



2001 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING

Census Paper

**2001 CENSUS: ANCESTRY - FIRST AND SECOND  
GENERATION AUSTRALIANS**

**(Census Paper No. 03/01a)**



**2001 CENSUS: ANCESTRY - FIRST AND SECOND  
GENERATION AUSTRALIANS**

**(Census Paper No. 03/01a)**

Chris Kunz

Population Census Evaluation  
June 2003

© Commonwealth of Australia 2003

This work is copyright. You may download, display, print and reproduce this material in unaltered form only (retaining this notice) for your personal, non-commercial use or use within your organisation. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, all other rights are reserved. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights in this publication should be addressed to:

The Manager  
Intermediary Management  
Australian Bureau of Statistics  
Locked Bag 10  
Belconnen ACT 2616

or telephone (02) 6252 6998 or fax (02) 6252 7102

or email <intermediary.management@abs.gov.au>.

In all cases, the ABS must be acknowledged as the source when reproducing or quoting any part of an ABS publication or other product.

For general inquiries about ABS products and services please call 1300 135 070. Overseas clients please call +61 2 9268 4909.

#### **INQUIRIES**

For further information about this paper, contact the Assistant Director, Census Evaluation by telephone: (02) 6252 5611 or email: joanne.healey@abs.gov.au

# CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 This Paper .....	1
1.2 The Detailed Paper .....	1
1.3 Defining Generations .....	1
1.4 First and Second Generation - The Numbers .....	1
1.5 Determining the Target Group .....	2
2. NON-RESPONSE .....	3
2.1 First Generation Australians .....	3
2.2 Second Generation Australians .....	4
3. ASPIRATIONAL AUSTRALIANS .....	5
3.1 Defining Aspirational Australians .....	5
3.2 First Generation Australians .....	5
3.3 Second Generation Australians .....	9
4. LOST ANCESTRIES .....	11
4.1 Target Group .....	11
4.2 Top Ten .....	12
4.3 First Generation Australians .....	13
4.4 Second Generation Australians .....	13
5. MULTIPLE ANCESTRIES .....	15
5.1 First Generation Australians .....	15
5.2 Second Generation Australians .....	15
5.3 With Other Census Variables .....	15
6. TARGET GROUP AND LANGUAGE .....	19
7. SUMMARY .....	21
8. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	22
APPENDIX 1: Non-reponse Rate with just One Parent Born Overseas .....	23
APPENDIX 2: Ancestry Loss with just One Parent Born Overseas .....	23



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 : Non-response Rate for Ancestry by Country of Birth, 2001 Census	3
Table 2 : Non-response Rate for Ancestry by Both Parents Born Overseas, for Australian-born, 2001 Census	4
Table 3 : Aspirational Australian Ancestry by Country of Birth, 2001 Census	5
Table 4 : Aspirational Australian Ancestry by Country of Birth, with Other Ancestry (the Target Group), 2001 Census	7
Table 5 : Estimate of Lost Ancestries from Target Ancestry Group, 2001 DQI Sample and Census	11
Table 6 : Top 10 Ancestries for Percent Lost, 2001 DQI Sample and Census	13
Table 7 : First Generation Australians who Lost Ancestries, 2001 DQI Sample	13
Table 8 : Second Generation Australians who Lost Ancestries, 2001 DQI Sample	13
Table 9 : Multiple Ancestries for First Generation Australians, 2001 Census	15
Table 10: Multiple Ancestries for Second Generation Australians, 2001 Census	15
Table 11: Multiple and Single Ancestries, and Not Stated by 1st and 2nd Generation, Other Census Variables, 2001 Census, Percent	15
Table 12: Ancestry by Birthplace by Proficiency in English for the Target Group, 2001 Census	19
Table 13: Non-response Rate for Ancestry by Father Born Overseas and Mother in Australia, for Australian-born, 2001 Census	23
Table 14: Non-response Rate for Ancestry by Mother Born Overseas and Father in Australia, for Australian-born, 2001 Census	23
Table 15: Ancestry Loss by Father Born Overseas and Mother Born in Australia, for Australian-born, 2001 DQI Sample	23
Table 16: Ancestry Loss by Mother Born Overseas and Father Born in Australia, for Australian-born, 2001 DQI Sample	23





## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 *This Paper***

This paper focuses on Ancestry from the perspective of first and second generation Australians - the key concern of policy makers seeking to understand and provide appropriate services for immigrants and their children.

### **1.2 *The Detailed Paper***

A comprehensive analysis of all 2001 Census Ancestry responses can be found in the *2001 Census: Ancestry - Detailed Paper (Census Paper No. 03/01b)*. This complementary paper contains an outline of the question history, its format, coding procedures and Discrepancy Rates, detailed analysis of sample data and analysis of the full range of final data.

### **1.3 *Defining Generations***

First generation Australians are those who were born overseas and arrived here as immigrants.

Second generation Australians are the Australian-born children of immigrants. For the purpose of this study, the strict definition has been adopted that excludes those with just one immigrant parent and the other of Australian birth. It is assumed that someone with an Australian-born parent has a considerable degree of familiarity with this country's language and customs and is less likely to require migrant services - and is, in any case, only second generation Australian through their overseas-born parent. A statistical breakdown of numbers in each variant has been provided (see *1.4 First and Second Generation - The Numbers*).

Nevertheless, persons with one parent only born overseas are added to Non-response Rate and Lost Ancestry analysis (see *Appendices 1 and 2* respectively), for interest and the fact that any loss from so short an Ancestral Distance is significant, in the case of the latter.

### **1.4 *First and Second Generation - The Numbers***

Those who indicated in the 2001 Census that they were born outside Australia, totalled 4,099,231. These are the first generation Australians. [Note that this still may include some with Australian Ancestry.]

Combining Birthplace of Individual (Australia), with Birthplace of both Male and Female Parents (Overseas), leads to 1,503,610 who can be classified as second generation Australians through both their parents.

