Chapter 1: Changing Spatial Patterns of Immigrant Settlement

Graeme Hugo

Introduction

While the major lineaments of post-war immigrant settlement remain, there have been some small, but nevertheless significant, changes in settlement patterns since 2001. While there are a number of causes of these shifts, undoubtedly one has been the paradigmatic shift which has occurred in Australian immigration policy since the mid 1990s¹. It has involved a number of elements. Since 1996 Australia has had an increasing substantial skilled temporary labour migration program as well as large student and working holiday-maker migration programs². There has been an increase in the proportion of settlers each year who are 'onshore' migrants who are already present in Australia as temporary residents but successfully apply for permanent residence. In 2007-08 onshore migrants made up 27.5 per cent of permanent additions to the population through migration³. The proportion of permanent arrivals in the skilled entry group has increased from 33.3 per cent in 2000-01 to 43.8 per cent in 2007-08. The introduction of the State Specific and Regional Migration Scheme (SSRM) effectively creates two classes of immigrants – one that can settle anywhere and another that is limited (at least initially) in where they settle. Each of these developments has had implications for the distribution of migrants in Australia.

Some data considerations

Australia has some of the most comprehensive stock information relating to immigrants, largely because of the comprehensive set of questions asked at five-yearly census enumerations. The variables collected include:

1 Hugo, G J (1999a). A New Paradigm of International Migration in Australia', *New Zealand Population Review*, 25, 1-2: 1-39.

2 Khoo, S E, Voigt-Graf, C, Hugo, G and McDonald, P (2003). 'Temporary Skilled Migration to Australia: The 457 Visa Sub-Class', *People and Place*, 11, 4: 27-40.

3 Department of Immigration and Citizenship (2008). *Population Flows: Immigration Aspects*.

- Country of birth
- Country of birth of parents
- Ancestry
- Length of residence in Australia
- Aboriginality
- Religion
- Nationality
- Language spoken at home
- Ability to speak English.

This allows first- and second-generation immigrants to be identified and later generations to also be partially detected.

These census data are available for the full hierarchy of spatial units with the basic building block being the Collection District (CD), which, for the 2006 census, has an average of about 225 dwellings⁴. After 2011 the building block will be even smaller: the mesh block will have a minimum number of dwellings of between 20 and 50 except where a mesh block is deliberately designed to have a zero population. As a result it is possible to analyse the migrant populations of most formal and functional regions within Australia, although there is some difficulty in matching small areas across time. The Australian census is a complete count for all questions asked (other than for religion), which means that it is possible to identify the location of even relatively small immigrant groups.

A critical question, however, is who among the foreign-born present in Australia on the night of the population census actually get included in census immigrant data? Prior to the 1990s most of the foreign-born in Australia on census night would have been permanent settlers, but international population movement has subsequently undergone massive change. Non-permanent movement has increased in scale and complexity. Figure 1 shows how, since the 1990s, there has been an exponential increase in the number of temporary migrants arriving in Australia with the right to work as students, working holiday-makers and temporary business migrants on 457 visas. Non-settler migration has increased much more quickly than permanent migration as is evident in Table 1.

4 Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006). *Census Dictionary: Australia 2006(Reissue)*, Catalogue No. 2901.0, ABS, Canberra.

Figure 1 Australia: Temporary Migration, 1986-87 to 2008-09

Source: DIAC, *Population Flows: Immigration Aspects*⁵

To what extent are these people, who are in Australia on some form of temporary visa, included in the census? The Australian census seeks to identify 'visitors to Australia' in order to exclude them from the usually resident population and from the tabulations of key characteristics of the population like birthplace, ancestry etc. Question 8 in the census form asks 'Where does the person usually live?' in order to exclude persons who are usually resident in another country. Prior to the 1996 census, overseas visitors were included in standard census data tabulations, but subsequently they have been excluded. However, the definition of 'visitor' has changed. In the 1996 census, overseas visitors were those people who indicated they would be usually resident in Australia for less than six months. For the 2001 and 2006 censuses this has been increased to less than one year.

⁵ Department of Immigration and Citizenship (2009a). 'Community Information Summary: Hong Kong-born Community'. <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/statistics/comm-summ/summary.htm>.

Table 1 Australia: Permanent, long and short term arrivals and departures, 1996-2001 and 2001-06

	1996-2001	2001-2006
Settler Arrivals	446,860	549,421
Permanent Departures	184,622	288,241
Net Permanent	262,238	261,180
LT Arrivals	1,005,218	1,463,394
LT Departures	754,467	894,799
Net Long Term	250,751	568,595
ST Arrivals	38,284,493	37,060,165
ST Departures	38,352,870	37,454,263
Net Short Term	-68,377	-394,098
Net Total	444,612	435,677

Note: ST Arrivals and Departures not available for 2001-02.

Source: DIAC unpublished data

Table 2 Overseas persons temporarily present in Australia on the night of the census

	Number
1996	139,594
2001	203,101
2006	206,358

Source: ABS

The number of visitors identified in the 1996, 2001 and 2006 census enumerations is shown in Table 2. These numbers differ quite significantly from estimates made by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) of the numbers of foreign citizens 'temporarily present' on 30 June of each year presented in Table 3, which are around three times greater than those identified as visitors by the census. With each new census the numbers of temporary residents who are captured in the census has increased. The distribution of temporary residents is quite different from that of permanent settlers.

Table 3 Australia: Number of persons temporarily present, 30 June 1999-2008

Year (30 June)	Number	Annual Percent Increase
2008	809,628	
2007	687,292	17.8
2006	630,513	14.5
2005	599,629	8.5
2004	590,566	1.7
2003	584,862	1.0
2002	555,569	5.0
2001	554,200	2.4
2000	513,900	8.0
1999	462,510	10.0

Source: DIAC, *Population Flows: Immigration Aspects*, various issues

The significance of place and space

Where people live is important. It exerts important influences on their social and economic lives. The characteristics of places which exert an influence on behaviour include⁶:

- The physical characteristics of the place.
- The characteristics of other people living in that place.
- The level and nature of service provision in that place.
- The place's relationship with other places, especially its accessibility to other places.

For some groups location can be an especially important factor influencing their behaviour. This is certainly the case for recently arrived migrants. Location can influence access to work opportunities and the ability to interact with people who speak the same language and have similar cultural and religious backgrounds. It will influence the extent they are able to draw on the social capital embodied in networks with fellow settlers from the same background, including those who have been in Australia longer who are able to cushion their adjustment to life in a new land. It is a significant factor influencing their access to goods and services, including those provided by different levels of government, which will also impinge on the speed and level of their adjustment.

Immigrants' ability to adjust to, and participate in, Australian housing and labour markets will be influenced by where they live. This influences the extent to which they mix on a day-to-day basis with second, third and later generation

6 Hugo, G J (2007). 'Space, Place, Population and Census Analysis in Australia'. *Australian Geographer*. 38, 3: 335.

Australians. It will have an impact on the extent of cultural and language maintenance they are able to achieve. It affects what schools their children can attend and the level of mixing they will have with non-immigrant children. The local community can be a crucial factor in the adjustment of new migrants to life in Australia, since it is the arena in which many of their day-to-day interactions take place.

Australian communities have differed greatly in the extent of their cultural diversity and the spatial patterning of diversity is changing. These changes are profoundly altering the nature of Australian places. In post-war Australia immigrant settlement has increasingly concentrated in Australia's large cities. Waves of new immigrants have reshaped suburbs, transforming their populations from being relatively Anglo-Celtic into diverse mixes of groups from Europe, the Middle East, Asia and more recently Africa. We are now also seeing such transformations outside of large cities.

In pre-war Australia, immigrants were a significant part of non-metropolitan populations, especially in areas of intensive agriculture like market gardening, sugar cane farming and irrigated agriculture⁷. Immigrants did not, however, settle in the extensive dry farming areas of the wheat-sheep belt or the pastoral interior. There was some settlement in mining and fishing communities and large regional industrial centres like Newcastle, Wollongong, Geelong and Whyalla. However, recent years have seen a small but significant settlement of immigrants in dry farming areas hitherto little influenced by immigrants.

