

The Occupational Concentration and Mobility of Asian Immigrants in Australia

Paper Published in *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*. 14(3):351-380. Copyright reserved by the Scalabrini Migration Center. Permission to publish on website kindly supplied by Scalabrini Migration Center

Nick Parr
Department of Business
Macquarie University
Sydney NSW 2109 Australia
Tel: 61-2-98508570
Fax: 61-2-98506065
Email: nparr@efs.mq.edu.au

Fei Guo
Department of Business
Macquarie University
Sydney NSW 2109 Australia
Tel: 61-2-98508445
Fax: 61-2-98506065
Email: fguo@efs.mq.edu.au

The Occupational Concentration and Mobility of Asian Immigrants in Australia

Abstract

Using data from the 1996 and 2001 censuses of Australia, this study provides a detailed description of the diverse patterns of occupational concentration and mobility of a selection of Asian immigrant groups. The study shows that the Asian-Australian population includes not only groups which remain relatively concentrated in “low-end” occupations, but also many others which are more likely than the Australia-born to be in “high-end” professional occupations, and that almost all the selected groups experienced some degree of upwards occupational mobility between 1996 and 2001. However, after controlling for a range of demographic and human capital characteristics the participation of most groups in the managerial and professional occupations is shown to be below that for the Australia-born. Hence, the high occupational status of most Asian groups does not mean they are advantaged.

Introduction

Since the abolition of the “White Australia” policy in the mid-1970s, Australia has accepted a substantial number of immigrants from countries in South-east, North-east and South Asia. By 2002 the estimated number of Australian residents who were born in these regions had risen to 1.117 million (5.7% of the total population and 24.5% of the overseas-born) (ABS 2004). Although the numbers of people migrating from these regions of Asia fell between the early 1990s and the late 1990s they nonetheless remain significant sources of migrants to Australia.

The allocation of visas for permanent residence in Australia is based on the grounds of skills, of family connections with existing citizens or permanent migrants, and on refugee or humanitarian grounds. In addition health and character criteria must be met. The largest components of the skills intake use points tests which assess eligibility for migration in terms of skills and work experience, age and English language ability. A few groups, most notably New Zealand citizens, are allowed to settle in Australia without having a permanent residence visa. The emphasis placed on selection on the basis of skills has increased in recent years, especially since the first election of the Howard government in 1996. After 1996 period the proportion of migrants who were selected on the basis of skills increased such that by 2003-2004 nearly 50% of the eligibility of settler arrivals was on the basis of skills. This compares with the 28% of settler arrivals in the equivalent categories in 1995-96 (DIMIA, 2002, 2005a). As a consequence a high proportion of newly arrived migrants in Australia have relatively high socioeconomic status occupations, with 23% of settler arrivals in 2003-04 who stated their occupation prior to arrival in Australia stating they had a professional occupation. The proportions of recent arrivals from North-East (62 per cent in 2003-04), South (73 per cent)

and South-East Asia (58 per cent) who are selected of the grounds of skills all have risen to over one-half.

One of the more striking changes in movement to Australia in recent years has been the upsurge in moves for which the intended length of stay in Australia is more than one year but which are not intended to be permanent (“long-term arrivals”). A significant component of this increase has been due to increased numbers of international students studying in Australia. In 2003/2004, more than 171,000 student visas were issued, which was a 17 per cent increase since 2000/2001 (DIMIA, 2005b). In recent years students from Asia have made up the majority of Australia’s overseas student population, with the largest groups being from Singapore, Hong Kong, China, Malaysia, India and Indonesia (Cameron, 2001, DEST, 2004). Most of the overseas students, especially those from Asia, have enrolled in the courses that would eventually lead them into the occupations such as accountants, economic and financial analysts, business administrators, IT professionals, and scientists and engineers (DEST, 2004). Government initiatives in immigration policy since 1998, including the introduction of a points allocation for Australian qualifications and the waiving of work experience requirements for those with such qualifications, have resulted in more overseas students, especially students from Asia, seeking migration after completing their university studies in Australia and subsequently joining the Australian labour force (Birrell, 2003: 154). However, even before the implementation of the new initiatives, many overseas Asian students opted to seek permanent residence in Australia after completing their studies. The skills level of the migrant population was also increased by has also been a significant increase in numbers of people in Australia on skills-related temporary visas (Hugo 2004, DIMIA 2005c)

The occupations of Australia’s post WWII migrants tended to be those at the lower end of the spectrum, particularly for migrants from Southern Europe and Western Asia

(Wooden, 1990:252). However, as a new pattern of migration to Australia with increased numbers of skilled and business migrants increased emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s, a number of studies using data from the 1986 census started to challenge the applicability to some Asian groups of the stereotypical view of migrants being part of an underclass (Inglis and Wu, 1992). While most Indochina-born migrant workers were to be found in blue-collar occupations (e.g. tradespersons and labourers and related workers), migrant workers with Chinese ancestry had levels of skill almost as high as the native-born workers, and one in four worked in professional and associate professional occupations (Coughlan, 1992, Jones, 1992, Coughlan, 1998). Using 1991 census data, Knapman (1997) showed that Asia-born migrants in Australia tended to be over-represented in professional occupations, but under-represented in managerial occupations. However, the Vietnamese-born community in Australia has shown little upwards occupational mobility. According to Coughlan (1998) their labour market performance was mainly determined by what happened to them soon after their arrival in Australia, and impacts of migrants' previous human capital variables on their occupational mobility did not appear to be significant.

The characterisation of the occupational outcomes of some migrant groups as either “better” or “worse” than the Australia-born may be oversimplistic. Recent labour force statistics in Australia show a seemingly polarised pattern of occupational attainment among the overseas born population – that is a concentration in such “high-end” occupations as professionals and also in such “low-end” occupations as labourers and related workers. In 2003, around 27% of all professionals in Australia were born overseas, which was noticeably higher than that of total employed persons (24%). At the same time, about 27% of all labourers and related workers were born overseas (ABS, 2003). Such a pattern has also been observed in some Asian migrant groups (Knapman, 1997).

The disruption of migrants' working careers as a result of migration may adversely affect migrants' job status in their early years of settlement. McAllister's (1995) study of occupational mobility, which focused on migrant cohorts arriving in Australia in 1960s and 1970s, concluded that migrants' economic disadvantages were mainly caused by the act of migration *per se* and the impacts of migration on migrants' labour market performance were long lasting. For many migrants migration represented a major economic dislocation. The lower occupational status at the beginning of their Australian working career determined their subsequent occupational status and economic disadvantages.

Migrants' success in the labour market has been shown to be related to the selection criteria under which they entered Australia (Khoo et al., 1994, Richardson et al., 2004). Skilled migrants have performed much better than migrants in other admissions categories, and also have a better chance to move upward in the labour market. Comparing two very different categories of migrants – skilled migrants and refugees, Khoo et al. (1994) showed that skilled migrants were very much less likely to be dependent upon government welfare, even after controlling for other factors, while refugees tended to be the most likely to become dependent on welfare payments. They also showed that the dissimilarity of the occupations of various Asian country of birth groups from the Australia-born reduced for most groups as the duration of residence increased. Cobb's (2000) study also suggested that skilled and business migrants were much more likely than migrants in other admission categories to participate in the job market shortly after their arrival.

Clearly differences in success in education have important implications for differences in rates of occupational mobility between country of birth groups (Knapman, 1997). Parr and Mok (1995) showed that in New South Wales students from Asian birthplaces were more likely to participate in higher education than the Australia-born. Such differences reflect both success in examinations and that a higher proportion of senior secondary school Asian-

Australians aspire to higher education, as opposed to other alternatives such as entry to the labour force. Marks, McMillan and Hilman (2001) showed that students from Asian backgrounds on average gained higher university administration scores than students whose fathers were born in Australia. The better academic performance of Asia background students persisted after controlling for socioeconomic status. Parental attitudes may help to explain the participation of Asian-Australians in higher education. Parr and Mok showed the importance that children see their parents placing on their children going to university was higher for Asian birthplace groups. Greater use of personal tutors and coaching colleges, and rising proportions attending private (as opposed to public or catholic) schools are likely to be other factors behind the continuing success in education of Asian-Australians.

