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Foreword

The location decisions of immigrants arriving in Australia have recently been the subject of great public attention. In particular, the reasons why so many of today’s settlers choose Sydney, and the consequences for its urban infrastructure, have aroused interest and controversy.

In Understanding Where Immigrants Live, one of Australia’s leading demographers, Professor Graeme Hugo, provides an excellent, clear overview of many features of this subject. Professor Hugo divides the work into three main parts: the geographical distribution of immigrants, the causes of their geographical concentration in Australia, and its implications.

Each of these three parts of Professor Hugo’s study makes fascinating reading, spelling out the geographical issues in the settlement of people who have come to Australia under its long-established immigration program.

The work is not merely intrinsically interesting, however. It also carries many messages for policy-makers, including some pertaining to possible incentives to immigrants to settle in defined cities or regions.

Professor Graeme Hugo is an outstanding guide through this field. His knowledge of the issues must be almost unparalleled in the group of authors who write on this topic in Australia. His style in this publication fits well into the Bureau’s objective for its Understanding series, which is designed to provide authoritative, balanced coverage at a level suitable for schools and non-specialists readers. I have great pleasure in welcoming the publication to the Bureau’s list.

John Nieuwenhuysen, Director, Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research
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Glossary of Terms

The census is a count of the total population, but it also measures a range of characteristics such as age, sex, employment status, family characteristics, housing tenure, etc. In Australia, a national census is undertaken by the Australian Bureau of Statistics every five years.

Chain migration is a form of group migration
which occurs through the linkages of family and kin networks. A typical case would be where an initial immigrant, once established in the new country, brings out other members of his or her family or facilitates their migration in some way.

**Counterurbanisation** describes a change in population movement which occurred in many developed countries during the 1970s and 1980s. Whereas, prior to this time, the net population movement tended to be from rural areas to large urban centres, a change in this pattern was observed, indicating that the growth rates of smaller non-metropolitan centres had begun to exceed the growth rates of major urban areas.

An **entrepreneur** is a person who undertakes a business or enterprise. **Entrepreneurship** refers to the characteristics of business and management skills, as well as the ability to initiate new projects and enterprises.

**Ethnic group** refers to a group of people who, because of shared culture, customs, place of birth and/or language, can be identified as a distinctive community. Within Australia, the term is usually applied to identifiable immigrant groups.

**Gentrification** refers to the renewal of older inner suburbs within cities, usually by professional middle-class people.

**Geographical concentration**, in relation to population, refers to the clustering of people in one particular location.

**Marginalisation**, as used in this report, refers to a process whereby a group of people is partly or totally excluded from sharing in the full range of benefits and opportunities which the wider community enjoys.

The terms **multicultural** and **multiculturalism** are used in this report to refer to the diversity of ethnic groups in Australia, particularly within the major cities. **Multiculturalism** can also be used in the context of government policy, in which case it refers to the accommodation and support of a wide range of people from diverse origins and with varied cultures within a single society.

**Net migration** is the difference between immigration and out-migration. For example, if 5000 people moved into an area during a period of time, and 1000 people moved out of that area during the same period of time, then the **net migration gain** for that area during the period would have been 4000 people.

**Non-English-speaking background (NESB)** is a term used to describe someone whose first language is not English, or whose cultural background is derived from a non-English-speaking region or country.

The **Points Assessment Test** is used by the Australian Government to assess applicants within some immigration categories. The test assesses a number of factors, such as skill levels, occupational type and language ability.

An **urban area** is defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics as a centre with more than 1000 inhabitants. The level of **urbanisation** in a country is the proportion of the population who live in urban areas. In Australia, the level of urbanisation in 1991 was 85.1 per cent, indicating that this proportion of Australians lived in urban areas, while the remaining 14.9 per cent lived in rural areas.

