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Abstract

Intimate partnerships between people of different ethnicities signal the decreasing social and cultural distance between ethnic groups. Such partnerships are also powerful agents of social and demographic change. They can further erode barriers between ethnic groups by fostering interactions within partners’ personal networks. Equally, they can re-shape the ethnic identities of future generations as their children typically identify with multiple ethnicities. A geographic perspective on mixed-ethnicity partnerships reveals that these processes of change are spatially uneven. Prejudices against mixed-ethnicity couples persist among some segments of society, and vary geographically. By shifting the scale of ethnic diversity research to the household, a geographic perspective on mixed-ethnicity partnerships sheds new light on ethnic landscapes, challenging established understandings of diversity and segregation across cities. Yet to date, distributions of mixed-ethnicity couples have seldom featured in social geographic analysis, and not at all in the Australian context. This is a significant oversight given rising rates of mixed-ethnicity partnering.

This thesis accordingly addresses the question, ‘How does a focus on Australian mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals advance established understandings of ethnic residential geographies?’ It adopts a mixed-methods approach, structured around distinct quantitative and qualitative components. Empirically, the focus is on couples involving an Anglo-European partner, and a partner from a visibly different ethnic minority group. The quantitative component of the study utilises customised census data to conduct Australia’s first-ever geographical analyses of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals. It adopts finer-grained ethnic groups that have been conflated within broader pan-ethnic or racial categories in much existing geographical research on this topic. The qualitative component draws on in-depth interviews to explore mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential decision-making processes.
Results portray the unique residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia. Mixed-ethnicity couples exhibit dispersed settlement patterns that do not align with those of their constituent ethnic groups. Broadly, their residential distributions are skewed towards moderately diverse, inner city localities and fall in-between those of ethnically homogeneous couples, affirming similar findings in the small number of comparable international studies. Their residential geographies counter ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups’ tendencies towards residential clustering. Mixed-ethnicity individuals have similarly dispersed residential patterns. Yet there are multiple geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals, that vary across ethnic groups. Analysis of subsequent interviews seeks to explain these distinctive geographies. Its findings are surprising, considering the importance ascribed to neighbourhood ethnic diversity in existing international geographic literature on mixed-ethnicity couples. ‘Conventional’ factors (e.g. proximity to jobs) dominated the interviewees’ accounts of residential decision-making. While the couples interviewed did not choose particular neighbourhoods based on their ethnic composition, they did enjoy diverse locales where they described feeling normal, or even invisible. Many preferred diverse contexts for raising mixed-ethnicity children.

This thesis concludes that a focus on intra-household ethnic diversity is essential for understanding Australia’s ethnic geographies. For instance, it shows that some suburbs often labelled ‘ethnic enclaves’ are actually key sites of ethnic mixing within the home. It also demonstrates how the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples speak back to broader theories of ethnic residential segregation, none of which sufficiently account for the observed results. Equally, this thesis has implications for theories regarding mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential outcomes, generating new insights into the ordinariness of their decision-making processes. Taken together, mixed-ethnicity couples’ distinctive residential patterns and explanatory
narratives suggest that they do not feel tethered to existing ethnic landscapes, underscoring their role as change agents.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Mixed-ethnicity (mixed-race) couples across time and space

The year 2017 marked the 50th anniversary of the landmark United States (US) Supreme Court decision in *Loving v. Virginia*, which legalised interracial marriage throughout the United States. In 1958, Richard Loving, a white man, married Mildred Jeter, an African-American woman in Washington, DC. They returned to live in their home state of Virginia, which had strict anti-miscegenation laws (Richer, 2017). Shortly afterwards, they were charged with illegal cohabitation as a mixed-race couple, and threatened with prison if they did not leave the state for 25 years (Richer, 2017). The Lovings returned to Washington, after being denied the right to live and raise a family in their home town (Bunbury, 2017). Several years later, in 1967, the US Supreme Court ruled against the original decision, effectively dismantling anti-miscegenation legislation across the country. This decision enabled considerable growth in the number of mixed-race marriages in the US over subsequent decades (Wright and Ellis, 2006).

Australia shares a similarly controversial history. In 1959, around the same time as the Lovings were forbidden from cohabiting as a mixed-race couple in Virginia, an Australian couple from the Northern Territory faced comparable struggles. Brook (1997) reported the story of Mick Daly, a white man, and his partner Gladys Namagu, an Aboriginal woman, and how the Government of the Northern Territory sought to impede their union. Many Aboriginal people, including Gladys, were declared wards of the state under the *Northern Territory Welfare Ordinance (1953)*. Under the *Ordinance* it was illegal for a man to live with a female ‘ward’ if they were not married (Brook, 1997). Initially, Mick was prosecuted for illegally cohabiting with Gladys while they were unmarried. Yet getting married was not a straightforward matter for this couple. Under the *Ordinance*, no ‘ward’ could be married without the consent of the
Director of Welfare. When Mick applied for permission to marry Gladys, this was denied, and Gladys was sent to an Aboriginal settlement in Warrabri in the Northern Territory. A prominent lawyer subsequently took up their case, which drew enormous interest from the media, Federal Parliament and even the United Nations. Several months later, the Legislative Council of the Northern Territory amended the *Ordinance* to include a right of appeal against decisions made by the Director of Welfare. Mick and Gladys lodged a successful appeal against the denial of their request to marry, and were married in January 1960 (Brook, 1997). A short time later, the *Australian Marriage Act (1961)* dismantled all remaining state and territory controls over who Aboriginal Australians could marry (Verass, 2017).

Mick and Gladys’ struggle was not an isolated case. From the earliest years of British settlement in Australia, colonial governments were anxious about maintaining white racial purity, and attempted to control mixing between the Aboriginal and white populations in various ways (Ellinghaus, 2003). In most cases, policies were aimed at biologically absorbing the Aboriginal population into the white population. From the early 20th Century, Aboriginal women living in the Northern Territory and Western Australia required permission from the Chief Protector of Aborigines to marry non-Aboriginal men (Ellinghaus, 2003; Probyn, 2003). Policy-makers in the Northern Territory and Western Australia were particularly concerned with preventing marriages between Aboriginal people and Asians or Pacific Islanders, as such unions did not align with their aim of biological absorption (Ellinghaus, 2003). Although New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia did not enact legislative controls on interracial marriages, they did participate in perhaps the most infamous and nefarious policy, which focussed on the growing numbers of mixed-descent or ‘half-caste’ children, in the parlance of the day (Ellinghaus, 2003). These children were perceived as a threat to the purity of white (Anglo-Celtic and Christian) Australia (Probyn, 2003). Between 1910 and 1970, policy-makers
across all states and territories planned the ‘biological absorption’ of the Aboriginal population by forcibly removing children of mixed descent from their Aboriginal families’ homes and placing them in settlements, missions or ‘training’ institutions where they would be prepared for work in non-Aboriginal society (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, 1997). These children became known as the Stolen Generations.

Historical attempts to maintain white racial purity, and to restrict mixed-race marriages, were not limited to relationships between Australia’s Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations. The 1901 Immigration Restriction Act (widely referred to as the White Australia policy) included strong legislative restrictions around non-European migration, with the aim of preserving white British predominance in the Australian population (National Archives of Australia, 2017). The Immigration Restriction Act restricted immigration to Australia through a dictation test, which required non-European people entering Australia to write a passage of 50 words in any European language dictated by an immigration officer (National Archives of Australia, 2017). Any migrant who failed the test was deported. The Act and its associated policies also inhibited partnerships between Anglo-Australians and migrants of non-European descent. Until the Nationality and Citizenship Act (1948), Australian women who married non-Europeans were liable to lose their citizenship (Owen, 2002). The War-time Refugee Removal Act (1949) required the repatriation of non-European refugees to their country of origin, even if they had an Australian partner or Australian-born children. Owen (2002: 30–32) described how such restrictions impacted the marriage of Samad, originally from Malaysia, and Mavis, an Australian woman. Samad arrived in Australia as a refugee during World War Two, and subsequently served with the Australian military in conflicts with Japanese forces in Papua. He was wounded and sent back to Australia, where he settled in Sydney and met Mavis in 1943. The two married and had children together. But when the war ended, Samad was deported.
because he was not European, and Mavis lost her citizenship because she had married him. Samad returned to Sydney a short time later, but was found and arrested by the Immigration Department. With the support of community organisations, Mavis fought and won their case in court in 1949. Samad was allowed to stay in Australia, and Mavis’ citizenship was reinstated (Owen, 2002).

Fast forward to the 21st Century, and Australia’s population has diversified enormously. At the time of the 2016 census, 49 per cent of Australians were either born overseas themselves, or had one or more overseas-born parents (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), 2017). The source countries of migration to Australia have also diversified considerably. Prior to World War Two, immigration was overwhelmingly dominated by those from Great Britain (Forrest et al., 2006a). The post-World War Two decades saw the arrival of greater numbers of Central, Southern and Eastern Europeans, followed by waves of Asian and Middle Eastern immigration throughout the 1970s and 1980s (Forrest et al., 2006a). In 2016–17, the top five source countries1 of migrants to Australia were India (21.2%), China (15.4%), United Kingdom (9.3%), Philippines (6.6%) and Pakistan (3.6%) (Department of Immigration and Border Protection, 2017).

Opposition towards, or indeed acceptance of, mixed-ethnicity marriages has evolved alongside the changing composition of Australian society. In a high-profile example, former Australian Foreign Minister, Senator Bob Carr, invoked his mixed-ethnicity marriage in defence of his wife’s presence on taxpayer-funded trips. In 2012, Senator Carr argued that his wife’s ethnicity

---

1 This list excludes New Zealand citizens, who are not counted as part of Australia’s migration programme. Under the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement, New Zealanders are able to migrate to Australia without prior approval (Spinks and Klapdor, 2016).
was an important factor in Australia’s successful lobbying for a temporary seat on the UN Security Council:

I think at every stage in our bid for the UN seat it was an advantage for the Foreign Minister to be accompanied by a wife who was born in Malaysia of Indian and Chinese parents…I think that sent a very positive message. She is an asset to Australia, an asset to me and I am very proud that she has accompanied me. (Vasek, 2012: para. 6–7)

That Senator Carr publicly deployed his mixed-ethnicity marriage as a strength, is indicative of the sizeable shift in public perceptions that has occurred over recent decades. This shift is also apparent in Australian media. Recent analyses of Australian films and television programmes have found that intimate relations between people of different ethnicities are represented with some frequency. That being said, there is scope for further improvement. Mixed-ethnicity couples on Australia’s television and cinema screens often receive little screen time, lack emotional intimacy, and are not in committed, long-lasting relationships involving marriage or cohabitation (Klocker, 2014; Klocker and Stanes, 2013). Perhaps the greatest indicator of shifting public perceptions of mixed-ethnicity marriages in Australia can be found in statistical evidence of their growing prevalence—as provided in Section 1.3. But first, some necessary notes on terminology and thesis structure.

1.2 Notes on terminology and thesis structure

The terminology used to describe mixed-ethnicity couples varies between, and even within, countries. There was not a universally agreed nomenclature for this thesis to draw upon. Terminological inconsistencies reflect constructions and understandings of ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ in different national contexts. Research in the US commonly refers to mixed-race
or inter-racial couples, reflecting the race-based terminology adopted in that country’s national census. Research emanating from the United Kingdom (UK) uses varied terminology. The term mixed-race is widely deployed, particularly in the literature on biracial individuals (e.g. Song, 2010; Song and Aspinall, 2012). Other UK-based studies refer to ‘mixed-ethnicity’ couples and families (e.g. Caballero et al., 2008; Smith et al., 2011) or ‘mixed-ethnic unions’ (Feng et al., 2014). In England and Wales, the census itself refers to ethnicity rather than race, and provides a ‘mixed ethnic group’ tick-box option (with sub-categories). Yet mixed-race is commonly used in everyday vernacular in the UK, including in media reports. This was evident in news headlines covering the recent engagement of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle (the daughter of an African American mother and white father). A headline in The Guardian read, ‘If Meghan Markle represents the “mixed-race community”, what about me?’ (Chambers, 2017); and another in The Telegraph, ‘Mixed race relationships are no longer an exotic rarity but the new normal’ (Katwala, 2017).

Australia lacks an established terminology for describing mixed-ethnicity couples. I have chosen to avoid the term ‘race’ in this thesis and publications, when referring to the Australian context. The Australian census eschews broad racial categories, instead asking individuals to indicate their country of birth and also to describe their own ancestry (with the instruction that they ought to consider the origins of their parents and grandparents in answering that question). This is in part a legacy of Australia’s history of harmful racialisation discourses and policies, particularly relating to Indigenous Australians. It also reflects the immense diversity of the Australian population (Perkins, 2004; Katz, 2012). To report on ancestry responses to the census, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) has developed the Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups (ASCCEG). In keeping with ABS terminology, and the census ancestry data that informed the quantitative components of this thesis (see
Chapters 3, 4 and 5, which draw directly upon the ASCCEG categories), this thesis adopts the language of ethnicity rather than race. Further detail on the ASCCEG is provided in Section 2.1.

When this project commenced it was framed around the term ‘inter-ethnic couples’, which was used on recruitment materials, participant information sheets and consent forms. However, as the research progressed it became apparent that this term was rarely used by the couples who were interviewed, and that it did not resonate with them. Many found it cold and distant. They far more commonly described themselves as ‘mixed-ethnicity couples’, or simply as ‘mixed-couples’, or as being in a ‘mixed-marriage’. With this in mind, the term ‘mixed-ethnicity’ is used throughout this thesis (and related publications) in relation to the empirical material presented. However, when referring specifically to other studies (including those published in the US and UK, for instance), the terminology used by those authors is retained wherever possible. Hence the reader should anticipate some terminological fluidity across this thesis.

Some explanation is also required regarding the structure and use of personal pronouns in this thesis. This is a thesis by compilation, and so includes full reproductions of articles either published or under review in journals (Chapters 3–5 and 7). Further, this project was embedded within a broader research endeavour led by my primary supervisor, Natascha Klocker. As such, and as is the case with most theses, the completion of this PhD did not occur in isolation. The project included quantitative and qualitative research approaches. In the quantitative components (Chapters 3–5), I took the lead role in data collection, data analysis and writing. Dr Klocker provided invaluable support in discussions of ideas and in the editing process for draft versions of Chapters 3 and 4. In recognition of these contributions, Dr Klocker is listed as a co-author on those papers. Chapter 5 is a sole-authored piece. In the qualitative components
of the project (Chapters 6–7), Dr Klocker and I were equally involved in recruiting participants and conducting interviews. I completed my own analysis of the qualitative data, which is detailed in the paper reproduced in Chapter 7. Dr Klocker is again listed as a co-author on that paper in recognition of her involvement in the data collection process, and her support in the data interpretation and editing processes. Short linking sections precede each empirical chapter. These include details of authorship and explain the shift in personal pronouns, from ‘I’ and ‘my’ in sole-authored material to ‘we’ and ‘our’ in co-authored pieces.

1.3 The social, cultural and numerical significance of mixed-ethnicity partnerships

The accounts hitherto presented in this chapter demonstrate the unique social and cultural significance of mixed-ethnicity partnerships, which challenge traditional notions of rigid and impermeable ethnic boundaries. Marriage (both formal and de facto) is widely regarded as one of the closest, most intimate forms of social relations (Khoo, 2011). As such, the frequency of marriage between people of different ethnic backgrounds is a powerful indicator of the extent of perceived social barriers between groups (Voas, 2009). More than 80 years ago, sociologist Emory Bogardus’ (1933) Social Distance Scale positioned ‘willingness to intermarry’ as an indicator of the strongest degree of intimacy and understanding between different social groups. Drawing on similar ideas, numerous academic studies have identified the propensity for ethnic minority groups to marry across traditional ethnic boundaries as an indicator of their assimilation or integration into broader society (Dribe and Lundh, 2008; Gordon, 1964; Khoo, 2011; Mohn, 2010; Price and Zubrzycki, 1962b; Rodriguez-Garcia et al., 2015).

Marriage is also a highly important demographic and life course event (Khoo, 2011). When people of different ethnic or racial backgrounds enter a marriage (formal or de facto), this has
extensive socio-cultural and demographic implications, not only for the spouses themselves but for their personal networks and the wider community. Indeed, according to Kalmijn (1998: 397):

> [W]hat makes intermarriage so relevant lies in its inherent dynamic: It is not just reflective of the boundaries that currently separate groups in society, it also bears the potential of cultural and socioeconomic change.

Mixed-ethnicity partnerships can therefore be both an effect and a cause of closer social relations between groups. They provide opportunities for greater interaction between people of different ethnic backgrounds, particularly through the creation of links between extended family members, across social networks and among communities (Callister, 2003; Kalmijn, 1998; Rodriguez-Garcia et al., 2015). Such interactions can foster greater inter-cultural understanding, helping to weaken harmful prejudices, stereotypes and discriminatory attitudes (Callister, 2003; Delaney, 2002; Kalmijn, 1998).

Major demographic changes will also accompany rising rates of mixed-ethnicity partnering. Through their children, such partnerships have potentially significant implications for the ethnic composition and identities of future generations (Song, 2009). People with mixed ethnic or racial ancestry are among the fastest-growing population sub-groups in the US (Pew Research Center, 2015), UK (Office for National Statistics (ONS), 2012) and Canada (Bascaramurty, 2018). The growth of populations of mixed-ethnicity individuals is likely to further challenge traditional group boundaries in future generations, as the children of mixed-partnerships are less likely to identify with the values or practices of a single ethnic group (Kalmijn, 1998). Wright et al. (2003: 460) thus conceptualised the mixed-race household as a
place ‘where newness can enter the world.’ These impacts are already becoming evident in multi-ethnic societies such as the US, UK, Canada and Australia, which have seen marked increases in mixed-marriages in recent decades. Between 2000 and 2010, the number of inter-racial couples in the US grew by 28 per cent (Lofquist et al., 2012). In England and Wales, mixed-ethnicity partnerships increased by 30 per cent between the 2001 and 2011 censuses (ONS, 2014). The share of Canadian couples living in mixed unions rose from 2.6 per cent in 1991 to 4.6 per cent in 2011 (Statistics Canada, 2014).

There is little available data on the national share of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia. According to the most recently published figures, 30 per cent of all couples involved partners of different ancestries\(^2\) at the 2006 census (Khoo, 2011). The rate of growth in mixed-ethnicity partnerships in Australia is most evident in the proportion of individuals who nominate multiple ancestries in the census, which rose from 22 per cent in 2001 to 32 per cent in 2011 (ABS, 2012).\(^3\) Such trends appear likely to continue, as the propensity to form exogamous partnerships (outside one’s own ethnic group) increases with each successive immigrant generation (Walker and Heard, 2015). For instance, Walker and Heard’s (2015) analysis of 2011 Australian census data found that 89.7 per cent of partnered first-generation Indian females had Indian partners, yet this had decreased to 29.3 per cent among the ‘third or later’ generations. The corresponding figures among Indian males were 88.8 per cent for first generation migrants, and 20.8 per cent among the third or later generations. This intergenerational shift towards greater exogamy held true for all ancestry groups in Walker and

\(^2\) This figure is based on the most fine-grained ancestries listed in the ASCCEG, which mostly equate to national origins.

\(^3\) These proportions are quite large compared to those cited for mixed-race individuals in the US and mixed-ethnicity individuals in England/Wales (see Section 5.1), however this reflects the fact that most Australians nominate ancestries that equate to national origins, for example, ‘English’ and ‘Vietnamese’. Thus, these figures encapsulate a much wider range of individuals than the US and UK data, where ‘mixed’ identifications reflect combinations of much broader racial and ethnic categories (e.g. combinations of white, black, Asian and Latino in the US; white, black African, black Caribbean and Asian in the UK).
Heard’s (2015) analysis, including Chinese, Greek, Italian and Lebanese individuals, among others. The authors further revealed that the speed and magnitude of this shift varies according to both ethnicity and gender.

1.4 Contemporary attitudes towards boundary-crossing partnerships

Given the important ways in which mixed-ethnicity partnerships challenge traditional social and cultural norms, it is unsurprising that rising rates of inter-marriage continue to evoke fear and discomfort for some. Owen (2002: 2) described mixed-marriages in Australia as a ‘highly charged, emotional issue’. Although the legal barriers to mixed-ethnicity or mixed-race partnerships discussed at the start of this chapter have eroded, and societal attitudes are generally more accepting than in the past (Romano, 2003), racism and prejudice against mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals persist among some segments of society. Ethnic mixing continues to challenge traditional socio-cultural hierarchies and national imaginaries of ‘pure’, mono-cultural white or European identities (Dunn et al., 2004; Wright et al., 2003). In the US, Wright et al. (2003: 468) argued that concerns about rising rates of inter-marriage are rooted in ‘implied, real and perceived challenges to white privilege.’ Equally, some ethnic minority groups may be concerned about the impacts of mixed-ethnicity relationships on the transmission and maintenance of languages, cultural identities and practices across generations (Clyne and Kipp, 1995; Khoo, 1995). Negative reactions to mixed-ethnicity couples have been described as ‘border-patrolling’ (Dalmage, 2000) and ‘boundary-policing’ (Osuji, 2013).

Enduring prejudice continues to affect mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals in a range of ways. Contemporary studies have revealed that mixed-ethnicity couples still experience isolated incidents of overt hostility in the form of verbal abuse and harassment, and in extreme cases, physical aggression and violence (Caballero et al., 2012; Osuji, 2013). More commonly,
they are exposed to ‘subtle antagonisms’ (Osuji, 2013: 180) such as discriminatory looks or stares from strangers, which reflect the persistence of stigmatisation and stereotypes (Caballero et al., 2008; Moore, 2015; Osuji, 2013). Mixed-ethnicity couples may also face structural discriminations, for instance, in the housing market, employment or in contact with the police (Caballero et al., 2012; Childs, 2005; Dalmage, 2000). Incidences of discrimination are not limited to the public sphere. Mixed-ethnicity couples may face disapproval or hostility from family members, particularly at the start of their relationships (Caballero et al., 2012). Discrimination often extends to the children of mixed-ethnicity partnerships. In the UK, Harman (2010) found that white mothers of mixed-race children experienced racism, directed at their children, in their schools and local areas and from their extended families.

Negative attitudes towards mixed-ethnicity partnerships are culturally uneven. Depending on the particular ethnic or racial hierarchies that are prevalent in a society, some types of mixed relationships are considered more acceptable (and less transgressive) than others. A 2009 survey of US residents found that 81 per cent of respondents ‘would be fine with’ a family member marrying a white American, but only 66 per cent would be fine with a family member marrying an African American (Wang, 2012). The corresponding figures for Asian and Hispanic Americans were in between: 75 and 73 per cent respectively (Wang, 2012). A recent Australian study of racist attitudes found that one-in-two survey respondents expressed some level of concern at the prospect of a close relative marrying someone of Middle Eastern background (Blair et al., 2017). This was the highest rate for any group mentioned in the survey. High proportions of respondents also expressed discomfort at mixed-marriages with African, Southern Asian and Jewish Australians (Blair et al., 2017). However, rates of concern were far
lower when respondents were asked how they would feel about a close relative marrying a person of British or Italian background, or of Christian faith.4

1.5 Exploring mixed-ethnicity partnerships through a geographic lens

Attitudes towards mixed-ethnicity partnerships are not only culturally uneven but also vary geographically. Dunn et al. (2004) described the nature of racism as ‘everywhere different’; and Forrest and Dunn (2006) found that attitudes towards ethnic mixing also vary according to local context. Caballero et al. (2012) suggested that local racialisation processes affect whether mixed-ethnicity or mixed-race families are perceived as ‘ordinary’ in different places. Thus, the experiences of such couples, families and individuals are likely to be contingent on where they live, including factors such as neighbourhood ethnic composition, the prevalence of conservative or progressive social and political attitudes, and socio-economic status. With this in mind, Song (2009) cautioned against generalised assumptions that intermarriage will result in widespread social integration. She highlighted the importance of a geographic perspective on mixed-ethnicity partnerships:

[E]xperiences of intermarriage will vary across and within different groups according to class, gender and region. For example, being in a Black/White relationship in the Deep South of the USA will differ considerably from the experiences of a Black/White couple in New York City, just as a Pakistani/English couple in a small English village may have a very different experience from a similar couple in West London. Thus, the specific ways in which intermarriage may or may not engender forms of integration

---

4 Although religion and ethnicity are often overlapping forms of identification, religion was not a focus of the present study.
must be explored in relation to different kinds of ‘mixed’ relationship in specific locations. (Song, 2009: 343)

Geography matters to the study of mixed-ethnicity partnerships. This is evident even in the historical examples presented at the beginning of this chapter. Robert and Mildred Loving were driven out of their home town and state because of Virginia’s anti-miscegenation laws, re-shaping their residential outcomes. Similarly, the treatment of Mick Daly and Gladys Namagu occurred under laws specific to the Northern Territory of Australia (although they would likely have faced some opposition in any part of Australia at that time).

Just as mixed-ethnicity couples’ lived experiences are likely to vary geographically, so too are the socio-cultural impacts of their partnerships. Most obviously, mixed-ethnicity couples’ experiences or perceptions of acceptance (or otherwise) in different localities, may shape their residential geographies. This, in turn, has implications for ethno-racial geographies across a variety of scales. Yet the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia have never been explored. This thesis responds to this research gap. Below, I articulate the specific aims of the thesis (Section 1.6). This is followed by a review of the existing (predominantly international) literature on the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples (Section 1.7), and an explanation of the conceptual framework that underpins this thesis (Section 1.8). This chapter closes with an overview of the remainder of the thesis (Section 1.9).

1.6 Research aims

In light of the socio-cultural significance of mixed-ethnicity partnerships, and the spatially contingent nature of their lived realities, this thesis seeks to answer the question, ‘How does a focus on Australian mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals advance established
understandings of ethnic residential geographies?’ In order to respond to this question, the project was framed by the following four research aims:

1. To conduct the first-ever mapping of the residential geographies of cohabiting mixed-ethnicity couples, across Australian cities and regions.
2. To explore how mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential geographies vary according to ethnicity combinations, gender configurations, and the presence or absence of dependent children.
3. To map the residential geographies of Australian mixed-ethnicity individuals, the descendants of mixed-ethnicity couples.
4. To explore the factors that influence the residential decision-making processes of mixed-ethnicity couples, through a qualitative approach.

These project aims are addressed using a combination of quantitative (Aims 1–3) and qualitative methods (Aim 4), which are discussed further in Chapter 2. In response to Aims 1 and 2, this thesis reveals the types of locations where mixed-ethnicity couples of different types tend to concentrate, in Australian cities and regions. This mapping process sheds light on the diverse geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples: an important population sub-group that has remained invisible in existing accounts of Australia’s ethnic residential geographies. Through a focus on diversity within the household (rather than standard counts of ethnically diverse individuals in a neighbourhood), the mapping component of this thesis unsettles established understandings of Australia’s ethnic geographies—specifically regarding patterns of segregation. It also signals how these geographies might shift as the prevalence of mixed-ethnicity marriages continues to rise in coming decades. The significance of this shift in focus (to the household scale) is discussed in further detail in Section 1.8.3. In responding to Aim 3,
this thesis further illuminates the tangible impacts of mixed-ethnicity partnerships through an analysis of the residential patterns of the offspring of such relationships.

The qualitative component of the research featured in-depth interviews with mixed-ethnicity couples. In responding to Aim 4, this thesis answers questions that quantitative analyses alone cannot address. Most obviously: why do mixed-ethnicity couples choose to live in certain places? And how do mixed-ethnicity couples’ lived experiences vary according to their residential neighbourhood? The following section provides an overview of the existing geographic literature on mixed-ethnicity couples. In so doing, I identify the important research gaps to which this thesis responds.

1.7 The residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples

Researchers have tended to approach the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples from two angles. The first seeks to understand how geographic context influences the formation of mixed-ethnicity partnerships (e.g. Blau et al., 1982; Feng et al., 2010; Hwang et al., 1997; Lievens et al., 1998). From that perspective, characteristics of an area’s population structure—or the ‘marriage market’—influence opportunities for out-marriage. The logic follows that people are more likely to ‘marry out’ if their ethnic group is relatively small compared to others in the geographic area, and when there is sufficient ethnic diversity to increase opportunities for inter-group social interactions (Blau et al., 1982; Feng et al., 2010). Studies conducted some decades ago made a case that opportunities for mixed-ethnicity partnering are greater in geographical areas where diverse ethnic groups are similar in terms of other attributes—for instance, age and socio-economic status (Blau et al., 1982; Lievens, 1998). So too, that inter-group contact tends to be greater in places where ethnic groups are spatially proximate to one another (Cready and Saenz, 1997; Morgan, 1981). The corollary is that ethnic residential
segregation reduces opportunities for inter-group contact and thus inhibits mixed-ethnicity partnering.

In light of evidence that it is becoming less common for individuals to meet their future spouse in the local neighbourhood (Bozon and Heran, 1989; Houston et al., 2005; Kalmijn and Flap, 2001), some scholars have argued that residential data is less instructive about where mixed-ethnicity couples form, and more instructive about where they choose to live (Ellis et al., 2006; Lievens, 1998; White and Sassler, 2000). Thus, an emergent body of literature focuses on the geographic outcomes of mixed-ethnicity partnerships, rather than where they formed (Caballero et al., 2008; Ellis et al., 2006; Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011; Tindale et al., 2014; White and Sassler, 2000; Wright et al., 2011). Drawing upon methods deployed in the broader body of research on ethnic and racial residential segregation, these studies have mapped the local-scale distributions of mixed-ethnicity couples and mixed-ethnicity households more broadly, primarily using cross-sectional data. They have explored the types of places in which mixed-ethnicity couples tend to live, mostly in terms of neighbourhood ethnic composition. This thesis is situated within this body of work, and aims to augment the existing literature through deepening understandings of how mixed-ethnicity couples are geographically distributed across Australian cities and regions.

Importantly, recent longitudinal studies have demonstrated that the observed residential patterns of mixed-ethnicity couples are not exclusively the result of either the formation of such partnerships in local areas, or their subsequent residential mobility decisions (Feng et al., 2014; Gabriel, 2016). This study recognises that the processes behind the geographic distributions of mixed-ethnicity couples are complex, and location of residence on census night may not always reflect desires or preferences for certain types of neighbourhoods. With that in mind, this thesis
includes a qualitative component that presents firsthand accounts of how mixed-ethnicity couples come to live in certain places. Below, I review existing literature on the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples, highlighting the major themes that have emerged thus far. To avoid unnecessary repetition, this review is brief, however further detail is provided in the literature review sections of Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 7.

Geographers have demonstrated that mixed-ethnicity couples (and households) are unevenly distributed across residential space (Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011; Tindale et al., 2014). On the whole, their residential geographies do not mirror extant patterns of ethnic segregation (Ellis et al., 2007, 2012; Iceland and Nelson, 2010). Ethnically mixed households are less likely than ethnically homogeneous households to be located in neighbourhoods with disproportionately high concentrations of their respective ethnic groups (Ellis et al., 2006 in the US; Feng et al., 2014 in the UK; Tindale et al., 2014 in Australia). There is instead evidence of their prevalence in neighbourhoods characterised by ethnic diversity (Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011; Wright et al., 2011). Based on comparisons with same-race households in twelve large US metropolitan areas, Holloway et al. (2005) devised the notion of ‘in-betweenness’ to describe the geographies of mixed-race households. Specifically, they showed that mixed-race households tended to live in more diverse neighbourhoods than same-race white households, but less diverse neighbourhoods than same-race minority households. The exception was black-white households, who lived in more diverse neighbourhoods than both same-race white and same-race black households. The ‘in-between’ thesis gained support in subsequent studies across the US (Wright et al., 2011), UK (Smith et al., 2011) and Australia (Tindale et al., 2014).
Seeking explanations for these patterns, scholars have turned to the scant qualitative literature on the topic of mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential preferences, which suggests that their affinity for diverse neighbourhoods may reflect a strategic avoidance of ‘places marked as the terrain of one group or the other’ (Dalmage, 2000; Holloway et al., 2005: 321; Twine, 1999). Ethnically homogeneous residential areas may be perceived as unsafe or uncomfortable due to concerns about discrimination against those who cross ethnic and racial boundaries. Importantly, the spatial outcomes of mixed-ethnicity partnerships vary according to other markers of identity, namely: family composition (Caballero et al., 2008); income and homeownership (Holloway et al., 2005); and gender configurations (Wright et al., 2013). It is therefore essential that explorations of mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential geographies account for additional lines of difference, wherever the data permits.

Australian studies of mixed-ethnicity partnerships have rarely adopted a geographic focus. Most explore rates of intermarriage among different ethnic groups, considering potential conditioning factors such as country of birth, ancestry, immigrant generation, gender and education (e.g. Giorgas and Jones, 2002; Jones and Luijkx, 1996; Khoo et al., 2009). The Australian Census of Population and Housing is the primary data source for such studies, although a small number have drawn on marriage registration statistics as an alternative (e.g. Price, 1982; Price and Zubrzycki, 1962b). The census is preferable for analysing the geography of mixed-ethnicity partnerships, as it facilitates disaggregation across smaller spatial units. It also enables co-habiting/de facto partnerships to be recognised, which is not possible when marriage registration statistics are used. Some Australian work has used census

---

5 Marriage registration data provides a measurement of the number of marriages that took place in Australia during a specific time frame, and is only able to capture ethnicity according to country of birth (Khoo, 2011; Price and Zubrzycki, 1962a). Censuses are the primary data source for the study of mixed-ethnicity partnerships in most countries, although in Nordic countries it is possible to use population registers to carry out such research (e.g. Mohn 2010).
data to investigate regional variations in rates of out-marriage for Indigenous Australians (Biddle, 2013; Heard et al., 2009; Walker and Heard, 2015). Those studies have shown that Indigenous people are more likely to have a non-Indigenous partner if they live in regions where Indigenous persons comprise lower proportions of the total population, such as large metropolitan areas. Yet only one Australian study has sought to map the residential distributions of mixed-ethnicity couples across Australia—our own work in Sydney based on 2006 census data (Tindale et al., 2014). That study was a preliminary investigation that established the distinctiveness of Australia’s mixed-ethnicity couple geographies, but was limited to one city and did not have scope to explore the residential patterns of disparate types of mixed-ethnicity couples. This thesis extends on this earlier work by mapping mixed-ethnicity couples across all of Australia, using updated 2011 census data (the most recently available at the time of data collection), and by cross-classifying each couple type according to other aspects of identity. It also disaggregates the broad category ‘mixed-ethnicity’ to explore the divergent geographies of couples with different ethnic backgrounds. Unlike our earlier work (Tindale et al. 2014), this thesis also goes beyond the census data, supplementing its quantitative findings with qualitative insights into the reasons behind mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential outcomes. Below, I explain the conceptual framework that underpins this thesis’ approach to mixed-ethnicity couples.

1.8 A conceptual framework for the geographical analysis of mixed-ethnicity couples

This thesis draws upon multiple theoretical perspectives in its exploration of the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples. Section 1.8.1 explains how ethnic identity is conceptualised in this study, drawing on theories of ethnicity and ethnic categories as social constructions that are fluid and intrinsically connected to other dimensions of identity. Section
1.8.2 details theories of ethnic residential segregation, which offer insights into the factors and processes that result in the distinctive geographies of diverse ethnic groups across urban residential space, and how these shift over time. While those theories have primarily been built around individuals with singular ethnic identities, this thesis adopts a household-level approach (Section 1.8.3) to examining ethnic residential geographies. A household-level approach, which brings cohabiting mixed-ethnicity couples into view, challenges traditional understandings of ethnic residential segregation. Section 1.8.4 draws these theoretical threads together, and discusses their implications for understanding the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples.

1.8.1 Conceptualising ethnic identities

This thesis is informed by theoretical perspectives that conceptualise race and ethnicity as fluid and socially constructed categories of difference. There is widespread agreement among social scientists and biologists alike that there is no biological basis for the existence of discrete racial or ethnic groups (Graves, 2001; Olsen, 2002; Stephan and Stephan, 2000). In the words of Ellis and Wright (2005: 15326), social categories such as ethnicity and race are ‘not fixed or preordained; rather they are social constructions imposed to order reality according to evolving ideas of human difference.’

As noted earlier, this thesis adopts the term ethnicity in preference to race. Ethnicity encompasses many different aspects of identity, and is therefore an unstable and highly contextual concept (Mateos et al., 2009). This is evident in the Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups (ASCCEG), which states that ethnicity is defined by ‘shared identity or similarity of a group of people on the basis of one or more factors’ including: history, cultural traditions, geographic origin, language, literature, religion, minority
status or racial conspicuousness (ABS, 2016a). In these official classifications, and in everyday practice, ethnicity is based on self-perceived and externally-imposed group identification, and as such is likely to be dynamic (Mateos et al., 2009).

As noted earlier, the concept of race has a particularly problematic history in Australia, having been utilised in government attempts to control the Aboriginal population and reinforce hierarchical systems of oppression and exclusion (Katz, 2012). ‘Race’ terminology has thus largely disappeared from official usage, but some scholars have argued that race remains an important signifier of identity for many people (Luke and Carrington, 2000; Perkins, 2004). Both ethnicity and race continue to powerfully shape people’s everyday lives through racialisation processes, experiences of racism and structural inequalities that disadvantage certain groups (Luke and Carrington, 2000). This thesis therefore adopts a nuanced approach, recognising that ethnicity and race are indeed fluid, unstable and socially constructed concepts, which retain salience in everyday life. Further, the significance of ethnic boundaries and the perceived social and cultural distance between ethnic groups is also fluid and likely to shift over time and space, with important implications for which combinations of ethnicities are perceived to constitute a ‘mixed-ethnicity partnership’ in the first place. Over the duration of my candidature, an inordinate amount of time was spent making careful decisions over the couples that would (and would not) be defined as mixed-ethnicity for the purposes of this thesis. Those decisions are outlined in detail in Chapter 2.

This fluid understanding of ethnicity/race is difficult to reconcile with quantitative approaches to mapping the geographies of ethnic groups, which depend on discrete and rigid census categories (Peake and Schein, 2000). As Peake and Kobayashi (2002: 58) have argued:
Numbers represent a genuine dilemma, in that the creation of ‘racial’ categories is a form of essentialism, and can impose a stasis upon those categories, and therefore upon the lives of racialized people. Reduction to numbers also negates the historical and geographical specificity of people’s lives…From a more practical perspective, numbers (and the statistical analyses they make possible) comprise an essential tool in policy analysis and in the application of social programs.

The quantitative methods used in this project aimed to respond to this problem by disaggregating broad ethnic categories to the greatest extent possible. Thus, for instance, the census data analyses featured in Chapters 3, 4 and 5 deconstruct the ‘white’ and ‘Asian’ categories commonly used in research on the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples and mixed-ethnicity individuals. Those broad categories have attracted criticism because they conceal important heterogeneity in their constituent sub-groups (Aspinall, 2003; Stillwell, 2010). Chapter 3 specifically aims to demonstrate the value in using finer-grained ethnic categories to define mixed-ethnicity couples for geographical analysis. In that chapter, the ethnic minority categories include Vietnamese, Filipino, Chinese, Indian and Lebanese; the first four of which have often been subsumed within the ‘Asian’ category in existing studies of mixed-ethnicity couples. Meanwhile, people of Lebanese background are counted as ‘white’ in the US census—an approach that risks concealing their distinctive experiences as individuals of ‘Middle Eastern appearance’ living in a country where they are vulnerable to discrimination and harassment, especially post-9/11 (Jamal and Naber, 2008; Salaita, 2005). I argue that disaggregation of ethnic categories, as attempted in this thesis, enables responsiveness to spatial and temporal shifts in the social salience of different types of mixed-ethnicity couples. This conceptualisation of ethnic categories as fluid is carried through into the qualitative component of the study (Chapters 6 and 7). Interviewees were asked to identify their own
ethnicities, in a manner that resonated with them at the time of interview. In recognition of the social construction of ethnicity, this thesis adheres to the terminology chosen by each participant, despite the fact that this introduces some terminological inconsistencies (given that two people who ostensibly shared the same ethnic background often chose to describe their ethnic identities in quite different ways).

In conceptualising ethnic identities for this project, it was also important to acknowledge that ethnicity intersects with several other aspects of identity to mediate the experiences of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals. In this regard, this thesis is informed by Vertovec’s (2007: 1025) notion of ‘super-diversity’, which highlights the unprecedented extent and scale of interplays between ethnicity and myriad other variables that affect ‘where, how and with whom people live.’ Vertovec (2007: 1025) argued that this ‘diversification of diversity’ means that in contemporary societies ‘it is not enough to see diversity only in terms of ethnicity.’ Australia is indeed a context characterised by super-diversity. This has arisen from large waves of immigration across a number of decades and a policy context that has, for the most part, encouraged extensive interaction between people from diverse source countries (Fozdar and Perkins, 2014). In response to Vertovec’s (2007: 1049) call for ethnic diversity research to ‘creatively consider the interaction of multiple axes of differentiation’, Chapter 4 of this thesis explores the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples when they are sub-divided according to additional socio-demographic characteristics, including gender configurations and parenting status. Chapter 5 examines the settlement patterns of mixed-ethnicity individuals according to their country of birth (overseas or Australia) and educational background.

The related concept of ‘intersectionality’ (Crenshaw, 1989) is also useful as a point of entry to understanding the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals. Intersectionality
emphasises how multiple interrelated aspects of identity combine to shape experiences of marginality and privilege (Crenshaw, 1989). Although both theoretical perspectives (super-diversity and intersectionality) foreground the interaction of multiple variables, intersectionality is distinguished through its traditional focus on the interlockings of race, gender and class, while super-diversity pays closer attention to nationality, country of origin, ethnicity, and other migration-related categories of difference (Meissner and Vertovec, 2015). In this thesis, I seek to sidestep questions of whether Vertovec’s super-diversity is indeed novel, or simply shifts the focus of earlier intersectional work. Both Vertovec’s work, and that of earlier intersectional theorists, have proven useful as part of this research project. Vertovec’s super-diversity appears in Chapter 5. Meanwhile, intersectionality was adopted as a theoretical lens in a paper analysing the everyday experiences of mixed-ethnicity families in public spaces (based on the qualitative data collected as part of this research project; Klocker and Tindale, under review). As I was not the lead author of that paper, it is not included in this thesis.

1.8.2 Theories of ethnic residential segregation

As international migration has intensified over the past several decades, scholars have become increasingly interested in how ethnic minority migrants are incorporated into the societies in which they settle. So too, in the extent to which established ethnic majority and minority populations (e.g. white and African Americans) mix, socially and spatially. Scholarly interest in residential settlement patterns is based on the logic that spatial distance both reflects and reinforces social distance (Murdie and Borgegård, 1998). Residential geographies thus provide a window through which to explore processes of integration and mixing.

There is a long history of research on ethnic residential segregation, which has explored the degree to which different ethnic groups live geographically separate lives (e.g. Lieberson,
Stemming primarily from the US, existing studies have documented ongoing patterns of segregation between ethnic and racial groups, particularly between whites and blacks (e.g. Logan et al., 2004; Massey and Tannen, 2017). Empirical evidence of segregation has given rise to multiple explanatory models, which seek to explain why ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups exhibit different residential patterns. These explanatory models can be broadly categorised into two camps: those that emphasise the importance of choice on the part of all ethnic groups in sustaining segregation, and those that foreground the constraints faced by ethnic minorities in the search for a place to live.

Theoretical perspectives emphasising the role of choice argue that observed patterns of ethnic residential concentration are the result of voluntary segregation by ethnic groups. According to the ethnic enclave model, ethnic minorities prefer to live in parts of the city where there are significant numbers of residents of the same ethnic background—in order to sustain cultural identities and practices and live in close proximity to co-ethnic support, resources and amenities (Portes and Jensen, 1987). The desire to live close to ‘co-ethnics’ produces residential clusters, or ethnic enclaves, in certain parts of the city. This tendency is particularly evident among recently-arrived migrants who require support when settling into their new country. From this perspective, ethnically clustered neighbourhoods are seen as an asset, and ethnic minority residents may choose to remain in those areas even if they can afford housing elsewhere (Fong and Chan, 2010; Zhou and Logan, 1991). A related body of literature—mainly originating in the US—has explored how segregation may result from people’s preferences for certain types of neighbourhoods based on their racial or ethnic composition (e.g. Charles, 2006; Clark, 2009; Krysan and Bader, 2007; Lewis et al., 2011). Schelling’s (1972) concept of ‘racial tipping points’ suggested that whites begin to move out of their local neighbourhood once the
proportion of non-white residents reaches a certain threshold. This concept gave rise to the notion of ‘white flight’, that is, white residents’ propensity to move out of an area as the number of black residents increases. These preferences also play out in terms of ‘white avoidance’, when whites choose not to move into neighbourhoods with larger proportions of ethnic minority residents (Quillian, 2002). These perspectives have made an important contribution by emphasising that ethnic majority populations also play a key role in maintaining segregation. Later studies of residential mobility have documented the persistence of white flight and avoidance in the US (Crowder et al., 2011; Pais et al., 2009) and also in European countries (Andersen, 2017; Bolt et al., 2008; Bramå, 2006). Overall, studies of neighbourhood racial preferences suggest that members of all groups express some degree of preference for own-group neighbours, but that this is mediated by income, education and local context (Clark, 2009; Krysan and Bader, 2007; Lewis et al., 2011).

Alternative perspectives argue that ethnic residential segregation results from socio-economic and structural barriers that constrain the residential outcomes of ethnic minorities. The spatial assimilation model interprets ethnic enclaves as ‘zones of transition in the life cycle of immigrant populations’ before they eventually disperse into wider parts of the city (Edgar, 2014: 364). From this perspective, migrants initially settle in suburbs with affordable housing and co-ethnic community support structures (Edgar, 2014). Over time, they make progress in acculturation and employment, and eventually translate socio-economic gains into residential mobility, moving away from initial clusters towards purportedly higher-amenity neighbourhoods with better quality housing (Edgar, 2014; Massey and Denton, 1985). This approach holds that ethnic minorities share similar residential aspirations as the ethnic majority, but need to overcome financial constraints before exhibiting similar spatial outcomes (Alba and Logan, 1991). This process of residential dispersal has been shown to occur across migrant
generations, with each successive generation more socially, culturally and economically assimilated—and thus more residentially dispersed—than the last (Alba and Nee, 1997; Edgar, 2014). Following on from the spatial assimilation model, Portes and Zhou (1993) developed segmented assimilation theory, which posits that different ethnic minority groups become assimilated into different ‘segments’ of the host society. According to their approach, differences in economic and spatial assimilation trajectories reflect group-specific differences in migration histories and economic circumstances upon arrival (Forrest et al., 2006b; Portes and Zhou, 1993).

Finally, the place stratification model highlights the significance of social exclusion and racism in limiting the potential range of residential locations for ethnic minorities—including migrants and established ethnic minority populations, such as African Americans (Logan and Alba, 1993). In the US, there is evidence that discrimination in the housing market restricts the ability of ethnic minorities to convert improvements in economic resources into greater residential mobility (Clark, 2013; Ross and Turner, 2005; Rugh and Massey, 2010). Ethnic minorities may also avoid certain types of (white dominated) neighbourhoods due to fears of discrimination or harassment (Charles, 2006; Phillips, 2006). Following relatively recent work in the field, this thesis adopts the viewpoint that ethnic residential geographies (including those of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals) are the outcome of a ‘dialectic relationship between choice and constraint’ (McGarrigle and Kearns, 2009: 453; Ratcliffe, 2004). People’s decisions about where to live reflect choices realised within the context of constraints—or ‘bounded choices’ (Phillips, 2003: 47). It follows that no single explanatory model offers a complete understanding of the segregation process, but each contributes important insights.
While most research has emanated from the US, comparative international studies have revealed disparate segregation levels across other immigrant-receiving, English-speaking countries (Johnston et al., 2007). Johnston et al. (2007) found that segregation in Australia and New Zealand was less pronounced than in Canada, the UK and US. Therefore, certain theoretical perspectives may be more applicable than others, depending on national context. In Australia, scholars have highlighted the applicability of the spatial assimilation model given evidence of intergenerational movement away from ethnic minority concentrations in large metropolitan areas (Edgar, 2014; Poulsen et al., 2004). Yet differences in spatial assimilation experiences across ethnic minority groups point to the validity of the segmented assimilation model (Forrest et al., 2006a, 2006b; Johnston et al., 2007). The distinctive segregation profiles of ethnic groups are highly reflective of their main period of arrival in Australia, which shaped groups’ occupational structures, and hence their economic resources and level of access to the housing market (Forrest et al., 2006a). For example, Forrest et al. (2006a) noted high levels of spatial assimilation among European migrant groups, such as Germans, whose main period of arrival was during the post-World War Two economic boom. On the other hand, spatial assimilation has been substantially lower among Australia’s Lebanese and Vietnamese populations, who arrived predominantly as refugees during the 1960s and 1970s. Another key element of segmented assimilation in Australia is the importance of local context in shaping unevenness in assimilation trajectories. According to Forrest et al. (2006a: 153), a range of distinct immigration and economic histories across Australian cities have produced inter-city variations in ethnic groups’ residential geographies, and ‘a set of relationships among peoples and spaces…that is uniquely Australian.’ The implications of the ethnic residential segregation theories outlined in this section, for this study of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals, are explained later in Section 1.8.4. But first, I consider how changes in the analytical scale of segregation research are key to understanding where mixed-ethnicity couples live.
1.8.3 Shifting geographic scales: from individuals to households

A key shortcoming of the dominant theories on ethnic residential segregation (outlined above) is their failure to account for how living arrangements condition residential patterns. Apart from some relatively recent studies (e.g. Holloway et al., 2005; Wright et al., 2011; Smith et al., 2011), segregation research has focused exclusively on counts of individuals in local areas, operating under the implicit assumption that individuals live with others of the same ethnic background. The existence of mixed-ethnicity partnerships disrupts this assumption, yet such couples are rendered invisible in research that ignores the household as a scale of analysis (Wright et al., 2003; Wright and Ellis, 2006). Traditional approaches to analysing ethnic residential segregation (that rely on counts of individuals) are unable to differentiate between two places with identical ethnic compositions, but different degrees of mixing within households (Wright and Ellis, 2006). Wright and Ellis (2006) therefore called for a re-scaling of segregation research to the household scale.

A household-level approach offers an alternative and important means of understanding ethnic residential geographies. When counts of individuals in neighbourhoods are used as the basis for analysis, the emphasis is placed on differences between groups, encouraging unhelpful distinctions between ‘us’ and ‘them’ (Wright and Ellis, 2006). In Australia, such accounts have fuelled anti-immigration sentiments and anxieties about ethnic enclaves in our cities (as documented by Forrest et al., 2017), including the notion that Sydney is a ‘metropolis divided’ where there is increasing bifurcation along ethnic lines (see Birrell, 2010; Healy and Birrell, 2003). A focus on households draws attention to intimate relations between ethnic groups. As shown in Chapter 3 of this thesis, based on Australian data, this approach provides evidence that counters narratives of ethnic minorities living separate or parallel lives from the host society.
The household is also an important unit of analysis because decisions about where to live are commonly made at the household level. Reaching beyond studies of ethnic residential geographies, household-level processes have been central in the development of residential mobility theories (Rossi, 1955; Stapleton, 1980). Thus, the conceptual framing of this thesis—and of Chapter 7 in particular—is informed by broader theories of household residential mobility and decision-making. Traditional studies in these fields have emphasised the importance of economic and demographic factors in shaping why and where people move (Bourne, 1981; Rossi, 1955). Job accessibility is commonly cited as one of the most crucial location factors (Horner, 2004; Kim et al., 2005), alongside housing affordability (So et al., 2001), proximity to retail and service facilities (Bowes and Ihlanfeldt, 2001) and environmental amenity (Rouwendal and Meijer, 2001).

Informed by the early works of behavioural and humanistic geographers (King and Golledge, 1978; Ley, 1977; Wolpert, 1966), this thesis does not assume an economically rational decision-making model for the residential patterns of mixed-ethnicity couples. Instead, decisions about where to live are based on individuals’ and households’ unique perceptions of, and incomplete knowledge about, different places (Timmermans and Golledge, 1990). Thus, subjective place attributes also play a key role in choices about where to live (Lee et al., 1994). With this in mind, social dimensions of place, such as the presence of local family and friendship networks, are vital to understanding residential decisions (Fischer and Malmberg, 2001; Karsten, 2007). Following Savage et al. (2005) and Karsten (2007), this thesis conceptualises residential location as a means of identity construction. That is, people define their social position through where they decide to live (Savage et al., 2005). Residential location also conditions access to facilities, services and amenities that shape identity construction (Savage et al., 2005). Importantly, residential preferences shift throughout the life
course, particularly as needs for dwelling space change along with available economic resources (Prashker et al., 2008; Rossi, 1955; Stapleton, 1980). These broader theories of household residential mobility and decision-making have been useful for the present study, as mixed-ethnicity couples share many considerations with other households, when deciding where to live. However, they additionally need to negotiate multiple ethnic identities when making such decisions.

