

PEOPLE AND PLACE

LANGUAGE CONCENTRATIONS IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

Michael Clyne and Sandra Kipp

Linguistic diversity is more evenly spread in Melbourne than in Sydney or Adelaide. Some languages are more concentrated than others in all cities, while others tend to be more dispersed. Some municipalities are characterised by the dominance of one community language while others are multilingual, and others have no significant community language presence at all.

INTRODUCTION

In recent articles in *People and Place*¹ we considered the changing demography of community languages in Australia, taking into account variation between the different states and territories. In this paper we focus on Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide in an attempt to ascertain how languages are distributed within capital cities. We consider which language communities tend to be more concentrated and which ones are more dispersed. We also characterise areas according to the extent of community language clustering. This may be of use in the planning of community language services.

CONCENTRATION OF PARTICULAR LANGUAGES

Community languages in Australia are concentrated in state capitals, particularly in Sydney and Melbourne, where 26.4 per cent and 25.4 per cent of the population respectively speak a language other than English in the home. In Adelaide, the city with the next highest proportion of home users of languages other than English, the figure is 14.9 per cent.

In order to assess the relative density of specific language communities in the three capitals, the following formula was applied:

$$\frac{A}{B} \times \frac{Bx}{Ax}$$

A in this equation represents the number of speakers of a community language in a particular LGA, and Ax represents the number of speakers of that community language in the entire metropolitan area. B represents the total population of the LGA in question, and Bx represents the total population of the entire metropolitan area.

The product of this equation is the 'concentration factor' for a language in a particular LGA. This figure reflects the actual number of speakers in an LGA as well as the proportion they represent within that LGA and further relates this to an expected distribution for the entire metropolitan area (once again using both actual and relative numerical strength). If a language were distributed evenly across the metropolitan area, it would have a concentration factor of 1. If the concentration factor is 2, then the concentration is twice that expected (from a completely even distribution), and if it is 0.5, then it is half that expected.

This equation will be applied to languages in Sydney and Melbourne which have 1,000+ speakers in any LGA, and (reflecting the relative total populations of Sydney/Melbourne and Adelaide) to those languages in Adelaide which have 500+ speakers in any LGA. For the purposes of calculating an 'average' concentration factor for a metropolitan area, the total number of speakers of a particular language in the 'top' five LGAs for that language is used for Sydney, and the total number of speakers in the 'top' three LGAs is used for Melbourne and Adelaide (reflecting the different sizes of LGAs across the state capitals). It will be noted that ranking in terms of numerical strength, and ranking in terms of concentration factor, do not necessarily correspond. For example, the Melbourne LGA with the largest number of Vietnamese speakers is the large and extremely ethno-linguistically diverse Brimbank, but the language is most strongly concentrated in the much smaller Maribyrnong (see Table 1).

Language	Mean concentration factor	LGA	Top three LGAs ^a		
			Concentration factor	No. of speakers of this CL in the LGA	% of total pop'n of LGA
Macedonian	4.1	Whittlesea	7.9	10,643	11.4
		Brimbank	3.1	6,133	4.4
		Darebin	2.1	3,462	3.0
Maltese	4.0	Brimbank	6.6	9,797	7.1
		Hobsons Bay	2.8	2,087	3.0
		Hume	1.4	1,554	1.5
Vietnamese	3.6	Brimbank	3.0	9,737	7.1
		Greater Dandenong	3.2	9,023	7.7