Since net migration has contributed around a half of Australia's post-war population growth, where migrants have settled has had a substantial influence on the national population distribution⁸. That migrants do not settle in Australia in the same pattern as the existing population distribution has had a major impact on the national population distribution. Moreover, recent migrants are more mobile within the country than non-migrants, although there is a convergence with increases in their length of residence.

Changing patterns of immigrant settlement in Australia

Australia has a distinctive pattern of population distribution⁹ characterised by:

- A high proportion of the population (88.0 per cent in 2006) living in urban areas.

7 Borrie, W D (1954). *Italians and Germans in Australia: A Study of Assimilation*, F W Cheshire, Melbourne.

8 Hugo, G J (2003). Changing Patterns of Population Distribution. In S-E Khoo and P McDonald (eds), *The Transformation of Australia's Population 1970-2030*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney: 200-201.

9 *Ibid.*

- A strong coastal orientation with 85.3 per cent of the population living within 50km of the coast in 2006.
- A high level of population mobility with 16.8 per cent of Australians changing their permanent place of residence in 2006.
- A high proportion of the population (63.7 per cent in 2006) living in the capital cities of the states and territories.
- A concentration of the population in the south-eastern quarter of the continent.

Immigrant settlement during the post-war period has made an important contribution to this distinctive pattern.

A spatial shift has occurred in Australia's post-war population away from the south-eastern states to the northern and western parts of the country. In 1947 the states of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania accounted for 78.4 per cent of the national population. By 2006 they had 67.9 per cent of the total. On the other hand, Queensland increased its share from 14.6 per cent to 19.7 per cent and Western Australia from 6.6 per cent to 9.9 per cent. This has been a function of structural change in the Australian economy in the last 30 years, with the south-eastern states being heavily reliant on manufacturing and suffering due to the loss of jobs in this sector.

While much of the shift in interstate distribution has been due to interstate population movements, it is also due to a propensity for immigrants to settle in particular states. Table 4 indicates that immigrants have settled disproportionately in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia. New South Wales shows an interesting pattern with the state accounting for 41.1 and 40.7 per cent of the nation's migrants who arrived in the last five years at the 1996 and 2001 censuses, compared with 33.2 and 32.6 per cent respectively of the national Australia-born population. However, at the 2006 census it had only 34.1 per cent of the recent migrants, revealing a sharp reduction in the proportion of new migrants settling in New South Wales. Victoria, on the other hand, has increased its share of new arrivals, as have Queensland, Western Australia and South Australia. The former is an interesting case. After a long period of getting less than its proportionate share of immigrants, it is now a significant magnet for migrants.

Table 4 Australian states and territories: Percentage distribution of the population by birthplace and overseas-born arriving in the last five years, 2001 and 2006

State/Territory	Australia-Born			Overseas-Born			Persons Arriving in Last 5 Yrs		
	1996	2001	2006	1996	2001	2006	1996	2001	2006
New South Wales	33.2	32.6	32.1	33.5	35.9	35.1	41.1	40.7	34.1
Victoria	24.0	24.0	24.4	26.6	26.3	25.9	24.2	23.6	26.1
Queensland	20.0	20.4	20.9	14.2	15.0	16.8	15.3	17.5	18.5
South Australia	8.2	8.1	8.0	7.7	7.2	6.8	4.5	4.1	5.7
Western Australia	8.9	9.1	9.1	12.2	12.6	11.8	11.6	11.3	12.5
Tasmania	3.0	2.8	2.8	1.2	1.1	1.4	0.8	0.7	0.9
Northern Territory	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7
Australian Capital Territory	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: ABS, 2001 and 2006 censuses

The relative contributions of net international migration as well as net interstate migration and national increase to population change in the states and territories are shown in Table 5. In New South Wales, the largest state, there was a net international migration gain of almost 200,000, which accounted for 79.6 per cent of the state's population growth between 2001 and 2006. Moreover, the state experienced a significant net loss due to interstate migration – a longstanding pattern¹⁰. In the past this has been the pattern in Victoria as well, but a turnaround in the state's economy saw a small net interstate migration gain between 1996 and 2001, although there was a small net loss in 2001-06. Conversely Queensland's net international migration gain was not as large as the net gain by interstate migration. Clearly there are wide differences between the states in the significance of immigrant settlement and this is undergoing substantial change.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

Table 5 Australian states and territories: Natural increase, net overseas migration, net interstate migration and total population growth, financial years, 2001-06

State/ Territory	Natural Increase		Net International Migration		Net Interstate Migration		Total Population Growth
	No.	% of Growth	No.	% of Growth	No	% of Growth	
New South Wales	191,089	79.0	192,586	79.6	-136,330	-56.3	241,965
Victoria	143,880	44.5	142,892	44.2	-2,197	-0.7	323,584
Queensland	132,050	28.5	129,944	28.1	164,362	35.5	462,600
South Australia	28,179	49.9	27,522	48.7	-12,639	-22.4	56,476
Western Australia	68,668	43.5	82,832	52.5	-1,399	-0.9	157,886
Tasmania	10,026	58.5	3,758	21.9	3,105	18.1	17,137
Northern Territory	13,862	107.4	3,475	26.9	-8,474	-65.7	12,906
Australian Capital Territory	13,531	90.8	2,412	16.2	-6,428	-43.1	14,908
Australia*	601,389	46.7	585,421	45.4	-	-	1,288,248

* Includes other territories.

Source: ABS, 2007

One of the characteristics of international migration to Australia has been variations in the spatial patterns of settlement of different birthplace groups. This is illustrated in Table 6 which indicates that in 2001 and 2006 the Language Other Than English (LOTE) origin immigrants are disproportionately represented in New South Wales and Victoria, which in 2006 had 73.8 per cent of the group compared with 56.5 per cent of the nation's Australia-born. On the other hand, Mainly English-Speaking (MES) origin settlers are under-represented with 46.2 per cent. This presents a stark contrast to Queensland which has a fifth of the Australia-born population but less than a tenth of the LOTE group and almost a quarter of the MES. Migration to both South and Western Australia is also strongly focused on groups coming from countries which are MES. Queensland now attracts more MES origin migrants than Victoria and about as many as New South Wales.

Table 6 Distribution of LOTE (Language Other Than English Spoken at Home) and MES overseas-born population between states and territories, 2001-2006

State/Territory	LOTE		MES	
	2001	2006	2001	2006
	%	%	%	%
New South Wales	41.9*	41.8*	28.4	27.1
Victoria	32.3*	32.0*	19.0	19.1
Queensland	8.9	9.6	21.8*	23.4*
South Australia	6.0	5.9	9.1*	8.7*
Western Australia	7.3	7.2	17.5*	17.8*
Tasmania	0.5	0.5	1.7	1.8
Northern Territory	1.6*	1.4*	0.9	0.7
Australian Capital Territory	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Number (million)	2.9	3.1	1.6	1.7

*Over-represented compared with Australia-born.

Source: ABS 2001 and 2006 censuses

Within states and territories the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) divides settlements for census purposes into the following 'Section of State'¹¹ categories:

- Major urban (population clusters of 100,000 or more);
- Other urban (population clusters of 1,000 to 99,999);
- Bounded locality (200 to 999);
- Rural balance (remainder of state/territory); and
- Migratory.

¹¹ Hugo, G J (2007). *op cit*.

Table 7 Distribution of Australia-born and overseas-born population between major urban, other urban and rural areas, 1947-2006

	Australia-born						Percent Change 1947- 2006
	1947		1996		2006		
	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	
Major urban	3,390,591	49.7	7,627,197	57.7	8,579,875	61.0	153.0
Other urban	1,263,724	18.5	3,485,125	26.3	3,530,407	25.1	179.4
Rural	2,173,068	31.8	2,108,242	16.0	1,958,711	13.9	-9.9
Total	6,827,383	100.0	13,220,564	100.0	14,068,993	100.0	106.1
	Overseas-Born						Percent Change 1947- 2006
	1947		1996		2006		
	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	
Major urban	453,368	61.8	3,126,260	80.0	3,654,920	82.8	706.2
Other urban	98,824	13.5	489,550	12.5	494,752	11.2	400.6
Rural	181,180	24.7	290,269	7.5	264,905	6.0	46.2
Total*	733,372	100.0	3,906,079	100.0	4,414,577	100.0	502.0

* Excludes people of no permanent residence.

Note: Overseas-born does not include Birthplace Not Stated.

