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**MIGRANT KNOWLEDGE WORKERS: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF GLOBAL SYDNEY AS A KNOWLEDGE CITY**

**Abstract:** Global Sydney is essentially a knowledge city. The global Sydney thesis has focused on Sydney’s performances in the knowledge-based economy, especially the advanced producer services, in an increasingly integrated world economy. Sydney’s emergence as a global city has been inseparable from its migrants from overseas and elsewhere in Australia. This study aims to bridge the theses of global Sydney and migration. The focus is on migrant knowledge workers employed in the knowledge-intensive industries and highly skilled occupations, which are the most reflective of Sydney’s knowledge capacity. Using data from the 2011 Australian Census and a community survey in the Sydney region, this study reveals new insights into the different patterns between international and internal migrant knowledge workers in terms of social-economic backgrounds, drivers for moving to Sydney, and employment before and in Sydney. The findings are useful to better understand migrant knowledge workers in global Sydney, and to contribute to the global city discourse and knowledge city research.
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**Highlights**
- A study on migrant knowledge workers employed in the knowledge-intensive industries and highly skilled occupations in Sydney.
- A complete analysis of data from the 2011 Australian Census and a community survey.
- New insights into the different patterns between international and internal migrant knowledge workers.
- Better understanding of global Sydney as a knowledge city and its relationship with migration.

1. **Introduction**

A global city is first of all a knowledge city. One critique to the discourse of global city and its knowledge capacity is that it is economic-centric and has not tackled migration to the extent it should (Samers, 2002; Benton-Short, Price, & Friedman, 2005; Ewers, 2007). Using economic measures as criteria of global cities is one dimensional, and fails to capture the multiple aspects of the relationship between globalization and cities. Sassen (1999) argues that we need to conceptualize globalization in broader senses than just the internationalization of capital and finance, and that migration should be seen as an equally central component of globalization as trade and finance. Flows of people and knowledge workers should not be separated from economic globalization. Freeman (2006) contends that people flows are fundamental to creating a global economy and that the interplay among immigration, capital, and trade is essential to understanding the way globalization affects economies. In the global city discourse, there should be an alternative research agenda to redress the lack of focus on the relationship between global cities and migration (Samers, 2002). This article is an effort to link global city and migration, utilizing Sydney as a case study. It pays attention to the
migrant knowledge workers (MKWs) to capture the essentiality of global city as a knowledge city.

Sydney is Australia’s leading global city. Global Sydney is essentialized in its knowledge capacity. The global Sydney thesis has been argued and testified by international and local writers (see Friedmann, 1986, 1995; Searle, 1996, 1998; Baum, 1997; Beaverstock, Taylor, & Smith, 1999; Godfrey & Zhou, 1999; Connell, 2000; Daly & Pritchard, 2000; Taylor, 2004; McNeill, Dowling, & Fagan, 2005; Searle & Valence, 2005; Fagan, 2000; Taylor et al., 2011; Hu, 2012a; Hu, Blakely, & Zhou, 2013). Likewise, economic globalization is the core of the global Sydney thesis, focusing on its capacity of providing global services that are knowledge-based. Meanwhile, Sydney’s rise as a global city has been accompanied by growing foreign-born population (Burnley, 2000; Hugo, 2008). The 2011 Australian Census indicates that Sydney has the largest population, the highest percentage of foreign-born population, and the most diverse ethnic groups, of all Australian major cities. In 2001-2011, metropolitan Sydney’s foreign-born living population increased from 31% to 34%, and foreign born working population increased from 36% to 40%. This trend is more prominent in central Sydney, where the knowledge-intensive sectors of global Sydney tend to concentrate. In the same period, central Sydney’s foreign-born living population increased from 31% to 38%, and foreign-born working population increased from 40% to 45%.

