of different countries within the same construct may differ in terms of (a) the language that they speak, (b) religion, and (c) socio-cultural values (George & Chaze, 2009), and therefore the small but significant differences in the language and

---

16 Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) recommended a sample size of 104+*m* (*m* = number of independent variables) to test the contribution of the each predictor in a regression analysis. However, the number of Indian participants in the present study was limited to 94.
identity dimensions are not unexpected. Notably, the percentage of variance explained by group membership was reasonably small in each instance.

Descriptive statistics related to all the study variables and the correlation tests results are presented in the next section.

5.4 Main Analyses

The means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis statistics, and internal consistency reliabilities for all continuous study variables are shown in Table 5.4. As described above, IVs and DVs were transformed as necessary prior to the main analysis.

Table 5.4 Mean, SD, Skewness, Kurtosis and Coefficient α values for all the continuous study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>38.52</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at migration</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language skills*</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-migration SES*</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect to return to country of birth</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel completely Australian</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language integration</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity integration</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour integration</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction*</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction*</td>
<td>145.53</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=306

*Statistics given here are after transformation
Results related to Research Question 1 (Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia: (1.1) socially integrated at language, identity and behaviour subscale level?; (1.2) satisfied with their lives?; (1.3) satisfied with their jobs?) are discussed next.

5.4.1 Social integration of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia

Research Question 1.1: Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia socially integrated in terms of language, identity and behaviour?

Mean scores presented in Table 5.4 above show that, at subscale level, participants are most integrated in language, followed by the behaviour and then identity dimensions. Only seven participants (2%) scored below 3.5 (low level of integration) for the language dimension. A total of 107 participants (35%) scored over six points (high level of integration) for the language dimension. On the identity subscale, 108 participants recorded a low level of integration, and 46 participants recorded a high level of integration. Fifty-four participants recorded a low level of integration on the behaviour subscale, whereas 41 recorded a high level of integration for the behaviour dimension.

As previous studies have shown gender is an important variable in predicting social integration (Ho, 2006; Kisselev et al., 2010; Remennick, 2009), an independent samples t-test was conducted to test for gender differences in social integration at dimension level. The results suggested a small significant difference for the language subscale, $t(303) = 2.51, p < .05$, indicating that men were more integrated than women for this dimension in the present study sample.

5.4.2 Life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia

Research Question 1.2: Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia satisfied with their lives?

In the present study, life satisfaction was assessed using the Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006). As prescribed in the PWI manual, scores which have been derived from a 0-10 scale were converted on a 0-100 point scale by simply shifting the decimal
point to the right. However, as Cummins (2006) suggested, this conversion does not alter the statistical meaning of the data set, as this is a simple linear conversion. Means, standard deviations (SD), skewness and kurtosis for all the items in the Personal Well-being Index were calculated to describe the characteristics of the present sample (see Table 5.5).

Table 5.5 Mean, SD, Skewness and Kurtosis for the different life domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life satisfaction domain</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean**</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life as a whole satisfaction</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>78.50</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>83.89</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>81.38</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements in life</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>79.27</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>82.32</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How safe you feel</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>84.58</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling part of your community</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future security</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>79.46</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>81.64</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWI*</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=306

*Average of the eight domains of life satisfaction.

** 0-100 scale converted mean.

As shown in Table 5.5, all the items in PWI show a negative skewness (ranging from - .71 to -1.65), which is consistent with the findings of previous research (Cummins, 2006; Renn et al., 2009; Wills, 2009). Means of the eight domains ranged from 73.33 to 84.58. Standard deviations of the eight domains ranged from 18.25 to 22.80. The overall PWI score, which predicts the overall level of life satisfaction, was between 70 and 80 points on average, which the scale author suggests is within the normative distribution of the PWI for Western countries; the normative range for Australia is 73.4 to 76.4 points. The Australian Unity Well-being Index for 2012 was 75.40 points and the PWI for the present sample group was 77.27 points, which is a difference of only 1.87. Furthermore, in the present sample, the Standard Deviation of PWI was 15.90 points, which indicated 81% (i.e., 250 participants) of the sample scored within the normative range. Hence it can be suggested that the majority of the sample were satisfied with their lives in Australia.
Consistent with previous studies, the eight domains in the PWI significantly correlated with ‘satisfaction with life as a whole’ at $p < .01$ (Renn et al., 2009; Wills, 2009). Domain inter-correlations are presented in Table 5.6 below. The PWI score correlates highly with all eight domain items (i.e., $r > .70$ in all the cases except the ‘spirituality’ domain, which had a correlation of .63). Furthermore, when the eight domains of the PWI were regressed onto the ‘satisfaction with life as a whole’ item in the scale, four domains (‘achievements in life’, ‘standards of living’, ‘feeling part of the community’ and ‘personal relationships’) contributed significantly to the regression model for ‘satisfaction with life as a whole’ (see Table 5.6). Consistent with previous studies, ‘health’, ‘how safe you feel’, ‘future security’ and ‘spirituality’ domains failed to make a significant contribution to the model (Renn et al., 2009; Wills, 2009). The adjusted $R^2$ for the model was 67%.

**Table 5.6 Regression for life as a whole and other domain items and inter-item correlations for the PWI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Life as a whole satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Standard of living</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>5.68*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Health</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Achievements in life</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal relationships</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How safe you feel</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Feeling part of your community</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>3.40*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Future security</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Spirituality</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PWI*</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N=306$; Adjusted $R^2 = .67$, $F = 78.98a$

*PWI is calculated by totalling results of the 8 domains. In all cases Pearson correlation coefficients are significant at the .01 level (2-tailed). * $p < .001$, **$p < .01$. 

Results for the PWI in the present study were compared with the 2012 Australian Unity Well-being Index survey results (see Table 5.7) in order to obtain a comparative understanding. The highest and the lowest mean scores recorded in the 2012 Well-being Index were ‘How safe you feel’ and ‘Feeling part of the community’, respectively, which was also the case in the present study. Furthermore, when the mean scores were arranged in a sequential order, results of the present study were very similar to the
sequential order reflected in the 2012 PWI survey results (See Figure 5.2). ‘Life as a whole satisfaction’ of the present study sample is 78.05 (SD, 21.04), whereas the Australian sample recorded 77.13 (SD, 16.38).

Table 5.7 Comparison of 2012 Australian Unity PWI results (Survey 27) with present study results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Australian Unity Well-being Index 2012 (Mean and SD)</th>
<th>Present Study Results (Mean and SD)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>78.40 (16.16)</td>
<td>83.89 (18.25)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>73.42 (19.30)</td>
<td>81.38 (20.77)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements in life</td>
<td>72.78 (18.54)</td>
<td>79.27 (20.75)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td>79.40 (20.56)</td>
<td>82.32 (21.97)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How safe you feel</td>
<td>80.38 (17.78)</td>
<td>84.58 (19.36)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling part of your community</td>
<td>71.90 (19.18)</td>
<td>73.33 (22.80)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future security</td>
<td>71.24 (19.72)</td>
<td>79.46 (20.85)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>78.37 (19.20)</td>
<td>81.64 (21.41)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Well-being Index</strong></td>
<td>75.40 (12.85)</td>
<td>77.27 (15.90)*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*transformed variable.

Note: Mean scores of the present sample are higher for all the life domains when compared with the Australian Unity 2012 sample; however, some of the differences are larger than the others.

Previous studies suggest that gender is an important variable in life satisfaction (Renn et al., 2009; Paiva et al., 2009; Wills, 2009). Accordingly, gender-based independent samples t-tests were conducted. Results showed that there were no differences between men and women in any of the domains, apart from a small but significant difference in the ‘personal relationship’ domain, $t (303) = 2.16, p < .001$, which suggested that women are more satisfied than their male counterparts in the relationship domain. However, there were no gender differences for the overall PWI Scale, indicating that there were no differences in overall level of life satisfaction between genders (Renn et al., 2009; Wills, 2009; Wills-Herrera, Islam & Hamilton, 2009).
5.4.3 Job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia

Research Question 1.3: Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia satisfied with their jobs?

Previous researchers have used two different approaches in interpreting JSS results (Spector et al., 2001): the normative approach (compare the target person/group with the norms of the sample set by the scale author) and the absolute approach (define some logical and arbitrary cut off points which distinguish satisfaction from dissatisfaction). In the present study, an absolute approach was used to interpret the results, not only due to its superior interpretative power and simplicity, but also due to non-availability of norms for an identical sample group.

As total job satisfaction level was assessed using all the 36 items in the scale, scores ranging from 36 to 108 reflect dissatisfaction, 144 to 216 reflect satisfaction, and 108 to 144 reflect ambivalence (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied). As shown in the Table 5.4, the mean of the overall job satisfaction score in the present study was 145.52, which is just near the borderline of the satisfaction range. Accordingly, these results reveal that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrant employees in Australia are moderately satisfied.
with their jobs, on average. ‘Satisfaction’ level ranged from 145.52, \( SD +/− 26.66 \) (i.e., 118.86 to 172.18). Out of the total sample of 306 participants, 209 fell within the satisfaction range, which is 68% from the overall sample. Gender-based independent samples \( t \)-tests on job satisfaction revealed no significant difference in job satisfaction between the genders, \( t (303) = 1.76, p > .001 \), even though women reported comparatively higher mean scores than their male counterparts (female, \( M=148.97, SD=26.44 \), and male, \( M=143.46, SD=26.66 \)). The JSS subscales were not confirmed by the factor analysis in the present study, and thus a facet level analysis was not conducted (see Appendix B).

In summary, the present study’s participants recorded an average of 77.27 points in the PWI, indicating that they feel satisfied with their overall lives in Australia. On average, they were most satisfied in the ‘safety’ domain and least satisfied in ‘Feeling part of your community’ domain. All the domains as a set contributed significantly towards ‘satisfaction with life as a whole’; however, ‘achievements in life’, ‘standards of living’, ‘feeling part of the community’ and ‘personal relationships’ were stronger predictors of overall life satisfaction than the other four domains. On average, Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are moderately satisfied with their jobs in Australia. Results for Research Questions 2 to 4 and results for Hypotheses are presented separately in Chapter 6, ‘Results Part II’.

The next section presents the correlations among study variables. These results will guide the inclusion of variables in the regression analyses reported in the next chapter.

### 5.4.4 Correlation analyses

Pearson’s product moment correlation analysis was conducted to examine bivariate relationships between the socio-demographic variables, social integration (at language, identity and behaviour subscale level), and life and job satisfaction. Relationships among social integration and life and job satisfaction were also tested. Details are discussed below and a Pearson’s Correlations matrix for all the study variables is presented in Table 5.8.
i) **Correlations among outcome variables**

The correlation results indicated that, as expected, language \((r=.32, p<.01)\), identity \((r=.35, p<.01)\) and behaviour \((r=.30, p<.01)\) integration were positively correlated with life satisfaction, suggesting that the more socially integrated the migrants are, the more they are satisfied with their lives. However, only identity was related to job satisfaction \((r=.35, p<.01)\). Furthermore, as expected, life satisfaction and job satisfaction were also positively correlated \((r=.44, p<.01)\).

ii) **Correlations among predictor and outcome variables**

Age at migration was expected to be negatively correlated with the social integration and life and job satisfaction. Age at migration was negatively correlated with the behaviour dimension of integration \((r=-.18, p<.01)\). However, age at migration failed to correlate significantly with identity and language dimensions of integration and with life satisfaction and job satisfaction.

Years since migration was positively correlated with the language \((r=.36, p<.01)\), identity \((r=.35, p<.01)\) and behaviour \((r=.28, p<.01)\) dimensions of integration. Life satisfaction increases with the time spent in the host country \((r=.26, p<.01)\), but job satisfaction was not related to years since migration.

English language skills were also positively correlated with the language \((r=.70, p<.01)\), identity \((r=.16, p<.05)\) and behaviour \((r=.32, p<.01)\) subscales. English language skills were positively correlated with life satisfaction \((r=.26, p<.01)\) and failed to correlate with job satisfaction.

Level of education was expected to correlate with social integration and life and job satisfaction. However, with the exception of the behaviour subscale \((r=.15, p<.01)\), level of education failed to correlate significantly with the other DVs.
Table 5.8 Pearson’s correlations matrix for all the study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Age at migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Highest education obtained country</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Feel completely Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Expect to return to COB</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Perceived inclusiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>English language skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Neighbourhood concentration of ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N= 306. $r < .10$ are non-significant and are not shown in the Table; $r < .14$| are significant at $p < .05$; $r > .15$| are significant at $p < .01$. (2-tailed). COB: Country of Birth, SES: Socio-Economic Status.
Contrary to expectations, neighbourhood concentration of ethnic migrants failed to correlate significantly with the social integration and life and job satisfaction. Pre-migration SES was correlated moderately with the language subscale \((r=.29, p<.01)\) and weakly with the behaviour subscale \((r=.13, p<.05)\), but failed to correlate with the identity subscale. Pre-migration SES was weakly and positively correlated with life satisfaction \((r=.14, p<.04)\), but failed to correlate with job satisfaction.

Perceived inclusiveness in the host society was positively related to all three subscales, language \((r=.23, p<.01)\), identity \((r=.26, p<.01)\), and behaviour \((r=.19, p<.01)\), as well as life satisfaction \((r=.41, p<.01)\) and job satisfaction \((r=.60, p<.01)\). These results suggest that feeling more included is associated with feeling more integrated and satisfied with one’s job and one’s life generally.

Expectation of returning to country of birth was negatively related to the language \((r=-.23, p<.01)\), identity \((r=-.33, p<.01)\), and behaviour \((r=.23, p<.01)\) subscales. Expectation of returning to country of birth was also negatively associated with life satisfaction \((r=-.26, p<.01)\) and job satisfaction \((r=-.23, p<.01)\).

In summary, at bivariate level, language, identity and behaviour integration were related to life satisfaction, but only identity was related to job satisfaction. Perceived inclusiveness, years since migration, and expectation to return to country of birth were correlated with all the subscales of social integration. However, neighbourhood concentration of ethnic migrants was not related to any of the subscales. Further relationships between variables are revisited in the next Chapter, with subsequent analyses being conducted at multivariate level. Variables that did not correlate with a particular DV (language, identity or behaviour integration, life satisfaction and job satisfaction) are not included in the multivariate analysis for that DV.

### 5.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter outlined the data analysis techniques and the preliminary data screening procedure employed in the present study. A statistical comparison between Indian and Sri Lankan groups was conducted (independent samples \(t\)-test and Mann-Whitney tests
and MANOVA) and the results were presented. Descriptive statistics related to the predictor and outcome variables, correlations between predictor and outcome variables, and the results related to first Research Questions were then presented.

Independent samples $t$-test and Mann-Whitney tests and MANOVA were conducted to determine if there were any significance differences between Sri Lankan and Indian subgroups on predictor and outcome variables. No significant differences were found in relation to the study variables, other than slight but significant differences in the language and identity components of social integration. However, the two groups were treated as a single group due to the inadequate sample size in the Indian group and commonalities across the two groups in the socio-demographic factors examined in the present study.

Language, identity and behaviour integration and life and job satisfaction were positively correlated, as expected. Years since migration and expectation to return to COB were positively correlated with language, identity and behaviour integration. However, neighbourhood concentration of ethnic migrants and level of education were not significantly correlated with any of the social integration subscales.

Results suggested that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are moderately socially integrated in relation to all the subscales, language being the most integrated and identity being the least integrated dimension, on average. Results also showed a high level of overall life satisfaction and a moderate level of job satisfaction among the participants, on average.

The next chapter presents the results related to Research Questions 2 to 4 and Hypotheses 1 to 11.
6.1 Chapter Introduction

Chapter 5 explained the data analysis procedure, descriptive statistics and the results related to Research Question 1. This chapter presents the results for Research Questions 2 to 4 and Hypotheses 1 to 11. The chapter is organised as follows. Results related to Research Question 2 are presented in Section 6.2. This section also presents the results for Hypotheses 1 to 8, which tested predictions about the relationships between socio-demographic variables and social integration dimensions. Section 6.3 presents the results related to Hypotheses 9 and 10. Section 6.4 presents mediated effect results related to Research Question 4 and Hypothesis 11. Finally, a chapter summary is provided in Section 6.5.

6.2 Factors that Significantly Influence Social Integration

6.2.1 Factors that significantly influence the language dimension of social integration

Research Question 2.1: What are the factors that significantly influence Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ language, identity and behavioural social integration?

