Residential Segregation in Australian Cities: A Literature Review

Seamus Grimes
University College Galway

In this review of literature dealing with the postwar immigrant experience in urban Australia, some of the key interpretations of residential segregation are assessed. The article focuses on studies which have examined ethnic clusters formed by southern Europeans in Sydney and Melbourne and more recently by Indochinese refugees. Much of the analysis to date has been based on measuring static residential patterns rather than social interaction, and the need to question the significance of ethnic concentrations which sometimes characterize the early stages of immigrant adaptation is suggested.

In this review of geographical and sociological literature on residential segregation in Australian cities, some of the traditional interpretations of the significance of segregation are questioned. The ID approach, which placed emphasis on the segregation of immigrants from the host society, was largely based on spatial analysis of aggregate census data. It is suggested that many unwarranted assumptions were made based on residential patterns, while little insight was provided into processes of social interaction or immigrant adaptation.

In the Australian context, it is important to stress the role played by immigration policy to obtain a better understanding of the emergence of a variety of immigrant residential patterns. Preference for British immigrants, who were seen as easily assimilable, dominated this policy until recently, and despite the significant influx of southern European immigrants during the 1950s and 1960s, the existing settlement policy for these immigrants was partly discriminatory. The emergence of southern European ethnic clusters in Sydney and Melbourne is outlined, and some of the factors which gave rise to them are examined. The more recent concentration of Indochinese refugees, particularly in western Sydney, is also analyzed. A longitudinal perspective of southern European adaptation suggests significant upward mobility by the second generation, even where their

residential patterns may not be markedly different from the first generation.

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

A long tradition of geographical and sociological research on residential segregation dates back to the seminal work by Robert Park (1926), who outlined his views on the relationship between physical and social distance. The classical paper of Duncan and Lieberson (1959) demonstrated an inverse relationship between segregation and assimilation of immigrants based on their residential distribution in cities. This work gave rise to the development of dissimilarity indices, or what Peach (1975) refers to as the "dissimilarist approach." Numerous geographical studies in Australia and elsewhere have been published mapping the residential distribution of immigrant groups and measuring relative levels of "segregation" from the "host society" using a range of dissimilarity indices. The underlying assumption in these studies has been that residential patterns were a good indicator of levels of "assimilation" or "segregation." In a strong defense of this positivist or "social physics" approach, Peach (1981) claimed that it had been a good predictor of patterns of social interaction.

Many other geographers would not share this assessment, and O'Loughlin (1986) remarks that two decades of immigration studies in northern European cities has little to show by means of explanation, despite the accumulation of detailed analysis of aggregate patterns. There has been an obvious growing disillusionment with the ID approach for a number of years. Going back to Boal's (1969) early statement about the need to focus on "activity segregation" rather than residential segregation per se, it becomes clear that few geographers have taken up this challenge. Despite the frequent criticisms of the ecological approach, little has been achieved other than illustrating rather obvious correlations between the socioeconomic characteristics of immigrants, all derived from the readily available but frequently inadequate census data. Such mapping exercises are a useful first step in the analysis of immigrant adaptation, but they have added little to our understanding of processes of social interaction. Rather than proceeding to an examination of the dialectical relationships between structures and individuals, most researchers have been content to stop at the basic mapping of immigrant distributions (O'Loughlin, 1986). The most serious criticism to be made of these studies is that they have accepted in an unquestioning way unproven assumptions made in the earlier statements by Park (1926) and Duncan and Lieberson (1959) regarding the insights into social interaction afforded by residential patterns.

One of the more prolific writers in the field, I. H. Burnley, has made widespread use of dissimilarity indices, frequently backed up with extensive fieldwork into the immigration process. He has pointed out that dissimilarity indices do not allow any inference as to which groups are "segregated" from which, or whether the "host" population is segregating itself from a given overseas-born group or vice versa (Burnley, 1988a). Indeed, as with many other researchers, he has been calling for more extensive network analysis of immigrant groups in Australian cities. One such study by Grimes (1989) of recent Irish immigration to Sydney questions the assumption of a relationship between residential distribution and immigrant adaptation. In a trenchent criticism of the ID methodology, Galvin (1980) concluded from her analysis of Italian immigrants in Newcastle that such indices were unreliable when applied to first generation immigrants. In addition to illustrating some of the well-known weaknesses associated with the indices, such as the influence of the size of area being analyzed, she claimed that it is difficult to apply any social significance to the index. Galvin also points to the problem of relying on census data which frequently hide significant heterogeneity in immigrant populations. There are inherent dangers in making assumptions about patterns of social interaction based on birthplace statistics.