		Maribyrnong	5.8	7,585	13.8
Turkish	3.4	Hume	6.5	7,376	6.5
		Brimbank	2.0	2,974	2.2
		Moreland	2.1	2,739	2.3
Arabic	2.6	Moreland	3.4	7,118	5.9
		Darebin	2.1	4,021	3.5
		Hume	2.1	3,718	3.5
Tagalog	2.6	Brimbank	3.2	2,995	2.2
Italian	2.2	Moreland	2.5	20,649	17.0
		Darebin	2.1	16,020	14.0
		Whittlesea	2.0	12,555	13.4
Serbian	2.1	Greater Dandenong	3.1	1,823	1.6
		Brimbank	2.0	1,409	1.0
Dutch	1.9	Yarra Ranges	2.5	1,096	0.9
Polish	1.8	Brimbank	2.3	2,710	2.0
		Greater Dandenong	1.4	1,534	1.3
		Glen Eira	1.4	1,339	1.3
Spanish	1.8	Brimbank	2.0	2,780	2.0
		Greater Dandenong	2.3	2,670	2.3
		Casey	1.2	1,496	1.2
Cantonese	1.7	Manningham	2.6	6,094	6.2
		Monash	1.5	5,171	3.6
		Whitehorse	1.3	4,018	3.2
Mandarin	1.6	Monash	1.7	2,839	2.0
		Boroondara	1.8	2,554	1.9
		Darebin	1.3	1,647	1.4
Greek	1.5	Darebin	1.8	11,412	10.0
		Monash	1.4	11,412	7.9
		Moreland	1.4	9,420	7.8
German ^b	1.1	Knox	1.4	1,700	1.4
		Yarra Ranges	1.1	1,301	1.1
		Monash	0.9	1,280	0.9

a If an LGA has fewer than 1,000 speakers of a particular community language it has not been listed, although it has been taken into account as one of the 'top three' in the calculation of the mean concentration factor.

b There are also significant (1,000+) numbers of German speakers in Greater Geelong.

Melbourne

Since 1991, LGA boundaries within Victoria have been redrawn. This has been largely a process of amalgamation, with the new LGA covering a greater area and usually encompassing part or all of at least two previous LGAs. As a result of this amalgamation, a language spoken in adjacent LGAs (now amalgamated into one LGA) will continue to display a similarly high concentration factor. However, the concentration factor for a language which may be spread over a wider geographical area (and/or in only one constituent part of the amalgamation) will be decreased rather than enhanced by amalgamation. For example, Brimbank, with a concentration

factor of 6.6 for Maltese, represents the amalgamation of Keilor and Sunshine, which had Melbourne's most concentrated clusters of Maltese speakers. Monash, on the other hand, is the result of the amalgamation of Oakleigh (which had Australia's highest concentration of Greek speakers) and Waverley (a large municipality with a modest number of Greek speakers). The concentration factor of Greek speakers in Monash is only 1.4.

Of the languages studied here, the ones with the highest concentrations within the Melbourne metropolitan area are Macedonian and Maltese, and those which are most dispersed are German and Greek.

Some languages are very strongly concentrated in one LGA (for example Macedonian, Maltese, Turkish and Vietnamese) while others (such as Greek and Italian) are more evenly dispersed over their top three LGAs. Macedonian, Maltese, Arabic and Italian all have their highest concentrations in contiguous LGAs, whereas languages such as Mandarin and Polish have their main areas well separated. Factors which facilitate a strong concentration in a particular LGA or LGAs include low dispersal rate from the first point of settlement. This first point of settlement is often close to a migrant reception centre, as evidenced by the large concentration of Vietnamese in Maribyrnong, where the Footscray migrant hostel was situated. Clustering is also affected by the presence of ethno-specific or language-specific religious, commercial and social facilities. The latter factor seems to be very marked for Muslims in both Melbourne and Sydney. Hume, with its Islamic Centre at Broadmeadows, and Auburn, also with its mosque, both have extremely high concentrations of Turkish speakers.

Greek and Italian are the major traditional community languages of Melbourne. While twenty years ago Greek was more concentrated within the metropolitan area than Italian, the reverse is true today.

While it is true that the majority of speakers of community languages in Melbourne live in industrialised and traditionally 'migrant' LGAs, there is also a significant presence in the more well-to-do residential areas of the city. Manningham, for example, in the affluent eastern suburbs, has significant numbers (6,000+) of speakers of Greek, Italian, and Cantonese, while inner-eastern Stonnington has 1,000+ speakers of Greek, Italian, Cantonese and Mandarin respectively. Neighbouring Glen Eira is home to over 5,000 Greek speakers, over 4,000 Russian speakers and more than 2,000 Italian speakers. The recent amalgamation of LGAs in Melbourne may, however, give a less than realistic picture of the actual concentration areas of various languages *vis-a-vis* social 'status'. The residential LGA of Monash in the south-east for example, which represents an amalgamation of less affluent Oakleigh and more affluent Waverley, is home to over 10,000 Greek speakers and over 5,000 speakers of both Italian and Cantonese. However, Greek speakers tend to be concentrated in Oakleigh, and Cantonese speakers in Waverley.