### Section 1 – Introduction

Post-Second World War immigration has changed Australia from a relatively culturally uniform country to one of the more diverse of nations. This period of immigration has represented a total break with the past because of its large scale, and the arrival of large numbers of immigrants from non-English-Irish backgrounds. Between 1947 and 1991, the national population increased from 7.6 million to 16.9 million and the 5.2 million new settlers arriving in Australia over that period accounted directly or indirectly (via their childbearing) for around half of that growth.
However, the impact of post-Second World War immigration has not been distributed uniformly throughout Australia’s economy and society. This has been reflected by the fact that many overseas-born groups have different locational patterns from that of the Australia-born population. Indeed, the pattern of post-war immigrants settling in particular areas has significantly influenced the distribution of Australia’s population, the rate of population change and changes in the structure and size of the labour force in various regions of the country (Jarvie 1984, 1989).

The geographical distribution of birthplace groups in Australia is of particular interest because patterns of settlement are related to a whole range of social and economic elements which affect the well-being of those groups, especially their means of earning a living and their social contacts within and outside the group (Price 1963, p. 140). The tendency for particular birthplace groups to concentrate in particular locations inevitably raises the question of whether such ethnic concentrations reflect the existence of social, economic or political divisions or problems. Indeed, this issue is one of some debate in Australia.

Section 2 – Geographical distribution of immigrants

The aim of this booklet is to review our present knowledge of the geographical distribution of immigrants in Australia. We will begin by summarising the present pattern of distribution of the major overseas-born groups and suggesting a number of explanations for these patterns. It must be stressed that the distribution of any birthplace group is constantly changing, so the following section discusses changes which are occurring in the distribution of major groups within Australia. Section 3 looks at some of the implications which flow from the different settlement patterns of various birthplace groups.

Australia is characterised by a high level of urbanisation, with some 85 per cent of the national population living in urban areas in 1991. The population is highly concentrated in the eastern, southeastern and southwestern coastal zones, which comprise only 3.3 per cent of the national land area but account for 80 per cent of the total population. The nation’s two largest cities, Sydney and Melbourne, have retained a fairly stable share of the national population over the post-war years - around 39 per cent between them. The settlement patterns of post-war immigrants have tended to reinforce the dominance of the major cities in the national settlement system.

Distribution between States and Territories

...The largest numbers of immigrants live in the capital cities, with very few being located elsewhere in the nation. Immigrants are therefore more concentrated in their locational patterns than are the Australia-born population.

...Western Australia has the greatest concentration of immigrants in relation to its total population, with 29.5 per cent of residents being born overseas compared with 22.8 per cent in the nation as a whole. The other part of the nation in which there is a higher than expected proportion of immigrants is the southeastern quadrant of the mainland comprising NSW, Victoria and the ACT.

The population of NSW and Victoria has been growing at below the national average, but these States have continued to receive a disproportionately large share of immigrants arriving in Australia. This is due partly to Melbourne and Sydney being important points of arrival of immigrants and also because many of the immigrants are ‘chain’ immigrants, that is, they wish to live with or near family and other settlers from their own country of origin who moved into Victoria and New South Wales in earlier years.

In South Australia substantial industrial development in the 1950s and 1960s attracted a large share of immigrants, but economic change and the decline of Australian manufacturing over the last two decades have resulted in a
much smaller share of immigrants settling there. Tasmania is the State least affected by immigrant settlement and the Northern Territory also has a below-average presence of immigrants. Most striking, however, is Queensland which, despite being far and away the most rapidly growing State over the last two decades, has a significant ‘under’ representation of overseas-born people, indicating clearly that the bulk of that State’s rapid growth has been fuelled by interstate rather than international immigration gains.

States and Territories have not only differed in the extent to which they have attracted immigrants but there are also some interesting differences in their ‘mix’ of birthplace groups. Some of these differences are briefly summarised below:

- Persons born in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland are the largest overseas-born group in each State, but especially in Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania, where they account for more than half of all overseas-born persons.

- Among the non-English-speaking-background (NESB) groups from Europe there is substantial interstate variation. For example, the Italy-born account for 6.2 per cent of all Australia’s overseas-born population but the share of States varies from 10.3 per cent (Victoria) to 2.4 per cent (Northern Territory).

- Victoria’s overseas-born have a larger southern European component than other States. For example, Greece-born persons account for 3.6 per cent of the total overseas-born in Australia but almost half (49.2 per cent) of them live in Victoria.

