

Changes in the Geographic Dispersion of Urban Employment in Australia

by

Boyd Hamilton HUNTER

1995

Declaration

This thesis was written while I was studying at the Economics Program, Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian National University. The opinions expressed are my own work, unless otherwise acknowledged in the text.

Boyd Hunter

May 1995

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank my supervisors Professor Bob Gregory, Dr. Steve Dowrick and Dr. Trevor Breusch for their advice and constructive criticism during the preparation of this thesis. I would particularly like to thank Professor Gregory for his thinly disguised mentorship and support.

Numerous people have offered helpful comments and advice on parts of this thesis. I would also like to thank Mr. Tom Karmel, Dr. Deborah Mitchell, Dr. Bruce Chapman, Dr. Raja Junankar, Professor Fred Gruen, Professor Max Neutze, Professor Patrick Troy and Ms Lou Will for their constructive comments which were useful in refining the thesis finally produced. These individuals do not necessarily agree with all the opinions expressed in this thesis.

The assistance of the staff at the Social Sciences Data Archives in providing the data is gratefully acknowledged. I would particularly like to thank John Pennhallurick and Dr. Roger Jones for their assistance in acquiring the appropriate data.

Chapter 4 was presented in a draft form to the Australian Labour Market Research Workshop on 17 February 1994 and the Metropolitan Seminar at Parliament House, 17 March 1994. Chapter 5 is a refinement of research conducted for the Department of Human Services in April 1994. I would like to thank all participants who contributed to discussion in the various forums.

Finally, a special thanks to Ngaire Hosking for her selection of a suitable cartoon and her tireless support throughout the thesis.

I am solely responsible for any errors or shortcomings.

Abstract

This thesis is an empirical investigation of the concentration of employment in Australian cities since 1976. In 1976, Australians shared the same access to employment irrespective of where they lived. However, by 1991 the employment–population ratios varied systematically by socio-economic status. The purpose of this thesis is to use a variety of basic statistical techniques to discern whether it matters where one lives.

A panel of 9384 small urban areas is constructed from the last four censuses to enable us to fully document the increasing spatial employment inequality in urban areas and to analyse the possible causes and effects of this increase. The first two chapters describe the overall changes in employment inequality in the urban panel using several summary indexes. Group averages from deciles ranked by socio-economic status are used to illustrate the nature of the problem.

The more formal analysis of the causes of increasing inequality commences with a shift share analysis of the changes in employment levels. The results show that national changes in industry structure play an important role in determining the intra-urban distribution of employment. The index of sectoral change also varies systematically within Australian cities, with sectoral change being concentrated in low status areas. The apparent importance of industry structure in determining the geographic dispersion of employment points to employment demand being a significant part of the story.

Basic regression techniques and principal component analysis are also used to shed light on several possible inter-related causes and effects of the increasing inequality of employment–population ratios including: increased concentrations of personal characteristics, spatial mismatch, neighbourhood effects and the development of an underclass.

There are three main findings about the causes and effects of neighbourhood employment inequality. Firstly, spatial mismatch within or between Australian cities is not an important explanation of the changes in the geographic dispersion of employment. Outside Sydney the location of workers *vis-à-vis* firms does not influence neighbourhood employment–population ratios. However, even in Sydney, spatial mismatch provides a very limited explanation of neighbourhood inequality.

Secondly, substantial neighbourhood-specific effects on employment–population ratios are apparent in the bottom decile(s) of urban neighbourhoods ranked by socio-economic status. These neighbourhood effects explain between one and two-thirds of the differential between the top and bottom decile. The rest of the differential can be explained by differences in endowments of personal characteristics such as human capital variables.

Finally, there is convincing evidence that class, and perhaps even an Australian underclass, are important determinants of the distribution of employment outcomes. The underclass in Australia, as measured using techniques similar to US studies, is still very small but is increasing at an alarming rate. However, the sensitivity analysis shows that the underclass, so measured, is closely related to a more general concept of class captured in standard socio-economic status indexes.

The scope of this thesis is limited by the regional aggregates supplied in all four censuses. Regional aggregates prevent us from asking subtle questions about who is being affected by the observed changes. The lack of adequate individual-level migration data for neighbourhoods means that it is not possible to directly test any hypothesis about social mobility. This thesis is merely a preliminary analysis of whether the local social environment is important.

