

Briefing Paper on Labour Force Utilisation in Queensland with Special Reference to Indigenous and Non-English Speaking and Overseas Born Backgrounds

John Mangan
University of Queensland

1.0 Introduction

Labour force utilisation may be defined as the degree to which the working age population engage in paid work. There are two broad dimensions to utilisation; *coverage* (the number of active persons in the working age population and the percentage of the working age population actually in employment) and the *intensity of utilisation* (the number of hours worked on average and the regularity of that degree of work). As a result, a standard measure of labour force utilisation is the average number of hours per week per capita. Other partial measures include the employment/population ratio (also known as the employment rate) the participation rate, the unemployment rate and the level of discouraged workers as a percentage of the labour force. At a macro level, the ageing of the population and its potential ramifications on labour force productivity and the dependency rate has placed increased attention upon the importance of the rate of labour force utilisation; the implication being that a falling activity rate needs be offset by increased utilisation of those remaining in the workforce.

In this regard, the recent Australian trends in labour utilisation have been encouraging. The All-Persons participation rate in 2006 reached 65 per cent, average hours worked per person have risen from 15 hours (1996) to 17.4 hours (2006) with the result that the accepted measure of national wealth, GDP per capita, has risen (in real terms) from \$343.50 in 1960 to \$977.77 in 2006¹. Moreover, the level of labour force utilisation in Australia compares well with benchmark nations such as the United States. As can be seen from chart 1, Australia and the US have similar levels of labour force utilisation but the US has a higher GDP per capita because of its higher productivity rate.

¹ Cited in Treasury Budget Paper 1, Statement 4, 2007

Chart 1: Labour Force Utilisation and Productivity in OECD (2006)



It is generally agreed that four main factors impact on labour force utilisation:

- demography - particularly the age structure of the population;
- participation rates;
- average number of hours worked; and
- employment/unemployment.

Demography is important because it deals with population size (which sets a finite limit to workforce size, once norms of acceptable age and working hours are set) and the age of the population, which in turn impacts upon participation decisions and productivity. In this context the activity or participation rate defines the effective short term limit on the percentage of the population that are working or immediately available for work. However, participation does not necessarily imply employment as those currently unemployed, but actively seeking work, are also listed as active. In this sense, participation rates overstate utilisation.

Employment/population ratios (employment rates) provide a reasonably accurate picture of effective labour force utilisation. Yet, even here there are some problems. In particular, there is the issue of employment intensity - that is, how many hours per week on average are worked and over what percentage of the year? This in turn raises issues in regard to the impact of different forms of employment such as full-time, part-time, seasonal or casual. It would also be expected that utilisation rates would be affected by the education and other supply factors of the group under consideration.

As a result of these concerns, average hours worked per capita are often seen as the best means of estimating labour force utilisation² or, in the absence of data on hours, the employment rate is often used as the next best alternative.

² It is however, likely that hours worked over a period are closely associated with the form of employment being offered.

2.0 Utilisation rates in Queensland with special attention to Indigenous and NESB in Australia

Differences in labour force utilisation rates are common within labour market groups (largely on the basis of age and education). For example, for All-Persons in Queensland, two age groups 15 years to 24 years and 54 years to 59 years have employment rates below 46 per cent and 40 per cent respectively. However, in many cases this low employment rate reflects educational, life-style and retirement choices as well as the impact of institutional and social security considerations and can only be seen as under-utilisation in an opportunity cost sense. That is, what output could be produced if these persons chose to be fully occupied? The fact that these low employment rates have persisted during a sustained labour market boom, indicates that supply side issues are the predominant cause³.

Nevertheless, there are some within these age groups and in the general population that do suffer systemic disadvantage in the labour market, part of which manifests in low utilisation rates⁴. While traditional determining factors such as education, language, poor health, criminality and homelessness explain much of this problem, it is often thought that systemic disadvantage applies to some labour market groups because of who they are rather than their other supply characteristics.

With this in mind, this report concentrates on the existence of systemic disadvantage for two specific groups, Indigenous persons and those from NESB backgrounds.

For example, Indigenous and the NESB groups have been traditionally linked together because they both are believed to suffer embedded labour market disadvantage. However, recent evidence points to diverging labour market experience between these two groups. In general, many NESB and overseas born Asians from English speaking environments (OSAB/ESE), particularly in managerial and professional occupations, have achieved labour market parity and often now exceed those born in Australia. However, Indigenous persons, both male and female, continue to suffer significant "ethnic" penalties in a range of labour market outcomes including labour utilisation rates⁵.

In terms of observed trends, the 2001 Census (RADL) unit record file remains the best current source of data on the relative position of the three groups on a unit record

³ It is true that the participation rates for those aged 55-59 have risen substantially in recent years in response both to longevity of the population and labour shortages. On the supply side this is an encouraging sign for an economy which is predicted to become increasingly labour scarce. Whether the demand for these workers will be maintained in recession remains to be seen; in other words will the mature worker problem re-emerge?

⁴ For example see Mangan, J and Stephen, K (2007) "Social Exclusion in Queensland Extent and Policy Options, DEIR: Brisbane.

⁵ Borooah, V.K. and Mangan, J. (2007) 'Born There; Living Here: The Economic Performance of Australia's Immigrants' *European Journal of Political Economy* 23 (2), 486-51

basis⁶. Appendix Tables A1 and A2 show the employment proportions, across 3 broad occupational groupings for Indigenous, non-Indigenous and a selection of NESB groups. Appendix Table A1 shows that less than 20 per cent of Indigenous men in full-time employment were in professional/managerial occupations, in contrast to 56 per cent of Other Asian, and 49 per cent of East Asian men in full-time employment. Appendix Table A2 shows that compared to men, a higher proportion (31 per cent compared to 20 per cent) of Indigenous women in full-time employment were in professional/managerial occupations and a lower proportion of full-time employed Other Asian (51 per cent) and East Asian (42 per cent) women were in professional/managerial occupations.

Given this background it is useful to further investigate the relative position of these two groups in terms of overall labour force utilisation.

2.1 Utilisation measures for Queensland workers

How then does this background information apply itself to current labour force utilisation rates in Queensland? First, it puts context into the use of aggregate employment rates as the measure of labour force utilisation. The data suggest that Indigenous have a much higher probability of working in elementary occupations but are at a distinct disadvantage in other higher level occupations. As well, the data should put paid to the idea that all NESB and OSAB/ESE in Queensland are at a labour market disadvantage. As Borooah and Mangan suggest:

It is now clear that the direction of labour market advantage in Australia is no longer one-directional; running in favour of the dominant racial group. For example, both Other Asians (males and females), do better in terms of occupational access and reward than the majority Other (white) group; similarly East Asian males do better in terms of access and East Asian females do better in terms of income reward than the dominant population group. Only the indigenous group do worse than the default group in terms of both access and reward⁷.