At the lower end of the concentration scale, the largest numbers of German speakers are to be found in LGAs on the rural-urban eastern fringe of the city (where the Dutch, with a higher concentration factor, are also clustered).

Sydney

Table 2 shows that, in Sydney, the most strongly concentrated languages are Macedonian, and Vietnamese, and the most dispersed are German and Polish. As in Melbourne, some languages, such as Macedonian, Vietnamese, Maltese and Turkish, are characterised by strong concentrations in particular LGAs, while Greek and Italian are again good examples of languages that are dispersed over a number of LGAs. Once again, low levels of dispersal from the primary area of settlement, proximity to migrant reception centres and/or the establishment of ethno-specific and language-specific resources are the most likely causes for particular 'pockets' of concentration.

Language	Mean concentration factor	LGA	Top five LGAs ^a		
			Concentration factor	No. of speakers of this CL in the LGA	% of total pop'n of LGA
Macedonian	3.4	Rockdale	9.0	5,292	6.7
		Bankstown	2.6	2,816	1.9
		Fairfield	1.5	1,891	1.1
		Hurstville	3.3	1,506	2.5
Vietnamese	3.2	Fairfield	6.2	21,499	12.9
		Bankstown	2.8	8,373	5.7
		Canterbury	1.8	4,563	3.7
		Marrickville	2.7	4,046	5.7
		Liverpool	1.3	3,009	2.8
Indonesian	3.0	Randwick	4.0	2,115	1.9
		Canterbury	5.5	1,108	2.5

Arabic	2.5	Bankstown	2.8	18,653	12.7
		Canterbury	3.2	18,070	14.8
		Parramatta	2.0	11,828	9.2
		Holroyd	1.9	6,613	8.8
		Auburn	2.8	6,016	12.8
Greek	2.5	Canterbury	3.5	14,771	12.1
		Rockdale	2.9	7,904	9.9
		Marrickville	2.7	6,496	9.1
		Bankstown	1.3	6,487	4.4
		Randwick	1.5	5,972	5.3
Portuguese ^b	2.5	Marrickville	9.4	3,049	4.3
		Canterbury	2.9	1,612	1.3
Maltese	2.2	Blacktown	2.8	3,954	1.9
		Holroyd	4.6	2,270	3.0
		Fairfield	1.6	1,819	1.1
		Penrith	1.5	1,449	1.0
Turkish	2.2	Auburn	12.1	3,423	7.3
		Blacktown	1.4	1,735	0.8
		Fairfield	1.4	1,380	0.8
Serbian ^c	2.1	Fairfield	5.0	4,614	2.8
		Liverpool	2.6	1,559	1.4
Spanish	1.6	Fairfield	3.1	9,092	5.4
		Liverpool	1.9	3,641	3.3
		Blacktown	0.8	2,779	1.3
		Campbelltown	1.1	2,524	1.9
		Randwick	1.0	1,940	1.7
Tagalog	1.6	Blacktown	3.3	9,678	4.6
		Fairfield	0.9	2,224	1.3
		Penrith	1.0	2,035	1.4
		Canterbury	1.1	1,950	1.6
		Parramatta	1.0	1,744	1.4
Croatian	1.5	Fairfield	2.6	4,046	2.4
		Blacktown	1.1	2,066	1.0
		Liverpool	1.4	1,387	1.3
		Penrith	0.8	1,126	0.8
		Holroyd	1.6	1,118	1.5
Mandarin	1.5	Canterbury	2.0	3,738	3.1
		Fairfield	1.4	3,604	2.2
		Parramatta	1.1	2,099	1.6