Years since migration, age at migration, expectation to return to country of birth, perceived inclusiveness, and pre-migration SES were entered into a regression equation predicting language integration. IVs that were not significantly correlated with language integration at bivariate level were not entered into the regression. Results showed that (Table 6.1) the overall model was significant, $R=.48$, $F (5,299) = 17.95$, $p < .001$, indicating that the IVs as a set contributed significantly to the prediction of language integration. All IVs except age at migration contributed uniquely and positively to prediction. Pre-migration SES (variance explained, 6%, $B=.24$, $p<.001$) was the strongest predictor of language integration and years since migration was the next
The strongest predictor (variance explained, 5%, $B=0.24$, $p<0.001$), followed by perceived inclusiveness (variance explained, 2%, $B=0.15$, $p<0.005$) and expectation to return to country of birth (variance explained, 2%, $B=0.14$, $p<0.01$). The shared variance contributed by all five IVs was approximately 8%.

Table 6.1 Regression results for direct relationship between socio-demographic variables and the language subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age at migration</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04n.s.</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perceived inclusiveness</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expectation to return to COB</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.14***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R=0.48$, $R^2=0.23$, Adjusted $R^2=0.21$

*p<0.001
**p<0.005
***p<0.01
n.s. = non-significant

This regression analysis tested Hypotheses H1 (c), H2 (a), H4 (a), H5 (a), H6 (a), H7 (a) and H8 (a) (see pp. 14-15, above). The results indicate that years since migration is related to language integration, and thus H2 (a) was supported. Pre-migration SES and perceived inclusiveness are also positively related to language integration, and thus H5 (a) and H7 (a) were supported. Expectation of returning to COB is negatively related to language integration, and therefore H8 (b) was supported. Age at migration was not related to language integration, and thus H1(c) was supported. Level of education and neighbourhood concentration of ethnic migrants were unrelated to language integration, even at bivariate level, and therefore H4 (a) and H6 (b) were unsupported.

6.2.2 Factors that significantly influence the identity dimension of social integration

Years since migration, age at migration, expectation to return to COB, perceived inclusiveness, and English language skills were entered as predictors in a regression analysis predicting identity integration. IVs that were not significantly correlated with identity integration at bivariate level were not entered into the regression. The overall
model predicting the relationship between the IVs and identity integration was significant, \( R = .53, F (5,300) = 23.77, p < .001 \) (see Table 6.2, below). Of the five variables entered into the regression analysis, only three IVs contributed uniquely to the model. Age at migration and English language skills failed to contribute uniquely to prediction. Expectation of returning to country of birth was the strongest predictor of identity integration (variance explained, 12%, \( B =-.35, p <.001 \)), followed by years since migration (variance explained 5%, \( B = .27, p<.001 \)) and perceived inclusiveness (variance explained 3 %, \( B =.16, p<.005 \)), respectively. The IVs as a set explained 8% in shared variance for identity integration.

Table 6.2 Regression results for direct relationship between socio-demographic variables and the identity subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( sr^2 )</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age at migration</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07(^{n.s} )</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.27(^{*} )</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English language skills</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.06(^{n.s} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perceived inclusiveness</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.16(^{**} )</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expectation to return to COB</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-.35(^{*} )</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R =.53, R^2 = .28, \) Adjusted \( R^2 = .27 \)

\(^* p<.001\)

\(^{**} p<.005\)

n.s. = non significant

This regression analysis tested H1 (a), H2 (b), H3 (a), H4 (b), H5 (b), H6 (b), H7 (b) and H8 (b). The results indicate that years since migration and perceived inclusiveness were related to identity integration, and thus H2 (b) and H7 (b) were supported. Expectation of returning to COB was negatively related to identity integration, and therefore H8 (b) was supported. Age at migration and English language skills were not related to identity integration, and thus H1 (a) and H3 (a) were not supported. Likewise, level of education, pre-migration SES and neighbourhood concentration of ethnic migrants were unrelated to identity integration even at bivariate level and therefore were not entered into the regression analysis, and thus H4 (b), H5 (b) and H6 (b) were unsupported.
6.2.3 Factors that significantly influence the behaviour dimension of social integration

In the multiple regression analysis for behaviour integration, seven IVs (age at migration, years since migration, level of education, expectation to return to COB, perceived inclusiveness, English language skills, and pre-migration SES) were entered. Neighbourhood concentration of ethnic migrants was not entered into the regression analysis, as it was not significantly related to behaviour integration at bivariate level. Results are summarised in Table 6.3, below.

Table 6.3 Regression results for direct relationship between socio-demographic variables and the behaviour subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age at migration</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English language skills</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.02n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Perceived inclusiveness</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Expectation to return to COB</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .48$, $R^2 = .23$, Adjusted $R^2 = .21$

*p < .001

**p < .005

***p < .01

n.s. = non significant

The overall model was significant, $R = .48$, $F(7,297) = 12.88$, $p < .001$, indicating that these socio-demographic variables contributed significantly to the behaviour dimension of social integration. Pre-migration SES failed to contribute uniquely to the model. All the other predictors showed a positive relationship with behaviour integration, except age at migration, which showed a negative relationship with behaviour integration, as expected. English language skills was the strongest predictor of behaviour integration (variance explained, 6%, $B = .26$, $p < .001$), followed by age at migration (variance explained, 3%, $B = -.19$, $p < .001$), expectation to return to country of birth (variance explained, 3%, $B = .16$, $p < .003$), years since migration (variance explained, 2%, $B = .14$, $p < .003$).
The IVs as a set contributed 7% in shared variance to the prediction of behaviour integration.

This regression analysis tested H1 (b), H2 (c), H3 (b), H4 (b), H5 (b), H6 (c), H7 (c) and H8 (c). The results indicate that age at migration, years since migration, English language skills, level of education and expectation to return to COB were related to the behaviour dimension of integration. Therefore, H1 (b), H2 (c), H3 (b), H4 (b), H8 (c) were supported. However, pre-migration SES and perceived inclusiveness and neighbourhood concentration of ethnic migrants were not related to behaviour integration, and thus Hypotheses 5 (b), 6 (c) and 7 (c) were not supported.

In summary, language integration was associated with years since migration, pre-migration SES, perceived inclusiveness, and expectation to return to COB, in that order. Identity integration was influenced by expectation to return to COB, years since migration, and perceived inclusiveness. Behaviour integration was influenced by English language skills, age at migration, expectation to return to country of birth, years since migration, level of education, and perceived inclusiveness. These results are summarised in Table 6.4, below. The results suggest that expectation to return to country of birth and years since migration are the socio-demographic factors that consistently influence social integration at dimension level. A summary of the results for Research Question 2.1 and Hypotheses 1 to 8 is presented in Tables 6.4 and 6.5, below.

Table 6.4 Socio-demographic factors that directly influence social integration at language, identity and behaviour dimension level, presented in order of magnitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
<td>Expectation to return to COB</td>
<td>English language skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
<td>Age at migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Expectation to return to COB</td>
<td>Perceived inclusiveness</td>
<td>Expectation return to COB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perceived inclusiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>Hypotheses supported/unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong> : Age at migration is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Negatively related to host country identity integration</td>
<td>(a) Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Negatively related to host country behaviour integration</td>
<td>(b) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Not related to host country language integration</td>
<td>(c) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong> : Years since migration is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Positively related to host country language integration</td>
<td>(a) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Positively related to host country identity integration</td>
<td>(b) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Positively related to host country behaviour integration</td>
<td>(c) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong> : Host country language proficiency is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Not related to host country identity integration</td>
<td>(a) Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Positively related to host country behaviour integration</td>
<td>(b) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4</strong> : Level of education is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Positively related to host country language integration</td>
<td>(a) Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Positively related to host country identity integration</td>
<td>(b) Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Positively related to host country behaviour integration</td>
<td>(c) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5</strong> : Pre-migration SES is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Positively related to host country language integration</td>
<td>(a) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Positively related to host country identity integration</td>
<td>(b) Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Positively related to host country behaviour integration</td>
<td>(c) Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6</strong> : Neighbourhood concentration of ethnic migrants is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Negatively related to host country language integration</td>
<td>(a) Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Negatively related to host country identity integration</td>
<td>(b) Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Negatively related to host country behaviour integration</td>
<td>(c) Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H7</strong> : Perceived inclusiveness is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Positively related to host country language integration</td>
<td>(a) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Positively related to host country identity integration</td>
<td>(b) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Positively related to host country behaviour integration</td>
<td>(c) Unsupported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H8</strong> : Expectation of return to COB is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Positively related to host country language integration</td>
<td>(a) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Positively related to host country identity integration</td>
<td>(b) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Positively related to host country behaviour integration</td>
<td>(c) Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.4 Factors that significantly influence life and job satisfaction

Research Question 2.2: What are the factors that significantly influence Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ life satisfaction, 2.3: job satisfaction?

i) Relationship between socio-demographic factors and life satisfaction

Years since migration, age at migration, expectation to return to COB, perceived inclusiveness, English language skills, and pre-migration SES were entered in a regression equation predicting life satisfaction. Level of education was not included in the equation due to non-significant correlations with life satisfaction at bivariate level. The overall model demonstrated a significant relationship between the predictors and life satisfaction, $R=.51$, $F (6, 298) = 17.62, p < .001$. The unstandardised ($B$) and standardised regression coefficient ($\beta$) for each variable, semipartial correlation ($sr^2$) and significance levels of $\beta$ are shown in Table 6.6.

Table 6.6 Multiple regression results for socio-demographic variables and life satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years since migration</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation to return to COB</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived inclusiveness</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language skills</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.05 n.s.</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at migration</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07 n.s.</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R=.51$, $R^2 = .26$, Adjusted $R^2 = .25$

*p<.001

**p<.005

***p<.01

n.s. = non significant

Pre-migration SES and age at migration failed to predict life satisfaction significantly. All the other IVs positively contributed to the prediction of life satisfaction. Perceived inclusiveness was the strongest predictor of life satisfaction (11% variance explained, $B = .35$, $p < .001$), followed by years since migration (3% of variance explained, $B = .19$, $p < .005$), expectation to return to COB (2% variance explained, $B = .15$, $p < .005$) and
English language skills (2% variance explained, $B = .15, p < .05$). The shared variance contributed by all IVs as a set was 8%.

**ii) Relationship between socio-demographic variables and job satisfaction**

Expectation of return to COB and perceived inclusiveness were entered in a regression equation predicting job satisfaction. Other IVs were not included in the equation due to non-significant correlations with job satisfaction at bivariate level. The overall model was significant, $R = .61, F (2,303) = 92.01, p < .001$, indicating that expectation to return to COB and perceived inclusiveness contributed significantly to the prediction of job satisfaction (see Table 6.7). Perceived inclusiveness was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction (variance explained 32%, $B = .58, p < .001$); however, expectation yo return to COB was also a significant predictor of job satisfaction (variance explained 2%, $B = .11, p < .01$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expectation to return to COB</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceived inclusiveness</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = .61, R^2 = .38, \text{Adjusted } R^2 = .37$

* $p < .001$
** $p < .01$

In summary, the results related to Research Questions 2.2 and 2.3 suggest that perceived inclusiveness, years since migration, expectation to return to COB and English language skills were significantly related to participants’ life satisfaction, whereas expectation to return to COB and perceived inclusiveness were related to job satisfaction.

In the next section, the associations between language, identity and behaviour integration and life and job satisfaction are examined to establish whether one of the initial conditions for mediation is met (i.e., whether there is a significant relationship between the mediator and the outcome variables, in this case between social integration [proposed mediator] and life and job satisfaction [outcomes]).
6.3 Relationship between the level of social integration and life satisfaction and job satisfaction

Research Question 3.1: Is there a relationship between language, identity and behavioural social integration and life satisfaction and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia?

The correlation results indicated that language (r=.32, p<.01), identity (r=.35, p<.01) and behaviour (r=.30, p<.01) integration were positively correlated with life satisfaction, suggesting the more socially integrated migrants are, the more satisfied they are with their lives. Therefore, language, identity and behaviour were regressed on life satisfaction: the overall model was significant: R=.41, F (3,302) = 20.96, p < .001, indicating that social integration significantly contributes to life satisfaction among skilled migrants in Australia. However, behaviour integration failed to contribute uniquely to the model. Identity contributed more (variance explained 5%, B = .24, p<.001) than language (variance explained 3%, B = .19, p<.001) integration. Thus Hypothesis 9 was supported.

Only identity integration was significantly related to job satisfaction at bivariate level (r=.35, p<.01). Therefore Hypothesis 10 was only partially supported.

In accordance with the results for Research Question 2.1, for the life satisfaction analysis, four different initial variables (years since migration, expectation to return to COB, perceived inclusiveness, pre-migration SES) and all three social integration mediators (language, identity and behaviour) met the initial criteria for mediation suggested by Preacher and Hayes (2008) and could be included in the mediated effect model in the present study. Hence, running multiple models with the same predictors but alternate mediators and covariates, which essentially amounts to testing the same model in each instance, was suggested (‘pers comm’, in an e-mail, 26 July 2012: see also Appendix I). Only three initial variables (years since migration, perceived inclusiveness, expectation to return to COB) and one social integration mediator (identity) met the criteria for inclusion in the mediated effect model for job satisfaction. Hence the mediated effect analysis for job satisfaction involved running three single
mediator models, alternating predictors and covariates. A summary of the models tested is listed in Table 6.8.


6.4 Mediated Regression Analyses

6.4.1 Mediating effect of language, identity and behaviour integration between socio-demographic factors and life and job satisfaction

A mediator is defined as a variable that explains the relationship between a predictor and an outcome (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Frazier et al., 2004). The most common method of testing mediation in psychological research was developed by David A. Kenny and his colleagues (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Frazier et al., 2004). According to Baron and Kenny (1986), there are four steps for testing a mediation effect. These are: (a) establish a significant relationship between the predictor and the outcome variable; (b) establish a relationship between the predictor and the mediator; (c) establish a relationship between the mediator and the outcome variable; and (d) show that the strength of the relationship between predictor and the outcome variable is significantly reduced when the mediator is introduced to the regression equation (Frazier et al., 2004). If there is complete mediation, the relationship between the predictor and the outcome variable will be zero after the mediator is introduced. If there is partial mediation, the relationship between the predictor and the outcome variable will be significantly lower (but it is greater than zero) when the mediator is introduced to the equation.

In the present study language, identity and behaviour dimensions of integration were hypothesised to mediate the relationship between the socio-demographic variables and life and job satisfaction. Figures 6.1 and 6.2 show examples of Direct Effect and Mediated Effect Models.
According to the Mediated Effect Model, the effect of an initial variable (e.g., years since migration) on an outcome variable (e.g., life satisfaction) can be divided into a direct component (c') and an indirect component (ab) (Kenny, 2011). For the mediated effect to be supported in this example, (a) years since migration must affect life satisfaction (path c' of Figure 6.2), (b) years since migration must affect identity integration (path a of Figure 6.2), (c) identity integration must affect life satisfaction (path b of Figure 6.2), and the effect of years since migration on life satisfaction (path c' in Figure 6.2) must be either eliminated (complete mediated effect) or reduced (partial mediated effect) when identity integration is controlled (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Kenny, 2011). In the case of partial mediation, years since migration still can impact on life satisfaction after controlling for identity integration.

More recently, researchers have suggested a significant direct effect of X on Y is not necessary for mediation to occur, because that criterion can be satisfied when the other three conditions are satisfied (Kenny et al., 1998; Preacher & Hayes, 2008). This approach to mediation assumes only criteria b, c' and d indicated in Baron and Kenny’s approach (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Multiple mediator models test the total indirect effect that an initial variable transmits to an outcome variable via a set of mediators (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). The models also test the specific indirect effect attached to
each mediator, because sometimes it is possible to show a significant specific indirect effect even though the total indirect effect is statistically non-significant due to a suppression effect (MacKinnon, Warsi & Dwyer, 1995). As it is superior to the other suggested methods, Bias-Corrected Bootstrap 95% confidence intervals were computed from 5000 bootstrap samples to examine the significance of the mediated effect (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). An SPSS macro script written by Preacher and Hayes (2008) to test multiple mediation was employed to run all models in the current study.

Steps for establishing a mediated effect were tested earlier in this chapter by establishing relationships between socio-demographics (predictor variables) and (a) the social integration variables (proposed mediators) and (b) the outcome variables of life and job satisfaction. The mediated pathways shown in Table 6.8 are the pathways that met the initial conditions for mediation, and thus the pathways for which full mediation analyses were conducted.