Table 7 shows the distribution of the Australian- and overseas-born between sections of state over the post-war period. The dominant trend over the post-war period has been an increasing concentration of population in urban areas. However, the pattern has been most marked among the migrant population. While in 1947 only one in eight people living in Australia's major cities was overseas-born, by 2006 it was three out of every ten. The proportion of immigrants living in major cities increased from 61.8 to 82.8 per cent in 2006 while for the Australia-born it grew from 49.7 to 61 per cent. While there was a decline in the numbers of Australia-born living in rural areas there was a small increase in the overseas-born. In 1947, 31.8 per cent of Australians lived in rural areas but, in 2006, it was only 13.9 per cent, while for the overseas-born the population fell from 24.7 to 6 per cent.

This strong pattern of increasing urbanisation of the overseas-born population was especially evident for recently arrived migrants. Table 8 shows that the pattern of concentration in capital cities is especially strong for immigrants who arrive from LOTE origin countries. By 2001, 90.1 per cent of new arrivals settled in capital cities compared with 86.2 per cent of those who had been in Australia longer than five years. The pattern is present but less marked among those from MES countries with 77.0 per cent and 70.2 per cent respectively.

Table 8 Number and percentage of overseas-born persons resident in capital cities by origin and length of residence, 1986, 2001 and 2006

	1986				2001				2006			
	O-4 Years		5 + Years		O-4 Years		5 + Years		O-4 Years		5 + Years	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
MES Origin	142,722	76.9	890,809	73.2	145,936	77.0	936,796	70.2	173,293	74.2	943,568	69.4
LOTE Origin	240,864	88.6	1,245,254	83.8	307,781	90.1	1,762,488	86.2	416,389	88.8	1,857,957	86.8
Total Overseas-born	383,586	83.9	2,136,063	79.0	453,717	85.4	2,699,284	79.9	589,681	83.9	2,801,524	80.0

Source: ABS, 1986, 2001 and 2006 censuses

There were increases in the percentages of new arrivals settling in capital cities with each new post-war census until the 2006 enumeration. While 83.9 per cent of migrants settled in these cities, the proportion fell for the first time during the post war period. The change is relatively small but it may be significant since in Europe and North America the last decade has also seen some decentralisation of migrant settlement away from major centres¹².

At the 2006 census, 63.1 per cent of the Australia-born lived in major cities compared with 93.0 per cent of the LOTE and 76.4 per cent of the MES-born population. For recent arrivals of LOTE and MES migrants the proportions are 92.2 per cent and 83.3 per cent respectively compared with 93.3 per cent and 75.3 per cent of those who had stayed in Australia longer than five years. There is some evidence then of a slight lessening of the dominance of the capital cities in the initial settlement of migrants. Nevertheless, cities are still the dominant settlement choice of migrants. There are then two long established elements in Australian post-war immigrant settlement patterns:

1. Immigrants from MES countries, especially New Zealand and the United Kingdom, although more concentrated in major cities compared with the Australia-born, are more like the Australia-born in their settlement patterns than is the case for those from LOTE origin countries.
2. For both groups, especially the MES group, there is a strong tendency over time, with increasing length of residence in Australia, for settlement patterns to converge toward those of the Australia-born.

These patterns are evident when we examine the pattern of immigrant settlement according to the degree of remoteness/accessibility of the places where they settle. The ABS has adopted the following classification of localities in Australia according to their remoteness:

Highly Accessible Major Cities – Locations with relatively unrestricted accessibility to a wide range of goods and services and opportunities for social interaction.

Accessible Inner Regional Areas – Locations with some restrictions to accessibility of some goods, services and opportunities for social interaction.

Moderately Accessible Outer Regional Areas – Locations with significantly restricted accessibility of goods, services and opportunities for social interaction.

Remote Areas – Locations with very restricted accessibility of goods, services and opportunities for social interaction.

Very Remote Areas – Locationally disadvantaged – very little accessibility of goods, services and opportunities for social interaction.

12 Hugo, G J and Moren, R (2008). Immigrant Settlement in non-Metropolitan Areas of OECD Countries; Editorial Introduction, *Population, Space and Place*, 14, 6: 473-477.

Table 9 shows that it is only in the most accessible major urban areas that migrants are over-represented in the Australian population, with 84.8 per cent living in those areas compared with 63.2 per cent of the Australia-born. The proportion of the Australia-born in all other remoteness categories is more than twice that for migrants. However, longstanding migrants are more strongly represented in the two middle level accessibility settled agriculture categories than are recent arrivals. In more remote areas there is little difference between recent and longstanding migrants, although both have only a third the representation of the Australia-born. Table 10 shows that the degree of concentration in the most accessible areas is especially strong among immigrants from countries where languages other than English are dominant. In Australian major cities three out of every 10 residents is a migrant, almost two of them from a LOTE country. In the rest of the country it is close to only one in 10 residents who are migrants.

One way of showing the difference between different groups in their spatial distribution is to calculate the population centroid. This has been defined by Plane and Rogerson as:

... also called the mean centre, mean point, the centre of gravity, or sometimes the centre of population. Conceptually, if the mythological Atlas were to hold up the entire area for which the centre is being computed ... (in this case Australia) ... assuming that people were the only objects contributing to the weight ... the point where he would have to stand to balance the country would be the centroid¹³.

Figure 2 shows the centroids at the 2006 census for particular subgroups of the Australian population. For the total population the centroid is located in central NSW near Cowra and in fact has changed little over the last century¹⁴. However, it will be noted that there are some interesting deviations for particular migrant groups:

- The overall centroid has moved northwest over time, indicating the shift of population away from New South Wales and Victoria toward Queensland and Western Australia.
- Centres of MES birthplace groups are located to the northwest, indicating the disproportionate concentration in Queensland and Western Australia.
- Centres of NES groups are located in the southeast reflecting the disproportionate concentration in Sydney and Melbourne.

13 Plane, D A and Rogerson, P A (1994). *The Geographical Analysis of Population: with Applications to Planning and Business*, John Wiley, New York: 31.

14 Hugo, G J (2004). *Australia's most recent immigrants*, Australian Census Analytic Program, Cat. No. 2053.0, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra: 58.

Table 9 Remoteness area categories: Breakdown according to birthplace, 2006

	Australia-Born		Overseas-Born		Recent Migrants		Longstanding Migrants		Year of Arrival Not Stated		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Major Cities	8,889,384	63.2	3,734,914	84.8	622,144	88.5	2,946,814	84.2	175,287	82.6	12,624,298	68.3
Inner Regional	3,250,439	23.1	421,788	9.6	45,620	6.5	354,807	10.1	22,194	10.5	3,672,227	19.9
Outer Regional	1,536,366	10.9	199,394	4.5	24,398	3.5	163,999	4.7	11,475	5.4	1,735,760	9.4
Remote	237,673	1.7	28,332	0.6	5,156	0.7	21,634	0.6	1,644	0.8	266,005	1.4
Very Remote	130,992	0.9	9,636	0.2	1,698	0.2	7,344	0.2	631	0.3	140,628	0.8
Total *	14,071,676	100.0	4,404,546	100.0	702,695	100.0	3,500,507	100.0	212,153	100.0	18,476,222	100.0

Source: ABS CDDATA 2006

Table 10 Remoteness area categories: Percentage of population born overseas, 2006

	Australia-born		Recent Migrants				Longstanding Migrants				Year of Arrival Not Stated				Total
	No.		LOTE	%	No.	%	LOTE	%	No.	%	LOTE	%	No.	%	No.
Major Cities	8,889,384	70.4	395,722	3.1	192,921	1.5	1,517,608	12.0	1,021,193	8.1	90,579	0.7	61,030	0.5	12,624,298
Inner Regional	3,250,439	88.5	19,564	0.5	23,251	0.6	65,747	1.8	222,411	6.1	4,420	0.1	13,098	0.4	3,672,227
Outer Regional	1,536,366	88.5	11,060	0.6	11,722	0.7	38,208	2.2	94,706	5.5	3,343	0.2	6,059	0.3	1,735,760
Remote	237,673	89.3	2,221	0.8	2,846	1.1	3,959	1.5	13,571	5.1	441	0.2	968	0.4	266,005
Very Remote	130,992	93.1	710	0.5	946	0.7	1,434	1.0	4,534	3.2	204	0.1	347	0.2	140,628
Total *	14,071,676	76.2	429,276	2.3	231,686	1.3	1,626,955	8.8	1,356,415	7.3	98,987	0.5	81,502	0.4	18,476,222

Source: ABS CDATA 2006

Figure 2 Australia: Population centroids of the Australian population and sub groups in 2006

Source: Calculated using 2006 Australian census data and Australian historical population statistics, 2006

Migrants in Australia's major cities

Not only have post-war migrants tended to settle in Australia's larger urban areas but also they have concentrated especially in two cities – Sydney (2006 population 4.1 million) and Melbourne (2006 population 3.6 million). While their populations have more than doubled, Sydney and Melbourne's share of the nation's overseas-born population has increased from 42.5 per cent in 1947 to 53.2 per cent in 2001, falling slightly to 53.1 per cent in 2006. Their share of the Australia-born has fallen from 38.7 per cent to 34.1 per cent. Of immigrants who have been in Australia less than five years, 56.0 per cent live in major urban areas in New South Wales and Victoria.