		Randwick	1.1	1,955	1.7
		Ashfield	3.3	1,903	5.0
Italian	1.5	Fairfield	1.7	9,620	5.8
		Liverpool	1.5	5,437	5.0
		Canterbury	1.3	5,189	4.3
		Drummoyne	4.7	4,550	15.9
		Bankstown	0.8	3,979	2.7
Cantonese	1.4	Fairfield	1.4	9,328	5.6
		Canterbury	1.4	6,818	5.6
		Hornsby	1.1	5,610	4.4
		Parramatta	1.0	5,220	4.0
		Auburn	2.6	4,850	10.4
Polish	1.3	Blacktown	1.4	1,738	0.8
		Fairfield	1.3	1,308	0.8
		Liverpool	1.9	1,250	1.1
		Bankstown	1.3	1,172	0.8
German	0.7	Blacktown	0.7	1,175	0.6

a If an LGA has fewer than 1,000 speakers of a particular community language it has not been listed, although it has been taken into account as one of the 'top five' in the calculation of the mean concentration factor.

b There are also significant (1,000+) numbers of Portuguese speakers in Wollongong.

c There are also significant (1,000+) numbers of Serbian speakers in Wollongong.

In contrast to Melbourne, Greek is more concentrated than Italian in Sydney, although the numerical strength of Greek in Sydney is considerably lower than in Melbourne.³

Cantonese and Mandarin, two of the most rapidly growing community languages in Sydney, have relatively low concentration factors. Such clustering as is evident takes place in the first instance in multicultural Fairfield and Canterbury, to the west and south-west of Sydney respectively. After that, however, while Mandarin is clustered in the older established areas south of the harbour (Ashfield, Randwick), Cantonese is concentrated in the higher-income areas of the North Shore (for example, Hornsby).

As in Melbourne, German is the most evenly dispersed language, and, as in Melbourne, it is characterised by decentralisation on the rural-urban fringe, in this case to the north and west.

Adelaide

Vietnamese and Serbian are the most highly concentrated languages in Adelaide, while Spanish and German are the least concentrated. Other languages which displayed particularly high concentration factors in Melbourne and Sydney (for example, Macedonian and Turkish) do not have sufficient numbers in Adelaide to qualify for inclusion in Table 3.⁴

Language	Mean concentration factor	LGA	Top three LGAs ^a		
			Concentration factor	No. of speakers of this CL in the LGA	% of total pop'n of LGA
Vietnamese	3.2	Enfield	5.9	3,379	6.0
		Salisbury	2.6	2,581	2.6
		Hindmarsh-Woodville	2.1	1,757	2.2

Serbian	2.6	Hindmarsh–Woodville	4.2	881	1.1
Greek	2.4	Hindmarsh–Woodville	2.2	4,400	5.5
		West Torrens	3.0	2,973	7.4
		Unley	2.0	1,664	5.0
Italian	2.1	Campbelltown	4.8	8,029	19.4
		Hindmarsh–Woodville	2.3	7,600	9.5
		Salisbury	0.8	3,202	3.2
Croatian	2.0	Hindmarsh–Woodville	2.9	760	1.0
		Salisbury	1.6	528	0.5
Cantonese	1.9	Enfield	2.1	728	1.3
		Hindmarsh–Woodville	1.3	667	0.8
		Burnside	2.7	618	1.7
Polish	1.9	Salisbury	1.6	1,276	1.3
		Hindmarsh–Woodville	1.9	1,215	1.5
		Enfield	2.0	894	1.6
Spanish	1.5	Salisbury	3.1	853	0.9
German	1.1	Tea Tree Gully	1.2	928	1.2
		Salisbury	0.9	804	0.9
		Enfield	1.4	738	1.4

a If an LGA has fewer than 500 speakers of a particular community language it has not been listed, although it has been taken into account in the calculation of the mean concentration factor.

Italian is by far the most widely spoken community language in Adelaide, and it is concentrated in one LGA (Campbelltown). This pattern is in contrast to both Sydney and Melbourne, where the concentration of Italian speakers is more dispersed over a number of LGAs (in Melbourne they are, however, contiguous). In Adelaide, as in Sydney, Greek is more concentrated than Italian. The ‘newer’ languages (Vietnamese, Cantonese) are concentrated in the first instance in Enfield, although Cantonese is considerably less concentrated than Vietnamese, as it is also in the other two capital cities.