Table 6.8 A summary of multiple mediator model content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Mediator/s</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Co-variates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years since migration</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Expectation of return to COB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation to return to COB</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Expectation of return to COB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation of return to COB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since migration</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation of return to COB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation of return to COB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of return to COB</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Years since migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following section separately describes the results related to the mediated relationship between each of the socio-demographic variables and life and job satisfaction via the social integration mediators in the pathways shown in Table 6.8. (Results related to Research Question 4.1, ‘Is the relationship between socio-demographic factors and life satisfaction mediated by language, identity and behavioural social integration?’ and Research Question 4.2, ‘Is the relationship between socio-demographic factors and job satisfaction mediated by language, identity and behavioural social integration?’ are presented next).

\[ i \) Total and specific indirect effect of years since migration on life satisfaction

Years since migration and the mediators (language, identity and behaviour) were regressed on life satisfaction simultaneously. The model tested in the analysis to follow is shown in Figure 6.3. Expectation of return to COB, perceived inclusiveness, and pre-migration SES were entered as covariates, given their correlation with the life satisfaction DV.  

![Figure 6.3 Total and specific indirect effect of years since migration on life satisfaction](image)

As indicated by the results, the total and direct effects of years since migration on life satisfaction are .2321, \( p < .001 \) and .1320, \( p < .08 \) respectively. The difference between the total and the direct effect is the indirect effect through language, identity and behaviour, with a point estimate of .1001 and a 95% BCA (Biased corrected and accelerated confidence intervals) bootstrap CI of .0494 to .1675. The total mediated effect of years since migration on life satisfaction through the three mediators was significant, as its confidence interval did not contain zero (BCA 95% CI lower = .0494,
BCA 95% CI upper = .1675, where CI does not contain zero). Thus, social integration partially mediated the relationship between years since migration and life satisfaction. However, an examination of specific indirect effect results indicated a significant effect of years since migration on life satisfaction through the identity dimension of integration only (BCA 95% CI lower = .0076, BCA 95% CI upper = .0997, where CI does not contain zero). Thus, the results supported only pathway b, but not pathways a and c', as shown in Figure 6.3, above.

**ii) Total and specific indirect effect of expectation to return to COB on life satisfaction**

Expectation of return to COB and the mediators (language, identity and behaviour integration) were regressed on life satisfaction simultaneously. The model tested in the analysis to follow is shown in Figure 6.4. Years since migration, perceived inclusiveness, and pre-migration SES were entered as covariates.

As indicated by the results, the total and direct effects of expectation to return to COB on life satisfaction are .0750, \( p < .003 \) and .0439, \( p < .10 \), respectively. The difference between the total and the direct effect is the total indirect effect through language, identity and behaviour, with a point estimate of .0217 and a 95% BCA (Biased corrected and accelerated confidence interval) bootstrap CI of .0139 to .0625. The results indicated that the difference between total and indirect effect of expectation to return to COB on life satisfaction is different from zero. Also it can be seen that the total indirect effect of expectation to return to COB through the three mediators was
significant (BCA 95% CI lower = 0.0139, BCA 95% CI upper = 0.0625, where CI does not contain zero), indicating that social integration partially mediated the relationship between expectation to return to COB and life satisfaction. An examination of specific indirect effect results indicated a significant effect of expectation to return to COB on life satisfaction through the identity dimension of integration only (BCA 95% CI lower 0.0023, BCA 95% CI upper = 0.0470, where CI does not contain zero). The specific indirect effect of expectation to return to COB on life satisfaction through language and behaviour was not statistically significant. Thus the results supported only pathway b, but not pathways a and c, as shown in Figure 6.4, above.

iii) Total and specific indirect effect of perceived inclusiveness on life satisfaction

Perceived inclusiveness and the mediators (language and identity) were regressed on life satisfaction simultaneously. The model tested in the analysis to follow is shown in Figure 6.5. Years since migration, expectation to return to COB and pre-migration SES were entered as covariates.

As indicated by the results, the total and direct effects of perceived inclusiveness on life satisfaction are 0.1875, \( p < 0.001 \) and 0.1645, \( p < 0.001 \), respectively. The difference between the total and the direct effect is the total indirect effect through language, identity and behaviour, with a point estimate of 0.0230 and a 95% BCA (Biased corrected and accelerated confidence interval) bootstrap CI of 0.0092 to 0.0446. The results indicated that the difference between total and indirect effect of perceived inclusiveness on life satisfaction is different from zero. The total indirect effect of
perceived inclusiveness through the two mediators was significant (BCA 95% CI lower = .0092, BCA 95% CI upper = .0446, where CI does not contain zero). The examination of specific indirect effect results indicated a significant effect of perceived inclusiveness on life satisfaction through both the language and identity dimensions of integration (Language: BCA 95% CI lower = .0015, BCA 95% CI upper = .0261, Identity: BCA 95% CI lower = .0026, BCA 95% CI upper = .0303, where CI does not contain zero in either instance), suggesting that both the language and identity dimensions of integration mediate the relationship between perceived inclusiveness and life satisfaction. Thus the results supported pathways a and b, as shown in Figure 6.5, above.

**iv) Specific indirect effect of Pre-migration SES on life satisfaction**

Pre-migration SES and the language mediator were regressed on life satisfaction simultaneously. The model tested in the analysis to follow is shown in Figure 6.6. Years since migration, expectation to return to country of birth, host country language skills and perceived inclusiveness were entered as covariates.

As indicated by the results, the total and direct effects of pre-migration SES on life satisfaction are .3110, \( p = .36 \) and .2545, \( p = .45 \), respectively. BCA results indicated that the mediated effect of pre-migration SES through language was not significant (BCA 95% CI lower = -.0068, BCA 95% CI upper = .2174, where CI contains zero). This result shows that language integration does not mediate the relationship between pre-migration SES and life satisfaction. Therefore the mediated pathway was not supported by the results.

**v) Specific indirect effect of years since migration on job satisfaction**

Years since migration and the identity mediator were regressed on job satisfaction simultaneously. The model tested in the analysis to follow is shown in Figure 6.7. Expectation of return to COB and perceived inclusiveness were entered as covariates. It was found that the mediated effect of years since migration through identity was not
significant (BCA 95% CI lower = -.1225, BCA 95% CI upper =1.1886, where CI contains zero). This result shows that identity does not mediate the relationship between years since migration and job satisfaction. Therefore the mediated pathway was not supported by the results.

![Figure 6.7 Specific indirect effect of years since migration on job satisfaction](image)

**vi) Specific indirect effect of perceived inclusiveness on job satisfaction**

Perceived inclusiveness and the identity dimension of social integration were regressed on job satisfaction simultaneously. The model tested in the analysis to follow is shown in Figure 6.8. Expectation of return to COB and years since migration were entered as covariates. Results revealed that the mediated effect of perceived inclusiveness through identity was not significant (BCA 95% CI lower = -.0242, BCA 95% CI upper =.3599, where CI contains zero). Therefore the mediated pathway was not supported by the results.

![Figure 6.8 Specific indirect effect of perceived inclusiveness on job satisfaction](image)

**vii) Specific indirect effect of expectation to return to country of birth on job satisfaction**

Expectation of return to COB and the identity mediator were regressed on job satisfaction simultaneously. The model tested in the analysis to follow is shown in Figure 6.9. Years since migration and perceived inclusiveness were entered as covariates. The results indicated that the mediated effect of expectation to return to country of birth through identity was not significant (BCA 95% CI lower = -.0775, BCA 95% CI upper =.6006, where CI does contain zero). Therefore the mediated pathway was not supported by the results.
Figure 6.9 Specific indirect effect of expectation to return to country of birth on job satisfaction

In summary, as shown in Table 6.9 below, results for Research Questions 4.1 and 4.2 suggest that language integration mediated between perceived inclusiveness and life satisfaction, identity integration mediated between years since migration, expectation to return to country of birth and perceived inclusiveness and life satisfaction, and behaviour integration did not mediate between any of the tested socio-demographic variables and life satisfaction. None of the social integration dimensions mediated between socio-demographics and job satisfaction. A summary of the mediated effect results is shown in Table 6.9.

Table 6.9 A summary of significant and non-significant indirect effect between socio-demographic variables and life and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Mediator/s</th>
<th>Lower and upper Confidence Intervals *</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years since migration</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>-.0088 / .0936</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>.0076 / .0997</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>-.0185 / .0705</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation to return to COB</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>-.0002 / .0216</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>.0023 / .0470</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>-.0034 / .0211</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>.0015 / .0261</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>.0026 / .0303</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-migration SES</td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>-.0068 / .2174</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year since migration</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>-.1225 / 1.1886</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1225 / 1.1886</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>-.0242 / .3599</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.0242 / .3599</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of return to COB</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>-.0775 / .6006</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.0775 / .6006</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*95% biased corrected and accelerated confidence intervals
6.4.2 Relationship between the level of job satisfaction and life satisfaction

Research Question 3.2: Is there a relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia?

Life satisfaction and job satisfaction were positively correlated \( r = .44, p < .01 \). In order to test Hypothesis 11, job satisfaction was regressed on life satisfaction (after controlling for social integration in its language, identity and behaviour dimensions, expectation to return to COB and perceived inclusiveness). Results showed that (Table 6.10) the overall model was significant: \( R = .56, F (6,305) = 23.63, p < .001 \), which indicated that there is a significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Job satisfaction significantly contributed to life satisfaction of the participants (variance explained 6\%, \( B = .29, p < .001 \)), Therefore Hypothesis 11 was supported.

Table 6.10 Regression results for relationship between life and job satisfaction after controlling for social integration, perceived inclusiveness and expectation to return to COB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( sr^2 )</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15n.s</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11n.s</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10n.s</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perceived Inclusiveness</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14n.s</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expectation to return to COB</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06n.s</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R = .56, R^2 = .32, \) Adjusted \( R^2 = .31 \)

*p < .001

**p < .01

n.s. = non-significant
6.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the results for Research Questions 2 to 4 and Hypotheses 1 to 11. It was found that language integration was positively predicted by years since migration, pre-migration SES, perceived inclusiveness, and negatively associated with expectation to return to COB, in that order. Identity integration was negatively influenced by expectation to return to COB and positively influenced by years since migration and perceived inclusiveness. Behaviour integration was positively influenced by English language skills, and negatively influenced by age at migration and expectation to return to COB, and positively influenced by years since migration, level of education and perceived inclusiveness. In addition, perceived inclusiveness, years since migration, and English language skills were positively and significantly related to life satisfaction, whereas expectation to return to COB was negatively related to life satisfaction and job satisfaction. Perceived inclusiveness was positively related to job satisfaction. Gender based analyses of the present study found that gender is not an important variable in predicting social integration, life and job satisfaction among the participants. However, gender orientation was not measured in the present study and could be considered in the future research (see Section 7.4 - Suggestions for Further Research).

Mediation analysis results suggested that perceived inclusiveness led to higher language integration, which in turn led to higher life satisfaction. Likewise, years since migration, expectation to return to country of birth and perceived inclusiveness led to higher identity integration, which in turn led to higher life satisfaction. However, behaviour integration did not mediate the relationship between any of the included socio-demographic variables and life satisfaction. Likewise, social integration did not mediate the relationship between included socio-demographic variables and job satisfaction.

The findings of the current study are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Chapter Introduction

The previous chapter presented the results for the research questions and hypotheses. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the results related to the research questions and hypotheses that directed this study with reference to the literature reviewed earlier in the thesis.

This chapter is organised as follows. Section 7.2 provides an overview of the research based on the Conceptual Framework developed for the study. The aims of the research are briefly revisited. Section 7.3 discusses key findings in relation to the research questions and the hypotheses in detail, with reference to previous research findings. While the research has some strengths and important findings, there are also limitations. Section 7.4 presents these limitations and how they could be addressed in future studies. The findings of this research contribute to an understanding of social integration and life and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Section 7.5 presents the implications of the research findings and the contribution of this research to the literature. Finally, the overall conclusions of the research are presented in Section 7.6.

7.2 An Overview of the Current Study

As shown in the Conceptual Framework in Figure 2.2 (p. 64), the current research aims to enhance understanding of social integration and life satisfaction and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia and, in particular, the extent to which various socio-demographic factors influence social integration. This research also explored the association between social integration and life satisfaction and the association between social integration and job satisfaction. Furthermore, the mediating effect of social integration (language, identity and behaviour as multiple mediators)
between IVs (socio-demographic, variables) and DVs (life and job satisfaction) was examined.

Currently, India and Sri Lanka are first and fourth largest skilled migrant-sending countries to Australia; thus migrants from these countries are a large minority group in present-day Australia. However, there is a dearth of literature that focuses on this migrant group. Therefore, the present study focused on Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.

Literature on migrants’ adaptation to host societies has identified social integration as a positive indicator of migrants’ contribution towards the economic growth of host societies (Drever & Hoffmeister, 2008; Hawthorne, 2002; Helliwell & Huang, 2010; Wulff & Dharmalingam, 2008), and as a factor that minimises social issues which can arise through differences and inequalities among migrants who come from different parts of the world (Hughes, 2002; Kwok-bun & Plüss, 2013). Therefore, exploring the level of social integration among the current study participants is one of the primary aims of this study. Social integration was assessed in terms of host country language, identity and behaviour.

Past research findings are inconsistent in regard to the association between socio-demographic factors and social integration, and the factors investigated have varied across studies. In the present study, the association between social integration and the following eight demographic factors was tested: (a) age at migration, (b) years since migration, (c) English language skills, (d) level of education, (e) pre-migration SES, (f) neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants, (g) perceived inclusiveness, and (h) expectation of returning to country of birth. These factors were chosen because they have emerged as consistent predictors of social integration among migrants across many studies (Dalgaard & Thapa, 2007; De Bree et al., 2010; King & Mai, 2003; Lu et al., 2012; Martinovic et al., 2010; Miller et al., 2009; Remennick, 2003; 2004).

In addition to social integration, the level of life satisfaction among the participants was assessed. Although a predominant motive for individuals to migrate to developed countries is to improve their life satisfaction (Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Sam, 1998;
Verkuyten, 2008), some research findings (e.g., Amit, 2010a; Berry, 1998; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Reitz et al., 2009; Safi, 2010; Sabharwal, 2011; Verkuyten, 2008) suggest that life satisfaction is relatively low among ethnic minorities in Western countries. Due to the limited evidence on Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ life satisfaction in Australia, the present study explored overall, as well as at domain level, life satisfaction among such migrants. The following domains of life satisfaction were assessed: (a) standard of living, (b) health, (c) achievements in life, (d) personal relationships, (e) safety, (f) sense of community, (g) future security, and (h) spirituality of life.

Ea et al. (2008) have stated that job satisfaction data can be utilised to make important decisions regarding skilled migrants (e.g., how fairly they are being treated in the workplace and whether the migrants are satisfied with their earnings, career advancement opportunities and work relationships). Although skilled migration is a popular way of sourcing employees for many developed nations including Australia, there has been relatively little literature published on the level of job satisfaction among skilled migrants (Al Alriss et al., 2013; Roberts, 2011). Therefore, the present research also explored job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.

In addition, relationships between social integration and life satisfaction and social integration and job satisfaction among such migrants in Australia were also explored. Furthermore, social integration (language, identity and behaviour subscales) was theorised as a mediator between socio-demographic variables and life and job satisfaction, and possible mediating effects of language, identity and behaviour integration were examined. Additionally, the relationship between life satisfaction and job satisfaction was examined.

Findings relating to the research questions and hypotheses are discussed in the next section. The section begins with Research Question 1 (Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia: (1.1) socially integrated at language, identity and behaviour subscale level? (1.2) satisfied with their lives? (1.3) satisfied with their jobs?). It is important to state that the findings of the present study need to be interpreted in the context of demographic characteristics discussed in Section 4.3.3 (for
instance, educated skilled migrants mainly employed in professional jobs, with a high level of English language proficiency and an average age of around 38 years, who have been living in Australia for an average of eight years).

7.3 Discussion of Results for Research Questions and Hypotheses

7.3.1 Social integration of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia

Research Question 1.1: Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia socially integrated in terms of language, identity and behaviour?

Research Question 1.1 concerned the extent to which Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are integrated into Australian society in terms of language, identity and behaviour. The Language, Identity and Behaviour Acculturation Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001) was employed to measure social integration. Notably, past research has used the LIB scale in humanitarian migrant-related studies (Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Birman, 2006; 2011; Ho & Birman, 2010; Trickett & Birman, 2005); hence the current study also tested the validity of the LIB scale for a skilled migrant sample.

The present study results suggest that the majority of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants were moderately socially integrated across language, identity and behaviour dimensions. Therefore, the frequently documented (Berry et al., 2006; Birman, 2006; George & Chaze, 2009; Sakamoto, 2007; Valento, 2009) low level of social integration among first-generation ethnic migrants in Western societies was not observed in the this study. Although the average scores were relatively consistent across the three social integration dimensions, the language dimension recorded the highest average score, followed by behaviour and identity, respectively.