Table 11 Sydney and Melbourne statistical divisions: Proportion of population overseas-born, 1947-2006

	Sydney Statistical Division		Melbourne Statistical Division		All Australia
	No. of Overseas-born	% of all Overseas-born	No. of Overseas-born	% of all Overseas-born	No. of Overseas-born
1947	191,107	25.7	125,258	16.8	744,187
1954	308,778	24.0	261,470	20.3	1,286,466
1961	434,663	24.4	444,479	25.0	1,778,780
1966	558,236	26.2	568,365	26.7	2,130,920
1971	681,313	26.4	687,266	26.6	2,579,318
1976	736,754	27.1	706,331	26.0	2,718,855
1981	834,280	27.8	754,117	25.1	3,003,833
1986	912,578	28.1	788,266	24.3	3,247,381
1991	1,070,627	28.5	893,445	23.8	3,755,554
1996	1,148,869	29.4	915,449	23.4	3,908,213
2001	1,233,487	30.0	954,037	23.2	4,105,444
2006	1,307,455	29.6	1,038,430	23.5	4,416,037

Source: ABS 1947, 1954, 1966, 1971, 1976, 1981, 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001 and 2006 censuses

Table 12 Australia: Percentage of immigrants arriving in five years prior to the census settling in capital cities, rest of state and Sydney, 1991-2006

Years		Capital Cities	Rest of State	Sydney
1991-96		86.3	13.7	37.5
1996-2001		85.5	14.5	37.3
2001-06	Total	83.9	16.1	30.6
	MES	74.2	25.8	22.2
	LOTE	88.8	11.2	34.8

Source: ABS population censuses of 1966, 2001 and 2006

In the 1990s Sydney accounted for over 37 per cent of new migrants settling in Australia, while for LOTE groups it was even higher. However, for 2001-06 the proportion fell dramatically to 30.6 per cent. The drop in the proportion settling in capital cities was not nearly so great, indicating that the dispersal away from Sydney was partly to other capitals. The increasing proportion settling outside capitals indicates a wider dispersal of settlement beyond capital cities.

Table 13 Australia: Birthplace groups with the highest concentration in major cities, 2006

Birthplace	Percentage
Vietnam	97.2
Lebanon	97.2
China	96.2
Bosnia-Herzegovina	96.1
Hong Kong	96.0
Iraq	96.0
Former Yugoslavia	95.6
S. Korea	95.2
Sri Lanka	94.5
Egypt	94.1
Turkey	93.5
Greece	93.4
India	92.4

Source: ABS 2006 census

There are significant variations between different birthplace groups in their propensity to settle in major cities. Table 13 shows the groups which have the highest concentrations in Australia's major cities and it is immediately noticeable that all are countries which mainly speak languages other than English. Moreover, several of these groups are among those who have most recently arrived in Australia in substantial numbers, including the Chinese and Indians. However, it also includes several longer standing groups with limited recent flows such as the Vietnamese, Turks and Greeks. If we look at those birthplace groups which have the lowest concentrations in major cities shown in Table 14, the MES origin countries are dominant, together with European countries whose peak of immigration was in the early post-war years and who have mature age structures (Netherlands, Germany and Malta). Papua New Guinea may appear an outlier but many in this group were born to Australians or Europeans working in Papua New Guinea during colonial and early post-colonial days.

Table 14 Australia: Birthplace groups with the lowest concentration in major cities, 2006

Birthplace	Percentage
Australia	61.0
Netherlands	61.0
UK	69.8
Germany	69.1
Papua New Guinea	72.6
USA	75.5
New Zealand	75.1
Canada	76.1
Ireland	79.1
Malta	80.9

Source: ABS 2006 census

Post-war immigration to Australia has occurred in a series of waves, each of which is characterised by a different mix of birthplace groups as Australia's immigration policy and the national and global economic, political and demographic situation has changed. The UK-Ireland-born have been the largest single birthplace group in the immigration intake most years. They have remained a constant element in the post-war immigration streams, although their share of the total intake has declined significantly (from 78.7 per cent in 1947 to 17.4 per cent in 2007-08). However, the mix of other (mainly non-English-speaking) birthplace groups in the incoming stream has undergone

significant change with different groups dominating successive waves over the post-war period. Eastern European refugees formed the first of these waves in the late 1940s and early 1950s and were followed by a substantial influx of Dutch and German origin settlers in the early 1950s, who, in turn, were followed in the mid and late 1950s by Italians, Greeks and Yugoslavs. In the 1960s, Lebanese and Turks came and in the 1970s the arrival of refugees from Vietnam was the beginning of a period which saw Asian-origin groups dominate for several decades. First, Southeast Asian groups, then those from East Asia, and finally South Asia, with groups from India and China forming the largest flows into Australia in recent years apart from those from the UK and New Zealand. Finally, in the last decade, African migrants have been significant.

Accordingly there has been a substantial shift in the ethnic structure of Australian cities with those changes. In Sydney, for example, Figure 3 shows changes in the proportions of the overseas-born population at various post-war censuses who originated from various regions of the world. It is clear that the shifts have been substantial.

Figure 3 Sydney: Birthplace composition of the overseas-born population, 1947-2006

Source: ABS censuses 1947-2006

Most striking is the consistent pattern of decline in the proportion from the UK and Ireland over the period (from 78.7 to 14.4 per cent) The proportion from Oceania (mainly New Zealand) declined over the first quarter century but subsequently increased. The pattern for Southern Europeans is one of a rapid increase up to 1971 but a subsequent attenuation as the flow of immigrants from Greece and Italy dried up over the last two decades. A similar pattern is apparent for migrants from other Continental European nations for which the trajectory of post-war migration has tended to follow the Southern Europeans.

The spectacular increase of Asian origin immigrants since 1971 is especially apparent, increasing from 3.2 to 33.8 per cent of overseas-born Sydneysiders. In 2006 some 13.0 per cent of Sydney's population was born in Asia. Other origin groups have a much smaller representation but a general pattern of increased significance in the last two decades. In the 2001-06 period there was a small but significant increase in the African origin population. Overall then the rapid increase in the overseas-born population in Sydney has been accompanied by an equally striking increase in ethnic diversity among them.

Figure 3 shows the changing ethnic mix of Sydney in terms of the major origins of migrants but the reality is much more complex, with a myriad of different nations being represented by significant communities. In 2006 there are many more than 20 separate birthplace groups with more than 1,000 representatives in Sydney and there are many other smaller but viable communities¹⁵. Recent changes in the sizes of the largest overseas-born groups are shown in Table 15. This shows the substantial change which occurred during the 1980s, with the increasing Asian presence being especially pronounced. In Sydney the 10 largest overseas-born groups in 1981 did not include a single Asian origin group, but by 2006 the Chinese, Vietnamese, Indians, Filipinos, Hong Kong-born and South Koreans were in the 10 largest groups. The Asia-born groups all have more than doubled in numbers, while most of the European origin groups actually declined as death and return migration reduced their numbers.

15 For example, see Burnley, I H (1996). *Atlas of the Australian People-1991 Census of New South Wales*, AGPS, Canberra; Burnley, I H (1999). 'Levels of Immigrant Residential Concentration in Sydney and their Relationship with Disadvantage, *Urban Studies*, 36, 8: 1295-1315; Burnley, I H (2004). *Migration Processes and Geographies of Population Diversity in Sydney, Australia: A 2001 Census Evaluation*. Presentation to Conference of New Zealand Geographical Society, Auckland.