This statement is reinforced, with some caveats, by examination of the available 2006 Census data. A crucial distinction in terms of the utilisation performance of the non-Australian born appears to be pre-exposure to the English language. These data provide the most recent cross section (by region) data on the Queensland labour market. They show that the utilisation outcomes for NESB are mixed but still significantly lower than the average Queensland performance when considered across males and females⁸. However for some NESB, such as Vietnamese (defined as NESB*), labour market outcomes are heading towards parity with the Queensland All-Person's

⁶ In the standard 2001 Census Unit record, Indigenous were not identified as a separate category. They were identified in the more comprehensive RADL version.

⁷ Borooah, V.K. and Mangan, J. (2007) 'Born There; Living Here: The Economic Performance of Australia's Immigrants' *European Journal of Political Economy* 23 (2), 486-51

⁸ It might also be argued that due to the prevalence of English as a widely spoken language the concept of NESB is becoming less relevant. Many Asian migrants, particularly those from India, Hong Kong, Sri Lanka etc where English is either the official language or widely spoken, do very well in the labour market. Whether they do as well as their education levels would suggest is another issue.

average. As well, those Asian born persons, particularly males from English speaking environments (OSAB/ESE) such as India, often exceed the State average across the four utilisation measures. Another point of significance is the presence of a noticeable gender gap among both NESB and OSAB/ESE which exceeds, in most cases, the gender gap among the community as a whole.

Table 1 examines broad aggregates for four measures of labour utilisation - employment rates, participation and unemployment rates and average hours.

Table 1 - Labour Utilisation Indicators- Queensland - All-Persons

	Employment rate	Age- Adjusted Employment rate*	Unemployment rate	Participation Rate	Average hours
Indigenous	48.9	44.5	13.1	56.2	9.3
NESB	52.3	Na	8.7	55.4	12.5
NESB (Vietnamese)*	57.0	Na	7.3	61.4	14.1
Overseas born ESE**	62.3	Na	7.0	67.0	16.1
All Queensland	58.9	58.9	4.7	61.8	17.5

Source: Estimated from data in the 2006 Census of Population and Housing

* See table 5 for method of age adjustment

In aggregate, it appears that both Indigenous and NESB (total) are experiencing lower than average labour force utilisation⁹. NESB as a whole have, compared to the Queensland average, a 6.6 percentage point lower employment rate, a 6.4 percentage point lower participation rate, receive on average, 30% less paid hours per week and have a 4 percentage point difference in unemployment rate.

But, in line with research cited above, some caution needs to be attached to this conclusion. First, the experience of NESB groups is diverse. The NESB (Vietnamese)* category refers to those of Vietnamese ancestry, who are currently the most successful (in terms of achieving high utilisation of the purely NESB groups)¹⁰ within the Queensland economy. It can be seen that this group does substantially better than Indigenous or NESB (total) but falls below the Queensland average in terms of employment rate (-1.9 percentage points) and average hours per capita (-19 per cent). They have approximately the same participation rate (-0.4 percentage points)., However, like the NESB (total), this group has a much higher propensity for unemployment (55 per cent or 2.6 percentage points above the Queensland average).

⁹ The NESB group was constructed from a number of immigrant groups in the Queensland labour market.

¹⁰ The issue is complicated by the prevalence of English as an official or widely spoken language in many Asian countries such as India, Philippines, Malaysia and Sri Lanka. While some of these persons may not personally speak English, they operate in an English speaking environment. Persons from these countries have, for example, employment rates for males of 70 per cent, 77 per cent, 70 per cent and 72 per cent respectively, which makes them among the more successful groups in the labour market. See appendix Table A3.

By contrast, Asians from English speaking environments (in this case, India) exceed the Queensland average in terms of participation (67 per cent compared to 61.8 per cent) and employment rates (62.0 compared to 58.9). They work, per capita less average hours per week (16.1 compared to 17.5) As well, even among this group some utilisation disadvantage exists with unemployment rates (7.0 per cent, noticeably higher (2.3 percentage points) than the average of 4.7 per cent)¹¹. It should also be noted that measures of utilisation do not take into account such factors as job desirability, workplace morale and earnings and conditions, nor do they show if overseas qualified persons are being forced to take jobs for which they are over-qualified.

Table 1 also contains age-adjusted employment rates for Indigenous because a legitimate comparison of the data arises from the fact that the Indigenous population has a noticeably younger age distribution than the Queensland population (and labour force) as a whole. Employment rates are influenced by age. As a result, direct comparisons of utilisation indices, especially employment rates, are made difficult by the problem of age-confounding. Age confounding occurs as a result of two factors (1) when the two populations being compared have different age distributions and (2) when the aspect being studied (employment rates) is likely to vary across the age groups.

The Indigenous population in Australia has a significantly younger age profile than that of the population as a whole and this is likely to bias direct comparisons¹². To counter this source of bias a statistical process known as age adjustment is often undertaken.

The process of age-adjustment changes the amount that each age group contributes to the overall rate in each community, so that the overall rates are based on the same age structure. Rates that are based on the same age distribution can then be compared to each other without the presence of confounding by age. Adjustment is accomplished by first multiplying the age-specific rates of employment rates by age-specific weights. The weighted rates are then summed across the age groups to give the age-adjusted rate. For example, the age adjustment process used in the case of Indigenous employment rates in Wide Bay-Burnett is shown in Table 2.

¹¹ It should be remembered that with NESB groups the length of stay in the country is very important. The unemployment rates for the NESB* groups after a two year stay is at least as low as the All-Persons average.

¹² In this case the younger age profile overstates the employment outcomes for Indigenous, because young workers in general have higher employment rates than older workers.

Table 2- Age adjustment of Indigenous Employment Rates

Age group	Number Employed (a)	LF Population (b)	Rate per 100,000 (c=(a ÷ b) x 1000)	Weight (d)*	Weighted Rate (c x d)
15-24	517	1366	378.5	0.14	53.0
25-34	407	952	427.5	0.12	51.3
35-44	489	967	505.7	0.17	86.0
45-54	352	731	481.5	0.18	86.7
55-64	132	440	300.0	0.18	54.0
65+	20	288	69.4	0.22	15.8
Total			404		346

Based on Wide Bay Labour Force as a whole

The results of the age adjustment process indicate that if the Indigenous population had the same age distribution as the workforce population as a whole, their employment rate would have been significantly lower (346 per 1000 or 34.6 per cent) and is currently biased upwards (404 per 1000; 40.4 per cent) by having a younger age distribution than the regional population as a whole.