The only language to show a significant presence in the most affluent Adelaide LGAs is Cantonese, with a concentration factor of 2.7 in Burnside. To this extent, the pattern is similar to that in Sydney and Melbourne, although in Melbourne Cantonese joins a number of other community languages in such LGAs. We must, however, always bear in mind that in Melbourne an LGA may represent an amalgamation of more affluent and more modest components, as exemplified by Monash — see above.

CHARACTERISATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS

In terms of absolute rather than relative distributions of community language speakers, four kinds of LGAs can be differentiated:

Type A: Those where one dominant language other than English is used in the home;

Type B: Those which have an ethno-linguistically mixed population but with one dominant language other than English. The number of home users of this language exceeds that of the combined number of speakers of the next two languages in the rank order;

Type C: Those with an ethnolinguistically mixed population and no dominant language other than English, that is none whose number of home users exceeds that of the next two languages;

Type D: Those with a relatively small number of speakers of languages other than English (<15 per cent of the total population of the LGA), and one or two significant community languages.

Type E: Those with no significant numbers of community language speakers (less than 1,000 in Sydney and Melbourne and less than 500 in Adelaide).

The distribution of LGAs by type in each city is shown in Table 4. Adelaide has the greatest proportion of LGAs with no significant community language presence, followed by Sydney, then Melbourne. A further differentiating factor here between Sydney and Melbourne is that, while outlying areas of both cities figure as *Type E* municipalities, there are also affluent inner-city areas in Sydney with no significant community language presence. This does not occur in Melbourne, where most of the LGAs with a higher socio-economic status are linguistically diverse (either *Type B* or *Type C*). Where there is a community language presence in Sydney’s

wealthier areas, for example, the North Shore suburbs, Cantonese is typically the only community language to show up in significant numbers.

There is overall a greater degree of linguistic diversity in Melbourne than in Sydney. Melbourne has only one *Type A* municipality, a lower proportion of *Type B* municipalities and a slightly higher proportion of *Type C* municipalities. This proportion of *Type Cs* is likely to rise by the next census because of the LGAs that are verging on it in 1996.⁵ Adelaide is still dominated by Italian and, to a lesser extent, Greek, although a wide range of other languages is becoming established in Enfield and Salisbury (*Type C*) and Hindmarsh–Woodville. (Although the latter LGA is still an Italian-dominated *Type B*, it has significant communities using seven other languages).

In Sydney, the LGAs with high proportions of community language speakers are largely contiguous, to the south and west of the city. In contrast, such LGAs in Melbourne are geographically more dispersed, although concentrated in two main areas (Brimbank to the north-west and Greater Dandenong to the south-east). While none of the LGAs on the rural-urban fringe of Sydney have significant numbers of community language speakers, this is true only of Melton (west) and Cardinia (south-east) in Melbourne. Adelaide is more similar to Sydney than Melbourne in this respect, with most community language speakers concentrated in contiguous LGAs to the west and north of the city centre.