The importance of English proficiency as a determinant of the labour market performance of migrants in Australia is now well established in the literature (Burnley et al., 1997, Knapman, 1997, Richardson et al., 2004). In response to this, in the 1990s the Australian government increased the emphasis placed on English language proficiency in the selection of migrants for Australia (Birrell, 2003:153). The time of arrival and the occupational sectors in which migrants have concentrated are other factors related to their labour market outcomes (Burnley, et al 1997). The significant reduction in Australia's unemployment rate between the early 1990s and the mid 1990s and the more gradual decline since 1997 would have contributed to the improved the labour market outcomes achieved by more recent newly-arrived migrants (ABS 2005a, Richardson *et al* 2004). Burnley *et al.* (1997) speculate that the under-representation of Asia-Pacific migrants in the rapidly growing service sector may adversely affect their occupational mobility.

The labour market success of migrants in Australia appears to be in contrast with the pattern of migrants in general being worse off economically compared with their native-born counterparts which has been observed for many other developed countries (Tienda and Lii

1987). For example migrants to Canada generally tend to be disadvantaged in the labour market compared with local residents. However, female migrants tended to perform better than their male counterparts (Shamsuddin 1998, Richardson and Lester 2004).

This paper aims to probe further into the changing patterns of occupational attainment and concentration with an aim of providing a better understanding of the patterns and their major contributing factors. Unlike some of the previous studies that consider all migrants groups as one general group, this study examines the diversified patterns of occupational attainment of a selection of major Asian immigrant groups – Mainland China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea (South), Malaysia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, and Vietnam. It aims to not only paint a general picture of occupational attainment of migrants, but also capture the specific differences among groups. It attempts to examine the extent to the differing patterns of occupation are explained by individual characteristics. Using data from the 1996 and 2001 censuses, this study analyses the aggregate-level changes in immigrants' occupational patterns over the period of five years. The effect of recent migration on these changes is assessed. Differences between the occupations of males and females are analysed. This study also compares Asian immigrants with locally born residents over time.

Data and Methods

The data used for this study are from the 1996 and 2001 censuses of Australia. Data on a person's occupation were collected specifically for the main job held in the week before the census. Responses were coded using the Australian Bureau of Statistics' (ABS) Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (ASCO). This classification has a hierarchical structure and includes 9 major (1 digit code) groups of occupations, 35 sub-major (2 digit code) groups, 81 minor (3 digit code) groups, and 445 unit (4 digit code) groups (ABS 2002). The classification of occupations, which reflects the level and type of skills they involve, was

identical for the 1996 and 2001 censuses. It differs somewhat from the classification used for earlier censuses (ABS, 1997).

Eleven Asian birthplace groups have been selected for this study; China (excluding Hong Kong SAR and Taiwan), Hong Kong (Special Administrative Region of China), India, Indonesia, Japan, Republic of Korea (South Korea), Malaysia, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, and Vietnam. The Australia-born is used as the reference group in comparison with the selected Asian birthplace groups. The rationale of selecting these groups includes: first, the selected groups represent a significant proportion of total migrant intake in recent years; and secondly that the patterns of occupation attainment for this diverse range of selected groups has not been well understood so far.

An index of dissimilarity is constructed to measure the extent of the differences of occupational patterns (as measured using major occupational groups) between the selected birthplace groups and the Australia-born (Siegel, 2002:26). The formula is as follows:

$$\text{Index of Dissimilarity for A} = \frac{\sum_i |p_{ai} - p_{ri}|}{2}$$

where

p_{ai} is the proportion of all people in classifiable occupations in birthplace group A who are in occupational category i,

p_{ri} is the proportion of all people in classifiable occupations in the reference group (the Australia-born) who are in occupational category i.

The values of the index of dissimilarity range between 0 (A has an identical occupational distribution to the reference group) and 1 (all members of A are in one particular occupational category and all members of the reference group are in a different occupational category). The absolute values of an index of dissimilarity will be affected by the number of categories over which the variable being measured is divided.

An index of heterogeneity is also constructed to measure the unevenness of the spread of the occupations of the selected birthplace groups between the nine major occupational groups (Siegel 2002:339). This is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Index of Heterogeneity for A} = 1 - \sum p_{ai}^2$$

where

p_{ai} is the proportion of all people in classifiable occupations in birthplace group A who are in occupational category i,

The minimum value possible of the index of heterogeneity (0) indicates all members of A are in one particular occupational category. The maximum will depend on the number of categories. If the occupations of A are evenly distributed over nine categories (the number of major groups in the ASCO) the value of the index of heterogeneity will be 0.89 (Siegel, 2002:339).

In addition, indirectly standardised indices (i.e. the ratios of the actual numbers of people in particular birthplace groups in the managerial and administrative occupations and in the professional occupations to the corresponding numbers which would be expected if the proportions of the Australia-born in the various age, sex, highest level of education and English-speaking proficiency categories in these occupational groups are applied to the distribution of employed people in the birthplace group by this combination of variables) are employed to examine the extent to which differences between migrant groups' participation in the top-end occupations differ from the Australia-born after controlling for the differences in the above-mentioned characteristics between the migrant group and the Australia-born.

Occupational Concentration

The indices of dissimilarity show all the Asian country of birth groups have very different occupational profiles from the Australia born (Table 1). Generally the extent of the dissimilarity with the occupations of the Australia-born tends to be greater for males than for females. Indeed, for all the Asian country of birth groups the occupational distributions of males and females exhibit a greater degree of similarity to each other than is the case for Australia-born males and Australia-born females. For males the dissimilarities of occupations tend to be greatest for three East Asian groups, namely the Japan-born, Hong Kong-born and Taiwan-born. The value of the dissimilarity index for Malaysia-born males also is relatively large. However for females it is three South-East Asian groups, namely the Vietnam-born, Philippines-born and Malaysia-born, which are the most dissimilar in their occupations from the Australia-born.

For males across the eleven countries of birth the two largest components of the index of dissimilarity tend to be the differences from the Australia-born in the percentages in professional occupations and in trades and related occupations (Table 2). The percentages of males in professional occupations are higher for all the Asian country of birth groups, except the Philippines-born, than for the Australia-born. This would reflect that for all of the selected Asian country of birth groups the percentage of those in employment who had bachelor degrees or above was higher than for the Australia-born. Taiwan-born workers are the most highly educated (Table 3). The three Asian source countries with the highest percentages of males in professional occupations (all have more than double the percentage of Australia-born males in these occupations), the Hong Kong-born, Malaysia-born and India-born, are all former British colonies from which a high percentage of migrants to Australia have entered under the skills migration schemes. They also have relatively high percentages who speak

English only, and the overwhelming majority of the remainder report speaking English well or very well. Significant proportions of the India-born (and to a lesser extent of the Hong Kong-born) who speak English only would be people of British or Irish ancestry who moved on to Australia (Khoo and Lucas, 2004:38-39).

All the Asian groups have a lower percentage of males in the trades and related occupations than the Australia-born (Table 2). Whilst almost all groups have a higher percentage of males in professional occupations than the Australia-born do, only the Japan-born and Taiwan-born also have a higher percentage in managerial and administrative occupations. Some of the higher representation of the Australia-born in managerial and administrative occupations would be attributable to their having a higher percentage than most of the Asian groups (the exceptions being the India-born and Sri Lanka-born) in the over 55 years age group. The two Asian groups with a higher percentage in managerial and administrative occupations are both groups in which high percentages of migrants have entered under the business skills schemes in recent years.