### **1.5 *Determining the Target Group***

The Ancestry question was included primarily to identify persons whose country of birth, alone, was insufficient to identify their Ancestry e.g., Kurds from Iraq or Turkey; Pacific Island peoples from New Zealand; Chinese from Malaysia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Philippines or Indonesia; those of Indian extraction from Fiji; Greeks or Turks from Cyprus and persons from various groups born in the former Yugoslavia.

To construct a target group, the following steps were taken:

- 1) Country of Birth was cross-classified with Ancestry.
- 2) An informal Main English Speaking Countries classification provided by ABS Classifications Section was used to eliminate those most likely to speak English. This meant that those born in the following countries were removed: Australia, Canada, Irish Republic, New Zealand, South Africa, USA and the United Kingdom (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales).
- 3) Two exceptions to Step 2 were made: for Lithuanians and Jews from South Africa, because they were relatively large proportions (22.3% and 7.2%, respectively) of their Ancestry's overseas born; while those of Pacific Islander Ancestry born in New Zealand have also been included as they have been identified as a target group for service provision.
- 4) Combinations where the Ancestry is ethnically and culturally close to the commonly acknowledged birthplace Ancestry, such as those of German Ancestry born in Austria, Spanish Ancestry born in Chile and Chinese Ancestry born in Singapore, have been omitted from the target group, as the focus is on identifying those who substantially could not be identified by birthplace.
- 5) To qualify for inclusion, the Ancestry group with a particular birthplace had to number 1,000 or more.

The countries of birth of this target group are first shown in the Non-response to Ancestry section *2.1 First Generation Australians* while the detail of varying Ancestries from those countries is shown in *Table 4* in the Aspirational Australian section *3.2 First Generation Australians*.

Naturally, the Target Group can only be defined for first generation Australians, as they are born overseas. Detail on specific Country of Birth of Parents was not requested in the 2001 Census, beyond 'Australia' and 'Overseas'. Target Group analysis is not possible beyond the first generation of Australians.

## 2. *NON-RESPONSE*

### 2.1 *First Generation Australians*

The Non-response Rate to Ancestry for those born in Australia was 4.15%.

The table below shows how each of the 39 Target Group countries of birth of first generation Australians, compare with the Australian-born Non-response Rate (the 52nd highest, by Birthplace):

**TABLE 1: NON-RESPONSE RATE FOR ANCESTRY BY COUNTRY OF BIRTH, 2001 CENSUS**

<i>Country of Birth</i>	<i>Non-response Rate for Ancestry</i>
Australia	4.15
New Zealand	3.56
Papua New Guinea	2.66
Fiji	2.71
France	2.51
Germany	2.22
Netherlands	1.99
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.90
Cyprus	2.45
FYR of Macedonia	4.43
Greece	2.45
Romania	4.43
Yugoslavia, Federal Republic of	4.00
Poland	4.30
Russian Federation	4.34
Ukraine	4.41
Egypt	3.11
Iran	2.38
Iraq	3.35
Lebanon	3.06
Turkey	3.50
Burma	2.94
Cambodia	3.48
Laos	2.75
Thailand	2.87
Viet Nam	4.37
Brunei	1.01
Indonesia	2.63
Malaysia	1.16
Philippines	2.71
Singapore	1.35

*continued...*

**TABLE 1: NON-RESPONSE RATE FOR ANCESTRY BY COUNTRY OF BIRTH, 2001 CENSUS**  
*continued...*

<i>Country of Birth</i>	<i>Non-response Rate for Ancestry</i>
China	1.66
India	2.12
Pakistan	3.76
Sri Lanka	2.86
Argentina	3.34
Uruguay	4.33
Kenya	1.65
Mauritius	3.54
South Africa	2.67

Most of the target countries show a Non-response Rate lower than that for Australian-born, suggesting that minority groups from those areas opted to record their Ancestry to differentiate from their place of birth.

Only seven countries had a Non-response Rate higher than the average for Australian-born: Romania and FYR of Macedonia (the equal highest of the Target Group at 4.43%), Ukraine, Viet Nam, Uruguay, Russian Federation and Poland.

It should be noted that in the case of Yugoslavia, most persons born in what were former Republics in the Yugoslav Federation, such as Croatia and Slovenia, had the opportunity to nominate their newly independent homeland as their birthplace, rather than 'Yugoslavia'.

Brunei (1.01%) and Malaysia (1.16%) recorded the lowest Non-response Rates of the Target Group countries of birth.

## **2.2 Second Generation Australians**

While exact birthplace of parent details were not requested on the 2001 Census Form (beyond 'Overseas'), those persons with both parents born Overseas, constituted 30.5% of the population, but only 19.9% of the non-responses.

Though these persons cannot definitively be said to be second generation Australians, as they may, too, have been born Overseas, the following figures provide clarification:

**TABLE 2: NON-RESPONSE RATE FOR ANCESTRY BY BOTH PARENTS BORN OVERSEAS, FOR AUSTRALIAN-BORN, 2001 CENSUS**

<i>2nd Generation Total</i>	<i>Total Non-response to Ancestry</i>	<i>Non-response Rate (%)</i>
1,503,610	50,080	3.33

The resulting 3.33% figure is lower than the 4.15% average for the full Australian-born population, but slightly higher than the 2.89% average for the non-Australian birthplaces in *Table 1*. Interestingly, those with just one parent (a father) born overseas, but mother born in Australia, are even more likely to have responded to the Ancestry question - see *Appendix 1*.

### 3. ASPIRATIONAL AUSTRALIANS

#### 3.1 *Defining Aspirational Australians*

Aspirational Australians are those who claim Australian Ancestry without having a parent or earlier ancestor born in this country.

This Aspirational analysis is conducted to check on the quality of registration of Australian Ancestry. It is possible that in 2006, Australian may be the only mark box option. If so, it is important to know whether respondents may opt to select Australian and not indicate another ancestry.

While the analysis in 3.2 and 3.3 cannot be said to be directly applicable to a hypothetical 2006 format, it shows that, certainly at the first generation Australian level, the quality of 2001 Australian Ancestry data is very high - and the risk to such data in 2006 is minimal.