In a multicultural society like Australia, where migrants have the access to materials, e.g., food and clothing, and activities, cultural functions and entertainment options from their own cultures on a daily basis, migrants have the option to be bi-culturally competent (Adachi, 2011; Au et al., 1998; George & Chaze, 2009). As a result, migrants in the current study may not fully integrate into Australian society or fully
separate themselves from it, thus explaining Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ moderate level of social integration. Another explanation could be that nowadays technology such as the internet facilitates the maintenance of connections with relatives and friends in one’s home country (Sakamoto, 2007). As they remain active in their own cultures and still maintain social connections with their home countries, they may be less reliant on mainstreamers for social connections and emotional support. Furthermore, given that India is the first and Sri Lanka is the fourth largest skilled migrant-sending society to Australia, the large representation of those groups may limit such migrants from fully socially integrating into Australian society (Martinovic et al., 2009), because they can maintain close ties with co-ethnics.

On the other hand, although integration was not high in the current study, it was higher than might be expected based on analysis in past studies, which have reported low integration among migrants (Adachi, 2011; Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Ho & Birman, 2010; Martinovic et al., 2009; Stark and Jakubek, 2013). Past studies have focused on migrant categories other than skilled migrants. The current study findings suggest that skilled migrants may be more capable of integrating into Western societies than other migrant categories such as humanitarian migrants because of their higher level of education, skills and occupational background.

As noted above, integration in the language dimension was higher than integration in the identity and behaviour dimensions in the present study context. One of the key selection criteria for skilled migration is a high level of English language proficiency. Furthermore, English is the second official language in Sri Lanka and in India, and thus it is a prominently used language within higher educational institutions and is also the official language of the majority of workplaces in these two countries (Bandyopadhyay, 2011; Kumar & Nevid, 2010). Therefore, it is not surprising to see higher scores for language integration among the present study participants.

With regard to identity integration, past research findings (Collins, 2013; Sam, 1998; Trickett & Birman, 2005) suggest that first-generation ethnic migrants prefer to maintain their own ethnic identity, as opposed to developing a high level of host country identification. In line with these findings, the present study participants reported lower
scores for identity integration compared to host country language and behaviour integration, on average. This finding is also consistent with the notion that ethnic identity is singular, and it is unlikely that one person can feel multiple ethnic identities (Birman, 2006; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Martinovic et al., 2009; Worrell & Gardner-Kitt, 2006). The results may also reflect the age of the present sample (Worrell & Gardner-Kitt, 2006): ethnic identity is mainly developed in adolescence and the average age at migration among the present study participants was 30 years, with an average current age of 38 years. In line with Worrell and Gardner-Kitt (2006), it can be argued that these skilled migrants had already established their ethnic identity and cultural values when they left their county as adults (see also Ho, 2012). In addition, the freedom to maintain one’s own ethnic identity in multicultural societies (Ho & Birman, 2010) may be another explanation for the participants reporting comparatively lower scores in the Australian identity dimension. However, the present study did not measure identity related to country of origin, and it is unclear to what extent Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants identify with their country of origin, that is, whether it is more or less than their identification with Australia. This could be investigated in future studies.

Remennick (2004) identified host country language skills as a key trigger for reshaping migrants’ host country identity. Consistent with this, the present study also found a moderate correlation between language and identity dimensions, suggesting that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants with a high level of English language proficiency had a stronger Australian identity.

It may be worthwhile to assess social integration among Sri Lankan and Indian humanitarian migrant groups in Australia, so that the present study results, which reflect skilled migrants’ integration, can be compared to other migrant groups in order to confirm whether social integration does differ across migration categories in Australia.
Research Question 1.2: Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia satisfied with their lives?

i) Overall life satisfaction

Research Question 1.2 concerned whether Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are satisfied with their lives in Australia. Life satisfaction was assessed using the Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006), which has been used with Australian samples. This enabled the results for the present sample to be compared with broader Australian community samples. According to the results, the majority of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants were satisfied with their lives in Australia. The present study participants’ life satisfaction scores were above the average Australian’s life satisfaction score, as reported in Cummins’ (2012) study.

Given that the present study involved a skilled migrant sample, it is possible that their education, skills, and better-paid jobs may have contributed to higher levels of life satisfaction than would be found in the Australian population taken as a whole. Even though some studies (Amit, 2010a; Choudhry, 2001; Sam, 1998; Sabharwal, 2011; Verkuylten, 2008) show that culturally distinct migrants are less satisfied in host societies, Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants were satisfied with their lives in Australia. Possible explanations for these findings are outlined below.

Past research has shown that perceived discrimination might influence the life satisfaction of migrants (Verkuylten, 2008). Perhaps skilled migrants in this sample are less likely to be discriminated against because of their educational background, English language skills and comparatively higher income. In addition, Australia is considered a ‘migrant-friendly’ country with positive multicultural policies towards migrants. As a result of these policies, ethnic skilled migrants may feel more welcome and included. These factors could be expected to improve Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ life satisfaction in Australia. In support of this explanation, the present study results also reported that these skilled migrants showed high scores on perceived inclusiveness.
Past research (Amit, 2010a; Martinovic et al., 2009) has found that co-ethnic group size can influence the life satisfaction of migrants in host societies. The present study results also showed that the ‘personal relationship’ domain influenced ‘satisfaction with life as a whole’ in this sample significantly. There is a large Sri Lankan (86,412) and Indian (295,362) migrant population living in Australia (DIAC, 2013), and thus these migrants may receive more support from friends and relatives from the same ethnic background compared to migrant groups with lower representation. This may lead migrants to accept Australia as their ‘home’ and may contribute positively to their life satisfaction.

Another reason for relatively high life satisfaction scores among the present study participants could be that skilled migrants have a choice of where they want to live, either to live permanently in the host country or to return to their country of birth if they are unhappy with their lives in the host country. In the case of other migrant categories such as humanitarian migrants, rather than choosing their own destination, they may be forced to migrate to another country due to unfavourable circumstances in their country of birth (Saﬁ, 2010; Sam, 1998; Verkuyten, 2008). Thus skilled migrants may also be more satisfied with their lives in host countries because it is their own choice of destination. Future studies could compare life satisfaction between humanitarian and skilled migrants in Australia.

While social and lifestyle improvements between the migrant sending and receiving societies could also account for the high level of life satisfaction among these skilled migrants (Diener & Diener, 1995; Morrison et al., 2011; Pan et al., 2008), the aim of the present study was not to assess pre-migration versus post-migration life satisfaction of the participants. Future studies in the field could compare the differences between pre- and post-migration life satisfaction of skilled migrants to determine whether factors that are offered in a Western country, such as a better quality of life, lower levels of crime and corruption, greater opportunities to achieve life aspirations, better medical care and positive social conditions are related to changes in life satisfaction.

Results related to ‘domain level’ life satisfaction are discussed below.
ii) Level of life satisfaction at domain level

In the present study, the four domains of life satisfaction that recorded the highest scores were ‘safety’, ‘standard of living’, ‘personal relationships’ and ‘spirituality’. Few studies have found ‘safety’ to be a high-scoring domain (see Cummins, 2012; Tomyn & Cummins, 2011). Developing counties experience comparatively higher social corruption, crime, poverty and political instability than developed countries, which leads to ‘safety’ issues (Wills, 2009). It could be that skilled migrants in Australia feel safer than before migration, and hence it is not surprising to see high scores for the ‘safety’ domain in the present study.

The ‘standards of living’ domain recorded the second highest mean score. It can be argued that life standards are generally higher when people live in Western countries, given better access to services such as medical care than are found in developing countries (Cummins, 2006; Diener, 1996, 2003). Also, individuals have more choices for their lives in terms of fulfilling basic needs such as food, shelter, education and career choices in a Western country than in a materially deprived country in the third world (Wills, 2009). Therefore, it is reasonable to attribute high scores for the ‘standards of living’ domain in the present study to the improvements experienced by skilled migrants who come from developing countries.

Consistent with some past research (Cummins, 2012; Tiliouine et al., 2006), the present study participants also showed comparatively higher scores for the ‘personal relationships’ domain, on average. The ‘spirituality’ domain received the fourth highest mean score in the present study. The skilled migrants in the present study come from cultural backgrounds with deep religious and spiritual beliefs stemming from religions such as Roman Catholicism, Hinduism and Buddhism. The findings suggest that the acceptance of a range of religions in Australia allows migrants to freely pursue their chosen beliefs and achieve satisfaction with this life domain.

The four domains of life satisfaction that recorded lower mean scores in the present study were ‘feeling part of the community’, ‘achievements’, ‘future security’ and ‘health’. Basic cultural differences between Sri Lankan/Indian and Australian societies could be a reason for ‘feeling part of the community’ recording the lowest mean score.
in the present study. For example, Sri Lankans and Indians come from collectivist societies that maintain close contacts with extended family and the wider community (Hofstede, 2001). However, an individualistic society like Australia may offer fewer opportunities to connect with the wider Australian community; instead, migrants may have to limit their close contacts to their own ethnic communities. Cummins’ (2012) study of an Australian sample also recorded comparatively lower mean scores for this domain, and thus the present study scores are not dissimilar to those of the broader Australian community.

iii) Important domains in understanding overall life satisfaction

In addition, results suggested that ‘achievements’, ‘standards of life’, ‘feeling part of the community’ and ‘personal relationship’ domains influenced global life satisfaction more strongly than ‘health’, ‘safety’, ‘spiritual life’ and ‘future security’ domains. These results are generally consistent with past research findings (see Cummins, 2006, 2012; Wills, 2009; Wills-Herrera, Islam, & Hamilton, 2009), especially with respect to the ‘achievements’, ‘standard of living’ and ‘feeling part of the community’ domains (Cummins, 2006, 2012; Wills, 2009; Wills-Herrera et al., 2009). There are several possible explanations for these four domains being the most influential domains for participants’ life satisfaction in Australia and these reasons are discussed below (some of the reasons discussed above for skilled migrants reporting high life satisfaction may also be applicable here, and are not repeated in the interests of brevity).

Results for ‘reason for migrating to Australia’ suggested that achievement is an important part of the migration decision for skilled migrants. The results showed that the main reasons for migration to Australia were to ‘attain better standards of living’, ‘better future for children’ and to ‘obtain higher education’. Arguably, all of these reasons reflect a desire for achievement in the host society. Therefore, it is not surprising to see a higher contribution from this domain to overall life satisfaction; life satisfaction in the host society is closely associated with the extent to which pre-migration aspirations are realised. In addition, the ‘feeling part of the community’ and the ‘personal relationship’ domains may have significantly contributed to overall life satisfaction, because participants were from collectivist societies which value close personal and community relationships in the community. These results are also
consistent with Kwan et al. (1997), who found that harmony in relationships among Asians influences overall life satisfaction more than for people who live in Western societies. Therefore, it is not surprising to see that ‘personal relationships’ and ‘feeling part of the community’ domains contributed significantly towards Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ life satisfaction.

Considering the average age of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in the present study, it can be suggested that they are less likely to place emphasis on ‘health’, ‘spiritual’ and ‘future security’ domains, which are more likely to be of concern to older adults (Wills-Herrera et al., 2009). Generally, people tend to think about ‘health’ and ‘spirituality’ domains in the latter part of their lives, or possibly at or close to retirement. Possibly as a result of this, these domains did not contribute significantly to the overall life satisfaction of the present study participants (Cummins, 2006; Wills, 2009, Wills-Herrera et al., 2009). Pan et al. (2008) attempted to define meaning of life satisfaction in relation to different ethnic groups and people of different countries. The finding that emerged from the present study is that skilled migrants from Sri Lanka and India who come to Australia define their life satisfaction primarily in relation to their ‘achievements’, ‘standards of life’, ‘feeling part of the community’ and ‘personal relationships’.

iv) Gender and life satisfaction

Previous studies have produced inconsistent findings with regard to gender and life satisfaction, where some studies suggest that gender predicts migrants’ life satisfaction (Kwan, 2008; Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Neto & Barros, 2007; Tomyn & Cummins, 2010), but others do not. Consistent with Renn et al. (2009), Tomyn and Cummins (2011), Wills (2009), and Wills-Herrera et al. (2009), no significant difference in the overall life satisfaction between men and women was reported in the present study. With the exception of the ‘personal relationship’ domain, all the other domains failed to show any significant differences in life satisfaction between men and women. It is worth examining the reasons why female skilled migrants are significantly happier than their male counterparts in the ‘personal relationship’ domain in future studies.
7.3.3 Job satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrant in Australia

Research Question 1.3: Are Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia satisfied with their jobs?

Research Question 1.3 concerned whether Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are satisfied with their jobs in Australia. The Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997) was employed to measure job satisfaction and results suggested that, overall, skilled migrants were moderately satisfied with their jobs in Australia. It is likely that most skilled migrants come to a new country hoping for better job opportunities and job satisfaction (Siow & Ng, 2013). Failure to achieve these aims can result in frustration. However, this situation was not evident for the majority of the present study participants, who were either ‘as satisfied’ or ‘more satisfied’ with their present jobs compared to last job they had held before migration. Given that the current study participants were skilled migrants employed in reasonably high-status jobs, they may experience better conditions than other migrants who are less satisfied with their jobs, as found in previous studies (Moyes et al., 2006; Sabharwal, 2011; Sanchez & Brock, 1996; Schmidt, 2007). Furthermore, pre-migration work experiences and inclusive work practices and policies within Australian organisations may have contributed to these skilled migrants’ feeling satisfied with their jobs (Parr & Guo, 2005).

The results indicated only a moderate level of job satisfaction. In line with the above findings, about 23% of the study participants have reported ‘less than satisfied’ in the present job than the last job held in their country of origin. One possible explanation for Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants not showing high job satisfaction could be that they tend to compare their income, benefits and career advancement opportunities etc. with those of mainstream employees who have similar credentials and qualifications (Li, 2000; Schmidt & Müller, 2013). Furthermore, many skilled migrants report high career satisfaction in their country of birth before migration (Choudhry, 2001; George & Chaze, 2009) and thus expect a comparatively higher income and other-career related benefits in host societies (Aguilera and Massey, 2003; Drever and Hoffmeister, 2008; Syed and Kramar, 2010; Al Ariss et al., 2011; Itzraki et al., 2012). In addition a substantial percentage of migrants in this sample were currently engaged in clerical and
administrative jobs. It is possible that they were less than satisfied because they are in lower status jobs.

Due to inconsistent factor loadings for the Job Satisfaction Survey, the present study could not assess participants’ job satisfaction at facet level. A facet-level analysis could provide more meaningful results in terms of identifying specific areas of concern. Consistent with past research findings (Gilman et al., 2012; Yu et al., 2012), the current study findings did not show a significant difference between male and female skilled migrants’ job satisfaction.

In the section that follows, results related to Research Question 2 and Hypotheses 1 to 8 are discussed.

7.3.4 Factors that significantly influence social integration at language, identity and behaviour dimensions of social integration

Research Question 2.1: What are the factors that significantly influence Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ language, identity and behavioural integration?

Age at migration was hypothesised to be negatively related to identity and behaviour integration; however, age at migration was not expected to be related to host country language integration for Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants. Contrary to expectation, the results indicated that the relationship between age at migration and identity integration was non-significant. Hence H1(a) was unsupported. The non-significant relationship between age at migration and identity could be possibly reflect the age of participants. Worrell and Gardner-Kitt (2006) found that individuals’ ethnic identity is mostly developed during their adolescent years. In line with the same notion, Martinovic et al. (2009) found that younger migrants were less socialised into their culture of origin and thus possessed greater capacity to absorb host culture identity. The average age at migration of the present study participants was 30 years. Thus it can be argued that these migrants have had a greater exposure to their own cultural identity and identified with country of birth since they migrated as adults. For that reason, too, age at
migration may not have been an influential variable in Australian identity formation for Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in this study.

Past research findings (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Fong & Ooka, 2006; Lu et al., 2011; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Remennick, 2003) suggest that migrants who arrive at a younger age are more likely to include locals in their personal networks, as they encounter more opportunities to interact with mainstreamers. Thus age at migration affects inter-ethnic contact development and behaviour integration. Consistent with these findings, an inverse association between age at migration and behaviour integration was found among the present study participants, supporting H1(b).

As expected, in the present study age at migration was unrelated to language integration, supporting H1(c). This confirms the notion that age at migration is not a significant variable that influences the language integration of Sri Lankan and Indian migrants. English is the second official language in Sri Lanka and India, and thus English was not a completely foreign language for the present study participants (Bernhardt, 2011, p.90).