This thesis is also underpinned by an awareness that the relationship between household decision-making, and the broader society, is mutually constitutive. The residential decisions made by households in general, and mixed-ethnicity households in particular, are shaped by the society in which they live, but in turn also have implications for society. Indeed, Buzar et al. (2005: 426) identified the household as a powerful agent of urban transformation, stressing ‘the need for an increased emphasis on household demography within contemporary interpretations of urban spatial processes.’ By adopting a household-level approach (regarding mixed-ethnicity couples), this thesis seeks to reveal ‘how mixing at one scale [the household] affects mixing at others [the city]’ (Holloway et al., 2005: 301). In so doing, it provides a different lens through which to view segregation patterns in Australian cities, disrupting traditional interpretations of Australia’s ethnic residential geographies.

1.8.4 Theorising ethnic residential geographies at the household level

Following on from the above, a re-scaling of ethnic residential segregation research (to the household scale) requires a re-thinking the standard explanatory models of ethnic segregation (outlined in Section 1.8.2), which have largely been developed based on counts of ethnically diverse individuals. Cohabiting mixed-ethnicity couples undoubtedly complicate these existing
theories, yet standard ethnic segregation theories nonetheless remain informative for studies of mixed-ethnicity couples.

The question of choice versus constraint remains pertinent when studying mixed-ethnicity couples’ geographies. Following Wright et al. (2011), alongside recent (individual-focused) studies of ethnic residential segregation (McGarrigle and Kearns, 2009; Phillips, 2003; Ratcliffe, 2004), mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential patterns are likely an outcome of choices realised within the context of constraints. Some mixed-ethnicity couples may prefer to live in clustered ethnic communities—as per the ethnic enclave model (Portes and Jensen, 1987)—so that the ethnic minority partner (or mixed-ethnicity children) can reap the benefits of living near co-ethnic support and resources. Others may prefer to live in ethnically diverse residential locations that reflect the range of ethnic identities incorporated in their household (Wright et al., 2011), and may seek out such locations within their financial and other constraints. Yet racial and ethnic identities are ‘not just a matter of personal choice’ (Wright et al., 2011: 6).

Community perceptions regarding the appropriateness of ethnic mixing can constrain the residential choices available to mixed-ethnicity couples. Following the place stratification model, mixed-ethnicity couples may face discrimination in the housing market, although there is little existing scholarly evidence of this occurring in Australia. Nonetheless, in light of the ‘everywhere different’ geography of racism in Australia, mixed-ethnicity couples may avoid residential areas where they believe they, or their children, will receive negative attention. Literature on mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential patterns in the US certainly suggests that they avoid neighbourhoods dominated by single groups, and are more inclined to select places characterised by high levels of ethnic diversity, where residents are less concerned about maintaining traditional ethnic boundaries (Holloway et al., 2005; Wright et al., 2011). These various issues remain an open question in studies of mixed-ethnicity households in Australia,
due to the paucity of existing research on their residential geographies. This thesis responds to this gap, and questions of choice and constraint are given particular consideration in Chapter 7 of this thesis, which focuses on the drivers behind our research participants’ residential decisions.

The spatial assimilation model is also relevant to the study of mixed-ethnicity households. Its central argument is that, over time, ethnic minorities translate economic progress into residence in higher-amenity neighbourhoods with larger proportions of ethnic majority residents (Massey, 1985). Importantly, the spatial assimilation model is based on assimilation theory more generally, which positions intermarriage with the ethnic majority as the final stage in the assimilation process for ethnic minorities (Gordon, 1964). According to the spatial assimilation model, then, mixed-ethnicity couples involving ethnic minority and ethnic majority partners would be expected to have residential patterns that mirror those of the ethnic majority. This is following the logic that an intermarried ethnic minority partner would be considered completely assimilated. Yet as Wright et al. (2011) have pointed out, existing studies of the geographies of mixed-couples demonstrate that their residential distributions are unique, and do not fully conform to those of the ethnic majority (see also Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011; Tindale et al., 2014). With this in mind, the segmented assimilation approach may prove to be more relevant to the study of mixed-ethnicity couples.

The segmented assimilation approach explores ethnic minority groups’ different propensities towards spatial assimilation. It highlights the importance of avoiding broad over-arching categorisations, and of exploring group-specific histories, dynamics and pressures. This focus suggests that existing studies of mixed-ethnicity households would benefit from further disaggregation (rather than treating diverse mixed-ethnicity households as a homogeneous
group). The benefits of disaggregation are discussed in greater detail in Section 2.1. Chapters 3 and 4 also provide insights in this regard—signalling how mixed-ethnicity couples have distinctive geographies and propensities for spatial assimilation vis-à-vis broader ethnic minority populations, and also how different types of mixed-ethnicity couples (based on the ethnic minority partner’s background) have distinctive geographies from one another.

1.9 Overview of thesis chapters and contribution

Following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 discusses the quantitative and qualitative methods used to respond to the aims of the thesis. In that chapter, I detail the process of extracting census data on the residential locations of mixed-ethnicity couples. I explain how ‘mixed-ethnicity couples’ were conceptualised for the purposes of this study, and how that informed the key decisions that shaped the customised data request from the ABS. I then describe the various quantitative techniques used to analyse the census data. Lastly, Chapter 2 outlines the approaches adopted in recruiting interview participants, as well as the methods deployed in conducting and analysing the interviews.

Chapter 3 addresses Aim 1 of the thesis. It details the first stage of the quantitative analysis—a nationwide mapping of mixed-ethnicity couples across Australian cities and regions. It reveals that mixed-ethnicity couples are more widely dispersed across Australia than their comparative co-ethnic minority couples, and showcases the diverse residential geographies of different types of mixed-ethnicity couples. It points to particularly high concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples in inner-cities, but also finds that significant concentrations exist in non-metropolitan areas. This is an important contribution given that the bulk of international research has tended to focus on cities. The findings also indicate that mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential distributions across the urban ethnic landscape are characterised by intermediate
positions in relation to couples where both partners share the same ethnic background. This demonstrates that Holloway et al.’s (2005) US-based ‘in-between’ thesis finds support in the Australian context. Chapter 3 is presented in paper format, as published in *Australian Geographer* in 2017.

Chapter 4 addresses Aim 2, and comprises the second stage of the quantitative analysis. It builds on Chapter 3 by providing an analysis of a more narrowly-defined sub-set of mixed-ethnicity couples, with a focus on the Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne metropolitan areas. It also uses a separately-obtained customised dataset to analyse the residential patterns of each couple type subdivided according to gender and ethnicity, and the presence/absence of dependent children in the household. Chapter 4 adopts a more advanced statistical approach, conducting a series of negative binomial regressions to develop a more systematic understanding of the relationship between counts of mixed-ethnicity couples in local areas and other characteristics of those areas. It also highlights the value in using finer-grained ethnic group categories, underlining differences in residential patterning between different types of mixed-ethnicity couples that have generally been subsumed in existing studies. Chapter 4 is presented in paper format, as published in *Environment and Planning A* in 2018.

Chapter 5 responds to Aim 3 of the thesis. It builds on the earlier quantitative analyses of mixed-ethnicity couples, by mapping the geographies of mixed-ethnicity *individuals*—the offspring of such partnerships—in Greater Sydney. This is important given one of the key long-term effects of mixed-ethnicity partnerships is the increase in mixed-ethnicity individuals. Chapter 5 aims to explore the kinds of neighbourhoods in which mixed-ethnicity individuals settle. It draws on data extracted online through ABS TableBuilder, and thus allows greater flexibility. Chapter 5 adopts the same framework for ethnic group categorisation developed in
Chapter 3, except that it explores individuals’ combinations of stated ancestries, rather than ancestry combinations within partnerships. It utilises a smaller geographic level (SA2s\(^6\)), which enables a more sophisticated neighbourhood classification scheme that considers how ethnic diversity can occur alongside high concentrations of certain ethnic groups. The analysis finds that the ‘in-between’ thesis posited by Holloway et al. (2005) holds true for mixed-ethnicity individuals in Sydney. The findings also reveal how mixed-ethnicity individuals’ residential geographies are powerfully differentiated according to country of birth and educational attainment. The material in Chapter 5 consists of a paper presently under review at *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (revisions were submitted in February 2018).

Chapters 6 and 7 detail the qualitative component of the research project, which draws upon 48 interviews with 86 partners in mixed-ethnicity families in the cities of Darwin and Sydney—the two major Australian cities with the highest concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples, according to the quantitative analysis in Chapter 3. Chapter 6 provides an overview of the attributes of the interview participants, including their ethnic identities, parenting status, religious affiliations and countries of birth. It also describes the ethnic geographies of Darwin and Sydney, and where our participants lived within these urban contexts. It concludes with vignettes that tell the stories of two couples from within the interview sample. Chapter 6 provides context for Chapter 7, which addresses Aim 4 of the thesis. Chapter 7 provides a qualitative analysis of the residential preferences of mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Darwin. It reveals that mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential decisions are primarily driven by ‘conventional’ factors, common concerns that are shared by the broader population. These include dwelling characteristics and affordability, proximity to workplace and family, and

---

\(^6\) SA2s are the geographic units at Statistical Area Level 2 in the Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS). They are designed to represent local communities (ABS, 2011b), and are much smaller than the SA3s and SA4s used in the analyses of mixed-ethnicity couples in Chapters 3 and 4. Further details on geographical scale are provided in Chapter 2.
accessibility of services and amenities. This was a somewhat unexpected finding, given the emphasis placed on the importance of neighbourhood ethnic diversity in the international quantitative literature on mixed-ethnicity households. However, the interview material presented in Chapter 7 does reveal that mixed-ethnicity couples overwhelmingly perceive ethnic diversity as a positive neighbourhood attribute, and value it in a variety of ways that may have more subtle impacts on where they choose to live. The material in Chapter 7 consists of a paper under review at *Urban Geography*, submitted in March 2018.

Taken together, Chapters 3–7 reveal the previously ‘hidden’ geographies of a diverse range of mixed-ethnicity couples across Australia, through a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods. In so doing, they present new understandings of Australia’s ethnic residential geographies, highlighting where people of different ethnicities live together in the intimate space of the home. The findings also utilise the unique Australian context to speak back to theories of mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential geographies developed in recent decades in the US and UK. Practically, the analyses contribute to discussions about the spatially-contingent everyday experiences of mixed-ethnicity couples, by directing attention to the characteristics of residential areas in which such couples are more likely to live. Chapter 8 reflects on these contributions and explains how the thesis has addressed its aims. It also explains the project’s limitations and offers recommendations for areas of future research.
Chapter 2: Methodology

This thesis adopts a mixed methods approach to exploring the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals across Australia. In responding to Aims 1–3, this research project used data from the 2011 Australian Census of Population and Housing. This was paired with a qualitative approach (Aim 4), which drew upon semi-structured interviews with partners in mixed-ethnicity relationships, with a view to elucidating the factors driving their decisions about where to live. Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 7, which are presented in paper-format, each contain a methods section. The level of methodological detail provided in those papers was necessarily restricted due to journal word limits. This chapter provides more detailed insights into the research methods, hence there is some unavoidable repetition between this chapter, and the methods sections of subsequent chapters.

2.1 Data extraction: conceptualising ‘mixed-ethnicity’ in the Australian census

This section details the process by which census data were extracted for the analyses detailed in Chapters 3, 4 and 5. Chapters 3 and 4 present quantitative analyses of the geographic distribution of several types of mixed-ethnicity couples across Australia (addressing Aims 1 and 2). Data on mixed-ethnicity couples is not published or readily available from the ABS. To map the geographies of these couples, two customised datasets were requested and purchased from the ABS. I compiled detailed data requests specifying in considerable detail the data to be extracted from the census by ABS consultants. This research project thus faced a challenging question from the early stages of planning these census data requests: how should mixed-ethnicity couples be defined in the Australian context? The various stages involved in obtaining the two customised census datasets are described throughout this section. The main differences between the two are that the first utilised broad (region-level) ethnic groups in the Australian
Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups (ASCCEG) and covered the whole of Australia, while the second focussed on finer-grained (national-level) ethnic groups in the ASCCEG and incorporated additional socio-demographic variables, but was limited to Sydney and Melbourne. Chapter 3 draws on the first customised dataset, and Chapter 4 focuses on the second. The key decision-making stages involved in obtaining the first set of customised data are summarised in Figure 2.1, and explained below in Section 2.1.1. The second dataset drew on similar decisions, but with some key differences that are outlined in Section 2.1.2. The quantitative datasets for the Chapter 5 analysis focused on mixed-ethnicity individuals, and were obtained via an online ABS resource. This process is also detailed later (in Section 2.1.3).

Figure 2.1: Flow chart depicting decision-making process for first customised census data request.

### 2.1.1 Mixed-ethnicity couples: the first census data request

In designing the first customised census data request (analysed in Chapter 3), it was necessary to determine what constitutes a ‘couple’ for the purposes of this study. ‘Couples’ were defined...
as encompassing all cohabiting couples, including both formal and de facto marriages; same-sex and opposite-sex. In the Australian census, ‘cohabiting couple’ status is derived from the Relationship in Household variable, which identifies the relationship of each household member to the individual nominated as the household reference person. This approach is able to distinguish couples from non-related co-habiting adults such as housemates. The focus on cohabiting couples arose from the study’s focus on residential geographies. Further, the census does not collect data on other types of couples.

Second, it was necessary to decide which census variable was most useful for capturing Australians’ ethnic backgrounds. The Australian census collects data on the ethnic background of the population using questions on country of birth, language spoken at home, ancestry and Indigenous status. The former two questions are inadequate in capturing the ethnic backgrounds of second and later migrant generations, because they are incapable of recording the ethnicities of individuals who identify with their parents or grandparents’ country of birth, but were born in Australia and may not speak the native language of that group. In short, when taken in isolation, country of birth and language are not adequate proxies for ethnicity.

The analytical utility of the question on Indigenous status is limited, as it can only distinguish broadly between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations. The non-Indigenous population contains an extremely diverse array of groups (as indeed does the Indigenous Australian population). With this in mind, the census ancestry question was considered most appropriate for identifying the ethnic origins of the population in this study. This seemed fitting given that the ABS itself classifies responses to the ancestry question according to the Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups (ASCCEG). The ancestry question allows respondents to openly nominate the ethnic group with which they identify at the time of the
The ancestry question instructs respondents to consider the origins of their parents and grandparents, and allows up to two open responses. Importantly, there are no restrictions on the ‘scale’ of ancestry responses—so, for instance, a person may refer to himself as Nigerian, or (at a finer-grained scale) as Ibo. This is consistent with the conceptualisation of ethnicity as fluid and highly personal (as discussed in Chapter 1, Section 1.8.1). Indeed, a key strength of the Australian census is that it recognises the complex and personal nature of ethnicity by allowing individuals to self-identify their ancestry, and to nominate two ancestries where relevant. The multiple-response option enriched the data and analysis presented in this thesis and its constituent papers/chapters. It offered scope to consider individuals with complex migration histories and multifaceted identities; for example, a Malaysian immigrant who was raised in Indonesia before relocating to Australia, may report their ancestry as both Malaysian and Indonesian. However, there were ensuing complications in defining who belonged to which ethnic group for the purposes of identifying a mixed-ethnicity couple. The method of including multiple-ancestry individuals in the data request is detailed later in this section.

The next step in designing the customised census data request was to define the ethnic group categories that would be drawn upon when defining a ‘mixed-ethnicity couple’ for the purposes of this research project. This was challenging because the ASCCEG includes over 300 separate ancestries at its most detailed level, which generally equate to national origins such as ‘Indian’ or ‘German’. It was beyond the scope, budget and timeframe of this project to explore every possible combination of ethnicities (at that level of detail). The decision about which couples to incorporate in this study was framed around a simple premise: not all combinations of ethnicities are considered equally transgressive of social norms in contemporary Australian society (as noted in Section 1.4). While prejudice against ethnic mixing persists in Australian society, couples comprised of ‘visibly different’ ethnicities are most likely to receive negative
attention from strangers (Luke and Luke, 1998). For example, a couple consisting of a German partner and an Anglo-Australian partner are ostensibly a mixed-ethnicity couple, but would be unlikely to experience discrimination on that basis. However, a couple involving an Anglo-Australian partner and a Nigerian partner may be at risk of such experiences, based on their visible differences. Given the potential link between exposure to (or fear of) discrimination and residential decision-making (Charles, 2006; Dalmage, 2000; Phillips, 2006), a decision was made to focus on this particular sub-set of mixed-ethnicity couples (that is, visibly different mixed-ethnicity couples).

As noted above, and following Klocker and Stanes (2013), the census data request focused on couples who had ‘crossed’ a socially salient ethnic boundary. Although visible difference was useful as an over-arching premise in deciding where such boundaries fell, there is an immense array of potential pairings of ethnicities that would be considered ‘visibly different’. To keep the research at a manageable scope, the requested census data could only focus on a limited number of combinations. Therefore, ‘new racism’ concepts of ethnic ‘in-groups’ and ‘out-groups’ were deployed to determine which combinations of ethnicities are most likely to transgress socially and culturally meaningful ethnic boundaries in contemporary Australian society (Dunn et al., 2004; Jayasuriya, 2002; Klocker and Stanes, 2013; Markus, 2001). Broadly speaking, the ‘in-group’ (or ethnic majority group) comprises the dominant cultural group in a society, while ‘out-groups’ (or ethnic minority groups) are those frequently perceived to be culturally incompatible with the dominant group (Jayasuriya, 2002; Markus, 2001). In public spaces, visible difference is pivotal in causing people of certain ethnicities to be identified as an ‘out-group’, because ‘[r]acisms and racializing practices occur, in the first instance of public encounters, on the basis of outward appearance and embodiment: dress and physical features’ (Luke, 2003: 381).
For the purposes of this study, mixed-ethnicity couples were defined as those in which one partner was from the ethnic majority ‘in-group’, and one was from a (visibly different) ethnic minority ‘out-group’. Couples involving partners from two visibly different ‘out-groups’ were not included in the data request, in part because they would likely be too few in number to analyse across geographic areas. It would also have created a prohibitively long list of different ‘types’ of mixed-ethnicity couples to explore, given word limits in journal articles. Finally, such an approach would have increased the cost of the customised census data request to an unaffordable level, given the project budget. Table 2.1 lists each of the ethnic groups incorporated in the census data request, and their included ancestries, based on the ASCCEG (see Appendix 1, page 282, for a detailed list of all ancestry codes used in classifying ethnic groups for this data request). However, the ASCCEG does not classify groups according to their perceived ‘in-group’ or ‘out-group’ status. The following sections details the evidence that was used to populate these categories in the present study.

In Australia, Farquharson (2007) has defined the ethnic ‘in-group’ as the ‘definitely white’ category, which includes only those of Anglo-Celtic or Northern European heritage. In this thesis, this group is labelled ‘Anglo-European’ and is also referred to as the ethnic majority across the various chapters. As shown in Table 2.1, for the purposes of this study it included all ancestries under the following ASCCEG categories: Australian; New Zealander; North-West European; and Caucasian, so described. The Anglo-European group represented 70 per cent of Australia’s population in 2011. Broad (regional level) ethnic ‘out-groups’ were defined based on prior surveys of racist attitudes in Australia (Forrest and Dunn, 2006): Pacific Islander; North African and Middle Eastern (NA/ME); Southern and Central (SC) Asian

---

7 The term ‘ethnic majority’ is used in this thesis to refer to the culturally and numerically dominant (Anglo-European) ethnic group in Australian society. Yet it is important to acknowledge that the culturally dominant ethnic group may not form a numerical majority of the population in other places (for example, the white population in many US cities).
(excluding Anglo-Indian); South-East (SE) Asian; North-East (NE) Asian; and Sub-Saharan (SS) African (excluding Zimbabwean, Afrikaans, South African). Throughout this thesis, these groups are referred to using these specific labels, or (when taken as a whole) as ethnic minority groups. In terms of the composition of these groups, the Pacific Islander group included all ancestries under the ASCCEG categories Maori, Melanesian and Papuan, Micronesian and Polynesian (Table 2.1). The other ‘out-groups’ mentioned above all matched the existing ‘broad’ categories provided in the ASCCEG, but some national-origin ancestries were excluded (as listed above; see also Table 2.1) if they did not fit neatly with the visible difference premise underpinning this research. For example, we excluded South Africans from the Sub-Saharan African group because it was not possible to distinguish between black and white South Africans based on census responses. All individuals who stated any ancestry coded as ‘inadequately described’ were also excluded.

Table 2.1: Ethnic group classifications for first census data request (used in Chapter 3 analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group name</th>
<th>Included ancestry categories from ASCCEG</th>
<th>Examples of included national-level ancestries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European (ethnic majority)</td>
<td>Australian; New Zealander (excluding Maori); North-West European; Caucasian (so described).</td>
<td>Australian; New Zealander; English; German; Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander (ethnic minority)</td>
<td>Maori; Melanesian and Papuan; Micronesian; Polynesian</td>
<td>Papua New Guinean; Fijian; Samoan; Tongan, Tahitian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North African and Middle Eastern (ethnic minority)</td>
<td>North African and Middle Eastern</td>
<td>Lebanese; Iraqi; Sudanese; Iranian; Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Asian (ethnic minority)</td>
<td>South-East Asian (excluding Anglo-Burmese)</td>
<td>Vietnamese; Filipino; Indonesian; Thai; Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Asian (ethnic minority)</td>
<td>North-East Asian</td>
<td>Chinese, Taiwanese, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern and Central Asian (ethnic minority)</td>
<td>Southern and Central Asian (excluding Anglo-Indian)</td>
<td>Indian; Nepalese; Pakistani; Bangladeshi; Afghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan African (ethnic minority)</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan African (excluding Afrikaner; South African; Zimbabwean)</td>
<td>Ghanaian; Nigerian; Congolese; Ethiopian; Tanzanian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data request also omitted two other ancestry groups who could not reliably be classified as belonging to either the ‘in-group’ or an ‘out-group’, and whose ‘visible difference’ from the (white) ethnic majority could not be reliably predicted: North and South Americans, and Southern and Eastern Europeans. North and South Americans were excluded because there are sizeable white and non-white populations in countries within those regions, and these populations could not be reliably distinguished using census data. Southern and Eastern Europeans were omitted for more complex, contextual reasons. Southern and Eastern Europeans are a numerically large group in contemporary Australian society, and recent research suggests they are among the least likely groups to experience racism (Blair et al., 2017). However, historically, Southern and Eastern European communities such as Greeks and Italians have struggled in the face of previous assimilation policies that privileged Anglo-Celtic values (Collins, 1999; Johnson, 2002). Overall, Southern and Eastern Europeans have been perceived as an ‘intermediate’ group, not definitively accepted as part of the dominant (white) Anglo-Celtic culture, but certainly not subjected to the same racialisation processes as migrants from Africa, the Middle East and various parts of Asia (Farquharson, 2007).

Unfortunately, it was not possible to include Aboriginal Australians as a separate category in the census data request, despite the fact that relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians undoubtedly constitute mixed-ethnicity partnerships. This exclusion occurred on the basis that the ancestry question does not effectively identify Aboriginal Australians—many of whom identify their ancestry as ‘Australian’, and record their indigeneity using the separate census question on Indigenous status (Khoo and Lucas, 2004). Other studies have analysed how rates of out-partnering vary geographically for Indigenous persons using that census question (Biddle, 2013; Heard et al., 2009; Walker and Heard, 2015). Although those approaches differ from that adopted in this thesis, it was not possible within
the scope or budget of this project to map the residential distributions of Indigenous/non-Indigenous couples because this would have necessitated a separate data request using the Indigenous status variable. That being said, the qualitative component of the study, which extended an open-invitation to mixed-ethnicity couples to participate, did incorporate a number of couples involving an Indigenous and non-Indigenous partner.

It is important to note here that, unlike many other studies, this research project made a concerted effort to include individuals of multiple ancestries in the analysis of mixed-ethnicity couples, as such individuals comprised 32 per cent of the Australian population in 2011. This introduced a key challenge when defining ‘mixed-ethnicity couples’ for the customised data request, because multiple-ancestry individuals may have stated ancestries in two of the ethnic groups defined above. For example, consider a couple in which one partner stated Irish (in the Anglo-European category) and Vietnamese (in the South-East Asian category) as their ancestries, and the other stated only Vietnamese. It is unlikely that those partners would be considered to have crossed a socially and culturally meaningful ethnic boundary, given they share a common (Vietnamese) ancestry. To avoid counting couples as ‘mixed-ethnicity’ when they had overlapping ancestries, the census data request only included multiple-ancestry individuals who stated both ancestries within the same broad ethnic group. For example, a person who nominated Welsh and German as their ancestries would be included in the Anglo-European category, because both of those national-level ancestries were classified as Anglo-European. However, a person who nominated Welsh (in the Anglo-European category) and Japanese (in the North-East Asian category) would be excluded from the analysis. Similarly, an individual who stated two ancestries in different ethnic minority categories (e.g. Indian and Filipino) would be excluded. This approach, while excluding some mixed-ethnicity individuals, ultimately included the overwhelming majority of multiple-ancestry persons. Of
all partnered multiple-ancestry persons who stated at least one ancestry from the seven regional-level ethnic groups (detailed in Table 2.1), 82.4 per cent stated both ancestries in the same group and were therefore included. Many of the multiple-ancestry individuals who were excluded from this analysis are included in Chapter 5, which focuses on mixed-ethnicity individuals who stated one Anglo-European ancestry and another ancestry from an ethnic minority category.

The customised dataset generated counts of six different ‘types’ of mixed-ethnicity couples across geographic regions (detailed in Section 2.2). Because all mixed-ethnicity couples in the analysis involved an Anglo-European partner, these different types of mixed-ethnicity couples are distinguished by the ethnicity of the ethnic minority partner. For example, the term ‘mixed NE Asian’ couple is used throughout this thesis to refer to a couple incorporating an Anglo-European partner and a NE Asian partner. Following this nomenclature, the other five mixed-ethnicity couple types incorporated in the analysis included: mixed Pacific Islander, mixed North African and Middle Eastern (abbreviated as mixed NA/ME), mixed South and Central Asian (mixed SC Asian), mixed South-East Asian (mixed SE Asian) and mixed sub-Saharan African (mixed SS African).

The first customised dataset also included counts of two types of mixed-ethnicity couples (and their corresponding co-ethnic couples) based on national-level ethnic minority groups: mixed Vietnamese couples and mixed Filipino couples. These were included in the Chapter 3 analysis because the Filipino and Vietnamese communities more broadly have quite different geographical distributions across Australia. Chapter 3 considers how these differences translate to mixed-ethnicity couples with a Filipino or Vietnamese partner. The customised data also included tables depicting counts of co-ethnic couples—that is, couples in which both partners
shared the same ethnic background (using the same categories as for mixed-ethnicity couples). These are used to draw comparisons and contrasts with mixed-ethnicity couples, in turn demonstrating the distinctive residential patterns associated with mixed-ethnicity partnerships. Co-ethnic couples are labelled according to the relevant ethnic group. For example, a co-ethnic Pacific Islander couple consists of two Pacific Islander partners.

2.1.2 Mixed-ethnicity couples: the second census data request

As noted earlier, the quantitative analysis detailed in Chapter 4 relied on a slightly different customised dataset. That analysis adopted finer-grained ethnic minority categories (at the national rather than regional level of the ASCCEG) that could shed light on distinctive residential patterns amongst groups that have often been conflated within the broader ‘white’ and ‘Asian’ categories in international census-based research on the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples (e.g. Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011). It is important to note that such conflation has often occurred out of necessity, based on data restrictions imposed by national statistical agencies. Chapter 4 responds to those authors’ calls for studies that investigate the geographies of select, or disaggregated, types of mixed-ethnicity couples. The census data request for this project incorporated counts of couples where one partner was Anglo-European and the other was: Lebanese, Vietnamese, Filipino, Chinese or Indian. These groups were selected because they meet the criteria outlined above (in terms of visible difference / ‘out-group’ status), and because they have sufficiently large populations in Australia to enable geographical analysis. Further, those of Lebanese ethnicity are typically subsumed within the broader ‘white’ category in international studies, while the latter four groups are often collectively counted as ‘Asian’. Individuals who stated multiple ancestries were again included, using the same approach adopted in the first customised data request (see Section 2.1.1). The methods section of Chapter 4 provides extensive detail on how this
approach was applied in the second customised data request (see Section 4.4). To avoid unnecessary repetition, that information is not repeated here.

Keeping in mind Vertovec’s (2007) concept of ‘super-diversity’, the analysis presented in Chapter 4 also aims to demonstrate how the geographies of these finer-grained mixed-ethnicity couple types might vary according to other axes of difference, namely: the ethnicity of the male/female partner, and the presence or absence of dependent children in the home (Aim 2). The gender variable was chosen because existing research in the US has revealed gender asymmetries in the neighbourhood locations of mixed-race couples (Wright et al., 2013). The racial composition of mixed-race households’ neighbourhoods has been shown to reflect the race of the male partner. There is also evidence that family composition affects where mixed-ethnicity couples decide to live. Studies have shown that those with children are drawn to ethnically diverse residential areas (Caballero et al., 2008; Twine, 1999). With this in mind, the customised data request was designed to enable each of the five mixed-ethnicity couple types, mentioned above, to be further sub-divided according to those additional demographic variables. While it would have been desirable to incorporate other socio-demographic variables in the data request, this was not possible due to the project budget. As in the customised data for Chapter 3, co-ethnic couples were included as points of comparison, and are similarly labelled according to the relevant ethnic group, for instance ‘co-ethnic Lebanese couples’ and ‘co-ethnic Vietnamese couples’.

2.1.3 Mixed-ethnicity individuals: extracting data using ABS TableBuilder

For the analysis of mixed-ethnicity individuals (Chapter 5), four of the same ‘broad’ (regional) ethnic groupings (as described for the first set of customised data on mixed-ethnicity couples) were used. A mixed-ethnicity individual was defined as someone who stated two ancestries,
one from the Anglo-European category, and the other from one of the following broad ethnic minority categories: NA/ME, SC Asian, SE Asian or NE Asian. These are ostensibly the offspring of mixed-ethnicity couples analysed in Chapter 3. However, since the data in this case were counts of individuals rather than couples, it was possible to extract user-generated tables of customised census data using TableBuilder—a free, online ABS resource—rather than formulating a separate customised census data request. Aim 1 (outlined in Section 1.6) sought to explore the residential choices of mixed-ethnicity individuals, thus ‘dependent children’—defined by the ABS (2011c) as those aged under 15, or full-time students aged 15-24 years residing with their parents/guardians—were excluded from this analysis. This facilitated a focus on individuals who would likely be involved in the residential decision-making process. Again, attuned to Vertovec’s (2007) notion of super-diversity, these tables were cross-classified according to demographic variables, in this case: the individual’s country of birth (overseas or Australia) and highest level of educational attainment (lower than a bachelor’s degree; bachelor’s degree and higher). Those variables were selected in light of evidence that residential geographies tend to be more dispersed among later immigrant generations, and those with higher socio-economic status (Edgar, 2014; Johnston et al., 2017). The following section explains which geographic units were selected for this dataset, and for the customised data requests.
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8 The volume of data extracted for the analysis of mixed-ethnicity individuals limited the number of ethnic minority categories that could be explored, in sufficient detail, in a single paper/chapter. I chose to exclude the categories ‘Pacific Islander’ and ‘Sub-Saharan African’ (that were utilised in defining mixed-ethnicity couples in Table 2.1) from this analysis of the geographies of mixed-ethnicity individuals. This decision was made in part because, following the analysis in Chapter 4, I preferred to continue to focus on Asian sub-groups that have often been conflated within a single ‘Asian’ group in existing studies, and the North African and Middle Eastern group, which is often hidden within the ‘white’ category. Although NA/ME, NE Asian, SE Asian and SC Asian are broader categories than used in Chapter 4 (being at the regional level, rather than national), they still offer a degree of categorical nuance absent from much international research.
2.2 Data extraction: decisions about geographic scale

Decisions about which geographic scales to use when requesting and extracting the census datasets were more complex than simply finding the most fine-grained scale available. These decisions involved a trade-off between the granularity of spatial units and the validity of the resulting data. To avoid the release of data that could be used to identify an individual, the ABS slightly adjusts all cells in census data tables in a technique known as ‘introduced random error’ (see ABS, 2011c). These random adjustments have the most significant impact on small cell counts. While the overall reliability of the tables is not compromised, the ABS advises census data users not to place reliance on small cell counts. This restricts the level of detail that can be appropriately used when designing customised datasets. For this project, it was important that counts of mixed-ethnicity couples were cross-classified according to geographic units that were small enough to facilitate meaningful spatial analysis, but not so small that the resulting data tables would contain a proliferation of small cell counts. These decisions also involved careful consideration of the granularity of ethnic groups being used to define mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals, and whether additional socio-demographic categories were going to be incorporated into the tables. For example, adopting broader ethnic groups would increase the total counts of each couple type, reducing the risk of obtaining large amounts of small cells when working at a finer geographic scale. However, this approach necessitates making a compromise on the granularity of the ethnic groups that can be considered (and vice versa).

After careful consideration of the factors noted above, the following decisions were made about geographic scale for each stage of the analysis. For the first customised census data request (Australia-wide; Chapter 3), two different types of geographic areas were selected. These are based on the Main Structure of the Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS), the framework the ABS uses for the dissemination of geographically classified data (ABS, 2011b).
In Australia’s five largest Greater Capital City Statistical Areas (Greater Sydney, Greater Melbourne, Greater Brisbane, Greater Adelaide and Greater Perth), Statistical Area Level 3 (SA3) was used. For simplicity, those metropolitan areas are often referred to throughout the thesis as Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, and so on. In metropolitan areas, SA3s represent ‘clusters of related suburbs’ (ABS, 2011b: 25). The 165 SA3s included across those five cities had a mean resident population of 81,283. The coarser Statistical Area Level 4 (SA4) geography was used for all areas outside those cities, in anticipation of lower counts of mixed-ethnicity couples in those parts of the country, and lower population densities more generally. SA4s are the aggregate of multiple SA3s and, according to the ABS (2011b) are designed to reflect labour markets. There were 44 SA4s included, with a mean population of 182,817. As discussed above, the second data request (the focus of Chapter 4) included finer-grained (national-level) ethnic minority categories, and additionally sub-divided each couple type by gender configurations and the presence/absence of dependent children. To support such fine-grained disaggregation, the geographic units were restricted to the 86 SA3s covering Australia’s two most populous and ethnically diverse cities—Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne (mean SA3 population 97,578). The data on mixed-ethnicity individuals (analysed in Chapter 5) was extracted at the more detailed Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2) geography, but limited to Greater Sydney. This was possible because counts of mixed-ethnicity individuals across Greater Sydney were sufficiently large to support disaggregation across the city’s 265 SA2s (mean population 16,572). This also allowed Chapter 5 to give greater attention to the specific patterns occurring within one city.

2.3 Geographical analyses: making sense of the census data

In Chapters 3, 4 and 5, geographic concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals are depicted through locations quotients (LQs). These are easily-interpretable ratios that
indicate whether the proportion of a sub-population of interest living in an area is above or below the average for the wider geographic context. The LQ formula can be found in the methods sections of those chapters (Sections 3.4, 4.4 and 5.5 of this thesis). Each of the chapters also uses cartography to visually portray the spatial distribution of mixed-ethnicity couples and mixed-ethnicity individuals of different types. Beyond these commonalities, diverse analyses were conducted for each quantitative chapter, and are outlined briefly below.

Chapter 3 presents nation-wide LQ maps of each broadly-defined mixed-ethnicity couple type, alongside their comparative co-ethnic minority couple type. For instance, maps depicting concentrations of mixed NE Asian couples are paired with maps showing concentrations of co-ethnic NE Asian couples. This comparison visually demonstrates how understandings of ethnic diversity, across space, shift when researchers look inside households. Chapter 3 also includes tables showing the percentage distributions of the various mixed-ethnicity couple types considered, across SA3s in the five largest metropolitan areas. Percentage distributions are grouped according to: overall ethnic diversity (measured using the index of standard entropy); co-ethnic minority share of SA3; and socio-economic status (based on median household income). These provide three different windows through which to view the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples. The index of standard entropy indicates the degree to which ethnic groups are equally present in a geographic area; higher values occur when there is greater evenness in the shares of each ethnic group, and thus greater diversity (White, 1986; Wright et al., 2011). The advantage of the entropy index is that it considers the ‘multiplicity of groups’ in an area, rather than focussing on the degree of dominance of a single reference group (Holloway et al., 2012a: 69). In the analyses presented in this thesis, it reveals the extent to which mixed-ethnicity couples live in areas that are ethnically diverse. The index of standard entropy is used in Chapters 3, 4 and 5, and its formula can be found in the methods sections of those chapters (Sections 3.4, 4.4 and 5.5). The co-ethnic minority share of each SA3 refers to
the percentage of each SA3 population who is from the same ethnic group as the ethnic minority partner in the couples under consideration. When contrasted with the respective co-ethnic minority couples, this analysis indicates the degree to which mixed-ethnicity partnerships are associated with residence outside areas with the greatest concentrations of the relevant ethnic minority group. Lastly, the distribution of mixed-ethnicity couples across SA3s according to median household income reveals an additional aspect to their residential outcomes beyond the ethnic landscape. This is important considering the spatial assimilation model, which holds that ethnic minorities attain residence in higher socio-economic status areas once they have achieved structural and cultural assimilation (Massey and Denton, 1985).

Chapter 4 similarly maps LQs of mixed-ethnicity couples (using finer-grained, national-level, ethnic categories) alongside those of their comparative co-ethnic minority couples. It also includes tabular analyses of the percentage distribution of each couple type across SA3s in Sydney and Melbourne, grouped according to: the relevant ethnic minority group’s share of the SA3 population; and overall ethnic diversity (using standard entropy). Additionally, it explores distributions across SA3s classified according to the Anglo-European share of the population. This provides a third perspective on how mixed-ethnicity couples are distributed across the ethnic landscapes of Sydney and Melbourne. It reveals the degree to which mixed-ethnicity couples live in areas dominated by members of the Anglo-European ethnic majority. This is relevant in light of existing research linking mixed-ethnicity partnerships to residence outside neighbourhoods dominated by single ethnic groups (Holloway et al., 2005).

Chapter 4 also goes beyond descriptive statistical approaches, applying a modelling procedure to systematically explore the relationships between counts of mixed-ethnicity couples in each SA3 and a range of explanatory variables. Negative binomial regression was selected as the
most suitable approach, because the dependent variables consisted of overdispersed count data—that is, the variances of the dependent variables greatly exceeded their respective means (Wright et al. 2011). The explanatory variables included the SA3 percentages belonging to each partner’s ethnic group, population density (indicating position within the urban morphology) and the percentage of residents with a bachelor’s degree (indicating socio-economic status). The total number of couples in each SA3 was included to control for population size, and a dummy variable controlled for potential metropolitan-area variations between Sydney and Melbourne. The modelling approach was chosen in order to ascertain whether there was a significant association between the prevalence of mixed-ethnicity couples in each SA3 and the share of each partner’s respective ethnic group, after controlling for the other SA3 characteristics listed above. Further details of this approach are provided in Chapter 4, Section 4.5.5.

The analysis in Chapter 5 (the final quantitative chapter in this thesis) largely rests upon a neighbourhood classification scheme adapted from Holloway et al. (2012a) and previously applied by Wright et al. (2011), in their study of mixed-race couples in the US. This approach can reveal locations where diversity and segregation intersect at points across the city, rather than being viewed as endpoints on a continuum of ethnic or racial dominance (Holloway et al. 2012a). That is, there are multiple forms of neighbourhood diversity, depending on which group is numerically dominant (if any). For example, two neighbourhoods may register identical diversity values according to the index of scaled entropy, but whites are the largest group in one and blacks the largest in the other. In Holloway et al.’s (2012a) scheme, census tracts are first classified as low, moderate or high diversity based on the index of scaled entropy, then low and moderate diversity tracts are further sub-divided according to which racial group is dominant (e.g. low-diversity, white-dominant; moderate diversity, black-dominant).
In Chapter 5, Holloway et al.’s (2012a) scheme is adapted to develop base maps depicting Sydney’s geography of compositional ethnic diversity. The adapted scheme similarly groups SA2s into low, moderate and high diversity based on the index of scaled entropy. The class break values used in this classification are slightly different to those used by Holloway et al. (2012a), mainly due to the different number of groups used in calculating the entropy index. They are defined in the methods section of Chapter 5 (Section 5.5.2). The key difference from Holloway et al.’s (2012a) approach is in the second step of the classification process. It is extremely rare for any ethnic minority group to numerically dominate in any of Sydney’s SA2s. In almost all SA2s, either Anglo-Europeans form the majority of the population, or no group forms the majority. Thus, SA2s that contain the largest concentrations of ethnic minority groups are more effectively identified using a 10 per cent threshold in the Australian context. Yet there are SA2s where multiple ethnic minority groups form 10 per cent or higher shares of the local population. Hence, a decision was made to construct separate classifications with respect to each ethnic minority group. For example, in the NE Asian classification, moderate and high diversity SA2s were sub-divided according to whether NE Asians formed 10 per cent or more of the SA2 population. Low diversity SA2s were not further sub-divided because none had 10 per cent or larger shares of any ethnic minority group. This resulted in five classes of SA2s: low-diversity; moderate-diversity (low NE Asian); moderate-diversity (high NE Asian); high-diversity (low NE Asian); and high-diversity (high NE Asian). Equivalent classes were generated for the other ethnic minority groups in the analysis (i.e. SE Asian, NA/ME, SC Asian). High concentrations (or ‘hotspots’) of different types of mixed-ethnicity individuals were mapped on top of their respective base layers.

The mapping approach in Chapter 5 is accompanied by a series of negative binomial regression models that assess relationships between counts of mixed-ethnicity individuals in SA2s and
their ethnic composition, while controlling for other SA2 attributes. The percentage belonging to the respective ethnic minority group and the index of scaled entropy (defined above) were included as measures of SA2 ethnic composition. Other explanatory variables included: median weekly household income; percentage living in owner-occupied dwellings (indicating SA2 socio-economic status); population density (indicating the position of each SA2 within the metropolitan area structure); percentage aged 65 and over (to account for SA2 age structure); and the total number of residents in each SA2 (to control for total population size). Due to concerns about multicollinearity, the SA2 percentage Anglo-European was excluded given its high correlation with the index of scaled entropy. There were also concerns about spatial autocorrelation in the dependent variables, so spatial lags of each dependent variable were included in their respective models. Akin to the regression analysis in Chapter 4, this modelling approach was able to reveal whether SA2 ethnic composition had significant effects on the presence of mixed-ethnicity individuals, independent of the effects of the SA2 socio-demographic characteristics.

2.4 Beyond the census: interviewing mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Darwin

The census-based analyses were able to reveal spatial patterns of residence for mixed-ethnicity couples at the aggregate level, but were unable to elucidate causal factors driving these patterns. In light of this limitation, the final methodological component of this study complemented the quantitative approaches outlined above through 48 semi-structured interviews with 86 adults in mixed-ethnicity families. This approach addressed Aim 4 of the thesis, to explore factors influencing the residential decision-making processes of mixed-ethnicity couples. The
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9 Spatial lags for each dependent variable were constructed in GeoDa as the average of counts in neighbouring SA2s according to rook contiguity.
interviews were conducted between 2014 and 2017. My supervisor (Dr Natascha Klocker) and I jointly conducted 25 of the 48 interviews, because they also provided data for the broader research project (led by Dr Klocker) encompassing this PhD. I conducted a further 11 interviews by myself, and Dr Klocker conducted an additional 12 by herself. All of these interviews were aggregated into a joint dataset that we analysed separately.

Two cities, Darwin and Sydney, were chosen as sites for the qualitative component of this project because—out of all major Australian cities—they have the two highest concentrations of the mixed-ethnicity couple types incorporated in the census data requests and analyses outlined above. The two cities also provide different contexts for exploring the residential decision-making of mixed-ethnicity couples. Both cities have ethnically diverse populations. Along with Melbourne, Sydney has been the predominant settlement destination for migrants to Australia over the past several decades (Edgar, 2014), and Darwin is the closest major Australian city to South-East Asia contributing to a sizeable migrant intake from that region. Yet the two cities have contrasting urban forms. Sydney had a resident population of 4.8 million in 2016, and as such its suburbs exhibit considerable variation in their levels of ethnic diversity, socio-economic characteristics and socio-political attitudes. By contrast, Darwin is a small city (137,000 residents in 2016) and has not seen the persistence of ethnic clusters, in part due to two historical events that destroyed and thence re-shaped the city: World War Two and Cyclone Tracy in 1974. Luke and Luke (1998: 735) argued that ‘the destruction and reconstruction of material spaces…destroyed people’s place-bound histories’. The two cities present entirely different urban ethnic landscapes within which mixed-ethnicity couples make decisions about where to live. The differences between these two cities allow the qualitative component of this study to shed light on a broader array of residential decision-making experiences.
Consistent with the focus of the census data analysis, participant recruitment was targeted at couples in which the partners had ‘visibly different’ ethnicities. We conducted an additional two interviews that were excluded from this thesis because the couples did not meet the criteria of visible difference. As noted earlier in this chapter, couples with visibly different partners are at greater risk of receiving negative attention in public settings on the basis of their outward appearance, which may play into decisions about where to live (Luke and Luke, 1998).

Recruitment methods in Sydney included a blog post promoted through social media and a paid advertisement on the website Gumtree10, although these were largely unsuccessful. The overwhelming majority of Sydney participants were recruited through my personal networks and those of my primary supervisor, and subsequent snowballing. In Darwin, recruitment occurred through media promotion via an interview on local radio (Appendix 2, page 283) and in a local newspaper (Appendix 3, page 284). Additionally, a large proportion of Darwin participants were recruited with assistance from the Multicultural Council of the Northern Territory. The resulting samples (in Sydney and Darwin) included participants from a diverse range of ethnic backgrounds, which are detailed in the participant attribute tables in Chapter 6 (Tables 6.1 and 6.2) and Chapter 7 (Tables 7.1 and 7.2). Our recruitment efforts in Sydney yielded a small number of participants who lived in the Illawarra, a coastal urban region that borders the Sydney metropolitan area to the south. Given the close proximity of the Illawarra to Sydney (so much so, that many residents commute between Sydney and the Illawarra for work on a daily basis), these participants were included as part of the Sydney sample. However, they are clearly distinguished in the participant attribute tables.

Interviews were conducted only after participants gave informed consent to being part of the research project. All were provided with a Participant Information Sheet (Appendix 4, pages
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10 Gumtree is an online classifieds website on which users can post advertisements.
285–286) that explained the purpose of the research, the topics being explored, and what participation in the research would involve. The consent form provided participants the option to consent to participate in an interview either as an individual or as a couple. There were 38 couples in which both partners chose to participate, and in all cases, they chose to be interviewed together. In the remaining 10 interviews, only one partner was available to participate. Nine of those interviews were with the female partner in the relationship, including four from an ethnic minority group, and five who identified in some way with the Anglo-European Australian ethnic majority. The remaining individual interview was with the husband of my primary supervisor, Natascha Klocker. He identifies as having African ancestry.

As this thesis informs a broader project headed by my primary supervisor, the interviews touched on a wide range of themes, only some of which are discussed in Chapters 6 and 7 of this thesis. On the whole, the interview schedule (see Appendix 5, pages 287–290) focussed on mixed-ethnicity couples’ engagements with the world around them, rather than their internal relationship dynamics. A key section of the interviews, that is of particular relevance to this thesis, sought to uncover the factors driving mixed-ethnicity couples’ decisions about where to live, and more broadly, to illuminate their residential preferences (see Questions 14–35 in Appendix 5). Questions in this section focussed on the interviewees’ housing histories, what made them decide to live in their current neighbourhoods, what they enjoyed about living in those neighbourhoods, and their everyday experiences across different parts of their suburb/city, including whether there are places where they feel particularly comfortable or uncomfortable as a mixed-ethnicity couple.

This section of the interviews included a mental mapping exercise. Also known as ‘sketch maps’ or ‘cognitive maps’, mental maps are ‘an individual’s cognitive representation[s] of
place’ (Brennan-Horley et al., 2010: 95; Tuan, 1975). Traditional mental mapping approaches ask participants to sketch free-hand maps of particular locations. However, following Brennan-Horley and Gibson (2009), this study adopted an alternative approach that involves providing participants with ‘accurate’ paper base maps. This approach allows interviewees to provide more spatially specific responses to interview questions, as the maps are used as ‘anchoring devices’ in spatially-oriented discussions (Brennan-Horley and Gibson, 2009: 2610). In our interviews, participants were presented with two paper base maps (one of their city and one of their local suburb), and were asked to use the maps to elucidate their experiences in different parts of the city/suburb, including where they feel particularly comfortable or uncomfortable as a mixed-ethnicity couple. Participants were provided with markers so they could draw on the maps as a means of expressing their answers visually.

The approach to the sketch mapping component of the interviews was intentionally open and flexible. Cognisant that participants would vary in their map literacy and level of comfort in using maps, we explained that drawing on the maps was an optional exercise. Some participants preferred just to use the maps as prompts for thinking about different locales within the city. Those who did conduct sketch-mapping were not provided with a list of restrictive instructions for how to draw on the maps. Instead, they were free to engage with the maps in ways they found most beneficial or intuitive. A total of 26 maps were generated across the 48 interviews. Figures 2.2 and 2.3 show examples of completed sketch maps. Darwin participants Fung and Steve used a single colour to indicate responses to questions about places they often visited in the city, and where they felt particularly comfortable or uncomfortable as a mixed-ethnicity couple (Figure 2.2). Sydney participants Malika and Johannes chose to use different colours to highlight places where they felt comfortable (green) or uncomfortable (red) as a mixed-ethnicity couple (Figure 2.3). In the planning stage of the research, we had envisaged using
these maps as both a tool for prompting rich place-based discussions in interviews, and also as a data source in their own right—the maps could be scanned, digitised and georeferenced for analysis of responses in a GIS (following Brennan-Horley and Gibson, 2009). However, due to significant variations in the extent and nature of participants’ engagements with the maps, it was not possible to use them for a systematic analysis. Instead, they served as an important anchor point and prompt both during interviews themselves, and when analysing the resultant interview transcripts.
Figure 2.2: Example of completed participant sketch map by Darwin participants, Fung and Steve.
Figure 2.3: Example of completed participant sketch map by Sydney participants, Malika and Johannes.
The interviews, which lasted between one and four hours, were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. They were conducted in English because all participants were competent English speakers. Participants were given the opportunity to review the transcripts and to withdraw any information they felt uncomfortable sharing. They were also able to indicate a preference for their real first name or a pseudonym to be used in research publications. Chapters 6 and 7, which draw on the interview data, adhere to these preferences. Pseudonyms are also used for all family members or friends who were mentioned during interviews, because they were unable to give informed consent.

I adopted a thematic analysis approach to exploring the interview data. Thematic analysis involves searching across a dataset for repeated patterns of meaning, using codes to organise the data into meaningful segments (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Presented in Chapter 7, the thematic analysis explored the factors that influenced mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential decision-making processes, addressing Aim 4 of the thesis. In the analysis, codes related to the various factors that shaped where the participants decided to live, and the factors that made a residential location enjoyable (or not). I thematically coded all 48 transcripts, beginning with \textit{a priori} codes developed on the basis of common themes in the existing literatures on residential mobility (e.g. job accessibility, dwelling affordability, proximity to family) and in the quantitative literature on the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples (e.g. neighbourhood ethnic diversity). I also developed inductive codes as I searched through the transcripts and identified emerging themes (e.g. the importance of social networks and climate-related factors). At the completion of the coding process, I revisited each transcript and tallied the number of interviews in which each theme was mentioned.
2.5 Conclusion

The mixed-methods approach adopted in this study allowed this thesis to respond to its aims. Aims 1–3 were addressed through quantitative methods drawing on census data. The combination of descriptive and modelling analyses established the aggregate settlement patterns of several different types of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals, and systematically explored the variables that may be driving those patterns. The interview-based approach (Aim 4) complemented those quantitative investigations by providing rich insights into mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential decision-making processes, insights that are not accessible through census data alone. Together, these research techniques demonstrated how a focus on mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals can shed new light on Australia’s ethnic geographies.
Chapter 3: Mapping the multiple geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia

Prelude I

Responding to Aim 1 of the thesis, this chapter presents the first-ever nation-wide mapping of the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples across Australia. The analysis draws upon the first set of customised 2011 census data ordered from the ABS, which focused on regional-level ethnic group classifications. It reveals previously hidden ethnic geographies and highlights the new insights that can be garnered through exploring the residential patterns of households rather than individuals. This nation-wide mapping was an important first step in the research process, as it provided a crucial starting point in planning subsequent phases of the project. The results provided a foundational understanding of which mixed-ethnicity couple types were most prevalent in different locations, and so shaped the design of the second customised dataset, which adopted a more detailed focus on national-level ethnic minority groups disaggregated according to gender configurations and family composition (see Chapter 4). The findings presented in this chapter also established Sydney and Darwin as the two major cities with the highest concentrations of visibly different mixed-ethnicity couples (as a percentage of all couples), informing the decision to select those cities as study sites for the qualitative, interview-based component of the thesis.