In attempting to define segregation, Boal (1978:51) touches on some of the uncomfortable assumptions which can be associated with the geographical tradition: "a particular ethnic group is completely unsegregated when its members are distributed uniformly, relative to the remainder of the population. Any deviation from such uniformity represents a situation characterized by segregation." In acknowledging some of the difficulties associated with the definition, Boal agrees that it would be more accurate to speak in terms of mutual segregation between Catholics and Protestants in Belfast and that the host community also displayed many features of ethnicity. Increasingly, geographers and others have begun to recognize the many positive functions of ethnic residential concentrations and, therefore, the need to avoid an assimilationist or integrationist approach to urban residential geography. Both O'Loughlin (1986) and Boal (1978) note that few researchers have paid attention to the views of ethnic groups regarding residential concentrations, thereby failing to obtain useful insights into the processes which create them.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

Between 1947 and 1987, about 4 million migrants arrived in Australia from more than 100 countries, making it the second most important immigrant

destination after Israel. During the postwar period, immigration accounted for about half the population increase in the metropolitan areas of Sydney and Melbourne. About 70 percent of Australia's postwar immigrants settled permanently and, apart from English and aboriginal languages, it is estimated that between 75 and 100 languages are currently used in Australia.

Until the late 1970s, when a number of reports on the treatment of immigrants in Australia were published, the immigration debate focused primarily on selection criteria and the size of the intake (Walmsley and Sorensen, 1988). The 1950s heralded the arrival of a boom period in Australia's economy, and an important function of immigration policy was to ensure a plentiful labor supply to develop the emerging manufacturing industry. The objective was to attract skilled immigrants, who would be easily assimilable and preferably from Britain.

Britain, however, could only supply a third of the annual requirement, and large numbers of eastern European refugees were assisted to migrate to Australia in the immediate postwar period. Increasingly, Australia turned to Mediterranean countries, who between 1947 and 1970 contributed more than a quarter of the total intake, of whom 277,000 were Italians, 170,500 Greeks and 58,600 Maltese. During this period, these three southern European groups accounted for 21 percent of the growth of Melbourne and 13.5 percent in Sydney (Burnley, 1974). Many of Australia's inner-city neighborhoods were transformed from being predominantly Anglo-Australian working-class areas to having a preponderance of non-English-speaking immigrants.

Britain, however, continued to be the largest single source area during the 1950s and 1960s, and until 1984 British immigrants received preferential treatment, such as the right to vote despite not being Australian citizens. Almost 90 percent of British immigrants benefited from the assisted passage scheme, compared with only a quarter of southern Europeans (Burnley, 1979). The British also were offered hostel accommodation upon arrival and, depending on their economic circumstances, they were eligible for public housing.

Australia's special relationship with Britain was fundamentally changed in 1973, when the latter gained accession to the European Economic Community. In the same year, Australia's immigration policy was radically altered with the ending of the White Australia policy. Political disturbances in Southeast Asia during the 1970s and 1980s resulted in a significant influx of Indochinese refugees to Australia, presenting a severe test for the new immigration policy. The settlement of these refugees in the two larger metropolitan areas also brought additional problems.

SETTLEMENT POLICY

In addition to the radical change in Australia's immigration policy, there also has been an evolution in the official approach toward immigrant settlement. This evolution has shifted from assimilationism, which began to be discarded in the 1970s in favor of integration, and more recently to a policy of multiculturalism. For almost two decades, Australia has been committed to the concept of a multicultural society. Although the term "multiculturalism" still evokes a degree of uncertainty, there is a growing acceptance of cultural diversity as a positive and valuable aspect of Australian society. There is also a growing recognition of the need to provide opportunities for minority groups to develop their cultures, provided it takes place within a framework of shared values. In practical terms, this has resulted in considerable state expenditure on the provision of special services such as ethnic broadcasting facilities (Clyne, 1988). In the current period of recession, when service provision in many low-income urban neighborhoods is under severe stress, such special provision is frequently resented by the Australian-born population. There is also a growing concern with the question of social cohesion, and Poole (1985) has argued that ethnic groups should transcend ethnocentrism, at least in the public domain, in order to promote uniquely Australian values.