A consistent positive relationship between years since migration and social integration has been documented in past research on migrant categories other than skilled migrants (Dustmann, 1994; Gordon, 1964; Martinovic et al., 2009; Sabharwal, 2011; Sakamoto, 2007). Consistent with those findings, the present study also found that years since migration was a significant socio-demographic predictor of language, identity and behavioural social integration. Therefore, H2(a), (b) and (c) were supported. An important finding was that years since migration was one of two variables that showed a significant link with all the three dimensions of social integration. Therefore, the present study findings extend the literature by showing that years since migration is also a significant variable for skilled migrants’ social integration.

Even though several studies (Chiswick & Miller, 2007; Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010; Syed & Kramar, 2010) have suggested that host country language is an important determinant of host country identity formation, due to the specific characteristics of the present sample and the study context (e.g., skilled migrants are expected to already have
high English language proficiency; English is not a complete foreign language to Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants; Australia is a multicultural society that promotes cultural diversity and allows migrants to use other languages through their naturalisation policies), it was predicted that English language skills would not be related to identity social integration.

As expected, English language skills were not significantly related to host country identity, thus H3 (a) was supported. However, this finding may also be partly due to the fact that language proficiency is not directly relevant to the items in the identity subscale. For instance, items such as ‘being Australian plays an important part in my life’ and ‘I am proud of being an Australian’, have no linear relationship to ‘English language proficiency’. In contrast, aspects in the behaviour subscale require a high level of English language proficiency, e.g., English language proficiency is important for reading Australian books, newspapers and magazines and for socialising with Australian friends. The present study expected English language skills to be a significant variable in behaviour integration, since better language proficiency may influence migrants’ behaviour in areas such as host country media consumption and participation in social events in wider society (Berman, 2006; Trickett & Birman 2005). English language was the strongest predictor of the behavioural dimension of social integration and thus hypothesis H3 (b) was supported.

Researchers (Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010; Gijsberts & Dagevos 2007; Kogan, 2010; Remennick, 2004; Selvarajah, 2003) have suggested that level of education is an important variable in determining successful adaptation into the host society. Thus it was hypothesised that level of education would be related to language, identity and behavioural social integration. However, contrary to expectations, the present research failed to identify a significant association between level of education and language and identity integration, and thus hypotheses H4(a) and (b) were unsupported.

These findings are in line with previous research findings such as Kumar and Nevid (2010), Massey and Parr (2012) and Lu et al. (2011). For skilled migrants, there may be less variability in level of education than for other categories of migrants, e.g., humanitarian migrants, and therefore the present study may not have captured the
broader relationship between education and language and identity dimensions of integration. For instance, a large majority of these skilled migrants had completed a Bachelor’s degree or equivalent professional qualification. In addition, Massey and Parr (2012) suggested that the education level of skilled migrants may not be highly advantaged in the social integration process, as the benefits of a high level of education can be cancelled out by a lack of networking opportunities and ethnic discrimination.

Consistent with past findings, as predicted, there was a significant and positive relationship between level of education and behavioural integration (Chiswick & Miller, 2002; Gijsberts & Dagevos 2007; Martinovic et al., 2009; Selvarajah, 2003), and thus hypothesis H4(c) was supported. As past research has suggested (Fitzgerald, 2010; Martinovic et al., 2009), educated migrants have more open-minded views on life, are willing to change their behaviour, and associate with highly educated people in the wider society who share similar world views. However, further studies may need to identify specific reasons as to why language and identity integration were not influenced by level of education but behaviour integration was influenced by this variable.

It was hypothesised that pre-migration SES would be associated with all three dimensions of social integration, in line with past findings (Li, 2007; Remennick, 2004). Contrary to prediction, however, there was no support for the hypothesised relationship between pre-migration SES and identity and behaviour integration. Thus Hypotheses 5(b) and (c) were un-supported. This may be partly due to the fact that the measure employed in the present study (pre-migration town of residence) was not an effective indicator of pre-migration SES. Future studies could employ an alternative measure to more directly assess migrants’ pre-migration SES. On the other hand, pre-migration SES may not influence migrants’ way of life in the host country. However, this research provided support for the association between pre-migration SES and language integration, supporting hypothesis H5 (a). People who live in metropolitan cities in Sri Lanka and India tend to use English more often than people who live in rural cities; they have more opportunities to access programs in private schools and private higher education institutes where teaching is in English. The results in the present study may have reflected these differences.
In contrast to past research (Au et al., 1998; George & Chaze, 2009; Hou, 2009), the present research failed to support that neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants limits the social integration of migrants, and thus hypotheses H6(a), (b) and (c) were unsupported. Due to the large representation of Sri Lankan and Indian populations in Australia (DIMIA, 2013), it is likely that there are some co-ethnic families living in any neighbourhood. Thus Sri Lankan and Indian migrants in Australia may have opportunities to meet with co-ethnics regardless of whether or not the neighbourhood consists of a high co-ethnic concentration (Martinovic et al., 2009). Past studies (Au et al., 1998; Ong & Umehoto, 1994) have identified that ethnic economies limit the social integration of non-skilled migrants who mostly associate with co-ethnics at work. In contrast to those findings which relate to non-skilled migrants, skilled migrants may get more opportunities to engage in the wider society and interact with mainstreamers and other ethnic groups in their workplace. As a result, neighbourhood ethnic concentration may not influence Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ ability to integrate into Australian society, as they have opportunities to deal with mainstreamers at work.

Hypothesis H7 predicted a positive relationship between perceived inclusiveness and language, identity and behavioural social integration. Consistent with previous findings that suggest that positive attitudes towards migrants among mainstreamers play an important role in migrants’ level of social integration (Neto & Barros, 2007; Remennick, 2003, 2004; Valenta, 2009), the present study results also indicated that perceived inclusiveness has a significant relationship with language and identity integration. Hence H7 (a) and (b) were supported. In contrast to past research findings, perceived inclusiveness failed to contribute to prediction for behaviour integration, and therefore H7(c) was unsupported. It could be that Sri Lankan and India skilled migrants are less concerned about inclusion by mainstreamers when behaviourally integrating into the host society, since there is a larger representation of co-ethnic and other ethnic skilled migrants in Australia.

Past research findings have suggested that migrants’ expectation of returning to their country of birth has a significant impact on adaptation to the host country (Hamas & Fokkemas, 2011; Labrianidis & Lyberaki, 2004). These past findings suggest that migrants with a high expectation of leaving the host country maintain more contact with
their home country and thus feel less compelled to integrate into the host country (Haas & Fokkema, 2011). Consistent with those findings, an inverse relationship was shown between expectation to return to country of birth and all three dimensions of integration. Thus H8 (a), (b) and (c) were supported. This is one of two factors that related to all three aspects of integration in the present study. The association between expectation to return to country of birth and social integration has rarely been reviewed. Therefore, the present study findings extend the literature by showing that expectation to return to country of birth influences skilled migrants’ social integration in Australia.

The next section discusses the findings related to factors that directly and indirectly influence the life satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, addressing Research Question 2.2 (What are the factors that influence life satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia?) and Research Question 4.1 (Is the relationship between socio-demographic factors and life satisfaction mediated by language, identity and behaviour dimensions of social integration?).

### 7.3.5 Factors that significantly influence life satisfaction

Studies have identified a range of predictors of life satisfaction among migrants in host societies, including ethnicity (Amit, 2010a; Kisslev et al., 2010; Sam, 1998; Oishi et al., 1999), level of education (Amit, 2010a), age at migration (Amit, 2010a; Foroughi et al., 2001; Sam, 1998; Yioliitis, 1994) expectations at the time of migration (Vohra & Adair, 2000), host country language skills (Amit, 2010b; Kisslev et al., 2010) and perceived discrimination (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Safi, 2010; Verkuyten, 2008). In the present study, perceived inclusiveness, years since migration, expectation of returning to country of birth and English language skills were the factors that significantly predicted life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.

According to previous research, the relationship between migrants’ perceived discrimination and life satisfaction is negative (Nato & Barros, 2007; Verkuyten, 2008). Consistent with these research findings, the present study indicated a significant and a positive relationship between perceived inclusiveness (the inverse of perceived discrimination) and life satisfaction. Notably, perceived inclusiveness was the strongest predictor of life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.
In addition to the significant and direct relationship between perceived inclusiveness and life satisfaction, there was an indirect relationship between perceived inclusiveness and life satisfaction via the language and identity dimensions of social integration. The finding that emerged from this study was that stronger perceived inclusiveness is associated with higher language and identity integration, which are in turn associated with higher life satisfaction. Thus, from the wider Australian societal point of view, it is vital to recognise Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants as a part of Australian society, because this positively influences their integration life satisfaction and in turn may influence the well-being of Australian society as a whole.

Consistent with previous studies (Amit, 2010a; Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Remennick, 2007), and as expected, the results of this study suggested that years since migration was significantly related to skilled migrants’ life satisfaction. When skilled migrants live longer in the host society they adjust as they get better jobs, income, housing opportunities and social contacts and become more familiar with the host country systems; this gradually increases their life satisfaction (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Eat et al., 2008; Li, 2003; Mara & Landesmann, 2013; Remennick, 2007).

In addition to the significant and direct relationship between years since migration and life satisfaction, there was an indirect relationship between years since migration and life satisfaction via identity integration. Years since migration was associated with higher identity integration, which in turn was associated with higher life satisfaction. The findings suggest that, when migrants live longer in host societies, they identify more with the host country and this increases their life satisfaction.

As expected, a significant negative relationship was shown between expectation of returning to country of birth and life satisfaction. Expectation of return was the third important factor that influences Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ life satisfaction in Australia in terms of variance explained by related socio-demographic factors. This finding is consistent with Mara and Landesmann (2013), who suggest that, when migrants expect to stay permanently, they attempt to psychologically and materially adjust into the host society and achieve higher life satisfaction than migrants who expect to leave the country or who are uncertain about the decision to return or to stay.
In addition, expectation to return to country of birth influenced the life satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants indirectly via the identity dimension of social integration. That is, lower expectation to return to country of birth was associated with higher identity integration, which in turn was associated with higher life satisfaction. Migrants who least expect to return to their country of birth may achieve higher identity integration and higher life satisfaction. Therefore, from the host society’s perspective, it is vital to have policies that fulfil the needs of skilled migrants and encourage permanent residency.

Past research findings (Chiswick & Miller, 1999; Kisselev et al., 2010; Kogan, 2010; Remennick, 2003, 2004) have suggested that host country language skills influence migrants’ life satisfaction. Consistent with those studies English language skills significantly and positively contributed to life satisfaction of skilled migrants in the present study. Language as the means of communication may support migrants to handle most situations confidently in the host country. For instance, connecting with mainstreamers and other ethnic groups of migrants, handling day-to-day activities or even finding a job should be easier for a person with better language skills than their less skilled counterparts (Kisselev et al., 2010). These positive circumstances may lead to higher life satisfaction in host societies by improving access to resources in the host country.

The next section discusses the findings related to factors that directly and indirectly influence the job satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, addressing Research Question 2.3 (What are the factors that influence job satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia?) and Research Question 4.2 (Is the relationship between socio-demographic factors and job satisfaction mediated by language, identity and behaviour dimensions of social integration?).

### 7.3.6 Factors that significantly influence job satisfaction

As discussed in the earlier section of this thesis, some researchers have argued that migrants’ job satisfaction is related to factors such as age, English language skills, level of education, and years since migration and perceived inclusiveness. Ahmed and colleagues’ (2013) study of migrants (mainly from Bangladesh, India and Pakistan) in
the U.K found that age, gender, income and level of education were not significant factors in job satisfaction. Similarly, the results of the present study do not show significant relationships between job satisfaction and age at migration and education. Nor were, English language skills, and years since migration significantly related to job satisfaction. A possible explanation may be that, as the sample comprised only of skilled migrants, there may have been little variation in level of education and English language skills, both of which tend to be high among skilled migrants. Measuring overall job satisfaction may also have observed relationships between facets and demographics (e.g., education and pay).

Perceived inclusiveness and expectation to return to country of birth were the only factors that were related to job satisfaction in the present study. Notably, perceived inclusiveness was the strongest predictor of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ job satisfaction. This is consistent with studies (Fossland, 2013; Georgellis & Lange, 2007) that have shown that providing a safe, inclusive and non-discriminatory work environment is important for migrants in order for them to achieve higher job satisfaction. An indirect effect of perceived inclusiveness on job satisfaction via identity integration was expected, but the results failed to support this indirect relationship.

Skilled migrants who considered Australia as their ‘home’ were happier with their jobs than those who were expecting to leave the country in the future. This finding is consistent with Ahmed et al. (2013), who suggest that migrant workers who intend to stay longer have positive attitudes and commit to adjusting their behaviour to the requirements of host country workplaces. Ahmed et al. further suggest that migrants who want to stay in the host country permanently are more likely to respond to job-related concerns and issues with more patience.

Although causal ordering is assumed to be from expectation to return to country of birth to job satisfaction, it is possible to argue that migrants who are not satisfied with their jobs may eventually leave Australia because they perceive that there are better career opportunities in their country of birth. However, the direction of the relationship between expectation to return to country of birth and job satisfaction was not tested in the present study because of its cross-sectional design.
An indirect effect of expectation to return to country of birth on job satisfaction via identity integration was expected, but the results failed to support a mediating relationship. Again, perhaps an alternative causal pathway is more plausible, as poor social integration may be a predictor of expectation to return to country of birth. Those who integrate well may be more likely to stay.

The present study also assessed the relationship between social integration and life and jobs satisfaction. The findings are discussed below.

7.3.7 Relationship between social integration and life satisfaction and job satisfaction

Research Question 3.1: Is there a relationship between language, identity and behavioural social integration and life satisfaction and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia?

The current research predicted that a high level of language, identity and behaviour integration is positively associated with life satisfaction. While three dimensions showed a positive relationship with life satisfaction at bivariate level, only language and identity integration predicted life satisfaction, and behaviour integration failed to contribute uniquely to prediction. Past research findings (Amit, 2010a, Heady & Wearing, 1992; Sam, 1998) have suggested that host country language proficiency helps migrants to overcome many practical and social challenges, such as finding a job and interaction with the majority population, which in turn leads to high life satisfaction. This might also be the case with Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, as they are come to Australia from culturally dissimilar countries. On the other hand, the relationship between identity integration and life satisfaction may be because skilled migrants value identification with their surrounding culture. Lu et al. (2011) have suggested that the Australian population is favourably disposed towards migrants who are committed to contributing to Australia. Therefore having an Australian identity may positively influence life satisfaction of skilled migrants because it promotes acceptance by mainstreamers. When analysing the items in the behaviour scale (e.g., media consumption, music, entertainment and food consumption), first-generation skilled migrants may derive less satisfaction from host country media consumption, music,
entertainment and food consumption as compared with country–of-origin alternatives, which are readily available in Australia (Birman et al., 2014). Thus the relationship between behaviour integration and life satisfaction may not be as high as expected. Supporting the same notion, Birman et al. (2014) suggest that behaving according to one’s own culture leads to higher life satisfaction.

The current research predicted that higher language, identity and behaviour integration is associated with higher job satisfaction (Ea et al., 2009; Valdivia & Flores, 2012). However, only identity integration was related to job satisfaction at bivariate level. Host country language and behaviour were not significantly related to job satisfaction, perhaps because English language proficiency is a minimum skill that skilled migrant employees are expected to have and therefore it does not confer an added advantage on them for their level of job satisfaction. Even though Birman et al.’s study found a positive relationship between host country behaviour and job satisfaction among refugees, the current study did not support their findings. Again, a possible reason could be that skilled migrants are expected to behave within behavioural norms of the workplace, and thus behavioural integration does not have an added advantage for their level of job satisfaction. Not behaving according to the host country’s customs may not be required, since Australian workplaces encourage multiculturalism.

Contrary to expectation, identity failed to predict job satisfaction after controlling for perceived inclusiveness and expectation to return to country of birth. Thus Hypothesis 10 was unsupported. Given that Australia has a large representation of migrant employees from non-Western countries, skilled migrants may experience more acceptance of cultural and language differences in Australian organisations. Equal employment opportunity and diversity policies within Australian organisations may lead to more supportive workplace cultures, making social integration less important for job satisfaction. In contrast to previous research findings (Birman et al., 2014; Ea et al., 2009; Syed & Özbilgin, 2009; Valdivia & Flores, 2012), it is interesting to observe that social integration was found to be unrelated to job satisfaction of skilled migrants in Australia.
In addition, factors such as income, career advancement opportunities, work-life balance, and job-related skills and competencies that may be related to job satisfaction were not measured in the current study (Mace et al., 2005; Malinen & Johnston, 2011). It remains worthwhile to explore other factors that may contribute to job satisfaction among migrants in future studies.

Findings related to the relationship between life and job satisfaction are discussed below.

7.3.8 Relationship between the level of job satisfaction and life satisfaction

Research Question 3.2: Is there a relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia?