A bipolar pattern with overrepresentation at both the high end and at the low end of the occupational distribution is evident in some groups of males (Table 2). For example, as well as being overrepresented in the professions, the China-born, Korea-born, Vietnam-born and Indonesia-born males are overrepresented in labouring and related occupations. The first three of these are groups in which, as well as there being high percentages with university degrees, there are also high percentages who report not speaking English well or not speaking English at all (Table 3).

For females the differences from the Australia-born in the percentages in professional occupations tend to be the largest components of the index of dissimilarity, with the Malaysia-born and Hong Kong-born having particularly large percentages of employed females in this category. As for males, in all the Asian groups the percentage of females with

a bachelor's degree or higher is above that for the Australia-born (Table 3). The dissimilarity of the occupations of Philippines-born females and the Vietnam-born females from the Australia-born is due mostly to higher percentages at the lower end of the occupational spectrum, particularly to the high percentages of females in these groups in labouring and related occupations. In the case of Vietnam-born females a high percentage who either do not speak English well or do not speak English at all may help to explain this. However such an explanation is not tenable for the concentration of Philippines-born females in "low end" jobs, since hardly any are unable to speak English well.

A comparison of Tables 4 and 5 shows that for most groups there remains a pattern of the more recent arrivals (those who arrived after 1996) tending to have lower occupational status than those with a longer duration of residence in Australia. However, for China-born males, Philippines-born males and India-born males and females it is the more recently arrived migrants who are more likely to be in professional occupations. Whilst for most groups it is those with longer residence which are the more likely to be in managerial or administrative occupations, for Taiwanese males and females and Japanese males it is the more recent migrants who are the more likely to be in these occupations. The exceptions are groups in which high percentages of recent arrivals have entered under the business skills scheme. In the case of Japanese males a significant number of long-term temporary moves by managerial staff who are sent to work in Australia by their employers would also be an important contributory factor. Data from DIMIA (2003) show that in 2001-02 among all long term temporary business visa recipients, the proportion from Japan (7%) was significantly higher than the proportion of all arrivals from this country. Many of these Japanese long term temporary business migrants, especially males, came to Australia to take up managerial positions in multi-national companies or Japanese owned companies operated in Australia. Similarly, the proportion of independent executive migrants from Taiwan (3% of all

independent executive migrants in 2001-02) is higher than the proportion of migrant arrivals from this source (DIMIA, 2003; ABS, 2002).

The values of the index of heterogeneity show that both for males and for females for most groups the occupational distributions of the selected country of birth tend to be more highly concentrated in particular major occupational groups than is the case for the Australia-born (Table 1). However whilst for Australia-born males the main occupational area of concentration is in trades and related occupations for all the Asian country of birth groups, except the Philippines-born and the Vietnam-born, the main area of concentration is the professions. Moreover, whilst for Australia-born females the main occupational area of concentration is in intermediate clerical, sales and service occupations, for just over half the Asian groups studied there are more females in professional occupations than in any other occupational group. Both for males and for females the three groups with the highest degree of concentration are the Hong Kong-born, Japan-born and Malaysia-born. The high occupational concentration of the Malaysia-born and the Hong Kong-born males and females is mainly due to the high percentages in professional occupations. The relatively high concentration of the occupations of the Japan-born males reflects the high percentages in professional occupations and in managerial occupations. However the explanation of the high degree of concentration of Japan-born females is due mostly to their concentration in the intermediate clerical, sales and service workers occupational group.

Differences in Participation in Particular Professions

For most of the birthplace groups, the professionals show a clear pattern of concentration in a small number of particular professions (Table 6). The differences from the Australia-born in the percentages are widest for computing professionals, accountants, auditors and corporate treasurers, and school teachers. The differences in the percentages who

are medical practitioners and nursing professionals are also relatively large.

For all the chosen Asian birthplace groups the percentages of males and females who are computing professionals are significantly higher than for the Australia-born. The India-born and the Hong Kong-born have particularly high percentages of both males and females who are employed as computing professionals, with the percentage of these groups in this profession being more than five times that for the Australia-born.

For males for all groups except for the Japan-born and the Vietnam-born, and for females for all eleven Asian groups the percentages who are employed as accountants, auditors and corporate treasurers are higher than for the Australia-born. For most groups the percentages in these professions are also higher than for the total overseas-born. The Malaysia-born and the Hong Kong-born are the most likely of the selected country of birth groups to be accountants, auditors or corporate treasurers (for both males and females more than three times as likely as the Australia-born), and, interestingly, whilst for the Australia-born males are more likely to be employed as accountants, auditors and corporate treasurers than females are, for all the Asian groups, except the two South Asian groups, females are more likely to be in this profession than males. The differing age distributions of the Asian groups and the Australia-born may contribute to the explanation of this pattern. A higher percentage of the Australia-born are in the later working ages than for most of the Asian groups (the exceptions are the two South Asian groups) and in contrast to the predominance of females below age 30, in the later working ages the overwhelming majority of accountants, auditors and corporate treasurers are male (Parr and Murray, 2004).

Interestingly, apart from the Japan-born, the percentages of males and females who are school teachers are lower for all the selected Asian country of birth groups than for the Australia-born, and in most cases also lower than the figures for migrants as a whole. The high percentage of the Japan-born who are employed as school teachers reflects the popularity

of Japanese in Australian schools in recent years, the presence of Japanese schools, and that Japanese teachers were identified in the list of “Migration Occupations in Demand” for many years. Statistics from the Department of Education, Science and Training (2002) show that among all foreign language programs offered in Australian high schools Japanese has been the most popular choice since the mid-1990s, accounting for more than 20% of all year 12 enrolments in foreign language courses. The Vietnam-born, the Philippines-born and the China-born are the least likely to be schoolteachers.

For males all the selected Asian groups except for the Philippines-born are more likely to be medical practitioners than the Australia-born, whilst for females all groups except the Japan-born are more likely than the Australia-born to be in this profession. For both males and females the Malaysia-born are the most likely to be medical practitioners. The India-born, the Sri Lanka and the Hong Kong-born also have relatively high propensities to be in this profession. As is the case for the Australia-born, for almost all the Asian groups studied males are more likely than females to be medical practitioners. In contrast, nursing professionals are overwhelmingly female, and, with the notable exceptions of the Malaysia-born, Philippines-born and Hong Kong-born, most of the Asian groups are less likely to be nursing professionals than the Australia-born.

The concentration of professional migrants in the selected Asian groups in particular professions would partly be due to the differential allocation of points on the Australian Government’s “Skilled Occupations” list and to some components of these groups being identified as “Migration Occupations in Demand” in recent years. Information technology professionals and most accounting occupations receive more points than many other types of professionals. That the expansion of some of these professions, particularly information technology, has coincided with the main periods of migration from these countries to Australia is another factor. Differences in the percentages completing different types of

university degree courses by country of birth would also be another contributory factor. Higher education statistics show that in 2003 about 45% of all overseas students in Australia were enrolled in commerce subjects and a further 16% were in information technology subjects, compared to 28% of domestic students in commerce subjects and 8% in information technology subjects (DEST 2003). The under-representation of most of the groups in teaching in part may be linked to teaching becoming an “Occupation Requiring English” somewhat earlier than most of the other professions (Birrell, 2003: 153). The slower growth of the school-age population and relatively low rates of recruitment into teaching in the period since the arrival of these most members of these groups into Australia would be other explanatory factors.

Controlling for the Effects of Demographic and Human Capital Factors on Occupational Concentration

The higher percentages are in professional occupations of most of the selected Asian groups is attributable to their demographic characteristics and levels of education. Table 7 shows that after standardising for age, sex, highest level of education and English-speaking ability most groups have a lower percentage in professional occupations than the Australia-born. The exceptions are the Hong Kong-born and the Malaysia-born, both countries from which a relatively large proportion of graduates have travelled to obtain their qualifications in Western countries.