Taking the age adjustment into account, it is clear that the lowest labour force utilisation rates across all measures take place among Indigenous persons. Table 3 sets out the extent of disadvantage faced by Indigenous (All-Persons) relative to the other groups identified in Table 1.

Table 3 - Indigenous (All-Persons) disadvantage in comparison to other groups Queensland 2006

%Disadvantage In Comparison to	Employment Rates*	Unemployment Rates	Participation Rates	Average hours Per capita
NESB	14.9	50.4	-1.4	25.6
NESB*	21.9	79.4	8.5	34.0
OSBA/ESE	28.6	87.1	16.1	42.2
Queensland Average	24.4	178.2	9.1	46.8

* Age- adjusted

- signifies that Indigenous performed ahead of the comparison group

Table 3, confirms that Indigenous persons have the lowest levels of labour force utilisation within the Queensland labour force and puts into perspective the gap that has opened up between this group and other groups in the labour force. The data indicate that a non-English background is now considerably less of a barrier to labour force utilisation than being Indigenous. For example;

- Indigenous(All-Persons) are 14.9 per cent less likely to be employed than the NESB group, 21.9 per cent less likely than Vietnamese, 28.6 per cent less likely

than Indians and 24.4 per cent less than the average member of the Queensland population as a whole.

- In terms of average hours per capita, the disadvantage respectively is 25.6 per cent, 34.0 per cent, 42.2 per cent and 46.8 per cent. In other words, the Indigenous population work, on average, about half the number of hours as the Queensland average.
- The differences in unemployment rates are very high, ranging from a 50 per cent disadvantage (NESB) to almost 200 per cent (Queensland average), indicating that the All-Persons Indigenous rate is approximating 3 times that of the Queensland All-Persons average.
- In only one instance, participation for NESB, did Indigenous perform above the other groups¹³.

Tables 4(a) and 4(b) also contain age-adjusted employment rates and disaggregate the other utilisation rate measures by sex.

Table 4(a) - Labour Utilisation Indicators- Queensland Males

	Employment rate	Age- Adjusted Employment rate	Unemployment Rate	Participation Rate	Average hours
Indigenous	55.0	51.7	15.1	62.9	10.2
NESB	56.8	Na	5.9	61.2	13.6
NESB*	67.0	Na	6.0	71.0	16.3
OSB/ESE	73.0	Na	5.0	77.0	18.4
All Queensland	64.7	64.7	4.4	67.7	19.5

Source: Estimated from data in the 2006 Census of Population and Housing

For the most part, the same trends are observable, with Indigenous males having the lowest utilisation rates across all categories. Indigenous males have lower employment rates, significantly lower average weekly hours and much higher unemployment rates than all other groups in the table. The gap in utilisation between all NESB* and NESB is greater among males than for total, but NESB* performs at a closer rate to the All Queensland average in terms of employment rate, participation rate and average weekly hours; although they continue to have higher unemployment rates (6.0 compared to 4.4)¹⁴. The OSAB/ESE group, among males, exceeds the All-Persons Queensland average in terms of employment rate and participation rate, moves closer in terms of average hours per capita but still has a significant gap in terms of unemployment rates.

¹³ It could be argued that some immigrant communities also have a low age profile and their employment rate should be age-adjusted, however, data were not available to allow this.

¹⁴ They also have a marginally higher rate than the NESB (total) category as a whole.

Table 4(b) - Labour Utilisation Indicators - Queensland - Females

	Employment rate	Age- Adjusted Employment rate	Unemployment Rate	Participation Rate	Average hours
Indigenous	43.1	40.2	12.6	50.0	7.6
NESB	45.8	Na	12.2	46.4	10.9
NESB*	47.0	Na	9.0	52.0	11.2
OSAB/ESE	48.0	Na	11.0	54.8	11.4
All Queensland	53.3	53.3	5.1	56.2	15.4

Source: Estimated from data in the 2006 Census of Population and Housing

Table 4(b) presents the same data for females and here we see some differences. That is:

- the gap between the Queensland average and the remaining 3 groups has grown for females;
- the NESB and NESB* and OSAB/ESE groups move closer together;
- the age -adjusted female employment rate for Indigenous is low at 40.2 per cent; and
- the gender gap among NESB* and OSAB/ESE, for example, in terms of employment rates, is significantly higher than the Queensland average (42.5 per cent and 52 per cent respectively compared to 21 per cent).

2.2 Regional concentration on Indigenous

The remainder of the report examines labour utilisation issues amongst Indigenous and does so by region and sex and education levels. Table 5(a) sets out the utilisation rate estimates for Indigenous and All-Persons at the regional level.

Table 5(a) - Labour Utilisation Indicators- Queensland and Regions Persons

Region	Employment rate	Age- Adjusted Employment rate*	Unemployment Rate**	Participation Rate	Av hours***
Brisbane (Indigenous)	52.1	48.4	12.9	59.8	9.8
Brisbane (All)	61.4	61.4	4.8	64.2	17.7
Central West (Indigenous)	57.2	54.2	12.2	65.1	9.20
Central West(all)	66.4	66.4	3.8	68.5	18.9
Darling Downs (Indigenous)	43.9	41.1	18.4	53.8	7.8

Darling Downs (All)	58.1	58.1	4.7	60.9	15.3
Fitzroy (Indigenous)	46.5	43.3	14.4	54.3	8.4
Fitzroy (All)	60.4	60.4	3.9	63.3	15.7
Mackay (Indigenous)	55.6	51.5	11.3	62.7	10.8
Mackay (all)	62.0	62.0	4.1	64.3	17.3
Northern (Indigenous)	39.9	37.9	17.5	48.4	5.7
Northern (All)	61.4	61.4	4.9	64.2	17.2
Gold Coast (Indigenous)	57.5	52.6	11.0	64.6	8.0
Gold Coast (all)	56.8	56.8	4.7	60.0	14.8
Far North (Indigenous)	50.7	47.7	10.5	56.6	9.0
Far North (all)	60.1	60.1	4.8	62.9	17.8
North West (Indigenous)	44.7	42.3	11.8	50.7	8.2
North West (all)	63.7	63.7	4.4	66.1	17.3
Sunshine Coast (Indigenous)	52.8	48.3	14.2	61.5	9.6
Sunshine Coast (all)	53.8	53.8	5.3	57.1	13.8
South West (Indigenous)	51.6	48.7	13.3	59.6	9.2
South West (all)	67.3	67.3	4.1	69.3	18.4
West Moreton (Indigenous)	45.0	40.2	16.1	53.6	8.1
West Moreton (all)	53.6	53.6	6.01	56.4	14.7
Wide Bay (Indigenous)	40.4	34.6	17.7	49.1	6.5
Wide Bay (All)	47.1	47.1	8.3	51.0	13.5
Queensland (Indigenous)	48.9	44.5	13.1	56.2	9.3
Queensland (All)	58.9	58.9	4.7	61.8	17.5