This chapter is a reproduction in full of the first paper published during my candidature:

As lead author on this paper, I was responsible for designing the customised census data request, analysing the data in Excel and QGIS, and writing the first full draft. Dr Klocker provided advice throughout the data collection and analysis processes, and we jointly edited the text to raise the article to a standard fit for publication. Although the text from the article is reproduced in full here, the Table and Figure numbers have been adjusted to fit within the structure of the thesis. In addition, the sections of the paper have been numbered to fit the broader structure of this thesis. There were several maps relevant to this analysis that were not included as figures in the paper due to space restrictions. They were accessible as Supplemental Files in the online version of the article, and have been included as Appendices in this thesis.
Abstract

Mixed-ethnicity partnerships are becoming increasingly common in Australia and other countries of high immigration. Formal and de facto marriages involving partners from different ethnic backgrounds are key indicators of decreasing social distance between groups. Yet mixed-ethnicity couples have received scant attention from Australian geographers. We use customised data from the 2011 Australian census to analyse the nation-wide distribution of several types of mixed-ethnicity couples. We focus on couples comprised of an Anglo-European (ethnic majority) partner, and a partner from a ‘visible’ ethnic minority group. Our analyses explore the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples vis-à-vis ‘co-ethnic couples’ (where partners share the same ethnicity). We find that mixed-ethnicity couples are more widely dispersed across Australian cities and regions than comparative co-ethnic couples. However, each type of mixed-ethnicity couple has its own unique residential pattern: there are multiple geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia. These distinctive patterns reflect the migration and settlement histories of the couples’ constituent ethnic groups, but also hold great potential to shift seemingly entrenched ethnic residential geographies in the present and future.

Keywords: mixed-ethnicity, census, diversity, segregation, households, residential geography, ancestry
3.1 Introduction

In Australia, decades of high immigration have contributed to a growing number of marriage partnerships (formal and de facto) involving individuals of different ethnic backgrounds: ‘mixed-ethnicity couples’. In 2006, 30 per cent of cohabiting Australian couples incorporated partners of different ancestries (Khoo, 2011). The prevalence of such partnerships has long been held as an indicator of the socio-cultural distance between ethnic groups (Bogardus, 1933). Indeed, Price (1982: 100) argued that intermarriage ‘breaks down ethnic exclusiveness and mixes the various ethnic populations more effectively than any other social process’. Mixed-ethnicity partnerships also contribute to social and demographic change. They can promote cross-cultural understanding in the partners’ wider family, friendship and community networks (Kalmijn, 1998) and contribute to shifts in the ethnic composition of a population through mixed-ethnicity offspring.

Opposition to mixed-ethnicity partnerships has waned in recent decades, but prejudice persists in segments of Australian society. For some, mixed-ethnicity couples undermine normative ethnic hierarchies and identities (Owen, 2002). In a survey of racist attitudes in Queensland and New South Wales, Forrest and Dunn (2006) found that 14 per cent of respondents thought it was not a good idea for people of different races to marry. These attitudes were geographically uneven (Forrest and Dunn, 2006). The everyday experiences of mixed-ethnicity couples (including their exposure to discrimination), may thus vary according to where they live, with likely implications for their residential decision-making processes. These assumptions have not yet been tested, because existing research on ethnic residential geographies in Australia has focused almost exclusively on counts of individuals (Edgar, 2014; Johnston et al., 2017), not couples. Such research effectively describes the degree to which individuals of different ethnicities share residential areas, but cannot illuminate the extent to
which ethnic ‘mixing’ occurs within the intimate sphere of the home. Shifting focus to the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples sheds light on the types of localities in which intimate interactions across ethnic boundaries are most common (Wright et al., 2003). In turn, evidence of the distinctive residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples, as outlined in this paper, signals their potential to alter broader ethnic residential geographies over time.

This paper presents the first nation-wide mapping of the residential distributions of mixed-ethnicity couples across Australia, using customised 2011 census data. We begin by reviewing research on Australia’s ethnic residential geographies, before discussing contemporary demographic trends in mixed-ethnicity partnering and existing international research on the residential geographies of these couples. The methods section describes our approach to mapping the geographies of the specific subset of mixed-ethnicity couples considered in our analysis (i.e. those comprised of one Anglo-European partner and one partner from an ethnic minority migrant background). Our results present new perspectives on Australia’s ethnic geographies. They show that ethnic minority persons with Anglo-European partners have distinctive residential distributions, which are less concentrated than those of ethnic minority persons with co-ethnic partners. International studies indicate that these unique patterns likely reflect mixed-ethnicity couples’ preferences for certain types of neighbourhoods (Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011; Wright et al., 2011). Our results additionally reveal that there are multiple geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples, contingent upon the ethnic groups involved. However, in an exploratory nation-wide analysis of this nature, we cannot elucidate the reasons behind the distinctive residential geographies of Australia’s mixed-ethnicity couples. Our broad coverage offers a platform for future research using more targeted statistical techniques (see Chapter 4) or qualitative approaches (see Chapter 7).
3.2 Australia’s ethnic residential geographies

The ethnic composition of Australia’s immigration intake shifted from a predominantly Anglo-Celtic focus post-federation to incorporate Central, Eastern and Southern Europeans after the Second World War. It diversified further following the gradual demise of the White Australia Policy (from the late 1960s), to incorporate migrants from Asia, the Middle East, the Pacific and, more recently, Africa. From the post-Second World War period to the present, most migrants have settled in major urban areas, particularly Sydney and Melbourne (Burnley, 2001). Within cities, migrants have often concentrated in particular localities but empirical evidence indicates that they have generally not formed the segregated enclaves or ‘ghettos’ typical of many US cities, and that levels of ethnic residential segregation are lower in Australia than in other multiethnic societies (Forrest et al., 2017; Johnston et al., 2007; Poulsen et al., 2004).

According to Forrest et al. (2006), the spatial separation that does exist between ethnic groups in Australia is mainly due to economic disadvantage. Post-war migrants from Southern and Eastern Europe often found manufacturing employment. They subsequently became residentially concentrated in industrial suburbs with cheaper housing, such as Fairfield and Auburn in Sydney, and Brunswick-Coburg in Melbourne (Burnley, 2001; Edgar, 2014; Johnston et al., 2001). Lebanese and Vietnamese refugees, for their part, often settled in suburbs close to migrant hostels (Burnley, 2001). Healy and Birrell (2003) interpreted such concentrations in Sydney as evidence of the city’s bifurcation along ethnic lines. In response, Poulsen et al. (2004) identified intergenerational movement away from areas of concentration, and argued that Australia’s ethnic enclaves are zones of transition. Their findings were in keeping with spatial assimilation theory, which posits that greater economic and cultural assimilation leads second and later generations of migrants to move out of enclaves (Edgar,
2014; Massey, 1985). However, a recent multi-scale analysis of segregation found that successive immigrant generations do disperse into different neighbourhoods, but generally remain within the same broad region of the city as the first generation (Johnston et al., 2017). Thus, while ethnic residential segregation is less pronounced in Australian cities than in the US, UK and Canada (Johnston et al., 2007), distinctive ethnic residential patterns remain—and these continue to attract negative media and political attention. Localities with high ethnic minority concentrations, such as Fairfield and Lakemba in Sydney, and Dandenong in Melbourne, are often cited as evidence that migrants are not ‘mixing’ with the broader population, fuelling anti-immigration agendas (as documented by Birrell, 2010; Devlin and Johnson, 2017; Forrest et al., 2017).

These studies of Australia’s ethnic residential geographies have occurred via counts of individuals in geographic areas. Yet decisions about where to live are commonly made at the household scale, and not all households are ethnically homogeneous (Wright et al., 2003). Previous Australian research has largely overlooked mixed-ethnicity households, thus questions remain about their residential patterns. According to general assimilation theory, intermarriage with members of the ‘host’ society represents the ultimate level of integration for ethnic minorities (Gordon, 1964). The spatial assimilation model (Massey, 1985) would thus predict that mixed-ethnicity couples are likely to mix residually with the ethnic majority, countering patterns of geographical separation. This paper considers whether this has indeed been the case in Australia.

3.3 The prevalence and geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples

In Australia and other countries of high immigration, mixed-ethnicity partnerships have increased in recent decades, attributable to factors such as the removal of discriminatory ‘anti-
miscgenation’ legislation, reduced societal opposition to such partnerships, and increasing ethnic diversity (Khoo, 2011; Wright et al., 2003). However, the propensity to ‘out-marry’ has varied by group. In Australia, post-Second World War migrants from Northern and Western Europe were more likely than those from Southern and Eastern Europe to partner with the Australian-born (Price and Zubrzycki, 1962b), although rates of out-partnering for the latter increased substantially with successive immigrant generations (Khoo, 2011). Migrants from Asia and the Middle East have followed similar trajectories. In 2011, 88.1 and 84.2 per cent of partnered first-generation Lebanese migrant females and males (respectively) had a Lebanese partner. Those rates fell to 31.9 and 25.4 per cent for third-plus generation migrants (Walker and Heard, 2015). All major immigrant groups in Australia tend to partner across ethnic boundaries by the third generation, though there are group-specific variations in the speed and magnitude of this transition (Walker and Heard, 2015). Although not the focus of this paper, out-partnering rates are also high for Indigenous Australians. In 2011, 57 and 59 per cent of partnered Indigenous males and females had a non-Indigenous partner (Walker and Heard, 2015). Further, the proportion of Australians claiming multiple ancestries grew from 13 per cent in 1986 to 32 per cent in 2011 (ABS, 2012; Khoo and Lucas, 2004)—another indicator of the growth in mixed-ethnicity partnerships. We currently know very little about where these growing segments of Australia’s population live, and how their geographies might impact the existing ethnic residential mosaic.

Internationally, two approaches have framed analyses of the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples. The first understands mixed-ethnicity relationships as an outcome of improvements in the socio-economic circumstances of ethnic minorities, and hence their ‘spatial assimilation’ (Gordon, 1964). The argument follows that residential propinquity fosters mixed-ethnicity partnerships (Peach, 1980). However, most contemporary research recognises that the local
neighbourhood is declining in significance as a meeting place for future partners (Houston et al., 2005), and thus focuses on the geographic outcomes of mixed-ethnicity partnerships. Their prevalence in a neighbourhood is now widely considered to be instructive about where couples choose to live (bearing in mind financial and other constraints) rather than where they formed (Ellis et al., 2012). From this perspective, mixed-ethnicity couples are seen to alter existing ethnic residential geographies; as ‘agents of change’ who can reduce segregation (Ellis et al., 2012). Researchers in the US (Holloway et al., 2005; Wright et al., 2011) and UK (Smith et al., 2011) have shown that the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity (or ‘mixed-race’12) couples differ from those of each partner’s ethnic (or racial) group. For instance, the spatial distribution of black–white couples in the US does not neatly align with that of the broader ‘black’ or ‘white’ populations (Wright et al., 2011). Wright et al. (2011) described an ‘in-between’ pattern: white/non-white couples in the US typically reside in more diverse neighbourhoods than white couples, but less diverse neighbourhoods than non-white couples. Ethnographic research suggests that a moderate level of neighbourhood diversity may reduce fears of discrimination (Dalmage, 2000), and is particularly important for mixed-race couples with children (Twine, 1999).

As already noted, the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples have received little research attention in Australia. A few studies have documented broad-scale spatial variations in rates of out-partnering amongst Indigenous persons, noting that rates are higher for Indigenous males and females living in capital cities than in regional areas (Biddle, 2013; Heard et al., 2009;

---

11 This conclusion has primarily been reached through cross-sectional studies. Recent longitudinal research points to the complexity of these geographies, suggesting that residential concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples are likely a reflection of both formation in situ and household mobility (Feng et al., 2014).
12 US-based research uses the terminology ‘mixed-race’ due to racial identification categories in the US census. This terminology is less appropriate in Australia, where the census classifies people according to the Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups. We use the term ‘mixed-ethnicity’ unless referring to studies where the terms ‘mixed-race’ or ‘interracial’ have been adopted.
Walker and Heard, 2015). To our knowledge, the only Australian study to have explored the geographic distribution of a broader range of mixed-ethnicity couples is our own work in Sydney (Tindale et al., 2014). Using 2006 census data, we showed that these couples were more residentially dispersed than other members of their respective ethnic minority groups, and that they appeared to gravitate towards moderately diverse, inner city areas of Sydney. This paper extends our mapping of mixed-ethnicity couples across Australia, using the latest available census data. Additionally, it explores how couples’ residential geographies vary according to the ancestry of the ethnic minority partner.

3.4 Data and Methods

Our analysis draws on customised data tables based on the ancestry variable from the 2011 Australian census. We included all cohabiting couples (registered and de facto marriages; same-sex and opposite-sex). For conceptual and data quality reasons, we focused on a subset of the total range of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia. The socio-cultural significance of these relationships varies according to the partners’ ethnicities. Those mixed-ethnicity couples who have ‘visibly different’ ethnic backgrounds are more likely to experience discrimination in their everyday lives (Luke and Luke, 1998), and as a factor shaping their residential decisions (Wright et al., 2003). Our analyses focused on couples with one partner from the culturally and numerically dominant ‘Anglo-European’ (AE) ethnic group, and another from a ‘visibly different’ ethnic minority group; and used ‘co-ethnic couples’ (i.e. partners who share the same ethnicity) as a point of comparison. We excluded mixed-ethnicity couples consisting of partners from two different ethnic minority groups (e.g. Chinese–Nigerian), as numbers were too small to support analysis across geographical areas. The Australian census allows individuals to nominate up to two ancestries, and 32 per cent of respondents did so in 2011 (ABS, 2012). To avoid ‘overlapping’ ethnicities between partners, we only included multiple-
ancestry individuals whose two ancestries were within the same broad ethnic groups (defined below).\footnote{For instance, an individual of English and Australian ancestry would be included in the ‘Anglo-European’ group; however, an individual of English and Vietnamese ancestry would be excluded from the analysis. Similarly, an individual of Tanzanian and Kenyan ancestry would be included in the SS African group; but one who stated Tanzanian and Korean ancestry would be excluded.}

Ancestry responses to the Australian census are classified according to the Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups (ASCCEG) (ABS, 2011a). There are over 300 ancestries at the most detailed level of the classification, too many to explore individually. We defined six broad ethnic minority groupings (which generally equated to geographic regions of origin), based on the highest level of the ASCCEG: Pacific Islander, North African/Middle Eastern (NA/ME), Southern and Central Asian (SC Asian), Sub-Saharan African (SS African), South-East Asian (SE Asian), and North-East Asian (NE Asian). We also requested data for finer-grained ‘country-level’ ancestry groupings. Two of these groups (Filipino and Vietnamese) are considered in this paper due to their distinctive geographic distributions. This list does not cover the entire Australian population. These groups were chosen because they have sizeable populations in Australia. The Americas were excluded because it was not possible to identify ‘visibly different’ individuals from that region. We did not include Indigenous/non-Indigenous couples because the ancestry variable is not a reliable indicator of Indigenous status.

The ‘Anglo-European’ ethnic majority group incorporated ancestries under the following ASCCEG categories: Australian, New Zealander (excluding Maori), North-West European and Caucasian. In 2011, this group incorporated 70 per cent of Australia’s population. Southern and Eastern Europeans were not included because they occupy an ‘in-between’ position in Australia’s cultural landscape, with some degree of perceived social and cultural distance from
the ethnic majority, but less so than the groups included in our ethnic minority category (Farquharson, 2007). In our analyses, we refer to the specific couple types by the ethnic minority group represented—for example, ‘mixed Pacific Islander couples’ and ‘co-ethnic Pacific Islander couples’, ‘mixed NA/ME couples’ and co-ethnic NA/ME couples’, and so on.

We obtained counts of mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couples at Statistical Area Level 3 (SA3) in the five most populated Greater Capital City Statistical Areas (GCCSAs): Greater Sydney, Greater Melbourne, Greater Brisbane, Greater Adelaide and Greater Perth. There was a necessary trade-off between the granularity of spatial units and data accuracy. The SA3 was the most fine-grained level at which we could confidently obtain sufficiently large counts of mixed-ethnicity couples for a reliable analysis (reducing the risk of small cell values and randomisation errors). In major urban areas, SA3s represent ‘clusters of related suburbs’ (ABS, 2011b: 25). There were 165 SA3s (mean population 81,283) across the aforementioned cities. Outside those cities, we used the larger Statistical Area Level 4 (SA4) due to lower population densities. The 44 SA4s included had a mean population of 182,817.

We used location quotients (LQs) to compare the geographies of each mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couple type. Location quotients depict the degree of residential concentration of a group in an area, relative to that group’s concentration in the wider geographical context. LQ

---

14 One SA3, Blue Mountains–South, was excluded as its resident population was close to zero.
15 Following Wright et al. (2011: 10), LQs are calculated as:

\[
LQ_j = \frac{\left( \frac{P_{ij}}{P_j} \right)}{\left( \frac{P_{jm}}{P_m} \right)}
\]

where \(LQ_j\) is the location quotient for mixed-ethnicity (or co-ethnic) couples in area \(j\). In the numerator, \(P_{ij}\) is the count of mixed-ethnicity (or co-ethnic) couples in area \(j\) and \(P_j\) the count of all couples in area \(j\). In the denominator, \(P_{jm}\) is the count of mixed-ethnicity (or co-ethnic) couples in Australia, and \(P_m\) is the count of all couples in Australia.
= 1.0 indicates that the proportion of mixed-ethnicity couples in an area is identical to the Australia-wide average (values >1.0 and <1.0 indicate above- and below-average proportions respectively). Location quotients were mapped using QGIS. Due to space constraints, only maps depicting the geographies of mixed and co-ethnic NE Asian couples are included here. Maps for the other couple types can be accessed online as Supplemental material. All Supplemental Files for this paper are located in Appendix 6 in this thesis (pages 291–304).

Our LQ-based maps for the five largest capital cities are embellished with the following information about SA3s obtained from the 2011 census: (i) overall ethnic diversity, measured using the standardised entropy index. We divided the total population into 11 ethnic groups. Index values range between 0 (one group forms 100% of the SA3 population) and 1 (all 11 groups are present in equal shares). (ii) Ethnic minority group presence. We highlight SA3s where the relevant ethnic minority group forms more than 10 per cent of the local population. (iii) Area-level socio-economic status based on median household income.

---

16 Appendix 5 includes 14 extra maps showing the geographies of the following couple types: mixed Pacific Islander; co-ethnic Pacific Islander; mixed NA/ME; co-ethnic NA/ME; mixed SC Asian; co-ethnic SC Asian; mixed SS African; co-ethnic SS African; mixed SE Asian; co-ethnic SE Asian; mixed Vietnamese; co-ethnic Vietnamese; mixed Filipino; and co-ethnic Filipino.

17 The standardised entropy index for each SA3 is calculated as:

\[ E = s \times - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (K_i) \log(K_i) \]

where \( K \) is the proportional share of the SA3 population for each ethnic group (1 through \( n \)). The scaling constant \( s \) ensures that potential values range from zero (no diversity) to one (all groups present in equal proportions).

18 These included: Anglo-European (defined previously), Pacific Islander, Southern and Eastern European, North African and Middle Eastern, South-East Asian, North-East Asian, Southern and Central Asian, Sub-Saharan African, mixed Anglo-European and SE European, mixed Anglo-European and one of the other aforementioned groups, and Other.
3.5 Where do Australia’s mixed-ethnicity couples live?

The 2011 census recorded a total of 139,751 mixed-ethnicity couples of the six types specified in this study, representing 3.2 per cent of all cohabiting couples in Australia. Mixed SE Asian and mixed NE Asian couples are the most common, totalling 45,784 and 39,945 respectively. However, Pacific Islanders have the highest rate of partnership with Anglo-Europeans: 27.9 per cent of partnered Pacific Islanders have Anglo-European partners, ahead of SE Asians (19.6%), SS Africans (15.2%), NE Asians (10.3%), NA/ME persons (7.5%) and SC Asians (5.7%). The two finer-grained SE Asian ethnic groups included in the analysis diverge markedly: 26.7 per cent of Filipinos have Anglo-European partners, compared to 5.5 per cent of Vietnamese individuals.

Collectively, the six mixed-ethnicity couple types are over-represented in metropolitan areas of Australia: 77.2 per cent reside in State or Territory capital cities, compared with 65.9 per cent of all couples. At the GCCSA level, Greater Darwin has the highest concentration. The six couple types comprise 6.5 per cent of couples in that city, over twice the national average. The next-highest concentrations are in Greater Sydney (4.3%), Australian Capital Territory (4.2%), Greater Perth (4.0%), Greater Brisbane (3.9%), Greater Melbourne (3.3%) and Rest of NT (3.2%).

At the SA3/SA4-level, capital city SA3s have the highest concentrations of our six mixed-ethnicity couple types (Table 3.1). The two highest concentrations are in Sydney Inner City (9.0% of all couples; LQ = 2.85) and Melbourne City (6.8%; LQ = 2.17); followed by three SA3s near Sydney Inner City (North Sydney–Mosman; Chatswood–Lane Cove; and

---

19 This percentage would be much higher if our analysis was able to include partnerships between Anglo-European Australians and Indigenous Australians.
Leichhardt); and one adjacent to Perth City (Belmont–Victoria Park). Darwin (SA4) ranks seventh. The remainder of the top 20 are primarily in inner city (and nearby) SA3s. Yet significant concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples are not limited to capital cities. Four regional SA4s have LQs greater than 1.0: Cairns (LQ = 1.55), Gold Coast (LQ = 1.43), Western Australia–Outback (LQ = 1.11) and Northern Territory–Outback (LQ = 1.03). The following sections describe the distinct geographies of different types of mixed-ethnicity couples. Some groups differ markedly from the overarching trends outlined above. Comparisons with co-ethnic minority couples indicate how mixed-ethnicity partnerships may alter Australia’s established ethnic residential geographies.

Table 3.1: Top 20 SA3/SA4 concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples (aggregated).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>SA3/SA4</th>
<th>GCCSA</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of all couples</th>
<th>LQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sydney Inner City</td>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Melbourne City</td>
<td>Greater Melbourne</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Sydney–Mosman</td>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chatswood–Lane Cove</td>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belmont–Victoria Park</td>
<td>Greater Perth</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>Greater Darwin</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Brisbane Inner</td>
<td>Greater Brisbane</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Marrickville–Sydenham–Petersham</td>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>South Perth</td>
<td>Greater Perth</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Perth City</td>
<td>Greater Perth</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hornsby</td>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nundah</td>
<td>Greater Brisbane</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Eastern Suburbs–South</td>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ryde– Hunters Hill</td>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Springwood–Kingston</td>
<td>Greater Brisbane</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stonnington–West</td>
<td>Greater Melbourne</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yarra</td>
<td>Greater Melbourne</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Eastern Suburbs–North</td>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Port Phillip</td>
<td>Greater Melbourne</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.
3.6 The multiple geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples

All six mixed-ethnicity couple types are disproportionately located in capital cities, although less so than their co-ethnic minority couple counterparts. Over 80 per cent of mixed NA/ME, mixed SC Asian, mixed SS African and mixed NE Asian couples reside in capital cities, compared to over 90 per cent of their corresponding co-ethnic minority counterparts. Mixed Pacific Islander and mixed SE Asian couples evince markedly lower levels of concentration in capital cities (65.9% and 71.1%) than co-ethnic Pacific Islander and SE Asian couples (83.9% and 93.4%). They are far more likely than their co-ethnic minority counterparts to reside in non-metropolitan areas. These results suggest that mixed-ethnicity partnerships extend the geographies of ethnic minority persons beyond metropolitan areas.

The following sections outline finer-grained (SA3/SA4-level) geographies. We refer to areas with LQs greater than 2.0 as ‘hotspots’, and provide the top 10 concentrations for each couple type (Table 3.2). For each ‘top 10’ area, Table 3.2 shows the corresponding LQs for co-ethnic Anglo-European couples and the respective co-ethnic minority couples. Spearman’s correlation coefficients ($r_s$) indicate the strength of the monotonic relationships between LQs for each mixed-ethnicity couple type and their co-ethnic peers, calculated across all 165 SA3s and 44 SA4s combined ($n = 209$). All mixed-ethnicity couples have significant positive relationships with concentrations of their respective co-ethnic minority couples (as LQs for mixed-ethnicity couples increase, so do those of their respective co-ethnic minority couples). Coefficients range from 0.48 (mixed SS African couples) to 0.79 (mixed NA/ME couples).

There are significant negative relationships between concentrations of co-ethnic Anglo-European couples and all types of mixed-ethnicity couples, excluding mixed Pacific Islander and mixed Filipino couples. Mixed NA/ME couples evince the strongest negative relationship with co-ethnic Anglo-European couples ($r_s = –0.72$). The following sections explore group-
specific nuances in the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in greater detail. The implications of these findings are discussed in the closing sections of the paper.
Table 3.2: Top 10 SA3/SA4 concentrations (LQs) of each mixed-ethnicity couple type (Mix), with corresponding LQs for respective co-ethnic minority couples (Min) and co-ethnic Anglo-European couples (AE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Mixed NA/ME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SA3/SA4</strong></td>
<td><strong>LQ Mix</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springwood–Kingston (B)</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield–Redbank (B)</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns Plains (B)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loganlea–Carbrook (B)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beenleigh (B)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nundah (B)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcliffe (B)</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandgate (B)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathpine (B)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lakes (B)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation mix and co-PI \( r_a = 0.76^a \) Correlation mix and co-NA/ME \( r_a = 0.79^a \)
Correlation mix and co-AE \( r_a = 0.08 \) Correlation mix and co-AE \( r_a = -0.72^a \)

| **SA3/SA4** | **LQ Mix** | **LQ Min** | **LQ AE** | **SA3/SA4** | **LQ Mix** | **LQ Min** | **LQ AE** |
|------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Leichhardt (S) | 2.53 | 0.27 | 0.92 | Casey–North (M) | 5.15 | 5.32 | 0.70 |
| Melbourne City (M) | 2.47 | 1.72 | 0.62 | Casey–South (M) | 4.48 | 7.39 | 0.76 |
| Perth City (P) | 2.44 | 1.31 | 0.80 | Kingston (M) | 3.43 | 1.11 | 0.91 |
| Stonnington–East (M) | 2.41 | 1.62 | 0.84 | Cardinia (M) | 3.29 | 1.02 | 1.19 |
| Casey–South (M) | 2.40 | 4.10 | 0.76 | Frankston (M) | 2.91 | 0.70 | 1.12 |
| Sydney Inner City (S) | 2.36 | 0.62 | 0.64 | Bayswater–Bass. (P) | 2.82 | 3.42 | 0.73 |
| North Sydney–Mosman (S) | 2.35 | 0.79 | 0.92 | Serpentine–Jarrahdale (P) | 2.80 | 0.41 | 1.30 |
| Casey–North (M) | 2.33 | 3.60 | 0.70 | Belmont–Victoria Park (P) | 2.72 | 6.44 | 0.75 |
| Port Phillip (M) | 2.33 | 0.87 | 0.82 | Wanneroo (P) | 2.63 | 2.75 | 0.97 |
| Chatswood–Lane Cove (S) | 2.24 | 1.51 | 0.71 | South Perth (P) | 2.63 | 2.55 | 0.87 |

Correlation mix and co-NA/ME \( r_a = 0.63^a \) Correlation mix and co-SS African \( r_a = 0.48^a \)
Correlation mix and co-AE \( r_a = -0.64^a \) Correlation mix and co-AE \( r_a = -0.50^a \)

| **SA3/SA4** | **LQ Mix** | **LQ Min** | **LQ AE** | **SA3/SA4** | **LQ Mix** | **LQ Min** | **LQ AE** |
|------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Darwin (D) | 3.68 | 1.91 | 0.97 | Sydney Inner City (S) | 4.80 | 3.07 | 0.64 |
| Belmont–Victoria Park (P) | 2.45 | 1.71 | 0.75 | Chatswood–Lane Cove (S) | 4.00 | 4.77 | 0.71 |
| Kwinana (P) | 2.16 | 0.92 | 1.06 | Melbourne City (M) | 3.79 | 4.22 | 0.62 |
| Gosnells (P) | 2.12 | 1.95 | 0.87 | Nth Sydney–Mosman (S) | 3.58 | 1.66 | 0.92 |
| Sydney Inner City (S) | 2.11 | 1.84 | 0.64 | Brisbane Inner (B) | 3.25 | 1.75 | 0.80 |
| Forest Lake–Oxley (B) | 2.04 | 7.33 | 0.78 | Adelaide City (A) | 2.99 | 2.65 | 0.84 |
| Mount Druitt (S) | 1.88 | 7.65 | 0.52 | Marrickville–Syd.–Pet. (S) | 2.84 | 1.06 | 0.61 |
| Campbelltown (S) | 1.84 | 2.37 | 0.79 | Leichhardt (S) | 2.80 | 0.45 | 0.92 |
| WA–Outback (RWA) | 1.83 | 0.62 | 1.13 | Ku-ring-gai (S) | 2.79 | 3.55 | 0.90 |
| Bayswater–Bassendean (P) | 1.81 | 2.20 | 0.73 | Ryde–Hunters Hill (S) | 2.63 | 6.04 | 0.55 |

Correlation mix and co-SE Asian \( r_a = 0.57^a \) Correlation mix and co-NE Asian \( r_a = 0.77^a \)
Correlation mix and co-AE \( r_a = -0.34^a \) Correlation mix and co-AE \( r_a = -0.55^a \)

*Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Note: GCCSA shown in parentheses: Greater Adelaide (A); Greater Brisbane (B); Greater Darwin (D); Greater Melbourne (M); Greater Perth (P); Rest of Western Australia (RWA); and Greater Sydney (S).
Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.
3.6.1 Mixed North-East (NE) Asian couples

Figures 3.1 and 3.2 map the LQs for co-ethnic and mixed NE Asian couples respectively. Darker greys represent higher LQs. To assist with interpretation, line patterns highlight ‘about average’ LQs (0.75 to <1.25) and point patterns highlight ‘well below average’ LQs (<0.75). All hotspots of mixed and co-ethnic NE Asian couples are in capital cities. The latter registered LQs below 0.50 in almost all of regional Australia (except Gold Coast; Figure 1A). Most regional SA4s also fall into the lowest LQ bracket for mixed NE Asian couples, but there are notable concentrations in Cairns (LQ = 1.78) and Gold Coast (LQ = 1.65).

Figures 3.1 and 3.2 (maps B–F) show residential patterns within the five largest capitals. Co-ethnic NE Asian couples have exceptionally high concentrations (LQ ≥ 4.00) in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane, predominantly in suburban SA3s. By contrast, mixed NE Asian couples appear to be drawn to inner cities. They only have such high concentrations in Sydney Inner City (LQ = 4.80) and Chatswood–Lane Cove (4.00). Most of their top 10 SA3s (see Table 3.2) are in inner cities (Melbourne City, Brisbane Inner, Adelaide City) or near the CBD (North Sydney–Mosman; Marrickville–Sydenham–Petersham; Leichhardt). Exceptions include suburban SA3s in Sydney’s north (Ku-ring-gai; Ryde–Hunters Hill). Overall, the top concentrations of mixed NE Asian couples are in places where co-ethnic NE Asian couples also have high or above-average concentrations; and co-ethnic Anglo-European couples have below-average concentrations. However, in Australia’s capital cities (excluding Adelaide), the highest concentrations of co-ethnic NE Asian couples are in suburban SA3s, while the highest concentrations of mixed NE Asian couples are in the inner cities, outside the traditional hubs of the NE Asian population.
Figure 3.1: Distribution of co-ethnic NE Asian couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.
Figure 3.2: Distribution of mixed NE Asian couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.
Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.
3.6.2 Mixed Pacific Islander couples

Mixed Pacific Islander couples are quite widely dispersed, but SA3/SA4-level hotspots (LQ ≥ 2.0) are found predominantly in Queensland, with the top 10 (Table 3.2) in Greater Brisbane. The distribution of mixed Pacific Islander couples in Brisbane resembles that of co-ethnic Pacific Islander couples, but is less intensely concentrated (see Appendix 6, pages 289–290, for maps similar to those provided above for mixed and co-ethnic NE Asian couples). The highest concentrations are in Springwood–Kingston and Springfield–Redbank, which have Brisbane’s top two concentrations of co-ethnic Pacific Islander couples. Mixed Pacific Islander couples show strong affinity for residential areas with high concentrations of Pacific Islanders, but they are more dispersed and less drawn to these locales than co-ethnic Pacific Islander couples.

Beyond Brisbane, there are hotspots of mixed Pacific Islander couples in Sydney’s west (Mount Druitt, Campbelltown, St Marys), and southern Perth (Rockingham). Those SA3s have the highest concentrations of co-ethnic Pacific Islander couples in those cities. There are also hotspots of mixed Pacific Islander couples in SA4s outside capital cities—Gold Coast (LQ = 2.70), Cairns (LQ = 2.48) and Western Australia–Outback (LQ = 2.08)—as well as notable regional concentrations in Queensland–Outback (LQ = 1.99), Mackay (LQ = 1.63) and Townsville (LQ = 1.55). These concentrations are likely the outcome of a history of Pacific Islander settlement in North Queensland. From 1863 to 1904, thousands of Pacific Islanders were brought to the region to work in the sugar industry (Burnley, 2001). Although many were deported under the Pacific Islander Labourers Act 1901, Pacific Islander communities survived and over time have integrated with Australians of European descent through mixed marriages (Burnley, 2001).
3.6.3 Mixed North African/Middle Eastern (NA/ME) couples

Mixed NA/ME couples are heavily concentrated in Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne—over two-thirds (67.5%) live in one of those cities, compared to 39.3 per cent of all couples. Table 3.2 shows that across all 209 areal units, mixed NA/ME couples’ geographies align quite closely with co-ethnic NA/ME couples \( (r_s = 0.79) \), but exhibit a strong negative relationship with co-ethnic Anglo-European couples \( (r_s = -0.72) \). Of the 31 hotspots (LQ \( \geq 2.0 \)) of mixed NA/ME couples, 25 are in Greater Sydney (including 9 of the top 10; Table 3.2). The highest concentration is in Merrylands–Guildford (LQ = 4.85), a western Sydney SA3 with Australia’s highest concentration of co-ethnic NA/ME couples (LQ = 12.77). The vast difference in these LQs highlights the more diffuse geographies of mixed NA/ME couples. Sydney’s co-ethnic NA/ME couples are heavily concentrated in contiguous SA3s in the western suburbs (Appendix 6, page 294). Meanwhile, mixed NA/ME couples are concentrated in Sydney’s inner western suburbs, inner city and eastern suburbs—again signifying a process of diffusion across urban space (Appendix 6, page 293). In fact, some of the highest concentrations of mixed NA/ME couples are in SA3s with below-average concentrations of co-ethnic NA/ME couples (Sydney Inner City; Leichhardt; North Sydney–Mosman; Table 3.2).

The remaining hotspots of mixed NA/ME couples are in Greater Melbourne—three in a cluster north of the CBD (Moreland–North; Tullamarine–Broadmeadows; and Brunswick–Coburg) and three in a cluster south of the CBD (Glen Eira; Stonnington–West; Port Phillip). Most of these also contain Melbourne’s highest concentrations of co-ethnic NA/ME couples, excluding Stonnington–West and Port Phillip, which have comparatively modest concentrations of the latter (LQs = 1.10 and 0.99). There are no hotspots (LQs \( \geq 2.0 \)) of mixed NA/ME couples in Brisbane, Perth or Adelaide, yet in each city the highest concentrations are located in and around the inner city.
3.6.4 Mixed Southern and Central (SC) Asian couples

There are 16 hotspots of mixed SC Asian couples: 10 in Melbourne, four in Sydney and two in Perth. Inner city SA3s dominate this list. Melbourne City, Perth City and Sydney Inner City are in the top 10, alongside nearby SA3s Leichhardt, North Sydney–Mosman and Chatswood–Lane Cove in Sydney; and Stonnington–East and Port Phillip in Melbourne (Table 3.2). This inner city focus contrasts markedly with the high suburban concentrations of co-ethnic SC Asian couples in Sydney and Melbourne (Appendix 6, pages 295–296). Sydney’s residential ‘hubs’ of co-ethnic SC Asian couples are in the western suburbs: Parramatta (LQ = 8.65), Blacktown–North (LQ = 5.73), Blacktown (LQ = 5.20) and Auburn (LQ = 4.63). None of these are among the top four concentrations of Sydney’s mixed SC Asian couples. Conversely, Leichhardt has Australia’s highest mixed SC Asian couple concentration (LQ = 2.53), but its LQ for co-ethnic SC Asian couples is just 0.27. A similar contrast is apparent in Sydney Inner City (LQ = 2.36 for mixed SC Asian couples; LQ = 0.62 for co-ethnic SC Asian couples). In Melbourne, co-ethnic SC Asian couples are most highly concentrated in the south-eastern suburbs (Dandenong; Casey–South; Casey–North). Mixed SC Asian couples also recorded quite high LQs in these SA3s, but their highest concentrations are in and around the inner city, in Melbourne City (LQ = 2.47) and Stonnington–East (LQ = 2.41). In summary, in both Sydney and Melbourne, the geographies of mixed SC Asian couples are markedly different from those of co-ethnic SC Asian couples, with a distinctive inner city focus for the former and suburban focus for the latter. This finding once again points towards a diffusion process.

3.6.5 Mixed Sub-Saharan (SS) African couples

Hotspots of mixed SS African couples are predominantly in Greater Melbourne and Greater Perth (Appendix 6, page 297). The five highest LQs are in contiguous SA3s in Melbourne’s south-eastern suburbs (Table 3.2). This bears some similarity to the geographies of co-ethnic
SS African couples (Appendix 6, page 298). Casey–North and Casey–South have the highest LQs for mixed SS African couples, and are also principal locations for Melbourne’s co-ethnic SS African couples. However, the next three highest concentrations of mixed SS African couples are in nearby SA3s with few co-ethnic SS African couples and larger Anglo-European populations: Kingston, Cardinia and Frankston. Further, mixed SS African couples registered comparatively low LQs in a cluster of three SA3s in and around Melbourne’s inner city (Essendon, Melbourne City, Maribyrnong) that have some of Australia’s highest concentrations of co-ethnic SS African couples. Mixed SS African couples also reside at high concentrations in Greater Perth, but are much more widely dispersed across the metropolitan area than co-ethnic SS African couples. While 55 per cent of all co-ethnic SS African couples in Greater Perth live in one of the following four SA3s—Stirling, Belmont–Victoria Park, Canning or Gosnells—only 28 per cent of mixed SS African couples do so. Again, mixed-ethnicity partnerships are associated with more dispersed, expanded residential geographies across cities.

3.6.6 Mixed South-East (SE) Asian couples

Hotspots of mixed SE Asian couples are found in locations across Australia (Appendix 6, page 299). Almost one-third (28.9%) live in regional areas compared to just 6.5 per cent of co-ethnic SE Asian couples (Appendix 6, page 300). Darwin (SA4) has the highest concentration (Table 3.2), likely due to its close proximity to SE Asia which has facilitated a long history of interactions between Anglo-Australian and SE Asian communities (Ford, 2009). Further, the respective sex ratios of the SE Asian and Anglo-European populations in Darwin are conducive to mixed-ethnicity partnership formation. Among those aged 15+ in 2011, there were just 60 SE Asian males for every 100 SE Asian females; but there were 111 Anglo-European males.
for every 100 Anglo-European females. Darwin may also be an attractive location for mixed SE Asian couples to settle because of its geographical proximity to relatives in SE Asia.

Other hotspots of mixed SE Asian couples are in three SA3s in Greater Perth (Kwinana; Belmont–Victoria Park; and Gosnells), as well as Sydney Inner City and Forest Lake–Oxley (in Brisbane’s south-western suburbs). Notable regional concentrations are in Western Australia–Outback (LQ = 1.83), Cairns (LQ = 1.77) and Northern Territory–Outback (LQ = 1.59). The diversity of locations with high concentrations of mixed SE Asian couples reflects the diverse migration and settlement histories of finer-grained SE Asian ethnic groups. To begin to unpack these nuances, we explore the geographies of mixed Vietnamese and mixed Filipino couples.

Mixed Vietnamese couples are highly concentrated in metropolitan areas (86.8%), while more than one-third of mixed Filipino couples (35.5%) lived outside Australia’s capital cities. This contrast holds true at the finer spatial scale. The 10 highest concentrations of mixed Vietnamese couples are all in capital cities (Table 3.3). Many align with high suburban concentrations of co-ethnic Vietnamese couples: Maribyrnong and Brimbank (Greater Melbourne), Forest Lake–Oxley (Greater Brisbane), and Fairfield (Greater Sydney). Localities such as Fairfield are often used as examples of ethnic minorities forming ‘ghetto-like’ concentrations and failing to properly integrate with the broader population (Devlin and Johnson, 2017; Melouney, 2008), but these results indicate that they are key locations for households characterised by mixing between Vietnamese and Anglo-European persons in the intimate sphere of the home. There are also several hotspots of mixed Vietnamese couples in inner city and neighbouring SA3s with few co-ethnic Vietnamese couples: Adelaide City, Melbourne City, Sydney Inner City, Port Phillip and Leichhardt. While dispersal is apparent, mixed Vietnamese couples show a
strong propensity to remain in close proximity to the traditional geographical hubs of the broader Vietnamese community (Appendix 6, pages 301–302).

Mixed Filipino couples (Table 3.3; Appendix 6, page 303) are most heavily concentrated in Darwin SA4, and three SA3s in Sydney’s western suburbs (Mount Druitt; St Marys; Campbelltown), all of which are home to large Filipino communities. There are also hotspots in the northern and southern suburbs of Brisbane, and in four regional SA4s (Cairns; Queensland–Outback; Northern Territory–Outback; Wide Bay in Queensland). Mixed Filipino couples have far more dispersed geographies than co-ethnic Filipino couples (Appendix 6, page 304), reflecting distinct waves of post-WWII Filipino migration. The first mainly comprised skilled workers who settled in Sydney in the 1950s and 1960s, establishing the Filipino communities that remain there today (Jackson, 1989). The second, in the 1970s and 1980s, was characterised by Filipina brides who migrated to join Australian husbands, and settled in their homes rather than in existing Filipino communities (Burnley, 2001; Jackson, 1989). The migration-for-marriage process extended beyond the capital cities, particularly to mining communities where the ‘marriage market’ was tight due to higher ratios of males to females in local populations (Jackson, 1989).
Table 3.3: Top 10 SA3/SA4 concentrations (LQs) of mixed Vietnamese and mixed Filipino couples (Mix), with corresponding LQs for relevant co-ethnic minority couples (Min) and co-ethnic Anglo-European couples (AE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA3/SA4</th>
<th>LQ Mix</th>
<th>LQ Min</th>
<th>LQ AE</th>
<th>SA3/SA4</th>
<th>LQ Mix</th>
<th>LQ Min</th>
<th>LQ AE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maribyrnong (M)</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>Darwin (D)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Lake–Oxley (B)</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>Mount Druitt (S)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macksville–Syd.–Pet. (S)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>St Marys (S)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne City (M)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Campbelltown (S)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide City (A)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Sandgate (B)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield–Redbank (B)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Caboolture (B)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield (S)</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Beenleigh (B)</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Inner City (S)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>Cairns (RQL)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brimbank (M)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>QLD–Outback (RQL)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayswater–Bassende (P)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>Nundah (B)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation mix and co-Viet. r_s = 0.72^a
Correlation mix and co-Filipino r_s = 0.50^a
Correlation mix and co-AE r_s = -0.66^a

^aCorrelation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note: GCCSA for each SA3/SA4 shown in brackets: Greater Adelaide (A); Greater Brisbane (B); Greater Darwin (D); Greater Melbourne (M); Greater Perth (P); Rest of Queensland (RQL); and Greater Sydney (S).

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.

3.7 In what types of areas do Australia’s mixed-ethnicity couples live?

The preceding sections have established that mixed-ethnicity couples have unique geographies across Australian cities and regions. Their areas of greatest residential concentration often diverge from those of their co-ethnically partnered peers. The remainder of our analysis explores the types of residential contexts in which mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couples tend to dwell across the 165 SA3s in metropolitan areas of Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide, and Perth. We focus on SA3-level ethnic diversity and socio-economic status. Table 3.4 shows the percentage distribution of each couple type across SA3s grouped into diversity quintiles (based on the entropy index).
Table 3.4: Percentage distribution of mixed and co-ethnic couples across 165 SA3s (in the five largest capital city metropolitan areas) classified by ethnic diversity quintiles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couple type</th>
<th>Diversity quintile (typical % Anglo-European)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (&gt;80%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td><strong>21.9</strong></td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic NE Asian</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td><strong>24.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Pacific Islander</td>
<td><strong>21.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.0</strong></td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td><strong>44.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td><strong>22.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic NA/ME</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td><strong>72.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td><strong>20.9</strong></td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic SC Asian</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td><strong>24.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SS African</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td><strong>18.9</strong></td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic SS African</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td><strong>24.2</strong></td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic SE Asian</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td><strong>20.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Vietnamese</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td><strong>11.5</strong></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td><strong>34.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Vietnamese</td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td><strong>17.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Filipino</td>
<td><strong>17.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.4</strong></td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td><strong>20.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Filipino</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td><strong>21.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European</td>
<td><strong>26.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.6</strong></td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All couples</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold numbers indicate proportions above the average for all couples.
Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.

The results reveal a striking consistency across all mixed-ethnicity couple types. At the two lower levels of diversity (quintiles 1 and 2, where Anglo-Europeans typically form >70% of the SA3 population), each set of mixed-ethnicity couples has higher proportions than their respective co-ethnic minority couples, but lower proportions than co-ethnic Anglo-Europeans. Conversely, all mixed-ethnicity couple types are more likely than co-ethnic Anglo-Europeans to reside in the most diverse SA3s (quintile 5; typically <50% Anglo-European), but less likely to do so than their co-ethnic minority counterparts. Echoing Holloway et al. (2005: 321) in the US, this presents evidence of an ‘in-betweenness’ to the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in relation to the ethnic diversity of localities.
There are also notable differences between the different mixed-ethnicity couple types. Mixed Pacific Islander and mixed SE Asian couples demonstrate a particular propensity to live in heavily Anglo-European SA3s (42% and 32% respectively in quintiles 1 or 2). However, Table 4 shows clear disparities between finer-grained SE Asian categories: 36 per cent of mixed Filipino couples reside in such SA3s, compared to 19 per cent of mixed Vietnamese couples. Conversely, mixed NA/ME couples have the strongest propensity to live in the most diverse (quintile 5) SA3s, reflecting similar patterns for co-ethnic NA/ME couples. Mixed SC Asian, mixed SS African and mixed NE Asian couples display a tendency to live in the second-most diverse class of SA3s (quintile 4). These differences further underscore the multiple geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia.

While the above analysis reveals how the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples align with SA3-level ethnic diversity, Figure 3.3 illustrates the propensity of each mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couple type to live in SA3s where their corresponding ethnic minority group comprises a large share\(^{20}\) (≥10%) of the local population. The findings provide further evidence of in-between geographies. Mixed-ethnicity couples are more likely to live in SA3s with large own-minority group populations than co-ethnic Anglo-Europeans, but less likely to do so than their respective co-ethnic minority couples. Yet in terms of percentage point differences, mixed-ethnicity couples tend to more closely resemble co-ethnic Anglo-European couples. For instance, the proportion of mixed SE Asian couples living in SA3s with large SE Asian populations is 4.1 percentage points higher than co-ethnic Anglo-European couples, but 24.6 percentage points lower than co-ethnic SE Asian couples. It is clear that for ethnic minority persons, being in a mixed-ethnicity partnership is associated with a greater propensity to reside

---

\(^{20}\) The 10 per cent threshold may not seem ‘large’, yet it is appropriate in identifying significant shares of ethnic minority groups at the SA3 level in Australian cities.
outside areas of large ethnic minority populations, but for Anglo-Europeans it is associated with only a slightly elevated likelihood of residence in such areas.

Figure 3.3: Percentage of couple type residing in SA3s where the respective ethnic minority group comprises ≥10% of SA3 population, Greater Sydney, Greater Melbourne, Greater Brisbane, Greater Adelaide and Greater Perth SA3s together, 2011.

Notes: The first three columns show the percentage of co-ethnic Anglo-European, mixed NA/ME and co-ethnic NA/ME couples who live in SA3s where NA/ME persons make up 10% or more of the local population. The second three columns refer to residence in SA3s with ≥10% SC Asian populations, and so on. Mixed Pacific Islander and mixed SS African couples were excluded from this analysis, as no SA3 contained ≥10% shares of Pacific Islanders or SS Africans.

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.

The final stage of our analysis explores the socio-economic characteristics of SA3s in which mixed-ethnicity couples tend to live (Table 3.5). US-based research suggests that for ethnic minorities, having a ‘white’ spouse is associated with residence in higher socio-economic status neighbourhoods (White and Sassler, 2000). Our findings similarly show that mixed-ethnicity couples in Australian cities are more likely to live in high-income SA3s (quintile 5) than their respective co-ethnic minority couples. However, an in-between pattern does not apply neatly in this case. Mixed NE Asian, mixed SC Asian and mixed NA/ME couples are more likely than
both their corresponding co-ethnic minority couples and co-ethnic Anglo-Europeans to live in the highest-income SA3s. Conversely, our six broad (regional-level) mixed-ethnicity couple types are all less likely to live in the lowest-income SA3s (quintile 1) than both their corresponding co-ethnic minority couples and co-ethnic Anglo-Europeans. Mixed Vietnamese and mixed Filipino couples have slightly higher propensities to reside in these low-income areas. This suggests that, for most couple types, being in a mixed-ethnicity partnership is associated with residence in higher-income areas for both Anglo-European and ethnic minority persons. The significance of these associations is unclear without controlling for the partners’ personal income levels. This can only be achieved using individual-level census data, which are currently available only at prohibitively coarse geographic scales.
Table 3.5: Percentage distribution of mixed and co-ethnic couples across 165 SA3s (in the five largest capital city metropolitan areas) grouped into quintiles by median household income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couple type</th>
<th>Median household income quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (lowest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic NE Asian</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Pacific Islander</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Pacific</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic NA/ME</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic SC Asian</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SS African</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic SS African</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic SE Asian</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Vietnamese</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Vietnamese</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Filipino</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Filipino</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All couples</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold numbers indicate proportions above the average for all couples.
Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.
3.8 Discussion and conclusions

The residential geographies of ethnic groups in Australia have typically been analysed based on counts of individuals across cities, regions and neighbourhoods. Few studies have considered how intra-household ethnic diversity might influence residential decision-making processes. This paper has analysed the geographies of several types of cohabiting mixed-ethnicity couples across Australia. With a particular focus on couples involving an Anglo-European partner and a partner from a ‘visible’ ethnic minority group, we find clear evidence that mixed-ethnicity couples have settlement patterns that deviate from those of their respective co-ethnic minority couples. We have also drawn attention to the multiple geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples, according to the ethnic minority group involved. Darwin stands out as Australia’s ‘capital’ of mixed SE Asian couples; Greater Brisbane is the hub for mixed Pacific Islander couples; mixed NA/ME and mixed NE Asian couples reside in their highest concentrations in Greater Sydney; mixed SC Asian couples are concentrated in Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne; and mixed SS African couples in Greater Melbourne and Greater Perth.

The vast majority of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia live in capital cities, more so than the total couple population. This is clearly linked to the concentration of ethnic minority populations in capital cities. However, mixed-ethnicity couples exhibit stronger tendencies than their co-ethnic minority couple counterparts to reside in regional areas. Our finding that significant concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples exist outside Australia’s capital cities echoes observations made by Smith et al. (2011) in England and Wales. Here, the Gold Coast and Cairns SA4s consistently rank among the top two or three regional concentrations. Mining areas, including Western Australia–Outback, Northern Territory–Outback and Queensland–Outback also feature among the top regional SA4s for mixed Pacific Islander and mixed SE
Asian couples. These two couple types have the highest proportions residing outside capital cities. These are important findings in light of the heavily metropolitan focus of most international research on the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples and, indeed, ethnic diversity in general.