This article aims to link global Sydney with migration through the nexus of MKWs to capture the essentiality of global Sydney as a knowledge city. Using data from the 2011 Australian Census and a community survey in the Sydney region, it compares the different patterns between international and domestic MKWs in terms of social-economic backgrounds, drivers for moving to Sydney, and employment in knowledge-intensive industries and highly skilled occupations. Following this introduction, the next section is a literature review that reveals the need of bridging global Sydney and migration in scholarship. Methods and results of this study are offered in the following two sections. This article concludes with a discussion of findings to better understand the MKWs in global Sydney, and to contribute to the global city discourse and knowledge city research.

2. Global Sydney as a knowledge city and migration

2.1. Global Sydney as a knowledge city

Scholarly work has been undertaken on Sydney’s rise as a global city judging from multiple transformations of its knowledge-based capacities. They include Sydney’s macroeconomic transformations, as well as the transformations of certain knowledge-intensive sectors that are the most impacted by contemporary globalization. The macroeconomic transformations include industrial shift from manufacturing to a post-industrial information economy (Fagan, 2000); changes in employment structure, and growth in global command and control functions, finance sector, and international economic connections (Searle, 1996); the emergence of a knowledge-based economy (Stein, 2002); and the cultural industries that constitute part of Sydney’s connectivity with the world city network (Mould, 2007). The financial sector and the advanced producer services, the defining functions of global cities, have attracted the most scholarly interest in arguing for global Sydney in international and national contexts. A global Sydney is reflected by being the headquarters of multinationals, producer services, and financial services in national, Asia Pacific, and international contexts (Stein, 2002). Nationally, Sydney is dominating Australian urban landscape in terms of agglomeration of advanced producer services (Spiller, 2003), and
in terms of agglomeration of corporate headquarters, particularly in real estate, and insurance and investment services (Tonts & Taylor, 2010). Daly and Pritchard (2000) provide a historical narrative of Sydney’s growth to be Australia’s financial and corporate capital, and its relation to the international financial system and the local political and geographical factors, such as the political aspiration for a global city and connections with Asia. O’Neill and McGuirk (2002, 2003, 2005) reveal the financialization of economic activities and its spatial manifestations in the Sydney region, and its impacts on office work in central Sydney through the practices of association, interaction, and shared work space.

There have been studies into the spatial concentration of the knowledge economy in central Sydney, to testify the thesis that global activities tend to be located in the central business districts (CBDs) of global cities (Sassen, 1995, 2001). Hu (2012a) provides a systematic analysis of the concentration of the knowledge economy in central Sydney in relation to metropolitan Sydney, and points out the strengthening trend of the concentration. The increasing concentration of the knowledge economy has been accompanied by a growing experience economy in central Sydney (Hu, 2014). Hu (2012b) contends that the concentration of the knowledge economy and the experience economy in central Sydney is related to important planning transformation to shape a global Sydney in the 1980s and 1990s. Other studies reveal the formation of certain knowledge-intensive clusters in central Sydney. They include a traditional central city focus of producer services that has been reinforced by globalization (Searle, 1998), an emerging inner city multimedia cluster (graphic design, advertising and related media) (Searle & Valence, 2005), and a concentration of the creative population living in and around central Sydney (Gibson, 2006). There is also a cluster of information technology and telecommunications in northern Sydney, whose expansion, however, has been motivated primarily by the increasingly centrality of advanced producer services within the high-order business sector in central Sydney (Searle & Pritchard, 2005). Consequently, Sydney’s rise as a global city is reflected by the growth and concentration of its knowledge-based capacities. Global Sydney is essentially a knowledge city according to the conceptualization of knowledge city (Yigitcanlar, O’Connor, & Westerman, 2008).

2.2. Migration

There has been some scholarly attention to the increasing scale and complexity of migration and its changing characteristics, including a growing component of knowledge workers, during the process of Sydney’s emergence as a global city. Australian international migration has undergone significant transformations in the last few decades of globalization in terms of nature, composition, and effects (Collins, 2006; Hugo, 2006b, 2008). Hugo (2006b) argues that the transformations constitute a paradigmatic shift in Australian international migration; one dimension of the shift is the increasing role played by the Australian cities most linked into the global economic system, especially Sydney. The global city discourse shows some interest in the complex roles played by international immigrants (Friedmann, 1986; Sassen, 2001; Samers, 2002; Benton-Short, Price, & Friedman, 2005). This is relevant to Sydney because of its emergent global city status and its attraction of a disproportionate amount of the overseas immigration to Australia (Burnley, 1998). Internationally, Sydney was ranked as an Alpha city in an Urban Immigrant Index, following New York, Toronto, Dubai, Los Angeles, and London (Benton-Short, Price, & Friedman, 2005).