#### 3.2 *First Generation Australians*

To assess Aspirational Australian Ancestry, first a comparison can be made for each of the 39 countries of birth in the Target Group:

**TABLE 3: ASPIRATIONAL AUSTRALIAN ANCESTRY BY COUNTRY OF BIRTH, 2001 CENSUS**

<i>Country of Birth</i>	<i>No. Responding to Ancestry Question</i>	<i>No. Claiming Australian Ancestry</i>	<i>Maximum Aspirational Australian Rate (%)</i>
New Zealand	342,600	20,471	5.98
Papua New Guinea	22,932	7,362	32.10
Fiji	42,969	1,513	3.52
France	16,813	560	3.33
Germany	105,765	1,257	1.19
Netherlands	81,635	886	1.09
Bosnia and Herzegovina	22,918	250	1.09
Cyprus	19,000	104	0.55
FYR of Macedonia	42,123	210	0.50
Greece	113,516	419	0.37
Romania	12,183	88	0.72
Yugoslavia, Federal Republic of	53,121	425	0.80
Poland	55,594	319	0.57
Russian Federation	14,366	117	0.81
Ukraine	13,441	77	0.57
Egypt	32,370	350	1.08
Iran	17,823	117	0.66
Iraq	23,467	138	0.59
Lebanon	69,031	782	1.13
Turkey	28,713	288	1.00

*continued...*

**TABLE 3: ASPIRATIONAL AUSTRALIAN ANCESTRY BY COUNTRY OF BIRTH, 2001 CENSUS**  
*continued...*

<i>Country of Birth</i>	<i>No. Responding to Ancestry Question</i>	<i>No. Claiming Australian Ancestry</i>	<i>Maximum Aspirational Australian Rate (%)</i>
Burma	10,641	80	0.75
Cambodia	22,131	110	0.50
Laos	9,275	32	0.35
Thailand	22,875	714	3.12
Viet Nam	147,486	904	0.61
Brunei	2,048	105	5.13
Indonesia	45,728	773	1.69
Malaysia	77,889	3,860	4.96
Philippines	101,067	1,740	1.72
Singapore	32,994	1,950	5.91
China	140,222	399	0.28
India	93,393	855	0.92
Pakistan	11,437	202	1.77
Sri Lanka	51,888	394	0.76
Argentina	10,396	85	0.82
Uruguay	9,057	32	0.35
Kenya	6,752	229	3.39
Mauritius	16,359	90	0.55
South Africa	77,279	1,997	2.58

The maximum Aspirational Rates for Papua New Guinea, New Zealand, Singapore, Brunei and Malaysia are significantly higher than the others. It is most likely, at least from the first two, that a very large proportion do have Australian-born fathers, mothers or grandparents.

Australian governmental, military and business relations in the region have no doubt contributed to the prominence of these ‘Aspirational’ figures, indicating that the true Aspirational Australian component is very low. This in turn validates the inclusion of ‘Australian’ as an Ancestry.

It would be expected that if there was to be an Aspirational Australian aspect to Ancestry figures, it might surface amongst immigrant groups wishing to be seen as Australians. The table below shows birthplace by Ancestries beyond that of the birthplace (the Target Group). It is these persons who, without the Ancestry aspect, would not surface in Census figures.

**TABLE 4: ASPIRATIONAL AUSTRALIAN ANCESTRY BY COUNTRY OF BIRTH, WITH OTHER ANCESTRY (THE TARGET GROUP), 2001 CENSUS**

<i>Country of Birth</i>	<i>Total from Birthplace</i>	<i>Other Ancestry</i>	<i>No. Claiming Other Ancestry</i>	<i>Other Ancestry with Australian</i>	<i>Maximum Aspirational Rate (%)</i>
New Zealand	355,241	Cook Islander	2,808	26	0.93
		Samoan	10,219	88	0.86
		Tongan	1,804	34	1.88
Papua New Guinea	23,559	Chinese	2,940	170	5.78
		German	1,499	179	11.94
Fiji	44,164	Chinese	1,290	28	2.17
		Indian	27,048	61	0.23
France	17,246	Italian	1,339	18	1.34
Germany	108,170	Latvian	1,046	5	0.48
		Polish	8,742	21	0.24
		Ukrainian	2,727	6	0.22
Netherlands	83,290	German	1,336	16	1.20
Bosnia and Herzegovina	23,848	Croatian	4,155	21	0.51
		Serbian	4,910	9	0.18
Cyprus	19,477	Greek	11,248	30	0.27
		Turkish	3,592	11	0.31
FYR of Macedonia	43,525	Albanian	1,772	5	0.28
Greece	116,365	Macedonian	2,919	3	0.10
Romania	12,748	Hungarian	1,422	3	0.21
Yugoslavia, Federal Republic of	55,333	Albanian	1,442	14	0.97
		Croatian	1,729	8	0.46
		German	1,591	8	0.50
		Hungarian	4,736	11	0.23
Poland	58,089	Jewish	1,403	0	0.00
		German	1,378	3	0.22
Russian Federation	15,017	Jewish	1,444	0	0.00
Ukraine	14,061	Jewish	1,775	4	0.23
Egypt	33,409	Armenian	1,463	3	0.21
		Greek	6,745	12	0.18
		Italian	3,260	8	0.25
		Maltese	2,246	0	0.00
Iran	18,258	Armenian	1,592	6	0.38
		Assyrian/Chaldean	1,572	3	0.19
Iraq	24,281	Assyrian/Chaldean	10,337	12	0.12
		Kurdish	1,348	9	0.67
Lebanon	71,210	Armenian	1,285	6	0.47
Turkey	29,753	Armenian	1,092	4	0.37
		Kurdish	1,123	3	0.27
Burma (Myanmar)	10,963	Chinese	1,253	0	0.00

*continued...*

**TABLE 4: ASPIRATIONAL AUSTRALIAN ANCESTRY BY COUNTRY OF BIRTH, WITH OTHER ANCESTRY (THE TARGET GROUP), 2001 CENSUS *continued...***