At a finer geographical scale, and across Australia’s five most populous capitals, many high concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples overlap with those of their respective co-ethnic minority couples. Yet in most cases they evince a trend of de-concentration away from traditional suburban areas of ethnic minority residence, and a clear shift towards inner city SA3s—which are often the top-ranked locations for mixed-ethnicity couples. This shift is particularly salient for mixed SC Asian and mixed NE Asian couples. Along with inner cities, this study has highlighted additional areas in which several types of mixed-ethnicity couples are present in high concentrations. For example, Leichhardt in Sydney’s inner west has ‘high’ concentrations of mixed NA/ME, mixed SC Asian and mixed NE Asian couples, and above-average concentrations of the three other mixed-ethnicity couple types considered in this study. Yet it is home to very few co-ethnic minority couples of any type (all LQs below 0.50). Areas like this, which are uniquely significant locations for a range of mixed-ethnicity couple types, are worthy of further enquiry.

There are clear commonalities in the characteristics of areas inhabited by different types of mixed-ethnicity couples, in relation to their respective co-ethnic minority peers and co-ethnic Anglo-European couples. All mixed-ethnicity couple types are more likely than their corresponding co-ethnic minority couples to live in SA3s with lower levels of ethnic diversity and larger Anglo-European populations, but less likely to do so than co-ethnic Anglo-European couples. The reverse is true in terms of their propensity to reside in SA3s with large proportions
of their own ethnic minority group. Mixed-ethnicity couples’ connections to broader spatial patterns of ethnic diversity and concentration are thus characterised by ‘in-between’ or intermediate positions in relation to ethnically homogeneous couples. This supports similar findings in relation to mixed-race households in the US (Holloway et al., 2005). The notion of ‘in-betweenness’ is less applicable in terms of the socio-economic status of areas. Mixed-ethnicity couples tend to reside in moderate to high-income areas at higher rates than their co-ethnic minority and majority counterparts.

The spatially diffuse patterns of residence exhibited by these mixed-ethnicity couples (vis-à-vis their co-ethnic counterparts) may be the outcome of differences in demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Intermarriage theory suggests that higher levels of education among ethnic minority persons are associated with stronger propensities to partner outside their own ethnic group (Kalmijn, 1998). The implications are that those in mixed-ethnicity partnerships are, on average, likely to be more highly educated and have higher household incomes—and are thus able to access a wider range of residential locations (White and Sassler, 2000). Although the available Australian literature suggests that the relationship between education and intermarriage is not straightforward; with complex variations according to gender and ancestry (Khoo et al. 2009). Thus, there are likely other factors at play. Ethnic minority persons in mixed-ethnicity partnerships are also more likely to belong to second or later immigrant generations (Walker and Heard, 2015), which have more dispersed residential geographies than first-generation immigrants (Edgar, 2014). Additionally, there may be qualities intrinsic to inner cities and nearby areas that are attractive to mixed-ethnicity couples. Inner city areas of Australia are known for their cosmopolitanism and progressive social cultures. Individuals who partner across perceived ethnic boundaries may feel that they are less likely to experience discrimination in such diverse locales (Dalmage, 2000; Holloway et al., 2005). Gorman-
Murray and Brennan-Horley (2010) suggested that the anonymity provided by high population densities could explain the high concentration of same-sex couples in Australian inner cities. In-depth interview data are essential to ascertain whether those factors play into residential decision-making for mixed-ethnicity couples.

There are important limitations in using census data to explore residential geographies. First, cross-sectional data only allow us to explore where mixed-ethnicity couples lived at a single point in time. It is thus not possible to ascertain whether mixed-ethnicity couples formed *in situ*, or chose to move to particular localities. The international literature suggests that the latter is more likely (Holloway et al., 2005; Wright et al., 2011). In Australia, future research could begin to disentangle these processes by utilising longitudinal census sample files to explore the residential mobility of mixed-ethnicity couples—although this is challenging due to small population numbers and the coarseness of geographic units available in those datasets. Second, there are several individual- and household-level attributes other than ethnicity that shape where people live. Education, income, family composition and gender are examples of variables that may intersect with ethnicity in complex ways to shape residential outcomes for mixed-ethnicity couples. These variables are difficult to include in a study using customised aggregate census data tables, which enable total coverage of the Australian population but cannot drill down into individual-level variables. Again, given Australia’s relatively small population, counts become increasingly sparse with each additional variable, raising issues of data reliability. In relation to both of these challenges, in-depth interviews would help to gain further insights into how and why mixed-ethnicity couples have come to live in particular places, and our own ongoing research seeks to address this gap (see Chapters 6 and 7).
This paper is a first pass at exploring the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples across Australian cities and regions. We have shown that a focus on intra-household ethnic diversity is essential to understand ethnic groups’ residential patterns. Mixed-ethnicity couples have unique geographies that do not simply reinforce existing ethnic concentrations (cf. Holloway et al., 2005). Previous Australian literature on ethnic residential patterns indicates intergenerational movement of immigrant groups away from ethnic minority enclaves, largely to different neighbourhoods within the same broad area (SA3) of the city (Edgar, 2014; Johnston et al., 2017). Our study has revealed that the likelihood of residing outside these areas is markedly higher for ethnic minority persons with Anglo-European partners than for those partnered within their co-ethnic minority group. As mixed-ethnicity partnerships continue to become more common in Australia, these couples will play a key role in reconfiguring urban and regional ethnic landscapes (Ellis et al., 2012). The existence of mixed-ethnicity couples provides evidence of ethnic mixing within the intimate sphere of the home. Their residential geographies, in turn, are indicative of ethnic mixing across cities and regions. Increasing knowledge of their residential choices may help to challenge perceptions of ethnic groups’ geographical segregation. This is important because notions of ‘ethnic ghettos’ have long been used as an instrument to stoke hostility and fear in the broader population.
Chapter 4: The diverse geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples

Prelude II

This chapter addresses Aim 2 of the thesis, by presenting an analysis of the residential geographies of five select types of mixed-ethnicity couples, and exploring variations according to the partners’ respective genders and whether they have dependent children. It builds on Chapter 3 by using finer-grained ethnic minority groups in its definition of mixed-ethnicity couples, and further sub-dividing these couple types by the additional demographic variables noted above. The finer level of detail and disaggregation in this analysis is met with a trade-off in geographic extent. Due to the higher risk of the customised tables generating a multitude of small numbers in other (less densely populated) parts of the country, the analysis was limited to SA3s in Sydney and Melbourne, Australia’s most populous cities. The analysis in Chapter 3 was also entirely descriptive, which is valuable for establishing patterns in the data, but cannot tease out the effects of the various area-level characteristics that may shape where mixed-ethnicity couples decide to live. With this in mind, Chapter 4 includes a negative binomial regression analysis that systematically assesses the relationship between SA3 counts of mixed-ethnicity couples and SA3-level variables relating to ethnic diversity, socio-economic status and population density. These analyses enable the chapter to more definitively characterise the types of areas in which diverse types of mixed-ethnicity couples, in Sydney and Melbourne, live.

This chapter is a reproduction in full of the second paper published during my candidature:

I was lead author on this paper. I designed the customised census data request and analysed the data using Excel and QGIS. I also wrote the first full draft of the article. My primary supervisor, Dr Klocker, provided advice in designing the data request, interpreting the results of the analysis and shaping the theoretical dimensions of the paper. We jointly edited later versions of the article. Initial reviewer comments expressed some criticism at the lack of modelling in the analysis that was conducted in the first version of this paper. Hence, I spent considerable time researching various modelling approaches before selecting and conducting a negative binomial regression analysis. I took primary responsibility for addressing the reviewers’ comments and for producing a revised version of the paper, which was accepted for publication following these major revisions. The text from that publication is reproduced in exact form in this chapter, although the Table and Figure numbers and section numbering have been adjusted to fit within the structure of the thesis.
Abstract

The geographical distribution of mixed-ethnicity (or mixed-race) couples is an important indicator of the spatial dimensions of cultural ‘mixing’ in a given society. A small number of studies have mapped the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples, revealing distinctive residential patterns that differ from those of each partner’s respective ethnic group. Most such analyses have adopted broad pan-ethnic or racial categories (e.g. ‘black–white’, ‘white–Asian’). The Australian census—which eschews broad racial categories—provides an opportunity to explore the unique residential geographies of different ‘types’ of mixed-ethnicity couples. Using customised 2011 census data, this paper maps the residential geographies of diverse mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia’s most populous cities: Sydney and Melbourne. We focus on couples where one partner nominated ‘Anglo-European’ ancestry and the other nominated one of five ‘minority’ ancestries. Our findings highlight the value in disaggregating the coarse pan-ethnic or racial groupings adopted in some existing studies, and prescribed in some national censuses. The residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples challenge established perspectives on urban ethnic landscapes. As these couples grow in number, particularly in immigrant societies, they have the potential to fundamentally reshape established ethnic residential geographies away from patterns of residential segregation. Fine-grained analyses such as ours provide scope to explore the myriad directions in which these shifts will unfurl. They also provide a starting point for better understanding the preferences and pressures that shape the residential geographies of diverse mixed-ethnicity couples.

Keywords: mixed-ethnicity, census, diversity, residential geography, segregation, mixed-race, households
4.1 Introduction

The growth in mixed-ethnicity (or mixed-race) partnerships in multi-ethnic societies in recent decades indicates that social barriers between some ethnic groups are becoming less significant (Kalmijn, 1998; Khoo, 2011). These relationships are, in turn, a powerful catalyst for social and demographic change (Khoo, 2011; Wright et al., 2003). Mixed-ethnicity partnerships facilitate interaction between people of different ethnicities, extending from the partners themselves to family and friendship networks (Kalmijn, 1998). In England and Wales, the number of mixed-ethnicity partnerships grew by over 30 per cent between the 2001 and 2011 censuses (Office for National Statistics, 2014); while in the US, the number of inter-racial couples grew by 28 per cent between 2000 and 2010 (Lofquist et al., 2012). In Australia, 23 per cent of all marriages formed in 2006 were between an Australian-born and overseas-born partner, a stark increase from 13 per cent in 1990 (Khoo, 2011). These trends have driven a marked rise in populations of mixed-ethnicity individuals in the US, UK and Australia (Johnston et al., 2013; Khoo, 2011; Shih and Sanchez, 2009). Mixed-ethnicity partnerships are fundamentally altering both the ethnic composition of these societies, and their ethnic residential geographies. This paper explores the residential geographies of five types of mixed-ethnicity couples in two Australian cities. It draws on a fine-grained ethnic classification to demonstrate how mixed-ethnicity partnerships impact the residential patterns of diverse ethnic groups that are often hidden within broader pan-ethnic or racial categories.

We use the term ‘mixed-ethnicity’ to refer to couples in which the two partners have different ethnic backgrounds. While this definition appears straightforward, conceptualisations of ethnically or racially mixed couples are contingent upon the ethno-racial composition of societies, the nature of government population data and contextually specific attitudes toward ethnicity/race. Just as understandings of ethnic categories are fluid and socially constructed, so
too are perceptions of which partnerships constitute mixed-ethnicity relationships (Jayasuriya, 2002). Decisions about ‘who counts’ as a mixed-ethnicity couple are spatially and temporally variable and highly complex. In Australia, successive waves of immigration have continually reshaped notions of acceptable and transgressive ethnic mixing. Following World War Two, large numbers of migrants arrived from Southern Europe. These migrants were initially perceived as culturally distant from the Anglo-Celtic Australian population (MacLeod, 2006), thus partnerships with Anglo-Celtic Australians were quite rare and contentious (Price and Zubrzycki, 1962b). Yet the social and cultural distance between those groups has faded. Partnerships involving an Anglo-Celtic Australian and Italian partner, for example, are now both common and normalised. Today, more salient cultural barriers are perceived to exist between Australia’s Anglo-European ethnic majority and migrant communities from Asia, Africa and the Middle East (Blair et al., 2017).

Cognisant of this fluidity, our study does not include all couples with partners of different ethnic backgrounds. Instead, we focus on those couples where perceived cultural barriers remain salient, and whose partnerships have been shown to raise ‘concern’ amongst some Australians (Blair et al., 2017). As discussed by Luke and Carrington (2000), such perceptions are often based on ‘visible differences’ between partners. Further detail on these definitions is provided in the methods section of the paper. Below, we review the established literature on the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples. We use the term ‘mixed-race’ only when referring to other studies that have used that terminology in their own analyses.

4.2 The residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples

Geographers have established that mixed-ethnicity couples inhabit space unevenly (Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011). The residential decisions of mixed-ethnicity
couples—within financial and other constraints—thus have the potential to reshape established ethnic residential geographies away from patterns of segregation. Existing studies—focussed predominantly on large cities in the US and UK—have made four key observations regarding the unique residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples (Ellis et al., 2006, 2012; Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011; White and Sassler, 2000). Mixed-ethnicity couples: i) are more residentially dispersed than their broader ethnic groups; ii) tend to live in moderately diverse neighbourhoods not dominated by single ethnic groups; iii) are less likely to live in socio-economically disadvantaged neighbourhoods than broader ethnic minority populations; and iv) gravitate towards areas known for progressive social attitudes. These observations are discussed further below. The empirical portion of this paper considers the salience of these findings in Australia, and the extent to which they hold true when broad ethnic categories are disaggregated.

4.2.1 Residential dispersal and neighbourhood diversity

When compared with co-ethnic couples (partners sharing the same ethnicity), mixed-ethnicity couples have lower levels of residential segregation (Ellis et al., 2012; Iceland and Nelson, 2010). Ethnic minority persons in mixed-ethnicity relationships are less likely to live in neighbourhoods with high concentrations of their own ethnic group, and accordingly are more dispersed than those in co-ethnic relationships (Ellis et al., 2006; Feng et al., 2014; Holloway et al., 2005). In Australia, Walker and Heard (2014) and Biddle (2013) found that Indigenous persons with non-Indigenous partners tend to live in urban areas, which typically have lower proportions of Indigenous residents. Our research in Sydney (Tindale et al., 2014) demonstrated that ethnic minority persons with ethnic majority partners were considerably less likely (than their co-ethnically partnered peers) to live in neighbourhoods with a high presence of same-ethnicity residents. Dispersal was also evident amongst ethnic majority persons: those
with an ethnic minority partner were much less likely to live in predominantly ‘white’ parts of Sydney.

Mixed-ethnicity couples often live in diverse neighbourhoods with moderate proportions of each partner’s ethnic group. In a study of 12 US metropolitan areas, Holloway et al. (2005) found that most types of mixed-race households (combinations of white, black, Asian, Latino and American Indian) lived in more diverse neighbourhoods than white same-race couples, but less diverse neighbourhoods than non-white same-race couples. These couples occupied an ‘in-between’ space in the ethno-racial landscape of cities, not aligned with existing racial geographies (Holloway et al., 2005; Wright et al., 2011). Lending support to Holloway et al.’s (2005) ‘in-between’ thesis, Tindale et al. (2014) showed that mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney live in more diverse areas than co-ethnic majority couples, but less diverse areas than co-ethnic minority couples.

‘In-betweenness’ may be a function of mixed-race couples’ desire to avoid neighbourhoods dominated by single racial groups, where their identities may be constrained (Holloway et al., 2005: 321). Diverse places may provide accepting environments (Dalmage, 2000). Of course, individuals who already live in a diverse neighbourhood may be more likely to meet a partner from another ethnic background. However, neighbourhoods are declining in their significance as meeting points for couples (Bozon and Héran, 1989; Kalmijn and Flap, 2001), hence recent studies argue that the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples reflect the decisions made by these couples, rather than their in-situ formation (Ellis et al., 2012; Holloway et al., 2005).
Ethnicity intersects with other demographic characteristics in shaping the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples. Neighbourhood diversity may be particularly important to mixed-ethnicity couples with dependent children (Dalmage, 2000; Twine, 1999). They may seek neighbourhoods where their children will not be ‘hyper-visible’, to minimise exposure to racism (Twine, 1999: 737). Geographers have shown that, in England and Wales, mixed-ethnicity couples with children cluster in multicultural areas more than those without children (Caballero et al., 2008). Education, income, housing tenure, religious affiliation, nativity and age also intertwine to produce the spatial differentiations observed in the geographic literature on mixed-ethnicity couples (Smith et al., 2011). For instance, Holloway et al. (2005) noted that higher-income, home-owning mixed-race couples tended to live in ‘whiter’ neighbourhoods than other mixed-race couples. Meanwhile Wright et al. (2013) revealed gender asymmetries: mixed-race couples’ settlement patterns tend to be more aligned with the male partner’s racial group. However, regression analyses have shown that the ethnicity of one’s partner exerts an independent effect on residential location after controlling for other demographic characteristics (Ellis et al., 2006; White and Sassler, 2000).

4.2.2 Neighbourhood socio-economic status and social attitudes

Existing studies have also shown that mixed-ethnicity couples are less likely to live in socio-economically disadvantaged neighbourhoods than broader ethnic minority populations (Feng et al., 2014; Tindale et al., 2014), even after controlling for their own personal socio-economic characteristics (White and Sassler, 2000). Relatedly, Tindale et al. (2014) identified mixed-ethnicity couples’ propensity to reside in expensive inner city areas of Sydney, a pattern that distinguishes them from broader ethnic minority populations. The latter exhibit highly suburbanised residential geographies. Notably, Tindale et al. (2014) found that mixed-ethnicity couples have a propensity to live in areas of Sydney with high concentrations of same-sex
couples (Gorman-Murray and Brennan-Horley, 2010). With a reputation for progressive social attitudes, low levels of intolerance and highly diverse populations across a variety of axes, inner cities may provide residential environments where mixed-ethnicity households (and indeed same-sex households) can feel safe from discrimination (Gorman-Murray and Brennan-Horley, 2010; Tindale et al., 2014; Twine, 1999). We are unaware of other studies that have identified the inner city as an attractive residential environment for mixed-ethnicity couples. Here, we build upon our earlier analyses by investigating whether the propensity to live in inner city areas varies for diverse (disaggregated) mixed-ethnicity couples.

4.3 Disaggregation: the benefits and challenges of pulling apart broad ethnic categories

Geographers have almost universally adopted broad pan-ethnic or racial categorisations of mixed-ethnicity couples. US-based studies typically use ‘white’, ‘black’, ‘Asian’ and ‘Latino’, while UK-based studies use ‘white British’, ‘black Caribbean’, ‘black African’, ‘South Asian’ and ‘Other Asian’. Yet critical whiteness scholars have challenged the unproblematic acceptance of ‘white’ as a fixed and homogeneous category, because it hides a multitude of diverse ethnicities and is temporally variable (Mateos, 2014; Pavlovskaya and Bier, 2012). In the US census, people of Arab ethnicity are subsumed within the ‘white’ category, despite widespread evidence of racism against this group (Salaita, 2005). Equally, pan-ethnic ‘black’ and ‘Asian’ categories have been criticised for conflating several heterogeneous ethnic and religious groups with distinctive migration histories and residential geographies (Aspinall, 2003; Stillwell, 2010).

The propensity to adopt broad pan-ethnic or racial categories has important implications for studies of mixed-ethnicity couples, because these categories conceal potentially important
differences in their geographies. Ellis et al. (2006) offered an exception, studying the effect of partnership on residential choice for eight foreign-born groups in Los Angeles, including four Asian sub-groups. For all groups, partnership with someone of a different national origin decreased the likelihood of living in a clustered own ethnic group neighbourhood. Holloway et al. (2005) called for more studies investigating the geographies of select types of mixed-race households; as did Smith et al. (2011) in the UK. This paper responds to this gap.

We use customised data from the 2011 Australian census to explore the geographies of select types of mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Melbourne. Our focus is on mixed-ethnicity couples in which one partner belongs to the Anglo-European ethnic majority, and the other is from one of five ethnic minority groups with a sizeable presence in Australia: Lebanese, Vietnamese, Filipino, Chinese and Indian. This study deconstructs the ‘white’ and ‘Asian’ categories commonly deployed in research on the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples, shedding light on the diverse geographies of different mixed-ethnicity couple types. Such disaggregation enables greater responsiveness to the changing social salience of ethnic categories in different places, and at different times. As noted earlier, ‘who counts’ as a mixed-ethnicity couple has changed over time—pulling apart categories that are usually considered in aggregate offers a means of responding to such changes.

However, there is often a necessary trade-off between the granularity of ethnic groups and geographic scale. Finer-grained groupings are available within the US and UK census classifications, but these are usually aggregated in analyses of small geographical areas, to preserve confidentiality in the data (Mateos et al., 2009). Equally, trade-offs need to be made between the granularity of ethnic categories, and the range of socio-demographic variables that can be considered. These issues are discussed further below. Given these trade-offs, we argue
that different types of studies are needed to shed light on the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples—those that adopt a fine-grained approach to geography but use broad ethnic/racial categories (as has typically been the case); *alongside* those that adopt fine-grained ethnic groupings but at coarser geographical scales (as in the present study).

### 4.4 Methods

Our analysis deploys data from the 2011 Australian census. Information on partners’ ethnic backgrounds is not openly available, so a customised dataset was purchased from the ABS. The data tables, which provide 100 per cent coverage of census responses, consisted of counts of mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couples across 86 areas within Sydney and Melbourne. We included all cohabiting couples (de facto and formally married; same-sex and opposite-sex).

The Australian census includes three variables commonly used as indicators of ethnicity: country of birth, language spoken at home and ancestry. We used the ancestry question as it most readily facilitates the inclusion of second and later generation migrants. The census form asks, ‘What is the person’s ancestry?’ and advises respondents to consider the origins of their parents/grandparents. Our conceptualisation of ethnicity is based on self-identified ancestry, but does not distinguish between immigrant generations. Adding country of birth to our customised dataset would have resulted in a preponderance of small cell counts, impacting reliability.

As discussed earlier, the social salience of different types of mixed-ethnicity couples varies temporally and spatially, necessitating nuanced analysis and flexible categories. Accordingly, only some couple-types were included in our analysis. When there is a ‘visible phenotypical difference’ between partners, they are at greater risk of experiencing discrimination in their
everyday lives, which may affect residential decisions (Luke and Carrington, 2000: 9; Wright et al. 2003). We restricted our analysis to a subset of mixed-ethnicity couples—those in which one partner is part of the ethnic majority (defined below), and the other partner is from one of five fine-grained ‘visible’ ethnic minority groups with sufficiently large populations to enable local scale geographical analyses (see also Tindale et al., 2014).

The ‘ethnic majority’ category was constructed within the framework of the Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups (ASCCEG) (ABS, 2011a). It includes any ancestry responses from the following categories: Australian, New Zealander (excluding Maori), North-West European and Caucasian. We refer to this group as ‘Anglo-European’. It is worth noting that this group excludes Southern and Eastern Europeans. As noted by Farquharson (2007), Southern and Eastern Europeans occupy an ‘intermediate’ position in Australia’s contemporary ethnic landscape. They have high levels of integration, but are not yet definitively accepted as part of the dominant (white) Anglo-Celtic and Northern European culture (see also Tindale et al., 2014). Due to small population numbers, it was only possible to include five ‘visible’ ethnic minority groups: Lebanese, Vietnamese, Filipino, Chinese and Indian. This paper thus focuses on mixed-ethnicity couples in which one partner is ‘Anglo-European’ (as defined above), and the other identifies with one of those five ethnicities. We refer to these couples as ‘mixed Lebanese couples’, ‘mixed Vietnamese couples’, and so on.

To illustrate the importance of using fine-grained ethnic categories, we also briefly explore the geographies of more broadly defined ‘mixed Asian’ couples. The ‘Asian’ group aggregates the South-East Asian, North-East Asian and Southern and Central Asian categories in the ASCCEG, and closely approximates the ‘Asian’ category adopted in international studies (e.g. Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011).
Dual ancestry responses complicated our customised data specifications but enriched our data. In 2011, 32 per cent of census respondents nominated two ancestries (ABS, 2012). While previous studies of mixed-ethnicity couples have excluded dual ancestry individuals, we considered this too large a population to ignore. To avoid ‘overlapping’ ethnicities between partners in mixed-ethnicity couples, we only included dual ancestry persons who nominated both ancestries within the same category. For example, a person who stated the ancestries English and Australian (the most common combination) would be included in the Anglo-European category. However, an individual of dual English (in the Anglo-European group) and Chinese ancestry would be excluded from both of those categories. Persons who stated two ancestries in different fine-grained ethnic minority categories (e.g. Chinese and Lebanese) were also excluded from the analysis; as were those who stated a second ancestry not included in our analysis (e.g. South African or Brazilian)21. This approach excluded a small minority of the population. Of all partnered persons in Sydney and Melbourne who stated at least one ancestry in the six included categories, only seven per cent were excluded because they stated a second ancestry in a different category.

Data were obtained at Statistical Area Level 3 (SA3) within the Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne metropolitan areas (referred to henceforth as Sydney and Melbourne). Forty-six SA3s were included covering Sydney, and 40 covering Melbourne, with a mean population of around 98,000. Within metropolitan areas, SA3s consist of economic hubs or ‘groups of related suburbs’ (ABS, 2011b: 26). SA3s were the smallest level of geography at which it was possible to use the detailed ethnic minority categories noted above. Research in the US and UK usually uses smaller census tracts/wards that more closely resemble neighbourhoods. The larger

---

21 When defining ‘mixed Asian’ and ‘co-ethnic Asian’ couples, we include dual ancestry individuals who stated both ancestries within the same broad Asian sub-group (North-East Asian, South-East Asian, Southern and Central Asian). Thus, a person who stated Chinese (NE Asian) and Korean (NE Asian) ancestry would be included in the broader Asian category, but not in the ‘fine-grained’ Chinese category.
Australian SA3 geography is likely to present less extreme segregation patterns, as it may overlook ethnic group concentrations that occur at smaller neighbourhood scales within the broader SA3 regions. Any comparison with research from the US and UK must be made with this caveat in mind.

The geographies of different types of mixed-ethnicity couples are analysed through location quotients\(^2\) (LQs), which depict levels of concentration in each area relative to the metropolitan average. An LQ of 1.0 means the proportion of mixed-ethnicity couples in an SA3 is identical to the broader metropolitan area. LQs greater and less than one indicate above- and below-average concentrations respectively. The geographies of co-ethnic couples (where partners share the same ethnicity) are used for comparison. Maps were developed using QGIS to depict the spatial patterning of high LQ scores.

Our results also show the percentage distributions of mixed-ethnicity couples across SA3s based on: each ethnic minority group’s percentage share of the SA3 population; the Anglo-European share of the SA3 population; and overall ethnic diversity. Census data on the ethnic composition of SA3s were extracted using ABS TableBuilder Pro. SA3-level ethnic diversity

\(^2\) Following Wright et al. (2011: 10), LQs are calculated as:

\[
LQ_j = \frac{\left(\frac{P_{ij}}{P_j}\right)}{\left(\frac{P_{im}}{P_m}\right)}
\]

where \(LQ_j\) is the location quotient for mixed-ethnicity couples in SA3 \(j\). In the numerator, \(P_{ij}\) is the count of mixed-ethnicity couples in SA3 \(j\) and \(P_j\) the count of all couples in SA3 \(j\). In the denominator, \(P_{im}\) is the count of mixed-ethnicity couples in the broader metropolitan area, and \(P_m\) is the count of all couples in the metropolitan area.
was calculated using the standardised entropy index\textsuperscript{23} on the basis of 11 ethnic groups\textsuperscript{24}. SA3s across both cities were ranked and divided into diversity quintiles. Relationships between the prevalence of mixed-ethnicity couples and SA3 characteristics (including percentage Anglo-European, percentage identifying with the relevant ethnic minority group, percentage with a bachelor’s degree, and population density) were modelled using negative binomial regression, as discussed in the results section.

In later sections of the analysis, we disaggregate each mixed-ethnicity couple type by two additional variables: the ethnicity of the male partner (for opposite-sex couples) and the presence of dependent children. These attributes were selected based on evidence that gender (Wright et al., 2013) and family composition (Caballero et al., 2008; Twine, 1999) impact mixed-ethnicity couples’ decisions about where to live. As our data consist of counts of couples in geographic areas, disaggregation according to other axes of difference was not feasible—it would have resulted in a proliferation of small numbers. The core aim of the paper, however, is to highlight the diverse geographies of different types of mixed-ethnicity couples which are often obfuscated within broader ethnic categorisations.

\textsuperscript{23} The standardised entropy index for each SA3 is calculated as:

\[ E = s \times - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (K_i) \log(K_i) \]

where \( K \) is the proportional share of the SA3 population for each ethnic group (1 through \( n \)). The scaling constant (\( s \)) ensured that potential values ranged from zero (no diversity) to one (all groups present in equal proportions).

\textsuperscript{24} These were broad ethnic groups including: Anglo-European (defined previously), Pacific Islander, Southern and Eastern European, North African and Middle Eastern, South-East Asian, North-East Asian, Southern and Central Asian, Sub-Saharan African, mixed Anglo-European and SE European, mixed Anglo-European and one of the other aforementioned groups, and Other.
### 4.5 The residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Melbourne

The 2011 census recorded 35,636 mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Melbourne where one partner fit our ethnic majority (Anglo-European) definition, and the other was Lebanese, Vietnamese, Filipino, Chinese or Indian (Table 4.1). Together, these couples comprise just over two per cent of all cohabiting couples in Sydney and Melbourne combined. Mixed Chinese couples are by far the most numerous, and mixed Vietnamese couples the least numerous of these five couple types, in each city (see Table 4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couple type</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th>Melbourne</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Lebanese</td>
<td>3,349</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Lebanese</td>
<td>20,939</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>5,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Vietnamese</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Vietnamese</td>
<td>11,450</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>11,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Filipino</td>
<td>5,097</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>3,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Filipino</td>
<td>11,818</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>5,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Chinese</td>
<td>9,339</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>6,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Chinese</td>
<td>63,420</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>39,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Indian</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Indian</td>
<td>27,658</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>25,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mixed-ethnicity</td>
<td>21,416</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>14,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total co-ethnic minority</td>
<td>135,285</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>88,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European</td>
<td>381,866</td>
<td>42.02</td>
<td>369,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.

Figures 4.1 and 4.2 demonstrate the importance of accounting for diverse ethnic minority backgrounds. These couples are not homogeneous—and at times have divergent residential geographies. Using LQs, Figure 4.1 depicts the residential distribution of ‘mixed Asian’
couples—those in which one partner is Anglo-European and the other belongs to the aggregated ‘Asian’ group. Darker shading represents higher LQ values. For ease of interpretation, those SA3s with ‘well below average’ LQs (<0.75) have dotted patterning, those with ‘around average’ LQs (0.75 to <1.25) have lined patterning, and those with ‘well above average’ LQs (≥1.25) have no additional patterning. For comparative purposes, any SA3s where co-ethnic Asian couples registered LQs greater than 2.0 (hotspots) are indicated using bold outlines. Using the same symbology, Figure 4.2 depicts the residential geographies of three ‘subsets’ of mixed Asian couples—mixed Filipino, mixed Chinese and mixed Indian—and highlights hotspots for co-ethnic Filipino, co-ethnic Chinese and co-ethnic Indian couples respectively.

Figure 4.1: Distribution of mixed Asian couples by location quotient, and location of SA3 ‘hotspots’ for co-ethnic Asian couples, Greater Sydney (A) and Greater Melbourne (B).

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Figure 4.2: Distribution of mixed Filipino, mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples by location quotient, and location of SA3 ‘hotspots’ for co-ethnic Filipino, co-ethnic Chinese and co-ethnic Indian couples, Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Aggregated mixed Asian couples are strikingly concentrated in inner city Sydney and Melbourne (Figure 4.1; inner city SA3s labelled), contrasting with the suburban hotspots of co-ethnic Asian couples. However, Figure 4.2 reveals multiple geographies for finer-grained Asian sub-groups. Not all types of mixed Asian couples reside at their greatest concentrations in inner city areas. Inner city SA3s have the highest concentrations of mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples, but suburban SA3s are focal points for mixed Filipino couples. Further, the highest concentrations of mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples do not coincide with hotspots for their comparative co-ethnic minority couples. Yet the highest concentrations of mixed Filipino couples largely overlap with hotspots of co-ethnic Filipino couples, suggesting lesser residential dispersal. This may reflect group differences in socio-economic status. At the 2011 census, partnered Filipino/a persons in Sydney and Melbourne were markedly less likely than partnered Chinese and Indian persons to be employed as managers and professionals. Relatedly, Filipino/a individuals were less likely than Chinese or Indian individuals to have a personal weekly income in the top two brackets as defined by the ABS ($1,500–$1,999; $2,000 or more). In line with segmented assimilation theory (Forrest et al., 2006a, 2006b; Portes and Zhou, 1993), such differences in economic resources may limit mixed Filipino couples’ residential mobility in comparison to mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples. The following sections explore the diverse geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Melbourne in greater detail; comparing them against their co-ethnically partnered peers. We consider whether the key findings foregrounded in existing studies of the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples (based on broad pan-ethnic and racial groups) hold true when ethnicities are disaggregated.
4.5.1 A preference for inner city living?

Tindale et al. (2014) identified a propensity for inner city living amongst Sydney’s mixed-ethnicity couples. Figure 4.2 shows that, when disaggregated, diverse mixed-ethnicity couple types concentrate in different parts of Sydney and Melbourne—whether by choice or due to financial or other constraints. Mixed Chinese, mixed Indian and mixed Vietnamese couples (see Appendix 7, page 305) reside at high concentrations in inner city and nearby SA3s, contrasting with the suburban hubs of their co-ethnic minority peers. In Sydney, over 20 per cent of mixed Chinese, mixed Indian and mixed Vietnamese couples live in either Sydney Inner City or an adjacent SA3, compared to just 13.3 per cent of all couples, and even lower percentages of co-ethnic Chinese (10.4%), co-ethnic Indian (4.5%) and co-ethnic Vietnamese (5.4%) couples. Melbourne City and adjacent SA3s are home to 11.2 per cent of all couples, but 20.9 per cent of mixed Chinese couples, 25.2 per cent of mixed Vietnamese couples, and 16.7 per cent of mixed Indian couples. These three mixed-ethnicity couple types are more likely to reside in inner city areas than both their co-ethnic minority counterparts and co-ethnic Anglo-European couples (13.4% of co-ethnic Anglo-European couples in Sydney; 10.4% in Melbourne). However, the proportions of mixed Filipino and mixed Lebanese couples living in the inner cities and adjacent SA3s are around half those of the other mixed-ethnicity couple types. The highest concentrations of these mixed-ethnicity couples are in the suburban SA3 hotspots for their respective co-ethnic minority couples (see Appendix 7, page 305 for maps of mixed Lebanese couples).

4.5.2 Residential dispersal

International literature suggests that individuals in mixed-ethnicity partnerships are more geographically dispersed than those in co-ethnic partnerships. They are less likely to live in residential areas with high concentrations of their own ethnic groups (Ellis et al., 2006; Feng
et al., 2014; Iceland and Nelson, 2010). This is apparent for all five mixed-ethnicity couple types in Sydney and Melbourne. Table 4.2 shows the extent to which couples congregate in SA3s with high concentrations of either partner’s ethnic group. ‘High concentrations’ are SA3s where the particular ethnic minority group’s share of the local population is over twice their share of the metropolitan area population. High concentrations of Anglo-Europeans are SA3s where they constitute greater than 75 per cent of the population.

Mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Melbourne are much less likely than co-ethnic minority couples to live in SA3s with high own ethnic minority group concentrations. For instance, 78.8 per cent and 62.6 per cent of co-ethnic Vietnamese couples in Sydney and Melbourne (respectively) reside in a high-concentration Vietnamese SA3. The comparable figures for mixed Vietnamese couples are just 29.6 per cent and 26.5 per cent. The proportion of mixed-ethnicity couples residing in SA3s with high own-minority group concentrations is typically less than half that of co-ethnic couples (Table 4.2). Yet important differences are apparent. Mixed Vietnamese and mixed Lebanese couples have the strongest tendency to live in areas with high own-minority group populations, despite being far more dispersed than their co-ethnically partnered peers.
Table 4.2: Percentage of mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couples living in SA3s with (i) high concentration of own minority group\(^a\) (LQ > 2) and (ii) high concentration of Anglo-Europeans (>75% of local population), Sydney and Melbourne.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couple type</th>
<th>% living in SA3s with high concentration of own minority group</th>
<th>% living in SA3s with high concentration of Anglo-Europeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Lebanese</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Lebanese</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Vietnamese</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Vietnamese</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Filipino</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Filipino</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Chinese</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Chinese</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Indian</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Indian</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) For example, first row, first column shows the percentage of mixed Lebanese couples in Sydney who lived in SA3s with high concentrations of the Lebanese population.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.

All mixed-ethnicity couple types considered in this study are far more likely than their respective co-ethnic minority couples to live in SA3s with high concentrations (>75%) of Anglo-Europeans (Table 4.2). In each city, these areas are home to less than 5 per cent of each co-ethnic minority couple type, but around one-third of co-ethnic Anglo-European couples. Mixed-ethnicity couples fall in-between those extremes. In both cities, mixed Filipino and mixed Indian couples are most likely to live in SA3s with high Anglo-European concentrations. Mixed Vietnamese couples have the lowest propensity to live in these locations, but remain far more likely to do so than co-ethnic Vietnamese couples. These patterns may arise from distinctive cultural preferences, or occur due to pragmatic concerns (e.g. housing affordability) and require further unpacking through qualitative research.
4.5.3 Ethnically mixed couples in ethnically diverse areas?

Several studies have shown that mixed-ethnicity couples reside in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods (Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011). All SA3s (Sydney and Melbourne together) were grouped into quintiles based on entropy diversity scores. Table 4.3 shows the distribution of each couple type according to SA3-level ethnic diversity. The results support Holloway et al.’s (2005) in-between thesis, regarding the distribution of mixed-ethnicity couples. All types of mixed-ethnicity couples are less likely to live in the most diverse SA3s (Quintile 5) than their co-ethnic minority peers, but are more likely to do so than co-ethnic Anglo-European couples. Conversely, mixed-ethnicity couples live in the least diverse SA3s (Quintile 1) at higher levels than their co-ethnic minority counterparts, but are less inclined to do so than co-ethnic Anglo-European couples.

Table 4.3: Percentage distribution of mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couples across SA3s by diversity quintiles, Sydney and Melbourne combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couple type</th>
<th>Diversity quintile</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Very low)</td>
<td>2 (Low)</td>
<td>3 (Moderate)</td>
<td>4 (High)</td>
<td>5 (Very high)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Lebanese</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Lebanese</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Vietnamese</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Vietnamese</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Filipino</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Filipino</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Chinese</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Chinese</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Indian</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Indian</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All couples</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Notwithstanding these broad trends, important differences exist. The distributions of mixed Vietnamese, mixed Lebanese and mixed Filipino couples peak at the most diverse SA3s (Quintile 5). These SA3s are also places with high concentrations of Vietnamese, Lebanese and Filipino persons, so it is difficult to disentangle the attraction of diversity from the attraction of own-group presence. Mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples’ distributions peak in SA3s of moderate or moderately high diversity. Their residential focal points are locations where neither partner’s ethnic group is present at particularly high levels—echoing trends among black-white couples in the US (Wright et al., 2011). These insights disrupt expectations about the ‘types’ of places in which mixed-ethnicity couples typically reside. Finer-grained ethnic groupings make plain that there is no single geography of mixed-ethnicity couples. Rather, there are multiple geographies that appear to be contingent upon the ethnic minority groups involved.

4.5.4 Variations by gender and family composition

The spatial patterns identified thus far are based solely on combinations of partners’ ethnicities. The following analysis disaggregates each mixed-ethnicity couple type according to two attributes likely to intersect with ethnicity to shape residential outcomes: the ethnicity of the male partner, and the presence of dependent children.

Research in the US suggests that mixed-race couples’ residential geographies more closely reflect the male partner’s race (Wright et al., 2013). We find no substantive evidence of gender imbalances in Australian mixed-ethnicity couples’ propensity to live in areas with either high ethnic minority or high Anglo-European concentrations.25 The largest disparity (of just 5.6

---

25 Mixed Vietnamese couples were omitted from this analysis as their counts were prohibitively small when disaggregated by gender.
percentage points) is among mixed Filipino couples in Sydney: 21.8 per cent of those with a male Filipino partner lived in SA3s with high Filipino concentrations, compared to 16.2 per cent of those with a male Anglo-European partner. Distributions across diversity quintiles are also barely affected by the intersection of gender and ethnicity. The largest difference (6.4 percentage points) is among mixed Lebanese couples in the most diverse SA3s (Quintile 5), which were home to 42.5 per cent of those with a male Lebanese partner, compared to 36.1 per cent of those with a male Anglo-European partner. Mixed Lebanese, mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples with a male Anglo-European partner were very slightly more likely to live in inner city or adjacent SA3s in both cities, but the opposite was true for mixed Filipino couples. The most pronounced difference was among mixed Lebanese couples in Sydney: 15.2 per cent of those with a male Anglo-European partner lived in Sydney Inner City or an adjacent SA3, compared to 9.1 per cent of those with a male Lebanese partner. Thus in this study, gender had minimal impact on the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples.

The presence of dependent children can motivate mixed-ethnicity couples to live in diverse neighbourhoods (Caballero et al., 2008; Dalmage, 2000; Twine, 1999). Yet we find no substantial differences by parenting status in the propensity for mixed-ethnicity couples to reside in highly diverse SA3s. Across almost all mixed-ethnicity couple types in both cities, those with dependent children are more likely to live in SA3s with high own-minority group concentrations, although the differences are very small (Figure 4.3). The sole exception is mixed Indian couples in Melbourne: those with dependent children are slightly less likely than their childless counterparts to reside in an SA3 with a high Indian concentration. Co-ethnic minority couples are considerably more likely (than all mixed-ethnicity couple types) to live in SA3s with high concentrations of their respective minority ethnic group—whether they have dependent children, or not (Figure 4.3). Conversely, all types of mixed-ethnicity couples are more likely to live in SA3s with high Anglo-European concentrations than their comparative
co-ethnic minority couples, irrespective of children. As expected, mixed-ethnicity couples without dependent children more commonly live in the inner cities (or adjacent SA3s) of Sydney or Melbourne. But, in both cities, all types of mixed-ethnicity couples with dependent children more commonly live in inner city areas than co-ethnic minority couples with dependent children. The differences between mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couples are much larger than differences resulting from parenting status (see Figure 4.3). Thus, accounting for the presence or absence of children does not erase differences in the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couples.

![Figure 4.3: Percentage of mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couples living in SA3s with high concentrations of own-minority group (LQ > 2), by presence/absence of dependent children in the family, Greater Sydney.](image)

Note: DC = dependent children; NDC = no dependent children.
Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
4.5.5 Negative binomial regression

The final component of our analysis ran a set of multivariate regression models to explore whether relationships between concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples and those of their respective ethnic groups are statistically significant after controlling for other SA3 characteristics. We follow Wright et al.’s (2011) approach, and build on their work by using finer-grained ethnic groups, and by further disaggregating couples by gender configurations and the presence/absence of children. We focus this analysis on mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples—the only couple types with sufficient total counts, once disaggregated according to the ethnicity of the male partner and the presence/absence of dependent children. Our dependent variables consisted of overdispersed\(^{26}\) count data, so we adopted negative binomial regression with a log link function (Wright et al., 2011).

Our models estimated SA3 counts of mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples, both overall and when disaggregated according to the gender and parenting status. We also modelled counts of co-ethnic Chinese, Indian and Anglo-European couples, in total and disaggregated by parenting status. The independent variables consisted of SA3-level characteristics. Ethnicity-based SA3-level variables included the SA3 percentage Anglo-European and percentage Chinese or Indian. The entropy measure of SA3 ethnic diversity was excluded due to high correlation with the SA3 percentage Anglo-European. The percentage with a bachelor’s degree provided a measure of residents’ socio-economic status in each SA3. Population density (persons per square kilometre) captured the position of each SA3 within the urban landscape (higher population densities tend to be found closer to the inner city). Finally, the total number of couples in each SA3 was included to control for population size, and a dummy variable controlled for potential metropolitan-area variations between Sydney and Melbourne.

\(^{26}\) That is, the variances of the dependent variables greatly exceeded their respective means.
The results of the negative binomial models are shown in Table 4.4. Following Wright et al. (2011), the parameter estimates for each independent variable were multiplied by its standard deviation, and then exponentiated. The resulting numbers are interpreted as the estimated factor change in predicted counts of the dependent variable with a one standard deviation increase in the independent variable (Wright et al., 2011). Thus, in the model for mixed Chinese couples, the value of 1.311 for ‘SA3 percentage Chinese’ indicates that a one standard deviation increase in the SA3 percentage Chinese generates a 31.1 per cent increase in the count of mixed Chinese couples. Similarly, counts of mixed Indian couples increase by 20.2 per cent in response to a one standard deviation increase in ‘SA3 percentage Indian’. The corresponding values are substantially larger for co-ethnic Chinese and Indian couples respectively (96.3% and 117.5%).

The models thus confirm the results presented earlier: mixed-ethnicity couples are drawn to areas with high proportions of their own ethnic minority groups, but to a far lesser extent than co-ethnic minority couples. Increases in ‘SA3 percentage Anglo-European’ produce the opposite effect—moderate increases in counts of mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples (16.3% and 17.4% respectively), but sizeable decreases in counts of their co-ethnic peers (–39.9% and –31.7%). Lending support to the ‘in-between’ thesis (Holloway et al., 2005), the responsiveness of mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples to increases in ‘SA3 percentage Anglo-European’ fall in-between their co-ethnic minority and co-ethnic Anglo-European reference groups.

The additional predictor variables also provide valuable insights into mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential patterns. Mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples were both drawn to SA3s with higher percentages of residents with a bachelor’s degree. In terms of population density, a one standard deviation increase significantly predicts increases in both mixed Chinese (12.5%) and mixed Indian (22.3%) couples, but was not significant in the models for co-ethnic couples. This
supports our contention that higher density, cosmopolitan inner city areas are attractive residential locations for mixed-ethnicity couples.

Table 4.4: Negative binomial regression results. Parameter estimates multiplied by standard deviation of predictor variable, then exponentiated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable (couple type)</th>
<th>SA3 % Chinese</th>
<th>SA3 % Anglo-European</th>
<th>SA3 % with bachelor’s degree</th>
<th>SA3 pop. density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Chinese</td>
<td>1.963</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Chinese</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Chinese (male Anglo-Euro.)</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>1.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Chinese (male Chinese)</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Chinese (DC)</td>
<td>2.035</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>0.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Chinese (DC)</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European (DC)</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Chinese (NDC)</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Chinese (NDC)</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>1.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European (NDC)</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable (couple type)</th>
<th>SA3 % Indian</th>
<th>SA3 % Anglo-European</th>
<th>SA3 % with bachelor’s degree</th>
<th>SA3 pop. density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Indian</td>
<td>2.175</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Indian</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>1.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>1.610</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Indian (male Anglo-Euro.)</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>1.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Indian (male Indian)</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>1.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Indian (DC)</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Indian (DC)</td>
<td>1.247</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European (DC)</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Indian (NDC)</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Indian (NDC)</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>1.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic Anglo-European (NDC)</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Bold numbers indicate significant predictor variables at p < 0.05. DC = dependent children in family; NDC = no dependent children in family. Parameter estimates for SA3 population size and metropolitan area dummy variables are excluded to save space. Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.

When the ethnicity of the male partner was accounted for, there were few notable changes in the results (Table 4.4). SA3 ‘percentage own minority group’ (Chinese or Indian) and SA3
‘percentage Anglo-European’ generate increases in counts of mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples of both gender configurations. Population density significantly predicts increases in counts of mixed Indian couples (irrespective of gender configurations) and mixed Chinese couples with a male Anglo-European partner.

Finally, the draw of own-minority group presence in the SA3 is higher for mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples who have dependent children, than for those who do not. This potentially points to the importance of raising mixed-ethnicity children in residential environs that are supportive of their ethnic minority identities. However, counts of co-ethnic Chinese and co-ethnic Indian couples with dependent children grow more sharply in response to increases in SA3 percentage Chinese and Indian respectively (Table 4.4). Thus, there are clear differences in residential outcomes for mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couples even after accounting for parenting status.

### 4.6 Conclusions

Literature on the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples has predominantly focused on broad pan-ethnic or racial groups. Researchers have generally deployed large categories such as ‘white’ and ‘Asian’ that enable analyses at very fine spatial scales. While the results of these analyses provide rigorous statistical insight into the neighbourhood dynamics of mixed-ethnicity partnering, they obfuscate the distinctive experiences of the groups subsumed within those broader categories. Findings thus tend to be skewed towards the geographies of numerically dominant mixed-ethnicity couples (e.g. mixed Chinese couples in Australia).

We used customised data from the 2011 Australian census to reveal the diverse residential geographies of five types of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia’s two largest and most
ethnically diverse cities. When considered in aggregate, mixed Asian couples in Sydney and Melbourne are heavily concentrated in inner city areas. However, when finer-grained Asian ancestry groups are considered separately, we find that the inner city is the primary residential location for mixed Indian and mixed Chinese couples only. Mixed Filipino couples evince suburban residential concentrations more closely aligned with those of co-ethnic Filipino couples. Mixed Vietnamese couples have high concentrations in both the inner city and outer suburban areas. Further, we find that mixed Lebanese couples—which are typically subsumed by the ‘white’ racial category—tend to concentrate most heavily in similar suburban regions to co-ethnic Lebanese couples.

Through its focus on fine-grained ethnic minority groups, this paper adds nuance to established theories regarding the residential locations of mixed-ethnicity couples and how these connect to cities’ broader ethnic geographies. We have shown that mixed-ethnicity couples vary in their degree of residential concentration and in their responsiveness to SA3 ethnic diversity. Mixed Lebanese and mixed Vietnamese couples are most spatially concentrated, and are more likely to live in SA3s of high ethnic diversity, with higher proportions of their own ethnic minority groups. Mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples more frequently reside in parts of the city with lower ethnic diversity and larger ethnic majority populations. Mixed Filipino couples are most likely to live in SA3s in the highest category of ethnic majority concentration.

These findings offer important insights into the implications of mixed-ethnicity partnerships for urban ethnic geographies. While dispersal occurs across all groups, not all mixed-ethnicity couple types display an equal tendency to shift away from patterns of ethnic segregation. Our results support Holloway et al.’s (2005) ‘in-between’ thesis regarding the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in relation to each partner's respective ethnic group.
This pattern is evoked in the geographical distributions of all of our mixed-ethnicity couple types. Yet our results show that there are residential spaces where mixed-ethnicity couple concentrations do not neatly fall in-between those of their corresponding co-ethnic minority and co-ethnic majority couples. Namely, mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Melbourne tend to live in inner city areas at higher proportions than either of their comparative co-ethnic couple types. The spatial patterns of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia are both distinctive and reflective of the geographies of their constituent ethnic groups.

There are many possible explanations for the distinctive residential geographies of different types of mixed-ethnicity couples. Differences in socio-economic profiles may afford some mixed-ethnicity couples the residential mobility to move into a larger range of areas. Socio-economic status may also affect the geographical location of partners’ workplaces (e.g. corporate careers in the inner city)—with implications for residential decision-making. Variations in cultural norms may lead some mixed-ethnicity couple types to prefer to stay close to extended family. Further research is required to determine which attributes of inner cities are attractive to some mixed-ethnicity couples, while others maintain suburbanised concentrations (whether by choice or constraint). Future research needs to better understand what factors beyond neighbourhood ethnic diversity and socio-economic status shape the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples. The varied geographies of the mixed-ethnicity couple types considered in our study may reflect distinctive cultural preferences, socio-economic limitations, unique migration histories and durations of residence in Australia, family ties, industries of employment, proximity to workplaces and gendered power dynamics. We encourage future quantitative studies of the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples to focus on fine-grained ethnic groupings, whenever possible. However, in order to unpack these complexities it will be necessary to expand the use of qualitative methods in this field of study.
Such efforts are an integral part of our own ongoing research on the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia (see Chapters 6 and 7).

This article has responded to calls for greater attention to the residential outcomes of ethnic mixing within couples and households (Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011). As mixed-ethnicity partnerships become increasingly common in multi-ethnic societies, traditional understandings of ethnic diversity and segregation across urban space will be challenged. The preponderance of evidence indicates that mixed-ethnicity couples will, over time, contribute to more diffuse urban ethnic geographies and a concomitant decrease in ethnic residential segregation. This has important implications at the societal level—but also at the household scale. We have argued that a focus on fine-grained ethnic categories facilitates insights into diverse residential geographies. However, this approach also supports fluid analyses—that adapt to take into account the social salience of different mixed-ethnicity couples at different times and in different places.