Migration patterns in global Sydney have experienced a variety of changes. One prominent change is demographic and cultural, referring to the growing scale and diversity of foreign-born population in Sydney (Burnley, 2000; Hugo, 2008), and in particular.
immigration flows from different parts of Asia (Burnley, 1998). In addition, Hugo (2008) identifies three important new characteristics of migration in global Sydney: the increasingly significant non-permanent migration, or circulation of transnationals; Sydney as a gateway for emigrants leaving the country; and the important relationships between international and internal migration. They include increases in temporary migration and knowledge workers in Sydney, which have been related to changes in Australian immigration policy. The most striking shift in Australian international migration policy is the move away from a favor of permanent settlement toward a complex array of visa categories with a range of lengths of stay, and toward a focus on skill in selection of migrants (Hugo, 2006b). The policy effect, coupled with Sydney’s increasing integration with the world economy, is that Sydney has a crucial gateway function not only for permanent settlers, but also for large numbers of temporary migrants who circulate between Sydney and other world cities, including many transnationals who move from one world city to another owing to job transfers or who change jobs within global labor markets (Hugo, 2008). The latter group of knowledge workers constitutes the knowledge base of global cities.

Not only is Sydney a gateway of permanent and temporary migration into Australia, but also a significant gateway through which Australians leave the country, knowledge workers in particular. In the 1990s, there was an upsurge in the permanent and long-term emigration of people born in Australia, and over two-thirds of them were managers, administrators, professionals, and para-professionals (Hugo, Rudd, & Harris, 2003). Around 1 million Australians currently live outside their homeland on a permanent or long-term basis, constituting a meaningful and distinctive Australian diaspora overseas (Hugo, 2006a). Sydney has been functioning as a ‘launching point’ for many young Australians to move to overseas destinations, predominantly to higher-order global cities, or as an ‘escalator region’ whereby it attracts young skilled immigrants from elsewhere in Australia who subsequently move to higher-order global cities (Hugo, 2008). The second type of out-migration from Sydney is especially characteristic of second- or lower-order global cities, which act as conduits to the most dominant global cities, especially New York and London; there may also be some type of ‘hierarchical cascade effect’ whereby global cities like Sydney attract substantial numbers of immigrants from cities in less developed countries, but in turn also experience a loss of natives to higher-order global cities (Hugo, 2008).

2.3. Bridging global Sydney and migration

Global Sydney’s increasing knowledge capacity and its growing migration are concurrent processes, and are intrinsically linked. The global Sydney thesis and the migration thesis have been developing in parallel. This study is an effort to bridge them through the nexus of MKWs, the migrant population who work for the global services in Sydney, which are most knowledge-intensive and require high skills. It moves from the traditional perception of migration as foreign-born population, and classifies migration into international migration and internal migration according to whether they moved from overseas or elsewhere in Australia. Comparing international migration and internal migration working for the knowledge-intensive industries and the highly skilled occupations, this study bridges the global Sydney thesis and the migration thesis, and captures the essentiality of global Sydney as a knowledge city. Methodologically, it adds to the existing analytical angles that either highlight the differences between high-end and low-end immigrants (Hugo, 2008), or emphasize the difference between locals and immigrants (Baum, 1997). Furthermore, comparing international and internal MKWs expands the scope of studies on the residential
locations of knowledge workers within a knowledge-based urban development region or an intra-metropolitan area (Chang, Lee, Lin, & Hu, 2010; Frenkel, Bendit, & Kaplan, 2013).