Contents

Declaration	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii
Contents	v
List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	xi
1 Introduction	1
Structure of the Thesis	4
Appendix A1.1a: Maps of Socio-Economic Status	10
Part 1 Construction and Description of the Urban Panel	12
2 Neighbourhood Inequality In Australia: A Descriptive Approach	13
2.0 Introduction	13
2.1 Data	13
Construction of the Urban Panel	13
Characterising Australian Neighbourhoods	14
2.2 Macro-economic Changes in Urban Labour Markets	16
2.3 Summary Measures of Neighbourhood Inequality of Employment Status	17
2.4 Describing the Changes in the Social Structure of Employment	19
Unemployment Rates	21
Participation Rates	22
Industry Structure	25
2.8 Conclusion	28
Appendix A2.1 Variable Definitions and Descriptions	30
Construction of Variables	34
Appendix A2.2 Representativeness of the Sample	35
Appendix A2.3 Structure of Employment by Industry	37
Appendix A2.4 Measures of Mismatch	39
Spatial Mismatch and the Turbulence Index	41
Spatial Mismatch within Australian Urban Areas	42

Part 2 Causes of the Increasing Geographic Dispersion of Employment–Population Ratios in Australia	44
3 Employment Demand and Industrial Mismatch Within Australian Cities	45
3.0 Introduction	45
3.1 Decomposition of Changes in Employment–Population Ratios	46
3.2 Shift Share Analysis of Employment Levels	49
Derivation of Shift Share Decomposition	49
Shift Share Analysis by Industry Across Socio-Economic Groups	52
3.3 Structural Change in the Industrial Composition Within Australian Cities	55
3.4 Discussion	59
Spatial Mismatch and the Shift Share Analysis	61
4 Spatial Mismatch in Australian Cities	63
4.0 Introduction	63
4.1 Ellwood's Spatial Mismatch Model	64
Survey of the Empirical Literature on Spatial Mismatch	66
General Criticisms of the Spatial Mismatch Literature	71
4.2 Data	73
Proxies for Spatial Mismatch	73
4.3 Methodology	77
Selective Migration	79
4.5 Regression Analysis of Employment–Population Ratios	82
Sydney Results	82
Estimation of Spatial Mismatch in Melbourne and Other State Capitals	85
Does Spatial Mismatch Vary Over the Business Cycle?	86
Spatial Mismatch in Low-Status Neighbourhoods	87
4.6 Discussion	89
Appendix A4.1 Spatial Auto-correlation, Bias and Heteroscedasticity in Models of Spatial Mismatch	94
Appendix A4.2 Estimating Spatial Mismatch	96
Variable Definitions	96
5 Neighbourhood Effects Hypothesis: Explaining Changes in Employment and Participation Rates	102
5.0 Introduction	102
5.1 A Description of the Changes in Employment–Population Ratios	104
5.2 Neighbourhood Effects	105
Basic Fixed Effects Models	105
Heteroscedasticity	107
Specification of Variables	108
Endogenising Migration Rates	109
Employment and Participation Rates	110

5.3	Estimation of the Fixed Effects Models	111
	Estimation of Changes in Employment–Population Ratios for Each Inter-censal Period	114
5.4	Is Geography Important?	116
5.6	Estimations for Sydney and Other Cities	120
5.7	Discussion	122
	Neighbourhood Effects on Employment and Participation Rates	123
	Ecological Fallacy	124
	Neighbourhood Effects and Spatial Mismatch	125
	Neighbourhood Effects on Participation and the Potential Underclass	127
	Appendix A5.1 Demographic Decompositions of Employment–Population Ratios	129
	Appendix A5.2 Estimation of Models	132
	Appendix A5.3 The Systematic Variation of the Fixed Effects and Spatial Mismatch	137
6	Explaining Changes in the Social Structure of Employment: The Importance of Geography	139
6.0	Introduction	139
6.1	How have Endowments Changed?	140
	Educational Endowments	140
	Demographic Changes	142
	Industry Endowments	143
6.2	Cross-sectional Models of Employment–Population Ratios	143
6.3	Why are Australian Cities Different Places in 1991 Compared with 1976?	146
	Differences in Endowments	146
	Blinder Decomposition of the Average Changes Between 1976 and 1991	148
	Differences in Coefficients	149
6.4	Why are Low-status Neighbourhoods Different?	151
	Blinder Decomposition of Employment–Population Differential Between Low-status and Other Neighbourhoods	153
	Endowment Components	154
	Coefficient Components	155
	Changes in Blinder Decomposition of the Differential Between Low-Status and Other Neighbourhoods	157
6.5	Explaining Changes in the Social Structure of Employment	159
6.6	Discussion	162
	Appendix A6.1 TSLS Estimation of Employment–Populations Ratios	165
Part 3	Effects of the Increasing Geographic Dispersion of Employment–Population Ratios in Australia	171
7	Is There an Australian Underclass?	172
7.0	Introduction	172