Despite the considerable economic difficulties of recent years, Australia's nondiscriminatory immigration policy continues to survive, but community reaction to the emergence of Indochinese immigrant concentrations has caused some vacillation. Since the 1950s, there has been little official concern about immigrant residential concentrations, but a bipartisan agreement adopted in 1979 stated that "while immigrants will have the same rights as other Australian residents to choose their place of residence individually or collectively, enclave settlements will not be encouraged. Immigration policy will not consider communities for mass movement to Australia in situations where closed enclave settlement would occur" (Jupp *et al.*, 1990).

Yet recent changes in immigration policy in relation to family reunion and Indochinese refugees have exacerbated the problem of residential concentrations. The Australian government's Indochinese refugee program has always been a quasi-family reunion program, and for the last two years sponsors have had to undertake a maintenance guarantee. This further adds to the concentrations when the new Indochinese arrivals have to live with or near their established relatives. Their dependence on accommodation, financial and material support means that they cannot move to an area of their choice away from the existing concentrations.

During the postwar period, therefore, Australia learned some important lessons from its earlier less glorious era of discriminatory policy, which assumed the emergence of a predominantly Anglo-Saxon national identity. While many immigrants adopted the Australian style of dress, language, sport and diet, there was considerable evidence of disadvantage among immigrant groups in terms of occupational status and educational attainment. Zubrzycki (1977:17) claimed that "although we would not assert the converse of the Green Paper's claim that 'relationships within Australian society between the various ethnic groups have been mostly positive and healthy' we believe that it would be more accurate to say that harmony has been preserved largely because ethnic communities have kept to themselves."

Though many studies have emphasized the segregated nature of immigrant groups, particularly in the larger Australian cities, some optimism for the future could be drawn from a recent analysis of the ethnic character of the Australian population (Price, 1988:128). This indicated that the major ethnic community in Australia is the ethnic mix, and that the "ethnic character of the Australian population is not one where separate ethnic people live side by side with relatively little social intercourse, constantly perpetuating their own languages and cultures and keeping distinct by continual marriage within the ethnic group." He acknowledges that in the case of a few groups, marriage patterns are predominantly within their own ethnic community, but that the majority of ethnic communities will be mixed by the third generation. Clyne's work on ethnic language shift shows considerable evidence of social interaction between ethnic groups and the majority culture (Jupp, 1990).

RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION AND ETHNIC CONCENTRATIONS

Having outlined the background to postwar immigration patterns and immigration policy, the second part of the article will look in more detail at the question of residential segregation in the two main cities of Sydney and Melbourne and focus in particular on ethnic concentrations among southern European and Indochinese immigrants. For many years, studies have illustrated the varying levels of residential segregation among immigrant groups in Australian cities. Socioeconomic background has been shown to have major implications for residential distribution and immigrant adjustment. In contrast with the majority of immigrants from Britain and northwestern Europe who have been skilled tradesmen, clerical and professional workers, southern Europeans have been mainly in unskilled and semiskilled occupations. Both Timms (1969), working in Queensland, and

Jones (1967), in Melbourne, identified strongly concentrated groups among the Greeks, Maltese, Italians and Yugoslavs, while the Poles and Dutch were moderately concentrated and immigrants from the British Isles and New Zealand were only slightly concentrated. Stimson (1970), also working on Melbourne, noted that southern Europeans were the most "segregated" due to the continuing process of chain migration. Burnley (1972, 1976), in a number of papers, identified similar patterns in both Sydney and Melbourne, with the Greeks and Maltese being the most concentrated groups and the British and Germans the least concentrated.