Based on previous research findings (Drobnick et al., 2010; Engle & Prince, 2011), a positive relationship between job and life satisfaction was predicted in hypothesis H11. Consistent with previous research, the results indicated a positive and moderately strong relationship between life and job satisfaction, supporting Hypothesis 11. Skilled migrants migrate to a new country expecting better job opportunities and higher career satisfaction, and thus fulfilment of these job-related expectations may lead to higher job satisfaction and, in turn, higher life satisfaction. Positive life experiences may enhance positive job experience, or the relationship may be reciprocal. However, this was not tested in the study. Primarily, having a better job and a better life is mutually supportive for the achievement of satisfaction in each domain (Illies et al., 2009; Malinen & Johnston 2011).

The next section discusses the limitations of the present study and suggestions are provided for further research.

7.4 Limitations of the Research and Suggestions for Further Research

The findings of this research should be interpreted with due consideration for the limitations of the study. Some of the limitations are specific to the present study, while
others are common limitations for all quantitative studies that employ cross-sectional survey designs. Limitations are discussed under the sub-headings of Research Design, Sample and Measures.

### 7.4.1 Research design

The research design employed in the present research was a cross-sectional survey design. Schwartz et al. (2012) have pointed out that a common limitation of cross-sectional survey data is their inability to assess the cause and effect relationship among variables because the data are collected at a single point of time. A longitudinal survey design would enable change in social integration, life satisfaction and job satisfaction to be measured over a period of time, so that change in one variable could be related to change in other variables. For instance, by using a longitudinal approach, social integration, life satisfaction and job satisfaction of migrants could be measured at different time intervals, such as one year since their arrival, five years since arrival and ten years since arrival.

Another research design limitation is that the present study used a self-report survey. A common limitation of using self-report surveys is the possibility of response bias (Paulhus, 1991). Extreme responding is a form of response bias in which the respondent shows a systematic tendency to choose the response option that is most extreme (Paulhus, 1991; Peer & Gamliel, 2011). Social desirability bias is another response bias. Mortel (2008) defined social desirability response bias as respondents’ tendency to give a favourable image of themselves through surveys: that is, a tendency to provide answers that make the respondent look good (Paulhus, 1991). Urlacher (2010) suggested that there is a tendency for participants to rate their perceived language skills as higher than their actual language skill level in a self-report survey. English language skills among the present study participants were reported at the high end of the scale. Therefore future researchers may consider measuring participants’ language skills using different methods (e.g., including objective test scores such as IELTS) or using interview methods in order to more accurately capture the level of skilled migrants’ language skills.
In the present study, participants reported their level of life satisfaction as very high. The life satisfaction results of the present study may also have been impacted by social desirability response bias. Social desirability response bias is a common limitation of self-report surveys; thus future research may consider including a social desirability scale and controlling for this response bias in analyses. Therefore the findings of the present study need to be interpreted cautiously. Even though qualitative research has its own benefits, mixed method research design is often more fitting when attempting to draw conclusions more confidently. In particular, it is suggested that qualitative studies are more appropriate for a study that addresses human feelings of participants (Kisselev et al., 2010) as they can be better expressed in words than in numbers. Hence in future studies, in-depth interviews can be conducted to validate and support quantitative results for life and job satisfaction.

7.4.2 Sample
Sampling limitations were specific to this study. The majority of the participants were recruited from the State of Victoria and New South Wales and the majority of the participants had been living in Australia for five to ten years. This sampling bias may have occurred as a result of convenience sampling technique used in the present study. Therefore one limitation of the current study is an incomplete representation of the Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrant population in Australia and, in particular, under-representation of new migrants, who are likely to be less integrated. Sampling bias in the present study may have limited the variability in socio-demographic factors, such as age at migration, years since migration, neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants, pre-migration SES and English language proficiency. Therefore it is possible that this sampling bias may also have impacted the relationship between socio-demographic factors and social integration. For instance, the present study results did not show an association between pre-migration SES and identity and behavioural integration; this could be due to there being little variability in pre-migration SES among the study’s participants. This may limit the generalisability of the research findings. Therefore it would be appropriate to replicate the study with a larger sample, with proportionate representation of the other States, and also sampling migrants who have lived in Australia for different time periods.
It should also be noted that results and the conclusions drawn from studies of this nature are restricted to the surveyed group of participants. Even though the objective of this study was to assess social integration, life and job satisfaction among skilled migrants in Australia, the current research findings refer exclusively to first-generation skilled migrants from Sri Lanka and India. Hence further research is needed on skilled migrants from different backgrounds in Australia and other skilled migrant-receiving countries. Therefore future research could focus on comparing different skilled migrant groups within Australia (e.g., important skilled migrant groups in Australia such as the People’s Republic of China, the UK and South Africa) and in other migrant-receiving societies, such as the UK, New Zealand and Canada, in order to determine the impact of ethnicity and host country on the social integration, life and job satisfaction of skilled migrants.

In addition, it is possible that individuals in the sampling frame (Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants) who were not integrated and felt distressed about their life in Australia did not volunteer to participate into the survey because they were struggling with these issues, since participation was by self-selection into the survey. Future research may consider incorporating level of employment status such as employed, unemployed and underemployed skilled migrants as the findings can contribute to better understanding of the topics addressed in the research, because social integration, life and job satisfaction levels may differ for unemployed and underemployed groups. For example it is possible that skilled migrants who have failed to secure employment or who are currently under employed may have ‘negative’ subjective outcomes in the host country (Kwok-bun & Plüss, 2013; Safi, 2010; Schmidt, 2007).

The limitations of measures employed in this study are discussed next.

7.4.3 Measures
Despite the cross-cultural validity of the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997), in the present study the factor structure of the measure was not confirmed. Inconsistent factor loadings limited the present study to analysing only overall job satisfaction and not job satisfaction at facet level. Therefore it was not possible to identify job facets with which participants were less satisfied. Future research could use alternative job satisfaction scales to measure skilled migrants’ facet-level job satisfaction.
The measure used to assess perceived inclusiveness in the present study was developed for the purpose of this research and consisted of only three items. This may have impacted the construct validity of the measure. In addition, there was common method variance with job satisfaction (i.e., variance that is attributable to the measurement method: Podsakoff et al., 2003), as the three items employed to measure perceived inclusiveness were measured on the same response scale as the Job Satisfaction Scale. Therefore the findings related to perceived inclusiveness measure need to be interpreted cautiously. Future research could invest in developing and validating the perceived inclusiveness construct, which appears to be important for skilled migrants’ social integration, life and job satisfaction.

Diener et al. (2003) suggested that life satisfaction is comparative (i.e., the present level of life satisfaction can be compared with one’s life satisfaction level ten years ago or one’s life satisfaction can be compared to different groups of people). As presented in Section 5.4.2, the life satisfaction results for Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants were compared with Cummins’ (2012) study of life satisfaction in the Australian population. While this enhanced understanding of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ life satisfaction was compared to the Australian population, on average, this study did compare the life satisfaction of skilled migrants with other migrant groups. Therefore, in future studies, the life satisfaction of these skilled migrants should be compared with other migrant groups in Australia, such as Sri Lankan humanitarian migrants, or with that of people who live in their country of birth of similar demographic backgrounds. It would also be interesting to compare pre- and post-migration life satisfaction to determine if migrating to a Western country positively impacts life satisfaction of skilled migrants.

As discussed in detail in this section, the following suggestions are made for future researchers.

- Use of a longitudinal survey design as an opposed to cross-sectional survey design to enable change in social integration, life satisfaction and job satisfaction to be measured over a period of time.
• Use of qualitative data collection and analysis methods to extend and better understand the results obtained via quantitative analysis.

• Inclusion of social desirability scales where possible, to control response bias in analysis.

• Inclusion of a larger sample, with proportionate representation of the other States, migrants who have lived in Australia for different time periods, skilled migrants with other ethnic backgrounds and participants other than skilled migrants to ensure a more representative sample and allow for intra group and inter group analysis.

• Future research may also extend the study to compare life satisfaction of skilled migrants and with other groups such as Sri Lankan humanitarian migrants.

• Use of alternative scales to measure job satisfaction that is more reliable to assess job satisfaction at facet level.

• Future research may consider using alternative scales to measure social integration that contain aspects other than cultural identity and behaviour. They may consider individual and ethnic identity as possible dimensions of integration.

• Future research could also invest in developing and validating the perceived inclusiveness construct which appears to be important for skilled migrants’ social integration, life and job satisfaction.

• In addition, future research may consider including additional socio-demographic variables such as religion and gender as factors that may have an influence on social integration.

The next section discusses the implications of the present study findings.

7.5 Implications of the Current Research and the Contribution to Knowledge

The findings of this research contribute to understanding of social integration and life and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia and the factors that influence these outcomes. This section discusses possible implications of the results for practice and policy related to skilled migrants in Australia. Implications
for practice are discussed at societal, organisational and individual level. Following this, the contribution of the current research findings to the literature is presented.

7.5.1 Implications for policy and practice at societal level

In terms of numbers, Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are an important subgroup in the Australian skilled migrant population. The results of the present study suggest that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are moderately integrated into Australian society in terms of language, identity and behaviour, satisfied with their lives and moderately satisfied with their jobs. This suggests that these skilled migrants attempt to socially integrate into Australian society, supporting Australia’s ‘common bond’ approach, and thus they cannot be considered as a group that attempts to separate themselves from mainstream Australian society. The high life satisfaction and moderate job satisfaction recorded in this study also indicate that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants have been able to achieve desirable migration outcomes. Therefore it is important to continue to introduce national and local government level policies to promote social integration of ethnic skilled migrants in Australia, since successful social integration is an achievable migration outcome as far as these skilled migrants are concerned.

Among the factors that influence social integration and life and job satisfaction, perceived inclusiveness and English language skills are vital from a policy maker’s perspectives, because the government can introduce intervention strategies to improve migrants’ inclusiveness and language skills. For instance, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship Australia could introduce social awareness programs through municipal councils to benefit the migrant community. The aims of such programs could be to officially welcome new skilled migrants to Australia, share important cultural dimensions of the country, allow past migrants to share their success stories of their migration journey, show opportunities that are available for skilled migrants, and the like. Nowadays new migrants most often get support from co-ethnics who are family members or friends (Choudhry, 2001). Introduction of social awareness programs may be helpful in establishing a systematic and positive start to life after migration and in clarifying how migrants can establish themselves in the new country and find necessary support, etc. Furthermore, such programs could also be used as a
networking event for new migrants to connect with the new community. Follow-up sessions could be arranged after the initial program.

Another strategy would be for the government to systematically introduce new skilled migrant support programs, partnering with not-for-profit organisations in local areas, such as religious bodies. These strategies would not only help skilled migrants to ease initial culture shock but also help them to positively connect with the neighbourhood and the local community in Australia. The government and local government could also provide websites containing useful information and targeting skilled migrants in Australia (such as renting houses, buying essential furniture, motor vehicles, how the transport system works, local hospitals, job search engines, criteria for entering schools for children), which would allow them to adapt to the country more easily.

Life satisfaction findings indicated that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are less satisfied with ‘feeling part of the community’ in Australia, even though this dimension was an important factor for their overall life satisfaction. Therefore it is important to develop policies and programs to encourage skilled migrants’ participation in host community events in their daily lives (such as the recent ‘Closing the Gap Agenda’ that targets the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians), so that skilled migrants do not remain isolated in their own co-ethnic communities. On the other hand, it is also important to develop intervention strategies that encourage host society members to accept people of different ethnic backgrounds. The importance of cultural diversity and treating every Australian with equal rights and opportunities, whatever their country of birth, should be promoted.

The present study results suggest that one quarter of the participants have experienced ‘negative’ career changes since migrating to Australia, suggesting that this group’s potential is not being fully utilised. In order to minimise negative shifts of this nature, it is vital to have mechanisms in place to ensure that the skills of these migrants are utilised productively. The introduction of career guidance and mentoring programs targeting new skilled migrants is one strategy that could reduce productive skill wastage. The role of such programs could include educating skilled migrants by showing them alternative career avenues suitable to their skill sets, including the pros
and cons of different career options, or by providing direction to skilled migrants regarding how to get their existing credentials recognised in Australia.

Even though English language proficiency was not a highly influential factor for social integration in this study (influencing only behavioural integration), English language proficiency did influence the life satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Therefore promoting English language learning opportunities to skilled migrants could also be a strategy that is worthy of attention. For instance, municipal councils might provide English as a second language programs at local libraries.

7.5.2 Implications for policy and practice at organisational level

It is evident that many Australian organisations, from family businesses to multinational companies, employ skilled migrants from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds (Dagher & D’Netto, 1997; Patrickson & Obrien, 2001; Syed & Kramar, 2010). Given the large number of skilled migrant employees within Australian workplaces, it is important that managers understand the level of job satisfaction among migrant workers and the factors that influence their job satisfaction.

The present study found that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are moderately satisfied with their jobs. The findings suggest that factors commonly identified in past research do not influence Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ job satisfaction; rather, perceived inclusiveness and expectation to return to country of birth were the most important factors. This may reflect the unique concerns, frustrations and difficulties that skilled migrants encounter when integrating into the workplace, and thus employers need to be attentive to such issues. On the other hand, the moderate level of job satisfaction may also reflect potential underutilisation of migrants’ skills. Therefore organisations could periodically monitor their skilled migrants’ job satisfaction to identify potential issues that negatively impact on their job satisfaction, including areas such as pay, promotion, and the nature of the work, and could support them to achieve better job satisfaction.

Given that perceived inclusiveness was identified as an influential factor for job satisfaction, managers could focus on developing and implementing policies that
encourage supportive and inclusive behaviours towards skilled migrants in the workplace, and identify the extent to which migrants feel included or excluded in the workplace and the reasons for their perception of inclusivity. Relevant information could be gathered through employee opinion surveys and also by analysing the patterns of skilled migrant employees’ work-related complaints and grievances. Organising cultural awareness programs, providing opportunities for workers to socialise with peers from different cultural backgrounds, and sharing information regarding socio-cultural events in Australia are some possible strategies that workplaces could introduce to improve migrants’ perceived inclusiveness in the workplace. Furthermore, organisations could promote employee assistance programs and provide mentors for skilled migrant employees to support skilled migrant employees and improve their job satisfaction.

7.5.3 Implications at the individual level

This section discusses the implications that the current study findings may have for Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants currently residing in Australia and for individuals from these countries who are planning to migrate to Australia as skilled migrants.

The positive life and job satisfaction experiences reported in the present study may enhance confidence among potential future Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants who are considering migration to Australia. Previous research (Choudhry, 2001; George & Chaze, 2009) has shown that Asian migrants experience loneliness and isolation in other host societies such as Canada and the UK; to some extent, this seems to be the case with Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, too, as participants were least satisfied with the feeling part of the community domain in Australia. Nevertheless, as indicated by the results, positive migration outcomes can be achievable for skilled migrants from Sri Lanka and India in Australia. The study found that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants were more satisfied with ‘safety’, ‘standard of living’, ‘personal relationships’ and ‘spirituality’ domains than with ‘health’, ‘future security’, ‘achievements’ and ‘feeling part of community’ domains, in that order. These findings provide a general overview of the domain-level life satisfaction of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia.
Results also showed that social integration and life satisfaction was higher for skilled migrants who had lived longer in Australia. These results suggest that social integration and life satisfaction increases with time. Therefore it is important that skilled migrants have realistic expectations about positive migration outcomes. For instance, achieving a high level of life satisfaction as soon as they migrate to Australia may not be realistic, but it could be a more realistic goal with increased time spent in the country.

The following section discusses the contribution of the research findings to the skilled migrant literature.

7.5.4 Contribution to knowledge

To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, the present study is the first to explore social integration, life satisfaction and job satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia. Thus the findings of the current study uniquely contribute to the literature in several ways by investigating social integration, life and job satisfaction in relation to a particular ethnic group of skilled migrants in the Australian context.

There is a lack of consistency in the literature regarding ethnic migrants’ level of social integration, life and job satisfaction in Western countries and the factors affecting successful social integration of migrants in different host societies. Due to lack of research that focuses exclusively on Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia, their level of social integration, life satisfaction and job satisfaction was not known. Thus the findings of the present study add new knowledge in relation to Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ subjective outcomes in Australia. This study found that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are socially integrated into Australian society at a moderate level, and thus the traditional social separation of ethnic migrants was not observed among this group.