7.1	A Brief Review of the Underclass Literature	173
7.2	Measuring the Underclass	176
7.3	Is there an Australian Underclass?	177
7.4	Where are these Underclass Areas?	180
7.5	Sensitivity Analysis of the Changing Extent of the Underclass Areas	183
7.6	Concentration of Risk Behaviours in Urban Areas	186
	Dropping out of School	186
	Welfare Dependency	187
	Single Parent Families	188
7.5	Discussion	189
Appendix A7.1	Sensitivity Analysis—A Principal Component Approach to the Underclass	192
8	Conclusion	194
	The Main Findings	194
	Spatial Mismatch Versus Personal Characteristics	195
	Neighbourhood Effects	196
	Is there an Australian Underclass?	197
	Policies for Addressing Extreme Neighbourhood Disadvantage	199
	Ghetto Gilding	199
	Ghetto Dispersal	200
	Mobility Strategy	201
	Suggestions For Further Research	202
Appendix A8.1	Australian Income Inequality—The Regional Dimension	206
	How Important is Spatial Income Inequality?	207
	References	211

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Population-weighted Coefficient of Variation for Selected Variables	17
Table A2.1	Correspondences Between the CCLO and ASCO Classifications	32
Table A2.2	Descriptive Statistics of Selected Variables	35
Table A2.3a	Female Population Between 15 and 64 Employed in Various Industry Sectors (%)	37
Table A2.3b	Male Population Between 15 and 64 Employed in Various Industry Sectors (%)	38
Table 2.4	Spatial Mismatch Within Australian Cities	41
Table 4.1	Studies of the Effects of Spatial Mismatch on Employment	68
Table 4.2	Rank Correlation of Spatial Mismatch Measures for Sydney and Melbourne	77
Table 4.3	Spatial Mismatch Measures for 1991 Census in all Panel CDs	83
Table 4.4	Spatial Mismatch Measures for 1986 Census in all Panel CDs	87
Table 4.5	Spatial Mismatch Measures for 1991 Census in Bottom Two Deciles of Socio-Economic Status	89
Table A4.2a	Descriptive Statistics For Sydney and Melbourne Regression Analysis	99
Table A4.2b	The 1991 Estimates of Employment–Population Ratios in Sydney	100
Table A4.2c	The 1991 Estimates of Employment–Population Ratios in Melbourne	101
Table 5.1	Residual and Actual Differences in Changes in Employment Status Between 1976 and 1991	118
Table 5.2	Residual Differentials in Sydney and Other Cities Residuals	121
Table A5.1	Non-Behavioural Decomposition of Changes in Employment–Population Ratios by Demographic Groups Between 1986 and 1991	130
Table A5.2a	Descriptive Statistics for Two-Factor Fixed Effects Estimation	133
Table A5.2b	TSLS Estimates of Employment Status Between 1976 and 1991	134
Table A5.2c	TSLS Estimates of Employment Status Between 1976 and 1991	135
Table A5.2d	Inter-censal TSLS Estimates of Employment–Population Ratios	136
Table 6.1	Decomposition of Average Change of Employment–Population Ratios between 1976 and 1991	149
Table 6.2	Blinder Decomposition of Cross-sectional Differentials between Low-status and Other Neighbourhoods	154
Table 6.3	Decomposition of Changes in the Differential of Employment–population Ratios between Low-status and Other Neighbourhoods	160
Table A6.1a	Estimation of Male Employment–Population Ratios in All Areas	165
Table A6.1b	Estimation of Female Employment–Population Ratios in All Areas	166
Table A6.1c	Estimation of Male Employment–Population Ratios in Low-status Areas	167
Table A6.1d	Estimation of Female Employment–Population Ratios in Low-status Areas	168
Table A6.1e	Estimation of Male Employment–Population Ratio in Other Areas	169