Table 15 Representation and growth of major overseas birthplace groups, 1981, 1991, 2001 and 2006 in Sydney

Country	1981	1991	2001	2006	Percent of National Total	Percent Change 1981-2006
United Kingdom	234,598	208,605	183,991	175,166	16.9	-25.3
China	13,162	41,741	82,029	109,142	52.8	729.2
New Zealand	53,025	62,529	81,963	81,064	20.8	52.9
Vietnam	15,385	47,492	61,423	62,144	38.9	303.9
Lebanon	36,010	49,937	52,008	54,502	72.8	51.4
India	10,182	17,851	34,503	52,975	36.0	420.3
Philippines	7,734	33,410	47,090	52,087	43.2	573.5
Italy	62,682	56,887	48,900	44,563	22.4	-28.9
Hong Kong	7,964	29,673	36,039	36,866	51.3	362.9
Korea, Republic of	3,099	15,044	26,928	32,124	60.9	936.6
Greece	43,628	40,531	33,688	32,022	29.1	-26.6
South Africa	9,012	16,112	25,190	28,427	27.3	215.4
Fiji	5,022	16,972	25,368	26,928	55.9	436.2
Malaysia	8,076	17,501	18,996	21,211	23.0	162.6
Indonesia	4,973	13,174	19,719	20,562	40.3	313.5
Germany	24,097	21,418	19,711	19,364	18.2	-19.6
Sri Lanka	3,261	9,595	15,744	17,917	28.8	449.4
Egypt	14,862	16,194	16,506	16,238	48.5	9.3
Malta	21,265	19,355	16,124	14,680	33.6	-31.0

Source: ABS censuses, 1981, 1991, 2001 and 2006

The distribution of immigrants in Australian cities, especially the degree of spatial concentration, and its implications has been an issue of considerable debate among social scientists in Australia. On the one hand are commentators¹⁶ who argue that the development of immigrant concentrations in particular suburbs jeopardises social harmony and cohesiveness in Australian society. On the other hand there are those¹⁷ who stress the positive roles played by ethnic concentrations in assisting immigrant economic and social adjustment.

16 Blainey, G (1993). 'A Critique of Indo-Chinese in Australia: The Issues of Unemployment and Residential Concentration', *BIPR Bulletin*: 9, July: 42-45; Blainey, G (1994). 'Melting Pot on the Boil', *The Bulletin*, 30 August: 22-27; Healy, E and Birrell, B (2003). 'Metropolis Divided: The Political Dynamic of Spatial Inequality and Migrant Settlement in Sydney', *People and Place*, 11,2: 65-87.

17 Viviani, N, Coughlan, J and Rowland, T (1993). *Indo-Chinese in Australia: The Issues of Unemployment and Residential Concentration*, AGPS, Canberra; Jupp, J (1993). 'Ethnic Concentrations: A Reply to Bob Birrell, *People and Place*, 4, 4: 51-52.

A distinctive characteristic of Australia's largest cities compared with some other world cities, however, is that while there are suburbs with high proportions of foreign-born residents, these concentrations are not dominated by a single birthplace group. This is partly a function of the fact that no single birthplace, language or religious group has been dominant in post-war migration to Australia.

Burnley¹⁸ has made a detailed analysis of ethnic diversity at the district level in Sydney. He found that even among the most 'segregated' population, the Vietnam-born, there was only one district in which there was more than half the population born in Vietnam and nine in which 40-49 per cent were. Moreover, 56 per cent of the Vietnam-born lived in districts where they made up less than five per cent of the resident population. For other concentrated groups the relevant percentages were 61 per cent for the Lebanon-born and 86 per cent for the China-born. Indeed, Burnley¹⁹ demonstrates that birthplace diversity is more evident in areas of immigrant concentration than elsewhere in the city.

Recent immigrant arrivals to Australian cities have a greater degree of spatial dispersal than earlier generations of arrivals. This is partly a function of the increasing bifurcation in both global and Australian immigration between high skilled migration (both permanent and temporary) and low skilled migration. Australia has increasingly targeted its immigration program at highly educated, highly skilled, higher income groups²⁰. The share of lower skilled migrants through the refugee-humanitarian and family reunion components of the Australian immigration program has decreased substantially. Accordingly, the proportion of newcomers to Australian cities made up of more skilled, English-speaking, better-off migrants has increased compared with early post-war years. Such groups are more likely to select areas to live based on socioeconomic rather than ethnic factors.

There are clearly differences between the two groups in their capacity to exercise choice about where to live upon arrival in Australian cities and the constellation of forces which shape where they settle. Those coming as family or refugee-humanitarian migrants are more constrained in where they can live, both economically in terms of what housing markets they can afford to buy into, and because they rely upon the support of friends, family and compatriots to support them in adjusting to life in Australia. The balance between the numbers in the skilled and family-refugee groups settling in major cities has moved in favour of skilled migrants since the mid-1990s, although it has been argued that the unskilled group are more likely to settle in Sydney and Melbourne than in other parts of the nation.

18 Burnley, I H (2004). *op cit*.

19 *Ibid*.

20 Hugo, G J (1999b). *Regional Development through Immigration? The Reality behind the Rhetoric*, Department of the Parliamentary Library Research Paper No.9 1999-2000, Department of the Parliamentary Library, Canberra; Hawthorne, L (2005). 'Picking Winners': The Recent Transformation of Australia's Skilled Migration Policy, *International Migration Review*, XXXIX, 3: 663-696.

The differing patterns of settlement of birthplace groups in Australia's major cities can be examined through the extent to which they are spatially concentrated. In order to do this we have calculated the Index of Dissimilarity for the major birthplace groups in Australia's major cities and these are depicted in Table 16.

Table 16 Australia's major capital cities: Index of Dissimilarity, 2006

Birthplace	2006 Census
Bosnia and Herzegovina	50.9
Canada	26.7
China (excl. SARs and Taiwan Province)	50.9
Croatia	38.5
Egypt	42.0
Fiji	48.6
Macedonia (FYROM)	66.9
Germany	14.7
Greece	50.9
Hong Kong (SAR of China)	50.9
India	38.5
Indonesia	45.5
Iraq	72.4
Ireland	22.0
Italy	40.7
Japan	44.7
Korea, Republic of (South)	58.4
Lebanon	64.0
Malaysia	42.6
Malta	51.2
Netherlands	21.6
New Zealand	23.0
Papua New Guinea	38.0
Philippines	39.3
Poland	29.0
Singapore	42.8
South Africa	35.0
Sri Lanka	47.3
Thailand	34.8
Turkey	58.7
United Kingdom(d)	21.6
United States of America	28.2
Vietnam	60.7

Source: ABS CDATA 2006

The Index of Dissimilarity can be interpreted as the percentage of a particular sub-population which would have to change their place of residence if the distribution of that group between sub-areas of the region under study is to be made exactly the same as that of the other sub-group. An index of 0 would mean that the two sub-populations had exactly the same relative distribution while an index value of 100 represents a complete 'apartheid' situation, with no person of one sub-group living in the same sub-area as people of the other sub-group.

These two extremes rarely occur. If the index is less than 20 there is little spatial separation of the two sub-populations, if it exceeds 30 there is some significant separation and if it exceeds 50 there is very significant separation.

There are wide differences between birthplace groups in their propensity to concentrate, with the highest being mainly for those groups that have come to Australia as refugee-humanitarian settlers, such as those from Iraq (72.4), Macedonia (66.9), Lebanon (64.0) and Vietnam (60.7). The lowest are for the MES groups such as those born in the UK (21.6), Ireland (22.0), New Zealand (23), Canada (26.7) and the USA (28.2). The figures are also low for longstanding Western European groups like those born in the Netherlands (21.6), Germany (14.7) and Poland (29). The Greece- and Italy-born are still quite concentrated (50.9 and 40.7 respectively) but their second generations have dispersed more widely throughout Australian cities, especially the Italians.