<i>Country of Birth</i>	<i>Total from Birthplace</i>	<i>Other Ancestry</i>	<i>No. Claiming Other Ancestry</i>	<i>Other Ancestry with Australian</i>	<i>Maximum Aspirational Australian Rate (%)</i>
Cambodia	22,929	Chinese	9,648	16	0.17
Laos	9,537	Chinese	1,749	0	0.00
Thailand	23,552	Chinese	3,362	21	0.62
		Khmer	1,875	9	0.48
Viet Nam	154,220	Chinese	41,595	51	0.12
Brunei	2,069	Chinese	1,365	3	0.22
Indonesia	46,963	Chinese	22,515	37	0.16
		Dutch	4,521	68	1.50
Malaysia	78,801	Chinese	55,177	258	0.47
		Indian	4,402	30	0.68
		Sinhalese	1,075	13	1.21
Philippines	103,884	Chinese	4,275	27	0.63
		Spanish	6,732	17	0.25
Singapore	33,445	Indian	2,797	17	0.61
		Malay	1,266	28	2.21
China	142,584	Russian	5,109	9	0.18
India	95,415	Portuguese	1,259	0	0.00
Pakistan	11,884	Indian	1,553	0	0.00
Sri Lanka	53,415	Dutch	3,556	10	0.28
Argentina	10,755	Italian	3,290	7	0.21
Uruguay	9,467	Italian	1,498	3	0.20
Kenya	6,865	Indian	1,725	6	0.35
Mauritius	16,959	Chinese	1,107	3	0.27
South Africa	79,395	Jewish	1,006	3	0.30
		Lithuanian	1,357	0	0.00

There are a total of 325,444 (strictly Ancestries, though mostly persons) - just among the selected Ancestries within this Target Group - who would not have their Ancestry identified if place of birth was the only 'ethnic origin' indicator.

[While it is also possible for the Ancestries to be multiple ones from the Target Group, from one country - e.g. both Jewish and Lithuanian Ancestry and born in South Africa - rates are low. In this specific case in the 2001 Census, 36 persons stated that for their first Ancestry (ANC1) they were Lithuanian and for their second Ancestry (ANC2) Jewish. 18 other persons stated this combination, but in reverse. This made a total of 54 persons with this combination, or 5.4% of the 1,006 Jewish Ancestry persons born in South Africa and 4% of the 1,357 persons of Lithuanian Ancestry. Overall, what is 2,363 Ancestries is in fact 2,309 different persons - a discount of only 2.3%.]

Combining Australian with one of the 'hidden' Ancestries shows only very low levels of an Aspirational component - generally far lower than the Maximum Aspirational Australian



Rate shown in *Table 4* displaying Rates for the full range of Ancestries for the target birthplaces. Overall, there are only two cases - both relating to Papua New Guinea, where the Rate is higher than the National average of 2.51% revealed in the *Ancestry - Detailed Paper*.

From this perspective, it can be said that the Aspirational Australian component of first generational Australians, and in particular this Target Group, is inconsequential.

### **3.3 *Second Generation Australians***

Those born in Australia of immigrant parents can logically claim to be 'Australians'. However they are only that by birth, and unlikely to be so via Ancestry. This aspect may well have been a point of confusion for some.

It is not possible to identify this second generational group by their parents' country of birth via standard Census output, as specific Country of Birth of Male and Female Parent was not asked in 2001.

Using the only available non-Australian birthplace of 'Overseas', there were, as numbers in *1.4 First and Second Generation - The Numbers* state, 1,503,610 second generation Australians.

Of that number, 85,635 or 5.7% claimed Australian Ancestry. If those who were Not Stated for Ancestry were removed (leaving a population of 1,453,530), the Maximum Aspirational Australian Rate climbs to 5.9%.

These figures are significantly higher than those for the first generation, clearly indicating that the driver for Aspirational Australian Ancestry is not the newly-arrived immigrant, but is most likely respondent confusion over what constitutes 'Australian Ancestry'. Being born in Australia, alone, is not sufficient.

It should be remembered that 5.9%, while relatively high, is still well below the Census average of 35.5% of all respondents, who stated Australian as an Ancestry.



## 4. LOST ANCESTRIES

### 4.1 *Lost Ancestries Generally*

As outlined in the *Ancestry - Detailed Paper*, an estimated 1,890,044 stated Ancestries were 'Lost' due to the coding of only the first two stated Ancestries for each person.

*Appendix B* in the *Detailed Paper* contains an exhaustive listing of estimated Ancestry Loss, based on the DQI (Data Quality Investigation) Sample, while section 5.1 of that paper outlines the DQI Sample.

*Table 5* (below) reveals the percentage lost from first and second generation Australians for the Target Group Ancestries.:

**TABLE 5: ESTIMATE OF LOST ANCESTRIES FROM TARGET ANCESTRY GROUP, 2001 DQI SAMPLE AND CENSUS**

<i>Ancestry Lost</i>	<i>No. Lost (Australia)</i>	<i>% Lost of Total Claiming</i>	<i>% of Lost that were 1st Generation Australian</i>	<i>% of Lost that were 2nd Generation Australian</i>
Albanian	399	3.7	0.0	12.5
Armenian	899	5.8	27.8	22.2
Assyrian/Chaldean	100	0.5	50.0	50.0
Chinese	19,722	3.4	13.7	6.3
Cook Islander	649	7.4	61.5	15.4
Croatian	7,490	6.6	19.3	6.7
Dutch	52,177	16.2	8.4	5.8
German	175,953	19.1	7.9	2.7
Greek	15,279	3.9	12.4	3.3
Hungarian	9,137	12.7	12.6	7.7
Indian	15,029	8.7	24.9	14.6
Italian	47,933	5.6	8.2	4.5
Jewish	7,040	23.8	23.4	3.5
Khmer	100	0.5	50.0	0.0
Kurdish	0	0.0	N/A	N/A
Latvian	3,196	14.4	7.8	7.8
Lithuanian	2,297	15.7	8.7	13.0
Macedonian	1,548	1.9	12.9	3.2
Malay	2,896	13.7	17.2	13.8
Maltese	15,528	10.2	7.4	6.1
Polish	32,155	17.5	12.1	7.6
Portuguese	7,839	18.0	28.0	17.8
Russian	15,978	21.0	15.0	9.7
Samoan	2,247	7.4	66.6	15.6
Serbian	8,288	7.8	13.9	6.6
Sinhalese	3,395	5.5	29.4	14.7