Though some geographical studies of immigrant residential patterns may be criticized for overemphasizing the social significance of ethnic segregation, particularly in the absence of extensive network analysis, much of the literature, nevertheless, gives a good indication of the variety of immigrant residential patterns. The wide range of settlement patterns in terms of location within cities and levels of concentration point toward a variety of adjustment strategies, which are related to factors such as the migration process itself, including chain migration, the formation of social networks, language ability and functioning of the housing market. The importance of examining immigrant adaptation using a longitudinal perspective is also becoming more evident, and spatial analysis of residential patterns at any given point in time is merely a useful starting point for further investigation.

An examination of immigrant residential patterns in the two major Australian metropolitan areas reveals that, while there is a variety of ethnic concentrations, the normal pattern is one of an ethnic mixture. In the case of Melbourne, Jupp (1988a) notes that it is not meaningful to talk in terms of one-nation "ghettoes," and though some immigrant groups did follow common lines of settlement, the residential patterns of many others were more related to the housing and employment markets. In both cities, large areas are characterized by having more than a quarter of their population who do not speak English at home, but even then such areas are not simply a contrast between an Australian-born "host" population and some specific immigrant group. Rather they are characterized by a significant mixing of ethnic groups together with the Australian-born population. Of course many Australian-born children form part of different ethnic groups. While some of the outer upper income suburbs do tend toward monoculturalism in their population composition, large parts of both cities are predominantly multicultural in character (Jupp *et al.*, 1990b).

Jupp (1988a) outlines some of the main characteristics of Melbourne's western suburbs, where a new kind of "ghetto" has grown up, namely the high income, home owning suburban concentration of former Eastern

European refugees and Maltese. One of these suburbs—St Albans—has the heaviest concentration of first and second generation European Australians of any area in Melbourne or Australia. Most of the major ethnic groups, such as the Maltese, Ukrainians and Poles who settled in the new western suburbs in the 1950s, were still there in the 1980s. This is Melbourne's largest industrial belt and, while household incomes are relatively high, there is also deprivation and the threat of youth unemployment, but it could hardly be referred to as a ghetto in the disparaging sense.

It is instructive to mention a number of the different types of ethnic clusters to be found in the two main cities. Burnley (1979) noted that the British formed few ethnic concentrations in Sydney and Melbourne except for certain public housing areas. He outlines the role of the South Australian Housing Trust in conjunction with the State Immigration Office organizing special migration and house purchase schemes, which resulted in 3,500 British families settling on the northeast and southwest fringes of Adelaide between 1954 and 1971. Jupp (1988b) identifies concentrations of British migrants in outlying areas of Perth and Adelaide which he describes as the highest concentrations of immigrants from any nationality in Australia.

At the other end of the social scale, the closest example to the American ghetto type of cluster to be found in Australia, but on a very tiny scale, is the aboriginal concentration in Sydney's Redfern. Like many other clusters, this has been largely attributed to the public policy decision to allocate housing to this largely rural immigrant population in this area. A rather different type of clustering is found among the middle-class Jewish community, who have formed distinctive enclaves in both cities. These clusters are largely explained by the desire of Orthodox Jews to reside within walking distance of their synagogues.

Among the most distinctive clusterings of immigrant groups are those of the southern Europeans, particularly the Italians and Greeks. Unlike British and other northern Europeans who for the most part are dispersed throughout the metropolitan areas, southern Europeans developed clearly identifiable ethnic neighborhoods in both Sydney and Melbourne and formed significant clusters both in inner and outer suburban locations. Both these clusters and those of the more recent Indochinese refugees will be examined in more detail.

SOUTHERN EUROPEANS

While the tendency has been to interpret the ethnic clusterings of southern Europeans in the major cities in terms of residential segregation, the paucity of investigation into the actual patterns of social interaction of these immigrants leaves the question in a somewhat inconclusive state. Yet some

excellent work has been carried out by Burnley and others into the processes behind the creation of these immigrant residential clusters, which throws considerable light on their significance for immigrant adaptation. Though the overall sizes of southern European immigrant populations has been quite large—in 1971, for example, there were 104,000 Italian, 75,700 Greek and 24,000 Maltese-born in metropolitan Melbourne—the significance of inner-city clusters both in terms of size and in proportion to the overall population needs to be carefully assessed. Quite high indices of dissimilarity were identified by Burnley (1976) for both Italian and Greek clusters in inner-city Melbourne in 1971, but many of these clusters are quite small in size and are related to the development of ethnic neighborhoods along particular streets in the city. In most cases the immigrant population, even in these most concentrated clusters, accounts for only about one third of the total population, which raises important questions about how the remaining population related to the southern Europeans.