A spatial concentration among some Asian, African and Middle Eastern birthplace groups is evident. For the Vietnamese, for example, 39.7 per cent of the group in Sydney live in a single local government area, Fairfield, which has 4.5 per cent of the total population of Sydney. There have been two major interpretations of those spatial patterns. Firstly Healy and Birrell²¹ argue that '... not only is the city's population growing it is also bifurcating ... there are now two Sydneys – one increasingly dominated by low to moderate income non English-speaking migrant communities in the west and south-west and the other comprised of established, inner, affluent areas and predominantly English-speaking 'aspirational' areas in the metropolitan periphery'.

Other commentators²² argue that Sydney is *not* characterised by ghettos or polarised ethnic enclaves but is rather an example of ethnic mix. They argue that it is inappropriate to regard all non-English-speaking groups as a single group because it ignores the differences between individual groups; also that it is necessary to separate more recent and longer standing migrants as well as including consideration of not just the first-generation migrants included

21 Healy, E and Birrell, B (2003). *op cit*: 65.

22 Poulsen, M, Johnston, R and Forrest, J (2002). 'Is Sydney a Divided City Ethnically?' *Australian Geographical Review*, 41, 3: 356-377.

in birthplace data but the second generation as well. A more nuanced analysis of changing patterns of ethnic distribution in Sydney, which considers these issues, concludes that:

The primary feature of Sydney's ethnic population to emerge from this study is one of residential mixing not of segregation or bifurcation ... Sydney appears to be moving towards being a city in which most of the population will live in areas that are classified as either non-isolated host communities, associated assimilation – pluralism communities or mixed enclaves – a hybrid city (to use a term popular with post modern theorists) in which the ongoing process of hybridisation [is] clearly reflected in the city's geography²³.

There has been a substantial increase in Sydney's foreign-born population, not an expansion of areas which are polarised ethnic enclaves but areas which are characterised by ethnic mix – in both high and low socio-economic areas. This is not to say that there are not significant divisions within Sydney, rather, as Burnley²⁴ has written:

Overall, the experience of major immigrant concentrations in Sydney is different from that in American and European cities. While there are serious societal issues in these concentrations, notably low incomes and unemployment, the ethnic composition of disadvantaged communities is not the central issue ... the issue now is not the distributional aspect of ethnically or racially distinct 'subgroups' but the conditions of life of racialized minorities, and more importantly, the dominant cultural forms which result in racialization.'

An increasing role for government in influencing where migrants settle

Immigrants have concentrated in New South Wales and especially Sydney in recent years. But it has been demonstrated here that the 2001-06 intercensal period saw for the first time in several decades a reversal of the trend of increasing concentration. It is apparent that government policy is playing a role in this change. While, during the post-war period, Australian immigration policy has been overwhelmingly concerned with shaping the scale and composition of the immigration intake, there have been some attempts by government to

23 Poulsen, M, Johnston, R and Forrest, J (2004). 'Plural Cities and Ethnic Enclaves: Introducing a Measurement Procedure for Comparative Study', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 2: 375).

24 Burnley, I H (1999). *op cit*: 1313.

influence where immigrants settle after their arrival in Australia²⁵. The federal government had a two-year bonding scheme for persons accepted as displaced persons in the early post-war years²⁶. These allocated settlers to areas suffering labour shortages, often in remote non-metropolitan areas such as large-scale construction projects like the Snowy Mountains Hydro Electric Scheme. At the end of the bond period many made their way to capital cities, but substantial communities remained.

It was not until the mid 1990s that the Australian government considered trying to shape on a large scale where immigrants settle. The sustainability of rural and regional communities became an important item on the national agenda with the establishment of a federal government department on regional development and the initiation of a rash of programs to facilitate regional development. Similarly, states which were lagging economically, like South Australia, were pressing for immigration to assist their economic development.

In May 1996 the annual meeting of Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs established a working party to examine ways in which a higher proportion of migrants might settle in regional Australia and in states which were lagging economically. Accordingly, a number of initiatives were taken to attract immigrants to areas which were receiving small intakes. Labour shortages began to be reported in regional areas and in the states receiving smaller numbers of migrants. Accordingly the State Specific and Regional Migration Scheme (SSRM) was initiated in May 1996 to attract immigrants to areas which were receiving small intakes. Several visa categories have been added to the scheme and a range of modifications has been made. A mechanism has been set up for the states, territories and the Department of Immigration and Citizenship to regularly assess and modify the scheme. The essence of this program was to enable employers, state and local governments and families in designated lagging economic regions to sponsor immigrants without the immigrants having to fully meet the stringent requirements of the Australian Points Assessment Scheme. There is an array of visa categories available under the scheme and some of their characteristics are summarised below.

The scheme focused on skill, restricting most SSRM visa categories to people who narrowly miss reaching the high pass threshold of the Points Assessment Scheme.

25 Hugo, G J (1993). The Changing Spatial Distribution of Major Ethnic Groups in Australia 1961-1986. (revised version of a report prepared for the Office of Multicultural Affairs, April; Hugo, G J (1999a). *op cit*.

26 Kunz, E F (1988). *Displaced Persons: Calwell's New Australians*, Australian National University Press, Sydney.

Some categories require the settler to live in a designated area as a temporary resident for three years, after which their degree of adjustment is assessed and they are given permanent residence. Thereafter they are free to settle anywhere in Australia.

Foreign students who study in an institution in a designated area get five bonus points in the Points Assessment Test.

In addition a 'Regional 457' (Long Term Business Migrants) visa was developed whereby concessions were granted which gave regional certifying bodies a greater role in supporting sponsorships in regional Australia. It allows them to grant exceptions from the gazetted minimum skill and salary requirements for positions nominated under temporary business visas, which are located in regional and low population growth areas and have been certified by a Regional Certifying Body.

This makes a fundamental distinction between types of migrants – settlers and provisional settlers. The precedent was established by the Australian government's action in 1999 of introducing a three-year Temporary Protection Visa for persons who entered Australia as asylum seekers and were assessed as having a valid claim for refugee status. This compared to other refugees accepted offshore who were granted full settler status²⁷. In the case of the SSRM, however, a distinction is made between those settlers who can live anywhere in Australia and those who are restricted, in their initial years at least, to live in designated areas.

The success of the SSRM programs is evident in Table 17 which shows that the SSRM Scheme increased its share of the total non-humanitarian intake from 2.3 per cent in 1997-98 to over a fifth in 2008-09. While South Australia has only 7.5 per cent of the national population and averaged only 4.9 per cent of the national immigrant intake between 1997 and 2009, the table shows that it has made disproportionate use of the SSRM Scheme. The locational requirements of the various SSRM visa categories vary, but *all* of South Australia has been eligible for all SSRM categories. This has meant that the major city of Adelaide (2006 population 1,105,839) has been eligible for settlement of SSRM immigrants, whereas other mainland state capital cities have not. The SSRM Scheme is targeted at 'contributing to the economic, demographic and social development of regional Australia and low population growth areas'²⁸. Adelaide is the only major metropolitan centre that has had access to the full suite of SSRM programs. This has undoubtedly given South Australia an advantage in its ability to attract migrants under the SSRM scheme.

27 Hugo, G J (2002). From Compassion to Compliance? Trends in Refugee and Humanitarian Migration in Australia, *GeoJournal*, 56: 27-37.

28 Department of Immigration and Citizenship (2007). *Population Flows*: 41.

Table 17 Number of immigrants with visas granted under the state specific regional migration mechanisms and their proportion of the total non-humanitarian intake, 1997-98 to 2005-06

Year	Number	Percent of Total Non-Humanitarian Intake	Percent in South Australia
1997-98	1,753	2.3	34.5
1998-99	2,804	3.3	36.9
1999-2000	3,309	3.6	21.2
2000-01	3,846	3.6	19.5
2001-02	4,136	4.6	17.5
2002-03	7,941	8.5	16.7
2003-04	12,725	11.4	16.6
2004-05	18,700	15.6	26.5
2005-06	27,488	19.2	29.8
2006-07	25,845	17.4	27.7
2007-08	26,162	17.5	26.9
2008-09	33,470	21.2	22.9

Source: DIAC *Population Flows: Immigration Aspects*, various issues; DIAC *Immigration Update*, various issues; DIAC unpublished data

The bulk of the SSRM Scheme visa categories relate only to skilled migrants and those eligible are potential immigrants who have narrowly failed the stringent Points Assessment Test. However, there have also been SSRM family-based initiatives and initiatives to attract business migrants to designated areas²⁹. There have been some elements in the Humanitarian part of the program which direct settlers to particular areas; South Australia in recent years. This has been a deliberate strategy of the South Australian government that has been active in providing support for refugee-humanitarian migrants and has lobbied DIAC to take a substantial number of refugee-humanitarian migrants.