- The Asia-born expanded their proportion of the overseas-born from 12.4 per cent in 1981 to 18.3 per cent in 1991. There is a disproportionate share of Asians in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia. These three States account for 82.2 per cent of the nation’s Asia-born population but only two-thirds of the Australia-born.

- Vietnam-born people (the largest Asian birthplace group) make up 3 per cent of the overseas-born in Australia and show a tendency to be concentrated in New South Wales and Victoria.

- Among other groups, there is generally less variation between States. An exception is New Zealanders, who are strongly concentrated in the States which experienced most rapid economic growth in the 1970s - most notably Queensland and the Northern Territory (McCaskill 1982). The attractiveness of Sydney to New Zealanders has also resulted in New South Wales having an above-average proportion of these immigrants (Hugo 1986a, 1988, 1989-92).

Urban-rural distribution of immigrants

One of the most distinctive features of post-war immigration to Australia has been the tendency for immigrants to settle in the nation’s largest cities. ...over the 1947-91 period the number of Australia-born persons living in large cities (100,000 or more people) more than doubled, so that by 1991, 58 per cent lived in such centres. In the largest cities, however, the numbers of overseas-born increased by more than six times, so that by 1991, 80 per cent lived in those cities. Hence the impact of immigration has been felt more in Australia’s major cities than in regional cities or rural areas. However, there was an increase in the absolute numbers of overseas-born people in the latter areas. In regional cities, for example, the number of people born overseas increased almost five times. At the same time, however, the proportion of the total national overseas-born population living outside major cities declined. The decline was quite small in the regional cities (13.5 to 12.4 per cent between 1947 and 1991) but larger in rural areas (24.7 per cent to 8.1 per cent during the same period). Hence, although the presence of overseas-born has increased across urban and rural areas, the impact has been greatest in major cities. This contrasts with a great deal of
pre-Second World War settlement of NESB groups who showed a greater tendency to live in rural areas (Borrie 1954).

It is interesting to note, however, that since the mid-1980s there has been no increase in the share of overseas-born living in major cities. Although immigrants have increasingly settled in major cities since 1986, those who have been established in Australia longer have an increasing tendency to settle outside major cities. This is consistent with a pattern of counterurbanisation or decentralisation among the Australia-born population that has been recognised since the early 1970s (Hugo 1994) and suggests that over time the internal migration patterns of the overseas-born may become more like those of the Australia-born. Among the large European groups who dominated immigration in the early post-war decades, only the Greek community has more than 90 per cent living in large cities.

Not only have post-war immigrants tended to settle in Australia’s larger cities, but they have concentrated especially in Sydney and Melbourne. This is reflected in Sydney and Melbourne’s share of the nation’s overseas-born population increasing from 46.5 per cent in 1947 to 52.3 per cent in 1991. International migration has been of critical importance in the post-war growth of Sydney and Melbourne. Over the first two post-war decades, more than half of the growth of these two cities was attributable to net gains of overseas immigrants.

Melbourne was dominant in the early post-war decades both in terms of population growth and in receiving overseas-born settlers, but since 1976 Sydney has been the major focus of settlement for immigrants. During the 1986-91 period Sydney recorded a net gain of 158,000 immigrants, compared with 105,000 in Melbourne. However, at the same time Sydney has experienced a net loss of Australia-born residents. This situation, whereby the loss of Australia-born people is counterbalanced by an inflow of overseas immigrants, has been an important feature of Sydney and Melbourne in the post-war period. The key point here is that international migration gains have directly accounted for more than half of Sydney and Melbourne’s population growth over the post-war period, and if the indirect contribution of immigrants via their Australia-born children is taken into account, that contribution is closer to two-thirds of growth.

... (looking at) the growth of Sydney and Melbourne’s population over the post-war period and the part of that growth due to the overseas-born, it can be seen that the number of overseas-born has grown at a faster rate than that of the total population. Especially striking is the growth in the number of those from non-English speaking countries. By 1961, Melbourne had surpassed Sydney as having the largest overseas-born community in the nation, but in the last two decades Sydney has once again become the major focus of immigrant settlement in Australia. At the 1991 Census Sydney had 28.5 per cent of the nation’s overseas-born, compared with 23.8 per cent in Melbourne.