Source: Estimated from data in the 2006 Census of Population and Housing

While some caution must attach to data based on small numbers, the results from Table 5(a) show that the employment rate, unemployment rates and average hours

worked, and to a lesser experience, are significantly lower for Indigenous than the averages for the workforce as a whole. Specifically;

- Average hours worked for Indigenous are, in almost every case, 40-50 per cent less than the regional average. The most extreme example being in Northern Region where the hours utilisation gap is over 65 per cent¹⁵.
- The age adjustment process allows an unbiased comparison of employment rates between the two groups. It shows that in several regions; Wide Bay-Burnett (34.6 per cent) and the Northern Region (37.9 per cent) the age-adjusted employment rates fell below 40 per cent. While a number of other regions such as Fitzroy, Darling Downs and West Moreton are in the lower 40 per cent
- Unemployment rates are also disproportionately higher among Indigenous with rates for this group 2-3 times higher¹⁶.
- Differences in participation rates between the two groups (impacted by higher Indigenous unemployment rates) were less significant than among the other measures of labour force utilisation, indicating that utilisation problems within the Indigenous were more demand than supply based.

Tables 5(b) and 5(c) disaggregate the data in Table 5(a) by sex.

Table 5(b) - Labour Utilisation Indicators- Queensland and Regions- Males

Region	Employment rate	Age-Adjusted Employment rate*	Unemployment Rate**	Participation Rate	Av hours***
Brisbane (Indigenous)	57.2	53.4	12.3	65.2	11.4
Brisbane (All)	67.3	67.3	4.6	70.2	18.9
Central West (Indigenous)	57.2	60.0	13.8	65.1	12.2
Central West(all)	70.7	70.7	3.7	72.8	18.9
Darling Downs (Indigenous)	53.0	49.9	16.6	63.5	10.1

¹⁵ Hours data were based on 2006 distribution of hours by form of employer. As well, the average hour data were averaged over the total workforce population rather than just those employed. It is arguable that this gives a better idea of the hour's utilization of the eligible population as a whole.

¹⁶ In keeping with the rest of the analysis, unemployment rates were derived from the supplied data but are very close to official ABS data for June 2006

(http://www.trainandemploy.qld.gov.au/resources/business_employers/pdf/qlm_review_june_2006.pdf).

Darling Downs (All)	65.3	65.3	4.4	68.1	15.3
Fitzroy (Indigenous)	51.3	48.6	13.8	59.5	9.9
Fitzroy (All)	60.4	60.4	3.8	63.3	15.7
Gold Coast (Indigenous)	64.9	60.2	10.1	72.2	13.4
Gold Coast (all)	62.3	62.3	4.9	65.5	15.1
Mackay (Indigenous)	65.5	60.7	9.5	72.4	14.1
Mackay (all)	68.7	68.7	4.1	70.8	17.2
Northern (Indigenous)	44.7	42.4	16.8	53.7	8.3
Northern (All)	61.4	61.4	5.1	64.2	15.5
Far North (Indigenous)	57.3	54.1	10.3	63.8	10.1
Far North (all)	64.5	64.5	4.8	67.4	16.8
North West (Indigenous)	54.8	51.7	12.0	62.3	8.3
North West (all)	63.7	63.7	4.4	66.1	17.3
Sunshine Coast (Indigenous)	57.8	54.0	13.7	67.0	11.0
Sunshine Coast (all)	53.8	53.8	4.4	57.1	13.8
South West (Indigenous)	57.9	54.9	13.5	66.9	10.5
South West (all)	67.3	67.3	3.9	69.3	18.4
West Moreton (Indigenous)	45.6	43.0	15.2	53.6	8.6
West Moreton (all)	53.6	53.6	5.3	56.4	13.9
Wide Bay (Indigenous)	44.8	42.3	17.6	54.4	7.4
Wide Bay (All)	52.0	52.0	8.0	56.0	13.5
Queensland (Indigenous)	55.0	51.7	15.1	62.9	10.2
Queensland (All)	64.7	64.7	4.4	67.7	17.5

Source: Estimated from data in the 2006 Census of Population and Housing

The data in Table 5(b) indicates that, in terms of labour force utilisation, Indigenous males perform better than indigenous females. This suggests a dichotomy between

occupational outcomes (a higher percentage of Indigenous females are in professional and managerial jobs) and labour force utilisation, and further reinforces that utilisation rates are only part of the overall mix of labour market success. It also suggests that a polarisation may be taking place within the ranks of Indigenous females. In comparing the utilisation rates of Indigenous males with Indigenous females, a number of factors stand out. That is;

- In all cases, Indigenous males have higher adjusted employment rates and higher participation rates. The relative unemployment rate performance compared with females is mixed. On average, they have a higher unemployment rate (no doubt connected to their higher participation rate levels) but lower rates in some regions.
- The gap in terms of average hours worked per capita the gender gap is pronounced, with the biggest gap in favour of males occurring in Mackay (14.1 hours compared to 6.6).
- The lowest gap occurring at the lower levels of average per capita hours in Wide Bay (7.0 to 5.4).
- Adjusted employment rates for males were lowest in Darling Downs (49.9 per cent). Fitzroy (48.6 per cent), West Moreton, (43.0 per cent) and Wide Bay-Burnett 42.3 per cent).
- Adjusted employment rates for females were lowest in Brisbane (44.0 per cent), Fitzroy (38.3 per cent), Northern (33.9 per cent), North West (34.1 per cent) and Wide Bay-Burnett (33.9 per cent).