Another contribution of the present study is the use of the LIB scale in a research that focuses on skilled migrants. The LIB Scale (Birman & Tricket, 2001) was originally developed to measure refugee migrants’ adaptation to host societies in terms of language, identity and behaviour. Going beyond the refugee migrant category, this study used the LIB scale to assess skilled migrants’ social integration in these three
dimensions, adding new scope to the existing literature on the validation of the scale. The factor structure of the scale was generally confirmed and all three dimensions showed meaningful associations with outcomes. It was found that the participants were more integrated in the language dimension than in the identity and behaviour dimensions, which is consistent with previous findings related to different groups of migrants, such as refugee migrants (Birman & Taylor-Ritzler, 2007; Birman, 2006; Ho & Birman, 2010). These findings show that, even though skilled migrants bring unique skills and work experiences when compared to refugee migrants, that does not necessarily mean that skilled migrants will integrate more consistently across all social integration dimensions.

Past research has identified different sets of socio-demographic variables affecting migrants’ social integration; however, the factors that affect Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia were not known in the literature. Thus the findings of the present research contribute by addressing this gap in literature. The present study found that years since migration positively influenced all dimensions of social integration and expectation of returning to country of birth negatively influenced all dimensions of social integration. Perceived inclusiveness was also important for participants’ social integration and was positively related to language and identity integration. Age at migration was negatively related to behaviour integration, and English language skills and education were positively related to behaviour integration only. Pre-migration SES was only related to language integration. Showing some inconsistency with previous findings (Au et al., 1998; Bisin et al., 2008; Li, 2003; Logan et al., 2002; Murdie & Ghosh, 2010; Ong & Umemoto, 1994), neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants did not influence Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants’ social integration in Australia. Accordingly, it can be said that factors that have traditionally been considered important, such as age at migration (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Martinovic et al., 2009; Nesdale & Mak, 2000; Remennick 2003), education (Fong & Ooka, 2006; Helliwell, 2003; Nauck, 2001; Pham & Harris, 2001; Remennick, 2004; Selvarajah, 2003), English language skills (Amit, 2012; Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2010; Martinovic et al., 2009; Remennick, 2004), and neighbourhood concentration of co-ethnic migrants (George & Chaze, 2009; Gijsberts & Dagevos, 2007; Logan et al., 2002; Murdie & Ghosh, 2010), are less important for the integration of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled
migrants in Australia.

As evident in the present study’s findings, the different dimensions of social integration contributed to migrants’ life satisfaction and job satisfaction differently. For instance, language and identity predicted life satisfaction but not behaviour integration. Similarly, socio-demographic factors contributed differently to different dimensions of social integration: for instance, while years since migration and expectation of return to country of birth influence all three dimensions of integration, pre-migration SES influences only language integration and level of education influences only behaviour integration. This approach enhanced the scope of social integration literature by reinforcing the importance of measuring social integration at dimension level.

Past research found that ethnic migrants’ life satisfaction is low in Western countries (Amit, 2010a; Sam, 1998; Verkuyten, 2008). However, life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia has not been explored in past research; thus present study findings contribute to the life satisfaction literature. The present study has found that the majority of Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants were satisfied with their lives in Australia. They were most satisfied in the ‘safety’ domain and least satisfied in the ‘feeling part of the community’ domain. Therefore the frequently documented low level of life satisfaction of ethnic migrants in Western societies was not observed among these skilled migrants. These findings suggest that ‘migrant category’ is likely to be an influential variable for life satisfaction.

The results also contribute to the literature by establishing the job satisfaction of this cohort, which was not known before conducting the present study. The study found that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are moderately satisfied with their jobs in Australia and the majority of them are either ‘more satisfied’ or ‘as satisfied’ with their jobs compared to the last job they held in their country of origin. This suggests that skilled migrants can achieve equivalent or higher job satisfaction after migrating to a Western country.
As discussed in this section, the findings from the present study suggest implications for policy and practice at societal, organisational and individual level. The study also contributes to the migration literature by establishing the levels of social integration, life and job satisfaction among a unique ethnic group of skilled migrants in the Australia context. The next section presents the conclusions of the research.

7.6 Conclusions

This study has explored the extent to which Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are socially integrated into Australian society and has identified the factors that influence their social integration. Additional aims of this study were to identify the level of life and job satisfaction among the participants and to understand the mediating effect of social integration between socio-demographic factors and life and job satisfaction.

On the basis of the present research findings, it can be concluded that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants do not experience the traditional social separation that many first-generation migrants or humanitarian migrants experience in other Western host societies. Therefore the present study findings are not consistent with previous research findings which suggest that first-generation migrants are socially separated and not integrated well into the host society. This may be due to the fact that participants were skilled migrants and thus possessed necessary skills and abilities to socially integrate well, because of the unique characteristics of migrants from this region (Sri Lanka and India), or because of the migration experience in Australia.

It can also be concluded that expectation to return to country of birth and years since migration are common determinants of social integration across language, identity and behaviour dimensions. On this basis, it can be concluded that English language skills, age at migration and level of education were not among the most important factors for social integration, which they are in other migrant categories such as refugee migrants. Notably, however, the influence of socio-demographic predictors varied across the three dimensions of social integration. Therefore measuring social integration at dimension level was more informative than measuring the construct globally.
Based on the findings, it can be concluded that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are satisfied with their lives in Australia. Sri Lankan and Indian migrants consider Australia a safe country in which to live, but, consistent with previous research findings, social isolation seems to remain an area of concern, with perceived inclusiveness emerging as an important predictor of life satisfaction. Years since migration, expectation of return to country of birth and English language skills were also important determinants of life satisfaction.

Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants are moderately satisfied with their jobs in Australia. Perceived inclusiveness and expectation of return to country of origin were important determinants of their job satisfaction. Furthermore, job satisfaction is related to life satisfaction. Based on this finding, it can be concluded that migrants’ job satisfaction is important for their life satisfaction, although the possibility of a reciprocal relationship has also been discussed.

The present study explores the mediating effect of language, identity and behaviour integration between socio-demographic variables and life and job satisfaction. The language dimension of social integration mediated the relationship between perceived inclusiveness and life satisfaction, suggesting that perceived inclusiveness leads to higher language integration, which in turn leads to higher life satisfaction. Identity integration mediated the relationship between years since migration, expectation of return to country of birth and perceived inclusiveness and life satisfaction, suggesting that those factors are important factors for achieving higher social integration and hence life satisfaction.

“It takes courage, endeavour and commitment to live in a new country and participate fully as a citizen” (DIAC, Our Common Bond, 2013, p.3).
In conclusion, the findings suggest that Sri Lankan and Indian skilled migrants in Australia are successful in achieving positive migration outcomes related to social integration, life satisfaction and job satisfaction that support the Australian ‘common bond’ concept. Future research in the field should aim to explore social integration and life and job satisfaction among other skilled migrant groups in Australia in order to determine whether these positive outcomes in the Australian context can be generalised to other groups.
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APPENDIX A: Survey Questionnaire

Diversity Spillover: Skilled Immigrants’ Social Integration, Work and Life Satisfaction in Australia

(Alternatively, you can log into http://opinio.online.swin.edu.au/s?s=sdsdsdsd and complete the survey online.)

This questionnaire consists of four main sections. Instructions for the completion of each section are provided, please read and respond accordingly. It should take approximately 20 minutes in total to complete this questionnaire.

Part 1 – (a) Demographic Background Information

Please complete this section by filling in the blanks or ticking the appropriate box.

1. Gender:
   - Male
   - Female

2. What is your country of origin?

3. At present are you,
   a) An Australian Citizen
   b) A Permanent Resident
   c) Other - Please specify

4. Under which migration category did you migrate to Australia?
   a) Skilled migration
   b) Other – Please specify

5. What best describes your town of residence before you migrated to Australia?
   Please circle your response on the scale below (1 = you had been living in “a highly metropolitan town” and 7 = “a very rural town”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly metropolitan</th>
<th>Very rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Where in Australia do you live?
   State:
   Post Code:
7. What proportion of the residents in your neighbourhood are immigrants from your own country of origin?

- Most
- Few families
- Very few families
- We are the only family
- Don’t know

8. At what age did you migrate to Australia? [ ] Years

9. How long have you been living in Australia?

- Less than 5 years
- 5 – 10 years
- 11 – 15 years
- 16 – 20 years
- More than 20 years

10. Please specify your highest education attainments (Please tick appropriate option and provide any further comments in writing. Example: Bachelors degree or equivalent – Engineering)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification Type</th>
<th>In the country of Origin</th>
<th>In Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree or equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please specify the area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What was your main reason for migrating to Australia?

- Lack of security in country of origin
- Poor quality of life in the country of origin
- Higher studies in Australia
- Better job opportunities in Australia
- Better quality of life in Australia
- Better future for children in Australia
- Other

(please specify)
12. What was your status when you migrated to Australia?
   - Single
   - With parents
   - With spouse
   - With spouse and children

13. What is your current family situation?
   - Single
   - Married
   - Married with children
   - Other

14. If you are married/have ever been married, in which country was your spouse born?
   - Same as my country of origin
   - Other (please specify)
   - Not applicable

15. If you have children at present, please indicate the following:
   - Number of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age/s (in years)</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I – (b) Occupation**

16. What was the last occupation you held in your country of origin?

17. What is your current occupation?

18. Have you changed your career/profession since migrating to Australia?
   - Yes
   - No (if “No” please go to question 20)

19. If you have changed/shifted your career since migrating to Australia, has it been a
   - Positive shift
   - or a
   - Negative shift

20. Right now do you feel
   - As satisfied
   - Less satisfied
   - More satisfied with your job than you did in your country of origin.
21. Which of the following categories best describes your present main employment status
   Self-employed  □
   Self-employed, employing others  □
   Employee, small scale organisation  □
   Employee, medium scale organisation  □
   Employee, large scale organisation  □
   Employee, multinational organisation  □

Part II – Life Satisfaction

The following questions ask how satisfied you feel, on a scale from zero to 10. Zero means you feel completely dissatisfied. 10 means you feel completely satisfied. And the middle of the scale is 5, which means you feel neutral, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.” Please circle the response for each question that comes closest to reflecting the level of satisfaction YOU FEEL AT PRESENT IN AUSTRALIA.

1. Thinking about your own life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How satisfied are you with your standard of living?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How satisfied are you with your health?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How satisfied are you with what you are achieving in life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How satisfied are you with your personal relationships?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How satisfied are you with how safe you feel?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How satisfied are you with feeling part of your community?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How satisfied are you with your future security?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How satisfied are you with your spirituality or religion?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Completely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part III – Job Satisfaction**

The statements below measure your level of job satisfaction at your current/most recent job. Please mark the response for each question that comes closest to reflecting your level of agreement at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Measures</th>
<th>Disagree very much</th>
<th>Disagree moderately</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree moderately</th>
<th>Agree very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I like the people I work with.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Communications seem good within this organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Raises are too few and far between.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 My supervisor is unfair to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 I like doing the things I do at work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 The goals of this organization are not clear to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Satisfaction Measures</td>
<td>Disagree very much</td>
<td>Disagree moderately</td>
<td>Disagree slightly</td>
<td>Agree slightly</td>
<td>Agree moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>There are few rewards for those who work here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I have too much to do at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I enjoy my co-workers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I like my supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I have too much paperwork.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I don’t feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>My job is enjoyable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I feel isolated at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I feel included in social functions at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I feel I am recognised as a valued member of the team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV – Social Integration
(a) For each item below, please circle your response on the scale provided.

1. Someday I will return to my country of origin permanently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Likely</th>
<th>Highly</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Someday I will feel completely Australian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Likely</th>
<th>Highly</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Language, Identity and Behaviour
The following statements measure your present level of Australian language, identity and behaviour. Please mark your answer by circling the response for each question that best describes your present situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language, Identity and Behaviour related to Australian Context</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your ability to speak English at the time of migration?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your ability to speak English now?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your ability to understand English now?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your ability to speak English in social situations now?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think of myself as being Australian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good about being Australian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Australian plays an important part in my life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am part of Australian culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone criticizes Australians I feel they are criticizing me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong sense of being Australian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of being Australian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviour</strong></td>
<td><strong>How much do you speak English:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>At home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>With friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>At work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>How much do you:</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Read Australian books, newspapers, or magazines?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eat at restaurants in Australia (other than Indian/Sri Lankan restaurants)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Attend Australian concerts, exhibitions etc.?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Buy groceries in Australian supermarkets?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Attend Australian sporting events?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Go to English speaking doctors?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Socialize with Australian friends?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eat Australian food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Watch English-language movies on DVD or in movie theatres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part IV – (c) Language, Identity and Behaviour II**

The following statements measure your present level of Indian (Indian respondents only) OR Sri Lankan (Sri Lankan respondents only) language, identity and behaviour. Please mark your answer by circling the response for each question that best describes your present situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Language, Identity and Behaviour related to country of origin</strong></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Language**

| 1 | How would you rate your ability to speak your own first language at the time of migration? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2 | How would you rate your ability to speak your own first language now? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3 | How would you rate your ability to understand your own first language now? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4 | How would you rate your ability to speak your own first language in social situations now? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Identity**

| 1 | I think of myself as being Indian/Sri Lankan | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2 | I feel good about being Indian/Sri Lankan | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3 | Being Indian/Sri Lankan plays an important part in my life | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4 | I feel that I am part of Indian/Sri Lankan culture | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5 | If someone criticizes Indians/Sri Lankans I feel they are criticizing me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6 | I have a strong sense of being Indian/Sri Lankan | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7 | I am proud of being Indian/Sri Lankan | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Behaviour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>How much do you speak your own first language:</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>At home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>With friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>At work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you:</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Read books, newspapers, or magazines of your own first language?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Eat at Indian/Sri Lankan restaurants?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Attend Indian/Sri Lankan concerts, exhibitions etc.?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Shop at Indian/Sri Lankan grocery stores?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Attend Indian/Sri Lankan sporting events?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Go to Indian/Sri Lankan doctors?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Socialize with Indian/Sri Lankan friends?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Eat Indian/Sri Lankan food?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Watch Indian/Sri Lankan movies on DVD or in movie theatres?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Output Reports for Factor Analyses and Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction Scale (Spector, 1997)

Factor Analyses

Establishing the reliability and the validity of scales is of paramount importance to obtaining accurate survey results (Fabrigar et al., 1999; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Accordingly, factor analyses were employed to examine the dimensionality of the Personal Well-being Index and the Language, Identity and Behavioural Acculturation Scale, to ensure items loaded on their respective factors. Factor analysis of the Job Satisfaction Scale was not performed as the scale was used at global level and reliability was found to be satisfactory. Following checks for dimensionality, scale reliabilities were computed for the Personal Well-being Index, Language, Identity and Behavioural Acculturation Scale, and Perceived Inclusiveness Scale.

Prior to the factor analyses, and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett’s Test and Barlett’s Test of Sphericity were conducted to ensure sample size was suitable and sufficient for factor analysis (Cunningham, 2007; Gupta et al, 2009; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). If the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value > .60, and Barlett’s Test of Sphericity tests results are significant at .001 ($p < .001$) then the data set is adequate for factor analysis (Cunningham, 2007; Gupta et al, 2009; Pallent, 2007). The results of these tests showed sample size was sufficient for factor analysis of the Personal Well-being Index (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin = .86; Barttlet’s test of Sphericity, Chi-square = 1261.57, $p < .001$). The results for the Language Identity and Behaviour scale also indicated sample sufficiency (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin was .91; Bartlett’s test of Sphericity, Chi-square = 4242.81, $p < .001$).

Principal Components Analysis extraction with Direct Oblimin Rotation was applied to determine the factor loadings of items in the Personal-Wellbeing Index and the Language, Identity and Behaviour subscales of the Acculturation Scale. More details of the factor analyses with the rationale for implementing the above extraction and rotation techniques for Personal-Wellbeing Index and Language, Identity and Behaviour scale are reported below.

Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006)

As mentioned in the Methods chapter, the life satisfaction measure for the present study consisted of eight domains of satisfaction that represent the first level of de-construction with “satisfaction with life as a whole”. The eight items were subjected to a factor analysis using Principal Components Analysis with Direct Oblimin Rotation17. (Maximum Likelihood Extraction, with Direct Oblimin Rotation captured 51.5 % of variance whereas Principal Components Analysis with Direct Oblimin Rotation captured 57.5% variance; hence results obtained using Principal Components Analysis with Direct Oblimin Rotation were retained for further analysis). In order to determine the number of factors that should be retained, a scree plot was examined and factors with Eigen values greater than one were retained (Cunningham, 2007; Costello & Osborne, 2005; Fabrigar et al, 1999). The factor loadings for all items exceeded 0.4 (Fabrigar et al, 1999). The factor analysis resulted in one factor with an eigenvalue > one, capturing 57.5 % of variance and with factor loadings between .62 to .79. The scree plot indicated a steep drop after the first factor. Hence, the results supported the original one factor solution (see below for scree plot results and factor loadings).