3. Methods

This study uses data from the Australian 2011 Census and a community survey to understand MKWs who moved from both overseas and elsewhere in Australia to work in global Sydney. Geographically, global Sydney refers to the Greater Sydney region, whose boundary is defined by the Sydney Statistical Division in the Australian Statistical Geography Classification (ASGC). It has a land area of 12,428 km², and had a resident population of 4,428,976 in the Australian 2011 Census.

The Five Years Usual Residence Indicator in the Australian 2011 Census was used to collect data for migrant workers moving from overseas and elsewhere in Australia into global Sydney in 2006-2011. The data was filtered for the working-age population of 15-64 years old. The international migrants and internal migrants were compared in terms of age cohorts, educational qualifications, income brackets, industries of employment, and occupations of employment. Built upon the census information, a community survey was carried out to understand the drivers for the international and internal migrants to move into global Sydney, and to compare the industries and occupations of the MKWs before and after they arrived in Sydney. Representative communities in the Sydney region were selected for the survey. They are the City of Sydney, North Sydney, Canada Bay, Leichhardt, Burwood, and Ashfield (see Figure 1).

Of the 307 online responses, 42% are international migrants, and 30% internal migrants (see Table 1). Respondents who moved from overseas are classified as international migrants; respondents who moved from elsewhere in Australia (outside the Greater Sydney) are classified as internal migrants. Two sets of criteria were used to classify MKWs. One set of criteria is that the migrants should work in the knowledge-intensive industries, including Information Media and Telecommunications; Financial and Insurance Services; Professional, Scientific and Technical Services; and Education and Training, as classified in the Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC) 2006. The other set of criteria is that the migrants should work in the highly skilled occupations, including Manager and Professional, as classified in the Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO) 2006.
4. Results

4.1. Migrant workers

Figures 2 to 6 illustrate information from the Australian 2011 Census concerning international and internal migrants at the working ages (15-64) in global Sydney. Figures 2 to 4 compare them by age cohorts, qualifications, and income brackets. Figure 5 and 6 compare their industries of employment and occupations of employment.

Sydney attracted the most young people (20-40s) from both overseas and Australia (see Figure 2). International migrants have much higher proportions in the age groups of 25-39, while internal migrants have higher proportions in younger or older age cohorts. International migrants have much higher educational qualifications than their internal counterparts (see Figure 3). The contrast is more impressive in university level qualifications (Bachelor and Postgraduate degrees). Internal migrants have a much higher proportion in below-university qualification of Certificate level. Overall, international migrants are financially worse-off than internal migrants (see Figure 4). The income inequality becomes even bigger in the higher income brackets. International migrants have slightly higher proportions than internal migrants in the lower-income brackets (less than $31,200 per year). On the contrary, internal migrants have considerably higher proportions than international migrants in the higher-income brackets (more than $31,200 per year). The overall trend of annual income for internal migrants is that higher proportions of internal migrants fall into higher income brackets. The international migrants indicate a bifurcating trend: higher proportions of international migrants fall into lower and higher income brackets, while the medium income bracket ($65,000-77,999) has the lowest proportion of international migrants.

[INSERT FIGURE 2]

[INSERT FIGURE 3]

[INSERT FIGURE 4]

International migrants and internal migrants demonstrate converging and diverging patterns in industries of employment (see Figure 5). The following industry divisions employ higher proportions of migrant workers (more than 6%) in global Sydney: Manufacturing; Retail Trade; Accommodation and Food Services; Financial and Insurance Services; Professional, Scientific and Technical Services; Public Administration and Safety; Education and Training; and Health Care and Social Assistance. They broadly fall into two groups of knowledge-intensive sectors and labor-intensive sectors, reflecting a polarization of migrant population in Sydney. The industry division of Professional, Scientific and Technical Services enjoys the highest proportion of migrant workers from overseas and Australia combined. The industry division of Accommodation and Food Services employs much higher proportion of international migrants than internal migrants; the industry division of Public Administration and Safety hires an even higher proportion of internal migrants than international migrants. Of the knowledge-intensive industries, the industry divisions of Financial and Insurance Services; and Professional, Scientific and Technical Services have higher proportions of international migrant workers, while the industry divisions of Information Media and Telecommunications; and Education and Training have higher proportions of internal migrant workers than international migrant workers. The occupation of Professionals has the highest proportion of migrant workers from both overseas and Australia (see Figure 6). It is followed by the occupation of Managers. In both of the higher levels of occupations, internal migrants have slightly higher proportions than international
migrants. International migrants have a higher proportion of laborers than their internal counterparts.