Though substantial residential concentrations of Italians formed in both Sydney and Melbourne, just as many Italians were found outside recognizable ethnic concentrations. By 1961, major concentrations had formed both in the inner and outer suburbs. Within twenty years, however, significant suburbanization had occurred, and only 1,000 of the earlier concentration of 6,000 remained in the city of Sydney, while Leichhardt's Italian population had fallen from 5,000 to 3,000. It was in Leichhardt that Sydney's most distinctive Italian neighborhood emerged. In 1976, it still retained 175 Italian businesses which catered to day-to-day needs of the local population (Burnley, 1988). Non-English-speaking migrants did influence the creation of these villagelike clusters, which provided a familiar environment for immigrants during their early stages of adjustment.

Similar patterns of concentration and ethnic neighborhoods characterized the Greek populations in Sydney and Melbourne, except that their initial concentrations were predominantly in inner-city locations. By the 1980s, however, suburbanization had also affected this immigrant population, which had been characterized by very high dissimilarity indices in the 1960s and 1970s.

Burnley (1976) notes that the age selectivity of the migration process resulted in southern Europeans comprising a significant proportion of the young adult population of ethnic neighborhoods, and though the evidence is scanty he suggests that they were considerably segregated from the predominantly older members of the remaining Australian population. It is clear, however, that inner-city schools did have catchment areas with a sizeable proportion of non-English-speaking homes. In the Tullamarine region of Melbourne, for example, 48 percent of state school students came

from first and second generation non-English-speaking homes (Jupp, 1988a). Although this resulted in considerable strain on schools in disadvantaged areas, it should also be remembered that schools and other parish institutions played an important integrating role, particularly among the Italian population.

Although ethnicity was an important factor contributing to the emergence of residential clusters, a major additional influence was the socioeconomic background of immigrants. Many Southern Europeans came from a peasant or small town background and arrived in Australia with few skills. Thus, their choice of housing in Australian cities was very limited. In the case of Melbourne, Jupp (1988a) concludes that immigrant residential patterns resulted as much from economic status as from conscious preferences. In addition to their limited choices in the housing market, other constraints included the need to locate near train stations and industrial suburbs.

Another important factor which contributed significantly to the emergence of southern European clusters in the early stages of immigrant adaptation was the impact of chain migration (Burnley, 1976; Jupp *et al.*, 1990). Though the tendency exists to regard such immigrant national groups as homogeneous, the reality is that they originated in particular districts of Italy, Greece and Malta. The tendency was to transplant particular rural villages through the process of migration. This was frequently achieved by means of the initial migration to Australia of the menfolk, and later these were followed by other members of the family who were assisted financially by the earlier migrants. Since few southern Europeans were assisted by the government, their migration resulted in considerable financial sacrifice on their behalf. An additional consequence arising from their predominantly rural and peasant background was the significance of the extended family and kin group, and this also resulted in contrasts between their household structure and Australian, or indeed other immigrant, households in the areas where they settled.

While many writers affirm that southern European immigrants came to form a significant proportion of Australia's urban industrial "working class," they are less likely to explain the process whereby this predominantly rural immigrant population with their peasant culture was transformed rather rapidly through migration. It is true to say that they made up a considerable proportion of the industrial work force, but certain characteristics would suggest significant differences between them and the host society or other immigrant groups. One of these features was the generally high level of home-ownership which they achieved in a rather short period. The purchase of their homes also influenced the tendency to locate in low-cost housing

areas and probably delayed their movement out of these areas. The strong desire to own property also indicates the influence of their peasant background, which was anything but working class. The tendency for social scientists to classify the population in purely convenient statistical categories frequently fails to appreciate the significant sociological nuances of the more important self-classification procedures of immigrants.