Table 5(c) - Labour Utilisation Indicators- Queensland and Regions- Females

Region	Employment rate	Age-Adjusted Employment rate*	Unemployment Rate**	Participation Rate	Av hours***
Brisbane (Indigenous)	47.4	44.0	13.5	54.8	7.5
Brisbane (All)	55.8	55.8	5.3	58.6	15.0
Central West (Indigenous)	52.6	48.4	10.4	58.7	7.2
Central West(all)	61.9	61.9	4.2	64.1	16.0
Darling Downs (Indigenous)	35.8	33.6	20.6	45.1	7.3
Darling Downs (All)	51.4	51.4	5.1	54.0	14.7
Fitzroy (Indigenous)	41.8	38.3	15.0	49.2	5.9
Fitzroy (All)	56.4	56.4	5.6	55.9	13.9
Gold Coast (Indigenous)	50.4	46.1	12.0	57.3	8.00

Gold Coast (All)	51.7	51.7	5.1	54.8	14.1
Mackay (Indigenous)	45.8	42.2	13.7	53.0	6.6
Mackay (all)	54.8	54.8	5.5	57.2	14.8
Northern (Indigenous)	35.6	33.9	18.3	43.5	7.3
Northern (All)	55.3	55.3	4.8	58.3	13.9
Far North (Indigenous)	44.6	41.9	10.8	50.0	7.1
Far North (all)	55.3	55.3	4.9	58.3	15.4
North West (Indigenous)	35.7	34.1	11.6	40.4	6.8
North West (all)	56.4	56.4	4.4	58.7	16.0
Sunshine Coast (Indigenous)	48.2	44.7	14.7	56.5	5.9
Sunshine Coast (all)	48.9	48.9	5.7	52.1	12.8
South West (Indigenous)	46.7	43.1	13.1	53.2	7.0
South West (all)	61.3	61.3	4.7	63.3	15.3
West Moreton (Indigenous)	41.5	37.7	17.1	50.1	7.0
West Moreton (all)	47.5	47.5	6.6	50.2	14.1
Wide Bay (indigenous)	36.3	33.9	17.8	44.1	5.4
Wide Bay (All)	42.4	42.4	8.7	46.1	11.5
Queensland (Indigenous)	43.1	40.2	12.6	50.0	7.6
Queensland (All)	53.3	53.3	5.1	56.2	15.1

Source: Estimated from data in the 2006 Census of Population and Housing

3.0 The impact of the Community Development Employment Program (CDEP) on estimates of Indigenous labour force utilisation

The Community Development Employment Program (CDEP) offers unemployed Indigenous Australians the chance to work on a variety of community projects. Its operation both increases the activity rate of the Indigenous workforce and reduces the observed unemployment rate. Because of this joint effect, the treatment of CDEP workers in the official labour force statistics has proven problematic¹⁷. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) has treated CDEP workers as separate from the labour force and has not included them in official labour force statistics since 1998-99¹⁸.

Table 6 shows that the CDEP is a significant contributor to labour force activity only in DEIR region North Queensland, which contains Northern SD, North West and Far North.

Table 6 - Distribution of labour Force Activity - DEIR Regions 2006

DEIR Region	% Government Employment	%Private Sector Employment	%CDEP Employment	%Self Employment
Brisbane	22	71	3	4
Central West	18	79	0	3
Central/Wide Bay	19	76	3	2
North Qld	33	44	22	1
Queensland	26	61	11	2

Source: ABS Census data (by place of usual residence) 2006

However, in these regions, the treatment of CDEP participants has major implications for the observed labour force data. Table 7 adjusts the employment rate and unemployment rate by the number of CDEP participants in each region¹⁹.

Table 7 - North Queensland Indigenous Labour Force Utilisation measures adjusted for CDEP numbers

Region	Employment rate*	Employment rate CDEP adjusted	Unemployment rate	Unemployment rate CDEP adjusted
Northern	39.9	55.6	17.5	28.0
North West	44.7	61.3	11.8	21.2
Far North	50.7	63.6	10.05	27.1

Derived from DEIR supplied ABS Census (2006) data

* Not adjusted for age distribution

¹⁷ See, Hunter, B., Kinfu, Y. and Taylor, J (2003) 'The Future of Indigenous Work Forecasts of Labour Force Status', Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy, WP 251, ANU

¹⁸ 'Exclusion of CDEP Schemes from 1998-99 Onwards' ABS Cat. 6261.0.55.001

¹⁹ Estimated from SLA data supplied by DEIR and should be regarded as approximate.

It may be seen that the CDEP adjustment has a double impact. First it raises employment rates and gives a better picture of the current level of activity among the Indigenous population²⁰. For example, it raises the employment rates in the Northern, North West and Far North by 28 per cent, 27 per cent and 20 per cent respectively. Second, if CDEP ceased and all participants transferred to unemployment the unemployment rates in the three regions would rise by 62 per cent, 44 per cent and 63 per cent, respectively.

These results, of course may be classified as speculative as there is no way of knowing how many CDEP participants would take up other jobs rather than moving into unemployment. However, in the short run it appears likely that the majority would move into unemployment, leading to an approximate doubling of the unemployment rate and seriously impacting on the level of Indigenous activity in North Queensland

Overall, it is clear that a significant labour utilisation problem exists for this group in the Queensland labour market. That it is occurring during a sustained labour market boom is an indication that direct labour market initiatives to promote higher utilisation rates among this group may be needed.

3.2 Welfare aspects of labour utilisation

Differences in the extent of labour force utilisation among specific labour force groups have significant welfare implications. In general, disadvantaged groups not only receive less income but they work fewer hours, participate less and have lower employment rates. These factors interrelate, with low income relating to lower hours worked or non-participation and identifying the tipping point is difficult.

Persons and groups have low utilisation rates for a number of reasons. On the demand side they possess skill sets and other characteristics that are not wanted by employers. On the supply side they do not supply many hours of work by choice, because they are unable to find job offers (discouraged workers) or because they are constrained in doing so by institutional or cultural barriers.

However, if we accept that low utilisation rates are at the heart of poverty and social exclusion the important policy questions become:

- Which groups suffer from the lowest levels of utilisation?
- What factors have produced this low utilisation level? and
- What are the public policy issues involved in increasing utilisation rates among these groups?

3.3 The causes of low utilisation

As identified above, a number of factors from both the demand and supply side impact upon observed labour force utilisation. Decomposing these factors can be difficult. For example, in terms of hours worked, part-time workers work less hours than full-time

²⁰ Remember that CDEP participants are not currently counted as employed by the ABS.

workers but is this because of demand side issues (no more hours are available) or supply issues (choose not to work more hours)?

A number of other well known factors also influence the number of hours worked including wage rates, occupation, industry, education, age, sex and the earnings of a spouse or partner. In general, the higher paid and better educated tend to work more paid hours. One common explanation for below average utilisation rates displayed by Indigenous Australians is their relative lack of education. Tables 8(a) and 8(b) examine the educational distribution across 4 educational milestones, Grade 10, and Grade 12, Trade and Vocational and Degree or above. In setting these broad parameters it is realised that they may overlap.