*continued...*

**TABLE 5: ESTIMATE OF LOST ANCESTRIES FROM TARGET ANCESTRY GROUP,**

## 2001 DQI SAMPLE AND CENSUS *continued...*

<i>Ancestry Lost</i>	<i>No. Lost (Australia)</i>	<i>% Lost of Total Claiming</i>	<i>% of Lost that were 1st Generation Australian</i>	<i>% of Lost that were 2nd Generation Australian</i>
Spanish	33,902	31.0	18.7	11.2
Tongan	1,098	6.9	31.8	13.6
Turkish	1,248	2.2	12.0	16.0
Ukrainian	5,243	13.4	6.7	4.8

Ignoring (for statistical distortion reasons) those groups whose Lost Ancestries totalled less than one thousand, Samoan Ancestry (a cumulative 82.2%), Portuguese (45.8% - and likely to include persons from East Timor), Tongan (45.4%) and Sinhalese (44.1%), are those with the highest percentages lost from first and second generation Australians. Each of these groups are among the more recently arrived.

At the other end of the scale of the target Ancestries are German (10.6% cumulatively), Ukrainian (11.5%), Italian (12.7%) and Maltese (13.5%). The heydays of immigration of these groups have long since passed and the first generation immigrants are literally dying out.

As with those in *Table 6*, it needs to be remembered that the second generation Australian component would be larger if only one parent born overseas (and not both).

Obviously, many of those Ancestries in *Tables 5* and *6* do not represent target groups requiring governmental support services - a reason Ancestry was included in addition to Birthplace in the Census. Some are groups well established in Australian society.

The sheer number of German Ancestry losses (estimated at 175,953) and those of Scottish (333,383 - see *Table 6*) combined with their relatively low first and second generation percentages, imply a high level of intermarriage and indicate just how strong the willingness to acknowledge is among decendants - whether prompted by the inheritance of surname or mere bloodline.

A number of the Target Groups (particularly those with loss rates in single digits) are Ancestrally, relatively homogeneous, despite in many first generation cases, coming from areas where they are minorities - and the opportunity for intermarriage is greater, but not often taken.

### 4.2 *Top Ten*

While the lost percentages in the *Table 5* may seem high in some cases relative to the national rate for Ancestral Loss of 8.1%, by comparison with other Ancestral groups such as the French, Swedish, Danish, Welsh and Norwegian who all lost over 40% of their 2001 Ancestry count, they are low.

*Table 6* applies the same framework to the Top 10 Ancestries for percentage lost. Here, Canadian (a cumulative 38% lost) and American (33.5%) are the highest, while Swedish (10.8%) and Danish (11.2%) are the lowest.

**TABLE 6: TOP 10 ANCESTRIES FOR PERCENT LOST, 2001 DQI SAMPLE AND CENSUS**

<i>Ancestry Lost</i>	<i>No. Lost (Australia)</i>	<i>% Lost of Total Claiming</i>	<i>% of Lost that were 1st Generation Australian</i>	<i>% of Lost that were 2nd Generation Australian</i>
French	72,448	47.8	14.2	5.3
Swedish	21,420	46.7	8.2	2.6
Danish	31,606	45.0	7.4	3.8
Welsh	65,358	43.7	9.8	4.9
Norwegian	12,283	41.5	12.2	4.5
Scottish	333,383	38.1	8.1	3.2
American	22,069	33.2	26.5	7.0
Spanish	33,902	31.0	18.7	11.2
Swiss	9,936	30.9	8.5	10.1
Canadian	7,889	28.3	32.3	5.7

### 4.3 First Generation Australians

**TABLE 7: FIRST GENERATION AUSTRALIANS WHO LOST ANCESTRIES, 2001 DQI SAMPLE**

<i>DQI Total Ancestry Losers by Birthplace</i>	<i>1st Generation Australian Total Ancestry Losers</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Multiplier to Full Australia Figure</i>	<i>Estimated Australia-wide Total of 1st Generation Ancestry Losers</i>
26,155	2,714	10.4	49.93	135,510

According to the DQI Sample, **10.4% of Ancestry losers were first generation Australians, who lost at least one Ancestry**. Extrapolated, this was 3.3% of the 4,099,231 first generation Australians in the 2001 Census.

### 4.4 Second Generation Australians

**TABLE 8: SECOND GENERATION AUSTRALIANS WHO LOST ANCESTRIES, 2001 DQI SAMPLE**

<i>DQI Total Ancestry Losers by Birthplace</i>	<i>2nd Generation Australian Total Ancestry Losers</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Multiplier to Full Australia Figure</i>	<i>Estimated Australia-wide Total of 2nd Generation Ancestry Losers</i>
26,155	1,177	4.5	49.93	58,767

Table 8 (also based on DQI figures) shows that 4.5% of Ancestry losers were second generation Australians. This is fairly low. Comparing the extrapolated total of 58,767 with the actual total of this group of 1,503,610 based on 2001 Census figures, shows that the losers were only 3.9% of the formal second generation Australian total.

It has to be remembered that this is second generation Australian defined in its most restrictive sense - with both parents born overseas.

Together, the first and second generation Australians losing Ancestries totalled only 14.9% of Ancestry losers.

Tables showing how the numbers would look if the strict definition of second generation was relaxed to include only one parent born overseas, appear in *Appendix 2*.

With these changes, the cumulative percentage of Ancestry losers for persons first or second generation Australian, now has expanded to 35.3% - over a third of all Ancestry losers are first or second generation Australians.

Conversely, around two-thirds of all Ancestry losers were at least third generation Australians.

For more detail on Ancestry loss, see *Ancestry - Detailed Paper*.

## 5. MULTIPLE ANCESTRIES

For more detailed treatment of Multiple Ancestries, see *Ancestry - Detailed Paper*.