City	LGA type								
	Type A		Type B		Type C		Type D		Type E
Sydney (44 LGAs)	Concord	(Italian)	Bankstown	(Arabic+9)	Ashfield	(5)			Blue Mountains
	Drummoyne	(Italian)	Baulkham Hills	(Cantonese+3)	Auburn	(6)			Camden
	Hornsby	(Cantonese)	Blacktown	(Tagalog+10)	Botany	(3)			Gosford
	Ku-ring-gai	(Cantonese)	Fairfield	(Viet+13)	Burwood	(4)			Hawkesbury
	Leichhardt	(Italian)	Holroyd	(Arabic+6)	Campbelltown	(3)			Hunter's Hill
	North Sydney	(Cantonese)	Parramatta	(Arabic+8)	Canterbury	(11)			Lane Cove
	South Sydney	(Cantonese)			Hurstville	(5)			Manly
	Sydney	(Cantonese)			Kogarah	(4)			Mosman
	Warringah	(Italian)			Liverpool	(9)			Wollondilly
	Waverley	(Russian)			Marrickville	(8)			Woollahra
					Penrith	(5)			Wyong
					Randwick	(8)			
					Rockdale	(7)			
					Ryde	(5)			
					Strathfield	(3)			
					Sutherland	(4)			
					Willoughby	(3)			
	10	(23%)	6	(14%)	17	(39%)			11 (25%)
Melbourne (31 LGAs)	Wyndham	(Italian)	Banyule	(Italian+2)	Boroondara	(4)	Bayside	(Greek/Ital.)	Cardinia
			Darebin	(Italian+6)	Brimbank	(14)	Maroondah	(Italian)	Frankston
			Greater Dandenong	(Vietnam.+12)	Casey	(6)	Mornington Peninsula	(Italian)	Melton
			Kingston	(Greek+3)	Glen Eira	(7)	Nillumbik	(Italian)	
			Maribyrnong	(Vietnam.+5)	Hobsons Bay	(6)	Yarra Ranges	(Ital./Germ/ Dutch)	
			Monash	(Greek+8)	Hume	(9)			
			Moonee Valley		Knox	(4)			
				Manningham	(5)				

			Moreland Stonnington	(Italian+6) (Italian+5) (Greek+3)	Melbourne Port Phillip Whitehorse Whittlesea Yarra	(3) (3) (7) (8) (5)			
	1	(3%)	9	(29%)	13	(42%)	5	(16%)	3 (10%)
Adelaide (29 LGAs)	Payneham St Peters	(Italian) (Italian)	Burnside Campbelltown Hindmarsh- Woodville Mitcham Tea Tree Gully Thebarton	(Italian+2) (Italian+2) (Italian+7) (Italian+7) (Greek+2) (Italian+3) (Greek+1)	Enfield Marion Port Adelaide Prospect Salisbury West Torrens	(6) (5) (4) (2) (7) (2)	Munno Para Noarlunga Unley	(Italian) (Germ./Polish) (Greek/Ital.)	Adelaide Brighton East Torrens Elizabeth Gawler Glenelg Happy Valley Henley- Grange Kensington- Norwood Stirling Walkerville Willunga 12 (41%)
	2	(7%)	6	(21%)	6	(21%)	3	(10%)	

A further difference to be noted between the cities is the growth of the ‘newer’ languages from Asia (and the Middle East) in Sydney. In Melbourne and Adelaide, the only *Type A* municipalities are Italian-dominant. While the majority of Sydney’s *Type A* municipalities are also Italian-dominant, the city also has three Cantonese-dominant LGAs and one Russian-dominant LGA. Vintage of immigration is of significance here. While Italian is a language that has been well established in all three cities since the 1950s, Cantonese is a relatively new arrival. Sydney’s *Type A* Cantonese municipalities, therefore, are a relatively new phenomenon. All of Adelaide’s *Type B* LGAs are dominated by Italian or Greek, as are all but two of Melbourne’s *Type B* municipalities, where Vietnamese is the major language. Sydney, on the other hand, has three Arabic-dominant ethnically diverse municipalities, one Tagalog-dominant municipality and one Vietnamese-dominated municipality.

The above considerations are limited to languages for which information is recorded in the Australian Bureau of Statistics’ ‘C-Data’.⁶ This means that unusually strong concentrations, such as those of Khmer in Greater Dandenong (Melbourne) and Fairfield (Sydney), and Yiddish in Glen Eira (Melbourne) are not included here (see endnote 2).

As a general observation, community languages have tended to cluster in the first instance around migrant reception centres (this is evident in Sydney in the Bankstown, Fairfield and Liverpool areas, in Melbourne in Maribyrnong and Greater Dandenong, and in Adelaide in Enfield and the neighbouring Port Adelaide). This will largely affect newer migrants, although many then choose to settle in areas with which they are familiar and where there are resources and support. Others relocate to LGAs where land or housing is relatively cheap to buy. These are usually some distance from the central business district (for example, Salisbury in Adelaide, Hume and Whittlesea in Melbourne, Penrith and Blacktown in Sydney). Some may then relocate once more to more prestigious areas as they become financially secure, while others (for example, business migrants) may arrive in Australia with considerable funds and settle in the first instance in more affluent areas. Within this general pattern there is no clear evidence that speakers of certain languages are more likely to cluster together than speakers of other languages.