Table 8(a) - Percentage Distribution of Education by Broad Qualification, Indigenous and Total - Males - Selected Regions

Region	% Degree or above		% Diploma or Trade Cert		% Grade 12		% Grade 10	
	Indigenous	All	Indigenous	All	Indigenous	All	Indigenous	All
Brisbane SD	4.7	17.5	21.5	30.8	29.3	50.1	27.5	24.5
Darling Downs	3.0	9.5	16.4	30.0	21.9	34.3	30.0	32.8
Northern SD	4.1	14.7	15.8	35.7	27.5	31.7	10.8	29.7
Far North	1.35	9.7	16.6	39.8	23.5	39.7	25.8	29.8
Wide Bay	4.5	19.1	20.1	17.4	17.2	26.9	29.6	34.9

Derived from DEIR supplied ABS Census (2006) Data - Usual place of residence

The data in table 8(a) show quite a disparity in educational achievement, with Indigenous males much less likely to possess a degree and less likely to have a diploma or trade qualification and/or a Grade 12 leaving certificate. There is a close correlation between Indigenous and All for Grade 10 certificate except in the Northern Statistical District²¹.

To put greater quantification to the observed differences, odds ratios were calculated and appear in Table 8(b).

²¹ This may be because of problems with small area data for Indigenous.

Table 8(b) - Odds Ratio of obtaining Qualifications Indigenous Males compared to All-Males

Region	Degree or above	Diploma or Trade Certificate	Grade 12	Grade 10
Brisbane SD	3.7	1.4	1.7	0.9
Darling Downs	3.2	1.8	1.6	1.1
Northern SD	3.6	2.3	1.2	2.8
Far North	7.2	2.4	1.7	1.2
Wide Bay	4.2	0.9	1.6	1.2

The odds ratios show how many times less likely an Indigenous male is to hold a particular educational milestone than the Queensland average. For example;

- Indigenous males were 3.7 times less likely to hold a degree or higher qualification. They were 5.6 times less likely in the Northern SD and 7.2 times less likely in the Far North.
- They were less likely to hold a diploma or trade certificate in all chosen regions except Wide Bay-Burnett where they were 14 per cent more likely than the average.
- In all regions they were approximately 50 per cent less likely to hold a Grade 12 leaving certificate.
- The results on the Grade 10 certificate are more difficult to increase. They are more likely for Brisbane, simply because most non-Indigenous go beyond grade 10 and the result for Far North may be more related to data problems than other factors. A similar exercise was undertaken for Indigenous females in comparison to the State average.

Table 9(a) - Percentage Distribution of Education by Broad Qualification, Indigenous and Total -Females - Selected Regions

Region	% Degree or above		%Diploma or Trade Cert		% Grade 12		% Grade 10	
	Indigenous	All	Indigenous	All	Indigenous	All	Indigenous	All
Brisbane SD	7.6	19.1	19.1	19.5	33.4	50.1	28.3	25.4
Darling Downs	5.1	12.7	14.5	19.4	23.6	37.5	33.3	32.1
Northern SD	4.1	14.6	15.00	18.8	26.5	42.7	27.7	29.4
Far North	3.1	14.7	15.5	22.9	26.0	43.9	28.5	28.1
Wide Bay	3.0	8.7	15.6	16.6	21.7	27.4	30.5	35.3

Derived from DEIR supplied ABS Census (2006) Data- Usual place of residence

Table 9(b) - Odds Ratio of obtaining Qualifications Indigenous compared to all Females

Region	Degree or above	Diploma or Trade Certificate	Grade 12	Grade 10
Brisbane SD	2.5	1.0	1.5	.90
Darling Downs	2.5	1.3	1.6	.96
Northern SD	3.6	1.3	1.7	1.1
Far North	4.7	1.5	1.7	1.0
Wide Bay	2.9	1.1	1.3	1.2

A similar pattern of educational disadvantage may be seen by examining the odds ratios for Indigenous females. Here;

- Indigenous females are less likely to hold a degree or above, particularly in the Far North. Although the extent of their disadvantage in this area seem less than Indigenous males.
- Indigenous females also close the gap, in comparison to Indigenous males, in terms of diploma or trade certificate. Achieving parity in Brisbane and near parity in Wide Bay, Darling Downs and Northern.
- At the other end of the spectrum, they still suffer a slight disadvantage in Grade 10 qualifications in the later 3 regions in Table 9(b).

The significance of the educational gap in producing lower than average utilisation rates is difficult to estimate. One study that casts some light on the education or “attributes” penalty faced by Indigenous persons in Australia was conducted by Borooah and Mangan²². Although this study was restricted to Professional and Managerial, the study is of relevance because educational qualifications are of major importance in securing employment in these areas.

Table 10 examines the difference in actual proportions of Indigenous males and females in Professional and Managerial jobs and tries to decompose this difference into those caused by attributes (largely education) and coefficients (largely ethnic or cultural).

²² Borooah, V.K. and Mangan, J. (2007) ‘Born There; Living Here: The Economic Performance of Australia’s Immigrants’ *European Journal of Political Economy* 23 (2), 486-51

Table 10 - Coefficient and Attribute Contributions to Differences in Proportions in Professional/Managerial Occupations

<i>Group X↓</i>	<i>Men: X's Attributes evaluated using Other White Coefficients</i>		
	Observed [†] Difference	% Due to Coefficient Differences	% Difference Due to Attribute Differences
Indigenous	-27.2	57	43
	<i>Women: X's Attributes evaluated using Other White Coefficients</i>		
	Observed Difference	% Due to Coefficient Differences	% Difference Due to Attribute Differences
Indigenous	-21.1	31	69

Source: Borooah and Mangan (2007)

The coefficients effect stems from evaluating inter-group differences in the probability of being employed in a professional/managerial occupation when a common set of attributes are evaluated using different coefficient vectors. In contrast, *the attributes effect* stems from evaluating inter-group differences in the probability of being employed in a professional/managerial occupation when a common coefficient vector is used to evaluate different sets of attributes. The overall difference is the sum of these two effects.

For Indigenous men, the difference was 27.2 points, of which 43 per cent was due to attribute (educational deficiencies); while for Indigenous women it was 21.1 points of which 69 per cent was due to attribute (educational) differences²³. When the attributes of other males were evaluated using Indigenous coefficients, their proportion in professional/managerial occupations would fall to 29.3 per cent.