### 5.1 First Generation Australians

**TABLE 9: MULTIPLE ANCESTRIES FOR FIRST GENERATION AUSTRALIANS, 2001 CENSUS**

<i>Ist Generation Total</i>	<i>Those Reporting Multiple Ancestries</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Those Reporting A Single Ancestry</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Not Stated</i>	<i>%</i>
4,099,231	441,063	10.8	3,545,078	86.5	113,190	2.8

Overwhelmingly, first generation Australians indicate only one Ancestry. Just 10.8% of them indicated multiple Ancestries.

### 5.2 Second Generation Australians

**TABLE 10: MULTIPLE ANCESTRIES FOR SECOND GENERATION AUSTRALIANS, 2001 CENSUS**

<i>2nd Generation Total</i>	<i>Those Reporting Multiple Ancestries</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Those Reporting A Single Ancestry</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Not Stated</i>	<i>%</i>
1,503,610	270,601	18.0	1,182,929	78.7	50,080	3.3

Multiple Ancestries rose to 18% among Second Generation Australians who had both parents born overseas.

### 5.3 With Other Census Variables

*Table 11* looks at the number of Ancestries for 1st and 2nd Generation for selected variables:

**TABLE 11: MULTIPLE AND SINGLE ANCESTRIES, AND NOT STATED BY 1ST AND 2ND GENERATION, OTHER CENSUS VARIABLES, 2001 CENSUS, PERCENT**

<i>Census Variable</i>	<i>1st Generation</i>			<i>2nd Generation</i>		
	<i>Multiple Ancestries</i>	<i>One Ancestry</i>	<i>Not Stated</i>	<i>Multiple Ancestries</i>	<i>One Ancestry</i>	<i>Not Stated</i>
<i>Language Spoken At Home (LANP):</i>						
English	78.0	48.6	44.5	83.8	55.5	53.8
All Others	21.5	50.8	49.1	15.0	43.0	38.7
Not Stated	0.5	0.6	6.4	1.2	1.5	7.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Proficiency in Spoken English (ENGP):</i>						
Very Well	14.1	22.1	18.7	12.3	34.5	27.6
Well	5.2	17.1	18.4	1.4	4.5	5.9

*continued...*

**TABLE 11: MULTIPLE AND SINGLE ANCESTRIES, AND NOT STATED BY 1ST AND 2ND GENERATION, OTHER CENSUS VARIABLES, 2001 CENSUS, PERCENT *continued...***

<i>Census Variable</i>	<i>1st Generation</i>			<i>2nd Generation</i>		
	<i>Multiple Ancestries</i>	<i>One Ancestry</i>	<i>Not Stated</i>	<i>Multiple Ancestries</i>	<i>One Ancestry</i>	<i>Not Stated</i>
<i>Proficiency in Spoken English ... cont'd</i>						
Not Well	1.9	9.4	10.3	0.7	2.2	3.1
Not at All	0.4	1.9	2.3	0.5	1.5	2.6
Not Stated LANP & ENGP	0.2	0.3	3.9	0.7	0.9	4.7
Not Stated ENGP	0.3	0.6	1.8	0.5	1.0	2.3
Not Applicable (Does not speak a language other than English at home)	78.0	48.6	44.5	83.8	55.5	53.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Qualification Indicator (QALIP):</i>						
Yes, Trade Certificate	11.7	12.6	9.3	9.0	10.9	6.5
Yes, Other	34.2	25.1	11.7	20.9	19.9	7.3
No	39.9	50.7	44.6	37.1	39.2	29.6
Not Stated	5.0	7.0	26.5	3.0	3.6	9.6
Not Applicable (Under 15 years of age)	9.2	4.6	8.0	30.0	26.4	47.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Individual Income - Weekly (INCP):</i>						
\$1,000 or more	14.3	10.2	4.3	8.2	8.9	2.8
\$600 - \$999	19.1	15.9	9.8	14.4	16.0	7.1
\$1 - \$599	48.1	57.3	53.2	39.4	40.4	30.9
Nil Income	5.7	6.9	5.0	5.0	4.8	3.9
Negative Income	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4
Not Stated	3.0	4.5	19.2	2.5	3.1	7.9
Not Applicable (Under 15 years of age)	9.2	4.6	8.0	30.0	26.4	47.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Tenure Type (Tend):</i>						
Fully Owned	29.3	42.5	35.4	30.6	42.4	36.2
Being Purchased	31.6	24.0	17.6	37.3	31.5	27.9
- under Rent/Buy Scheme	0.8	1.1	1.3	0.9	1.2	1.7
Rented	32.4	25.8	28.9	25.8	18.8	24.6
Being Occupied Rent-free	1.1	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.1	0.9
Being Occupied - Life Tenure Scheme	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
Other Tenure Type	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.0	1.5	1.9
Not Stated	1.2	2.0	9.7	1.2	1.7	5.8

*continued...*



**TABLE 11: MULTIPLE AND SINGLE ANCESTRIES, AND NOT STATED BY 1ST AND 2ND GENERATION, OTHER CENSUS VARIABLES, 2001 CENSUS, PERCENT *continued...***

<i>Census Variable</i>	<i>1st Generation</i>			<i>2nd Generation</i>		
	<i>Multiple Ancestries</i>	<i>One Ancestry</i>	<i>Not Stated</i>	<i>Multiple Ancestries</i>	<i>One Ancestry</i>	<i>Not Stated</i>
<i>Tenure Type (Tend) continued:</i>						
Not Applicable (Unoccupied and Non-private Dwellings)	2.5	2.5	4.8	2.0	1.6	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Persons of both generations stating Multiple Ancestries are more likely than those stating only one to: speak English only at home and have a non-trade qualification; while those stating one are relatively more likely to speak a language other than English at home; have no qualification; to have not stated their income and to fully own their dwelling.