[INSERT FIGURE 5]
[INSERT FIGURE 6]

4.2 Migrant knowledge workers

Tables (3-5) provide results from the community survey to understand international and internal MKWs in global Sydney.

Sydney has attracted migrants to live and work there for different reasons (see Table 2). More than 50% of the respondents indicate the following factors as ‘strong’ or ‘very strong’ factors for their decisions to move to global Sydney: lifestyle (83.1%); ease of access to transport and utilities (75.1%); job or career opportunities (58.4%); being close to spouse, family and/or friends (51.2%); and safety and security (50.3%). Further comparison reveals that ‘job or career opportunities’ is a more important factor for international migrants, while ‘being close to spouse, family and/or friends’ is a more important factor for internal migrants. International and internal migrants indicate no significant difference in weighing the qualities of local communities in terms of ‘lifestyle’, ‘ease of access to transport and utilities’, and ‘safety and security’.

[INSERT TABLE 2]

Table 3 cross-tabulates international and internal MKWs’ industries of employment in Sydney and in previous place of residence. Of the international migrants surveyed, the most of them work in Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (21.5%) in Sydney, followed by Information Media and Telecommunications (14%). Of the internal migrants surveyed, the most of them work in Education and Training (17.4%) in Sydney, followed by Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (14%).

Compared to internal migrants, much higher proportions of international migrants work in the same knowledge-intensive industries in Sydney as their previous places of residence. Except for Financial and Insurance Services, more than half of international migrants work in the same knowledge-intensive industries in and before Sydney. In contrast, none of the knowledge-intensive industries have more than half of internal migrants working in the same industry in and before Sydney. The only exception is Professional, Scientific and Technical Services, which have exactly 50% of migrants working for it in and before Sydney.

International and internal MKWs’ demonstrate different patterns concerning industries of employment in and before Sydney. Of the international migrants working in Finance and Insurance Services before Sydney, 11.1% of them choose to work in Information Media and Telecommunications, and 22.2% choose to work in Professional, Scientific and Technical Services in Sydney. Of the internal migrants working in Information Media and Telecommunications before Sydney, 20% of them choose to work in Education and Training in Sydney. For the internal migrants working in Professional, Scientific and Technical Services before Sydney, 12.5% of them choose to work in Finance and Insurance Services; and Education and Training respectively in Sydney.

[INSERT TABLE 3]

Table 4 cross-tabulates international and internal MKWs’ occupations of employment in Sydney and in previous place of residence. Of the international migrants surveyed, 45.5% of them work as Professionals in Sydney. The proportion of working as Professionals is even
higher for internal migrants surveyed (51.2%). Manager is the second largest occupation for both internal and international migrants surveyed.

Compared to international migrants, much higher proportions of internal migrants work in the same higher levels of occupations in Sydney as their previous places of residence. More internal migrants maintain their occupation of Manager than of Professional. On the contrary, more international migrants maintain their occupation of Professional than of Manager. Of the international migrants working as Professionals before Sydney, nearly 10% of them choose to work as Managers in Sydney. Of the internal migrants working as Managers before Sydney, 14.3% of them choose to work as Professionals in Sydney.