The differential impact of different types of migration on the Australian states and territories can be measured using an Index of Dissimilarity. In Table 18, for example, there is little difference between settler arrivals and onshore migrants in the way in which they distribute themselves between states and territories. Only 8.9 per cent of onshore migrants would have to change their state of residence to duplicate the distribution of settler arrivals. There is a slightly greater difference between humanitarian settlers and non-humanitarian settlers with one in eight humanitarian settlers having to change states to duplicate the distribution of other settlers. However, nearly a half of SSRM migrants would

²⁹ *Ibid*: 43.

need to change their state of residence to duplicate the distribution of those settling in Australia under the regular migration program. This is of course to be expected given the targeting of the SSRM program to lagging parts of Australia.

Table 18 Australia: Indexes of dissimilarity between different types of international migration between states and territories, 2004-05 and 2008-09

Comparison	Index of Dissimilarity	
	2004-05	2008-09
SSRM vs Regular Migration	45.3	34.2
Onshore vs Offshore Migration	8.9	6.3
Humanitarian vs Non-Humanitarian	12.6	14.1

Source: Calculated from data in DIMA, 2006

South Australia is clearly the biggest proportionate user of the SSRM scheme. In 2004 it was the first state to introduce a population policy³⁰, which, among other things, sought to increase the state's share of immigrants to around 7.5 per cent by 2014. International migration has been a key element in the Population Policy and in the State's Strategic Plan³¹. The state government initiated a number of strategies in order to achieve an increase in international migration. It set up a state government agency *Immigration SA* within the Department of Trade and Economic Development to drive the achievement of the immigration objectives. It set up an agency *Education Adelaide* to increase the state's share of foreign students. It set up offices in key origin countries of immigrants to facilitate the recruitment and emigration of settlers for South Australia.

It appointed a number of Migration Officers to be affiliated with Regional Development Boards in South Australia to assist local governments and employers to bring in migrants.

30 Government of South Australia (2004a). *Prosperity through People: a Population Policy for South Australia*, Government of South Australia, Adelaide.

31 Government of South Australia (2004b). *South Australia's Strategic Plan*, Government of South Australia, Adelaide.

Figure 4 Australia: Settler arrivals by state according to whether they are state specific and regional migration scheme migrants or other migrants, 2006-07

Source: DIAC *Population Flows: Immigration Aspects*, various issues; DIAC *Immigration Update*, various issues

At no time since Federation have state governments been more heavily involved in the immigration policy and operations. Victoria has had the largest number of SSRM migrants since that state too introduced a population policy³². New South Wales has not been very active in this program.

Migrants in Australia's non-metropolitan areas

Until 2006 there had been successive increases in the proportion of immigrants living in Australia's major cities. However, 2006 saw the percentage of immigrants living outside of Australia's cities increased, albeit marginally, as is indicated by Table 19.

³² Government of Victoria (2004). *Beyond Five Million: The Victorian Government's Population Policy*, State of Victoria, Melbourne.

Table 19 Australia: Distribution of overseas-born between major urban, other urban and rural areas, 2001 and 2006

	2001		2006	
	Number	%	Number	%
Major Urban	3,363,323	82.5	3,654,920	82.8
Other Urban	442,723	10.9	494,752	11.2
Rural	271,690	6.7	264,905	6.0
Total	4,077,736	100.0	4,414,577	100.0

Source: ABS 2001 and 2006 censuses

Immigrants outside the capital cities, especially those from a LOTE background, tended to settle in particular areas, such as:

- Intensive agricultural areas such as sugar farming in Queensland, irrigated agriculture along the Murray and Murrumbidgee Rivers and in intensive horticultural areas close to major cities³³.
- Major provincial centres where many were involved in small businesses.
- Mining and industrial centres like Wollongong, Newcastle, Whyalla, Geelong.
- Some fishing communities.

They avoided the dry farming, extensive agricultural areas of the Australian wheat-sheep belt. Accordingly, the non-metropolitan overseas-born population in Australia has been even more concentrated than those settling in major cities. Table 20 shows that the Indices of Dissimilarity calculated for non-metropolitan areas are quite a bit higher than those for the same birthplace groups in major urban areas (Table 16). Again, however, it is the LOTE groups which are most concentrated.

³³ Borrie, W D (1954). *op cit*; Price, C A (1963). *Southern Europeans in Australia*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.

Table 20 Australia non-metropolitan areas: Index of Dissimilarity, 2006

Birthplace	ID
Bosnia and Herzegovina	67.4
Canada	29.1
China (excl. SARs and Taiwan Province)(b)	44.1
Croatia	50.5
Egypt	44.1
Fiji	35.1
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM)	80.8
Germany	23.3
Greece	44.8
Hong Kong (SAR of China)(b)	43.5
India	34.5
Indonesia	38.8
Iraq	71.3
Ireland	25.1
Italy	44.9
Japan	59.2
Korea, Republic of (South)	56.5
Lebanon	58.7
Malaysia	33.4
Malta	44.9
Netherlands	22.2
New Zealand	36.5
Papua New Guinea	44.5
Philippines	27.5
Poland	36.9
Singapore	43.7
South Africa	35.8
Sri Lanka	38.2
Thailand	36.2
Turkey	68.4
United Kingdom(d)	24.4
United States of America	27.1
Vietnam	48.0

Source: ABS CDATA, 2006

For the first time there has been some settlement in areas previously eschewed by immigrants, especially those from a LOTE background, partly because of severe labour shortages in many such areas where low fertility and ageing have been exacerbated by youth out-migration³⁴.

Immigrants add an element of diversity to what, in many regional areas, have been strongly Anglo-Celtic dominant societies. Regional communities lack both formal post-arrival services as well as established communities of similar ethnic backgrounds that can provide informal support during initial settlement. A particular problem relates to the lack of interpreter services which can be a barrier to non-English-speaking groups accessing health, education and other services. The dearth of formal and informal support services has in some areas been countered by the mobilisation of local community groups, organisations and local government. The enthusiasm with which some communities have welcomed migrants has been at odds with conventional stereotypes of regional populations having conservative and even racist attitudes³⁵. Indeed in many cases the newcomers are seen as valuable additions to communities which have been struggling to maintain services, losing young populations and have not been able to fill job vacancies, while the cultural diversity they add has been embraced with enthusiasm. There have however also been instances of backlash.

Issues remain about the injection of new elements of diversity into regional communities which have not previously been multicultural. Undoubtedly the adjustment of new migrants in regional communities and of the communities to the migrant is a topic of needed research.

There are a number of work related concerns. Birrell, Hawthorne and Richardson³⁶ show that regional skilled migrants experience more problems in entering the Australian labour market than any other category of skilled settlers. Satisfactory entry into regional labour and housing markets will be a critical factor in attracting and retaining immigrant families in regional communities.

One issue that will need to be faced is that in many regional communities the labour shortages which are emerging require unskilled or semi-skilled labour, whereas the bulk of available immigration visa categories relate to skilled migrants. The focus has been strongly on regional employers in this lobbying³⁷. Thus far the government has resisted pointing to the 4.5 per cent unemployment level within Australia and arguing that it would work against the integrity of

34 Hugo, G J (2008a). 'Immigrant Settlement Outside of Australia's Capital Cities' In *Population, Space and Place*, 14,6: 553-571.

35 *Ibid.*

36 Birrell, R, Hawthorne, L and Richardson, S (2006). *Evaluation of the General Skilled Migration Categories*, AGPS, Canberra.

37 Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Workforce Relations and Workforce Participation, 2006. *Perspectives on the Future of the Harvest Labour Force*, Department of the Senate, Canberra.

the Australian immigration program³⁸. However, these pressures seem likely to increase and it could be advisable for the Australian government to develop a pilot program to assess the efficacy of a temporary labour migration strategy. This could perhaps be focused on particular industries (e.g. harvesting, aged care) and focus on particular countries of origin (eg, some Pacific nations). New Zealand has begun such a program.