While all overseas-born groups show a greater tendency than the Australia-born to settle in the nation’s major cities, there are some variations between different groups... The groups with settlement patterns most similar to the Australia-born are those from English-speaking countries, especially New Zealand, England and the USA and some long-established continental European groups like the Dutch. Among those which are very heavily concentrated in the major cities, NESB groups are prominent. The majority of Asian-origin groups have more than 90 per cent of their communities living in major cities. Middle Eastern groups such as the Lebanese are also prominent among those who are strongly concentrated in major cities.

Distribution of immigrants within cities

Four out of five overseas-born Australians live in cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants. We will now turn our attention to patterns of settlement within those cities, especially Sydney and Melbourne, where more than half of Australia’s immigrants live. There are wide
variations between ethnic groups in their degree of clustering within Melbourne and Sydney...

Measurements of geographical concentration

One way of measuring the degree of geographical concentration of a group of people is to use the Index of Dissimilarity. This index is calculated from data giving the percentage of the total of two populations (in this case the Australia-born and the origin group) occurring in each geographical unit (in this case local government areas). The index can be interpreted as a measure of net displacement, by showing the percentage of one population (e.g. Italy-born) that would have to move into another area in order to reproduce the percentage distribution of the other population (Australia-born). The index has a possible range from 0 to 100. A score of 0 means the two populations have exactly the same relative distribution, while an index value of 100 represents a situation where the two groups are completely separated from one another (i.e. an 'apartheid' situation).

The degree of concentration of a particular ethnic group may reflect the stage of that group’s migration history to Australia. Post-war immigration has occurred in a series of waves, each of which is characterised by a different mix of birthplace groups. Although these waves have tended to overlap to varying degrees, a simplified list of the major waves is given below:

Major waves of migration to Australia, 1947-1993

1947    Eastern Europeans
        Dutch, Germans, Poles
        Italians
        Greeks
        Yugoslavs
        Turks, Lebanese,
        Egyptians
        Vietnamese
        New Zealanders
        Filipinos, Malaysians

1993    Hong Kong, Chinese

The contemporary patterns of distribution of the NESB populations in Sydney... (show) there are very large communities in the local government area of Fairfield, where 54.5 per cent of residents were born overseas in non-English-speaking countries - the largest such concentration in the nation. There has also been some growth of the NESB population in some of the more affluent suburbs of Sydney (e.g. on the North Shore). This is partly due to the fact that many of the people of Asian origin settling in Sydney in the 1980s arrived with substantial financial assets and skills and hence settled in high-income areas. This is especially true of the Hong Kong-born and Malaysia-born groups.

Case study 1: The Vietnamese in Sydney

An example of a highly concentrated ethnic group in Sydney is the Vietnamese... concentrated in a belt extending westward from the southern parts of the City of Sydney, with the largest cluster in Fairfield and other significant concentrations in Marrickville, Bankstown, Auburn and the western part of Canterbury. A detailed examination of the settlement patterns and processes of Vietnamese in Sydney found that the high level of concentration comprised two elements (Burnley 1989, pp. 150-1). First, recent arrivals were attracted to the existing ethnic communities, which could provide support and a familiar cultural environment. Second, in addition to these recent arrivals who settled in western Sydney, there was evidence of ‘gravitation’ migration of longer-standing Vietnamese residents. They were also attracted to the areas of ethnic concentration after initially settling elsewhere. Burnley also found an association between residential concentration, low occupational status and incomes. This suggests that, especially in times of economic hardship, the support available when living within an ethnic enclave is a powerful locational force, operating not only on recent arrivals but on overseas-born groups of longer standing.

...the distribution of the NESB population in Melbourne in 1991 (shows) patterns similar to those in Sydney... The middle western suburbs
of Sunshine and Keilor have the largest NESB populations in the city. While the NESB population is still concentrated in less affluent western industrial suburbs, this is not as marked as it was in earlier decades.