[INSERT TABLE 4]

5. Concluding discussion

This study provides new insights into international and internal migrants in global Sydney as a knowledge city, in particular the MKWs working for knowledge-intensive industries and highly skilled occupations. Global Sydney has attracted younger international migrants with higher educational qualifications, compared to their internal counterparts. This reflects a major transformation of an increasing focus on skill in selection of migrants in Australian immigration policy since the early 1990s, which “has been largely a result of globalization and a response to it” (Hugo, 2006b, p. 107). On the other hand, internal migrants are financially better-off than their international counterparts, especially in higher income brackets. In industries of employment, although a polarization exists between migrants for knowledge-intensive sectors and labor-intensive sectors, international migrants and internal migrants have both converging and diverging patterns. But in higher levels of occupations, internal migrants enjoy slightly higher proportions than international migrants. Inequality exists between international and internal migrants in terms of income and occupational structure.

Leading driving factors for migrants to move to global Sydney do not deviate much from those identified in the scholarship on competitiveness of cities in attracting and retaining knowledge workers (Ewers, 2007; Yigitcanlar, Baum, & Horton, 2007; Hu, Blakely, & Zhou, 2013). The uniqueness of Sydney is its lifestyle, which is found to be the most attractive factor for migrants from both overseas and elsewhere in Australia. Job or career opportunity is more important for international migrants, while proximity to spouse, family and/or friends is more important for internal migrants. The driving factors for internal migrants incorporate those for residential location of knowledge workers within a region or an intra-metropolitan area (Chang, Lee, Lin, & Hu, 2010; Frenkel, Bendit, & Kaplan, 2013), as well as extra-metropolitan and inter-state migrants.

The different patterns between international and internal migrants are more prominent with MKWs, viewed through the lenses of industries and occupations of employment before and in global Sydney. Higher proportions of international MKWs work for the same knowledge-intensive industries before and in Sydney, compared to their internal counterparts. However, much higher proportions of internal MKWs work for the same highly skilled occupations before and in Sydney, compared to their international counterparts. It follows that internal MKWs have more flexibility in choosing knowledge-intensive industries, and are more likely to retain higher levels of occupations after moving to Sydney. Conversely, international MKWs are more likely to work in the same knowledge-intensive industries, but tend to work at lower levels of occupations after moving to global Sydney.
Global Sydney is a knowledge city and a migration city: it relies on migrants from overseas and Australia, especially the MKWs, for its global capacities and knowledge-based sectors. International migrants and internal migrants demonstrate different patterns in being associated with global Sydney as a knowledge city. Results from analyzing the Australian 2011 Census show the inequality in income and occupational structure between international and internal migrants; the community survey results further reveal the differentiated patterns in choices of knowledge-intensive industries and highly skilled occupations between international and internal MKWs. Including international and internal migrants, and MKWs in particular, adds a new dimension to the global city—polarization thesis in Sydney, which mostly looks at changes in occupational structure and income polarization (Baum, 1997). It also adds a new dimension to the understanding of attraction and retention of knowledge workers in knowledge cities (Yigitcanlar, Baum, & Horton, 2007; Yigitcanlar, O’Connor, & Westerman, 2008).

The study on global Sydney as a knowledge city and migration contributes to the global city discourse and knowledge city research. Firstly, integrating global Sydney as a knowledge city and migration offers a new research agenda. The existing research has not sufficiently addressed the relationship between global Sydney’s knowledge capacity and migration. This is in line with the critique to the global city discourse that a focus on the business and technological dimensions of global cities is accompanied by the lack of focus on the relationship between immigration and global cities (Samers, 2002; Benton-Short, Price, & Friedman, 2005). In effect, migration constituted an important component of the original global city hypothesis. In Friedmann’s (1986) world city hypothesis, world cities are points of destination for large number of both domestic and/or international migrants. For Sassen (1991), global cities are not only the centers of command and control in an increasingly globalized economy, but also the main destinations for immigrants. The subsequent development of the global city discourse, including the global Sydney thesis, has highlighted the dimension of economic globalization and global cities as the centers of command and control (Taylor, 2004; Taylor et al., 2011), which are essentially knowledge-based. This study is more than a return back to the original conceptualization of global cities as destinations of migration. It pays particular attention to the MKWs who work for the global services and knowledge sectors that define global cities’ roles as command and control centers of the integrated world economy. The relationship between global city and migration is articulated via the essentiality of global city as a knowledge city.