Conversely, when Indigenous male attributes were evaluated using other coefficients, the proportion of Indigenous males in professional/managerial occupations would rise to 33.2 per cent. In other words, the evidence pointed to a coefficients bias against Indigenous men: 57-58 per cent of the professional/managerial gap between fully-employed Indigenous and Other males was due to the coefficients effect: 15.7 points out of 27.2 when other attributes were evaluated using Indigenous coefficients and 15.4 points out of 27.2 when Indigenous attributes were evaluated using other coefficients.

The coefficients bias against Indigenous women was considerably less than for Indigenous men. Of the professional/managerial gap between fully-employed Indigenous and Other females, 29-31 per cent was due to the coefficients effect: 6.1

²³ 45 per cent of males and 50.9 per cent of females, full-time employed Other Whites, were in professional/managerial occupations compared to 17.8 per cent of Indigenous males and 29.8 per cent of Indigenous females.

points out of 21.1 points when other attributes were evaluated using Indigenous coefficients and 6.6 points out of 21.1 points when Indigenous attributes were evaluated using other coefficients.

In both cases, educational differences were important, but more important for females where they were the chief barrier to high level employment. Indigenous males faced other issues that led to disadvantage.

4.0 Conclusions

Queensland has, by international standards a high level of labour force utilisation under a number of indicators; employment/population ratios, participation, average hours worked and unemployment rates. In-group variations do occur. In particular two age groups, those aged 15-24 (employment rate of 46 per cent) and those aged 55-59 years (employment rate 36 per cent) are well below the national average, but there are a number of institutional, educational and life style issues that influence these rates.

However, even in tight labour markets some groups do less well than others. This may be because of below average education or health or because of spatial and institutional barriers. There is also the possibility of systemic disadvantage. This report considered two groups who may be impacted in this way; those from non-English speaking backgrounds and Indigenous Australians. It did so in the light of recent research that suggests that many overseas born (but not necessarily NESB) are now achieving labour market outcomes equivalent to the national average or above.

The most recent data showed that while NESB (in total) are still underutilised in comparison to the Queensland average, some NESB such as the Vietnamese and NESB(Vietnamese)* are starting to gain greater parity with the average indicators for the labour force as a whole. Among NESB (total), males do better (are more utilised) than females and a greater gender gap exists among these groups than for the labour force as a whole.

Another significant group in the labour force is the overseas Asian born from an English Speaking Environment (OSAB/ESE) including those from India, Philippines, Hong Kong and Sri Lanka. Males in this group match or exceed the Queensland average in all circumstances except unemployment rate. This group also do significantly better than NESB (total) and the best performing of the purely NESB, such as the NESB (Vietnamese)*.

Females in this group are less successful and their outcomes match those of NESB and NESB (Vietnamese)*. However, in all cases (except male participation rates in one case) Indigenous Queenslanders have the lowest labour force utilisation results. Taken as a whole;

- The pattern of underutilisation was across all regions in Queensland, especially in Darling Downs, Fitzroy, West Moreton and Wide Bay. The study found that: average hours worked for Indigenous are, in almost every case, 40-50 per cent

less than the regional average. The most extreme example being in Northern Region, where the hours utilisation gap is over 65 per cent²⁴.

- The age adjustment process allows an unbiased comparison of employment rates between the two groups. It shows that in several regions; Wide Bay-Burnett (34.6 per cent) and the Northern Region (37.9 per cent) the age-adjusted employment rates fell below 40 per cent. While a number of other regions such as Fitzroy, Darling Downs and West Moreton are in the lower 40 per cent
- Unemployment rates are also disproportionately higher among Indigenous with rates for this group 2-3 times higher²⁵.
- Differences in participation rates between the two groups (impacted by higher Indigenous unemployment rates) were less significant than among the other measures of labour force utilisation, indicating that utilisation problems within the Indigenous group were more demand than supply based.

The data indicate that, in terms of labour force utilisation, Indigenous males perform better than indigenous females.

- In all cases, Indigenous males have higher adjusted employment rates and higher participation rates. The relative unemployment rate performance compared with females is mixed. On average, they have a higher unemployment rate (no doubt connected to their higher participation rate levels) but lower rates in some regions.
- The gap in terms of average hours worked per capita the gender gap is pronounced, with the biggest gap in favour of males occurring in Mackay (14.1 hours compared to 6.6).
- The lowest gap occurring at the lower levels of average per capita hours in Wide Bay (7.0 to 5.4).
- Adjusted employment rates for males were lowest in Darling Downs (49.9 per cent). Fitzroy (48.6 per cent), West Moreton, (43.0 per cent) and Wide Bay-Burnett 42.3 per cent).
- Adjusted employment rates for females were lowest in Brisbane (44.0 per cent), Fitzroy (38.3 per cent), Northern (33.9 per cent), North West (34.1 per cent) and Wide Bay-Burnett (33.9 per cent).

²⁴ Hours data were based on 2006 distribution of hours by form of employer. As well the average hours figure was averaged over the total workforce population rather than just those employed. It is arguable that this gives a better idea of the hour's utilization of the eligible population as a whole.

²⁵ In keeping with the rest of the analysis unemployment rates were derived from data but are very close to ABS data for June 2006

(http://www.trainandemploy.qld.gov.au/resources/business_employers/pdf/qlm_review_june_2006.pdf).

It was found that CDEP was only important to labour utilisation outcomes for Northern Regions (Northern SD, North West and Far North). However, in these regions, the treatment of CDEP participants has major implications for the observed labour force data.

- First it raises employment rates and gives a better picture of the current level of activity among Indigenous population. For example, it raises the employment rates in the Northern, North West and Far North by 28 per cent, 27 per cent and 20 per cent respectively.
- Second, if CDEP ceased and all participants transferred to unemployment, the unemployment rates in the three regions would rise by 62 per cent, 44% per cent and 63 per cent respectively.

Of course, these results may be classified as speculative as there is no way of knowing how many CDEP participants would take up other jobs rather than moving into unemployment. However, in the short run, it appears likely that the majority would move into unemployment leading to an approximate doubling of the unemployment rate and seriously impacting on the level of Indigenous activity in North Queensland

It is commonly thought that lower education standards are the root cause of labour market disadvantage suffered by Indigenous persons. To examine this, educational distribution of Indigenous by gender and DEIR region were examined and odds-ratios (the odds by which Indigenous were more/less likely to hold a qualification) were derived. These showed;

- Indigenous males were 3.7 times less likely to hold a degree or higher qualification. They were 5.7 times less likely in the Northern SD and 7.1 times less likely in the Far North.
- They were less likely to hold a diploma or trade certificate in all chosen regions except Wide Bay-Burnett where they were 14 per cent more likely than the average.
- In all regions they were approximately 50 per cent less likely to hold a Grade 12 leaving certificate.