## 6. TARGET GROUP AND LANGUAGE

Language Spoken At Home and Proficiency of English are the Census indicators for Language. When these variables are applied to the (first generation) Target Group, the following table results:

**TABLE 12: ANCESTRY BY BIRTHPLACE BY PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH FOR THE TARGET GROUP, 2001 CENSUS**

<i>Country of Birth</i>	<i>Other Ancestry</i>	<i>Lang/Prof</i>		<i>Proficiency in English (%)</i>			
		<i>Stated No. (%)</i>	<i>English Only(%)</i>	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Not Well</i>	<i>Not At All</i>
New Zealand	Cook Islander	2,773 (98.8)	81.8	14.2	3.3	0.6	0.1
	Samoan	10,069 (98.5)	42.2	49.1	6.4	1.9	0.4
	Tongan	1,753 (97.2)	42.1	47.4	7.7	2.5	0.3
Papua New Guinea	Chinese	2,930 (99.7)	42.3	43.3	11.2	3.0	0.3
	German	1,496 (99.8)	89.5	9.0	1.3	0.2	0.0
Fiji	Chinese	1,286 (99.7)	59.9	35.1	4.0	0.9	0.0
	Indian	26,761 (98.9)	12.9	71.5	12.0	2.9	0.6
France	Italian	1,325 (99.0)	34.7	44.3	16.8	4.0	0.3
Germany	Latvian	1,046 (100)	73.3	25.3	1.1	0.0	0.0
	Polish	8,717 (99.7)	70.2	26.0	3.1	0.7	0.0
	Ukrainian	2,711 (99.4)	65.3	32.6	2.0	0.2	0.1
Netherlands	German	1,329 (99.5)	67.9	25.9	5.9	0.4	0.0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Croatian	4,122 (99.2)	3.7	36.4	31.0	23.9	5.0
	Serbian	4,863 (99.0)	2.0	32.6	31.2	26.0	8.2
Cyprus	Greek	11,133 (99.0)	8.3	41.3	28.7	18.9	2.7
	Turkish	3,560 (99.1)	8.1	35.5	34.6	19.6	2.2
FYR of Macedonia	Albanian	1,756 (99.1)	3.9	32.4	39.0	20.8	4.6
Greece	Macedonian	2,879 (98.6)	8.5	28.3	36.7	24.2	2.3
Romania	Hungarian	1,403 (98.7)	17.5	38.7	31.3	10.7	1.8
Yugoslavia, Federal Republic of	Albanian	1,424 (98.8)	7.7	31.2	38.1	18.3	4.6
	Croatian	1,717 (99.3)	23.5	35.4	27.7	11.6	1.8
	German	1,580 (99.3)	37.9	31.9	25.4	4.2	0.6
	Hungarian	4,693 (99.1)	20.3	33.0	31.6	13.8	1.2
Poland	Jewish	1,392 (99.2)	33.6	34.9	26.7	4.3	0.4
	German	1,378 (100)	42.5	29.8	23.1	4.0	0.4
Russian Federation	Jewish	1,424 (98.6)	6.0	30.6	30.3	25.7	7.2
Ukraine	Jewish	1,757 (99.0)	1.9	27.4	30.3	31.2	9.2
Egypt	Armenian	1,454 (99.4)	22.0	47.6	25.4	4.5	0.6
	Greek	6,693 (99.2)	23.5	45.1	23.6	7.2	0.6
	Italian	3,234 (99.2)	34.9	40.9	19.8	4.2	0.2
	Maltese	2,238 (99.6)	47.3	35.7	13.7	2.9	0.4
Iran	Armenian	1,574 (98.9)	8.6	45.0	31.3	11.4	3.5
	Assyrian/Chaldean	1,560 (99.2)	5.0	42.4	30.6	17.2	4.9
Iraq	Assyrian/Chaldean	10,184 (99.5)	2.3	36.4	37.7	18.1	5.4
	Kurdish	1,308 (97.0)	3.0	30.6	38.8	22.5	5.2

*continued...*

**TABLE 12: ANCESTRY BY BIRTHPLACE BY PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH FOR THE TARGET GROUP, 2001 CENSUS *continued...***

<i>Country of Birth</i>	<i>Other Ancestry</i>	<i>Lang/Prof Stated No. (%)</i>	<i>English Only(%)</i>	<i>Proficiency in English (%)</i>			
				<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Not Well</i>	<i>Not At All</i>
Lebanon	Armenian	1,274 (99.1)	8.4	50.1	28.6	12.0	0.9
Turkey	Armenian	1,080 (98.9)	5.6	28.8	32.8	26.5	6.3
	Kurdish	1,104 (98.3)	3.0	25.0	31.2	30.4	10.4
Burma	Chinese	1,249 (99.7)	12.0	29.2	42.0	14.8	1.9
Cambodia	Chinese	9,518 (98.7)	3.2	23.2	30.5	33.8	9.4
Laos	Chinese	1,713 (97.9)	6.6	32.4	28.2	26.4	6.5
Thailand	Chinese	3,333 (99.1)	16.2	36.6	33.5	12.2	1.4
	Khmer	1,849 (98.6)	8.5	78.0	12.0	1.46	0.2
Viet Nam	Chinese	41,186 (99.0)	2.3	24.5	32.1	32.4	8.7
Brunei	Chinese	1,353 (99.1)	19.6	51.4	25.3	3.6	0.0
Indonesia	Chinese	22,379 (99.4)	7.3	33.1	49.6	9.0	1.1
	Dutch	4,507 (99.7)	55.6	30.8	12.5	1.1	0.1
Malaysia	Chinese	54,888 (99.5)	24.3	48.5	20.8	5.6	0.9
	Indian	4,384 (99.6)	57.8	37.9	3.8	0.4	0.1
	Sinhalese	1,075 (100)	59.7	36.0	3.5	0.6	0.0
Philippines	Chinese	4,247 (99.3)	27.7	55.6	14.9	1.6	0.1
	Spanish	6,676 (99.2)	32.9	52.4	13.1	1.6	0.1
Singapore	Indian	2,774 (99.2)	52.8	42.2	4.7	0.3	0.1
	Malay	1,263 (99.8)	30.9	47.0	17.7	3.7	0.6
China	Russian	5,076 (99.4)	26.7	34.6	22.9	14.1	1.8
India	Portuguese	1,256 (99.8)	93.0	6.2	0.9	0.0	0.0
Pakistan	Indian	1,538 (99.0)	31.8	46.0	16.4	4.4	1.6
Sri Lanka	Dutch	3,553 (99.9)	94.1	5.5	0.4	0.0	0.0
Argentina	Italian	3,265 (99.2)	14.9	49.2	26.0	8.6	1.2
Uruguay	Italian	1,483 (99.0)	11.9	44.2	29.5	12.2	2.4
Kenya	Indian	1,722 (99.8)	36.4	58.8	4.2	0.6	0.0
Mauritius	Chinese	1,097 (99.1)	20.0	55.2	21.5	3.0	0.7
South Africa	Jewish	1,000 (99.4)	92.4	7.5	0.3	0.0	0.0
	Lithuanian	1,357 (100)	97.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