---

17 Principal Component Analysis and Oblimin Rotation is meaningful to apply to a data set with a number of variables that are correlated with one another, and results provide a correlation matrix (Cunningham, 2007; Fabrigar et al, 1999; Spector, 1992). Also in the present study these two techniques provided meaningful results.
Table 1
Personal well-Being Index (Cummins, 2006) – Factor loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How satisfied are you with your standard of living?</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How satisfied are you with your health?</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How satisfied are you with what you are achieving in life?</td>
<td>0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How satisfied are you with your personal relationships?</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How satisfied are you with how safe you feel?</td>
<td>0.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How satisfied are you with feeling part of your community?</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How satisfied are you with your future security?</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How satisfied are you with your spirituality or religion?</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Scree plot results – Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006)
The Language, Identity and Behaviour Acculturation Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001)

This scale consists of three subscales (Language, Identity and Behaviour). All 22 items were subjected to factor analysis using Principal Components Analysis Extraction and with Direct Oblimin Rotation. Principal Components Analysis and the Direct Oblimin rotation results produced more theoretically sensible and readily interpretable results in this model than other extraction and rotation methods (e.g., Maximum Likelihood Extraction and Direct Oblimin Rotation, See below table and the figure) and explained more variance than Maximum Likelihood Extraction with Direct Oblimin Rotation (63.50% versus 57.97%).

Items loaded on a four factor structure instead of the original three factor one. Further inspection revealed that two items from the Behaviour sub-scale loaded on the fourth factor. These two items showed higher means compared to the means of other items in the scale (‘How much do you buy groceries from Australian supermarkets?’ = M, 6.32, SD, 1.03 and ‘How much do you speak English at work?’ = M, 6.79, SD, 0.55; whilst means of the other items ranged from 3.42 to 5.75). It is sensible that speaking English in the workplace and buying groceries from Australian supermarkets are commonplace circumstances for the sample group; language skills of over seven points for all four components of the IELTS test (or equivalent) are a prerequisite for the category of skilled migrants (DIMIA, 2011). Australian supermarkets dominate the grocery marketplace and are therefore often the only option with few other alternatives.

Therefore, a decision was made to eliminate these two items from the scale as they failed to discriminate between differing levels of social integration in the present context. In addition, two items in the Behaviour subscale (‘How much do you speak English at home’ and ‘How much do you speak English with friends’) loaded with the Language factor (See below table and the figure). This situation is consistent with previous studies (Zea et al, 2003). As they meaningfully loaded onto the Language subscale, it was decided to retain these two items as part of the Language subscale rather than the Behaviour subscale in the present study. As a result, eight of the 12 original items were retained in the Behaviour subscale (two items were deleted and two items were moved to Language subscale).

The dimensional validity and reliability of all three subscales was re-tested after modification and was found to be satisfactory. Results showed a three factor structure (three components with Eigenvalues > one), explaining 63.50% of the variance. The scree plot indicated a break point in the data whereby the curve flattened after the third point. Factor loadings of items on their respective factors exceeded .40, with only one item which loaded .35 on the expected factor (see below table and the figure). There were no cross-factor loadings (i.e., items that loaded above .40 for more than one factor) (Fabrigar et al, 1999; see below table and the figure for factor loadings and scree plot results).
Table 2
Language, Identity and Behaviour Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001) - Factor loading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>PCA and DO Rotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How would you rate your ability to speak English now?</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How would you rate your ability to understand English now?</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How would you rate your ability to speak English in social situations now?</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think of myself as being Australian</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel good about being Australian</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Being Australian plays an important part in my life</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel that I am part of Australian culture</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>If someone criticizes Australians I feel they are criticizing me</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I have a strong sense of being Australian</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am proud of being Australian</td>
<td>0.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How much do you speak English at home?</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How much do you speak English with friends?</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How much do you read Australian books, newspapers, or magazines?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How much do you eat at restaurants in Australia (other than Indian/Sri Lankan restaurants)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How much do you attend Australian concerts, exhibitions etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How much do you attend Australian sporting events?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>How much do you go to English speaking doctors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>How much do you socialize with Australian friends?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>How much do you eat Australian food?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>How much do you watch English-language movies on DVD or in movie theatres?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only one item reported loading level below 0.40
Scree Plot Results – Language, Identity and Behaviour Acculturation Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001)

![Scree Plot](image)

**Job Satisfaction Scale (Spector, 1997)**

Means, SD, skewness and kurtosis for all the sub-scales and for overall Job Satisfaction are given in the Table below.

Table 3
Descriptive statistics for Job Satisfaction Scale/Sub-scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating procedures</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>145.52</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=306
Table 4  
Reliability scores of Job Satisfaction Scale (Spector, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Item numbers</th>
<th>*Spector 2001</th>
<th>Present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Pay and remuneration</td>
<td>1, 10, 19, 28</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion and Opportunities</td>
<td>2, 11, 20, 33</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Immediate supervisor</td>
<td>3, 12, 21, 30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>Monitory and non-monitory fringe benefits</td>
<td>4, 13, 22, 29</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>Appreciation, recognition, and rewards for good work</td>
<td>5, 14, 23, 32</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating procedures</td>
<td>Operating policies and procedures</td>
<td>6, 15, 24, 31</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>People you work with</td>
<td>7, 16, 25, 34</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>Job task themselves</td>
<td>8, 17, 27, 35</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication within the organisation</td>
<td>9, 18, 26, 36</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total of all facets</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reference: Spector, 2001, internal consistency reliability are (coefficient alpha) based on a sample of 2870.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My supervisor is unfair to me.</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I like my supervisor.</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. My job is enjoyable.</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like the people I work with.</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I like doing the things I do at work.</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Communications seem good within this organization.</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I enjoy my co-workers.</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. There are few rewards for those who work here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. There is too much bickering and fighting at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Work assignments are not fully explained.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The goals of this organization are not clear to me.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I have too much to do at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I have too much paperwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Raises are too few and far between.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Scale Reliabilities

Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha$) was adequate for all established measures used in the current study, with reliability coefficients ranging from 0.75 to 0.92. Reliability for the Personal Well-being Index (Cummins, 2006) was 0.89, and reliability for the overall Language, Identity and Behavioural Acculturation Scale (Birman & Trickett, 2001) was 0.91 (individual subscale reliabilities were as follows: Language = 0.90, Identity = 0.96, and Behaviour = 0.84). Eight of the nine facets of the Job Satisfaction Scale (Spector, 1984) showed adequate internal consistency reliabilities (> .60), and the overall reliability (all subscales combined) was .92. The “Operational Procedures” facet had a low internal consistency reliability of .27. Previous findings also have reported low stability of subscales in the Job Satisfaction Scale (1984), especially the operating procedures facet (Saane et al., 2003). However, only the overall scale, and not the individual subscales, was used for the purpose of the present study. Perceived level of inclusiveness was assessed using a three item scale developed for the purpose of this study. Internal consistency reliability for this scale was .58.
Can you compute a mean of each subscale: language, identity, behavior, rather than the sum? Since they each have a different amount of items, the sums won't help you compare, but the means will put them all on the same scale, from 1 to 7.

Then you can test the differences between means for these three components (language, identity, and behavior) to determine whether they are significantly different from each other.

There is no cutoff to determine high or low acculturation; I think of acculturation as a continuous variable. What were the anchors you used on your 1 to 7 scale? Was it 1 not at all and 7 very much? So then if your mean language score, for example, is 6.3 you can say that it was quite high, on a 7 point scale; if it's 3.4, I'd call that low. If it's in the middle, around 4, then it's around the midpoint.

On reason I use 4-point scales in my work is that there is no midpoint, and it forces respondents to choose high or low... but in any case, if your scale is 1-7, then that's how you interpret the mean scores.

Does that make sense?

Dina Birman, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Director of Undergraduate Studies
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois at Chicago
dbirman@uic.edu
APPENDIX D: Ethics Clearance from the Swinburne University of Technology

From: Ann Gaeth [AGAETH@groupwise.swin.edu.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 30 March 2011 5:06 PM
To: Diana Rajendran
Cc: Resethics; Sharon Grant
Subject: SUHREC Project 2011/044 Ethics clearance

To: Dr D Rajendran, Asanka Nirmalie Gunasekara (bc) FHEL
CC: Dr Sharon Grant REA, Ms Nadine White Research Administration Coordinator FHEL

Dear Diana and Asanka,

SUHREC Project 2011/044 Diversity Spillover: Skilled immigrants' social integration, work and life satisfaction in Australia
Dr D Rajendran Asanka Nirmalie Gunasekara FHEL
Proposed duration from 1/02/2011 To 1/02/2013

Ethical review of the above project protocol was undertaken on behalf of Swinburne's Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC) by a SUHREC Subcommittee (SHESC3) at a meeting held 25 March 2011.

I am pleased to advise that, as submitted to date, the project may proceed in line with standard on-going ethics clearance conditions here outlined.

- All human research activity undertaken under Swinburne auspices must conform to Swinburne and external regulatory standards, including the current National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans and with respect to secure data use, retention and disposal.

- The named Swinburne Chief Investigator/Supervisor remains responsible for any personnel appointed to or associated with the project being made aware of ethics clearance conditions, including research and consent procedures or instruments approved. Any change in chief investigator/supervisor requires timely notification and SUHREC endorsement.

- The above project has been approved as submitted for ethical review by or on behalf of SUHREC. Amendments to approved procedures or instruments ordinarily require prior ethical appraisal/clearance. SUHREC must be notified immediately or as soon as possible thereafter of (a) any serious or unexpected adverse effects on participants and any redress measures; (b) proposed changes in protocols; and (c) unforeseen events which might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project.

- At a minimum, an annual report on the progress of the project is required as well as at the conclusion (or abandonment) of the project.

- A duly authorised external or internal audit of the project may be undertaken at any time.
Please contact me if you have any queries about on-going ethics clearance. The SUHREC project number should be quoted in communication. Chief Investigators/Supervisors and Student Researchers should retain a copy of this email as part of project record-keeping.

Best wishes for project.

Yours sincerely,

Ann Gaeth
Secretary, SHESC3

---

**Ann Gaeth, PhD**
Administrative Officer (Research Ethics)
****MON/TUES/WED and FRI am ONLY****
Swinburne Research (H68)
Swinburne University of Technology
P.O. Box 218
HAWTHORN VIC 3122
Tel: +61 3 9214 5935
Fax: +61 3 9214 5267
Greetings,

We are currently conducting a research project to examine social integration, work satisfaction, and life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian skilled immigrants in Australia.

After migrating to a new country, individuals develop different levels of social connections in the community and in the workplace. This process has been described as Social Integration. Research has shown that social integration is also an important determinant of work and life satisfaction. This research will explore the level to which skilled immigrants feel they have integrated into Australian society and how this is related to the level of satisfaction they have about their work and their lives generally.

We are seeking immigrants from India and Sri Lanka who migrated to Australia under the migration category of ‘Skilled Immigrant’. If you are interested in participating in this research project, please go to the link below which will direct you to further information about this research project and an electronic questionnaire. The questionnaire involves ticking or circling responses as appropriate or providing brief, written answers and takes approximately 20 minutes.

http://opinio.online.swin.edu.au/s?s=sdssdsdssd

Thank you for your time.

Asanka Gunasekara (PhD Candidate)

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact:

Dr. Diana Rajendran
Faculty of Higher Education
Swinburne University of Technology, Lilydale
Lilydale, Victoria 3140
Australia
CONSENT INFORMATION STATEMENT

FACULTY OF HIGHER EDUCATION, LILYDALE

SWINBURNE UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Consent Information Statement

PROJECT TITLE: Diversity Spillover: Skilled Immigrants’ Social Integration, Work and Life Satisfaction in Australia

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S): Dr Diana Rajendran, Lecturer in Management; Dr. Glenda Ballantyne, Senior Lecturer in Sociology; Dr. Sharon Grant, Senior Lecturer in Psychology; Asanka Gunasekara, PhD Candidate.

WHAT THIS PROJECT IS ABOUT AND WHY IT IS IMPORTANT?

Socio-cultural integration a growing research area in multicultural societies. After migrating to a new country, each individual immigrant develops social connections with the new community and at the workplace as an inevitable part of their migration journey. This gradual inclusion of new comers into the receiving society is often referred to as social integration.

Social integration may depend on ethnicity, age at migration, time spent in the host society, migration status, language proficiency, level of social acceptance by the dominant group in the receiving society, and many other individual and socioeconomic factors. Social integration is also an important determinant of an immigrant’s work and life satisfaction.

Although Australia has been identified as an important destination for skilled immigrants, research on social integration in Australia is lacking, particularly for cultural groups such as Indian and Sri Lankan immigrants who now make up a large proportion of those who migrate to Australia. This research project will examine the level to which Indian and Sri Lankan skilled immigrants feel they have successfully integrated into Australian society and how this relates to the level of satisfaction they have about with their work and their lives generally.

WHAT DOES THE STUDY INVOLVE AND WHAT IS THE TIME COMMITMENT?

We are seeking respondents from India and Sri Lanka who migrated to Australia under the migration category of ‘Skilled Immigrant’.

Participating in the study involves completing a questionnaire which will take approximately 20 minutes. The questionnaire consists of four main sections:
demographic information, life satisfaction, work satisfaction, and social integration (these questions relate to language, identity and behaviour in the Australian context and your country of origin). You will be asked to respond by providing short, written answers, and ticking or circling response options.

Your participation is voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time even after you have started answering the questionnaire.

WILL ALL DATA PROVIDED BE PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL?
You will not be required to give your name or to provide any other identifying information. Accordingly, all data will be anonymous and data will not be traceable to a particular individual. No information about any individual will be given to Swinburne University, or to any other individual or organisation. All processed data will be stored electronically with password protection. Only the researchers will have access to the data.

HOW WILL THE DATA BE USED?
Findings from this project will be published in the form of PhD thesis and may be published in academic journals and or presented at conferences. Data will be analysed and reported on an aggregated (grouped) basis only therefore individual responses will not be identifiable.

HOW DO I TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?
If you would like to participate in this research project, complete and return the attached questionnaire using the reply paid envelope provided.

If you have any questions regarding the project at any stage, please contact: Dr. Diana Rajendran on Faculty of Higher Education, Swinburne University of Technology, Lilydale Campus on (03) 9215 7144 or at DRajendran@swin.edu.au

If this questionnaire raises issues that are of concern to you, please contact Life Line (Ph 13 11 14) for free, 24 hour counseling.

This project has been approved by or on behalf of Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee in line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans. If you have any concern or complaint about the conduct of this project, you can contact:

Research Ethics Officer, Swinburne Research, Swinburne University of Technology, P.O. Box 218, Hawthorn, VIC 3122. Tel. (03) 9214 5218 or rethics@swin.edu.au

Retain this sheet for your records.
APPENDIX G: Invitation to participate in the survey (hard copy survey)

Greetings,

We are currently conducting a research project to examine social integration, work satisfaction, and life satisfaction among Sri Lankan and Indian immigrants in Australia. We kindly request you to assist us by completing this simple questionnaire which takes only 15 - 20 minutes from your valuable time and return it using the reply paid envelope provided.

Asanka Gunasekara (PhD Candidate)

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact:

Dr. Diana Rajendran
Faculty of Higher Education
Swinburne University of Technology, Lilydale
Lilydale, Victoria 3140
Australia
APPENDIX H: Statistical comparison between on-line and hard copy survey data

Table 6
Independent samples $t$-tests results for hard-copy version and on-line version of the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Significance (two-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of residence before migration</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at migration</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived level of inclusion</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language skills</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification*</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year since migration*</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>64.95</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>63.75</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>147.03</td>
<td>26.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>142.14</td>
<td>26.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: Hard copy = 41 and On-line = 265, * represent ordinal variables
Hi Sharon,

Yes, that is how we recommend doing it. It is actually the same model being run each time -- they differ only in which variable is considered the primary IV.

Kris

At 07:34 PM 7/25/2012, Sharon Grant wrote:

Dear Kristopher,

I am currently supervising two students who are working with your multiple mediator macro in SPSS. In both cases, the students have more than one predictor or initial variable. Where there is only a single mediator for a given initial variable, they are using the macro to test for mediation while controlling for the other predictors as covariates. Given that there are several (e.g., four) initial variables, is it appropriate for the students to run separate models for each initial variable, one at a time, controlling for the other variables as covariates in each instance?

Many thanks for your assistance.

Best regards,

Sharon

Kristopher J. Preacher
Quantitative Methods
Psychology & Human Development
Vanderbilt University
PMB 552, 230 Appleton Place
Nashville, TN 37203-5721