To the extent that mixed-ethnicity couples and their children challenge existing ethnic residential geographies, they may find themselves living in neighbourhoods with minimal previous exposure to ethnic diversity, and in which they may be confronted by social expectations around the cultural (in)compatibility of particular ethnic groups. These experiences are likely to raise particular challenges for couples in which the two partners are ‘visibly different’ from one another, such as those included in our analysis. As ‘pioneers’, in predominantly ‘white’ neighbourhoods, these couples and their children may face discrimination. Such experiences demand research attention and—if found to be pervasive—intervention.
Chapter 5: New patterns of ethnic diversity: exploring the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity individuals in Sydney, Australia

Prelude III

This chapter addresses Aim 3 of the thesis by mapping the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity individuals in Greater Sydney. It builds on the couple-focused analyses in Chapters 3 and 4. This chapter provides additional insights into the potential impacts of mixed-ethnicity partnerships on ethnic residential geographies, over time, through the lens of mixed-ethnicity couples’ offspring. The data I have drawn upon in this chapter was extracted directly from the free online facility ABS TableBuilder. The analysis includes a mapping approach developed in the US by Holloway et al. (2012a), which I have adapted for the Australian context.

This chapter is a reproduction in full of a paper submitted during my candidature:


I was the sole author of this paper. I was fully responsible for designing and extracting the customised census data tables in ABS TableBuilder, analysing the resulting data, and writing and editing the paper to a standard suitable for submission to *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies (JEMS)*. The text from that manuscript is reproduced in exact form in this chapter, although I have adjusted the Table and Figure numbers, and section numbering, to fit within the structure of the thesis.
Abstract

In multi-ethnic societies, the rise in mixed-ethnicity partnerships has contributed to strong growth in populations of mixed-ethnicity individuals. Yet scholarship on ethnic residential geographies has predominantly focused on individuals with singular ethnic identities. Using 2011 Australian census data, this paper explores the residential patterns of mixed-ethnicity populations in Sydney, Australia’s most populous city. I deploy a mapping analysis to show that mixed-ethnicity populations’ residential geographies are unique, and do not match those of their constituent ethnic groups. In many cases, mixed-ethnicity individuals concentrate in inner city areas, in contrast to the suburban hubs of their respective ethnic minority groups. They are also more likely to reside outside neighbourhoods with high proportions of their constituent ethnic groups, and instead gravitate towards moderately diverse neighbourhoods. The paper demonstrates the in-between nature of the geographies of mixed-ethnicity individuals, echoing established findings for mixed-race/ethnicity couples. Further, these geographies are powerfully differentiated according to birthplace and educational attainment. Australia-born mixed-ethnicity individuals and those with bachelor’s degrees exhibit particularly extensive deviation from Sydney’s established ethnic landscape. The growing number of mixed-ethnicity individuals has implications for ethnic residential geographies both in this city, and in other diverse contexts.

Keywords: mixed race; mixed ethnicity; census; diversity; segregation
5.1 Introduction

Scholars have described the mixed-race household as a place ‘where newness can enter the world’ (Wright et al., 2003: 460). Mixed-race/ethnicity partnerships have substantial demographic implications through the birth of children with multiple racial or ethnic backgrounds (Song, 2009). Increasing numbers of mixed-race/ethnicity individuals disrupt established ethnic and racial boundaries: both social and spatial. The US mixed-race population is growing three times faster than the total population (Pew Research Center, 2015). Multiracial adults comprised 6.9 per cent of the adult US population in 2015. The share for multiracial children was even higher and growing more quickly (Pew Research Center, 2015). In England and Wales, 2.2 per cent of respondents selected a ‘mixed’ ethnic group in the 2011 census, up from 1.3 per cent in 2001 (Bradford, 2006; Office for National Statistics (ONS), 2012). In 2011, 32 per cent of Australians stated multiple ancestries, a large increase from 22 per cent in 2001 (ABS, 2012).

Conceptualisations of ethnic or racial ‘mixedness’ are contingent upon countries’ distinctive migration histories, perceptions of group boundaries and, relatedly, their census categories (Morning, 2014). The magnitude of the Australian figures noted above, vis-à-vis the US and Britain, reflects the distinctive operationalisation of race and ethnicity (and by extension, mixed-race/ethnicity) in each country’s census. The Australian census adopts a multidimensional approach (Aspinall, 2009), asking separate questions on different aspects of ethnicity, including country of birth, language, religion and ancestry. Mixed-ethnicity is indicated via multiple responses to the ancestry question, which lists tick-box categories that are coterminous with nationalities (e.g. English, Chinese), alongside an open-response option. The US and British censuses also enquire about various dimensions of race/ethnicity, but include an additional question that treats race/ethnicity as a global concept (Aspinall, 2009).
That is, respondents are asked to identify with a collective racial or ethnic grouping. In the US, mixed-race is indicated by selecting multiple races, from a list including white and black as response options. The British census offers four mixed-ethnicity response options (white and black Caribbean, white and black African, white and Asian; and open response). Multiple ancestry responses in the Australian census operate at a finer scale, and so encompass more people. Here, a person of English and Scottish origins would likely indicate multiple ancestries. In the US or UK, that same person would likely select a single ‘white’ category.

These cross-national differences result in varied nomenclature for mixed individuals. ‘Mixed-race’ or ‘multiracial’ are commonly deployed in the US. The UK census refers to ‘mixed/multiple ethnic groups’, but ‘mixed-race’ is more widely used in scholarship and everyday vernacular (Aspinall and Song, 2013). Accordingly, this paper contains some terminological fluidity. I use mixed-ethnicity when discussing findings of the present study, based on the Australian census. However, ‘mixed-race’ is used when discussing existing literature that adopts that term, and ‘mixed’ is used as a broad catch-all that encompasses mixed-race/mixed-ethnicity.

Existing research has explored how mixed individuals challenge socially constructed boundaries, and has documented their unique experiences of family life and discrimination (Parker and Song, 2001). Research has also explored the identification processes of mixed individuals, including how the choices parents make when describing their children on census forms depend on where they live (Holloway et al., 2012b; Roth, 2005). These studies—which are discussed in a later section outlining geographical perspectives on mixed-ethnicity

27 Other options include: American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian, Guamanian or Chamorro, Samoan, Other Pacific Islander, Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Other Asian, and Some other race.
populations—have revealed diverse, fluid and contextually-contingent identities. Thus, geography matters to the study of mixed populations.

This paper examines the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity individuals in Sydney, Australia’s most populous city. Following Song (2010), it avoids framing mixed-ethnicity people as a coherent group with common experiences. Most existing research has centred on black/white ‘mixing’, but mixed populations, and their experiences, are highly diverse (Aspinall and Song, 2013; Song, 2010). Mixed ethnic or racial identities intersect with other aspects of identity (e.g. gender, socio-economic status), mediating experiences of ‘mixedness’ (Song, 2010). Vertovec’s (2007) concept of ‘super-diversity’ is pertinent here, for highlighting the complex interplays between ethnicity and multitudinous other attributes that shape everyday life in diverse societies. Vertovec (2007: 1049) called for ethnic diversity research to ‘creatively consider the interaction of multiple axes of differentiation’. Notably, there has been minimal consideration of ethnically/racially mixed populations as an element of super-diversity (Fozdar and Perkins, 2014). Informed by Vertovec (2007), this study considers how birthplace and educational background intersect with ethnicity to shape the residential patterns of mixed-ethnicity persons. Inspired by Song (2010), it disaggregates the broad category ‘mixed-ethnicity’ into finer-grained groups and eschews one-size-fits-all conclusions.

This analysis is a first in Australia, where literature on ethnic residential geographies has overlooked people of mixed-ethnicity. Following international literature (Clark and Maas, 2009; Clark et al., 2018), my analysis explores how the geographies of mixed-ethnicity individuals connect to broader patterns of urban ethnic diversity and segregation. The paper extends previous works in two main ways. First, it presents an underexplored antipodean perspective (Fozdar and McGavin, 2017). Most research emanates from the UK and North
America. The lack of research elsewhere is problematic ‘given the importance of social and cultural location and policy context’ to experiences of mixedness (Fozdar and McGavin, 2017: 5). Second, it contributes novel insights to international scholarship on mixed populations by drawing upon distinctive (finer-grained) categories to define mixed-ethnicity individuals, and by showing how additional axes of identity (birthplace and education) intersect to produce unique residential patterns. The following sections describe the Australian ethnic landscape and migration context, conceptualise ethnic mixing in Australia, and then situate the study within existing research on mixed-ethnicity populations’ residential geographies.

5.2 Australia: a unique context for the study of mixed-ethnicity populations

The unique colonial and migration history of Australia and its contemporary socio-cultural environment offer a distinctive context for exploring the lived realities of ‘mixedness’ (Fozdar and McGavin, 2017). Australia’s migration history bears some similarities with the US and UK, particularly a diversification of immigrant source countries following World War Two. Prior immigration to Australia was heavily dominated by people from Great Britain, and indeed the 1901 Immigration Restriction Act (the White Australia Policy) inhibited the entry of non-white immigrants (Forrest et al., 2006a). In the 1950s and 1960s, Australia’s immigration intake extended to continental Europe. The dismantling of the White Australia Policy from the late 1960s enabled further diversification, including large numbers of migrants from Asia and the Middle East (Forrest et al., 2006a). Australia’s proximity to Asia has contributed to its unique contemporary ethnic composition. Further, Australia does not have numerically ‘dominant’ minority groups equivalent to African Americans and Latino/as in the US.

Notably, Australian cities have distinctive ethnic residential geographies vis-à-vis international comparators. Johnston et al. (2007) found that levels of ethnic residential segregation are
substantially lower in Australia than in the UK and US. Here, much larger proportions of the population live in ethnically mixed neighbourhoods, and ethnic minority groups usually live in neighbourhoods where they do not constitute a high proportion of the population. Ethnic minorities share residential spaces with members of the (Anglo-European) ethnic majority (Forrest et al., 2017), and this trend deepens across immigrant generations (Edgar, 2014; Johnston et al., 2017). These differences have been attributed, in part, to Australia’s multicultural policies, but also to the ‘relative openness’ of Australian society and a period of economic prosperity that enabled socio-economic progress and residential mobility amongst ethnic minorities (Johnston et al., 2007: 733). These processes have ‘produce[d] a set of relationships among peoples and spaces in the nation’s major urban areas which is uniquely Australian’ (Forrest et al. 2006a: 153). Accordingly, international studies of mixed-ethnicity populations are not directly applicable to the Australian context, although there are undoubtedly insights to be shared in both directions.

5.3 Conceptualising mixed-ethnicity in Australia

Ethnicity and race are dynamic, overlapping, socially constructed concepts that are temporally and spatially variable (Aspinall and Song, 2013). As discussed earlier, geographical differences in their conceptualisation are manifest in national census questions. The ancestry question provides the only opportunity to indicate mixed-ethnicity in the Australian census. The 2011 questionnaire asked, ‘What is the person’s ancestry?’ and provided seven tick-box options, which equated to nationalities (English, Irish, Scottish, Italian, German, Chinese and Australian), alongside an open-response option that allowed space for two ancestries. The census guide advised respondents to ‘consider the origins of the person’s parents and grandparents’ when responding to the question.
While the ancestry question has enabled mixed-ethnicity responses since 2001, few researchers have used it to study mixed populations. This reflects the lack of a mixed-race consciousness and vocabulary in Australian academic, policy or public discourses, compared to the US which has seen the growth of collective mixed-race identities (Fozdar and Perkins, 2014; Katz, 2012; Perkins, 2004). Public interest in mixed-race populations has also increased significantly in the UK in recent decades (Aspinall, 2015). Following the end of the White Australia Policy, race-based terminology has been deliberately avoided in the official lexicon in Australia, including the census (Katz, 2012). This has arguably hindered the development of mixed-race research in Australia (Fozdar and Perkins, 2014; Katz, 2012; Perkins, 2004).

An exception is Fozdar and Perkins (2014), who identified two main categories of mixed-race populations in Australia: those with mixed Indigenous/non-Indigenous ancestries, and those with white (Anglo-European) and non-white immigrant ancestries. The former category has received more scholarly attention (e.g. Paradies, 2006), due to a painful history of opposition to relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians, powerfully embodied by the Stolen Generations. The second category is challenging to define. Non-white immigrant ancestries are generally taken to encompass non-European migrants—predominantly from Asia, the Middle East and Africa. Further, ‘white’ has itself been a mutable and elastic category in Australian society. Those of Anglo-Celtic and Northern European backgrounds have historically been considered ‘more white’ than people of Southern European descent (Farquharson, 2007: 5).

---

28 From the early 20th Century until the 1960s, children of mixed Indigenous/European parentage were forcibly removed from their Indigenous families, with the intent of absorbing them into mainstream ‘white’ society (Katz, 2012).
Notwithstanding the lack of a clear Australian vocabulary vis-à-vis ‘mixedness’, mixed-ethnicity individuals and couples have faced opposition. Historically, scrutiny was rooted in sociobiological understandings of race underpinned by racial separatism (Forrest and Dunn, 2006). Contemporary opposition is more likely based on beliefs that cultural differences are insurmountable (Markus, 2001). Of course, some types of ethnic mixing draw more attention than others. In a recent Australian study, one-in-two survey respondents expressed concern at the prospect of a close relative marrying someone of Middle Eastern background. High proportions also expressed concern regarding African, Southern Asian and Jewish Australians (Blair et al., 2017). As explained in the methods section, these distinctions informed the framing of mixed-ethnicity in this study. The following section outlines the geographical literature on mixed-ethnicity/mixed-race populations. A focus on mixed-ethnicity populations’ residential geographies is relevant given evidence that attitudes towards ethnic mixing vary spatially (Forrest and Dunn, 2006); and that place powerfully shapes the experiences of mixed-ethnicity persons (Luke and Luke, 1998; Dalmage, 2000; Mahtani, 2002).

5.4 Geographical perspectives on mixed-ethnicity populations

Residential geographies offer important insights into the construction and enactment of mixed identities. Mahtani’s (2002) interviews with Canadian mixed-race women revealed that performances of mixed identities are place-specific. In the US, Holloway et al. (2012b) and Roth (2005) found that mixed-race children’s parents were more likely to identify them as multiracial in residential contexts with higher proportions of mixed-race individuals. Equally, the very presence of mixed families and individuals can impact the character of places by producing of new forms of urban diversity (Holloway et al., 2005) and reducing segregation (Clark et al., 2018; Ellis et al., 2012). There is thus a mutually constitutive relationship between place and racial/ethnic identities. Yet apart from a small number of studies in the US and UK
(Baugh, 2014; Bennett, 2011; Clark and Maas, 2009; Clark et al., 2018; Johnston et al., 2006), little is known about where mixed individuals live.

Research on the residential patterns of mixed populations is informed by broader studies of ethnic/racial residential segregation. Spatial assimilation theory posits that minorities translate acculturation and socio-economic gains into residential mobility, moving away from residential clusters (or ‘enclaves’) to purportedly higher amenity neighbourhoods. The result is greater residential propinquity with the majority (Massey and Denton, 1985). Mixed marriage has been positioned as the ‘ultimate’ stage in minorities’ assimilation (Wright et al., 2011). By extension, mixed couples and individuals may be expected to have similar residential patterns to whites. Indeed, Frey and Myers (2002) found that multiracial people in the US were less segregated (from whites) than single-race blacks, Asians or Hispanics. Similarly, Johnston et al. (2006) reported that in British cities, individuals with dual (part-white) ethnicities more commonly lived in white-majority areas than those with single non-white ethnicities. While these studies point towards spatial assimilation, others have shown that mixed populations’ geographies are complex.

Despite being less segregated than single-race minorities, mixed individuals’ (and couples’) residential patterns do not fully converge with whites, raising questions about the validity of spatial assimilation as an explanatory model (Wright et al., 2011). Clark and Maas (2009) found that the residential patterns of mixed Asian/other and mixed black/other Californians were distinctive from those of their constituent groups. They appeared to make intermediate residential choices, settling in diverse neighbourhoods. Additionally, Clark et al. (2018) found a positive association between neighbourhood racial diversity and high shares of mixed-race individuals in San Francisco and Los Angeles. Likewise, Baugh’s (2014) analysis of
multiracial adults in Atlanta illustrated a proclivity for moderately diverse areas. Research on the geographies of mixed couples has yielded similar results. Mixed-race couples in the US appear to avoid neighbourhoods dominated by single racial groups, instead exhibiting ‘in-between’ residential patterns focused on diverse neighbourhoods (Holloway et al., 2005; Wright et al., 2011). Analogous patterns have been observed in the UK (Smith et al., 2011) and Australia (Tindale et al., 2014; Tindale and Klocker, 2017).

Based on their lower segregation levels, Bennett (2011) argued that mixed-race individuals in the US occupy an ‘in-between’ social position. But this ‘middle ground’ is stratified: black-white individuals are more segregated than other mixed-race groups, affirming Song’s (2010) call to avoid treating mixed individuals as a single, coherent group. The distinctive residential geographies of mixed-race individuals in general, and of different types of mixed-race individuals in particular, likely reflect both preferences and constraints (Wright et al., 2011). Dalmage’s (2000) ethnography suggested that mixed-race black/white families prefer racially diverse neighbourhoods in part due to concerns about discrimination (or ‘borderism’29) in homogeneous areas. In UK-based research, white mothers of mixed-race children favoured diverse communities where their children would not be ‘hyper-visible’ and potential targets of racial abuse (Twine, 1999). Diverse neighbourhoods may allow mixed individuals and families to comfortably enact their mixed identities (Wright et al., 2011). Such neighbourhood choices may be available to mixed populations due to their socioeconomic status. Clark and Maas (2009) noted that mixed-race individuals had higher mean incomes than single-race individuals. However, Bennett (2011) found that socio-economic differences did not fully explain the higher segregation levels of black-white persons relative to other multiracial groups.

29 ‘Borderism’ refers to negative reactions towards those who traverse racial boundaries (Dalmage, 2000).
In Australia, existing analyses of ethnic residential geographies have not accounted for mixed-ethnicity persons. Given growth in mixed-ethnicity populations, it is timely to extend Australian research to incorporate this group. Further, despite the apparent interplay between race/ethnicity and socio-economic status (SES) in shaping mixed individuals’ residential geographies (noted above), no previous studies—in Australia or internationally—have mapped these patterns. This paper responds by outlining the geographies of Sydney’s mixed-ethnicity populations according to educational attainment.

5.5 Methods

5.5.1 Extracting data from the Australian census

Data from the 2011 Australian census were accessed using TableBuilder, an online ABS facility that allows users to generate customised tables. Extracted tables contained counts of mixed-ethnicity persons resident within the Greater Sydney Capital City Statistical Area, according to first and second ancestry response-combinations. The geographical unit was Statistical Area Level 2 (SA2), which represents a local community (ABS 2011b). It was not practical to use smaller units (SA1s)—which are closer in population size to census tracts (US) and wards (UK)—because the ABS randomly adjusts cell counts for confidentiality purposes, and small counts are most heavily affected by this process. Overall, 265 SA2s across Greater Sydney were included (mean population 16,572).

Responses to the census ancestry question are coded according to the Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups (ASCCEG) (ABS 2011a). Because there are no pre-defined mixed-ethnicity categories respondents can record personally-salient identities. However, there are over 300 ancestries at the most detailed level of the ASCCEG. My analysis was necessarily limited to certain ancestry-combinations. Mixed Indigenous/non-Indigenous
persons were unavoidably excluded because the census collects data on Indigenous status through a separate question that does not offer scope to indicate mixed origins.

To ensure sufficiently sized mixed-ethnicity populations for geographical analysis, ancestries at the most detailed level of the ASCCEG (predominantly based on national origins) were aggregated to reflect regional origins. The framework delineating these groups was established in earlier papers on mixed-ethnicity couples (Tindale et al., 2014; Tindale and Klocker, 2017). It distinguishes between the (Anglo-European) ethnic majority and several broadly defined ethnic minorities. In the remainder of this paper, mixed-ethnicity individuals are those who listed both an ethnic majority and ethnic minority ancestry on the census (see Table 5.1). The ‘ethnic majority’ reflects the culturally dominant (white) ‘in-group’ in Australian society, defined by Farquharson (2007) as those of Anglo-Celtic or Northern European heritage (henceforth referred to as ‘Anglo-European’). This included the following ASCCEG categories: Australian30, New Zealander (excluding Maori), North-West European and Caucasian.

---

30 This categorisation was constructed while cognisant that ‘Australian’ ancestry is conceptualised variously by census respondents. In the 2001 census, Khoo and Lucas (2004) found that second generation Australians were most likely to list ‘Australian’ in a dual-ancestry response. These are likely the children of mixed-ethnicity partnerships between migrants and persons of Australian ancestry. However, the authors conceded that some children of ethnic minority migrant parents, having been born in Australia, may list Australian as an indication of their nationality (i.e. an Australia-born individual with two Vietnamese migrant parents may list Vietnamese and Australian ancestries as part of a ‘transitional stage’ in their cultural affiliations, rather than an indication of ethnically mixed parentage). Nonetheless, Australian was included in the Anglo-European ancestry group, given the history of Anglo-Celtic predominance in the Australian population, and the instructions in the census guide to consider the origins of parents/grandparents in responding to the ancestry question.
Table 5.1: Framework for defining mixed-ethnicity individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic groups</th>
<th>Examples of included ancestries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic majority group</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>Australian, New Zealander, English, German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic minority groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North African and Middle Eastern</td>
<td>Iraqi, Lebanese, Jewish, Turkish, Sudanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Asian</td>
<td>Chinese, Taiwanese, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asian</td>
<td>Thai, Vietnamese, Filipino/a, Indonesian, Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern and Central Asian</td>
<td>Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Nepalese, Afghan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four ethnic minority groups included: North African and Middle Eastern (NA/ME); North East Asian (NE Asian), South East Asian (SE Asian); and Southern and Central Asian (SC Asian). These groups do not incorporate all ethnic minorities in Australia, but were selected for two reasons. First, they are usually ‘visibly different’ from the (white) Anglo-European majority. Visible difference is a key element of ‘out-group’ status and increases exposure to racism (Forrest and Dunn, 2006); with likely implications for residential decision-making processes (Luke and Luke, 1998). Second, these groups are sufficiently large to enable geographical analysis. This ethnic classification framework is unique amongst existing studies on the geographies of mixed individuals (e.g. Clark and Mass, 2009; Clark et al., 2018), which were unable to disaggregate the heterogeneous ‘Asian’ group due to data restrictions. Additionally, the framework facilitates analysis of mixed-ethnicity individuals with North African or Middle Eastern identities, which are subsumed within the ‘white’ racial category in the US census (Pavlovskaya and Bier, 2012).

In the following analyses, mixed-ethnicity individuals are labelled according to the relevant ethnic minority ancestry. For example, ‘mixed NA/ME’ refers to individuals who stated one ancestry from the North African and Middle Eastern category (e.g. Lebanese), and another from the Anglo-European category (e.g. Scottish). Throughout the analysis, I explore the geographies of ‘non-mixed’ individuals from the defined ethnic groups for comparison. ‘Non-
mixed’ refers to single-ancestry individuals in each of the defined regional-level groups, and dual-ancestry individuals who stated both ancestries in the same regional-level group\(^{31}\) (e.g. Filipino and Vietnamese in the SE Asian group).

The analysis was restricted to individuals who were likely to be residential decision-makers. These were identified using the Australian census’ ‘Relationship in Household’ variable, which distinguishes between ‘dependent’ and ‘non-dependent’ children. Dependent children are under 15, or full-time students aged 15–24 years residing with their parents/guardians. By excluding ‘dependent children’, the dataset reflects the residential patterns of ostensibly ‘independent’ persons. Informed by Vertovec’s (2007) discussion of super-diversity, and given evidence of residential dispersal of later immigrant generations and those with higher socio-economic status (Edgar, 2014; Johnston et al., 2017), each mixed-ethnicity population was sub-divided according to (i) birthplace (overseas or Australia) and (ii) highest level of educational attainment (lower than a bachelor’s degree, or bachelor’s degree and higher).

5.5.2 Analysing the geographies of mixed-ethnicity populations

Cartographic and tabular analyses revealed the spatial distribution of mixed-ethnicity individuals across Sydney. Holloway et al.’s (2012a) neighbourhood classification scheme, applied in geographical analyses of mixed-race individuals and couples in US cities (Baugh, 2014; Wright et al., 2011), was adapted for this study. Holloway et al. (2012a) argued that diversity and segregation intersect across the urban racial landscape. Neighbourhood diversity takes multiple forms depending on which group is numerically dominant. They divided census tracts into three diversity levels (low, moderate and high) based on the scaled entropy index.

---

\(^{31}\) This terminology is used for convenience, and is not intended to suggest that an individual with multiple ancestries within the same regional ethnic grouping is not ethnically ‘mixed’ in the more general sense.
Low- and moderate-diversity tracts were further sub-divided according to the numerically dominant group (white, black, Asian or Latino). Tracts were described as: ‘high-diversity’; ‘low-diversity, white-dominant’; ‘low-diversity, black-dominant’, ‘low-diversity, Latino-dominant’ and ‘low-diversity, Asian-dominant’ (the same breakdown was applied to ‘moderate-diversity’ areas).

In the present study, this approach was modified to suit Sydney’s ethnic landscape using different entropy class break values and separate classifications for each ethnic minority group. First, the scaled entropy index\(^{32}\) was used to group SA2s into three levels of ethnic diversity: ‘low-diversity’ (entropy < 0.408); ‘high-diversity’ (entropy > 0.778); and ‘moderate-diversity’ (entropy 0.408–0.778). Second, because it is rare for a single ethnic group (other than Anglo-Europeans) to form a majority in Sydney’s SA2s, moderate- and high-diversity SA2s were sub-divided according to whether the respective ethnic minority group formed 10 per cent or more of the population. Low-diversity SA2s, heavily dominated by Anglo-Europeans, were not sub-divided because no ethnic minority group exceeded the 10 per cent threshold in those areas. The resulting five SA2 types, using the Southern and Central (SC) Asian classification as an example, include: low-diversity; moderate-diversity (low SC Asian); moderate-diversity (high SC Asian); high-diversity (low SC Asian); and high-diversity (high SC Asian). This approach

\[^{32}\text{The scaled entropy index is calculated for each SA2 as:}
\]

\[E = s - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (K_i) \log(K_i)\]

where \(K\) is the proportional share of the SA2 population for each ethnic group (1 through \(n\)). The scaling constant \((s)\) ensures that potential values range from zero (no diversity) to 1 (all groups present in equal proportions). For these calculations, the total population of each SA2 was divided into 10 ancestry groups largely based on the broadest level of the ASCCEG: Anglo-European, Pacific Islander, Southern and Eastern European, North African and Middle Eastern, South-East Asian, North-East Asian, Southern and Central Asian, Sub-Saharan African, Mixed and Other. Dual-ancestry persons with both responses in a single category are counted in that group, and those with ancestries in different groups are counted as Mixed. ‘Other’ includes all ancestries that do not fit within the other nine groups.
reveals, for instance, whether mixed SC Asian individuals only concentrate in high-diversity SA2s with large SC Asian populations, or whether diversity remains salient in the absence of SC Asian concentrations.

QGIS was used to create base map layers of Sydney’s SA2-level compositional ethnic diversity according to the approach described above. Separate layers were developed for each ethnic minority group, then overlaid with layers depicting high concentrations (hotspots) of mixed-ethnicity individuals (according to ethnicity, birthplace and educational attainment), measured using location quotients\(^{33}\) (LQs). LQs indicate the extent to which mixed-ethnicity individuals are concentrated above (LQ > 1) or below (LQ < 1) the metropolitan area average (LQ = 1) in each SA2. Following Wright et al. (2011), I distinguished two levels of hotspots\(^{34}\) using thin (2.0 ≤ LQ < 3.0) and thick (LQ ≥ 3.0) red outlines (see Figures 5.1–5.4). The resulting maps display the geographies of different types of mixed-ethnicity populations across Sydney’s urban ethnic landscape. For clearer visualisation, the maps are zoomed in towards the city centre, excluding some outer metropolitan SA2s. These excluded areas were all low-diversity SA2s with zero hotspots. Accompanying tables show the percentage distribution of each mixed and non-mixed population across the five SA2 types (see Tables 5.3 and 5.4). Finally, multiple regression models (detailed later in the paper) assessed relationships between SA2-level ethnic

\[^{33}\text{Following Wright et al. (2011), LQs are calculated for each set of mixed-ethnicity individuals as:}\]

\[ LQ_j = \left( \frac{P_{ij}}{P_j} \right) \left( \frac{P_{im}}{P_m} \right) \]

where \(LQ_j\) is the location quotient for mixed-ethnicity individuals in SA2 \(j\). In the numerator, \(P_{ij}\) is the count of mixed-ethnicity individuals in area \(j\) and \(P_j\) the total population of area \(j\). In the denominator, \(P_{im}\) is the count of mixed-ethnicity individuals in Greater Sydney, and \(P_m\) is the total population of Greater Sydney. All counts used in these calculations are restricted to individuals classified as likely residential decision-makers, defined in the methods section.

\[^{34}\text{An SA2 was only included as a hotspot if its count for the group of interest was greater than 20. This excluded small counts, which are unreliable due to the effects of random cell adjustment in customised tables.}\]
composition and counts of mixed-ethnicity individuals, while controlling for SA2 socio-economic characteristics.

5.6 The geographies of mixed-ethnicity individuals in Sydney

The 2011 census recorded 38,466 mixed-ethnicity individuals of the four types specified above, 1.3 per cent of all residential decision-makers in Sydney. Mixed NE Asians (12,778 in total) and mixed NA/ME individuals (11,342) are most common, followed by mixed SC Asians (7,350) and mixed SE Asians (6,996). Each mixed-ethnicity population is considerably less likely to be overseas-born than their (non-mixed) ethnic minority counterparts (Table 5.2). Differences in educational attainment are less straightforward. Mixed SE Asians, mixed NE Asians and mixed SC Asians are less likely to have a bachelor’s degree than non-mixed ethnic minority comparators, but more likely to do so than Anglo-Europeans. Mixed NA/ME individuals are more likely to have a bachelor’s degree than both non-mixed NA/ME persons and non-mixed Anglo-Europeans. The following results reveal the unique geographies of mixed-ethnicity persons, demonstrating variations by birthplace and educational attainment. These additional variables impact residential outcomes, but do not obviate the effect of ‘mixedness’.
Table 5.2: Characteristics of mixed and non-mixed populations in Greater Sydney, 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Country of birth (%)</th>
<th>Educational attainment (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME</td>
<td>11,342</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA/ME</td>
<td>168,049</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian</td>
<td>6,996</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asian</td>
<td>134,517</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian</td>
<td>12,778</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Asian</td>
<td>284,551</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian</td>
<td>7,350</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Asian</td>
<td>166,278</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>1,534,378</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Country of birth ‘Other’ category includes ‘Not stated’, ‘Inadequately described’ and ‘At sea’. Educational Attainment ‘Other’ category includes ‘Not stated’ and ‘Inadequately described’. Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.

5.6.1 Mapping mixed-ethnicity individuals: patterns by birthplace

Figures 5.1 and 5.2 depict the geographical hotspots for mixed NE Asians and mixed SC Asians, sub-divided according place of birth (Australia or overseas). Appendix 8 contains the corresponding maps for mixed NA/ME (page 306) and mixed SE Asians (page 307). For mixed NE Asian, mixed SC Asian and mixed SE Asian individuals, there are clear contrasts in hotspot distributions according to birthplace. The overseas-born concentrate in moderate- and high-diversity SA2s with high (≥10%) proportions of their respective ethnic minority group, often located in suburban clusters west of Sydney’s central business district (CBD). The Australia-born concentrate in a smaller number of SA2s, most of which are moderate-diversity with low (<10%) own-minority group proportions, commonly located in the eastern metropolitan area close to the CBD. Overseas-born and Australia-born mixed NA/ME individuals have overlapping hotspot locations, primarily in a large cluster of high-diversity, high proportion NA/ME SA2s in the western suburbs.
Figure 5.1: High concentrations of mixed NE Asian individuals (A) born overseas and (B) born in Australia, SA2s, Greater Sydney, 2011.

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.
Figure 5.2: High concentrations of mixed SC Asian individuals (A) born overseas and (B) born in Australia, SA2s, Greater Sydney, 2011.

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.
Supplementing these visual portrayals, Table 5.3 shows the percentage distributions of each mixed-ethnicity population (disaggregated by birthplace) across the five SA2 types. The corresponding distributions of non-mixed minority groups, non-mixed Anglo-Europeans, and the total population (of residential decision-makers) are included. Overseas-born (OS-born) mixed persons evince consistently closer distributions to their ethnic minority counterparts, while the Australia-born (Aus.-born) are more similar to Anglo-Europeans. The latter are more often resident in low- and moderate-diversity SA2s with low co-ethnic minority populations. For example, 5.0 per cent of overseas-born mixed NE Asians live in low-diversity SA2s, compared with 20.7 per cent of the Australia-born. For all groups, overseas-born mixed-persons are substantially more likely to reside in moderate- and high-diversity SA2s with high co-ethnic minority populations. The presence of a high co-ethnic minority population is a major distinguishing factor. The furthermost right column in Table 5.3 shows the total percentage of each group residing in any SA2s with high own-minority group populations. Across all mixed groups, the Australia-born have a far lower propensity to live in such localities (by 20–30 percentage points) than the overseas-born. All types of mixed-ethnicity individuals considered in this study exhibit residential dispersal away from areas associated with their respective ethnic minority groups, but this is particularly pronounced for the Australia-born.
Table 5.3: Percentage distribution of mixed (by birthplace) and non-mixed populations across SA2 diversity types, Greater Sydney.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate (&lt;10% minority)</th>
<th>Moderate (≥10% minority)</th>
<th>High (&lt;10% minority)</th>
<th>High (≥10% minority)</th>
<th>All SA2s with ≥10% minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA/ME SA2 classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA/ME</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME (OS-born)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME (Aus.-born)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE Asian SA2 classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asian</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian (OS-born)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian (Aus.-born)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE Asian SA2 classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Asian</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian (OS-born)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian (Aus.-born)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC Asian SA2 classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Asian</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian (OS-born)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian (Aus.-born)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The SA2 types (excluding ‘low diversity’) are defined relative to the ethnic minority group of interest. For example, the first row, second column shows that 33.3% of non-mixed NA/ME persons live in moderate diversity SA2s with <10% NA/ME populations.

<sup>b</sup> Refers to those classified as residential decision-makers.

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.

Notwithstanding these differences, the salience of mixedness remains. The distributions of all mixed-ethnicity populations across SA2 types are situated in-between those of their respective non-mixed groups, irrespective of birthplace (Table 5.3). For each mixed-ethnicity population, both birthplace cohorts are more likely to live in low-diversity SA2s than their respective non-mixed ethnic minority groups, but less likely to do so than non-mixed Anglo-Europeans. With only one exception (mixed NE Asians in high-diversity, low NE Asian SA2s), all mixed groups
are more likely than non-mixed Anglo-Europeans to live in high-diversity SA2s, and moderate-diversity SA2s with high co-ethnic minority populations, but are less likely to do so than their respective non-mixed minority groups. The in-between pattern is broken in moderate-diversity SA2s with low co-ethnic minority populations. Australia-born mixed SE Asians, mixed NE Asians and mixed SC Asians more commonly reside in such locales than their (non-mixed) ethnic minority peers and (non-mixed) Anglo-Europeans groups. Overall, Table 5.3 indicates a general pattern of ‘in-betweenness’ and suggests that birthplace is important but cannot fully account for differences in residential geographies between mixed and non-mixed individuals.

5.6.2 Mapping mixed-ethnicity individuals: patterns by education

Figures 5.3 and 5.4 display the geographical hotspots for mixed NA/ME and mixed SE Asian individuals according to their educational attainment (see Appendix 8, pages 308–309, for mixed NE Asians and mixed SC Asians). These maps underscore the role of socio-economic status in shaping residential outcomes for mixed-ethnicity individuals. Those without bachelor’s degrees concentrate in moderate- and high-diversity SA2s with high co-ethnic minority populations. Those with bachelor’s degrees shift towards moderate-diversity inner city SA2s with low co-ethnic minority populations. For mixed NA/ME and mixed SE Asian individuals, hotspots for those with bachelor’s degrees are located almost entirely outside SA2s with high NA/ME and SE Asian populations respectively.
Figure 5.3: High concentrations of mixed NA/ME individuals (A) without a bachelor’s degree and (B) with a bachelor’s degree or higher, SA2s, Greater Sydney, 2011.

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.
Figure 5.4: High concentrations of mixed SE Asian individuals (A) without a bachelor’s degree and (B) with a bachelor’s degree or higher, SA2s, Greater Sydney, 2011.

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.
Table 5.4 is structured like Table 5.3 but focuses on educational attainment. As with birthplace, the distributions of each mixed population generally fall in-between those of their respective (non-mixed) ethnic minority group and non-mixed Anglo-Europeans, across educational attainment levels. Exceptions include mixed NA/ME and mixed SE Asian individuals with bachelor’s degrees, who are more likely to live in moderate-diversity SA2s with low co-ethnic minority populations than their comparative non-mixed ethnic minority groups and Anglo-Europeans. There are two SA2 types where distributional differences pertaining to education are most stark. First, those with bachelor’s degrees are far more likely to reside in moderate-diversity SA2s with low co-ethnic minority populations. For example, 69.6 per cent of mixed NA/ME individuals with bachelor’s degrees live in such SA2s, compared to just 40.4 per cent of those without bachelor’s degrees. Second, those without bachelor’s degrees have much larger proportions in high-diversity SA2s with high co-ethnic minority populations. For example, 33.5 per cent of mixed NA/ME individuals without a bachelor’s degree reside in such SA2s, compared to just 10.5 per cent of those with a bachelor’s degree. The propensity to reside in any SA2 with a high co-ethnic minority population (Table 5.4) is generally lower for mixed individuals with a bachelor’s degree than those without. Mixed NE Asians are the exception: 49.9 per cent of those with a bachelor’s degree live in SA2s with high NE Asian populations, compared to 44.2 per cent of those without a bachelor’s degree.
Table 5.4: Percentage distribution of mixed (by educational attainment) and non-mixed populations across SA2 diversity types, Greater Sydney.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>Low (&lt;10% minority)</th>
<th>Moderate (≥10% minority)</th>
<th>High (&lt;10% minority)</th>
<th>High (≥10% minority)</th>
<th>All SA2s with ≥10% minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA/ME SA2 classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA/ME</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME (no degree)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME (degree)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asian SA2 classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asian</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian (no degree)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian (degree)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Asian SA2 classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Asian</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian (no degree)</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian (degree)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Asian SA2 classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Asian</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian (no degree)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian (degree)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The SA2 types (other than ‘low diversity’) are defined relative to the ethnic minority group of interest. For example, the first row, third column shows that 11.6% of non-mixed NA/ME persons live in moderate-diversity SA2s with large (≥10%) NA/ME populations.

<sup>b</sup>Refers to those classified as residential decision-makers.

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.

Unexpectedly, mixed SE Asians, mixed NE Asians and mixed SC Asians with a bachelor’s degree are less likely to live in low-diversity (predominantly Anglo-European) SA2s than those without. According to spatial assimilation theory, ethnic minorities translate socio-economic progress (indicated here by educational attainment) into ‘improved’ residential location and greater residential propinquity with the ethnic majority (Massey and Denton, 1985). Yet in these cases, those with higher education levels are less likely to live in low-diversity, Anglo-
European-dominated areas. This is likely because Sydney’s most socio-economically advantaged residential areas are not exclusively dominated by Anglo-Europeans. A large proportion of Sydney’s wealthiest neighbourhoods—located in and to the north of the CBD—are moderately diverse. Mixed individuals may be converting educational attainment into residence in higher-status neighbourhoods, but these are not necessarily dominated by Anglo-Europeans.

5.6.3 Regression models

Following Wright et al. (2011) and Baugh (2014), multivariate regression models were used to explore the effects of co-ethnic minority group presence and overall ethnic diversity on concentrations of mixed individuals, after controlling for other SA2-level socio-economic and demographic characteristics. The models estimate SA2 counts of each mixed-ethnicity population (disaggregated by birthplace and education), non-mixed ethnic minority population and non-mixed Anglo-Europeans. These dependent variables consist of overdispersed\(^{35}\) count data, so negative binomial regression with a log link function was used (Wright et al., 2011). The independent variables are SA2 characteristics: the percentage of the population in the respective ethnic minority group; scaled entropy; median weekly household income; percentage living in owner-occupied dwellings (an indicator of socio-economic status); population density per square kilometre (an indicator of each SA2’s position within the urban morphology—higher population densities are generally in the inner city); percentage aged 65+ (to account for age structure); and the total number of residents in each SA2 (to control for population size). Percentage Anglo-European was excluded due to high correlation with entropy and associated concerns about multicollinearity. To account for spatial autocorrelation,

\(^{35}\) The variances of the dependent variables greatly exceeded their respective means.
spatial lags of the dependent variables were included, constructed using GeoDa as the average of counts in neighbouring SA2s.

Table 5.5 shows the model results. Following Wright et al. (2011), the parameter estimate for each independent variable was multiplied by its standard deviation, then exponentiated. The resulting numbers are interpreted as the estimated factor change in the dependent variable with a one standard deviation increase in the independent variable (Wright et al., 2011). Thus, in the model for mixed NE Asians (OS-born), the value of 1.408 for ‘% own-minority group’ indicates that a one standard deviation increase in the SA2 percentage NE Asian generates a 40.8 per cent increase in the count of overseas-born mixed NE Asians. The results show that co-ethnic minority presence is attractive to almost all types of mixed populations considered in this study, but is not significant for mixed SE Asians with bachelor’s degrees, or Australia-born mixed NE Asians, mixed SE Asians or mixed SC Asians. Overall, the results affirm the findings from the tabular analysis: mixed individuals appear to maintain some attachment to local areas based on the presence of co-ethnic minority populations. Birthplace and educational background condition these levels of attachment to an extent.
Table 5.5: Negative binomial regression results—parameter estimates (multiplied by standard deviation of independent variable, then exponentiated).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable (counts in SA2s)</th>
<th>% own minority group a</th>
<th>Scaled entropy</th>
<th>Pop. density</th>
<th>% aged 65+</th>
<th>% owner-occupied dwellings</th>
<th>Median household income</th>
<th>Total persons</th>
<th>Spatial lag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA/ME models</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA/ME</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td>2.595</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>1.502</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME (OS-born)</td>
<td>1.690</td>
<td>1.420</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME (Aus.-born)</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>1.466</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME (No bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NA/ME (Bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td>1.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE Asian models</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Asian</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td>1.809</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian (OS-born)</td>
<td>1.376</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>1.531</td>
<td>1.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian (Aus.-born)</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian (No bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>1.232</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td>1.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SE Asian (Bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td>1.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>1.516</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE Asian models</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Asian</td>
<td>1.576</td>
<td>1.941</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>1.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian (OS-born)</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>1.496</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian (Aus.-born)</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian (No bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>1.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed NE Asian (Bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>1.548</td>
<td>1.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>1.535</td>
<td>1.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC Asian models</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Asian</td>
<td>1.685</td>
<td>1.998</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>1.678</td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian (OS-born)</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>1.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian (Aus.-born)</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>1.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian (No bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>1.585</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed SC Asian (Bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>1.501</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-European</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>1.530</td>
<td>1.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Refers to the specific ethnic minority group within each set of models. For instance, the first six rows refer to the SA2 % NA/ME.

Note: Bold numbers indicate statistically significant independent variables at p < 0.05.

Source: Generated using data provided by the ABS.
Consistent with the in-between thesis outlined for mixed-race couples (Holloway et al., 2005), the sensitivities of mixed individuals to neighbourhood diversity fall in-between those of Anglo-Europeans and their respective (non-mixed) ethnic minority populations (Table 5.5). Across the four sets of models, a one standard deviation increase in entropy generates 22.3 per cent to 25.2 per cent decreases in counts of non-mixed Anglo-Europeans. Conversely, counts of non-mixed minority individuals grow by 80.9 per cent (SE Asians) to 159.5 per cent (NA/ME). The effects on mixed populations fall in-between these extremes. Although entropy (i.e. diversity) is significant in the models for all non-mixed groups, it is only significant in half of the models for mixed populations. Among mixed NA/ME individuals, only the overseas-born and without a bachelor’s degree are drawn to diverse SA2s. For mixed NE Asians, a one standard deviation increase in entropy produces a 34.4 per cent increase in counts of the overseas-born, but a 16.5 per cent decrease in counts of the Australia-born, and a 10.4 per cent decrease in counts of those without a bachelor’s degree. Among mixed SE Asians, only those with a bachelor’s degree are attracted to diverse SA2s. For mixed SC Asians, diversity negatively impacts counts of the Australia-born and those without a bachelor’s degree. These results underscore the complex ways in which mixed populations map onto broader geographies of ethnic diversity. The attraction of diversity is dependent on both the specific mixed-ethnicity group under consideration, alongside other identity markers.

5.7 Discussion and conclusions

The residential geographies of ethnic groups provide insights into levels of integration. Theoretical approaches have predicted the gradual incorporation of ethnic minority migrants into the ‘host’ society, with economic and cultural integration reducing residential separation over time. This process is mediated by preferences for certain neighbourhood types (based on ethnic composition) as well as constraints faced by ethnic minorities in the search for housing.
Rarely, however, have studies of this nature considered the geographies of mixed populations. The growth in such populations challenges existing notions of how ethnic diversity and segregation play out across space. The relatively recent addition of mixed categories in national censuses presents an opportunity to explore mixed individuals’ residential choices.

Based on the 2011 Australian census, this study explored the unique geographies of four mixed-ethnicity populations in Sydney. It has shown that mixed-ethnicity populations have diverse spatial patterns of residence, which vary according to ethnicity, birthplace and educational attainment. The study utilised three analytical approaches. First, a cartographic analysis demonstrated that mixed-ethnicity individuals (particularly the Australia-born and those with bachelor’s degrees) tend to concentrate in different parts of Sydney to their constituent non-mixed groups. Several mixed-ethnicity populations have residential hotspots in high socio-economic status neighbourhoods in inner Sydney, in contrast to the suburban concentrations of their respective (non-mixed) ethnic minority groups, and outer-suburban concentrations of the Anglo-European ethnic majority. These findings mirror those for mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney, who also evince inner city hubs of concentration (Tindale et al., 2014; Tindale and Klocker, 2017). Ethnographic methods are necessary to elucidate the attractiveness of inner city locales for these groups.

The cartographic analysis offered striking visual portrayals of where Sydney’s mixed-ethnicity populations live. An accompanying tabular analysis outline the percentage distributions of each mixed-ethnicity and non-mixed population across SA2 types, according to their overall level of ethnic diversity and concentration of the respective ethnic minority group. Overall, mixed-ethnicity individuals evince distributions in-between their comparative (non-mixed) ethnicity minority groups and Anglo-European Australians. Mixed-ethnicity populations are more likely
to live in low-diversity (Anglo-European-dominated) SA2s than their respective non-mixed ethnic minority groups. However, they are less likely to live in such areas than Anglo-Europeans. Conversely, mixed-ethnicity individuals are less likely to reside in high-diversity SA2s than their non-mixed ethnic minority counterparts, but more likely to do so than Anglo-Europeans. The propensity for mixed-ethnicity individuals to live in moderately diverse areas is strongly differentiated according to the presence/absence of a co-ethnic minority concentration. Compared to their ethnic minority counterparts, mixed-ethnicity individuals are more likely to live in moderately diverse SA2s with low (<10%) populations of their respective ethnic minority group. The reverse is true in comparison to Anglo-Europeans.

The final component of the analysis was a set of negative binomial regression models, which affirmed the findings of the tabular analysis. The models demonstrated that mixed-ethnicity individuals’ attraction to diverse areas falls between Anglo-Europeans and their respective (non-mixed) ethnic minority groups, even after controlling for SA2-level socio-demographic characteristics. The models also underscored the influence of birthplace and educational attainment on these residential patterns.

These trends are similar to those observed among mixed-race individuals (Baugh, 2014; Clark and Maas, 2009) and couples (Wright et al., 2011) in the US, who are drawn to moderately diverse neighbourhoods that are not dominated by either of their constituent ethnic groups. They support Johnston et al.’s (2006) UK-based study, which found that dual-ethnicity individuals more commonly lived in white-dominated neighbourhoods than those with single minority ethnicities. The findings suggest that mixed-ethnicity individuals have lesser geographical attachment to their broader ethnic groups (minority and majority). Their residential geographies pull against ethnic residential clustering. Moreover, the residential
decisions of mixed-ethnicity individuals vary according to birthplace and educational attainment. The Australia-born are particularly inclined to reside outside SA2s with large own-minority group populations; so too are mixed NA/ME and mixed SE Asian individuals with bachelor’s degrees. These findings affirm the importance of nuanced approaches to mixed-ethnicity populations that consider multiple axes of difference (Vertovec, 2007) and avoid treating diverse mixed-ethnicity populations as one coherent group (Song, 2010).

While this study was based on census data, it is cognisant of their limitations and of the need for interview-based research to fill remaining knowledge-gaps. Ethnicity and race are fluid and intimately connected to temporal and spatial factors. The very likelihood that someone will identify as mixed on the census varies according to local context (Holloway et al., 2012b). Further, conceptualisations of race and ethnicity vary across national censuses. Different countries adopt varied terminology, measurement approaches and classification schemes. Hence, there are inevitable limitations in cross-national comparisons of the geographies of mixed-ethnicity populations. The results presented in this paper, and connections made to international studies, must be interpreted with these caveats in mind.

This paper builds on existing investigations of the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples, and the very small number of geographical studies of mixed-ethnicity individuals. It is the first study of this type to be conducted in Australia. Internationally, this paper is significant for its novel ethnic categorisation framework, which pays attention to the diversity of Asian sub-groups and provides a distinct ‘North African and Middle Eastern’ category. The latter is typically conflated with the ‘white’ racial group in the US. So too, for differentiating mixed-ethnicity populations according to birthplace and educational attainment. The residential patterns of different mixed-ethnicity populations in Sydney are diverse, and
undoubtedly shaped by these additional markers of identity. However, the overall relevance of mixedness remains. Overwhelmingly, mixed-ethnicity individuals make residential choices that do not align with their respective (non-mixed) ethnic minority or ethnic majority groups. As mixed-ethnicity populations continue to grow in Australia and elsewhere, existing patterns of ethnic diversity and segregation are likely to be re-shaped. Further research on the geographies of mixed-ethnicity groups is paramount to understanding these changes.
Chapter 6: Qualitative research with mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Darwin

Thus far, this thesis has deployed quantitative methods to analyse the residential geographies of several types of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals across Australian cities and regions. It has revealed that mixed-ethnicity couples have distinct spatial patterns in relation to couples where both partners share the same ethnic background. These patterns are the aggregate outcome of residential decisions made by each household. But census data are unable to enter this realm of enquiry. While census-based analyses can provide insights into certain demographic characteristics of mixed-ethnicity couples, including where they live, they cannot shed light on the complex motivations driving couples’ choice of residential location. Given this limitation, the final two empirical chapters of this thesis complement and expand upon the quantitative investigations presented in Chapters 3, 4, and 5. They do so through an analysis of 48 interviews with 86 adult members of mixed-ethnicity families in the cities of Sydney and Darwin. Chapter 7 systematically explores these couples’ explanations of their residential decision-making processes. In so doing, it responds to the fourth aim of this thesis, which was to explore the factors that influence the residential decision-making of mixed-ethnicity couples.

But first, this chapter provides an overview of the research participants, in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics, residential locations, and experiences of being a mixed-ethnicity couple in Australia. With regards to the latter, this chapter pays attention to the extent to which these visibly different mixed-ethnicity couples have experienced any form of discrimination or negative attention in their everyday lives. In so doing, it ‘sets the scene’ for the remainder of the thesis. Chapter 6 begins with an overview of the attributes of the study participants and then contextualises this qualitative phase of the project through descriptions of Sydney and
Darwin, the two case study sites. It also shows where in these cities the participants lived and describes the level of ethnic diversity within their suburbs of residence. The chapter concludes with vignettes that paint a more detailed picture of two select couples from the interview sample—one from Sydney, and one from Darwin. These couples were chosen because they present quite divergent narratives of life as a mixed-ethnicity couple in Australia, in terms of how their relationship has been received by others, and how this affects both their residential decisions and everyday movements across space. Together, their stories demonstrate the diversity and complexity of mixed-ethnicity couples’ experiences in Australia.