After standardising most groups also have a lower percentage in managerial and administrative occupations than the Australia-born. The exceptions are the Japan-born the Taiwan-born and the Korea-born. In each of these North-east Asian groups the higher standardised rate is largely due to higher male (as opposed to female) propensities to be in

managerial or administrative work. As noted earlier, in the case of the first two groups, the explanation may be linked to the high percentages which have entered under the business skills program and to temporary movers with managerial occupations.

Occupational Mobility

Between 1996 and 2001 the most notable change shown by the index of dissimilarity for males was the marked convergence of the occupational distribution of the Vietnam-born with that for the Australia-born. For females the major change was the convergence of the occupations of the China-born and the Vietnam-born (the two groups which previously were most dissimilar to the Australia-born) with those of the Australia-born. For most groups the changes in the indexes of dissimilarity were slight.

The main components of the convergence of the occupational distributions of the Vietnam-born males with the Australia-born males were the increased percentages in the professional occupations and the reduced percentages in intermediate production and transport occupations. A greater increase in the percentage in professions than the Australia-born and a much greater reduction in the percentage in intermediate transport and production occupations are the main components of the reductions in the dissimilarities of the occupations of China-born and Vietnam-born females with those of the Australia-born. Between 1996 and 2001 change in the index of heterogeneity was generally slight, with the greatest change being the reduction in the heterogeneity of the occupations of Hong Kong-born females (Table 1). This was mostly due to a rising proportion in the professional occupations.

Between 1996 and 2001 for females for all the selected Asian country of birth groups and for males for all except the Japan-born the percentage of employed persons in

professional occupations increased, with most increases being greater than for the Australia-born (Tables 2 and 8). The Taiwan-born showed the greatest increase in the percentage of males employed in professional occupations, followed by the China-born, the Vietnam-born and the Indonesia-born. In 2001 the Vietnam-born males, a group whose disadvantage has received much attention in the literature, had risen above the corresponding figure for the Australia-born. Except for the Taiwan-born and the Japan-born, the percentage of males in managerial and administrative occupations increased, albeit slightly, for all the selected Asian groups. This contrasts with a slight decline for the Australia-born.

For females the China-born and the Vietnam-born were the two groups in which the percentage of females in professional occupations increased most. The percentages of females in managerial and administrative occupations also rose significantly in these two groups, in contrast to a slight decline for the Australia-born. There were also significant increases in the percentages of employed females in professional occupations for the Hong Kong-born, Taiwan-born, India-born and Sri Lanka-born females, and a significant increase in the percentage of Indonesia-born females in managerial and administrative occupations.

The upwards occupational mobility observed for most of the Asian groups may in part be due to increased levels of education and improvements in English-speaking abilities over the period (Table 3). In particular the upwards occupational mobility of the China-born and Vietnam-born coincides with marked increases in the educational levels and improvements in English-speaking abilities over this period, with the improvements for females being greater than those for males. Some of the upwards occupational mobility over this period may also be due to abnormally long processing times for permanent residence visas in 1996 having disrupted the entry of some recently-arrived skilled migrants into professional occupations in Australia.

Comparison of Tables 5 and 8 shows there was upwards mobility in almost all the Asian groups between 1996 and 2001 among those who arrived before 1996, and, interestingly, females who arrived in Australia before 1996 tended to show a greater upwards mobility than males. The percentages of pre-1996 arrival China-born and Vietnam-born females and Indonesia-born males in professional occupations increased markedly. For the Taiwan-born who arrived before 1996 both for males and for females there was a marked increase in the percentage in professional occupations, but also a marked reduction in the percentage in managerial and administrative occupations. The one group of pre-1996 arrivals to show a marked downwards occupational mobility was the Japan-born males, whose percentage in managerial and administrative occupations fell markedly. The number of Japan-born males who arrived before 1996 fell markedly from 1996 to 2001 it may be that outmigration of Japan-born managers, including significant numbers who arrived on temporary visas, can explain this pattern.

People who migrated since the 1996 census formed over 30 per cent of the employed Indonesia-born and Japan-born, and more than 20 per cent of the China-born, India-born and Korea-born, but less than 10 per cent of the Hong Kong-born and Vietnam-born (Table 9). In the case of the China-born males a significant component of the increased percentage of professionals is due the significant number of migrants over the 1996 to 2001 period being somewhat more likely than those who had arrived before 1996 to work in professional occupations (Tables 4 and 5). However, the increased percentage of the Vietnam-born in professional occupations cannot be explained this way, both because the percentage of the employed population formed by post-1996 migrants is small and because the percentage of post 1996 migrants who were employed in professional occupations is far below the average for those who arrived earlier. By comparing Tables 6 and 9 we see the main reason for the upwards occupational mobility of the Vietnam-born is the marked improvement over the five

years in the percentage employed in professional occupations among those who arrived in Australia prior to 1996. Much of this would be attributable to the success in education of Vietnam-born who arrived in Australia at younger ages and were educated in Australia and the flow on effect of their graduation into the professions (Parr and Mok 1995).

There were marked differences between the Australia-born and the Asian country of birth groups in the pattern of growth in the percentage in professional occupations by age. For the Australia-born the increases in the percentage in professional occupations were slightly larger between the ages of 45 and 64 than in the younger ages. In contrast, with the exception of the Japan-born, for most of the Asian groups the increases were much greater below the age of 40 than above it. The distribution of the increased percentage of professionals in the Asian groups would be linked to the graduation of Asian-Australian students from universities and for some groups the influx of highly skilled migrants. Differences between different age groups in the changes in the percentages of employed people in managerial and administrative occupations were generally not large.

Some of the changes in the occupational structures of the selected birthplace groups in this study would be the product of the increased number of Asian students in Australia who have stayed on and obtained permanent residence. The achievement of upwards occupational mobility by Asian groups, that is, the percentage in “high-end” occupations has increased while the percentage in “low-end” occupations decreased, may reflect the greater recognition of Australian qualifications, as opposed to the recognition of qualifications obtained overseas. A greater awareness of and attunement to the Australian labour market and the development of networks and contacts during their study period may also have facilitated the ready entry into “high-end” jobs of the growing numbers who were overseas students in Australia and stayed on to become permanent residents.

Discussion

The results of this study serve to illustrate not only the differences in their occupations between the various East, South-East and South Asian country of birth groups covered and the Australia-born and also the marked differences between the various Asian groups. The Asian population includes groups, such as the Philippines-born, which remain relatively concentrated in “low- end” occupations, many groups which are more likely than the native-born to be in “high-end” professional occupations, and also some groups which show a bipolar distribution of occupations, with concentrations at both the low and the high ends. Asian migrants as a group are not economically worse-off compared to their Australia-born counterparts, as the proportions of people employed in “high-end” professional occupations for most groups are higher than for the Australia-born. Some of these differences would be explained by differences in the timing of the migration to Australia and the differences in migrant selection over time. The arrival of birthplace groups in Australia has been characterised by a series of waves, with arrivals being concentrated in a particular time period (Hugo 1995). The bipolar patterns of occupational distribution of some Asian migrant worker groups may reflect an emerging trend of polarisation in the labour markets of the developed countries. While the demand for highly trained specialists increases, there are also growing numbers of low-skilled jobs in low-end occupational categories (Castles, 1992).