One of the serious lacunae in Australian immigration studies to date has been the small number of longitudinal analyses of social network evolution among immigrants (Holton, 1990). An exceptional study in this respect was Bottomly's (1979) examination of Greek social networks in Sydney. This study illustrates how Sydney's Greeks succeeded in confining certain social relationships to community networks, while participating in the wider community through the labor market and the educational system. She also indicates that while a small number did not participate in the wider Australian community, the second generation of immigrants tends to develop wider networks than their parents. In a similar vein, Grimes (1989) identified distinctive patterns of social networks among rural and urban Irish immigrants in Sydney. Over time, ethnic friendship and occupational networks which characterized some immigrant groupings in their early stages of adaptation began to decline in importance as immigrants became more settled and were dispersed throughout the metropolitan area.

INDOCHINESE CONCENTRATIONS

On a per capita basis, Australia accepted more Indochinese refugees than any other country, with more than 120,000 arriving since 1975. The majority settled in Sydney and Melbourne, forming populations of more than 30,000 in both cities. Although the popular media has tended to stereotype all Asian immigrants as one group, there are a number of distinct ethnic groups represented. Among the longer settled are the Chinese, many of whom are well dispersed residentially and represented in higher socioeconomic suburbs.

Among the Indochinese refugees, however, the largest and most visible group are the Vietnam born, who in turn can be divided between the ethnic Vietnamese and the ethnic Chinese from Vietnam. Viviani (1984) has estimated the breakdown between them to be 40 percent Vietnamese and 60 percent Chinese. Although these two groups have a history of mutual antagonism from their home country and apparently do not interact socially in Australia, they are not found spatially segregated from each other (Burnley, 1989). By 1981, a significant concentration of about 5,500 Vietnam born had emerged in the Sydney municipality of Fairfield, and by 1986 this had further grown to about 9,500. It should also be noted that in addition

to this Fairfield concentration, a number of local government areas extending inwards toward the city, and including Bankstown, Canterbury, Auburn and Marrickville, also had significant numbers of Vietnam-born refugees. By 1986, the Indochinese refugee population in Fairfield LGA included 3,792 Kampuchean born and 2,980 Laos born. Although the Vietnam-born population in Fairfield, with 6.3 percent of the population in 1986, did comprise the biggest non-Australian immigrant group, this was not the case in terms of language groupings. The largest groupings of those who did not speak English at home were the following: Italian (15%), Chinese (12.6%), Spanish (11.2%), Vietnamese (8.9%) and Arabic/Lebanese (8.5%).

Despite this considerable ethnic mixture, however, in 1985, half the shops and businesses in the Cabramatta shopping center in Fairfield were owned by Indochinese (Burnley, 1989). Although Cabramatta has come to be seen as being predominantly Vietnamese because of the negative images perpetuated by the media, the ethnic Chinese exert the strongest visible influence, as is evident from the architecture and ornaments adorning the shopping area. The only visible Vietnamese presence is the Vietnamese writings on the shops and the Vietnamese shopkeepers and customers. Viviani (1984) also noted the much more intense involvement of the ethnic Chinese in trade, which only formed a subsidiary activity for the ethnic Vietnamese. Of those who had arrived between 1975 and 1982, 64 percent were unskilled and 26 percent were unemployed compared with about 8 percent of the Australian born. Unemployment rates among the Vietnam born have further deteriorated to between 30 percent and 40 percent in recent years (Burnley, 1989). Unfortunately the major intake of Indochinese refugees occurred at the time of a severe rise in unemployment, particularly in manufacturing and construction. Although many of the Vietnamese were derived from the middle-class strata of their own society, incompatible qualifications and the lack of competence in English resulted in significant deskilling.

Though many had become used to southern European concentrations in previous decades, there has been a very strong public reaction to the more recent and very visible Chinese-Vietnamese cluster in Cabramatta. Despite consistent government policy to discourage immigrant concentrations, it is generally accepted that this western suburbs cluster is directly related to the government decision to lodge the majority of Indochinese upon arrival in the three western suburb migrant centers (Viviani, 1984). Although Richmond in Melbourne had a higher concentration of Indochinese refugees than any other local government area, mainly because the authorities housed them in "hard to let" high rise apartments, unlike Sydney, Mel-

bourne did have a number of such concentrations in other parts of the city (Jupp *et al.*, 1990).