Secondly, global Sydney as a knowledge city provides a meaningful spatial unit for migration analysis. The importance of city-based analysis of contemporary globalization has been acknowledged in the discourse of global city and knowledge city. The nation state-based macroeconomic changes of post-industrial economy, international division of labor, and competition for capital, technology, and talents, are impacting cities as the gateways for the new wave of globalization. One direct result is that a single world economic system is overtaking the traditional economic roles and powers of nation states, and cities are emerging as dominant spatial scales replacing countries as central nodes in the world economy (Friedmann & Wolff, 1982; Friedmann, 1986; Sassen, 1991, 1994). In this process, some cities are growing to be world cities or global cities, and are emerging as key world locations and as a new ‘sub-national scale of economic agency’ (Pain, 2008, p. 28). Global city regions are now ‘active agents in shaping globalization itself’ as ‘motors’ or new ‘spatial nodes’ of the global economy (Scott, 2001, p. 11). The command and control roles in the world economy are essentialized in the knowledge capacity of global cities. However, our understanding of the dynamics of immigration in shaping the knowledge base of global cities and its effects remains limited. A barrier to this search for understanding is a failure to
recognize that the global city is an important and appropriate unit for analyzing the effects of both immigration and internal migration (Hugo, 2008). This study employs a city-based approach to analyzing international and internal migration, utilizing global Sydney as a spatial unit and focusing on the MKW for its knowledge capacities. It proves a valid approach for providing insights into the relationship between migration and global Sydney as a knowledge city.

To sum up, this study combines results from the Australian 2011 Census and a community survey to provide a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of the international and internal migrants, MKWs in particular, in global Sydney as a knowledge city. Their different patterns offer new insights into the relationship between global Sydney’s knowledge capacity and migration. Furthermore, the analytical framework integrating global Sydney as a knowledge city and migration through the nexus of MKWs contributes to the discourse of global city and knowledge city. It incorporates the important element of migration into the analysis of global city and knowledge city, employs a city-based approach to analyzing migration and global city’s knowledge capacity, and focuses on the MKWs who work for the global services and knowledge sectors.
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**Table 1**
Online responses of the community survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous place of residence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived my whole life in Sydney</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Drivers for migrants to move to global Sydney (N=307).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for deciding to live in the Greater Sydney region</th>
<th>Levels of influence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Weak (%)</td>
<td>Weak (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The global standing of Sydney</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job or career opportunities</strong></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business opportunities</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational opportunities</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifestyle</strong></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and security</strong></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of access to transport and utilities</strong></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being close to spouse, family and/or friends</strong></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being close to people of the same or similar cultural/ethnic group</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of religion, culture, or political beliefs</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Industry of employment for international and internal MKWs (N=307).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous place of residence</th>
<th>Industry of employment before moving to Sydney</th>
<th>Industry of employment in Sydney</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Media and Telecommunications (%)</td>
<td>Financial and Insurance Services (%)</td>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas (N=128)</td>
<td>Informatio n Media and Telecommun ications</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial and Insurance Services</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (N=92)</td>
<td>Informatio n Media and Telecommun ications</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial and Insurance Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4
Occupation of employment for international and internal MKWs (N=307).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous place of residence</th>
<th>Occupation of employment in Sydney</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager (%)</td>
<td>Professional (%)</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas  (N=128)</td>
<td>Occupation of employment before moving to Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia  (N=92)</td>
<td>Occupation of employment before moving to Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Selected communities for survey in global Sydney.
Fig. 2. Age cohorts of international and internal migrants in global Sydney.
Fig. 3. Educational qualifications of international and internal migrants in global Sydney.
Fig. 4. Income brackets of international and internal migrants in global Sydney.
**Fig. 5.** Industry of employment for international and internal migrants in global Sydney.
Fig. 6. Occupation of employment for international and internal migrants in global Sydney.