The results of this study may reflect that the act of migration *per se*, at least for migrants in the selected birthplace groups, in recent years is not such a disadvantageous factor affecting migrants’ occupational attainment in the Australian labour market as it was in the past. For many, migration *per se* would be the process of obtaining an advanced university degree, which in turn may have enhanced their competitive position in Australian labour

market. In an increasingly globalised social and economic environment, migration need not be such a disruption of one's working career. Except for the professions such as medical practitioners, lawyers, and other occupations that are subjected to a strict process of "credential recognition" for the degrees obtained overseas, many professions enjoy a much less strict recognition process, for example IT professionals and engineers. A certificate from Microsoft, or working experience using PeopleSoft software, for example, may bear equal weight in Australia and many overseas labour markets. This seems quite different from the observations in a previous study (McAllister, 1995), which investigated migrant cohorts arriving in Australia in 1960s and 1970s. That study indicated that the act of migration *per se* had long-lasting impacts on migrants' labour market performance as it was a disruption of migrants' working careers.

The higher percentages of most of the Asian birthplace groups in professional occupations do not mean that these groups are advantaged. After standardisation for education the propensity to be in professional occupations of most of these groups is below that of the Australia-born, showing it is the human capital these groups either arrive with or attain in Australia which explains the relatively high status of their occupations. In other words simply being in one of the selected Asian birthplace groups does not necessarily enhance one's position in the labour market. On the other hand, this study also shows that simply having been born an Australian does not necessarily guarantee one's position in the labour market. It is one's human capital, especially one's educational qualifications that are more important in determining one's labour market performance. The lower standardised rates of employment in professional and managerial occupations of many of the Asian groups may at least in part be attributable to discrimination and a "glass-ceiling" in some sections of the labour market faced by Asian-Australians.

The results from this study also show that almost all the selected Asian birthplace groups experienced some degree of occupational mobility, represented by the increase in the percentage in “high-end” occupations in some groups, or decrease in “low-end” occupations in the other groups. Whilst a significant component of the increased percentage in professional occupations in some of the selected Asian birthplace groups, particularly the China-born and the India-born, is attributable to an increasing influx of highly skilled migrants which has occurred since the first election of the Howard Government in 1996, for most of the groups covered by this study overwhelmingly the main reason component of the increase is the upwards mobility of those who were already resident in Australia before then. The success of Asian migrants in education in Australia may well be the major reason for their upwards occupational mobility (Parr and Mok 1995, Marks, McMillan and Hillman 2001).

The occupational mobility of the selected Asian groups would have been affected by return migration. Iredale, Guo and Rozario (2003) have shown the return of skilled and business migrants to some Asian countries, including China, Vietnam and Taiwan, from Australia and other developed nations benefited Australia and the other developed countries from which the returns were made. The international links between offshore businesses and Australia provided by the return migrants that began to emerge since the 1990s are a valuable form of cultural capital. The cultural capital associated with these international business links may produce some increase in the skill level in some “high-end” occupations among migrants. However, the return migration of less successful migrants to Asia is unlikely to have played a major role in the upwards occupational mobility of the Asian birthplace groups, since rates of return migration for most groups have been low.

An important finding of this paper is that the improvements in occupational status have been most marked among two groups with relatively low status; the China-born and the Vietnam-born. The significant upward mobility of the Vietnam-born, recorded in this study, is

in marked contrast to previous studies (Coughlan, 1994, 1998) which found little upward mobility in this group. The upward mobility of the Vietnamese is only among the younger adults, particularly those in their 20s. In view of the relatively low occupational status of recent Vietnamese migrants, the explanation of the upward mobility of this group must lie in their success in the Australian education system. A graduate employment market which has improved considerably since the recession of the early 1990s, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria where most Vietnamese-Australians live, may also have assisted.

For the China-born, with over a fifth of the employed having arrived in the 1996 to 2001 period and the recent male arrivals tending to occupy higher status jobs than longer established male residents, the selectivity of recent migration has undoubtedly been a significant cause of their upwards occupational mobility. It may also be that many Chinese having participated as overseas students in Australian higher education before achieving a permanent residence visa and the more favourable economic climate, particularly in Sydney the main destination for Chinese immigration, have facilitated the entry of recent Chinese migrants into the higher status occupations. Whilst the China-born and the Vietnam-born both have achieved significant upwards mobility in recent years, the explanations for their success are clearly contrasting, particularly in relation to the role of recent migration, The effects on the relationships between generations in many of the Asian birthplace groups of the percentages of younger workers in “top end” jobs being much higher than for older age groups also may merit further consideration.

TABLE 1: INDEX OF DISSIMILARITY OF OCCUPATIONS FROM AUSTRALIA-BORN AND INDEX OF HETEROGENEITY FOR SELECTED BIRTHPLACE GROUPS: 1996 AND 2001 CENSUSES

Birthplace	Index of Dissimilarity				Index of Heterogeneity			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	1996	2001	1996	2001	1996	2001	1996	2001
Australia	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.86	0.86	0.84	0.83
China*	0.10	0.11	0.26	0.16	0.85	0.85	0.86	0.86
Hong Kong	0.30	0.31	0.12	0.13	0.80	0.80	0.81	0.79
India	0.18	0.20	0.11	0.09	0.84	0.84	0.81	0.80
Indonesia	0.19	0.17	0.17	0.13	0.86	0.87	0.85	0.84
Japan	0.36	0.34	0.13	0.12	0.81	0.82	0.78	0.78
Malaysia	0.28	0.28	0.20	0.20	0.78	0.78	0.77	0.76
Philippines	0.20	0.18	0.20	0.18	0.86	0.86	0.83	0.83
South Korea	0.15	0.15	0.18	0.15	0.85	0.85	0.86	0.85
Sri Lanka	0.19	0.18	0.12	0.11	0.84	0.84	0.81	0.80
Taiwan	0.27	0.29	0.11	0.11	0.84	0.83	0.84	0.81
Viet Nam	0.23	0.17	0.33	0.25	0.84	0.85	0.86	0.86
All Overseas	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.86	0.86	0.85	0.84
All	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.86	0.86	0.84	0.83

Note: *China excludes SARs and Taiwan Province

TABLE 2: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP FOR SELECTED BIRTHPLACE GROUPS BY SEX:
2001 CENSUS

Birthplace	Managerial & Administrative	Professionals	Associate Professionals	Trades & Related	Advanced Clerical & Service	Intermediate Clerical, Sales, & Service	Intermediate Production & Transport	Elementary Clerical, Sales & Service	Labourers & Related	N
Males										
Australia	12.8	15.3	12.2	20.8	0.8	8.9	12.9	6.2	10.1	3,267,137
China*	9.2	19.3	18.3	18.2	0.6	6.8	11.3	5.1	11.3	33,775
Hong Kong	8.2	36.2	19.3	10.1	0.9	11.5	4.3	4.9	4.6	16,412
India	10.7	30.7	12.0	9.3	0.9	10.7	10.7	8.8	6.2	32,226
Indonesia	7.8	19.4	12.0	8.9	1.0	10.6	14.7	9.4	16.1	9,594
Japan	22.2	22.0	21.8	6.5	0.9	17.0	1.8	4.3	3.4	4,854
Malaysia	10.8	40.0	14.5	8.0	1.2	9.4	5.8	4.7	5.6	21,953
Philippines	3.6	14.9	9.5	15.5	1.0	13.4	17.7	9.5	14.9	22,287
South										
Korea	11.0	20.4	15.0	17.4	0.4	7.4	5.2	5.7	17.5	7,337
Sri Lanka	9.4	29.9	11.8	9.2	1.0	11.5	10.6	7.2	9.3	17,694
Taiwan	19.2	29.0	15.3	4.7	1.2	12.2	4.8	8.7	4.8	3,035
Viet Nam	5.7	15.4	9.7	16.7	0.5	5.7	21.9	6.6	17.8	41,532
All										
Overseas	11.4	19.1	12.7	18.9	0.7	8.4	13.0	5.6	10.1	1,109,852
All	12.4	16.3	12.3	20.3	0.8	8.8	12.9	6.1	10.1	4,376,989
Females										
Australia	6.0	21.4	11.7	3.0	7.6	27.1	2.1	14.8	6.3	2,776,465
China*	5.3	21.1	12.2	4.6	4.2	18.8	8.6	11.4	13.7	27,628
Hong Kong	5.0	33.9	11.6	1.9	7.1	24.3	2.6	9.4	4.3	14,704
India	4.7	28.2	10.5	0.9	8.1	29.1	2.0	10.1	6.2	20,918