**Case study 2: The Italians in Melbourne**

The largest NESB group in Melbourne is the Italy-born. Italian settlement in the city goes back more than a century, with initial concentrations being in the Carlton and Fitzroy areas (Jones 1965, p. 90). This formed the ‘anchor’ for settlement of large numbers of Italian post-war immigrants, so that by 1961, one in five people living in Carlton were Italy-born. In the post-war years the pattern of settlement began to spread northwards from Carlton. ...the current distribution of the Italy-born still displays a concentration in the inner and middle suburbs. This is despite the fact that some of the original factors attracting Italians to those areas in the 1950s and 1960s (e.g. cheap rental housing, industrial employment) no longer apply. Nevertheless, the outward northward spread of Italian settlement along Sydney Road is apparent... so that the local government areas with the largest Italian communities are in the outer middle and outer northern areas of Preston, Broadmeadows, Whittlesea, Keilor and Coburg. It is important also to identify two other significant areas of Italian settlement in Melbourne - Lilydale and Doncaster-Templestowe. These were based originally on market gardens, which have now been taken up by more intensive land uses but retained their Italian population. This is a pattern also found in other Australian cities (e.g. in the Campbelltown and West Torrens-Woodville areas of Adelaide). The concentration in the southeastern corridors of Oakleigh, Springvale and Dandenong is associated with the 1960s development of manufacturing in that area. Despite the length of settlement of Italians in Melbourne and their declining numbers, they have retained a high degree of geographical concentration.

**Distribution of immigrants in non-metropolitan areas**

Only one in five overseas-born persons in Australia live outside the major cities and there is considerable variation between birthplace groups in their likelihood of settling in non-metropolitan areas... In general, the English speaking background groups and longer established continental European groups have the largest proportions living in non-metropolitan areas, although all have smaller proportions than the Australia-born.

It is often overlooked that the tendency to concentrate in particular places is even greater in non-metropolitan areas than in major cities. Since settlement in rural areas is focused on so few local communities, the impact which it has is often very great. There is a tendency for birthplace groups which are well known for their concentrated pattern of settlement within large metropolitan centres to also have quite a concentrated settlement pattern in non-metropolitan areas.

As is the case with the metropolitan-based communities, the groups from English speaking backgrounds show the greatest similarity to the distribution of the Australia-born in non-metropolitan areas. This especially applies to those from the United Kingdom. They show a tendency to concentrate in regional cities outside the capitals, like Newcastle, Wollongong and Geelong. The non-metropolitan UK-born are also found in large numbers in the fast-growing east coast areas and in the regions near major cities - the areas which are also experiencing fast growth of the Australia-born population.

The New Zealand-born, although found in regional centres, are not as concentrated in those centres as other groups. There are significant concentrations in the expanding east coast resort-retirement areas. There is also some representation in the wheat-sheep belt, with a number of New Zealanders being employed as shearsers, other farm workers and managers. This pattern differentiates them from nearly all other
overseas-born groups. Also, unlike many other
groups, New Zealanders are significantly
represented in the sparsely settled mining and
pastoral areas of central and north-northwestern
Australia.

The Italy-born population, in the pre-Second
World War period, settled mainly outside capital
cities in mining, fishing, market gardening,
sugar cane growing and irrigated farming areas.
In the early post-war years, non-metropolitan
areas continued to attract Italian immigrants but
increasingly the major cities became the focus of
settlement, not only of new arrivals but also of
Italians leaving regional Australia.

Both Greek and Italian non-metropolitan
settlement has avoided the extensive wheat-
sheep belt and grazing lands and concentrated
in the more intensively cultivated areas such as
market gardening areas near cities, orchard,
vineyard and sugar cane regions. The
importance of ‘chain migration’ in the growth
of these communities, with family and friends
joining initial immigrant settlers, has been
found in the literature (Price 1963; Burnley
1976, pp. 82-93; Hugo 1975). One feature of
Greek settlement in the Upper Murray region of
South Australia was ‘secondary migration’, that
is, immigrants moving to the area after they had
spent time elsewhere, usually in the
metropolitan areas (Hugo & Menzies 1980, pp.
190-1).