Table A6.1f	Estimation of Female Employment–Population Ratio in All Other Areas	170
Table 7.1	Instability in the Australian Underclass Areas: Correspondences Between Underclass Neighbourhoods	181
Table 7.2	Rank Correlation of Underclass Indicators in 1976 Census	184
Table 7.3	Distribution of the Underclass Measure Based on Principal Components	185
Table A7.1	The Standardised Scoring Coefficients for the Principal Component Measure of the Underclass in 1976	193
Table A7.2	Descriptive Statistics for the Factor Calculated from the Principal Component Analysis in 1976	193
Table A8.1	Regional Dimension to Income Inequality in the Urban Panel	206
Table A8.2	Percentage of Total Income Inequality Attributable to Inter-Regional Inequality in Urban Areas	208

Lists of Figures

Figure 1.1	The Increasing Concentration of Unemployment in Neighbourhoods With High Unemployment Rates	2
Figure 1.2	The Changing Social Structure of Employment	3
Figure 2.1	Female Employment–Population Ratio by Socio-Economic Status	19
Figure 2.2	Male Employment–Population Ratio by Socio-economic Status	20
Figure 2.3	The Concentration of Female Unemployment in Low-status Areas	21
Figure 2.4	The Concentration of Male Unemployment in Low-Status Areas	22
Figure 2.5	Discouraged Worker Effect on Female Participation	23
Figure 2.6	Discouraged Worker Effect on Male Participation	24
Figure 2.7	The Manufacturing Sector and the Social Structure of Female Employment	26
Figure 2.8	The Manufacturing Sector and the Social Structure of Male Employment	26
Figure 2.9	The Community Services Sector and the Social Structure of Female Employment	27
Figure 2.10	The Wholesale and Retail Sector and the Social Structure of Female Employment	28
Figure A2.4	Spatial Mismatch Across Major Urban Areas Between 1976 and 1991	42
Figure 3.1	Comparison of Changes in Employment Levels, Population Levels and Participation Rates for Females Between 1976 and 1991	47
Figure 3.2	Comparison of Changes in Employment Levels, Population Levels and Participation Rates for Males Between 1976 and 1991	48
Figure 3.3	Shift Share Analysis of Employment by Industry Between 1976 and 1991	52
Figure 3.4	Industrial Mix Contribution to Employment Demand	54
Figure 3.5	Shift Share Analysis by Industry Between 1986 and 1991	55
Figure 3.6	Inter-sectoral Changes in Employment By Industry Across Socio-Economic Areas Between 1976 and 1991	57
Figure 4.1	Access to Labour Market in Sydney and Melbourne in 1986	76
Figure A4.2a	Map of a Spatial Measure of Access to Employment in Sydney	97
Figure A4.2b	Map of a Spatial Measure of Access to Employment in Melbourne	98
Figure 5.1	Decomposition of the Change in Female Employment–Population Ratios Between 1976 and 1991	104
Figure 5.2	Decomposition of Change in Male Employment–Population Ratios Between 1976 and 1991	105
Figure 5.3	Decomposition of Residual Change in Female Employment–Population Ratios Between 1976 and 1991	113
Figure 5.4	Decomposition of Residual Change in Male Employment–Population Ratios Between 1976 and 1991	113

Figure 5.5	Residual Changes in Female Employment–Population Ratios	115
Figure 5.6	Residual Changes in Male Employment–Population Ratios	115
Figure A5.3a	Importance of Fixed Effects in the Structure of Female Employment–Population Ratios Within Cities	137
Figure A5.3b	Importance of Fixed Effects in the Structure of Male Employment–Population Ratios Within Cities	138
Figure 6.1	Proportion of Females Without Post-Secondary Qualifications	141
Figure 6.2	Proportion of Males Without Post-Secondary Qualifications	141
Figure 6.3	The Effect of Changes in Endowments On Male Employment–Population Ratios	146
Figure 6.4	The Effect of Changes in Endowments On Female Employment–Population Ratios	147
Figure 7.1	Proportion of Population Who Left School at or Before 15	187
Figure 7.2	Proportion of Population that Lives in Public Housing	188
Figure 7.3	Proportion of Families with a Single Parent	189
Figure 8.1	Average Household Income versus Socio-Economic Status	203