LANGUAGE CONCENTRATION AND LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE

It might be expected that a language whose speakers are more concentrated within a metropolitan area will be more likely to be maintained than one whose speakers are more dispersed. Fishman’s⁷ notion of family-neighbourhood-community based transmission of language is dependent upon this sort of concentration. Our data offer both support for, and counter-evidence of, the link. Of the four

groups with high concentration factors in Melbourne — Macedonian, Maltese, Vietnamese and Turkish — two (Macedonian and Turkish) also have low language shift rates (2.6 per cent and 4.4 per cent shift to ‘English only’ home use in the first generation).⁸ Here close proximity to other speakers and the clustering of language-specific facilities work in the interests of language maintenance and inter-generational transmission of the language. (Second generation shift is only 14.8 per cent for Australian-born children of Macedonian-born and 16.1 per cent for Australian-born children of the Turkish-born.⁹) For reasons we have indicated in a previous article,¹⁰ it has not been possible to calculate language shift for Vietnamese. However, the pattern does not hold for Maltese. Although it has the second highest concentration factor, the Maltese language has been lost in many homes, with a 36.5 per cent shift rate nationally in the first generation and a rate of 82.1 per cent in the second. In our previous article¹² we provided possible reasons for such a shift, in part going back to the relative status of English and Maltese in pre-migration Malta. High concentration alone is clearly not enough to guarantee the future of a community language, although the potential benefits to language maintenance are considerable.

This argument can be confirmed from a pair of languages in an advanced state of shift in Melbourne — German and Dutch. Although both are quite dispersed, the concentration factor for Dutch is much higher than it is for German (1.9 as opposed to 1.1). The shift rate is, however, even higher for Dutch (62.1 per cent in the first generation, 95 per cent in the second generation) than it is for German (48.2 per cent in the first generation and 89.7 per cent in the second generation).

Another example of an inverse relation between concentration of community language speakers and language maintenance may be found among Greek- and Italian-Australians in Melbourne. There is a shift of only 5.1 per cent in the first generation and 22.5 per cent in the second from Greek, while the shift from Italian is 11.9 per cent in the first generation and 50.7 per cent in the second. The concentration factor of 2.2 for Italian contrasts with that of 1.5 for Greek. (See Table 5.) It could be argued that the high language maintenance rate for Greek is partly the result of a high concentration (3.98) twenty years ago.¹² However, many of the Greek language maintenance efforts are now organised centrally or on a broader regional basis and are not dependent on local concentrations. It remains to be seen if the maintenance of Greek is adversely affected by the increased dispersion of Greek speakers. A comparison between Greek and Italian concentration factors and language shift rates in Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide does not reveal any consistent pattern, although the general observations made for Melbourne also hold for the other two capitals.

	Melbourne		Sydney		Adelaide	
	Conc. factor	Lang. shift	Conc. factor	Lang. shift	Conc. factor	Lang. shift
Italian	2.2	11.9%	1.5	14.3%	2.1	13.1%
Greek	1.5	5.1%	2.5	5.5%	2.4	6%

LANGUAGE POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR THE TYPES OF LGAs

The planning of service provision in community languages (for example, social welfare, interpreting, library holdings) needs to be balanced between a centralised and a decentralised approach. This would safeguard the interests of all those community languages that have not rated a mention on our tables above and would mean that local and regional initiatives were mediated at the central level.