There is a significant variation, from the Lithuanians born in South Africa, only 2.2% of whom do not speak English at home - but who speak it very well, in any case - to the Chinese from Viet Nam and Cambodia and the Turkish Kurds, more than 40% of whom speak English 'Not Well' or 'Not At All'.

## 7. SUMMARY

- 1) Non-response to Ancestry was mostly lower than the Australian-born average in the target countries - suggesting that those with an Ancestry different from their country of birth took the opportunity to record this fact.
- 2) Those with both parents born overseas (the full second generation Australians), were more likely (with 3.3% Non-response) to respond to Ancestry than the 4.15% Australian-born average - though slightly less likely to respond than the target country first generation average of 2.89%.
- 3) Those with just a father born overseas were the most likely to respond - at 3.19% Non-response - while those with mother only born overseas had a higher Non-response Rate of 3.43% (see *Appendix 1*).
- 4) Most counts indicating Aspirational Australians are most likely really true Australian Ancestry. The idea that refugees or recent immigrants might opt in sizeable numbers to call themselves 'Australians', simply did not occur.
- 5) The Maximum Aspirational Australian Rate is in fact higher (5.9%) among second generation Australians, indicating some misconception that being born in Australia automatically qualifies a person to claim Australian Ancestry. Nevertheless, points 4. and 5. indicate that Australian can safely be used as a mark box Ancestry option without seriously compromising data quality.
- 6) Just among the limited Target Group, there were 325,444 (Ancestries and mostly persons) who would not have had their Ancestry identifiable if the question had not been included in the Census, as they were born in a country that did not represent their Ancestry. Were a complete analysis beyond the Target Group to be made, this figure would most likely be over 500,000. Numbers of these sort alone - indicating those for whom Country of Birth did not define Ancestry - would appear to be justification for the retention of an Ancestry question in the Census.
- 7) Nearly all ethnic and cultural groups lost Ancestries in the Census due to the practice of coding only the first two Ancestries recorded. It was estimated that 135,510 first generation Australians and 58,767 (strictly defined) second generation Australians lost Ancestries, though the latter figure would increase by 266,376 if those with just one parent born overseas included.
- 8) Ancestry loss by first and second generation Australians amounted to 14.9% of total losses when second generation is defined in its most restrictive sense. When second generation can also include just one parent born overseas, the loss grows to 35.3% (see *Appendix 2*).
- 9) As suggested in point 7., multiple Ancestries are more common amongst second generation Australians (18%), than the first generation (10.8%).

10) Those responding with multiple Ancestries are more likely than their single Ancestry counterparts to speak English at home and have a non-trade qualification, while they are less likely to have not stated their income and to fully own their dwelling.

## **8. RECOMMENDATIONS**

See *Recommendations* section in *Ancestry - Detailed Paper*

## APPENDIX 1: Non-response Rate with just One Parent Born Overseas

**TABLE 13: NON-RESPONSE RATE FOR ANCESTRY BY FATHER BORN OVERSEAS AND MOTHER IN AUSTRALIA, FOR AUSTRALIAN-BORN, 2001 CENSUS**

<i>2nd Generation Total (Through Father)</i>	<i>Total Non-response to Ancestry</i>	<i>Non-response Rate (%)</i>
1,168,772	37,299	3.19

Those with the reverse combination are less likely than ‘full’ second generation Australians, to have responded:

**TABLE 14: NON-RESPONSE RATE FOR ANCESTRY BY MOTHER BORN OVERSEAS AND FATHER IN AUSTRALIA, FOR AUSTRALIAN-BORN, 2001 CENSUS**

<i>2nd Generation Total (Through Mother)</i>	<i>Total Non-response to Ancestry</i>	<i>Non-response Rate (%)</i>
755,508	25,892	3.43

The data shows that those with a father (rather than a mother) only born overseas were more likely to respond to Ancestry.

## APPENDIX 2: Ancestry Loss with just One Parent Born Overseas

While first and second generation Australians losing Ancestries totalled only 14.9% of Ancestry Losers, if the strict definition of second generation was discarded, the percentage lost would climb:

**TABLE 15: ANCESTRY LOSS BY FATHER BORN OVERSEAS AND MOTHER BORN IN AUSTRALIA, FOR AUSTRALIAN-BORN, 2001 DQI SAMPLE**

<i>DQI Total Ancestry Losers by Birthplace</i>	<i>2nd Generation Australian Total Ancestry Losers</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Multiplier to Full Australia Figure</i>	<i>Estimated Australia-wide Total of 2nd Generation Ancestry Losers</i>
26,155	3,012	11.5	49.93	150,389

With Father only born overseas, the cumulative percentage loss climbs to 26.4%.

**TABLE 16: ANCESTRY LOSS BY MOTHER BORN OVERSEAS AND FATHER BORN IN AUSTRALIA, FOR AUSTRALIAN-BORN, 2001 DQI SAMPLE**

<i>DQI Total Ancestry Losers by Birthplace</i>	<i>2nd Generation Australian Total Ancestry Losers</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Multiplier to Full Australia Figure</i>	<i>Estimated Australia-wide Total of 2nd Generation Ancestry Losers</i>
26,155	2,323	8.9	49.93	115,987

A further 8.9%, means the cumulative percentage of all Ancestry Losers that were first or second generation Australians Losers reached 35.3%.