Indonesia	3.8	17.6	9.1	3.3	5.1	25.0	3.7	20.2	12.2	8,945
Japan	4.3	24.8	10.4	2.3	5.2	35.2	0.5	14.1	3.2	6,219
Malaysia	5.1	40.9	11.4	1.9	5.9	20.6	1.5	8.0	4.6	22,282
Philippines	2.3	16.4	7.6	1.9	4.2	26.8	5.6	16.1	19.1	35,814
South										
Korea	5.4	19.4	13.2	5.9	3.6	19.2	2.6	16.6	14.2	5,976
Sri Lanka	3.6	24.5	9.4	1.5	6.9	32.3	3.0	10.4	8.5	12,284
Taiwan	8.8	29.0	10.6	1.5	7.7	24.0	1.4	12.8	4.1	3,372
Viet Nam	3.9	17.6	8.2	6.2	3.0	17.0	14.3	13.5	16.4	29,818
All										
Overseas	5.4	22.7	11.6	3.1	7.0	24.8	3.8	11.7	9.9	848,960
All	5.8	21.7	11.7	3.0	7.5	26.5	2.5	14.1	7.1	3,625,425

Note: *China excludes SARs and Taiwan Province

TABLE 3: PERCENT OF EMPLOYED PEOPLE WHO HAVE A BACHELOR DEGREE OR ABOVE AND PERCENT OF EMPLOYED PEOPLE WHO SPEAK ENGLISH NOT WELL OR NOT AT ALL FOR SELECTED COUNTRY OF BIRTH GROUPS: 1996 AND 2001 CENSUSES

Birthplace	Percent With Bachelor's Degree				Percent Speak English Not Well or Not At All			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	1996	2001	1996	2001	1996	2001	1996	2001
Australia	29.4	30.4	45.8	48.9	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
China*	59.9	65.9	56.0	63.2	30.6	27.6	32.9	27.5
Hong Kong	70.3	71.2	61.1	69.2	11.0	10.9	9.2	8.2
India	63.7	67.3	75.4	78.0	1.0	0.9	1.1	1.1
Indonesia	52.0	60.7	54.6	58.8	10.8	5.7	10.3	5.1
Japan	79.7	77.0	63.4	60.3	20.0	18.8	15.2	9.8
Malaysia	72.9	73.5	61.7	68.5	3.1	2.8	2.4	2.0
Philippines	65.9	58.8	80.6	72.6	1.1	0.8	0.8	0.7
South Korea	70.4	72.3	72.0	69.1	31.7	27.7	36.6	26.9
Sri Lanka	54.2	55.0	55.4	56.8	3.9	1.2	2.0	1.0
Taiwan	77.0	79.0	68.8	76.5	23.9	16.3	19.5	14.6
Viet Nam	58.5	59.8	56.6	61.9	30.8	26.4	34.2	27.8
All Overseas	37.8	42.0	51.2	54.5	5.1	4.7	4.8	4.2
Total	31.7	33.3	47.1	50.4	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.0

Note: *China excludes SARs and Taiwan Province

TABLE 4: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP FOR PERSONS ARRIVING AFTER 1996 CENSUS* BY SEX FOR SELECTED COUNTRY OF BIRTH GROUPS: 2001 CENSUS

	Managers and Administrators	Professionals	Associate Professionals	Tradespersons and Related Workers	Advanced Clerical and Service Workers	Intermediate Clerical, Sales and Service Workers	Intermediate Production and Transport Workers	Elementary Clerical, Sales and Service Workers	Labourers and Related Workers	N
Male										
China*	8.3	23.7	12.7	13.9	0.4	9.1	7.8	7.3	16.8	5,300
Hong Kong	8.0	28.2	16.6	10.1	0.3	14.6	4.3	7.2	10.7	1,272
India	5.5	30.8	8.4	6.8	0.8	11.3	10.7	15.7	9.9	8,918
Indonesia	5.8	16.0	8.3	6.6	0.7	13.5	10.3	14.2	24.5	2,758
Japan	28.9	20.4	21.0	4.9	0.9	14.4	0.9	5.0	3.6	1,740
Malaysia	10.4	30.4	14.6	7.2	0.9	14.2	4.8	6.9	10.5	1,594
Philippines	2.2	17.0	7.1	12.8	0.7	12.4	15.4	10.2	22.2	2,980
South										
Korea	10.6	17.8	12.5	16.2	0.2	8.6	5.0	5.0	24.2	1,804
Sri Lanka	4.2	25.2	7.1	6.7	1.0	9.1	12.2	12.0	22.5	2,816
Taiwan	26.8	23.2	13.7	2.8	1.6	12.2	5.7	8.3	5.8	555
Viet Nam	4.4	8.1	4.3	16.2	0.2	5.6	19.1	6.7	35.4	1,484
All										126,010
Overseas	10.5	23.5	10.5	14.7	0.7	9.0	10.4	7.2	13.5	
Female										
China*	5.2	18.5	8.3	4.0	3.6	21.1	7.0	14.3	18.0	5,697
Hong Kong	5.3	25.4	8.9	2.0	7.7	30.7	2.2	14.0	3.8	1,257
India	3.3	32.6	7.8	0.6	3.9	28.5	1.0	14.6	7.6	3,395
Indonesia	2.3	10.0	6.1	2.5	3.4	28.5	3.2	29.8	14.3	2,964
Japan	3.5	17.8	6.9	3.8	3.5	37.8	2.8	15.5	8.5	2,529

Malaysia	4.7	30.3	10.8	2.4	5.0	29.1	1.1	11.6	5.0	1,736
Philippines	1.6	14.0	6.0	1.4	2.9	26.3	5.2	19.4	23.2	4,058
South										
Korea	4.6	16.3	10.1	7.3	1.2	25.4	1.7	17.0	16.2	1,489
Sri Lanka	2.5	23.4	5.0	2.6	2.7	29.7	2.9	16.4	14.7	1,283
Taiwan	10.7	22.7	11.1	0.7	6.3	29.9	0.6	12.2	5.8	818
Viet Nam	2.5	6.7	2.8	7.6	2.0	15.0	16.1	17.2	30.3	1,794
All										93,254
Overseas	4.9	24.6	9.6	2.9	4.9	25.6	3.0	13.1	11.3	

Notes: + Based on the assumption that 5/12 of arrivals in 1996 occurred after Census.

*China excludes SARs and Taiwan Province

TABLE 5: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP FOR PEOPLE WHO ARRIVED IN AUSTRALIA BEFORE 1996 CENSUS BY SEX FOR SELECTED COUNTRY OF BIRTH GROUPS: 2001 CENSUS