The results on the Grade 10 certificate are more difficult to increase. They are more likely for Brisbane, simply because most non-Indigenous go beyond grade 10 and the result for Far North may be more related to data problems than other factors. For females;

- Indigenous females are less likely to hold a degree or above, particularly in the Far North. Although the extent of their disadvantage in this area seems less than Indigenous males.
- Indigenous females also close the gap, in comparison to Indigenous males, in terms of diploma or trade certificate. Achieving parity in Brisbane and near parity in Wide Bay, Darling Downs and Northern.

- At the other end of the spectrum, they still suffer a slight disadvantage in grade 10 qualifications in the later 3 regions in Table 9(b).

A recent study indicated that major causes of lack of Indigenous labour market success are related to attributes such as education. But, after discounting for these factors there was still an underlying "coefficients" bias. In terms of employment type (occupation), 57 per cent of the disadvantage suffered by Indigenous males related to coefficient bias, "who they were" rather than their supply characteristics. In terms of hours worked, Indigenous workers have a 23 per cent higher likelihood than the average Queenslander of being in "low" hour's employment.

References

Borooah, V.K. (2001), 'How Do Employees of Ethnic Origin Fare on the Occupational Ladder in Britain?' *The Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 48, 1-26.

Borooah, V.K. and Mangan, J. (2002) 'An Analysis of Occupational Outcomes for Indigenous and Asian Employees in Australia' *The Economic Record* 78, 31-49.

Borooah, V.K. and Mangan, J. (2007) 'Born There; Living Here: The Economic Performance of Australia's Immigrants' *European Journal of Political Economy* 23 (2), 486-51

Hunter, B., Kinfu, Y. and Taylor, J. (2003) "The Future of Indigenous Work Forecasts of Labour Force Status, Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy, WP 251, ANU

ABS 'Exclusion of CDEP Schemes from 1998-99 Onwards', ABS Cat. 6261.0.55.0

Data Appendix

Table A1: The Proportion of Men in Full Time Employment in Three Occupational Classes

	<i>Elementary and unskilled</i>	<i>Intermediate occupations</i>	<i>Professional and Managerial occupations</i>	<i>Total</i>
Indigenous Persons [308 men]	24	57	19	100
East Asians [1,485 men]	14	37	49	100
Other Asians [785 men]	10	34	56	100
North African & Lebanese [488 men]	16	39	45	100
Whites (East or South Europe) [6,841 men]	12	44	44	100
Residual Whites [22,831 men]	12	43	45	100
All [32,738 men]	12	43	45	100

Figures in table are percentages.

Table A2: The Proportion of Women in Full Time Employment in Three Occupational Classes

	<i>Elementary and unskilled</i>	<i>Intermediate occupations</i>	<i>Professional and Managerial occupations</i>	<i>Total</i>
Indigenous Persons [193 women]	22	47	31	100
East Asians [1,173 women]	20	38	42	100
Other Asians [403 women]	13	36	51	100
North African & Lebanese [205 women]	15	35	50	100
Whites (East or South Europe) [3,625 women]	13	39	48	100
Residual Whites [12,028 women]	11	38	51	100
All [17,627 women]	12	38	50	100

Figures in table are percentages.

Table A3 Overseas Born by 3 measures of labour Utilisation

Country	Male	Male	Male	Female	Female	Female
	Employment rate	Participation	Unemployment	Employment rate	Participation	Unemployment
Australia	0.70	0.73	0.04	0.58	0.61	0.05
Bosnia & Herzegovina	0.54	0.59	0.08	0.44	0.48	0.08
Canada	0.72	0.76	0.05	0.62	0.65	0.05
China (excl. SARs & Taiwan Province)(b)	0.53	0.59	0.09	0.44	0.49	0.11
Croatia	0.45	0.48	0.05	0.39	0.41	0.05
Egypt	0.52	0.55	0.07	0.34	0.37	0.08
Fiji	0.74	0.78	0.05	0.58	0.62	0.07
Former Yugoslav Rep of Macedonia (FYROM)	0.56	0.60	0.07	0.52	0.54	0.04
Germany	0.52	0.54	0.05	0.42	0.44	0.05
Greece	0.44	0.46	0.05	0.26	0.27	0.05
Hong Kong (SAR of China)(b)	0.59	0.63	0.07	0.52	0.56	0.07
India	0.73	0.77	0.05	0.48	0.54	0.11
Indonesia	0.53	0.57	0.07	0.43	0.49	0.11
Iraq	0.49	0.60	0.17	0.25	0.35	0.27
Ireland	0.64	0.67	0.04	0.51	0.53	0.04
Italy	0.41	0.43	0.03	0.26	0.27	0.04
Japan	0.61	0.64	0.05	0.47	0.51	0.07
Korea, Republic of (South)	0.46	0.51	0.09	0.33	0.38	0.13
Lebanon	0.58	0.62	0.06	0.32	0.35	0.09
Malaysia	0.70	0.74	0.05	0.57	0.62	0.07
Malta	0.46	0.48	0.03	0.33	0.34	0.04
Netherlands	0.49	0.51	0.03	0.37	0.39	0.04
New Zealand	0.78	0.81	0.04	0.63	0.67	0.06
Papua New Guinea	0.76	0.80	0.05	0.60	0.64	0.07
Philippines	0.78	0.82	0.05	0.57	0.61	0.06
Poland	0.49	0.53	0.07	0.41	0.44	0.05
Singapore	0.64	0.68	0.06	0.52	0.57	0.08
South Africa	0.79	0.82	0.04	0.64	0.67	0.05
South Eastern Europe, Nfd(c)	0.48	0.51	0.07	0.41	0.43	0.05
Sri Lanka	0.72	0.76	0.04	0.54	0.58	0.08
Thailand	0.65	0.71	0.08	0.53	0.58	0.08
Turkey	0.65	0.70	0.08	0.42	0.47	0.11
United Kingdom(d)	0.60	0.63	0.04	0.47	0.50	0.05
United States of America	0.67	0.71	0.06	0.58	0.61	0.05
Viet Nam	0.67	0.71	0.06	0.47	0.52	0.09
Born elsewhere(e)	0.59	0.64	0.07	0.46	0.51	0.09
Country of birth not stated	0.16	0.16		0.14	0.15	0.06