A major issue relates to the question of retention of immigrants in regional areas once they are free to settle wherever they wish. There is likely to be significant leakage out of regional areas. Tomas Hammar³⁹ shows that in Sweden in the 1970s there was a policy of dispersal of immigrants and most 'leaked' back to Stockholm. Also studies in the UK⁴⁰ and Australia⁴¹ showed that Vietnamese refugees settled in dispersed locations later gravitated to major metropolitan centres. This is a challenge which many regional communities are taking up and it will be interesting to see how successful their efforts turn out to be.

Temporary migration

One of the most profound changes in Australia's immigration system since the mid 1990s has been an increase in non-permanent migration. On 30 June 2008 there were 809,628 persons temporarily present in Australia⁴² and, until the onset of the Global Financial Crisis, the numbers were increasing by 15 per cent per year. Where these groups go when they arrive in Australia has an impact on population distribution. Moreover, DIAC⁴³ reports that 64 per cent of groups stay in Australia longer than three months and not all are detected in the census.

One of the major categories of temporary migrants is the Long Stay Temporary Business Entrants (Visa Category 457) which numbered a record 110,570 in 2007-08. Although the numbers declined a little in 2008-09 (101,280), these migrants are restricted to the top three skill categories and are able to stay in Australia for up to four years. They need to be nominated by an employer and the numbers are not capped. They are more concentrated in Australia's major cities than are permanent migrants. Some 51 per cent of all 457s coming in 2001-

38 Hugo, G J (2005). 'Migration Policies in Australia and their Impact on Development in Countries of Origin'. In *International Migration and the Millenium Development Goals*, UNEPA Expert Group Meeting, United Nations Population Fund, New York.

39 Hammar, T (1993). 'The 'Sweden-wide Strategy' of Refugee Dispersal'. In R Black and V Robinson (eds), *Geography and Refugees*, Belhaven, London.

40 Robinson, V and Hale, S (1989). *The Geography of Vietnamese Secondary Migration in the UK*, Warwick University Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, Coventry (UK); Robinson, V (1993). 'North and South: Resettling Vietnamese Refugees in Australia and the UK'. In Black, R and Robinson, V (eds), *Geography and Refugees*, Belhaven, London.

41 Burnley, I H (1989). *op cit*.

42 Department of Immigration and Citizenship (2009b). 'Community Information Summary: Malaysia-born Community'. <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/statistics/comm-summ/summary.htm>.

43 *Ibid*.

03 went to Sydney and 83.6 per cent went to Australia's five largest cities⁴⁴. In 2002 a regional version of the 457 visa was introduced with a number of 'concessional arrangements ... to reflect the skill needs of regional Australia'⁴⁵. These concessions included a lower minimum level of skill and salary than was the case for the regular 457 program. They needed to be endorsed by relevant state, territory or regional certifying bodies, be at locally relevant wage levels and it had to be shown that no locals were available to fill the job. The numbers of regional 457s grew quite rapidly but they became the subject of controversy because of accusations that employers have used the visa to undercut the wages and conditions of Australian workers in regional areas – especially in the abattoir industry. Accordingly, there was a tightening of regulations. Although 457s are disproportionately concentrated in major cities, they are increasingly important in filling job vacancies in regional areas, especially regional cities. One group of temporary skilled migrants of great significance in regional areas is doctors and other health personnel.

The largest category of temporary residents is overseas students who numbered 317,897 in 2008. There is a strong concentration in major mainland cities which is to be expected since most universities are located in such centres (Figure 5). It is interesting to note, however, that there are more students in Melbourne than in Sydney, which is different to the pattern for permanent settlers and 457s. Regional centres with universities like Ballarat are making a substantial effort to attract students both to contribute to the local economy as students but also in the hope that they will later become permanent residents locally when they finish their studies.

One of the categories of temporary migration which has increased in scale over the last decade and which has impinged on non-metropolitan Australia is Working Holiday Makers (WHM). This program involves '... the temporary entry and stay of young people wanting to combine a holiday in Australia with the opportunity to supplement travel funds through incidental employment'⁴⁶.

They can stay for a period of a year and work in a single job for up to three months. They are especially involved in the hospitality, horticultural and rural industries and many of the jobs are located outside of Australia's major cities. Hugo⁴⁷ shows, for example, how this group has become fundamentally important in providing seasonal harvest labour in horticultural, irrigated fruit growing and grape harvesting activities. Indeed they have been so significant

44 Khoo *et al.*, (2003). *op cit.*

45 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (2007). *Population Flows: Immigration Aspects*: 46.

46 *Ibid*: 64.

47 Hugo, G J (2001). International Migration and Agricultural Labour in Australia. Paper presented at Changing Face Workshop, Imperial Valley, California, 16-18 January.

that since late 2005 WHM 'who have undertaken seasonal work in regional Australia for a minimum of three months'⁴⁸ are eligible to apply for a second 12 month WHM visa.

Figure 5 Location of overseas fee-paying students, 2002

Source: Department of Education, Science and Training

In 2008-09 there were 187,696 WHM visas granted, an increase of 21.8 per cent on the previous year and a doubling since 2003-04. Hence they have become an important element in the population of particular communities on a seasonal basis. The harvesting industry in Australia has been very active in lobbying the federal government for permission to bring in unskilled agricultural workers from Asia and the Pacific, but has not been successful. The WHM are filling a niche in regional seasonal labour markets which in countries like the US, New Zealand, Canada and in Europe are filled by seasonal agricultural workers migrations⁴⁹. However, Figure 6 depicts the location of places visited by a sample of WHMs in a 2008 study and it is immediately apparent that there is less concentration in the

⁴⁸ Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (2007). *Op cit*: 64.

⁴⁹ Hugo, G J (2001). *op cit*.

major cities than is the case for other immigrant groups. There is a particularly strong geographical concentration in coastal areas. However, the large cities are significant for WHMs since, in an earlier survey of WHMs, 42 per cent reported spending some time working in Sydney⁵⁰.

Figure 6 Major localities which WHMs visited, 2008

Source: Tan *et al*, 2009: 70

While temporary migration is playing an important role in some non-metropolitan communities, in total they are more concentrated in major cities than are permanent settlers. They are more directed to Australia's largest cities, especially Sydney. Census data significantly understates the impact of non-permanent international migration on world cities like Sydney. Sydney has a crucial gateway function not only for permanent settlers but large numbers of temporary migrants who circulate between it and other world cities. Moreover this group includes many transnationals who move from one world city to another on job transfer or as they change jobs within global labour markets. With high-level skills and income they represent a significant presence in the world city and play an important role in its economic growth and labour market.

⁵⁰ Harding, G and Webster, E (2002). *The Working Holiday Maker Scheme and the Australian Labour Market*, Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne.

Conclusion

Australia's population distribution has changed little over the last century⁵¹. Figure 2 shows the nation's population centroid has shifted little since 1901. However, it is a deceptive stability since there is a great deal of dynamism and international migration is an important element of this dynamism. International migration has been of crucial significance in the urbanisation of Australia and in dramatically changing the composition of Australia's urban populations. Immigration is the key demographic process in the development of Australia's major cities, especially the 'Gateway City' of Sydney⁵². It is not only the major demographic growth engine, it also has an important role in economic and social change. Immigrants are crucial to several sectors of the urban economy and they shape much of the social and cultural life of Australian cities. Immigrants are increasingly developing and strengthening transnational networks that link Australian cities with the rest of the world. Yet our understanding of the dynamics of immigration in shaping Australian cities and its impacts remains limited. This, especially, applies to the scale and impact of temporary international migration.

This study has also identified a significant, albeit small, shift in the settlement patterns of immigrants in recent years; a shift away from New South Wales as the predominant destination of immigrants and a reduction in the significance of Sydney as the initial settlement of immigrants. Immigration is playing an increasingly significant role in regional and state development in Australia. It is being increasingly factored into economic planning at state, regional and local levels. However, our understanding of settlement in these areas remains limited and it is likely that immigration to peripheral states and to regional areas will grow in importance in the future.

51 Hugo, G J (2003). *op cit*.

52 Hugo, G J (2008b). 'Sydney: The Globalization of an Established Immigrant Gateway', in M Price and L Benton-Short (eds), *Migrants in the Metropolis - the Rise of Immigrants Gateway Cities*, Syracuse University Press: 68-96.