For many services the local government area is the most appropriate planning base (e.g. focus of school LOTE [Languages other than English] programs, libraries, local government community services). We would propose that in *Type A* areas, maximum support be afforded to the dominant community language. In area types *B* and *C*, multilingual facilities should be provided to help at least those communities with significant numbers of speakers (we suggest 1,000+ per LGA in Melbourne and Sydney and 500+ in Adelaide). Support frameworks, once in place, can be easily adapted and extended to accommodate the changing linguistic demography of these linguistically and culturally diverse areas. It is indeed to be expected that ‘newer’ languages will increase in numbers and significance as ‘older’ ones disperse. Schools in areas subject to such changes could offer a choice of community languages and be encouraged to develop innovative second-language and/or bilingual programs.

Central planning, on the other hand, is essential for those languages with low concentration factors but a significant presence over the entire metropolitan area. Languages such as these are likely to occur in *Type D* municipalities and as less significant languages in *Type A* areas.

Language concentration may be of greater value in understanding ethnic distribution than birthplace concentration, as birthplace often does not correspond to ethnicity. What must also be pointed out, however, is that the language figures we have presented do not tell us anything about people of a particular community language background who now use only English in the home.

CONCLUSION

In this article we have identified particular areas of concentration of specific community languages in Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide. We have shown that some languages are far more concentrated than others, and we have characterised different municipalities in terms of clustering. In Sydney there are far more *Type A* municipalities (with only one significant community language) than in either Melbourne or Adelaide. Both Sydney and Adelaide have far more *Type E* municipalities (with no significant community language presence) than Melbourne. Melbourne, on the other hand, has a far higher proportion of *Type B* municipalities (linguistically diverse but with one dominant community language) than either Sydney or Adelaide. It also has a higher proportion of

Type C municipalities (linguistically diverse but with no dominant community language) than either of the other two cities. Melbourne is thus emerging as a city in which linguistic diversity is spread over much of its area. The large number of *Type A* areas in Sydney, on the other hand, can be attributed to the stronger concentration of newer community languages in Sydney. With time, ethno-linguistic groups tend to disperse from their first areas of settlement. The smaller number of languages co-clustering in Adelaide reflects the less dramatic recent changes in the ethno-linguistic profile of that city, as well as the smaller existing community language base (both in terms of languages and speakers of those languages).

It is our hope that the data presented will be useful to those endeavouring to provide vital services in community languages and to those planning the devolution of resources now and in the future.

Acknowledgment

The authors wish to thank Language Australia and the Faculty of Arts, Monash University, for supporting this project.

References

1 M. Clyne and S. Kipp, 'Linguistic diversity in Australia', *People and Place*, vol. 5, no. 3, 1997, pp. 6-11; M. Clyne and S. Kipp, 'Language maintenance and language shift: community languages in Australia, 1996', *People and Place*, vol. 5, no. 4, 1997, pp. 19-27

2 Several of the 'newer' languages from Asia to arrive in Australia (and particularly in Sydney) may also be very interesting in terms of their concentration factors, but do not appear in the C-data format. These include Korean, Khmer and Japanese. According to Burnley (I. Burnley, *Atlas of the Australian People* —

1991 *Census. New South Wales*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1996), Korean and Japanese were both concentrated on Sydney's North Shore (representing the professional and business component of the migration), and Korean was also concentrated in the inner south and west of Sydney (representing the less highly-skilled component of the migration program and the ensuing family migration). Khmer, with 71 per cent of all speakers in Sydney living in Fairfield in 1991, was the most highly concentrated of all community languages at that time.

3 Clyne and Kipp, 'Linguistic diversity in Australia', op. cit.

4 Even with the small numbers involved, however, each of these languages has one 'significant' LGA: Munno Para for Turkish and Hindmarsh-Woodville for Macedonian.

5 Darwin (presently Italian-dominant), Greater Dandenong (presently Vietnamese-dominant), Monash (presently Greek-dominant)

6 C-Data is a commercially produced CD-ROM from the Australian Bureau of Statistics containing basic community profile data.

7 J. A. Fishman, *Reversing Language Shift: Multilingual Matters*, Clevedon, 1991

8 Language shift in the first generation is calculated as the proportion of people born in a particular non-English-speaking country who now use only English in the home.

9 Language shift in the second generation is the proportion of people born in Australia of parents born in a particular non-English speaking country who currently English in the home.

© 2001 Monash University. All rights reserved. ISSN 1446-2000