	Managers and Administrators	Professionals	Associate Professionals	Tradespersons and Related Workers	Advanced Clerical and Service Workers	Intermediate Clerical, Sales and Service Workers	Intermediate Production and Transport Workers	Elementary Clerical, Sales and Service Workers	Labourers and Related Workers	N
Male										
China*	9.3	18.5	19.3	19.1	0.6	6.2	12.1	4.7	10.1	27,536
Hong Kong	8.2	37.1	19.6	10.2	1.0	11.0	4.3	4.7	4.0	14,752
India	12.8	30.6	13.4	10.4	0.9	10.5	10.7	6.1	4.7	22,521
Indonesia	8.7	20.9	13.5	10.0	1.1	9.6	16.6	7.4	12.2	6,549
Japan	18.6	22.4	22.8	7.3	1.1	18.5	2.3	4.1	2.9	2,790
Malaysia	10.9	41.1	14.4	7.9	1.2	9.1	5.8	4.5	5.1	19,679
Philippines	3.8	14.6	9.8	16.0	1.1	13.5	18.1	9.4	13.6	18,663
South Korea	11.2	21.5	16.1	17.6	0.5	7.2	5.3	5.7	14.9	5,181
Sri Lanka	10.4	31.1	12.8	9.7	0.9	12.0	10.2	6.2	6.7	14,488
Taiwan	17.1	30.6	15.7	5.0	1.1	12.3	4.8	8.7	4.6	2,385
Viet Nam	5.6	15.7	9.9	16.6	0.5	5.7	22.1	6.7	17.1	38,697
All Overseas	11.6	18.7	13.0	19.4	0.7	8.3	13.4	5.3	9.6	942,571
Female										
China*	5.3	21.7	13.6	4.7	4.4	18.0	9.5	10.4	12.4	19,544
Hong Kong	5.1	34.4	11.9	1.8	7.1	23.4	2.6	9.2	4.6	13,243
India	5.0	27.6	11.1	1.0	9.2	29.0	2.2	9.1	5.7	16,781
Indonesia	3.8	21.1	10.5	3.3	5.4	22.7	4.3	15.3	13.6	6,126

Japan	5.3	27.1	11.4	2.6	5.7	27.2	2.3	12.7	5.7	4,941
Malaysia	5.2	42.0	11.4	1.9	6.0	19.8	1.6	7.6	4.5	19,768
Philippines	2.4	17.0	7.9	2.0	4.5	27.2	5.5	15.5	18.0	30,164
South										
Korea	6.0	21.7	14.3	4.8	4.6	17.5	3.0	15.8	12.2	4,398
Sri Lanka	3.7	24.7	10.0	1.7	7.3	32.2	2.9	9.9	7.7	10,604
Taiwan	6.9	31.7	10.1	1.2	7.2	24.1	1.6	12.0	5.2	2,918
Viet Nam	3.8	18.6	8.6	5.9	3.2	17.4	14.0	13.2	15.2	27,090
All										725,587
Overseas	5.5	22.6	11.8	3.1	7.3	24.7	3.9	11.5	9.7	

Notes: + Based on the assumption that 7/12 of arrivals in 1996 occurred before 1996 Census.

*China excludes SARs and Taiwan Province

TABLE 6: PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYED IN SELECTED PROFESSIONS BY SEX FOR SELECTED COUNTRY OF BIRTH GROUPS:
2001 CENSUS

Birthplace	Computing Professionals	Accountants, Auditors and Corporate Treasurers	School Teachers	Medical Practitioners	Nursing Professionals
Male					
Australia	1.8	1.5	1.7	0.6	0.3
China*	5.2	1.9	0.4	1.0	0.2
Hong Kong	9.8	5.1	0.8	3.6	0.7
India	9.7	2.3	1.1	3.5	0.2
Indonesia	5.4	2.6	0.7	1.0	0.3
Japan	2.8	1.4	2.6	0.8	0.1
Malaysia	6.9	6.2	1.5	6.8	1.2
Philippines	5.1	1.9	0.2	0.4	1.1
South Korea	5.1	1.7	0.5	0.9	0.0
Sri Lanka	6.0	4.9	0.9	2.8	0.4
Taiwan	7.0	2.1	0.9	2.4	0.1
Viet Nam	5.4	1.3	0.4	1.0	0.1
All Overseas	3.4	1.6	1.2	1.3	0.4
All	2.2	1.5	1.6	0.7	0.3
Female					
Australia	0.6	1.2	5.6	0.3	4.2
China	2.8	5.1	1.4	0.6	2.6
Hong Kong	4.2	7.3	1.6	1.6	5.9
India	4.3	2.1	5.2	2.7	3.5
Indonesia	2.1	3.8	1.6	0.6	1.6
Japan	1.2	1.6	5.8	0.1	1.1
Malaysia	3.2	6.2	3.1	2.8	12.2
Philippines	2.2	2.4	0.8	0.3	6.6

South Korea	1.4	2.6	2.2	0.4	3.4
Sri Lanka	2.2	4.2	2.6	3.0	3.4
Taiwan	2.7	5.4	3.6	1.8	2.0
Viet Nam	3.2	3.5	0.9	0.7	1.1
All Overseas	1.4	2.0	3.5	0.8	4.6
All	0.8	1.4	5.1	0.4	4.3

Note: *China excludes SARs and Taiwan Province

TABLE 7: AGE, SEX, HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND ENGLISH-SPEAKING PROFICIENCY INDIRECTLY STANDARDISED RATIOS FOR PERCENTAGES IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS FOR SELECTED BIRTHPLACE GROUPS: 2001 CENSUS

Birthplace	Managerial and Administrative	Professional
Australia	1.00	1.00
China*	0.75	0.74
Hong Kong	0.77	1.11
India	0.71	0.79
Indonesia	0.74	0.70
Japan	1.37	0.71
Korea	1.02	0.67
Malaysia	0.79	1.07
Philippines	0.33	0.49
Sri Lanka	0.68	0.98
Taiwan	1.49	0.83
Viet Nam	0.54	1.00

Note: Australia-born used as standard

Note: *China excludes SARs and Taiwan Province

TABLE 8: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP FOR SELECTED BIRTHPLACE GROUPS BY SEX:
1996 CENSUS

Birthplace	Managerial & Administrative	Professionals	Associate Professionals	Trades & Related	Advanced Clerical & Service	Intermediate Clerical, Sales, & Service	Intermediate Production & Transport	Elementary Clerical, Sales & Service	Labourers & Related	N
Male										
Australia	12.9	14.8	12.2	21.5	0.9	9.0	13.3	5.8	9.6	3,063,036
China*	8.0	15.5	16.1	22.4	0.3	6.2	13.4	4.1	14.0	27,820
Hong Kong	8.0	35.2	19.2	11.0	1.1	11.7	4.5	4.4	4.8	14,621
India	10.3	29.9	12.6	12.5	1.1	10.5	10.4	6.5	6.1	24,566
Indonesia	7.1	15.8	10.8	11.6	0.4	8.1	21.0	6.7	18.6	8,868
Japan	27.0	22.5	19.4	4.2	1.0	16.1	1.7	4.7	3.4	4,491
Malaysia	10.4	40.0	14.3	8.7	1.2	9.1	6.3	4.4	5.7	19,379
Philippines	2.9	13.4	8.8	16.8	1.2	13.4	18.9	8.9	15.8	17,471
South Korea	10.5	17.2	15.2	18.0	0.4	8.8	5.6	5.3	18.8	5,085
Sri Lanka	8.4	29.4	12.7	9.8	1.3	12.8	11.0	5.8	8.9	14,530
Taiwan	23.5	21.8	16.2	6.7	1.6	9.2	5.8	10.4	4.8	1,639
Viet Nam	4.7	11.8	8.7	17.8	0.4	5.3	24.9	7.6	18.9	34,655
All Overseas	11.0	17.6	12.6	20.9	0.8	8.2	13.8	5.1	9.9	1,052,677
Total	12.4	15.5	12.3	21.3	0.9	8.8	13.4	5.6	9.7	4,115,713
Female										
Australia	6.1	20.4	10.6	3.3	9.1	26.7	2.5	14.4	7.0	2,486,833
China*	4.8	15.9	10.1	5.7	3.9	17.4	16.0	9.1	17.1	19,251
Hong Kong	4.7	30.3	11.8	1.8	8.9	25.5	3.8	8.1	5.3	12,343
India	4.8	25.3	9.3	1.3	11.2	30.5	2.3	8.2	7.2	16,786
Indonesia	2.9	17.0	9.5	4.0	5.1	23.2	8.7	12.2	17.3	6,628
Japan	4.8	23.6	8.9	1.5	6.8	36.1	0.7	15.1	2.4	4,887