6.1 An overview of the study participants

As discussed in Section 2.4 of this thesis, participant recruitment did not specify certain combinations of ethnic backgrounds; hence the participants in our sample identified with a wide variety of ethnicities. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 list the self-defined ethnic identities of each participant (and their partner in cases where only one partner participated in the interview). The decision to refer to participants using their self-defined ethnicities reflects the conceptualisation of ethnicity in this study—as a fluid and contextual identifier, that can vary over time, across space, and in accordance with life experience (for instance, via migration or through mixed-ethnicity partnership itself). Tables 6.1 and 6.2 also indicate which couples had children resident with them at the time of interview, and specify each couple’s home suburb. The tables include brief descriptions of each suburb, in terms of their position in the metropolitan area.

36 In Sydney, the descriptors of position in the metropolitan area are based on the distance of the centroid of each suburb from the city centre, defined as the centroid of the suburb named Sydney (which contains the city’s CBD). All suburbs within 10km of the city centre were classified as ‘inner city’, those located between 10 and 20km from the city centre as ‘middle ring’, and those further than 20km as ‘outer suburban’. Given Darwin’s different urban form, its descriptors are based on SA3 (Statistical Area Level 3) boundaries, which effectively divide the city into meaningful regions. ‘Inner Darwin’ equates to the ‘Darwin City’ SA3, ‘Suburban Darwin’ equates to the ‘Darwin Suburbs’ SA3, and ‘Outer Darwin’ is the aggregate of the ‘Palmerston’ and ‘Litchfield’ SA3s, which make up the remainder of the Greater Darwin Capital City Statistical Area.
the overall ethnic diversity of their population, and the percentage of residents classified as Anglo-European (AE). The ethnic diversity classification process is explained further in Section 6.2, which also discusses the propensity of the interviewees to live in different types of suburbs. One couple—Tiffany and Matthew—were engaged but not yet living together at the time of interview, so their individual suburbs are listed. These suburbs are located very close to one another, and each was in the ‘moderately high’ diversity category. They were included in Table 6.1 because Tiffany and Matthew stated that they planned on remaining in the same area once they move in together. Table 6.1 also identifies the four couples who lived in the Illawarra region, which borders metropolitan Sydney to the south, along the coastline. Due to the geographical proximity of these areas, the Illawarra participants are counted within the Sydney sample in Chapter 7, but are separated at points throughout this chapter for clarity.

The couples involved in this study consisted of ‘visibly different’ partners, one of whom was ‘white’ (Anglo-European) and one of whom identified with an ethnic minority group. There was only one exception in this regard—Savita (Fijian Indian) and Bernard (Aboriginal and Indian)—who both stated ethnic minority identities. Because of their visibly different backgrounds, they were still included in the study. When asked about their ethnic identities, the participants generally stated fine-grained ethnicities equating to national origins (Tables 6.1 and 6.2). In broad terms, Asian ethnicities were most common among our ethnic minority participants (30 of 44). A further five ethnic minority participants were Indigenous Australian, three stated Sub-Saharan African ethnicities, two North African or Middle Eastern, two Pacific Islander and two South American. This diversity allowed us to explore a wide range of experiences of being a mixed-ethnicity couple in Australia and how these experiences might impact decisions about where to live.
Table 6.1: Attributes of Sydney (n = 22) and Illawarra (n = 4) interviewees and their partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names and self-defined ethnicities</th>
<th>Children (yes/no)</th>
<th>Suburb name</th>
<th>Suburb description (based on 2011 census data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sydney participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette (Australian-born Chinese); Shaun (Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately low diversity; 66% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena (England-born Romanian/Polish); Jonah (New Zealand-born Samoan)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kogarah Bay</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderately high diversity; 33% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet (Chinese from Hong Kong); Hefin (Welsh)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lane Cove North</td>
<td>Inner city; moderate diversity; 53% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica (Australian); David (black Brazilian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kangaroo Point</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderate diversity; 44% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiyeon (Korean); Thomas (German)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rockdale</td>
<td>Middle ring; high diversity; 18% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce (Aboriginal); Colin (Manx-Celtic)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>MacLean*</td>
<td>Regional town; low diversity; 91% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June (Australian); Peter (Egypt-born Lebanese)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Peakhurst</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderate diversity; 53% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin (Switzerland-born Australian); Jin (Chinese)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dulwich Hill</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately high diversity; 48% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate (Anglo-Saxon); Charlie (Lebanese)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kingsgrove</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderately high diversity; 24% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malika (Indo-Mauritian); Johannes (German/white/Caucasian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woollahra</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately low diversity; 69% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momoko (Japanese); Erik (Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td>Middle ring; low diversity; 79% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natascha (Austrian); Paul (African)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cronulla</td>
<td>Outer suburban; low diversity; 80% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael (Anglo-Irish-Celtic Australian); Carlos (Colombian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Centennial Park</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately low diversity; 68% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn (Australian); Jack (Caribbean)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cronulla</td>
<td>Outer suburban; low diversity; 80% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammy (Anglo-Indian); Ben (Australian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Blakehurst</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderately high diversity; 38% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sendy (Indonesian); Franck (French)</td>
<td>Yes^</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately high diversity; 39% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalini (Malaysia-born Sri Lankan Tamil); Mark (Anglo-Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>Outer suburban; moderately low diversity; 72% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shigi (Chinese); Matt (white/Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>Inner city; moderate diversity; 56% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley (Australian); John (Egypt-born Greek)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Kogarah Bay</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderately high diversity; 33% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takumi (Japanese); Peter (Anglo-Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Erskineville</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately low diversity; 67% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara (Australian); Daniel (Australian-born Chinese)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Bossley Park</td>
<td>Outer suburban; high diversity; 18% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany (Australian with Sri Lankan parents); Matthew (Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Eagle Vale / Minto</td>
<td>Outer suburban; moderately high diversity; 57% AE (Eagle Vale); 48% AE (Minto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illawarra participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine (Anglo New Zealander); James (Rotuman)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Figtree</td>
<td>Illawarra; moderate diversity; 68% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey (Eurasian); Bruce (Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Woonona</td>
<td>Illawarra; low diversity; 84% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz (Australian); Kim (Australian-born Vietnamese)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Horsley</td>
<td>Illawarra; low diversity; 78% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe (European Australian); Romano (Rotuman)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kiama</td>
<td>Illawarra; low diversity; 87% AE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Female partner’s name is listed first in each couple, except for Takumi and Peter (a same-sex male couple). Italicised names indicate partners who did not participate in the interview. They have all been given pseudonyms. AE = Anglo-European. N/A = not applicable.

* Couple has adult children who have moved out.

* Couple lives outside Sydney, but has lived in Sydney previously and interview took place in Sydney.

Interviewee is no longer in a relationship with “partner”.

The ethnic diversity of each suburb was measured using the index of standard entropy, explained in Section 6.2. The percentage of residents classified as Anglo-European was based on ancestry responses to the census, using the same definition as elsewhere in this thesis (for example, see Section 2.1.1).

This is Dr Natascha Klocker, my primary supervisor. She was not interviewed, but her experiences were detailed in many other interviews during conversations with participants around shared experiences of being in a visibly different mixed-ethnicity couple. Her husband, Paul, was interviewed separately for this study.
Table 6.2: Attributes of Darwin interviewees and their partners (n = 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names and self-defined ethnicities</th>
<th>Children (y/n)</th>
<th>Suburb name</th>
<th>Suburb description (based on 2011 census data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aihong (Chinese); Kon (Greek)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nightcliff</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 62% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna (Australian); Kwento (Ibo Nigerian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Malak</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderately low diversity; 65% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ari (Indonesian); Scott (New Zealand-born Australian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Humpty Doo</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; low diversity; 84% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didamain (Indigenous); Mick (Australian)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Malak</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderately low diversity; 65% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna (Australian); Lethabo (Xhosa South African)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Wanguri</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 60% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fung (Chinese-Balinese); Steve (Anglo-Saxon)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Karama</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 56% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene (Filippina); Nick (Australian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jingga</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 72% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane (Caucasian Australian); Shammon (Indigenous Australian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nightcliff</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 62% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna (Australian); Joshua (Australian with Chinese-Indonesian father and Chinese mother)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Millner</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 60% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet (Australian); Dinesh (Sri Lankan)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; moderately low diversity; 75% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kushala (Malaysia-born Indian); Max (German/Scottish)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; moderately low diversity; 75% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea (Indonesian); Rob (Australian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; low diversity; 90% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah (Aboriginal); Shane (English/New Zealander)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Coconut Grove</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 57% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily (Malaysian-Chinese); Colin (Anglo-Saxon)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nakara</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderately high diversity; 52% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina (Italian); Kelvin (Australian with Japanese/Filipino/Dutch/German ancestry)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Malak</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderately low diversity; 65% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia (Australian with Indonesian parents); Oli (Czech)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Farrar</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; low diversity; 78% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie (Australian); Terry (Maghreb Libyan)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stuart Park</td>
<td>Inner Darwin; moderately low diversity; 68% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita (Indonesian); Richard (Australian)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Rosebery</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; low diversity; 79% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara (Pakeha New Zealander); Felino (Filipino)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Howard Springs</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; low diversity; 88% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savita (Fijian Indian); Bernard (Aboriginal and Indian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Berrimah</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; low diversity; 84% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya (Australian); Ben (Nigerian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Coconut Grove</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 57% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulan (Indonesian); Grant (Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Darwin City</td>
<td>Inner Darwin; moderate diversity; 66% AE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Female partner’s name is listed first in each couple. Italicised names indicate partners who did not participate in interview. They have all been given pseudonyms. AE = Anglo-European.

* Couple has adult children who have moved out.

b The ethnic diversity of each suburb was measured using the index of standard entropy, explained in Section 6.2. The percentage of residents classified as Anglo-European was based on ancestry responses to the census, using the same definition as elsewhere in this thesis (for example, see Section 2.1.1).

In addition to their diverse ethnic backgrounds, the participants also varied in terms of other socio-demographic characteristics, summarised in Table 6.3. The participants ranged widely in age, from early 20s to mid-70s. However, the bulk were aged between the late 20s and early
In most cases, the partners shared common religious affiliations (33/48 interviews; 68.8%), however this was much more typical among the Sydney sample. In eight of the eleven ‘inter-religious’ couples involved in this study, one partner stated no religious affiliation. There were only three couples in which both partners were religious, but with different affiliations. These combinations included: Buddhist and Greek Orthodox; (Aihong and Kon) Hindu and Catholic (Savita and Bernard); and Muslim and Christian (Rita and Richard). In four interviews, due to time restrictions and the natural flow of conversations, the interviewees did not explain whether they had any religious affiliations. In the majority of couples (25/48; 52.1%), one partner was born in Australia, and one was born overseas. In 11/48 couples, both partners were born in Australia; and in 12/48 both were born overseas. Most couples had originally met in Australia, although one-third met while overseas. There were notable differences between the two cities in this regard, with Darwin-based couples more likely to have met outside Australia.

It was quite common for the study participants to have children living with them at home (58.3% overall), particularly among the Darwin sample (see Table 6.3). This is an important consideration given existing studies have emphasised the influence of mixed-ethnicity children on residential location (Caballero et al., 2008; Twine, 1999). Yet childless couples were also well-represented (13/48 interviews; 27.1%). Finally, as noted in Chapter 2, efforts were made to recruit both same-sex and heterosexual couples. However, only one same-sex couple ultimately participated in the study (Takumi and Peter). Across the heterosexual couples in the sample, there was quite an even representation of gender/ethnicity configurations—24 couples involved a female ethnic minority partner and a male ethnic majority partner, and in 22 couples the reverse was true. As mentioned earlier, one couple in Darwin (Savita and Bernard) included two partners stating ethnic minority backgrounds.
Table 6.3: Overview of key participant attributes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute of partners</th>
<th>Darwin count (%)</th>
<th>Sydney count (%)</th>
<th>Total count (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same religious affiliation</td>
<td>12 (54.5)</td>
<td>21 (80.8)</td>
<td>33 (68.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different religious affiliations</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>3 (11.5)</td>
<td>11 (22.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data not gathered</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>2 (7.7)</td>
<td>4 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both overseas</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>8 (30.8)</td>
<td>12 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Australia</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>7 (26.9)</td>
<td>11 (22.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One overseas, one Australia</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
<td>11 (42.3)</td>
<td>25 (52.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, living at home</td>
<td>15 (68.2)</td>
<td>13 (50.0)</td>
<td>28 (58.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult children (moved out)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>3 (11.5)</td>
<td>7 (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
<td>10 (38.5)</td>
<td>13 (27.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where couple met</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>9 (40.9)</td>
<td>7 (26.9)</td>
<td>16 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>11 (50.0)</td>
<td>18 (69.2)</td>
<td>29 (60.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>1 (3.8)</td>
<td>3 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender/ethnicity configuration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female ethnic minority partner</td>
<td>12 (54.5)</td>
<td>12 (46.2)</td>
<td>24 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male ethnic minority partner</td>
<td>9 (40.9)</td>
<td>13 (50.0)</td>
<td>22 (45.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both partners ethnic minority</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male same-sex couple</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (3.8)</td>
<td>1 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: These are counts of interviews, not individuals. When both partners participated in an interview, they contribute once to the tallies. Percentages are calculated in relation to all Darwin interviews, all Sydney interviews (including those in Illawarra) and total interviews across both cities.

6.2 Case study sites: Darwin and Sydney

Darwin and Sydney were chosen as the two case study cities for the qualitative component of this study, in part because the analysis in Chapter 3 revealed that in 2011 they had larger proportions of visibly different mixed-ethnicity couples than any other major Australian cities. Collectively, the six ‘types’ of mixed-ethnicity couples included in that quantitative analysis comprised 6.5 per cent of all cohabiting couples in Greater Darwin, and 4.6 per cent in Greater Sydney, both markedly higher than the national average (3.2%). Darwin and Sydney also
present two contrasting urban settings within which to explore processes of residential decision-making. At the 2016 census, the Greater Sydney\textsuperscript{37} metropolitan area was home to almost five million residents. In the decades since the Federal Government abolished the White Australia Policy, Sydney has been a primary settlement destination for migrants from a wide array of source countries (Edgar, 2014). Its sheer size has facilitated the development of a range of neighbourhoods that vary considerably in their socio-economic and ethnic make-up.

In 2016, the population of Greater Darwin\textsuperscript{38} was just 137,000 (ABS, 2016b). Darwin, the capital city of the Northern Territory, is quite remote in relation to other Australian cities. Its small population, proximity to South-East Asia, and relative isolation within Australia have produced a unique climate of racial and ethnic relations not found in the southern capitals (e.g. Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane) (Ford, 2009; Luke and Luke, 1998). And indeed, the Darwin-based participants in this study commented regularly on the distinctiveness of their city’s ethnic mix, and regularly compared it favourably to cities in ‘the South’. Further details about Sydney and Darwin are provided in the following chapter (Section 7.5). To avoid duplication, they are not repeated here. The focus in this chapter is on the geographies of ethnic diversity in Sydney and Darwin, and where the participants lived across those geographies. Establishing these patterns is important because previous research suggests that the ethnic character of residential areas is pivotal in shaping the experiences of mixed-ethnicity couples, and that many such couples strategically select neighbourhoods that are most conducive to the enactment of mixed identities (Dalmage, 2000; Holloway et al., 2005; Luke and Luke, 1998; Twine, 1999; Wright et al., 2011). This analysis also reveals whether our participants had residential geographies

\textsuperscript{37} This population count, and subsequent figures, refer to the Greater Sydney Capital City Statistical Area.

\textsuperscript{38} This population count, and subsequent figures, refer to the Greater Darwin Capital City Statistical Area.
that aligned with the broader settlement patterns of mixed-ethnicity couples described in Chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis.

The contrasting ethnic geographies of Darwin and Sydney (including the Illawarra) are illustrated in Figures 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3. Figure 6.1 shows the full extent of the Greater Darwin region, according to suburb-level ethnic diversity. The spatial distribution of Darwin participants is shown in an inset map, zoomed in to provide visual clarity. Figure 6.2 illustrates the full extent of the Greater Sydney and Illawarra regions, and similarly includes an inset map (zoomed in) showing the spatial distribution of Illawarra participants. The locations of Sydney participants are shown in a separate map (Figure 6.3) so that a sufficient level of detail can be displayed. Each participant distribution map consists of two layers: one that depicts the home suburbs of each of our participants at the time of their interview; and another that shows the degree of ethnic diversity within the resident populations of each suburb across the two cities. The ethnic diversity of each suburb was measured using the index of standard entropy based on classifying each suburb’s population into 10 ethnic groups according to ancestry responses in the 2011 census (ABS, 2011d): Anglo-European, Pacific Islander, Southern and

---

39 Figure 6.3 excludes Sydney participants Tiffany and Matthew, who lived in different suburbs at the time of interview; and Colin and Joyce, who lived in a regional town called Maclean, several hundred kilometres north of Sydney, at the time of their interview. Colin and Joyce were still included in the study because they had spent a large portion of their lives as a couple living in both Sydney and Darwin, and moved to Maclean as retirees. They are counted as a Sydney couple in Table 6.1 because they lived there for a longer period, and because their interview took place in Sydney.

40 While the term ‘suburbs’ is generally associated with the outer residential districts of a metropolitan area, the ABS classifies the entirety of Australia into suburbs, including inner city and rural areas.

41 The standardised entropy index for each suburb is calculated as:

\[ E = s \ast - \sum_{1}^{n} (K_i)\log(K_i) \]

where \( K \) is the proportional share of the suburb population for each ethnic (ancestry) group (1 through \( n \)). The scaling constant (s) ensures that potential values range from zero (no diversity) to one (all groups present in equal proportions).

42 Dual-ancestry persons with both responses in a single category (e.g. English and German in the Anglo-European category) are counted in that group, and those with ancestries in different groups (e.g. English and Chinese) are counted as Mixed. ‘Other’ includes all persons whose ancestry responses do not fit within any of the other nine groups.
Eastern European, North African and Middle Eastern, South-East Asian, North-East Asian, Southern and Central Asian, Sub-Saharan African, Mixed and Other. Suburbs were then classified into five diversity classes based on entropy values: low (entropy < 0.408); moderately low (0.408–0.551); moderate (0.552–0.673); moderately high (0.674–0.777); and high (≥0.778). This diversity classification is based on that adopted in Chapter 5, except in this instance, the large ‘moderate-diversity’ category from that chapter was divided into three smaller classes. This added nuance to the visual interpretation of each city’s geographies of ethnic diversity. The classification scheme adopted in Chapter 5 was limited to three entropy classes because those were further sub-divided according to ethnic minority concentrations. The class break values adopted here represent the maximum possible entropy values when the share of a single ethnic group reaches a certain threshold in the suburb population. For example, the first break value (0.408) is the maximum possible when one ethnic group comprises 80 per cent of the suburb population. The other break values represent the maximum possible entropy when a single group forms 70 per cent (0.552), 60 per cent (0.674) and 50 per cent (0.778) of the suburb population respectively.

Overall, Darwin’s suburbs exhibit considerably less variation in their levels of ethnic diversity than do Sydney’s suburbs (Figures 6.1 and 6.2 respectively). In Darwin, there are no suburbs classified as ‘high’ diversity according to the adopted classification scheme. The most diverse suburbs are located in the area north of Darwin International Airport (labelled in Figure 6.1). Almost all of Darwin’s outer suburbs, extending south-east from the airport, have low levels of ethnic diversity. Apart from those that constitute the satellite city of Palmerston, suburbs in Outer Darwin are much more sparsely populated than the more central suburbs near the airport and CBD. Unlike Darwin, Sydney’s geographies of ethnic diversity are characterised by a large number of highly diverse suburbs in the regions west and south-west of the CBD (Figure 6.2).
Less diverse suburbs are mainly located on the metropolitan periphery in the north, south and far west. A key point of contrast between the two cities is that Darwin has no notable residential clusters of ethnic minority groups in any of its suburbs. Although Sydney has low levels of segregation by international standards (Johnston et al., 2007), it has seen the development of some ethnic minority concentrations. For example, Sydney’s highest concentration of SE Asians is in the suburb of Cabramatta, where they comprise 42.2 per cent of the local population. By contrast, Darwin’s highest concentration of SE Asians is just 15.9 per cent in Wagaman, despite the fact that individuals of SE Asian ancestry comprise a higher proportion of Darwin’s population (5.2% of Darwin’s population is SE Asian, compared to 4.6% of Sydney’s population). Similarly, Sydney’s strongest concentration of SC Asians (53.8% in Harris Park) is substantially higher than Darwin’s (13.6% in Brinkin)—a far larger discrepancy than their comparative citywide SC Asian proportions would suggest (2.4% in Darwin and 5.6% in Sydney). The range of neighbourhood types available to our participants, in terms of ethnic composition, thus varied significantly between the two cities.
Figure 6.1: Spatial distribution of Darwin participants, by suburb, at the time of interview.

Notes: To maintain privacy, each point is located at the centroid of the suburb polygon, rather than the precise location of participants’ homes within each suburb. Suburb ethnic diversity is based on data from the 2011 Australian census.
Figure 6.2: Ethnic diversity, by suburb, Sydney and Illawarra, and spatial distribution of Illawarra participants at the time of interview.

Notes: To maintain privacy, each point is located at the centroid of the suburb polygon, rather than the precise location of participants’ homes within each suburb. Suburb ethnic diversity is based on data from the 2011 Australian census.
Figure 6.3: Spatial distribution of Sydney participants, by suburb, at the time of interview.

Notes: To maintain privacy, each point is located at the centroid of the suburb polygon, rather than the precise location of participants’ homes within each suburb. Suburb ethnic diversity is based on data from the 2011 Australian census.
The study participants lived in a wide range of suburb types across these urban ethnic landscapes, as shown via the star-shaped icons in Figures 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3. These maps can be interpreted in conjunction with Tables 6.1 and 6.2, which provide further details on each of the participants’ suburbs, including their name, location, diversity level (low, moderately low, moderate, moderately high, high) and percentage of residents who were Anglo-European. Table 6.4 tallies the number of participating couples (or individual partners) living in each type of suburb, according to their level of ethnic diversity and their position in the metropolitan area.

Table 6.4: Percentage distribution of participants across suburbs by ethnic diversity and Anglo-European (AE) percentage, Sydney, Illawarra and Darwin samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb attribute</th>
<th>Sydney % (count)</th>
<th>Sydney broader pop. %</th>
<th>Illawarra % (count)</th>
<th>Illawarra broader pop. %</th>
<th>Darwin % (count)</th>
<th>Darwin broader pop. %</th>
<th>All interviews % (count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9.1 (2)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately high</td>
<td>31.8 (7)</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16.7 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>18.2 (4)</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>36.4 (8)</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.1 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately low</td>
<td>22.7 (5)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.8 (7)</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>25.0 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18.2 (4)</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>75.0 (3)</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>27.3 (6)</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>27.1 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage AE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
<td>40.9 (9)</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>18.2 (4)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>18.2 (4)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.7 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>18.2 (4)</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>40.9 (9)</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>29.2 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>9.1 (2)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>22.7 (5)</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>16.7 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 80</td>
<td>13.6 (3)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>50.0 (2)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>18.2 (4)</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>18.9 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: These are counts of interviews, not individuals. When both partners participated in an interview, they contribute once to the tallies. Percentages are calculated based on column totals for ‘ethnic diversity’ and ‘percentage AE’ separately. The broader population columns show the distribution of the total populations of these cities, across different suburb types, for comparison with our interviewees. ‘Sydney’ refers to Greater Sydney, ‘Illawarra’ to the Illawarra SA4, and ‘Darwin’ to Greater Darwin.

In Darwin, participants were quite evenly spread out, generally following the distribution of the broader population. The majority of Darwin interviews were with participants living in suburbs of moderate diversity (8/22 interviews) or moderately low diversity (7/22). Eleven of these were in ‘suburban Darwin’ which includes the suburbs north and immediately east of the airport (Figure 6.1, Table 6.4). A further six interviews were with participants who lived in
low-diversity suburbs, including five in ‘outer Darwin’, which comprises the low-density suburbs spreading east from the airport. There was only one interview with participants living in a suburb of moderately high diversity. Overall, the types of suburbs that our Darwin-based interviewees lived in, reflected the geography of ethnic diversity across the entire metropolitan area. There were no participants who lived in suburbs classified as high-diversity, because no such suburbs exist in Greater Darwin. The participants were most likely to live in suburbs that had 60 to 69 per cent Anglo-European populations (9/22 interviews; 40.9%), and were indeed more likely to do so than the general population of Greater Darwin (25.6% of all persons). No participants lived in suburbs with less than 50 per cent Anglo-European populations (although only a very small proportion of the total population did so), and fewer lived in suburbs that were greater than 80 per cent Anglo-European (4/22; 18.2%) compared to the total population (33.7%).

The Sydney-based participants were less evenly spread out across the metropolitan area (Figure 6.3). Given the size of Sydney, it was challenging to find participants in every region of the city. The inner city, inner south-western and southern suburbs are well represented amongst the participants in this study, but there were few participants living in the western and northern suburbs. This was not the result of strategic sampling. In order to achieve greater representation from that region, additional recruitment attempts were conducted targeting western Sydney residents later in the data collection phase of the project, however those efforts were unsuccessful. Despite this limitation, participants were quite evenly spread across the range of suburb types. There were eight interviews with participants living in inner city suburbs, eight with those in middle-ring suburbs and five with those in outer suburban Sydney. In terms of ethnic diversity, the Sydney-based participants were most likely to live in suburbs classified as having moderately high diversity (7/22 interviews; 31.8%) (Table 6.4). That diversity level was
also the most common among the residential locations of the total population, yet to a lesser degree (21.8%). Fifty per cent of Sydney-based interviewees lived in either moderately high diversity, or moderate diversity, suburbs. Only two couples lived in suburbs classified as ‘high-diversity’—Jiyeon and Thomas in Rockdale and Tara and Daniel in Bossley Park.

The residential geographies of the study participants in Sydney and Darwin largely reflected the broader spatial patterns of mixed-ethnicity couples mapped in Chapters 3 and 4. These patterns are not directly comparable due to differences in geographic scales (suburbs here as opposed to SA3s and SA4s) and associated differences in diversity classifications. However, the findings of the analyses presented in Chapter 3 and 4 were echoed in the types of contexts in which the participants lived. Those analyses found that mixed-ethnicity couples tended to concentrate in inner city areas, which was also the case among the Sydney-based interviewees. Those chapters also demonstrated that mixed-ethnicity couples did not live exclusively in certain types of areas according to their ethnic diversity. They were widely spread across the ethnic landscape, but in most cases had above-average concentrations in moderately diverse places. This is reflected to some extent in the geographies of both the Darwin and Sydney participants. Compared to the total population, the Sydney participants were more likely to live in moderately high and moderately low diversity suburbs, and less likely to live in suburbs at the extreme ends of the diversity classification (high or low). Similar trends were apparent among the Darwin participants, who were more inclined than the general population to live in moderate and moderately low diversity suburbs, but less inclined to live in suburbs classified as low diversity. These patterns also align with the international literature which suggests that mixed-ethnicity couples gravitate towards moderately diverse neighbourhoods that are not dominated by either partner’s respective ethnic group (Dalmage, 2000; Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011; Wright et al., 2011).
Table 6.5 shows the percentage distributions of interview participants across suburb types according to whether they have children (including adult children who have moved out). Patterns in the residential geographies of our interviewees, based on their parenting status, were mixed. Those without children were more likely to live in moderately low diversity suburbs, while those with children had higher proportions living in both moderately high diversity suburbs and low diversity suburbs. Those with children were also more likely to live in suburbs at either end of the Anglo-European classification; in suburbs with less than 50 per cent Anglo-Europeans, and in those with greater than 80 per cent Anglo-Europeans. The stronger proclivity for mixed-ethnicity parents to reside in suburbs with minority Anglo-European populations may indicate a desire on the part of some to avoid residential settings dominated by a single ethnic group (Dalmage, 2000; Twine, 1999). Chapter 7 will explore the residential decision-making processes of participants that resulted in the residential geographies described in this section.

Table 6.5: Distribution of participants across suburbs by ethnic diversity and percentage of residents Anglo-European (AE), by parenting status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb attribute</th>
<th>Children % (count)</th>
<th>No children % (count)</th>
<th>All interviews % (count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.9 (1)</td>
<td>7.7 (1)</td>
<td>4.2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately high</td>
<td>20.0 (7)</td>
<td>7.7 (1)</td>
<td>16.7 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>28.6 (10)</td>
<td>23.1 (3)</td>
<td>27.1 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately low</td>
<td>20.0 (7)</td>
<td>38.5 (5)</td>
<td>25.0 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.6 (10)</td>
<td>23.1 (3)</td>
<td>27.1 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE % share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
<td>20.0 (7)</td>
<td>15.4 (2)</td>
<td>18.8 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>17.1 (6)</td>
<td>15.4 (2)</td>
<td>16.7 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>25.7 (9)</td>
<td>38.5 (5)</td>
<td>29.2 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>14.3 (5)</td>
<td>23.1 (3)</td>
<td>16.7 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 80</td>
<td>22.9 (8)</td>
<td>7.7 (1)</td>
<td>18.8 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: These are counts of interviews, not individuals. When both partners participated in an interview, they contribute once to the tallies. Percentages are calculated based on column totals for ‘ethnic diversity’ and ‘percentage AE’ separately.
6.3 Stories of two mixed-ethnicity couples

The 48 interviews produced a detailed dataset on participants’ experiences of living as part of a mixed-ethnicity family in Australia. While Chapter 7 focuses specifically on the study participants’ decisions about where to live, their stories included broader accounts of how their relationships have been received by others (including extended families, and the broader community). So too, discussions of how being a mixed-ethnicity couple affects their day-to-day experiences in different places. Overall, the interviewees told largely positive stories of living in Australia with a partner of a visibly different ethnic background. Most stated that they had never felt overtly discriminated against because of their relationship, and there were few contexts where they had felt, or would feel, uncomfortable as a mixed-ethnicity couple. As Irene (Filipina) explained, ‘Here in Darwin, I can hold hands with him [her husband] any time without thinking about what other people will think’. Liz (Australian) felt similarly about how her relationship with Kim (Australian-born Vietnamese) has been received by others: ‘Maybe we’re just oblivious to it or something, but I don’t feel like people have treated us any different or said anything differently to us.’ Many of the partners interviewed stated that they rarely thought about themselves as being in a mixed-ethnicity relationship, as articulated by Lina (Italian), ‘We just feel like everybody else’.

Nonetheless, the interviews were replete with stories of how couples’ visible differences drew attention in public mainly in the form of stares, comments or questions. These forms of attention were usually quite subtle. In many cases, they were well-intentioned, stemming from curiosity on the part of the person(s) involved. In the words of Paul (African), ‘You get…you know, looks and things. More people will be kind of like just looking and going, “Oh, that’s not something you see every day,” but not in a judgemental way.’ Several mothers in the interview sample regularly received questions about their relationship with their mixed-
ethnicity children. Those questions mainly arose when ethnic majority women were out in public with their mixed-ethnicity children, but without their partner. Catherine (Anglo-New Zealander) was labelled as an adoptive mother when a bystander saw her with her mixed-ethnicity daughters, a common experience for white women in our interview sample. Jo (Australian) explained that she feels compelled to explain why she is visibly different to her children:

[I]n the supermarket…people ask about the kids. And they kind of look a bit awkward…I just tend to jump in and say, “Yeah my husband is Chinese”…I know that for other people it’s helpful just to be able to think that way and I don’t need to make people feel awkward. It doesn’t bother me that people ask…

Like Jo, many interviewees were not troubled by such occurrences. Others had experienced more overt discrimination or had been the target of negative stereotypes about mixed-ethnicity relationships. Some interviewees faced assumptions that their relationship was a marriage of convenience, for visa purposes. The mail-order bride stereotype was encountered by several female participants of Asian ethnicities. Such stereotypes generally manifest in uncomfortable stares or questions, yet there were rare occasions of more direct hostility. It is beyond the scope of this thesis (in relation to its aims) to systematically analyse these experiences, as the focus is on participants’ accounts of their residential decision-making processes. Exposure to stereotyping in the public sphere is discussed in more detail in Klocker and Tindale (under review), which has not been included in this thesis for reasons discussed in the Statement of Authorship, and in Chapter 1.
In the remainder of this section, I set the scene for Chapter 7 through vignettes that focus on two particular couples: Matt and Shiqi in Sydney, and Juliet and Dinesh in Darwin. These couples were chosen because they paint quite different pictures of life as a mixed-ethnicity couple in Australia. The vignettes provide detailed accounts of how these couples decided where to live. Relevant trends are then analysed systematically, for the entire sample population, in Chapter 7. The vignettes also draw more widely upon other discussions during interviews that centred on these participants’ everyday experiences of belonging and discrimination in different places. These experiences provide insights into the unique concerns mixed-ethnicity couples may need to negotiate in choosing a comfortable residential location. Shiqi and Matt’s narrative resonates with the majority of participants, who recounted very few, if any, experiences of overt discrimination as a mixed-ethnicity couple in Australia. On the other hand, Juliet and Dinesh’s story contains numerous accounts of significant hostility and prejudice against their relationship.

6.3.1 The story of Shiqi and Matt

Shiqi (Chinese) and Matt (white, Australian) were one of the youngest couples in our sample, aged in their mid-to-late twenties at the time of interview. At the time of their interview, they had been married and living together for five months in Surry Hills, a densely-populated suburb in Sydney’s inner city which has Australia’s highest concentration of visibly different mixed-ethnicity couples (see Chapter 3). But the pair had not met in Australia. Shiqi grew up in central China, before moving to Beijing to study. She then moved to the United States to work as a Chinese language teacher in a high school in New Hampshire. Matt was born in Sydney but spent most of his childhood in country towns. After completing his bachelor’s degree, he moved to China for Christian missionary work. He later joined an American company and moved to the United States, where he met Shiqi at a foreign language teaching conference in
Denver, Colorado. Matt eventually decided he needed to return to Australia after nine years living overseas. The two got engaged and decided to relocate to Sydney together, because Matt had roots there and because of the city’s work and study opportunities.

Upon arrival in Sydney, Shiqi and Matt lived in separate dwellings until their marriage. Shiqi rented a room in Camperdown, another inner city suburb, while Matt lived in Hurstville, a middle-ring suburb in Sydney’s south with one of Australia’s highest concentrations of Chinese residents. After they had married, the couple moved into an apartment in Surry Hills. They had considered staying in Hurstville, but decided that Surry Hills would be more convenient. Their decision had nothing to do with the suburb’s ethnic composition: they moved to Surry Hills because Shiqi’s favourite yoga studio was nearby. Living in the inner city also had financial benefits as they were able to use public transport more frequently, and thus could sell their car. Although Hurstville has a large Chinese community with plenty of Chinese grocery stores, those factors did not ultimately draw Shiqi to live in that area. Living in Surry Hills would still provide easy access to Chinese markets in the inner city, and Shiqi felt that Hurstville did not reflect her experiences or expectations of modern Chinese culture. She described Hurstville as ‘80s or 90s China’, and continued to explain:

[Hurstville is] mostly just market and restaurant and a lot of older generation people … If I were to live in China now I would have a different life to living in Hurstville. So you got the convenience of getting the fruit and vegetables but it’s not really China, the life you would get if you were living in China.

In deciding where to live, Shiqi and Matt prioritised living near key services and retail facilities that supported their lifestyle choices, especially the aforementioned yoga studio. Apart from
maintaining access to Chinese grocery stores, ethnicity was not at the forefront of their residential decision-making. Shiqi and Matt had not directly experienced any discrimination or negative attention in Australia because of their mixed-ethnicity relationship, nor did Shiqi feel she had been the target of racism as an individual. Yet they were aware of persistent stereotypes in Australian society about mixed-ethnicity partnerships between white males and Asian females, and noted that these have subtle impacts on their everyday lives. Matt described wanting to avoid being ‘lumped’ into the category of older, divorced white men who find younger partners in South-East Asian countries (it is worth noting that he was neither markedly older than Shiqi, nor divorced). Prevalent stereotypes also had an impact on Shiqi, who said, ‘I don’t want people to think I am going for your [Matt’s] money.’

Although they did not recall any incidences where people had overtly deployed these stereotypes towards them, Matt and Shiqi were aware of people ‘noticing’ them with a sense of non-malicious curiosity. They explained that the level of attention they receive varies geographically. In their day-to-day navigation of the city, Shiqi and Matt do not necessarily feel uncomfortable as a mixed-ethnicity couple, but there are certain places where they described feeling more self-conscious. Matt, especially, noted that these feelings vary depending on whether he is alone or with Shiqi. When walking around alone, Matt feels comfortable pretty much anywhere. When walking around with Shiqi, he feels most comfortable in inner city areas of Sydney. Outside those parts of the city, his self-consciousness is elevated. Matt described these place-based experiences, alongside Shiqi, using the metaphor of a ‘radar’.

The CBD and inner suburbs [are most comfortable]…There is no question. They all feel much the same to me. And then Newtown and heading in that direction, but outside
of that you start to hit some mono-cultural white areas I think and…maybe I don’t feel less comfortable, maybe a little more conspicuous and if I…start to get a sense that I am being observed more, then I will start to feel uncomfortable…I wouldn’t say I am a perceptive person, but I have my radar on for any negative or any different—maybe not necessarily negative but I am getting a bit of a response somehow and then I would become conscious of that… [If the two of us are together maybe there would be times where it [the radar] would be on and other times where it wouldn’t. So walking around Surry Hills and the inner city I don’t think the radar is on very much until you get to the Chinese area as we were talking about before. So Surry Hills, you know Darlinghurst, Chippendale and all those kinds of places—not really thinking about it that much.

Matt explained that his ‘radar’ is on when walking around with Shiqi in both mono-cultural white areas, and areas with large Chinese populations:

If I am just walking through [Chinese areas] by myself I know I will go under the radar because we are in Sydney. But if we go through as a couple then I know straight away that it is going to draw—if we just walk side by side without holding hands we could just be colleagues but as soon as we hold hands then I think that’s going to be like, you know that people are going to notice.

Matt’s university campus, which has a large number of Chinese international students, is another context in which the radar is on for both him and Shiqi, as described in this exchange:
Matt: If Shiqi comes to my campus, I’d feel very conscious of the impact of us being together would make. Because I know exactly what they are talking about behind the scenes…In terms of our students seeing us, I don't have a problem with that but I am aware and very conscious of what they will be thinking and what they will say afterwards…

Shiqi: I don't like being on campus because I know there are so many Chinese students there and they are going to just talk about…

Matt: [I]’s gossip but it’s not malicious—well I don't think its malicious—generally it’s not, there will always be those people that may say a few things. But it’s just generally they all talk. It’s just a fascination and I kind of don't want to feed that too much and the same would go walking through Hurstville [Sydney suburb with a large Chinese population] where you can just sense people are noticing a bit more.

Shiqi and Matt’s story was quite typical of the broader interview sample. Their narrative paints an overwhelmingly positive picture of life as a mixed-ethnicity couple in Australia. Yet despite the absence of overt, direct experiences of racism or discrimination, stereotypes about mixed-ethnicity couples still affect their everyday lives, in subtle ways. Their self-consciousness about being in a mixed-ethnicity relationship is intrinsically place-bound. This was a common theme among the other interviewees. Most agreed that being in a mixed-ethnicity relationship did not influence their day-to-day navigation of urban spaces in their neighbourhood or the wider city. Moreover, and as discussed in Chapter 7, it was not a crucial consideration in selecting a place to live.
6.3.2 The story of Juliet and Dinesh

I now turn to the story of Juliet and Dinesh, a couple from Darwin who vividly described their spatially-contingent experiences of exclusion and belonging in different Australian cities. While Shiqi and Matt had been living together in Australia for less than six months at the time of their interview, Juliet and Dinesh had been doing so for almost 20 years, and had faced a significant amount of opposition at various times throughout those decades. Their story is less typical of the study participants, but also demonstrates that visibly different mixed-ethnicity couples’ interactions with the broader public (whether taking the form of overt racism, micro-aggressions, subtle disapproval or friendly curiosity) vary geographically, particularly in terms of the ethnic composition of places through which they move. Chapter 7 explores the implications of these place-based experiences for where mixed-ethnicity couples decide to live.

Juliet (Australian) and Dinesh (Sri Lankan) met in Albury-Wodonga, a regional town located inland on the state border between New South Wales and Victoria. Juliet had grown up in Melbourne but moved to Albury-Wodonga in the mid-1990s to join her parents, who had previously relocated there. Dinesh was born in Sri Lanka and migrated to Australia in the early 1990s. He attended university in Albury-Wodonga, where he met Juliet at a local supermarket. They began dating and were married within a year. However, from the outset their relationship faced opposition and disapproval in both the private and public spheres. In recounting their experiences of living in various parts of Australia, Juliet and Dinesh drew contrasts between the negative treatment they received while living in the ‘southern states’, and the sense of belonging and acceptance they feel in Darwin.

When Juliet and Dinesh began their relationship in Albury-Wodonga in the 1990s, they often received looks and comments of disapproval from members of the public and felt isolated
within society. As Juliet recalled, ‘[W]e’d be walking down the street holding hands, and people would look at us like we had leprosy or something.’ Common stereotypes about mixed-ethnicity relationships between migrants and Anglo-Australians shaped public perceptions of their partnership. Dinesh was often suspected of marrying Juliet purely to obtain permanent residency for himself:

Dinesh: We were going out and obviously someone, you know, marrying an Australian girl…there’s a hidden agenda behind it so the person can stay and get residency. But why would I want to do that? I already had the residency, but I can’t carry a badge on my back saying, “Hey, I’m dating an Australian girl. I’m a permanent resident of Australia. I’m not dating her so I can stay in Australia!” But interestingly, every time I [went] out somewhere with her, the question popped up… That’s how the society saw us, and the attitudes towards us were that we were not a genuine couple, we were not a genuine entity. It was some sort of arrangement or…convenience…so I can stay in the country.

Dinesh’s experiences of discrimination in particular have been multifaceted. He has been the subject of harassment and prejudice both on the basis of his individual ethnic identity, and also because of his partnership with Juliet. On his experiences living in Albury-Wodonga, Dinesh recounted, ‘I had enough problems as it is just being ethnic! So when I start dating a white girl, it’s just like, you know, putting salt into a wound!’

On numerous occasions the couple’s relationship had gone unrecognised in public places, due to their visible differences. After three years in Albury-Wodonga, they moved to Canberra. During their time in Canberra, staff in shops served Juliet and Dinesh separately on the
assumption that they were not a couple, despite having entered the shop together. The revelation that they were together was met with surprised reactions from salespeople who, in Juliet and Dinesh’s view, could not conceive of a relationship between two people of different ethnic backgrounds. In more overt instances, they had overheard strangers verbally scrutinising their relationship, with comments like, ‘What’s wrong with her? …Probably she couldn’t get anyone Australian, so she’s gone with something ethnic.’

At certain times, such experiences of discrimination—or ‘borderism’ (Dalmage, 2000)—have restricted the couple’s use of urban space. Reflecting on their early years back in Albury-Wodonga, Dinesh recalled having to stay at home on Australia Day to avoid being harassed:

So Australia Day celebrations I tend to lock myself in my unit and won’t go out! …Because I don’t want…utes slowing down and telling me to bugger off back to my own town! …And if you happen to have a white girl next to me…when Juliet’s there, “What are you doing with [a] white girl up there? Are you alright, mate?”

In contrast to most other interviewees, Juliet and Dinesh described feeling uncomfortable in a range of contexts in ‘southern’ cities. After 10 years in Canberra, they moved to Sydney, where they continued to encounter difficulties because of their different ethnic backgrounds. Juliet felt uncomfortable going to tourism-heavy areas in Sydney’s inner city, because of the dominance of Anglo-Saxon people there. She recalled noticing looks of disapproval in those contexts, but not in places like Chinatown, which she felt were more diverse. Dinesh added that in a broad sense, they were likely to feel uncomfortable and at risk of discriminatory treatment in ‘places of public gathering’ such as train stations, supermarkets, restaurants, entertainment venues and simply walking down the street. Due to these feelings of discomfort,
they often regretted having gone out at all, as Dinesh explained: ‘[Y]ou feel like...this is probably a bad idea, maybe should have actually grabbed a pizza and stayed home and watched videos’.

Juliet and Dinesh’s treatment while living in Canberra and Sydney has often been mediated by their young daughter (aged eight at the time of interview). They explained that her presence re-frames the way others perceive their relationship, as explained in the following exchange:

Dinesh: If you travel as three of us, we’ve gone through Sydney, airports and all that, with Sophie [their daughter] the attitude is totally different. Me, Sophie, Juliet travelling as an entity...society’s attitude is totally different to me going there by myself, or us going as a couple...it’s totally different, like a lot more accepting...going to places of public as three...

Juliet: They can’t do enough to help you.

Dinesh: Yeah, it’s a different attitude...So three different entities, three different scenarios I face. If I’m going through customs in the airport on my own, yeah, always a cavity check, bomb threat detection, everything, and if I’m with Juliet, it probably doesn’t change much of the reaction or attitude towards me. If the three of us go in, it’s all good. “Right, no worries mate.”

Dinesh explained that his daughter’s presence helps to debunk commonly-held stereotypes with which he is often labelled, and gives a greater sense of legitimacy to his relationship with Juliet—in the public eye:
[T]hey see us in a long-term relationship. Obviously she [their daughter] is eight or nine, they can see this is…there’s something there and so obviously he’s not married and trying to sort of, deceive immigration to get a visa, and also they probably see me as a father, [rather] than a low-skilled migrant worker who’s just been released from detention, who’s come here in a boat sort of scenario.

Despite explaining that their daughter’s presence tends to improve their treatment in public places, Dinesh described the ongoing difficulty of countering stereotypes that continue to affect him as an ethnic minority person, when she is not there:

Dinesh: So what we going to do? We going to have big bloody board carrying on the top of our head, “Yes, he works for Defence. Yes, he married [an] Aussie girl. Yes, he’s got a child. Yes, his entry to Australia was on [date redacted to maintain privacy]. No, he did not marry her to get residency.” So do you really have to have a board up there?

Dinesh and Juliet’s experiences were at the extreme end of those narrated by the participants in this study. They were one of the few couples to feel that they had faced discrimination and hostility. However, there was a common thread between their experiences and those of many other participants, who often felt they needed to have their whole family together, including their children, to be correctly identified (as a family unit) and to minimise the propensity for negative stereotyping and questions regarding the legitimacy of their relationships. These issues are discussed in further detail in a paper by Klocker and Tindale (under review), and are beyond the immediate scope of this thesis—which is focused specifically on the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples, rather than their experiences in public places more generally. Nonetheless, Chapter 7 does engage with the important question of how visibly
different mixed-ethnicity couples’ experiences, in different places, shape their residential decision-making processes, or not.

Returning to Juliet and Dinesh, twelve years ago the couple moved to Darwin, because they wanted to live somewhere tropical. Yet the move has yielded many improvements in terms of their sense of wellbeing and belonging. In Darwin, Dinesh feels they are ‘not the lowest denomination’ and that they are ‘treated as an entity.’ He explained the latter statement by noting that when they walk into shops in Darwin, they are treated as a couple not as separate individuals. Dinesh described Darwin as ‘a different cluster of society’ that is ‘more accepting.’ The prevalence of other mixed-ethnicity couples adds to their sense of belonging. Dinesh explained that when they walk down the street in Darwin, they ‘see heaps of ethnic folks, inter-married folks, or inter-relationship folks—don’t know if they’re married or not—walking around in the street. So it’s just not an issue.’

Juliet and Dinesh’s experiences in Darwin have been so positive that the couple stated that they ‘won’t live anywhere else in Australia’ in the future. Yet their initial reasons for moving there were nothing to do with their ethnic identities—or the perception that it would offer relief from scrutiny and discrimination—but rather their preference for a warmer, tropical climate.

6.4 Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that the interviewees involved in this study were quite diverse—not only in terms of their ethnic identities, but also along other socio-demographic lines. Nonetheless, they displayed a strong propensity to live in moderately diverse suburbs, in both Sydney and Darwin. This finding fits well with the quantitative evidence presented in Chapters 3 and 4, and with international literature which has argued that mixed-ethnicity couples prefer
such residential locations, which are not dominated by the ethnic group of either partner (Dalmage, 2000; Holloway et al., 2005). This chapter has also explained that the mixed-ethnicity couples involved in this study generally described their experiences in positive terms. They felt that Australian society, today, is generally accepting of mixed-ethnicity couples. While almost all felt a sense of being watched in public, this was generally attributed to curiosity rather than hostility—and usually did not cause great discomfort. More commonly, their experiences were recounted with humour, or mild irritation. Very few of the interviewees felt that they had been overtly discriminated against due to their mixed-ethnicity relationship—an optimistic finding given historical trends of discrimination against mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia.

Given that the interviewees’ experiences of being in public varied across space—and, in no small part, in relation to the ethnic composition of an area—it might be anticipated ethnic diversity would be at the forefront of couples’ minds when deciding on a place to live. This question is addressed in Chapter 7, which explores the residential decision-making processes of mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Darwin.
Chapter 7: Neighbourhood ethnic diversity and residential choice: how do mixed-ethnicity couples decide where to live?

Prelude IV

This chapter adopts a qualitative approach, based on 48 interviews with 86 adult members of mixed-ethnicity households. It seeks to complement the quantitative techniques deployed in Chapters 3, 4 and 5. Qualitative approaches are vital to gain deeper understandings of the factors that drive the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples, as depicted in Chapters 3 and 4 (based on analyses of census data). Those chapters showed that mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia have distinctive geographies vis-à-vis co-ethnic couples, and tend to live in moderately diverse areas. This prompts the question: how important is neighbourhood ethnic diversity to mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential decision-making processes?

This chapter is a reproduction in full of a paper submitted to Urban Geography during my candidature:


I was lead author on this paper. The 48 interviews upon which the paper is based were conducted by myself and/or my supervisor Natascha Klocker between 2014 and 2017. Dr Klocker and I were both active in the recruitment of participants. Our analyses of the resulting data-set were conducted separately. For this paper, I was solely responsible for coding and interpreting all of the interview transcripts to identify recurring themes in mixed-ethnicity
couples’ stories about deciding where to live. I wrote the first full draft of the manuscript, and Dr Klocker assisted in formulating an argument for the paper and provided important feedback throughout the editing process. Although the text from the article is reproduced in full here, the Table and Figure numbers, and section numbering, have been adjusted to fit within the structure of the thesis. The participant attribute tables from Chapter 6 (Tables 6.1 and 6.2) are duplicated in this chapter (Tables 7.1 and 7.2), as they were included in the submitted manuscript. Table 7.3 is included in this chapter, but was excluded from the submitted manuscript due to space constraints.
Abstract

Ethnically mixed households are considered a signifier of eroding social and cultural barriers between ethnic groups. They also bear strong potential for changing how urban ethnic landscapes are configured and understood. Quantitative research has revealed mixed-ethnicity couples’ distinctive and diverse residential geographies, which interrupt established patterns of segregation. Census data analyses show that mixed-ethnicity couples concentrate in diverse and cosmopolitan neighbourhoods. Yet few qualitative researchers have asked these couples to explain their residential decision-making. The reasons behind their unique residential geographies remain opaque. We respond to this gap, drawing on 48 interviews with mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia. Conventional, everyday concerns prevailed in their discussions of neighbourhood choice: dwelling characteristics and affordability, proximity to workplace and family, and accessibility of services and amenities. Most expressed affinity for ethnically diverse neighbourhoods, but this was rarely cited as a primary factor. Our findings counter assumptions that ethnic differences are front-and-centre of mixed-ethnicity families’ everyday decision-making, and highlight their ordinariness. Amidst persistent criticism of (purported) ethnic residential enclaves in diverse cities, mixed-ethnicity couples’ seeming lack of focus on their neighbourhoods’ ethnic composition offers a welcome counter-narrative.

Keywords: diversity; mixed-race; residential mobility; segregation; neighbourhood choice
7.1 Introduction

Scholarship on intimate partnerships across ethnic boundaries is key to understanding urban areas’ evolving ethno-racial character. Sociologists have long described mixed-ethnicity partnerships as the most powerful indicator of decreasing social distance between ethnic groups (Bogardus, 1933). Their prevalence is considered a signifier of the progress of multiculturalism (Khoo, 2011). Equally, mixed-ethnicity couples carry the potential to generate profound socio-cultural change. They can weaken ethnic prejudices by generating opportunities for partners’ ethnically distinctive family, friendship and community networks to interact (Kalmijn, 1998). Mixed-ethnicity partnerships also impact future generations, as their children may identify with multiple ethnic groups (Khoo, 2011).