As indicated earlier, the Asian groups which
have dominated recent NESB migration to
Australia have shown a very strong preference
for settling in the nation’s major cities,
especially Sydney and Melbourne. A partial
exception to this is the Philippines-born
population, 16 per cent of whom live outside
the major cities. Jackson and Flores (1989)
made the important observation that the
geographical distribution of Filipinos in
Australia really consists of two distinct patterns.
First, wholly Filipino families tend to be highly
concentrated in the middle-income to low-
income suburbs of capital cities. Second, where
Filipinos (mostly women) have married
Australia-based partners under various schemes,
the distribution is much more spread out, not
only within large metropolitan areas but also
outside capital cities. Much of the media
attention concerning Filipino immigration to
Australia has been focused on those settling
outside the major cities, especially where the
women arrived in Australia as sponsored
prospective wives.

Section 3 –
Causes of geographical
concentration of immigrant
groups in Australia

The tendency for particular birthplace groups to
concentrate in some regions is important in
identifying areas and groups in greatest need of
particular services. The occurrence of ethnic
concentrations, however, does not necessarily
indicate the existence of social, economic or
political division or problems.

Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that some
minority ethnic groups do have particular
problems such as: language difficulties; social
dislocation; reduced opportunity for economic
advancement; and general deprivation.
Knowledge of the extent to which such
problems are associated with, made worse by, or
lessened by, geographical concentration is
essential to development of many policies and
programs relating to ethnic groups.

A review of studies of immigrant settlement
suggests that the factors influencing the patterns
of settlement and degree of concentration of
birthplace groups in post-war Australia include
the following.

Distribution of job opportunities at the time
of arrival

The concentration of southern European
immigrants of the 1950s and 1960s in
Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide was partly due
to the creation of semi-skilled and unskilled job
opportunities associated with the rapid
expansion of manufacturing in the economies of
those cities. The pattern of settlement of these
groups within those cities was, in turn, partly
determined by their seeking to be close to the factories offering those jobs, thus minimising costs of the journey to work.

**Distribution of housing opportunities at the time of arrival**

During the 1950s and 1960s the bulk of available cheap rental housing was located in the inner suburban areas of major cities. This was a factor attracting newly arrived southern European immigrants to those areas. In the last two decades, however, these inner areas have been affected by ‘gentrification’ - the inflow of higher-income residents and the improvement of old buildings within the inner areas. Much of the cheap rental housing is now found in sections of the outer suburbs. Hence, there are significant concentrations of groups like the Vietnamese in these outer areas.

**Timing of the peak immigration of particular groups**

It is characteristic of post-war Australian immigration for immigrants to arrive in ‘waves’ according to various countries of origin. The timing of the peak of the wave for each country has tended to vary according to changes in Australian immigration policy and fluctuating conditions in the home country. For example, Vietnamese immigration was very high in the years following the Vietnam War, as Australia accepted many refugee settlers. Since the distribution of particular job and housing opportunities is constantly changing, the pattern which existed during the peak immigration of one group will not necessarily apply during the peak period of settlement of another group. Hence the location of particular ethnic groups may reflect employment of housing opportunities existing at the time of their peak arrivals.

**Scale of immigration of a particular group**

Where there is a very large influx of an immigrant group, its members may concentrate at the fringe of the city, where the main stock of newly constructed housing occurs. For example, it has been shown that immigrants to Adelaide from the United Kingdom exhibit a marked tendency toward concentration (Hugo 1986b). This is not due to those immigrants seeking to cluster together for mutual support in a strange environment, but is due to the nature of the housing market in Adelaide during the 1950s and 1960s. In that period immigrant families from the UK were entering Adelaide in large numbers and substantial concentrations developed at the northern and southern edges of the metropolitan area, where most new housing was being built at that time.

**Initial place of arrival**

It has long been accepted that the port of disembarkation of immigrants is a significant determinant of which city they settle in. The place of first settlement within that city is also important. Hence it is characteristic of the Vietnamese in Australia’s major cities to be clustered in suburbs around the location of former migrant hostels, where the bulk of refugee immigrants were first placed on arrival in Australia. This was also true for the Eastern European refugees arriving in Australia some three decades earlier.