Malaysia	4.9	40.4	9.7	2.0	7.0	21.4	2.1	7.5	5.1	18,737
Philippines	2.3	15.7	6.7	2.1	5.2	27.2	6.8	12.1	21.9	27,910
South Korea	5.4	17.6	13.3	5.8	5.0	16.4	4.8	14.3	17.3	3,783
Sri Lanka	3.3	21.6	9.3	1.7	10.2	33.6	4.0	8.1	8.2	9,758
Taiwan	11.3	25.2	10.6	1.4	9.6	21.1	1.8	14.4	4.6	1,864
Viet Nam	3.3	12.2	7.0	7.8	2.9	16.3	20.3	12.9	17.5	23,471
All Overseas	5.4	20.5	10.8	3.4	8.5	24.2	5.2	10.7	11.3	761,208
Total	5.9	20.4	10.7	3.3	8.9	26.1	3.1	13.5	8.0	3,248,041

Note: *China excludes SARs and Taiwan Province

TABLE 9: ESTIMATED PERCENT OF EMPLOYED PERSONS WHO HAVE ARRIVED
 IN AUSTRALIA SINCE THE 1996 CENSUS FOR SELECTED COUNTRY OF BIRTH GROUPS:
 2001 CENSUS

Birthplace	Percent Arrived Since 1996 Census	
	Males	Females
China*	16.1	23.7
Hong Kong	7.9	8.4
India	28.4	17.2
Indonesia	29.6	32.2
Japan	38.4	31.8
Malaysia	7.5	8.3
Philippines	13.8	12.3
South Korea	25.8	24.8
Sri Lanka	16.3	11.1
Taiwan	18.9	19.0
Vietnam	3.7	6.2
All Overseas	11.8	11.4

Note: *China excludes SARs and Taiwan Province

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics
1997 *Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (ASCO) Second Edition*. Catalogue Number 1220.0. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics
2002 *Overseas Arrivals and Departures*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Australia Bureau of Statistics
2003 *The Labour Force*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics
2004 *Migration*. Catalogue Number 3412.0. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics
2005a *The Labour Force*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics
2005b *Australian Labour Force Statistics*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Birrell, Bob
2003 "The management of immigration: patterns of reform," in *The Transformation of Australia's Population 1970-2030*, edited by Khoo, Siew-Ean and Peter McDonald. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Bureau of Immigration and Population Research
1994 *Community Profiles 1991 Census: China-born*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Burnley, Ian, Peter Murphy, and Robert Fagan
1997 *Immigration and Australian Cities*. Sydney: Federation Press.
- Cameron, N.
2001 "Australian education on top." *Business Asia* 9(August): 20-21.
- Castles, Stephen
1992 "The "new" migration and Australian immigration policy," in Inglis, C., S. Gunasekaran, G. Sullivan, and C. T. Wu (ed.) *Asians in Australia: The Dynamics of Migration and Settlement*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.
- Cobb-Clark, Deborah
2000 "Do selection criteria make a difference? Visa category and labour market status of immigrations to Australia." *Economic Record* 76(232):15-31.
- Coughlan, James E.
1992 "Patterns of settlement in Australia of Indochinese refugees," in Inglis, C., S. Gunasekaran, G. Sullivan, and C. T. Wu (ed.) *Asians in Australia: The Dynamics of Migration and Settlement*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.
- Coughlan, James E.
1994 "Occupational mobility within Australia's Vietnamese community: fact or fallacy?" *People and Place* 2(1):15-21.
- Coughlan, James E.

1998 “Occupational mobility of Australia’s Vietnamese community: its direction and human capital determinants”. *International Migration Review* 32(1): 175-201.

Department of Education, Science and Training

2002 *Executive Summary of the Review of the Australian Government Languages Other than English Programme (LOTE) – Report*.
http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/school_education/publications_resources/lotte_programme_review

Department of Education, Science and Training

2004 *Students 2004: Selected Higher Education Statistics*.
http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/publications_resources/profiles/students_2004_full_year_selected_higher_education.htm

Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs

2000a *Community Profiles 1996 Census: China-born*. Canberra.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs

2000b *Immigration Update: June Quarter*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs.

2002 *Australian Immigration Consolidated Statistics*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs

2003 *Immigration, Population and Citizenship Digest*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs.

2005a *Immigration Update*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs.

2005b *Student Visa Statistics*. www.immi.gov.au/study/overview/index.htm#statistics.

Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs.

2005c *Temporary Residence in Australia*.
www.immi.gov.au/facts/47temporary_residence.htm#5

Hugo, G.J.

1995 *Understanding Where Migrants Live*, Bureau of Immigration, Multicultural and Population Research, Canberra.

Hugo, G.J.

2004 *Australia’s Most Recent Immigrants*, 2001 Catalogue No. 2053.0 ABS, Canberra.

Inglis, Christine and Chung-Tong Wu

1992 “The ‘new’ migration of Asian skills and capital to Australia,” in Inglis, C., S. Gunasekaran, G. Sullivan, and C. T. Wu (ed.) *Asians in Australia: The Dynamics of Migration and Settlement*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.

Iredale, Robyn, Fei Guo and Santi Rozario

2003 *Return Migration in the Asia Pacific*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Jones, F. L.
1992 "Labour market outcomes among the Chinese at the 1986 Census," in Inglis, C., S. Gunasekaran, G. Sullivan, and C. T. Wu (ed.) *Asians in Australia: The Dynamics of Migration and Settlement*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.
- Khoo, Siew-Ean.
1994 "Correlates of welfare dependency among immigrants in Australia." *International Migration Review* 28(1): 68-91.
- Khoo, Siew-Ean and David Lucas,
2004 *Australians' Ancestries*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Khoo, Siew-Ean, K. Pookong, T. Dang, and J. Shu.
1994 "Asian immigrant settlement and adjustment in Australia." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 3(2-3):339-372.
- Knapman, B.
1997 "The labour force status of Asia-born immigrants in Australia," pp99-119, in J.E. Coughlan, and D. McNamara (eds), *Asians in Australia*. Melbourne: MacMillan.
- Marks, G.N., J. McMillan, and K. Hillman.
2001 *Tertiary Entrance Performance: the Role of Student Background and School Factors*. Research Report No 22. Camberwell, Victoria: Australian Council for Higher Education.
- McAllister, I.
1995 "Occupational mobility among immigrants: the impacts of migration on economic success in Australia." *International Migration Review*, 29(2): 441-468.
- Parr, Nick and Magdalena Mok
1995 "Differences in the educational achievements, aspirations and values of birthplace groups in New South Wales." *People and Place* 3(2):1-8.
- Parr, Nick and Peter Murray
2004 "Gender unmasked: the implications for policy of demographic shifts and gender discrimination," in *Making the Link: Affirmative Action and Employment Relations*. Edited by Edward, M. Davis, and Valerie Pratt. Sydney: CCH
- Richardson, Sue, and Laurence Lester
2004 *A Comparison of Australian and Canadian Immigration Policies and Labour Market Outcomes*. Canberra: AGPS
- Richardson, Sue, Josh Healy, Sue Stack, Diana Ilsley, Laurence Lester and John Horrocks
2004 *The Changing Labour Force Experience of New Migrants*. Canberra: AGPS.
- Shamsuddin, A. F. M.
1998 "The double-negative effect on the earnings of foreign-born females in Canada." *Applied Economics* 30(9):1187-1201.
- Siegel, Jacob S.
2002 *Applied Demography*. Academic Press: San Diego.

Tienda, M. and Lii D.

1987 "Minority concentration and earnings inequality: blacks, Hispanics and Asians compared." *American Journal of Sociology* 93:141-165.

Wooden, M.

1990 "The labour market experience of migrants." Pp227-292, in Wooden, M., R. Holton, G. Hugo, and J. Sloan. *Australian Immigration: A Survey of the Issues*. Canberra: AGPS.