Research on mixed-ethnicity families has largely focused on negotiations of cultural differences within the home, identity construction, and experiences of discrimination (Holloway et al., 2012b; Luke and Luke, 1998; Twine, 1999). Additionally, geographers have explored where these families live within cities’ ethnic landscapes (Caballero et al., 2008; Tindale and Klocker, 2017; Wright et al., 2011). Collectively, these quantitative studies have revealed mixed-ethnicity couples’ distinctive residential patterns vis-à-vis ethnically homogeneous households, perhaps signalling unique neighbourhood preferences. Qualitative research is necessary to comprehend mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential decisions. Such research is scarce, but necessary, given growth in mixed-ethnicity partnerships in countries

---

43 Terminologies used to describe mixed couples are contingent upon countries’ conceptualizations of race/ethnicity and the language adopted in censuses. US-based studies typically refer to ‘inter-racial’ or ‘mixed-race’ couples (e.g. Wright et al., 2011); and UK-based studies to ‘mixed-ethnicity’ families or unions (Caballero et al., 2008; Feng et al., 2014). The ABS classifies the population according to the Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups, not by racial categories. Accordingly, we use the term ‘mixed-ethnicity couples’ except when discussing other studies, in which case we retain their phrasing wherever possible.
such as the United States (Lofquist et al., 2012), United Kingdom (Office for National Statistics, 2014), and Australia (Khoo, 2011).

Alert to this need, this paper presents the findings of 48 interviews with mixed-ethnicity families in Sydney and Darwin: the two cities with Australia’s highest concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples (Tindale and Klocker, 2017). We explore couples’ residential decision-making processes and valued neighbourhood attributes, testing the assertion that ethnic diversity is a drawcard for mixed-ethnicity households. Our findings were unexpected: interviewees identified neighbourhood ethnic diversity as desirable, but prioritized ‘classic’ location factors (identified in the residential mobility literature) when deciding where to live. Their narratives signal the ordinariness of mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential decision-making, raising a complex question: why are mixed-ethnicity couples’ urban geographies distinctive if ethnicity is not a driving factor?

7.2 Theories of residential mobility and household location choice

Classic residential mobility theories posit that economic and demographic factors (e.g. age/life-course, marital status, family composition) determine households’ residential locations (Kim et al., 2005; Lawton et al., 2013; Rossi, 1955). Job accessibility is frequently cited as a primary driver of residential location (Kim et al., 2005; Prashker et al., 2008). Following this logic, other neighbourhood attributes are negotiated alongside proximity to the workplace, including: environmental amenity (Rouwendal and Meijer, 2001); accessibility of recreational opportunities/greenspace (Colwell et al., 2002); proximity to services (Bowes and Ihlanfeldt, 2001); and housing prices (So et al., 2001). Following these classic theories, all residential location decisions happen amidst constraints, especially financial resources and housing affordability. Residential priorities shift temporally, particularly across key life stages:
marriage, childbearing and retirement (Kim et al., 2005; Prashker et al., 2008; Rossi, 1955). People without children typically reside closer to their workplaces, while households with children often prioritize more dwelling space, quality schools and recreational spaces (Karsten, 2007; Kim et al., 2005).

Additional perspectives have built on the seminal works of behavioural and humanistic geographers, who argued that individuals’ spatial behaviours are not entirely ‘rational’; they are informed by unique and subjective understandings of place (Ley, 1977; Wolpert, 1966). Perceptions of neighbourhood context thus impact residential decision-making (Lee et al., 1994). For instance, a sense of strong neighbourhood-based social networks (including extended family and/or friendship groups) and attendant feelings of social embeddedness are influential when choosing where to live, particularly for families with children (Fischer and Malmberg, 2001; Karsten, 2007). Moving further beyond ‘rational’ economic and accessibility-based factors, Karsten (2007) posited that people construct identities in relation to where they live, and that these residential identities impact residential choices. Underpinning residential identities are various forms of social distinction (e.g. income, ethnicity, age, social attitudes). Crucially, this perspective emphasizes that residential location is a means of defining one’s social position; particular neighbourhoods can support or constrain expressions of cultural identity (Savage et al., 2005).

Of course, subjective understandings and experiences of place are likely to differ for diverse ethnic groups. People often prefer homogeneous social networks, including along ethnic lines (Butler and Robson, 2001). Further, neighbourhood ethnic composition impacts individuals’ sense of belonging and capacity to enact their cultural identity, particularly if they fear exposure to racism (Phillips, 2006; Twine, 1999). For further insights, the following section turns to the
literature on ethnic residential segregation. We then review existing research on mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential geographies, demonstrating the research gap to which this paper responds. Our analysis draws on all of these bodies of work to unpack the residential decision-making processes narrated by our participants. As ethnicity does not operate in isolation, we are attentive to overlapping aspects of identity (especially age, class and family composition) in driving their choices of where to live.

7.3 Theories of ethnic residential segregation

Scholars have long sought explanations for patterns of ethnic segregation in cities (e.g. Logan and Alba, 1993; Portes and Jensen, 1987) and have debated the relative importance of choice and constraint. Choice is central to both the ethnic enclave model and theories of racial tipping points. The former posits that ethnic minorities—particularly recent migrants—prefer to live in residential clusters with sizeable co-ethnic populations, even if they are financially able to move elsewhere (Portes and Jensen, 1987). Strong co-ethnic networks and services are important drawcards. The latter, based on Schelling’s (1972) concept of ‘racial tipping points’, highlights ethnic majority households’ neighbourhood preferences. Writing from the United States, Schelling suggested that whites tolerate certain levels of neighbourhood ethnic diversity before opting to relocate. Later studies confirmed whites’ preferences for predominantly white neighbourhoods and their role in sustaining segregation in the US (Crowder et al., 2011) and Europe (Andersen, 2017).

Constraint-based perspectives emphasize socio-economic and structural barriers that limit ethnic minorities’ residential options, particularly among new migrants. According to the spatial assimilation model, ethnic residential clusters reflect minorities’ socio-economic position, not preferences. Ethnic minority households move away from initial clusters, to
‘improved’ residential locations, when they can afford to do so (Massey, 1985). Segmented assimilation theory adds nuance to this argument, highlighting that economic and spatial assimilation trajectories vary for different ethnic groups (Portes and Zhou, 1993). Both models assume that ethnic minorities’ residential preferences align with those of the ethnic majority, and that financial progress leads to spatial assimilation. The place stratification model emphasizes that this is not always the case. Moving beyond financial constraints, it argues that social exclusion and racism inhibit ethnic minorities’ residential choices (Logan and Alba, 1993). Structural racism in the housing market and fear of discrimination at the neighbourhood-level can limit ethnic minorities’ ability to convert economic mobility into residential mobility (Logan and Alba, 1993; Phillips, 2006).

Drawing these threads together, recent studies have described a ‘dialectic relationship between choice and constraint’ (McGarrigle and Kearns, 2009: 453). Residential outcomes result from ‘bounded choices’ (Phillips, 2003: 47), that vary between ethnic groups. Notably, these theories of ethnic residential segregation have been informed by counts of individuals in geographic areas, operating under the implicit assumption of ethnically homogeneous households. Ethnically mixed households offer different insights into urban ethnic geographies.

7.4 The geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples

Quantitative research has shown that the residential distributions of mixed-ethnicity couples diverge from each partner’s respective ethnic group (in the US: Ellis et al., 2006; Holloway et al., 2005; Wright et al., 2011; in the UK: Caballero et al., 2008; Feng et al., 2014; in Australia: Tindale and Klocker, 2017). The geographies of ethnic minority persons vary according to their partner’s ethnicity: those with white partners have heightened propensities to live outside neighbourhoods with high own ethnic group concentrations (Ellis et al., 2006; Feng et al., 2014;
Thus mixed-ethnicity couples may alter established ethnic geographies, by pulling against segregation.

There is also evidence that mixed-ethnicity couples gravitate towards diverse residential areas (Gabriel, 2016; Holloway et al., 2005; Tindale and Klocker, 2017; Wright et al., 2011). Holloway et al. (2005) identified an ‘in-between’ pattern in 12 United States metropolitan areas: most types of mixed-race couples live in more diverse neighbourhoods than same-race white couples, but less diverse neighbourhoods than non-white same-race couples. The exception is black–white couples, who live in more diverse neighbourhoods than same-race white and black couples. Research in Australian cities supports this ‘in-between’ thesis for couples comprised of an Anglo-European (ethnic majority) partner and a visibly different ethnic minority partner (Tindale and Klocker, 2017). These mixed-ethnicity couples are more likely to live in highly diverse neighbourhoods than co-ethnic Anglo-European (white) couples, but are less likely to do so than their respective co-ethnic minority couples.

Census-based studies argue that ‘mixed-ethnicity couples ‘view neighbourhoods as sites for creating and enacting their identities’ (Wright et al., 2011: 6); and so choose neighbourhoods that are not ‘marked out as the terrain of one group or the other’ (Holloway et al., 2005: 321). Residence in diverse neighbourhoods may reflect the combined preferences of each partner (Gabriel, 2016). Quantitative research has also identified life course factors as important. In England and Wales, mixed-ethnicity couples with children cluster in ‘multicultural’ areas more than those without children (Caballero et al., 2008).

Recent quantitative longitudinal studies have questioned the degree to which mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential geographies reflect unique desires to move into diverse neighbourhoods
(Gabriel, 2016), or those with lower co-ethnic concentrations (Feng et al., 2014). In the United States, Gabriel (2016) found that mixed-race couples tended to move into more diverse neighbourhoods than mono-racial white couples, but the diversity of their destination neighbourhoods did not differ substantially from mono-racial black couples. In the United Kingdom, Feng et al. (2014) found that black people with white partners were no more likely than black people in co-ethnic unions to move into neighbourhoods with fewer black residents. The authors argued that the overrepresentation of mixed-ethnic (black–white) unions in areas with lower concentrations of black residents may signal couple formation in such neighbourhoods, rather than subsequent mobility. This argument does not apply straightforwardly to the couples involved in our study. Very few of our participants met their partner in their neighbourhood. Only 11 of 48 couples lived in the same location as one another when they met, and many such locations were broad (e.g. Abu Dhabi, Amsterdam), rather than shared neighbourhoods. Further, at the time of interview only two couples lived in the neighbourhood where they had met. Nonetheless, these longitudinal studies provide information unavailable via cross-sectional methods. They suggest that mixed-ethnicity couples’ distinctive residential patterns are not solely attributable to decisions made, by couples, to move into ethnically diverse neighbourhoods.

Overall, the motivations behind mixed-ethnicity couples’ unique residential geographies remain unclear due to limited qualitative investigations. Extant qualitative studies contend that mixed-ethnicity couples’ lives and residential decisions are shaped by concerns that co-ethnic couples do not experience (Luke and Luke, 1998). Exploring the residential motivations of black–white families in the United States, Dalmage (2000) emphasized the role of ‘borderism’, a form of racism targeting those who traverse racial boundaries. She argued that mixed-race couples (especially with children) consider racially diverse neighbourhoods more accepting of
racial mixing, and less prone to borderism (Dalmage, 2000). Interviewing white mothers of mixed-race children in the United Kingdom, Twine (1999: 737) also uncovered a preference for diverse communities where their children would not be ‘hyper-visible’ and hence less likely targets of racial abuse. Parents may also perceive that diverse neighbourhoods provide opportunities for mixed-ethnicity children to enact mixed-identities and have regular contact with members of each parent’s ethnic community (Dalmage, 2000; Moran, 2001). Participants in Houston and Wright’s (2008: 85) study of mixed-race couples in Seattle expressed a desire for their children to ‘interact with multiple communities’. However, more generic residential priorities (e.g. proximity to family) were also salient. Houston and Wright focused on mixed-race couples’ experiences of belonging and displacement, not residential decision-making per se. Here, we use insights from the segregation and residential mobility literatures, alongside our interviewees’ explicit avowals of their residential choices, to deepen understandings of mixed-ethnicity households’ distinctive geographies.

7.5 Methods and study sites

We conducted 48 semi-structured interviews with 86 adult members of mixed-ethnicity families in Darwin ($n = 22$) and Sydney\(^4\) ($n = 26$) between 2014 and 2017. In Darwin, participants were recruited via media coverage in the local newspaper (NT News), a radio interview (ABC Darwin), and with assistance from local community organizations. In Sydney, the researchers’ hometown, recruitment occurred through personal networks and snowballing. Recruitment did not target couples involving specific combinations of ethnicities, but prioritized ‘visible differences’ between partners because ‘[r]acisms and racializing practices occur, in the first instance of public encounters, on the basis of outward appearance’ (Luke, 2001).

\(^4\) Four ‘Sydney’ families lived in the Illawarra region, which borders the Sydney metropolitan area to the south. Illawarra’s major city, Wollongong, is approximately 40 minutes’ drive from Sydney’s southernmost suburbs.
2003: 381); and because exposure to racism may affect couples’ residential decisions. In almost all cases, one partner was white (i.e. Anglo-Australian/European ancestry) and the other identified with a visible ethnic minority group.

Participants were able to choose between an individual or couple interview. In all cases where both partners participated ($n = 38$), they elected to be interviewed together. In the remaining interviews, only the female partner was available/interested in participating. All participants were given the option of being referred to by their real first name or a pseudonym in published materials. These requests have been adhered to in this paper.

The interviews lasted from one to four hours, and all were conducted in English. Discussions were broadly focused on participants’ engagements with—and everyday experiences of—the world outside the home, rather than internal relationship dynamics. Questions gathered background information about each couple: how and where they met, their household structure and self-described ethnic identities. A series of questions focused specifically on participants’ housing histories, residential decision-making processes, and whether there were certain places (in their neighbourhood or the wider city) that caused them to feel dis/comfort as a mixed-ethnicity couple. We approached interviews with an open orientation, asking our participants what mattered to them—rather than listing factors and asking if they were influential. We also asked participants how their relationships had been received by others and whether they (or their children) had experienced discrimination. Interviews were audio-recorded with informed consent, transcribed verbatim, and coded thematically.

45 Given the personal nature of ethnic identity, we use participants’ own terminology throughout this paper. Accordingly, there is some inconsistency in how ethnicities are phrased.
Darwin and Sydney were selected as study sites because 2011 census data revealed that they have higher proportions of visibly different mixed-ethnicity couples than any other cities in Australia (Tindale and Klocker, 2017). Further, the two cities present distinctive contexts for exploring the residential decisions of mixed-ethnicity couples, providing access to a broader set of experiences.

Darwin, the capital of the Northern Territory, is a remote city. At the 2016 census, its resident population was just 136,828 (ABS, 2016b). Darwin’s ethnic composition reflects its proximity to South-East Asia. In 2016, 22.2% of residents spoke a language other than English at home, and 26.0% were overseas-born. Residents of South-East Asian ancestry formed 8.3% of the population. Darwin also has a higher proportion of Indigenous residents than other Australian capitals; 8.7% of the population (compared to 2.8% nationwide; ABS, 2016b). Despite being an immigrant-receiving city, Darwin has not developed ethnic residential clusters (Ford, 2009). This is likely due to the city’s small population and unique urban form, which was destroyed and then fundamentally re-shaped by World War Two and again by Cyclone Tracey in 1974 (Brennan-Horley and Gibson, 2009). Those events recontextualized ethnic relations in Darwin (Luke and Luke, 1998).

In 2016, Sydney’s population totalled 4.8 million, with 37% overseas-born (ABS, 2016b). After World War Two, the city’s predominantly British population increasingly incorporated mainland European migrants (in the 1950s/1960s); followed by migrants from other regions as the White Australia Policy was dismantled from the late 1960s (Johnston et al., 2017). Since
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46 In that analysis, ‘mixed-ethnicity couples’ included those where one partner stated Anglo-European ancestry, and the other stated a ‘visibly different’ ethnic minority ancestry. For further detail, see Tindale and Klocker (2017).

47 All census data for Darwin and Sydney refer to the Greater Darwin and Greater Sydney Capital City Statistical Areas respectively.
then, migrants and refugees—especially from Asia and the Middle East—have arrived in sizeable numbers (Johnston et al., 2017). While less ethnically segregated than overseas cities (notably in the U.S.), some Sydney suburbs contain notable ethnic minority concentrations (Johnston et al., 2007). Another distinguishing feature of Sydney, highly relevant to residential decision-making, is housing unaffordability. Residence in the inner city, and surrounding areas, is unattainable for most (Birrell and McCloskey, 2016).

7.6 Participant attributes and residential geographies

Tables 7.1 and 7.2 detail participants’ self-defined ethnic identities, parenting status and home suburb. All but one couple involved an Anglo-European Australian partner and a partner from a visibly different ethnic minority group, the exception being Savita (Fijian Indian) and Bernard (Aboriginal and Indian). Our sample (particularly in Sydney) was skewed towards middle-class couples in their late 20s to mid-40s. All bar one were heterosexual. This was not intentional, the recruitment materials welcomed same-sex and heterosexual couples. Most interviews (35/48; 72.9%) were with participants who had children (either co-resident dependent children, or adult children who had moved out). Couples without children were more prevalent in Sydney (10/26 interviews; 38.5%) than Darwin (3/22; 13.6%).
Table 7.1: Attributes of Sydney (n = 22) and Illawarra (n = 4) interviewees and their partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names and self-defined ethnicities</th>
<th>Children (yes/no)</th>
<th>Suburb name</th>
<th>Suburb description (based on 2011 census data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sydney participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette (Australian-born Chinese); Shaun (Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately low diversity; 66% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena (England-born Romanian/Polish); Jonah (New Zealand-born Samoan)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kogarah Bay</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderately high diversity; 33% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet (Chinese from Hong Kong); Hefin (Welsh)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lane Cove North</td>
<td>Inner city; moderate diversity; 53% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica (Australian); David (black Brazilian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kangaroo Point</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderate diversity; 44% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiyeon (Korean); Thomas (German)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rockdale</td>
<td>Middle ring; high diversity; 18% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce (Aboriginal); Colin (Manx-Celtic)</td>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>MacLean&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Regional town; low diversity; 91% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June (Australian); Peter (Egypt-born Lebanese)</td>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Peakhurst</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderate diversity; 53% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin (Switzerland-born Australian); Jin (Chinese)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dulwich Hill</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately high diversity; 48% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate (Anglo-Saxon); Charlie (Lebanese)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kingsgrove</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderately high diversity; 24% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malika (Indo-Mauritian); Johannes (German/white/Caucasian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woollahra</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately low diversity; 69% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momoko (Japanese); Erik (Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td>Middle ring; low diversity; 79% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natascha (Austrian)&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;; Paul (African)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cronulla</td>
<td>Outer suburban; low diversity; 80% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael (Anglo-Irish-Celtic Australian); Carlos (Colombian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Centennial Park</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately low diversity; 68% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn (Australian); Jack (Caribbean)&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cronulla</td>
<td>Outer suburban; low diversity; 80% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammy (Anglo-Indian); Ben (Australian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Blakehurst</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderately high diversity; 38% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sendy (Indonesian); Franck (French)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately high diversity; 39% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalini (Malaysia-born Sri Lankan Tamil); Mark (Anglo-Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>Outer suburban; moderately low diversity; 72% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiqi (Chinese); Matt (white/Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>Inner city; moderate diversity; 56% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley (Australian); John (Egypt-born Greek)</td>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Kogarah Bay</td>
<td>Middle ring; moderately high diversity; 33% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takumi (Japanese); Peter (Anglo-Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Erskineville</td>
<td>Inner city; moderately low diversity; 67% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara (Australian); Daniel (Australian-born Chinese)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Bossley Park</td>
<td>Outer suburban; high diversity; 18% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany (Australian with Sri Lankan parents); Matthew (Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Eagle Vale / Minto</td>
<td>Outer suburban; moderately high diversity; 57% AE (Eagle Vale); 48% AE (Minto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illawarra participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine (Anglo New Zealander); James (Rotuman)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Figtree</td>
<td>Illawarra; moderate diversity; 68% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey (Eurasian); Bruce (Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Woonona</td>
<td>Illawarra; low diversity; 84% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz (Australian); Kim (Australian-born Vietnamese)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Horsley</td>
<td>Illawarra; low diversity; 78% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe (European Australian); Romano (Rotuman)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kiama</td>
<td>Illawarra; low diversity; 87% AE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Female partner’s name is listed first, except for Takumi and Peter (a same-sex male couple). Italicised names indicate partners who did not participate in the interview (all have been given pseudonyms). AE = Anglo-European. The percentage of residents classified as Anglo-European is based on ancestry responses to the census, and encompassed ancestries coded as Australian, New Zealander, North-West European and Caucasian (so described).

<sup>a</sup> Couple has adult children who have moved out.
<sup>b</sup> Couple lives outside Sydney, but previously lived in Sydney and interview took place in Sydney.
<sup>c</sup> Interviewee is no longer in a relationship with ‘partner’.
<sup>d</sup> This is Dr Natascha Klocker, my primary supervisor. She was not interviewed, but her experiences were detailed in many other interviews during conversations with participants around shared experiences of being in a visibly different mixed-ethnicity couple. Her husband, Paul, was interviewed separately for this study.
Table 7.2: Attributes of Darwin interviewees and their partners (n = 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names and self-defined ethnicities</th>
<th>Children (y/n)</th>
<th>Suburb name</th>
<th>Suburb description (based on 2011 census data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aihong (Chinese); Kon (Greek)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nightcliff</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 62% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna (Australian); Kwento (Ibo Nigerian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Malak</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderately low diversity; 65% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ari (Indonesian); Scott (New Zealand-born Australian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Humpty Doo</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; low diversity; 84% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didamain (Indigenous); Mick (Australian)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Malak</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderately low diversity; 65% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna (Australian); Lethabo (Xhosa South African)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Wanguri</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 60% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fung (Chinese-Balinese); Steve (Anglo-Saxon)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Karama</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 56% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene (Filipina); Nick (Australian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jingga</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderately low diversity; 72% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane (Caucasian Australian); Shammon (Indigenous Australian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nightcliff</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 62% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna (Australian); Joshua (Australian with Chinese-Indonesian father and Chinese mother)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Millner</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 60% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet (Australian); Dinesh (Sri Lankan)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; moderately low diversity; 75% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kushala (Malaysia-born Indian); Max (German/Scottish)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; moderately low diversity; 75% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea (Indonesian); Rob (Australian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; low diversity; 90% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah (Aboriginal); Shane (English/New Zealander)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Coconut Grove</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 57% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily (Malaysian-Chinese); Colin (Anglo-Saxon)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nakara</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderately high diversity; 52% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina (Italian); Kelvin (Australian with Japanese/Filipino/Dutch/German ancestry)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Malak</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderately low diversity; 65% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia (Australian with Indonesian parents); Oli (Czech)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Farrar</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; low diversity; 78% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie (Australian); Terry (Maghreb Libyan)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stuart Park</td>
<td>Inner Darwin; moderately low diversity; 68% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita (Indonesian); Richard (Australian)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Rosebery</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; low diversity; 79% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara (Pakeha New Zealander); Felino (Filipino)</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Howard Springs</td>
<td>Outer Darwin; low diversity; 88% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savita (Fijian Indian); Bernard (Aboriginal and Indian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Berrimah</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; low diversity; 84% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya (Australian); Ben (Nigerian)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Coconut Grove</td>
<td>Suburban Darwin; moderate diversity; 57% AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulan (Indonesian); Grant (Australian)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Darwin City</td>
<td>Inner Darwin; moderate diversity; 66% AE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All notes apply as for Table 7.1.
* Couple has adult children who have moved out.

The characteristics of our participants’ home suburbs are listed individually in Tables 7.1 and 7.2, then summarised in Table 7.3. The index of standard entropy\(^{48}\) was used to measure the

\[ E = s * - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (K_i) \log(K_i) \]

\(^{48}\) The standardised entropy index for each suburb was calculated as:
level of ethnic diversity, after first classifying each suburb’s population (at the 2011 census) into 10 ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{49} The entropy index measures the evenness of each ethnic group’s share of the local population. The maximum possible (1) indicates that all 10 groups are present in equal shares. The minimum (0) indicates that one group comprises 100 per cent of the population. Suburbs were arranged into five ethnic diversity groups: low (entropy < 0.408); moderately low (0.408–0.551) moderate (0.552–0.673); moderately high (0.674–0.777); and high (≥0.778). Tables 7.1 and 7.2 also indicate the Anglo-European percentage of each suburb’s population. Low diversity suburbs are typically more than 75 per cent Anglo-European, and high diversity suburbs less than 20 per cent.

Table 7.3: Percentage distribution of participants across suburbs by ethnic diversity, Sydney, Illawarra and Darwin samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb attribute</th>
<th>Sydney % (count)</th>
<th>Sydney broader pop. %</th>
<th>Illawarra % (count)</th>
<th>Illawarra broader pop. %</th>
<th>Darwin % (count)</th>
<th>Darwin broader pop. %</th>
<th>All interviews % (count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9.1 (2)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately high</td>
<td>31.8 (7)</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5 (1)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16.7 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>18.2 (4)</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>25.0 (1)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>36.4 (8)</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.1 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately low</td>
<td>22.7 (5)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.8 (7)</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>25.0 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18.2 (4)</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>75.0 (3)</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>27.3 (6)</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>27.1 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: These are based on counts of interviews, not individuals. When both partners participated in an interview, they contribute once to the tallies. The broader population columns show the distribution of the total populations of these cities, across different suburb types, for comparison with our interviewees. ‘Sydney’ refers to Greater Sydney, ‘Illawarra’ to the Illawarra SA4, and ‘Darwin’ to Greater Darwin.

Table 7.3 compares the distributions of participating couples across each level of ethnic diversity, to the corresponding distributions of the total population. Nine of twenty-two Sydney

where \( K \) is the proportional share of the suburb population for each ethnic group (1 through \( n \)). The scaling constant \((s)\) ensures that potential values range from zero (no diversity) to one (all groups present in equal proportions).

\textsuperscript{49} Ethnic groups were constructed using census ancestry responses and included: Anglo-European, Pacific Islander, Southern and Eastern European, North African and Middle Eastern, South-East Asian, North-East Asian, Southern and Central Asian, Sub-Saharan African, Mixed and Other. Dual-ancestry persons with both responses in one of these categories (e.g. English and German in the Anglo-European group) were counted in that group, those with ancestries in different groups were counted as Mixed. ‘Other’ included all ancestries that did not fit within the other nine groups.
interviews were with residents of moderately high diversity \((n = 7)\) or high diversity \((n = 2)\) suburbs. The remainder were spread across moderate, moderately low and low diversity suburbs. Three of four Illawarra-based participants lived in low diversity suburbs. Almost all Darwin participants \((21 \text{ of } 22 \text{ couples})\) lived in moderate, moderately low or low diversity suburbs. Compared to the general population, our Sydney participants were overrepresented in moderately high and moderately low diversity suburbs, while Darwin participants were overrepresented in moderate and moderately low diversity suburbs. This echoes earlier analyses that revealed the propensity for Australian mixed-ethnicity couples to live in places of moderate ethnic diversity (Tindale and Klocker, 2017).

Tables 7.1 and 7.2 also describe each suburb’s position in the metropolitan area, using different descriptors for Sydney and Darwin due to their dissimilar urban forms. Sydney participants were quite evenly spread across inner city \((8/22 \text{ interviews})\), middle ring \((8/22)\) and outer suburban \((5/22)\) areas.\(^{50}\) Many Darwin-based participants \((13/22 \text{ interviews})\) lived in Suburban Darwin, with smaller numbers in Outer Darwin \((7/22)\) and Inner Darwin \((2/22)\).

7.7 How do mixed-ethnicity couples decide where to live?

Our participants’ narratives regarding neighbourhood choice and valued neighbourhood attributes largely aligned with conventional residential location factors: job accessibility, housing affordability and proximity of services; concerns shared by the broader population (Kim et al., 2005; Rossi, 1955). When asked to identify reasons for living in their current suburb, neighbourhood ethnic diversity was mentioned in only 10.4 per cent of interviews (Table 7.4). This finding is surprising, but reflects the broader narrative projected during

\(^{50}\) Tallies exclude Joyce and Colin, who previously lived in Sydney, but had moved away by the time of interview.
interviews: participants downplayed the everyday significance of ethnicity in their lives, and did not strongly identify with the mixed-ethnicity tag. They regularly asserted, ‘I just think of...us as a couple’ (June, Australian), or ‘we just see it [our relationship] as normal’ (Savita, Fijian Indian).

While neighbourhood ethnic diversity did not drive our interviewees’ decisions, it was mentioned as an attractive attribute in 54.2 per cent of interviews (Table 7.4) The following section discusses the role of conventional factors in mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential decision-making. We then explore their reasons for valuing neighbourhood ethnic diversity, focusing on four central themes: diversity and invisibility; diversity across multiple social axes; diversity and children; and proximity to co-ethnic communities.

7.7.1 The primacy of conventional factors in mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential lives

Classic residential preference theory suggests residential choices are underpinned by pragmatic considerations: job location, dwelling space needs, housing affordability and environmental amenity (Kim et al., 2005; Rossi, 1955). Further research has identified the importance of social networks (Karsten, 2007). These ‘conventional’ factors—which apply to the broader population not just mixed-couples—dominated our interviewees’ accounts (Tables 7.4 and 7.5). The most common were: dwelling characteristics and affordability (39.6% of interviews), job accessibility (39.6%), social dimensions (39.6%); proximity to retail/services (29.2%); and children’s perceived needs (27.1% of all interviews; but 37.1% for those with children).
Table 7.4: Tallies\(^a\) of reasons behind suburb choice and valued place attributes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why did you choose to live in this suburb?</th>
<th>Sydney count (%)(^b)</th>
<th>Darwin count (%)</th>
<th>Total count (%)</th>
<th>What do you like about living in this suburb?</th>
<th>Sydney count (%)(^b)</th>
<th>Darwin count (%)</th>
<th>Total count (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling characteristics/affordability</td>
<td>7 (26.9)</td>
<td>12 (54.5)</td>
<td>19 (39.6)</td>
<td>Social dimensions</td>
<td>18 (69.2)</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>28 (58.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job accessibility</td>
<td>9 (34.6)</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>19 (39.6)</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>15 (57.7)</td>
<td>11 (50.0)</td>
<td>26 (54.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social dimensions</td>
<td>11 (42.3)</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>19 (39.6)</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>15 (57.7)</td>
<td>11 (50.0)</td>
<td>26 (54.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to family(^c)</td>
<td>8 (30.8)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>12 (25.0)</td>
<td>Proximity to retail/services</td>
<td>13 (50.0)</td>
<td>5 (22.7)</td>
<td>18 (37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to retail/services</td>
<td>10 (38.5)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>14 (29.2)</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>9 (34.6)</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>17 (35.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s needs</td>
<td>6 (23.1)</td>
<td>7 (31.8)</td>
<td>13 (27.1)</td>
<td>Environmental amenity</td>
<td>9 (34.6)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>13 (27.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>7 (26.9)</td>
<td>5 (22.7)</td>
<td>12 (25.0)</td>
<td>Proximity to co-ethnic community</td>
<td>6 (23.1)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>8 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td>6 (23.1)</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
<td>9 (18.8)</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>7 (31.8)</td>
<td>7 (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal histories (area is ‘home’)</td>
<td>6 (23.1)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>8 (16.7)</td>
<td>Area is ‘home’</td>
<td>3 (11.5)</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
<td>6 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>3 (11.5)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>5 (10.4)</td>
<td>Family-friendly</td>
<td>2 (7.7)</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
<td>5 (10.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrating partner moved in with Australian partner</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (22.7)</td>
<td>5 (10.4)</td>
<td>Proximity to immigrant partner's country of origin</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>4 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>4 (8.3)</td>
<td>Dwelling characteristics</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
<td>3 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to co-ethnic community</td>
<td>1 (3.8)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>3 (6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to immigrant partner's country of origin</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
<td>1 (2.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Tallies are counts of interviews where reason/attribute was explicitly identified.

\(^b\) Includes Illawarra participants.

\(^c\) Tallies for ‘social dimensions’ include the sub-set ‘proximity to family’.
In Sydney, couples typically sought residence in a broad region of the city based on job accessibility. They then decided on a specific neighbourhood (within that area) where housing met their needs (dwelling size and characteristics) and price range. Workplace location was also a factor for some Darwin participants, many of whom had moved to that city for work-related reasons (e.g. in the mining/construction sectors). However, once there, their neighbourhood’s proximity to the workplace was relatively unimportant due to Darwin’s smaller size and shorter commuting times. Ben D.\(^{51}\) (Nigerian) explained, ‘It’s easy to get to everywhere. Fifteen minutes, twenty minutes.’ In Darwin, dwelling type and affordability drove neighbourhood choice (Table 7.4). Mick (Australian) and Scott (New Zealand-born Australian) both explained that they were happy to live in any part of Darwin that suited their housing needs (see Table 7.5). Sydney-based interviewees were less likely to cite dwelling characteristics and affordability as key (26.9%). Proximity to retail and services (e.g. the CBD) (38.5%), job accessibility (34.5%) and social factors (42.3%) were key drivers—a reflection of the city’s lengthy travel times whether for work, socialising, or to access services (see Table 7.4).

\(^{51}\) Two participants named Ben both wished to be referred to using their real names. One was from Darwin, the other from Sydney, so we refer to Ben D. and Ben S. respectively. The same nomenclature has been applied to two participants named Colin.
Table 7.5: Participant quotes: the top five ‘conventional’ reasons for neighbourhood choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling characteristics and affordability</th>
<th>Participant quotes: the top five ‘conventional’ reasons for neighbourhood choice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was just a matter of a three-bedroom place that we can afford anywhere! (Karin, Switzerland-born Australian, Sydney)</td>
<td>Dwelling characteristics and affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think what attract[ed] me is the space itself [size of the block]. I like to live in big places. (Terry, Maghreb Libyan, Darwin)</td>
<td>It could have been any suburb...we were looking for a house type. (Mick, Australian, Darwin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was more where we found a place…it’s much more expensive in Cronulla…a little bit further out, you can get a house with a yard, and stuff. So, space! (Mark, Anglo-Australian, Sydney)</td>
<td>It was more around the quality of the property…than the location…anywhere in Darwin would have been fine. (Scott, New Zealand-born Australian, Darwin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of Hefin’s job, he needs to be close enough for people to be able to visit here, and for him to get to work quickly. (Janet, Chinese from Hong Kong, Sydney)</td>
<td>Because I had the job it needed to be something in this area. (Thomas, German, Sydney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[E]mployment options were probably the main factor [in deciding to move to Darwin]…that was really the deciding factor… (Scott, New Zealand-born Australian, Darwin)</td>
<td>[W]e made a conscious choice when we were trying to find a place to live…to stay north [of Wollongong], because of the proximity to [Sydney]…I knew career-wise I’d always…be heading to [Sydney]. (Kelsey, Eurasian, Illawarra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[W]e made a conscious choice when we were trying to find a place to live…to stay north [of Wollongong], because of the proximity to [Sydney]…I knew career-wise I’d always…be heading to [Sydney]. (Kelsey, Eurasian, Illawarra)</td>
<td>Strategically being a little bit closer to work…so we can get a little bit of our life back rather than wasting the few hours a day we do just driving to work. (Jessica, Australian, Sydney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to retail and services</td>
<td>[O]ne of the main factors [in choosing this neighbourhood] is that Shiqi is doing Yoga …it’s a type of Yoga that isn’t done much around Sydney…a very specific type. And the studio that Shiqi prefers…is just up…near Surry Hills Library. (Matt, white/Australian, Sydney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That was actually…one of the decisions for moving out of Cronulla. If you needed to go to the airport or if I had gigs in the city—that extra twenty minutes would knock you out, especially with the kids. (Jonah, New Zealand-born Samoan, Sydney)</td>
<td>Darwin’s not very big, but…we wanted to be not too far from the city, and…this was kind of where we could afford for what we wanted... (Tanya, Australian, Darwin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[The reason for moving was] probably more in terms of being accessible to services, or just to the inner city culture. You know, cafes and restaurants. (Annette, Australian-born Chinese, Sydney)</td>
<td>Social dimensions of place (including proximity to family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin’s not very big, but…we wanted to be not too far from the city, and…this was kind of where we could afford for what we wanted... (Tanya, Australian, Darwin)</td>
<td>I think we both find…that friendship is really what keeps you—human connections are what keeps you where you are... (Steve, Anglo-Saxon, Darwin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[O]ne of the main factors [in choosing this neighbourhood] is that Shiqi is doing Yoga …it’s a type of Yoga that isn’t done much around Sydney…a very specific type. And the studio that Shiqi prefers…is just up…near Surry Hills Library. (Matt, white/Australian, Sydney)</td>
<td>[I]t was a combination of having your [his partner’s] family around, so in terms of child care, and being not too far from [his partner’s workplace] … (Paul, African, Sydney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin’s not very big, but…we wanted to be not too far from the city, and…this was kind of where we could afford for what we wanted... (Tanya, Australian, Darwin)</td>
<td>We chose to live in parts of Sydney that we knew…and where we had expanded our friendship groups. (Colin, Anglo-Saxon, Sydney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social dimensions of place (including proximity to family)</td>
<td>[W]e wanted to stay close to your mum…and your grandma, so we could go over there and help them out and look after them a little bit…that was a big reason why we stayed locally... (Bruce, Australian, Illawarra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We chose to live in parts of Sydney that we knew…and where we had expanded our friendship groups. (Colin, Anglo-Saxon, Sydney)</td>
<td>Yeah, cause it’s [their suburb is] family orientated, you get a lot of people that are…in a similar situation…married…raising younger kids. (Kim, Australian-born Vietnamese, Illawarra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s perceived needs</td>
<td>Children’s perceived needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s really because of the schools that we moved here…We know nothing about the neighbourhood. We just don’t care, as long as it’s close to the school. (Sendy, Indonesian, Sydney)</td>
<td>[W]e wanted to stay close to your mum…and your grandma, so we could go over there and help them out and look after them a little bit…that was a big reason why we stayed locally... (Bruce, Australian, Illawarra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We chose to come here because it’s a bit nicer and it’s close to the beach and parks and everything for Jensen [Jane’s son] (Jane, Caucasian Australian, Darwin)</td>
<td>Yeah, cause it’s [their suburb is] family orientated, you get a lot of people that are…in a similar situation…married…raising younger kids. (Kim, Australian-born Vietnamese, Illawarra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s perceived needs</td>
<td>Children’s perceived needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This house is between their [her children’s] schools and they wanted to walk to school so… (Lily, Malaysian-Chinese, Darwin)</td>
<td>This house is between their [her children’s] schools and they wanted to walk to school so… (Lily, Malaysian-Chinese, Darwin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Tables 7.4 and 7.5, many interviewees’ residential decisions were based on social considerations, including proximity to family (e.g. Paul and Bruce), local friendship networks (e.g. Steve and Colin S.), and a sense of connectedness to other local residents (e.g. Liz). Research has shown that couples with young children tend to invest in local social networks and subsequently remain in an area longer-term (Fischer and Malmberg, 2001; Karsten, 2007). For Kim (Australia-born Vietnamese) and Liz (Australian), who have three young children, the child-friendliness of their neighbourhood was important. Proximity to family was often important for couples with children, especially in Sydney (many Darwin-based participants had moved there from other states for work opportunities, so their extended families were far away). There was often a trade-off between participants’ residential preferences and their need to live close to extended family. Family support, particularly ‘in terms of child care’, led Paul (African) to live in Cronulla, a low-diversity suburb in Sydney’s south-east. Moreover, while Paul expressed a personal preference for more ethnically diverse areas, his family’s needs were prioritized in residential decision-making:

[I]t would be good to have a mixed population…from different cultural backgrounds…that would enhance…feeling safe…and not just one dominant group against the minority…but it comes down to what’s in it for my family…it’s not my individual choice…I’ve got to factor [in] schools…amenities, things that will be best for children, and you [Paul’s wife].

Paul’s words demonstrate the centrality of the household scale in understanding mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential geographies. If alone, he would opt for a more diverse part of Sydney.
Life course factors (including proximity to extended family, dwelling size, and amenities) cut across our interviewees’ accounts, again reflecting classic theories of residential decision-making. Lina (Italian) and Kelvin (Australian with Japanese, Filipino, Dutch and German ancestry) purchased a bigger house when they moved in together, along with their sons (from previous relationships). House size was their priority; location was less important. Children’s perceived needs were pertinent for numerous participants—for instance, school location and proximity to beaches and parks (e.g. Sendy, Jane and Lily in Table 7.5).

Less frequently mentioned ‘conventional’ factors that influenced couples’ residential decisions—and which had nothing to do with their ‘mixedness’—included personal histories (the area is ‘home’) and climate preferences. The latter was mentioned by Darwin-based participants, who were looking for a warm, tropical place to live. The examples discussed thus far collectively demonstrate that these mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential priorities aligned with established understandings of residential decision-making among the general population (Kim et al., 2005; Rossi, 1955). Ethnicity-related factors were central for a minority of households (as discussed in the following section).

When asked what they liked about their neighbourhoods (as opposed to why they chose their neighbourhoods), participants in Sydney and Darwin emphasized social dimensions (58.3%; see Table 7.4), including personal social networks and a sense of shared attitudes and characteristics with other residents. Other place attributes commonly valued or identified as enjoyable included proximity to retail and service facilities (37.5%), lifestyle (35.4%) and environmental amenity (27.1%). Although ethnic diversity rarely determined residential location, it was mentioned as a valued place attribute in over half of the interviews (54.2%; Table 7.4). The remainder of the paper unpacks how diversity was valued by our participants.
7.8 The importance of diverse neighbourhoods for mixed-ethnicity couples

Quantitative research has identified neighbourhood ethnic diversity as a likely explanation for the unique residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples (Holloway et al., 2005; Tindale and Klocker, 2017; Wright et al., 2011). Geographers have posited that these couples prefer diverse neighbourhoods because their identities are less constrained, and they are less likely to be targets of racism (Dalmage, 2000; Holloway et al., 2005). The mixed-ethnicity couples we interviewed valued neighbourhood ethnic diversity, but it rarely guided their decision-making. As discussed above, conventional factors (unrelated to ethnicity) were front of mind, as explained by June (Australian). When asked whether neighbourhood diversity was important for her and Peter (Egypt-born Lebanese) June replied, ‘Yes, yes. Very important…our life is enriched by it.’ Yet ethnic diversity would not determine their place of residence:

June: It…certainly would not…influence [us] as a couple…that would be the least of my considerations as to where I’d move to…

Natascha: And what would be the first of your considerations?

June: …I guess family…I would miss my family if I had to move too far away…then, selfishly, access to the city, access to public transport.

Enjoyment of ethnic diversity surfaced when participants were asked: ‘What do you like about living in your neighbourhood?’ (Table 7.4) and ‘What is it like being part of a mixed-ethnicity couple in your neighbourhood?’ Four dominant themes emerged in these conversations (see Table 7.6). When discussing these themes below, we make specific reference to the few participants for whom diversity did inform residential choice (Annette, Peter and Takumi, Matthew and Tiffany, Ben and Tanya, Nick and Irene).
Table 7.6: Participant quotes: what do mixed-ethnicity couples value about ethnically diverse neighbourhoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity and invisibility</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There’s all different types of couples [in Newtown]. Gay, lesbian, inter-ethnic…We fit in quite well, because everyone’s sort of different. (Annette, Australian-born Chinese, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[I]n Ultimo and Glebe…you’re kind of invisible, you know? You can dress like a galah [Australian bird] and walk around…no one would bat an eye. You just look like part of the city. (Jonah, New Zealand-born Samoan, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, we’re not sticking out, put it that way. Everybody is ethnic here [in Rockdale]. (Thomas, German, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Erskineville is] comfortable and you feel relaxed because you know…no one’s judging you and no one’s worrying about who you are or what you look like, or what you’re doing, so long as you’re not interfering with them. (Peter, Anglo-Australian, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Darwin is] tolerant because no one is looking at you that you’re different because everyone is different. (Oli, Czech, Darwin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin in general is just very forgiving. You can be a bit different and nobody cares, and I mean we are different...we are not the typical Aussie couple… (Ari, Indonesian, Darwin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity and vibrancy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[W]e like the diversity of people... [Newtown] was just a bit more exciting than Neutral Bay...people were a bit more vibrant, from our perspective. (Annette, Australian-born Chinese, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[D]iversity…adds something to…the culture of the area…you walk up and down King Street [Newtown] and nothing’ll shock you as you walk, because there’s…everything you can imagine… (Peter, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We love bringing people out here [Bossley Park]…eating Iraqi food together…eating…traditional Northern Vietnamese cuisine together…we love it. (Daniel, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The different cultures that you’d get in such a small place [Sydney’s inner-west] we really loved…we would find the best place to buy Turkish bread or hummus or dumplings… we did like that kind of diversity. (Joanna, Australian, Darwin, speaking about her former suburb in Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diverse contexts for raising children</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[T]he thought of going…anywhere else, where it’s like a small country town where it might not have as much diversity…makes me feel concerned for my children and what reception they might have. (Zoe, European Australian, Illawarra)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[I]t’s a good place to bring up kids…in that sort of environment where they see there are a lot of different ethnicities. (Scott, New Zealand-born Samoan, Darwin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Chinese people are really just engaging with other Chinese, and he [Karin’s husband] doesn’t want to do that…he wants Amy [daughter] to have whatever friends, but not to be just engaging with other Chinese people. (Karin, Swiss-born Australian, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d like to have that kind of mixed feel, so that even our children can…get to know kids from all these different sorts of background…not feel like…a minority because they’re not a part of this big dominant culture… (Tiffany, Australian with Sri Lankan parents, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity to co-ethnic communities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe. I don’t feel different. It’s nice…I really like the sense of— you’re approaching a shopkeeper and they cannot judge you, because there are just too many Asians here [Kensington]. (Sendy, Indonesian, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a lot [more] comfortable if there’s other Asian[s] or there’s even friends that come from the same country… (Lea, Indonesian, Darwin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[W]e just want our kid…to know that they belong to somewhere…they see other kid[s]…and they can just catch up together and…they are from the same area, they are Nigerian…(Ben D., Nigerian, Darwin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He [Catherine’s husband] kind of prided himself that he was the only one [Rotuman] here [in Figtree]…he prefers that than being in a place where there are other people from his ethnicity. (Catherine, Anglo New Zealander, Illawarra)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t want to feel trapped there or thinking that if I get stuck a Rotuman person can just come and help me. I like to be away a little bit [from other Rotumans] so I can just…progress my own self. (Romano, Rotuman, Illawarra)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[I]f I lived in a place where there’s lots of Africans…the place would most likely be a cheaper area to live…so you’re most likely to live with white people from lower socioeconomic [backgrounds]…with lots of anger towards anyone who seems like they’re…competing for resources, jobs and housing… (Paul, African, Sydney)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighbourhood ethnic diversity was most often valued by our participants because it helped them feel normal or invisible, and fostered a sense of belonging because they ‘fit in’ (e.g. Annette, Table 7.6). Belonging often stemmed from a shared sense of being ‘different’, whether due to their neighbourhood’s ethnic diversity overall, or because there were other mixed-ethnicity couples around. For some, diverse neighbourhoods allowed couples’ mixedness to go unnoticed. Jonah (New Zealand-born Samoan) recalled feeling ‘invisible’ when he and Elena (England-born Romanian/Polish) lived in inner city Sydney. Jiyeon (Korean) and Thomas (German) live in Rockdale, the most ethnically diverse suburb of any participants, and discussed ‘not sticking out’ there.

Some participants associated neighbourhood ethnic diversity with progressive social attitudes, which underpinned their sense of comfort. Peter (Anglo-Australian), Oli (Czech) and Ari (Indonesian) all expressed affinity for diverse places because they believed other residents would be tolerant (Table 7.6). Dinesh (Sri Lankan) and Juliet (Australian) had negative encounters in other Australian cities, but experienced a marked shift upon moving to Darwin.

Dinesh: Darwin…is one of the best places to live. I feel we are not the lowest denomination up here…you see a lot of ethnic couples up here, and we are not treated as a separate entity…Most southern states, they treat us as two separate entities…that’s my personal experience…here [in Darwin], you walk into a shop, they greet us as a couple, not as separate.

In Dinesh’s view, these positive experiences stem from Darwin’s multiculturalism, including the prevalence of other mixed-ethnicity couples. These findings echo Wright et al.’s (2011: 2)
suggestion that black–white couples in United States cities congregate ‘in places where there is already a willingness to traverse racial boundaries’, or ‘locations where diversity is welcomed’. Yet, while our participants appreciated living in diverse and accepting places, this was rarely a driving factor in neighbourhood choice.

7.8.2 ‘A mixture of all sorts of diverse people’: Multifaceted diversity and vibrancy

Many interviewees explained that neighbourhood diversity is about more than ethnicity. Multifaceted diversity provided comfort, belonging and a sense of vibrancy and excitement. For Takumi (Japanese) and Peter (Anglo-Australian)—a male same-sex couple living in inner city Sydney—diversity did impact neighbourhood choice, alongside the desire for an affordable larger dwelling.

Peter: [P]rimarily we were looking for a larger apartment, within you know a reasonable price…we’d spent a lot of time around Newtown and Erskineville…[it’s] quite a big gay area, it’s a pretty eclectic sort of…a lot of lesbians…it’s pretty relaxed and sort of suits our lifestyle, so…we were quite comfortable living here…

Peter and Takumi associated Erskineville’s multifaceted diversity with progressive and accepting attitudes among residents, who ‘just accept you for who you are’ (Takumi). Annette (Australia-born Chinese) also described the diversity of Newtown (adjacent to Erskineville) in terms of ethnicity and sexual orientation. She felt that she and Shaun (Australian) ‘fit in quite well’ because ‘there’s all types of different couples…gay, lesbian, inter-ethnic. Just normal, everyday couples.’ Like Takumi and Peter, Annette was one of the few participants for whom diversity was front-and-centre of the residential decision-making process. Annette, and Takumi and Peter, also appreciated multifaceted neighbourhood diversity for adding to their suburbs’
cultural amenity, to the ‘mix of things happening in the neighbourhood’ (Annette). Erskineville’s ‘mixture of all sorts of diverse people’ made it ‘a very entertaining and enjoyable place to live’ for Peter. Several other participants also enjoyed the vibrancy and excitement of diverse places. A recurring sub-theme was the presence of diverse food outlets (e.g. Daniel and Joanna’s comments in Table 7.6). In such cases, participants did not connect enjoyment of neighbourhood diversity to their own ethnic identities, but rather to the general cultural amenity of diverse places.

7.8.3 Diverse contexts for raising children

The importance of neighbourhood diversity varies across life stages. Mixed-race couples in the United States (Dalmage, 2000) and United Kingdom (Twine, 1999) have been found to prefer raising children in diverse contexts, which are perceived to protect against discrimination. For several of our interviewees, having children influenced neighbourhood choice. Yet in most cases, this related to the location of quality schools or the need for a larger dwelling to suit their children’s needs. Neighbourhood ethnic diversity was rarely central. Nonetheless, the value of diverse locales for mixed-ethnicity children surfaced when participants were asked what they liked about their neighbourhoods. Some—like Ben D. (Nigerian) and Tanya (Australian)—expressed concern for their children’s treatment and identity development in less diverse settings (Table 7.6; see also Zoe’s comment). When asked if they would consider moving back to Tanya’s childhood neighbourhood in the Sutherland Shire—a predominantly Anglo-Australian part of Sydney—they reflected:

Tanya: If it was just us…I wouldn’t care. But since I’ve had Bisi…there are places I wouldn’t live again…

Ben D.: Yeah, that’s one concern…
Tanya: I want her to be around different people—not just because of racism against her, but so she learns about different cultures…her childcare [in Darwin] would only be 50 per cent white…there’s Aboriginal, Asian, African kids…that’s a good environment to grow up in, for anyone—even if they are purely of one nationality.

Ben D.: Just in…educating the kids too…to know about the other culture.

For this couple, having a child made neighbourhood ethnic composition more important. Similarly, despite not yet having children, Tiffany (Australian with Sri Lankan parents) aspired to live in a suburb with a ‘mixed feel’ where her ‘future’ children would be able to interact with people of diverse ethnicities and not feel like a minority. She and Matthew (Australian) clearly stated that ethnic diversity would inform future residential decision-making.

7.8.4 Proximity to co-ethnic communities

Quantitative studies show that mixed-ethnicity couples are less likely than co-ethnic couples to live in areas with high concentrations of a single ethnic community (Ellis et al., 2006; Feng et al., 2014), perhaps because they hold weaker ties to single ethnic groups, and wish to avoid constraints on their own identities (Holloway et al., 2005). Our interviewees expressed mixed views. For some, the presence of individuals who share the ethnic minority partner’s ancestry was desirable. Sendy (Indonesian) enjoys living in Kensington (inner city Sydney) which has a large Asian population. She feels comfortable because she is not judged or treated differently (Table 7.6). In Darwin, Lea described the benefits of living near fellow Indonesians because they can share experiences of settling and raising children in Australia.