**Location of family members and people from the same country of origin**

Burnley has pointed out (1982, p. 92) that the location of original settlers often becomes an important anchor for later generations of immigrants. This is partly because later immigrants often spend an initial period living with established relatives. Their information about housing opportunities may therefore be biased toward that area. In any case, they may choose to locate near relatives and friends for the economic and emotional support and social interaction which such a location will allow. Once such a nucleus is established, it will tend to attract ethnic-specific shops, restaurants and institutions which will be a further reason for newcomers from that country to settle in that part of the city.
Language

Non-English speaking groups have a greater tendency to concentrate together because of their mutual need to be near people they can communicate with. Furthermore, once a community is established, many local shops and services will have at least one employee who can speak the group’s language. This reinforces the presence of ethnic-specific food shops, restaurants, clubs, churches, etc. in attracting subsequent immigrants from the groups.

Marginalisation

Several of the above factors place emphasis on individual immigrants and immigrant communities exercising choice in deciding whether or not they settle in a particular area. However, an alternative approach suggests that immigrants may have little choice in their location because various social mechanisms can influence where particular groups live. In this way immigrants may be ‘marginalised’ or excluded from the mainstream of economic and social activity within the wider community. For example, discrimination in the housing market is one way in which this marginalisation occurs and may limit the locations into which immigrants can move. There can be little doubt that some ethnic groups, at some stages in their settlement in Australia, have been socially, economically and even legally marginalised and that this has shaped their pattern of settlement.

Type of immigration

The type of immigration may also exert some influence on the pattern of settlement adopted by a particular group. For example, among immigrants who enter Australia as part of the family reunion program there is often a greater tendency toward geographical concentration than there is among people who immigrate independently.

In summary, it can be seen that residential segregation of some immigrant groups has occurred in Australia, especially within major cities. To some extent this segregation has been forced on new NESB arrivals because:

- they are joining family members or others who have sponsored their immigration;
- they have limited financial means;
- their lack of English language skills means that they need to congregate with people from their own country; and
- various social mechanisms channel them into living in particular areas, especially through the operation of housing markets.

On the other hand, there is often an element of choice due to:

- their desire to live close to people with similar language, cultural and religious background for social and economic support; and
- their desire to gain employment in a business which has a proportion of other workers of similar ethnic background.

Section 4 – Implications of geographical concentration of immigrant groups in Australia

Issues arising from geographical concentration

An important issue is the extent to which concentrations of ethnic groups affect the process of adjustment of recently arrived immigrants. The common view of ethnic enclaves is generally a negative one - that they tend to encourage separatism and delay or impede adjustment to the wider society. However, the research evidence does not support such a view. Instead, it tends to highlight the positive role of ethnic enclaves in assisting the adjustment of new arrivals into Australian society through the support given by people of the same linguistic and cultural background.

Nevertheless, in the long term there may be some negative effects of continued patterns of
ethnic concentration. For example, some people living in an ethnic enclave may be discouraged from learning English and acquiring knowledge about Australian institutions. Without this knowledge their long-term adjustment, prosperity and well-being may be hampered. The small proportion of English speakers among older members (especially women) of long-established, highly concentrated birthplace groups (e.g. southern Europeans) may be because they have lived most of their lives in such an enclave. As a result, it may be that their well-being in their later years is detrimentally affected (Hugo 1983).

Following from the issue of ethnic concentration is the question of whether there should be government intervention to influence where immigrants initially settle. There are suggestions that the disproportionate concentration of overseas immigrants in Sydney and Melbourne is having a range of negative environmental and economic consequences in these cities (National Population Council 1992). As a result, it has been suggested that some immigrants should be diverted away from Sydney and Melbourne on arrival in Australia. There have been a few attempts to influence where certain immigrants settle during the post-war period (Hugo 1993). One example was the two-year bonding system applied to the settlement of Displaced Persons and some other European groups in the early post-war years (Kunz 1988), which allocated settlers to areas suffering labour shortages, often in remote locations. Some States, such as South Australia, offered incentive packages in the 1950s and 1960s (e.g. housing, job, assisted passage) for immigrants to settle there. More recently there has been an allocation of a small number of points in the Points Assessment Test to immigrants whose sponsor was located in a particular region. Overall, however, immigration policy has been non-interventionist in terms of influencing immigrants’ choice of where they settle.

Locational policies are unlikely to have a major impact as long as the main economic opportunities and social support for ethnic communities are in major capital cities. Unbalanced distribution of the population (both of immigrants and Australia-born) can only be changed if those elements of the economic system which favour the growth of the largest cities are addressed. If non-metropolitan or peripheral areas are made attractive to investment, people will move to them.

The data show that most residential concentrations of ethnic groups are in areas with lower socioeconomic status. Hence, the major concentrations of NESB populations are in the industrial and lower-cost housing areas of the major cities - for example, the western suburbs of Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide. This leads to the question of whether geographical concentration can cause or exacerbate poverty. There is some evidence from the United States (where patterns of residential segregation are much greater than in Australia) that there may be a relationship between ethnic concentration and poverty (Rosenbaum 1992). However, the geographical segregation of ethnic communities in Australia has not reached the extent that it has in many other countries (Jupp, McRobbie & York 1990). This is partly due to the fact that, in Australia, there is great diversity in the populations of the cities and no single ethnic group dominates among those of non-Anglo-Celtic origin.

### Issues related to service provision

Another important issue arising from the changing distribution of immigrant groups in Australia relates to the planning and provision of goods and services at the community level. While it is generally understood by most Australians that the nation as a whole is multicultural, it is realised less often that the extent and nature of multiculturalism varies from one suburb to another and from one country region to another. In order to provide appropriate services for particular ethnic groups, in an equitable and cost-efficient manner, there needs to be good knowledge of the geographical distribution of those groups. This knowledge needs to be of the distribution at a single point in time and also of how and why the
The changing locational patterns of ethnic groups have important implications for planning and supplying goods and services. For example, in the first three decades of post-war immigrant settlement, most newly arrived immigrants from NES countries settled in inner suburban areas of Australian cities. In recent times, however, many immigrants have settled in outer suburban areas as well. These areas usually have low densities of residential population and service delivery is therefore made very difficult. For example, public transport is less economical in areas of low density because fewer patrons are located within easy access of the transport line. Other services in the outer suburbs, such as schools, hospitals and community centres, are also likely to be spread out and accessible only by car because of this low density. This may worsen the isolation experienced by newly arrived immigrant groups.

**Economic opportunities**

An issue which is becoming increasingly important is the connection between ethnic residential concentration and ethnic business enterprise. It is clear that such an association exists. Aldrich and Waldinger (1990), in their review of ethnicity and entrepreneurship, found that ethnic residential concentration greatly facilitated the development of ethnic businesses. A crucial point in the development of such businesses comes when they extend beyond the ethnic concentration to serve non-ethnic markets.

In Australia, our knowledge of whether immigrant groups have a high incidence of business ownership and apparent entrepreneurship is still limited (Evans 1989; Castles et al. 1991; Lever Tracy et al. 1991). We do not know to what extent the existence of ethnic residential concentrations within Australian cities can and does foster the development of businesses by immigrants. It may well be that in-depth research in such areas may reveal a ‘seed-bed’ function for businesses in those communities. Clearly it would be helpful to establish precisely what types of environments encourage the development of ethnic entrepreneurs and what assists them in breaking through to serve the wider community beyond the ethnic community.

**Section 5 – Conclusion**

Where immigrants live is important. It impinges on virtually every aspect of their overall well-being and shapes much of their day-to-day lives. Of all the many aspects of Australian contemporary society that differ from the pre-war period, none is more striking than the nation’s rapid transition to being a multicultural society. So rapid has the change been that some sections of the community and some of our institutions and services have not adjusted to meet the needs of a more diverse and ethnically complex society. At all levels of Australian society, greater understanding of the nature and implications of this transformation is needed. Such an understanding will be greatly assisted through an expansion of our knowledge of this multicultural society. One important element here is the dynamic and distinctive locational patterns of the diverse groups making up the society. Knowledge of these patterns has crucial political, economic, social and demographic implications for leaders of ethnic communities, policy makers and planners at all three levels of government, as well as service providers in both the public and private sectors. More importantly, these patterns have an influence on the daily lives of all Australians and affect a wide variety of social, political and economic processes. An understanding of the changing distribution of Australia’s diverse cultural, ethnic, birthplace and racial groups is essential to the development and effective implementation of policies and programs which give all Australians the greatest possible opportunity to realise their individual potential and to gain equitable access to the services which allow them to live their lives in a state of well-being, social justice and dignity.
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