Having co-ethnic minority residents in close proximity was important for some couples because of concerns for their children. Ben D. (Nigerian) and Tanya (Australian) discussed the
importance of having a Nigerian Association in Darwin to support their daughter’s sense of belonging (Table 7.6). Similarly, Irene (Filipina) explained that a key benefit of living in Darwin is that her children have Filipino peers at school. Ethnic diversity was also a factor when Irene and her husband Nick (Australian) decided to move to Darwin from the United Arab Emirates (where they met). Nick considered Darwin ‘a good option’ because ‘it’s an easy place for Irene [and her children] to fit into…to bring the kids in and to have them settle here [in Darwin] was easier than going somewhere else.’

Some participants’ preferences regarding neighbourhood ethnic composition went unrealized, as they prioritized other locational attributes and balanced their families’ multiple ethnic identities. Jiyeon (Korean) and Thomas (German) chose to live in Rockdale—a highly diverse middle-ring suburb in Sydney’s south—because of its proximity to Thomas’s workplace, but Jiyeon would prefer a neighbourhood with more Koreans:

Jiyeon: He [Thomas] likes it here [Rockdale]. But…I want to go somewhere with more Koreans. For me there are more opportunities for jobs or meeting other friends…
Author A: Have you found it hard living in Rockdale when there is not as many…
Jiyeon: I find it myself—many hard time. Because Koreans are not very common here so sometimes culture is not very common and harder to find a friend for me and there is no Korean food.

Other interviewees preferred to avoid areas with large co-ethnic minority communities (e.g. Catherine, Karin, Romano and Paul in Table 7.6). For Catherine’s husband James and for Romano (both Rotuman), living in an area without other Rotumans enabled independence. Karin (Switzerland-born Australian) and Jin (Chinese) avoided living amongst high
concentrations of Chinese people because they do not want their daughters to socialize exclusively with that group. Moreover, Paul (African) would be uncomfortable living in an area with numerous Africans. He felt that white residents of such areas may be hostile, based on perceptions that ethnic minorities constitute a threat by competing for jobs and resources. All of these participants deliberately avoided residing in areas inhabited by the ethnic minority partners’ co-ethnic community.

We have outlined some of the many ways in which neighbourhood diversity matters to mixed-ethnicity couples. Although rarely pivotal in their decision-making, participants valued diversity for several reasons. Oftentimes, they had chosen their neighbourhood for reasons unrelated to ethnic composition, but appreciated the area’s diversity after spending time living there. Dinesh (Sri Lankan) and Juliet (Australian) spoke at length about Darwin’s ethnic diversity, and their traumatic and racist encounters in other Australian cities. Yet, when asked what actually brought them to Darwin, it was the city’s climate.

Dinesh: The main reason…we wanted to live somewhere tropical…it was too cold for us…in Canberra…you can't have an outdoors lifestyle. I like outdoor sports and stuff…when we were here we realized it’s a different cluster of society…

Juliet: More accepting.

Dinesh: More accepting…So [we] decided, oh, this is good. It's a bonus up here!

In such cases, ethnic diversity was not a conscious factor in residential decision-making. Once experienced as a positive place attribute, diversity can encourage mixed-ethnicity couples to stay put. As Dinesh reflected, ‘We wouldn’t live anywhere else [than Darwin].’
7.9 Discussion and conclusions

Quantitative analyses of census data have exposed mixed-ethnicity couples’ distinctive residential geographies—they appear less inclined to live in ethnically homogeneous areas, instead concentrating in diverse neighbourhoods (Holloway et al., 2005; Tindale and Klocker, 2017; Wright et al., 2011). Such analyses signal the potential for ethnic mixing to reconfigure urban ethnic landscapes, by countering segregation. Notwithstanding its obvious value in highlighting aggregate spatial patterns, census data is limited in what it can reveal about mixed-ethnicity couples’ motivations. Over a decade ago, Ellis et al. (2006) called for qualitative investigations into how mixed couples make residential decisions. This paper has responded to that call through an analysis of 48 interviews with 86 adult members of mixed-ethnicity families in Sydney and Darwin—two Australian cities with contrasting urban forms, and very different histories of migration and contemporary ethnic geographies.

We have shown that mixed-ethnicity couples negotiate many of the same concerns as the broader population when choosing where to live. Classic residential mobility factors are pertinent: job accessibility, housing affordability and the desire to live close to services and amenities. Social factors are also key, including proximity to extended family and other local support networks. Neighbourhood ethnic composition was rarely central to participants’ residential decisions, yet surfaced regularly when discussing what they enjoyed about their neighbourhoods. Diversity was a valued place attribute for multiple reasons. First, ethnically diverse places provided contexts where couples could feel ‘normal’ or ‘invisible’, affording a sense of comfort that may not exist in more homogeneous areas. This affirms the small number of previous qualitative studies that touch on mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential decisions (Dalmage, 2000; Twine, 1999). However, our participants did not always conceptualize diversity in ethnic/racial terms. Several felt a sense of comfort and anonymity living in places
where ‘everyone is different’. This supports Wright et al.’s (2011: 19) contention that ‘highly diverse spaces need not only adhere to diversity along the lines of race’.

Many of our participants lived with dependent children, which shaped their neighbourhood choices. Conventional concerns—like school location—were usually front of mind, rather than factors relating to ethnicity. However, some couples perceived ethnically diverse areas as preferable for mixed-ethnicity children, either due to fears about their children’s treatment and identity development in homogeneous settings, or the perceived benefits of exposure to other cultures. Some parents decided to raise their children in places with a community of people from the ethnic minority partner’s background, to support their sense of belonging. Yet, across our sample, there were mixed views on whether it was desirable to live close to such communities. Some ethnic minority partners preferred to live at a distance from their co-ethnic community, to maintain independence.

The dominance of conventional factors in our participants’ accounts begs the question: why are mixed-ethnicity couples’ geographies distinctive if ethnicity rarely drives their residential decision-making? Our data suggest a few possible explanations. Several participants appeared to adopt a ‘colourblind’ approach to their relationships. Ethnicity in general, and ethnic differences between the two partners specifically, were framed as having minimal bearing on their everyday lives, and how they viewed themselves. This may have affected their propensity to identify neighbourhood diversity as a factor informing their decisions. There may also be a temporal factor at play. Participants moved to their neighbourhood for conventional reasons (e.g. job accessibility) but then developed an appreciation of diversity over time.

---

52 We do not mean to imply that ethnicity has no impact on mixed-ethnicity couples’ lived experiences. In another paper, we demonstrate that visible ethnic differences are salient, but largely become so through external influences (e.g. stares, questions and judgement in public spaces) rather than couples’ own perceptions or actions (Klocker and Tindale, under review).
Following this logic, diversity may encourage mixed-ethnicity couples to remain in a particular neighbourhood, rather than drawing them there in the first place. Alternatively, it may be the very lack of priority given to ethnicity that produces mixed-ethnicity couples’ unique geographies. The predominance of conventional location factors indicates that mixed-ethnicity couples are not tethered to existing urban ethnic landscapes. These findings require verification in other national contexts, especially as Australian cities have been shown to be less segregated than international comparators (Johnston et al., 2007). Neighbourhood ethnic diversity may indeed underpin residential decision-making for mixed-ethnicity couples in highly segregated cities.

We commenced this paper with various conceptual frameworks that could be used to unpack mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential geographies. Overall, our findings show that conventional theories of residential mobility are salient for mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia. Ethnic segregation theories, for their part, pay close attention to how ethnic/racial identities shape residential outcomes, but are framed around individuals. The position of the mixed-ethnicity household within such frameworks is unclear, and so our findings speak back to well-established segregation models.

The place stratification model (Logan and Alba, 1993) appears pertinent as some mixed-ethnicity couples felt geographically constrained by concerns about their families’ treatment in less diverse locales. While the traditional model focuses on constraints faced by ethnic minority individuals, our findings show that a desire to avoid particular neighbourhoods extends to ethnic majority partners in mixed-ethnicity couples. Additionally, the residential decisions of some interviewees followed the ethnic enclave model (Portes and Jensen, 1987). This was particularly evident among Darwin-based participants—especially female migrants from Asia,
a number of whom wanted to live near co-ethnic communities to access support and promote belonging while adjusting to life in Australia. However, none of those couples lived in what would be considered an ethnic enclave. Again, a household focus demonstrates that desires for co-ethnic minority presence also impact the residential outcomes of ethnic majority individuals in mixed-ethnicity relationships. Amongst other interviewees, the spatial assimilation model (Massey, 1985) seemed applicable, as couples’ residential priorities reflected conventional concerns shared by the broader population. The lack of priority given to neighbourhood ethnic diversity arguably affirms the spatial assimilation viewpoint.

Together, our findings underscore the complexity of mixed-ethnicity couples’ decisions about where to live. Mixedness had more subtle impacts on decision-making than might be expected, given the distinctive residential patterns documented in quantitative studies. Our findings signal the ordinariness of mixed-ethnicity couples’ everyday lives. Like other couples, they are concerned with household budgets, job opportunities, the length of the daily commute, child-rearing and extended family networks. Like others, they desire greenspaces for their children to play in, good schools for them to attend, and dwellings that meet their needs. While ethnic differences may be front-and-centre of other people’s minds when they see visibly different mixed-ethnicity couples, the same cannot be said for the couples themselves. In this respect, this paper joins other recent studies (e.g. Caballero et al., 2012) that seek to disrupt pathologising narratives that suggest mixed-ethnicity families and individuals’ lives are framed by cultural gaps and clashes—narratives that can make mixed-ethnicity couples feel abnormal and surveilled in public places.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

This thesis began by outlining how geography matters to the study of mixed-ethnicity couples. Throughout history, ethnically mixed couples have faced opposition in a variety of forms, from legislative restrictions imposed by governments (Brook, 1997; Ellinghaus, 2003, Owen, 2002) to discriminatory ‘border-patrolling’ attitudes and behaviours by members of the public who disapprove of partnerships that cross ethnic boundaries (Dalmage, 2000; Osuji, 2013). Such opposition has been geographically uneven (Caballero et al., 2012; Forrest and Dunn, 2006; Song, 2009), and so mixed-ethnicity couples’ everyday lives (and indeed, their rights) have varied considerably across space.

Although legislative barriers to mixed-ethnicity marriages have been removed in countries such as the US, UK and Australia, hostile attitudes persist among some segments of the population (Blair et al., 2017; Caballero et al., 2012; Moore, 2015; Osuji, 2013; Wang, 2012). Mixed-ethnicity couples’ decisions about where to live may therefore be shaped by concerns about how their relationships will be received in different neighbourhoods. The residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples, in turn, offer unique insights into patterns of ethnic residential segregation in urban areas by shifting focus from the individual to the household (Holloway et al., 2005; Wright and Ellis, 2006). They also hold potential to alter established ethnic landscapes in cities and regions, through the residential choices they make. Yet to date, there has been minimal investigation of where mixed-ethnicity couples live across Australia.

This thesis sought to answer the question, ‘How does a focus on Australian mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals advance established understandings of ethnic residential geographies?’ My approach to this question was framed by four primary aims, which were addressed by pairing quantitative and qualitative methods (census data analysis and in-depth semi-structured
interviews). This concluding chapter outlines how the thesis has addressed each aim. It then turns to the theoretical and practical implications of the project findings, before briefly discussing the limitations of the research and suggesting avenues for future scholarly inquiry.

8.1 Revisiting research aims

The first aim of the thesis was to conduct the first-ever mapping of the residential geographies of cohabiting mixed-ethnicity couples across Australian cities and regions. To achieve this aim, a customised 2011 census data request was designed, purchased and then analysed using Excel, and mapped using a Geographic Information System. Chapter 3 detailed the results of this analysis, which focused on couples in which one partner was classified as ‘Anglo-European’, and the other was from one of six broadly-defined visible ethnic minority groups. Co-ethnic couples—those in which both partners are from the same ethnic group—were adopted as points of comparison, to account for the impact of partnership in general (rather than mixed-ethnicity partnership in particular) on ethnic geographies. The analysis demonstrated that, on the whole, the settlement patterns of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia are distinct from those of co-ethnic couples. Broadly speaking, mixed-ethnicity couples tend to have above-average levels of concentration in capital city metropolitan areas, but are simultaneously much more likely to live in rural and regional areas of Australia than their comparative co-ethnic minority couples. Within capital cities, mixed-ethnicity couples are quite geographically dispersed. In contrast to their respective co-ethnic minority couples, their spatial patterning exhibits a shift away from traditional ethnic minority hubs. Inner city areas tend to attract particularly high residential concentrations. Yet despite sharing similar propensities for geographic dispersal, there are multiple geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia, depending on the specific combinations of ethnicities involved. At a national scale, Greater Darwin and Greater Sydney have the highest concentrations of mixed-ethnicity couples when taken in aggregate. However
certain types of mixed-ethnicity couples are concentrated more heavily in other cities, such as mixed Pacific Islander couples in Greater Brisbane, and mixed Sub-Saharan African couples in Greater Melbourne and Greater Perth. Together, the findings of Chapter 3 underscored the potential for mixed-ethnicity couples to re-shape Australia’s urban and regional ethnic landscapes, through their distinctive residential patterns.

The second aim—addressed in Chapter 4—was also centred around the quantitative mapping of mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential geographies, however it sought to explore how these vary according to finer-grained ethnic groups and additional socio-demographic characteristics. In responding to this aim, a second set of customised 2011 census data was purchased from the ABS. This dataset consisted of counts of five select types of mixed-ethnicity couples (and their corresponding co-ethnic couple types) across SA3s in Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne. These couples included an Anglo-European partner, and a partner from one of five finer-grained ethnic minority groups that equate to national, rather than regional, origins (Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, Indian and Lebanese). This approach built on that adopted for Chapter 3 by providing insights into heterogeneous ethnic groups often hidden within broader pan-ethnic ‘Asian’ or ‘white’ categories in existing studies. To add even more nuance, each couple type was further disaggregated according to two key demographic variables identified as being significant in the international literature on the geography of mixed-ethnicity couples: parenting status (whether there are dependent children living in the household) and gender configuration (the respective ethnicities of the male and female partners) (Caballero et al., 2008; Wright et al., 2013). The analyses, conducted in Excel and QGIS, revealed the diverse residential geographies of the five types of mixed-ethnicity couples mentioned above. In comparison with their corresponding co-ethnic minority couples, all five exhibit marked shifts away from patterns of ethnic segregation, but to varying degrees. Mixed
Lebanese and mixed Vietnamese couples in particular tend to be more residentially concentrated in similar geographical areas as their broader ethnic minority communities. Mixed Chinese and mixed Indian couples concentrate in inner city areas, while their co-ethnic minority counterparts display more suburbanised geographies. Mixed Filipino couples, for their part, are more likely than the other mixed-ethnicity couple types considered in Chapter 4, to live in parts of the city with the highest shares of Anglo-Europeans. The analysis presented in Chapter 4 also found that gender and parenting status have minimal impacts on the geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples in Sydney and Melbourne. This demonstrated that accounting for those additional demographic variables does not erase differences in the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity and co-ethnic couples.

The third aim was to conduct the first mapping of mixed-ethnicity individuals in Australia. This component of the project built upon the first two aims by shifting focus to individuals who are ostensibly the children or descendants of mixed-ethnicity couples. The geographies of these individuals shed further light on the capacity for mixed-ethnicity partnerships to alter ethnic residential geographies over time. This aim was addressed in Chapter 5, which drew upon user-generated customised census data tables depicting counts of individuals by ancestry across SA2s within Greater Sydney. The analysis focused on four ‘types’ of mixed-ethnicity individuals: those who stated two ancestries, including one in the ‘Anglo-European’ category, and another in one of four ethnic minority categories (North African and Middle Eastern; Southern and Central Asian; South-East Asian; North-East Asian). Cognisant of the importance of accounting for multiple axes of identity in contexts characterised by ‘super-diversity’ (Vertovec, 2007), these mixed-ethnicity populations were each sub-categorised according to country of birth (Australia or overseas) and educational attainment. The analysis found that mixed-ethnicity individuals congregate in different parts of the metropolitan area to non-mixed
individuals. They exhibit similarly diffuse patterns to mixed-ethnicity couples, and these patterns are particularly pronounced for mixed-ethnicity individuals with bachelor’s degrees and those born in Australia. In another parallel with the couple-focused analyses in Chapters 3 and 4, mixed-ethnicity individuals were found to have high concentrations in the inner city. These findings illustrated the potential for mixed-ethnicity individuals to counter established patterns of segregation, and highlighted the importance of nuanced research approaches attuned to the diversity of mixed-ethnicity populations.

Given the limitations of census data in shedding light on the actual factors driving households’ settlement patterns, the final aim of the thesis was to explore the residential decision-making processes of mixed-ethnicity couples, through a qualitative approach. Chapter 7 addressed this aim, drawing upon 48 interviews with 86 partners in mixed-ethnicity relationships, living in Sydney\textsuperscript{53} and Darwin. These mixed-ethnicity couples’ accounts of how they chose their residential neighbourhoods were dominated by ‘conventional’ concerns, commonly shared by the general population: job accessibility, housing affordability and proximity to retail and service facilities, among others. Although existing quantitative literature posits that mixed-ethnicity couples are attracted to ethnically diverse neighbourhoods (Holloway et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2011; Wright et al., 2011), the participants in this study seldom identified diversity as a key priority shaping their residential decisions. Yet diversity did come to the fore when interviewees were asked what they enjoy about living in their current neighbourhood, and which neighbourhood has been their favourite place to live across their housing history as a couple. Diversity was indeed a valued place attribute for multiple reasons, but appears to have subtler-than-expected impacts on how Australian mixed-ethnicity couples think about where

---

\textsuperscript{53} The Sydney total incorporated four interviews with seven partners in mixed-ethnicity families living in the Illawarra region, south of Sydney.
to live. It appears that the very lack of significance given to neighbourhood ethnic diversity—by the mixed-ethnicity couples involved in this study—may explain the dispersed geographies observed in the quantitative sections of this thesis. The interviewees made plain that they did not feel tethered to particular ethnic landscapes. Mixed-ethnicity couples’ apparent lack of concern with neighbourhood ethnic diversity may reflect the uniqueness of the Australian context. In other countries, where rates of ethnic/racial segregation have been shown to be considerably higher (Johnston et al., 2007), mixed-ethnicity couples may report different priorities to those uncovered in this study. Thus there is need for further systematic qualitative enquiry into residential decision-making processes in diverse contexts.

8.2 Limitations and future research directions

Although this thesis has made important contributions to understandings of where mixed-ethnicity couples live, in contemporary Australia, it has faced some limitations that are worth explaining, and that provide important points of reference for future research projects. First, there are inherent limitations in the utility of cross-sectional census data, which provide only a snapshot-in-time of where mixed-ethnicity couples lived on the date of the census. These data cannot shed light on the residential mobility of mixed-ethnicity couples. They also cannot ascertain whether mixed-ethnicity couples live in certain locations because they are their desired neighbourhoods, or because they are financially restricted to those neighbourhoods. While the pairing of qualitative and quantitative methods in this thesis helped to address this challenge, deeper statistical insights can be gained through longitudinal analyses that track the changing residential locations of mixed-ethnicity couples over time. Such approaches would need to draw on time-series data attached to individuals in households, rather than aggregated counts of couples in neighbourhoods. If attempting such analyses, future Australian studies could follow the lead of Feng et al. (2014) in the UK, and Gabriel (2016, 2018) in the US, who
drew on longitudinal sample files to analyse the migration propensities and neighbourhood attainment of ethnically and racially mixed couples. Unfortunately, comparable Australian data has been scarcely available, until recent years. The ABS now provides access to the Australian Census Longitudinal Dataset (ACLD), which may enable researchers to explore how mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential locations change between censuses, and additionally account for several other socio-demographic attributes of each partner in modelling their residential mobility. The ACLD was not utilised in this thesis, primarily because it was not made available until midway through my candidature, and thus did not fit within the manageable scope of the project.

Moreover, a specific limitation of the census ancestry variable adopted in this study, is that it is largely ineffective in enumerating Indigenous Australians. This is mainly due to the issue of ‘Australian’ ancestry, which may be interpreted in different ways by individuals filling out census forms. The Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups (ABS, 2011a) includes the fine-grained categories ‘Australian Aboriginal’ and ‘Torres Strait Islander’, but given that Indigenous Australians have deeper ancestral roots in Australia than any other ethnic group, many nominate ‘Australian’ as their ancestry on the census (Khoo and Lucas, 2004). This assigns Indigenous Australians’ ancestry responses to the same category as those who identify as ‘Australian’, but have British or European descent going back several generations.\(^\text{54}\)

\(^{54}\) The ‘Anglo-European’ category used throughout the quantitative analyses may have included a relatively small number of Indigenous Australians. This would have had a very small overall impact on the reliability of the ‘Anglo-European’ category used in this study. At the 2011 census, just 2.7 per cent of partnered persons who stated ‘Australian’ ancestry also stated that they were Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander in response to the separate question on Indigenous Status (ABS, 2011d).
Due to these data limitations, I was unable to include couples with an Anglo-European partner and an Indigenous Australian partner in the study. I was also unable to reliably include an ‘Indigenous Australian’ category in calculating the entropy index to measure the degree of ethnic diversity in each geographic area. This was a reluctant decision, given that Indigenous Australians contribute fundamentally to the ethnic diversity of local areas across Australia—and given the history of discrimination against couples involving an Indigenous and non-Indigenous partner (Ellinghaus, 2003; Probyn, 2003). Of course, the more appropriate census variable to use in analysing the Indigenous population of Australia is the Indigenous Status variable, which directly indicates whether a person has identified themselves as Australian Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander. This variable has been used to explore geographic variations in rates of partnership between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians (i.e. the percentage of partnered Indigenous persons in an area whose partner was non-Indigenous; see Biddle, 2013; Walker and Heard, 2015), but there is scope for future studies to map the distributions of ethnically mixed couples involving an Indigenous partner and a non-Indigenous partner. The limitation remains that such studies will not be able to ascertain the ethnicity of the non-Indigenous partner.

Lastly, there were some shortcomings during the interview-based component of this study. The interview sample included a highly diverse range of partners in mixed-ethnicity families, yet same-sex couples were drastically under-represented despite designing recruitment material that invited both same-sex and heterosexual couples to participate. Furthermore, as shown in Figure 6.3, the Sydney-based participants were skewed towards those living in the inner city, inner south-west and southern suburbs. This distribution does reflect the geographies of Sydney’s mixed-ethnicity couples to a certain extent (as discussed in Chapters 3 and 4), however, it also reflects the challenges of obtaining a geographically dispersed sample across
such a large metropolitan area. The lack of participants living in Sydney’s western suburbs was a particular drawback, as western Sydney contains a plethora of ethnic minority communities, and is often a focal point in debates over ethnic relations and social cohesion in Australian cities. Future ethnographic approaches could adopt a more geographically targeted recruitment approach. The missing pieces of the geographic puzzle are not limited to Sydney. In this study, the residential experiences of mixed-ethnicity couples have been explored through qualitative research in two cities: Sydney and Darwin. Yet there remain questions about whether these experiences are typical of those living in rural and regional Australia, which have vastly different histories of migration and settlement of ethnic minorities. Future qualitative investigations are also required in contexts outside Australia—particularly the US and UK, which have higher levels of ethnic and racial residential segregation (Johnston et al., 2007).

8.3 Where mixed-ethnicity couples live: conceptual and practical implications

I now return to the overarching research question driving this thesis. How does a focus on Australian mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals advance established understandings of ethnic residential geographies? First, the household-level approach adopted in this study to map mixed-ethnicity couples (Chapters 3 and 4) has presented new insights into Australia’s ethnic residential geographies that cannot be garnered via counts of individuals, which have predominated in existing Australian scholarship. While a focus on individuals is also vital to inform understandings of ethnic segregation, studies of that nature can only reveal part of the picture. Problematically, some such studies have provided grist for the mill of media narratives that depict ethnically divided cities, evoking fear and anxieties within the broader population (Birrell, 2010; Devlin and Johnson, 2017; Healy and Birrell, 2003). Rather than focusing on
differences between individuals of diverse ethnic backgrounds, this thesis has drawn attention to households within which they share their daily lives. As Wright and Ellis (2006: 286) argued:

> A household approach shifts the perspective from an exclusive focus on individuals, which makes distinctions between ‘us’ and ‘them’, to one that searches for ways in which the lives of ‘us’ and ‘them’ intimately intertwine at home.

This scale of focus makes sense, methodologically, because the household is a vital decision-making unit impacting residential outcomes (Buzar et al., 2005; Ellis and Wright, 2005). Ellis and Wright (2005: 15330) emphasised the importance of living arrangements in understanding residential geographies; with whom a person lives relates to where they live. The analyses of census data in Chapters 3 and 4 have demonstrated how living arrangements condition the settlement patterns of both ethnic majority and ethnic minority individuals in Australia. The geographic distributions of ethnically mixed couples are markedly different to those of couples where both partners share the same ethnic background. Ethnic minority individuals who live with an Anglo-European partner are far more likely to live outside zones of the city with high concentrations of their own ethnic minority group. They are also far more likely to live outside of cities all together, than other members of their ethnic minority group. In the opposite direction, Anglo-Europeans in mixed-ethnicity partnerships have an elevated propensity to reside in locations with larger ethnic minority populations. That is, they are less likely to live in predominantly white neighbourhoods. Together, being in a mixed-ethnicity partnership is associated with residence in moderately diverse locales. All of these patterns pull against ethnic segregation, and towards greater spatial mixing between diverse groups. While much of the previous Australian literature has highlighted the impacts of income, educational attainment and immigrant generation on ethnic minorities’ residential geographies (Edgar, 2014; Johnston
et al., 2016, 2017), the findings presented in this thesis show that understandings of Australia’s ethnic landscapes remain incomplete when householders’ living arrangements are sidelined—particularly when the potential for intra-household ethnic diversity is overlooked.

The geographical analysis of mixed-ethnicity individuals in Greater Sydney (Chapter 5) has provided another important insight into Australia’s evolving ethnic landscapes. No previous Australian research has mapped the residential geographies of individuals who have mixed ethnic backgrounds. Instead, individuals have commonly been assigned to homogeneous, singular ethnic groups. This constitutes an oversimplification of many Australians’ ethnic identities, particularly those who are the children of mixed-ethnicity couples. In one of the first attempts to utilise the Australian census’ ancestry variable to define mixed-ethnicity individuals, the analysis in Chapter 5 demonstrated the value of a nuanced approach to ethnic group classifications in exploring residential geographies. The unique spatial patterns of mixed-ethnicity individuals illustrate their potential to re-shape patterns of ethnic diversity and segregation, especially in light of sustained growth in the proportion of the population stating multiple ancestries (ABS, 2012).

By foregrounding the household as a unit of analysis (and indeed, of social change), the findings of this thesis also feed back into existing theories of ethnic residential segregation, from which mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals are largely absent. The quantitative mapping components of the research (Chapters 3, 4 and 5) overwhelmingly highlighted the geographically diffuse residential patterns of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals. Ethnic minority persons with ethnic majority (Anglo-European) partners are more likely to live outside traditional suburban concentrations of their specific ethnic minority groups. In one sense, these findings align with the spatial assimilation model, which posits that ethnic
minorities attain the financial means to move away from initial residential clusters via the assimilative processes of acculturation and economic integration (Alba and Logan, 1991; Massey and Denton, 1985). In turn, this leads to residence in (purportedly) higher-amenity neighbourhoods and greater residential propinquity with the ethnic majority population. Following a broad assimilation framework, an ethnic minority person who has formed a partnership with a member of the ethnic majority would be considered ‘fully assimilated’, and thus would be expected to have moved out of neighbourhoods with ethnic minority concentrations. This is certainly evident in the data presented in Chapters 3 and 4—but only partially so. Mixed-ethnicity couples’ geographies do not match those of the broader ethnic majority population. That is, they do not live exclusively in areas dominated by Anglo-European residents. Other factors are at play that are not accounted for by the spatial assimilation logic.

The findings detailed in Chapter 7, which explored mixed-ethnicity couples’ actual residential decision-making processes (based on interview data), perhaps speak most directly to ethnic segregation theories—although they do so by decentring the significance of ethnicity itself, in residential decision-making processes. The overwhelming dominance of conventional, everyday concerns amongst the study participants—rather than ethnicity-related factors—suggests that Australian mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential geographies are not closely informed by the existing urban ethnic mosaic. This finding lends some support to the spatial assimilation approach (Alba and Logan, 1991; Massey and Denton, 1985), as it provides evidence that mixed-ethnicity couples’ residential priorities align with those of the broader population. However, despite this overarching theme, interview participants’ stories about choosing a place to live were manifold. It became clear that no single explanatory model of segregation was sufficient to capture this complexity. Some couples discussed consciously
avoiding certain locations because of their lack of ethnic diversity, particularly parents who were concerned about how their mixed-ethnicity children would experience life in ethnically homogeneous places. The place stratification model (Logan and Alba, 1993) is of some utility here, given evidence that some mixed-ethnicity couples feel restricted in where they can live due to fears of negative attention in certain areas. With such concerns in mind, a small number of participants sought out places with other residents from the ethnic minority partner’s background. Having a co-ethnic community nearby helped some overseas-born ethnic minority participants to adjust to life in Australia and fostered a sense of belonging. Such accounts echo the ethnic enclave model (Portes and Zhou, 1987; Zhou and Logan, 1991), although only to a limited extent as the actual suburbs where those participants lived would not be classified as ‘enclaves’.

Across the board, the findings of this thesis have shown that ethnic majority individuals are impacted by the processes described in various explanatory models for ethnic segregation. While existing research has emphasised how these perspectives shed light on ethnic minorities’ geographies, they are equally salient for ethnic majority persons—when they have an ethnic minority partner. In ethnically mixed households, concerns normally considered to impact ethnic minority individuals alone, are extended to their ethnic majority partners. A household-level approach demonstrates that ethnic minority ‘incorporation’ into a host society is not a one-way street. Mixed-ethnicity partnerships impact the residential outcomes of both the ethnic minority and ethnic majority partners.

This thesis also has implications for emergent theoretical perspectives on the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples and individuals. It has augmented the important agenda-setting works of scholars in the US (Ellis et al., 2006; Holloway et al., 2005; Wright et
al., 2011) and UK (Caballero et al., 2008; Feng et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2011) by exploring patterns in the Australian context. It has provided an antipodean perspective that is mostly absent from existing literature. Chapters 3 and 4 both found that mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia are less likely than co-ethnic couples to live in areas with disproportionately high concentrations of their respective ethnic groups. Rather, they have diffuse settlement geographies that run counter to patterns of ethnic segregation, affirming the findings of various studies overseas (Ellis et al., 2006, 2007, 2012; Iceland and Nelson, 2010). Instead of reinforcing existing ethnic spatial structures (Holloway et al., 2005), mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia tend to gravitate towards areas characterised by moderate levels of ethnic diversity.

All types of mixed-ethnicity couples have geographies characterised by ‘in-betweenness’ (Holloway et al., 2005; Wright et al., 2011). That is, they tend to live in more diverse places than co-ethnic Anglo-European couples, but less diverse places than co-ethnic minority couples, supporting the thesis developed by US scholars (Holloway et al., 2005; Wright et al., 2011). Importantly, the analyses presented here indicate that these patterns hold true for several, disaggregated, types of mixed-ethnicity couples not previously considered in international studies. This was especially clear in Chapter 4, which defined mixed-ethnicity couples using heterogeneous finer-grained ethnic groups whose experiences are normally hidden within broader aggregations. That analysis added important nuances to established theories, revealing how diverse types of mixed-ethnicity couples have varying degrees of attraction to ethnically diverse areas. This study has clearly shown that there is no single geography of mixed-ethnicity couples, but multiple and distinctive geographies that are contingent upon the ethnicity of the ethnic minority partner.

The research has also contributed internationally novel insights into the types of places in which mixed-ethnicity couples live. Using cartographic approaches, Chapters 3 and 4 revealed
that inner city areas of Australian cities are home to high concentrations of several types of mixed-ethnicity couples. No studies in Australia, or overseas, have previously commented on the location of mixed-ethnicity couples according to urban morphology. These findings suggest that mixed-ethnicity couples may be attracted to certain characteristics of inner city areas outside existing explanatory approaches, such as population density (which may provide a sense of anonymity or invisibility) or the cosmopolitan attitudes of inner city residents that welcome diversity and difference (Gorman-Murray and Brennan-Horley, 2010). Furthermore, inner city areas add nuance to the in-between thesis mentioned above. In Australia’s inner-cities, an in-between pattern does not apply. Instead, mixed-ethnicity couples are more likely to live in inner cities than both co-ethnic minority and co-ethnic majority couples. Chapter 3 further demonstrated that the in-between pattern is disrupted when the socio-economic status of residential areas is taken into consideration. Mixed-ethnicity couples are more frequently resident in high-income areas than ethnically homogeneous couples (including, ethnically homogeneous couples involving two ethnic majority partners).

Finally, the qualitative analysis detailed in Chapter 7 is a key step forward in developing deeper understandings of why mixed-ethnicity couples have unique residential geographies. Its results question whether mixed-ethnicity couples are consciously attracted to ethnically diverse neighbourhoods, and suggest that their residential priorities for the most part align with the broader population. It is important, however, to recognise that these findings are based on the unique Australian context. Ethnic diversity may indeed be a key factor driving the residential decision-making processes of mixed-ethnicity couples in other countries with different histories of immigration and settlement, and higher levels of segregation, such as the US or UK (Johnston et al., 2007). Systematic qualitative investigations are required to deepen
understandings of the factors driving the unique residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity/race households in those contexts.

Together, the results of this thesis highlight both the ordinariness and complexities of life for mixed-ethnicity couples in Australia. Examining their lived realities through the lens of residential decision-making, this thesis joins ongoing scholarly efforts to disrupt the stereotype of mixed-ethnicity families as internally conflicted and inherently problematic (see Caballero et al., 2008, 2012). Chapters 6 and 7 tell, for the most part, a good news story about what it is like to be in a mixed-ethnicity relationship in 21st Century Australia. Interview participants rarely described experiences of overt harassment or discrimination in their everyday lives. Almost all felt that Australia is a comfortable and accepting place for couples with mixed ethnic backgrounds, and for their mixed-ethnicity children. So much so that many rarely thought about their ‘mixedness’. However, caution must be taken to avoid painting all mixed-ethnicity couples with the same brush. Echoing the conclusions of Smith et al. (2011: 1473), the quantitative chapters of this thesis (3, 4 and 5) have problematised ‘simplistic representations of mixed-ethnicity’ that ‘do not distinguish between combinations of ethnicit[ies] in families’.

In addition, Chapters 6 and 7 showed that many mixed-ethnicity couples still face subtle antagonisms and curiosities that affect their daily use of space, and decisions about where to live. Mixedness remains important in shaping the experiences of Australian families and individuals. Yet the findings presented in this thesis do destabilise the common assumption that ethnicity in general, and ethnic differences between partners in particular, are always front-and-centre of mixed-ethnicity couples’ minds.
8.4 Concluding remarks

It is now 51 years since Loving v. Virginia legalised mixed-race marriages across the United States, and 58 years since Mick Daly and Gladys Namagu were allowed to marry after battling state attempts to curtail their relationship. Although legal barriers to partnerships across ethnic boundaries no longer exist in Australia, prejudices of varying degrees may continue to simmer below the surface, impacting the everyday lives of mixed-ethnicity couples in various contexts. The spatial contingency of such attitudes necessitates research into where mixed-ethnicity couples live. In turn, the residential geographies of mixed-ethnicity couples present a new lens through which to explore how Australia’s ethnic geographies are evolving. This thesis has mapped the settlement patterns of visibly different mixed-ethnicity couples across Australia. In so doing it has revealed the previously hidden geographies of a culturally and demographically important subset of the population. Mixed-ethnicity couples have unique residential geographies that deviate from the patterns exhibited by ethnically homogeneous couples. This thesis has combined quantitative methods with a qualitative approach to provide a nuanced and detailed account of where mixed-ethnicity couples live, and insights into their decision-making processes. For the most part, the mixed-ethnicity couples involved in this study feel they are able to choose residential locations without worrying about whether they will face discrimination or discomfort in certain places. This is an exciting outcome that signals the enormity of the social and cultural changes that have occurred in Australia over recent decades. Ethnic mixing within households is likely to continue to rise, and understandings of Australia’s ethnic geographies will remain incomplete without studies that recognise that the lives of ethnically different individuals are intimately woven together in many households.
References


Bunbury S (2017) Ruth Negga: ‘More people should know about this couple, because I fell deeply in love with them’. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 March. Available at:


Chambers G (2017) If Meghan Markle represents the ‘mixed-race community’, what about me? *The Guardian,* 4 December. Available at:


ONS (Office for National Statistics) (2014) *What Does the 2011 Census Tell Us About Inter-ethnic Relationships?* Newport: ONS. Available at:


Verass S (2017) Illegal love: Is this NT couple Australia’s Richard and Mildred Loving? *NITV News*, 7 April. Available at:


## Appendices

### Appendix 1: ASCCEG codes used to define broad ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group name</th>
<th>Ancestry labels</th>
<th>Ancestry Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West European</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian, so described</td>
<td>0905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West European, nfd</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British, nfd</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western European, nfd</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern European, nfd</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanesian and Papuan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polynesian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanesian and Papuan, nfd</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesian, nfd</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polynesian, nfd</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North African and Middle Eastern</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North African and Middle Eastern, nfd</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab, nfd</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples of the Sudan, nfd</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other North African and Middle Eastern, nfd</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Asian (excl. Anglo-Burmese)</td>
<td>5 (excl. 5101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Asian, nfd</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland South-East Asian, nfd</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime South-East Asian, nfd</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Asian, nfd</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Asian, nfd</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other North-East Asian, nfd</td>
<td>6900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern and Central Asian (excl. Anglo-Indian)</td>
<td>7 (excl. 7101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern and Central Asian, nfd</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Asian, nfd</td>
<td>7100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asian, nfd</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan African (excl. Afrikaner, South African, Zimbabwean)</td>
<td>9 (excl. 9201, 9215, 9221)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan African, nfd</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and West African, nfd</td>
<td>9100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ‘nfd’ = not further defined.
Appendix 2: Transcript of news segment on ABC Radio Darwin.

A University of Wollongong researcher is exploring why Darwin has the highest percentage of inter-ethnic marriages in the country.

Alexander Tindale will be interviewing inter-ethnic couples about their experiences.

Mr Tindale says it's the first research of its kind and Darwin's multiculturalism is an important example for the rest of the country.

“Mixed marriages can also have really positive impacts on the wider community because they help to increase interactions between people of different ethnic groups and in doing so this can actually help to break down any barriers or prejudice between different groups in the community.”

DURATION 0:13

A University of Wollongong researcher studying inter-ethnic couples in Darwin says the city's multiculturalism is an example to the rest of the country.

Alexander Tindale says Darwin has the highest percentage of inter-ethnic partnerships in the country.

Mr Tindale says he's interviewing Darwin couples about their experiences in October and it's the first research of its kind.

“One likely reason for the high rate of mixed marriages in Darwin is its high level of ethnic diversity. People of many different ethnic backgrounds tend to live together in the same neighbourhoods in Darwin. It's actually quite unique when you compare it to some of Australia's southern cities.”

DURATION 0:15
YOU could say Darwin is a multi-ethnic love shack.

Or a melting pot of love.

Maybe a modern-day Othello and Desdemona without the racism and war stuff.

Whatever you decide, our dynamic population has claimed us as having the highest number per capita of inter-ethnic couples than any other Australian city, according to research from the University of Wollongong’s Australian Centre for Cultural Environmental Research.

But do we notice? Farrar residents Oli Dubsky and Lydia Gawa say their ethnic backgrounds haven’t shocked the pants of Darwinites.

Oli is from the Czech Republic and Lydia is an Australian with Indonesian parents.

Lydia grew up in Darwin and met Oli while travelling in Brisbane.

While they’ve never encountered any undeserved attitudes in Australia, they did receive weird interest in the Czech Republic.

“Multi-ethnic relationships are not that common. In general the country isn’t multi-cultural,” Lydia said.

“People asked more questions. It’s not racism but people would question it more. They’d pay a bit more attention than people are used to.”

Their friends are a melting pot of love, too.

So what makes Darwin so conducive of inter-ethnic couples?

Researchers from the University of Wollongong, Dr Natasha Kloker and PHD student Alex Tindale, will be interviewing some of Darwin’s multi-ethnic couples next month to find out why.

If you would like to be a part of Mr Tindale’s interviews, email him on at96@uowmail.edu.au
Appendix 4: Participant Information Sheet

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET FOR INTER-ETHNIC COUPLES

TITLE: Exploring the everyday experiences of inter-ethnic couples in Australia

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH: This is an invitation to participate in a study conducted by researchers at the University of Wollongong. The purpose of the research is to better understand the everyday lives of inter-ethnic couples in Australia – that is, couples in which the two partners involved have different ethnic backgrounds. Individuals’ ethnic identities are often very personal. When we refer to ethnic background we are particularly interested in your ancestry and nationality (for instance, Anglo-Australian, Indigenous Australian, Chinese, Greek, Tanzanian and so on). We would like to learn more about individuals’ and couples’ everyday experiences in their communities, and also in their extended family and friendship networks. We would also like to learn more about the factors that influence inter-ethnic couples’ decisions about where to live, and whether there are certain places (in their neighbourhoods, towns, cities) where they feel comfortable or uncomfortable as inter-ethnic couples.

INVESTIGATORS:
Dr Natascha Klocker (lead investigator), Faculty of Social Sciences, (02) 4298 1331; natascha@uow.edu.au
Alexander Tindale (student investigator), Faculty of Social Sciences, 0448 188 513 at196@uowmail.edu.au

WHAT YOU WILL BE ASKED TO DO: If you choose to be included, you will be asked to participate in up to three interviews over a one year period. These will take place at a time and location that suits you. Importantly, the level and frequency of your involvement will be tailored to meet your time constraints. Interviews can be undertaken as a couple, or individually. We will ask for your permission to audio-record the interviews. Consent will be reconfirmed at the beginning of each interview.

During the interviews, we will cover three key topic areas:
1. **Background** information: we will ask you to tell us a bit about your relationship and your household structure – for example, whether you have children living in your home. Questions that you will be asked include: Can you tell us a bit about how and where you met your partner? How would you describe your ethnic background/s? If you are a migrant, what was your experience of getting a visa to live in Australia?

2. We will ask you some questions about the **neighbourhood** where you live, and your housing history. We would like to find out whether being in an inter-ethnic relationship has influenced your choice of residential location. Possible questions include: What do you like about living in this area? How do you feel being part of an inter-ethnic couple in this neighbourhood/community? Are there certain places in your neighbourhood or city where you feel uncomfortable or unsafe as an inter-ethnic couple? We will provide you with a map of your neighbourhood and wider city on which you can identify places that you visit often and places that you avoid.

3. Finally, we would like to find out more about your **everyday experiences** of being an inter-ethnic couple, particularly how you feel your relationship is received by others. Questions that you will be asked include: How do your extended families feel about your inter-ethnic relationship? Have either of you – as an individual or couple – been exposed to discrimination? If you have children, can you tell us a bit about your experiences of parenting mixed-ethnicity children in Australia?

We will also invite you to participate in a diary keeping activity to help us better understand how you use the spaces of your neighbourhood/city. This would involve writing down the places you visit (as an individual and couple) over a one or two week period. You may wish to take landscape photos as part of this diary. This activity is entirely optional and we will discuss it with you during the first interview.
POSSIBLE RISKS, INCONVENIENCES AND DISCOMFORTS: Apart from the time taken to participate in this research, we can foresee no inconvenience for you. We anticipate that each interview will be around one hour in duration. We will tailor your involvement to suit your availability and needs, and you will not be pressured to participate in more activities than you feel comfortable with.

You may find some of the topics that we wish to discuss with you upsetting. This depends on your experiences of being in an inter-ethnic relationship, and whether you or your family members have experienced discrimination. The interviews will be conducted professionally and ethically, and sensitivity will be shown towards any emotional distress. You will not be pressured to answer questions that make you uncomfortable, and your involvement is entirely voluntary. You may halt your participation at any time and withdraw any data that you have provided to that point. You can also withdraw any data you have provided for up to two months following the completion of your participation. If you decide not to participate, this will not affect your relationship with the University of Wollongong.

FUNDING AND BENEFITS OF THE RESEARCH: This study is funded by a University of Wollongong Small Grant. The research will be used to better understand the experiences of inter-ethnic couples in Australia. It will be published in academic journal articles, books, conference papers and a PhD thesis. The findings may also be discussed in media interviews. Recorded interview materials may also be used to produce an audio documentary to raise awareness of the unique experiences of inter-ethnic couples. Participating in an interview does not oblige you to agree to this. You will be given a separate opportunity to indicate whether you consent to having audio-recordings of your interviews used in an audio documentary.

We will provide you with an opportunity to review transcripts and/or recordings to ensure that you feel comfortable with the information. You will also be given a CD copy of your full and unedited interviews for reference and personal use. You will be able to choose whether you would prefer to be referred to by your real name in published materials, or whether you would prefer to use a pseudonym (false name). In accordance with the law, all data that we obtain from you will be stored for a minimum of 5 years in locked filing cabinets in the team leader’s office at the University of Wollongong (41.G13), and on password protected computers. After this time, the data may be archived by the team leader in a locked filing cabinet within the secure Human Geography archive room (41.G24). With approval from the Human Research Ethics Committee, the data may continue to be used by the researchers after the 5 year period in related research and publications.

ETHICS REVIEW AND COMPLAINTS: This study has been reviewed by the Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Wollongong (HE13/409). If you have any concerns or complaints regarding the way this research has been conducted you can contact the UOW Ethics Officer on (02) 4221 3386 or email rso-ethics@uow.edu.au. If you have any questions about the study, please contact the team leader, Dr Natascha Klocker. Thank you for your interest in this study.

Natascha Klocker

Natascha Klocker
Appendix 5: Interview schedule

Background:
1. Can you tell us the story of how and where you met your partner?
2. How long have you been in a relationship/married/living together?
3. Do you have children? What are their ages?
4. What is/are your occupations?
5. How would you describe your ethnic background/s?
6. Do either of you speak a language other than English? If so, which language(s) do you (your partner) speak at home? Has this changed since you began living together? Which language/s do you speak when you’re together in public places?
7. If you have children, what language/s do they speak at home?
8. How would you describe your religious affiliation/s? (including whether practising or not).
9. Were you (your partner) born in Australia? If not, can you tell us a bit about when you/they migrated? What prompted you/them to migrate?
10. What was your/their experience of getting a visa to live in Australia?
11. Do you view yourself as being in an inter-ethnic relationship? [and inter-religious if two religions] How does that term make you feel? Is there another term that you would normally use/prefer to use?
12. Is being in an inter-ethnic relationship something that you give much thought to in your everyday lives?
13. Has that changed over time—was it something you thought about differently (or more or less) when you first got together?

Neighbourhood:
14. How long have you lived in your present home/ neighbourhood?
15. Can you tell us a bit about your housing history as a couple - where else have you lived as a couple?
16. Where did you live before moving in together?
17. What has been your favourite neighbourhood that you’ve lived in, as a couple? Why?
18. What do you like about living in this area?

19. What made you decide to live in this neighbourhood?

[Using the maps]

20. Where (in which suburb) do you work/study? [If far from place of residence explore why] How do you usually travel to work?

21. Where do your children go to school/childcare? [If far from place of residence explore why] How do you usually get them there?

22. Where do you usually do your grocery shopping? Do you ever travel to different parts of Sydney to access ingredients that you like to cook with? [If far from place of residence explore why] Is this by public transport or car?

23. Where do your extended families live? [If far from place of residence explore why]

24. Do most of your friends live in a similar part of Sydney to you?

25. Which parts of the city do you usually like to go to when you’re going out, or catching up with friends/family?

26. Where is your favourite part of Sydney to spend time in when you are relaxing or socialising together? What about when you are going out separately?

27. What is it like being part of an inter-ethnic couple in this neighbourhood/community?

28. How would you describe the feeling of walking around this neighbourhood as an inter-ethnic couple? Do you experience your neighbourhood differently when you are walking around together/apart?

29. Are there any parts of this neighbourhood where you feel really comfortable as part of an inter-ethnic couple? Can you explain why you feel this way?

30. Are there any parts of this neighbourhood where you feel uncomfortable as part of an inter-ethnic couple? Are there places that you would avoid? Can you explain why you feel this way? Does this depend on the time of day?

31. Would you recommend your neighbourhood as a place for other inter-ethnic couples to live? Why/why not?

32. Thinking about Sydney more generally, what are the places where you feel most comfortable going as an inter-ethnic couple? Can you explain why you feel this way?

33. Again, thinking about Sydney more generally, what are the places where you feel least comfortable going as an inter-ethnic couple? Are there places that you avoid? Can you explain why you feel this way? Does this depend on the time of day?
34. What differences have you noticed in terms of the places where you feel uncomfortable—depending on if you are by yourself, or with each other (or with your children)?

35. How do you feel moving about on public transport as an inter-ethnic couple/family? Is this different depending on the type of public transport? Does it depend on the time of day?

**Experiences of acceptance/discrimination:**

36. Do you see much of your extended families have much contact with them?

37. How did your extended families respond to your relationship when you first got together? Has this changed over time?

38. How did your friends respond to your relationship when you first got together? Has this changed over time?

39. Have either of you—as an individual, or as a couple—experienced discrimination on the grounds of your ethnicity (or religion)? If you feel comfortable doing so, can you please tell us a little bit about those experiences, and how you responded to them?

40. What kind of attention do you get (from people in everyday places) when you are out and about as a couple / family?

41. Have you developed specific strategies in everyday life to try to avoid being exposed to unwanted attention or even discrimination (for instance, by avoiding particular places)? Can you tell us a little bit about these strategies?

42. Have you ever experienced discrimination in the neighbourhood where you live now? Or in any other neighbourhoods where you have lived in the past?

43. If you have children, how would you describe their ethnicity?

44. Is the term mixed-ethnicity something that you would identify with them? Is there a term that you prefer to use?

45. Can you tell us a little bit about your experiences of parenting mixed-ethnicity children in the neighbourhood where you live?

46. To your knowledge, have your children ever been exposed to discrimination? And do you have strategies for managing this?

47. Do you ever discuss your children’s ethnic identity with them? Can you tell us a little bit about these conversations?

48. In your experience, how comfortable do you think Sydneysiders are with inter-ethnic couples / mixed-ethnicity families?

49. In your experience, how easy/difficult is it being part of an inter-ethnic couple in Sydney?
50. Is there anything else you want to tell us about your experiences?

51. Do you know of any other inter-ethnic couples who might be interested in participating in this research?
Appendix 6: Additional maps from Chapter 3 analysis.

Map A. Distribution of mixed Pacific Islander couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map B. Distribution of co-ethnic Pacific Islander couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map C. Distribution of mixed NA/ME couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.
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Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map D. Distribution of co-ethnic NA/ME couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map E. Distribution of mixed SC Asian couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map F. Distribution of co-ethnic SC Asian couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.
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Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map G. Distribution of mixed SS African couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map H. Distribution of co-ethnic SS African couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map I. Distribution of mixed SE Asian couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map J. Distribution of co-ethnic SE Asian couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map K. Distribution of mixed Vietnamese couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map L. Distribution of co-ethnic Vietnamese couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map M. Distribution of mixed Filipino couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Map N. Distribution of co-ethnic Filipino couples by SA3 and SA4, Australia, 2011.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Appendix 7: Additional maps from Chapter 4 analysis.

Map A: Distribution of mixed Vietnamese and mixed Lebanese couples by location quotient, and location of SA3 ‘hotspots’ for co-ethnic Vietnamese and co-ethnic Lebanese couples, Greater Sydney and Greater Melbourne.

Source: Generated using data supplied by the ABS.
Appendix 8: Additional maps from Chapter 5 analysis.

Map A. High concentrations of mixed NA/ME individuals (A) born overseas and (B) born in Australia, SA2s, Greater Sydney, 2011.
Map B. High concentrations of mixed SE Asian individuals (A) born overseas and (B) born in Australia, SA2s, Greater Sydney, 2011.
Map C. High concentrations of mixed NE Asian individuals (A) without a bachelor’s degree and (B) with a bachelor’s degree or higher, SA2s, Greater Sydney, 2011.
Map D. High concentrations of mixed SC Asian individuals (A) without a bachelor’s degree and (B) with a bachelor’s degree or higher, SA2s, Greater Sydney, 2011.