Though based on a very small sample of twenty interviews, one of the few studies which examines the Cabramatta concentration from a Vietnamese perspective, explains it in terms both of choices and constraints (Dunn, 1990). While low-income constraints did influence the emergence of the concentration, the Vietnamese also exercised spatial choices in their decision to live in Cabramatta. While certain groups of Vietnamese such as the elderly and single females are likely to remain in the Cabramatta area, it is expected that increased social mobility in the future will be accompanied by a greater degree of residential dispersion. The Vietnamese themselves did not feel particularly excluded from Australian society, and they expressed considerable bewilderment at the excessive media attention being given to Cabramatta.

In addition to the racism which characterizes the adverse Australian reaction to the Cabramatta Vietnam-born concentration, there is also a genuine concern about employment and the pressures which this influx has placed on social services. There is little doubt that the ideology of assimilation is still very much to the fore, but Australian reaction to the rapid change in the character of their neighborhood is understandable. Yet the positive functions of these ethnic clusters should be understood (Viviani, 1984). These ethnic clusters play an important role in the early settlement process of the Vietnamese. As with the earlier southern European ethnic neighborhoods in inner-city locations, the entrepreneurial spirit of the Indochinese is also making an important commercial contribution to property values in places like Cabramatta.

One of the key issues which a number of researchers have already begun to address is whether Indochinese residential concentrations are increasing over time (Burnley, 1989; Wilson, 1990). Apart from the methodological issues associated with the various ways of measuring concentration or segregation, it is important to remember that this latest wave of immigration is still relatively recent in terms of reaching conclusions about adaptation, and most of the debate has been based on the short intercensus period between 1981 and 1986. Studies of other immigrant groups, some with low levels of residential concentration, have indicated that the early period of immigrant adjustment tends to be characterized by transience and considerable residential mobility (Grimes, 1989). Not surprisingly, therefore, Wilson (1990) found the same to be true of his survey sample of Sydney Vietnamese. Many had made a number of moves, often within the same suburb and within that part of Sydney where there was a significant concentration of industrial employment.

Burnley's (1989) analysis of the 1981–1986 period did reveal some evidence of longer settled Vietnam-born immigrants gravitating toward the Fairfield concentration from other parts of Sydney and indeed from outside the city. However, he also noted a gradual spread of the new arrivals during this period from the Fairfield area toward the inner city. Wilson (1990), basing his interpretation on survey findings, places greater emphasis on this growing dispersion of Indochinese refugees, and both authors conclude that, while established concentrations will continue for some time, increased dispersion could be expected as social mobility is achieved.

SOCIAL MOBILITY

The need for a longitudinal analysis of urban residential patterns is revealed by the fact that many studies have indicated considerable levels of upward social mobility within Australian society, including immigrant groups who were characterized by residential concentration in their earlier period of settlement (Burnley, 1985; Hugo, 1986). It has been shown that, even in the 1950s and 1960s, no immigrant population was segregated in any one quarter of the city, and the majority of immigrants except the most recent resided outside ethnic concentrations. Suburbanization of southern European immigrants has been considerable during the past twenty years, and a major factor of the high level of residential mobility has been the open nature of the housing market and the potential for home ownership.

Many studies have noted the disproportionate involvement of non-English-speaking immigrants in self-employment and small business. Some researchers have argued that this phenomenon is more an indicator of economic crisis than of upward social mobility (Castles *et al.*, 1988). Holton (1990), however, feels that while neo-Marxist theorists should be given some credit for identifying particular areas of possible disadvantage, their interpretation of ethnic business has been unduly pessimistic.

The research to date indicates that immigrants generally have equal opportunities in the Australian labor market, and there is no evidence of an ethnic underclass emerging in Australia. Yet, among first generation immigrants from non-English-speaking backgrounds, who have still some considerable ground to make up in the labor market, are women and Mediterranean males (Holton, 1990). Though studies of second generation Australians are few, the evidence indicates a high degree of upward intergenerational mobility, particularly among southern Europeans (Holton, 1990). Holton also points out that the second generation from non-English-speaking homes has achieved a higher level of access to postsecondary education than the general population as a whole. In one of the few studies of intergenerational mobility by a geographer, Burnley (1985) claims, in

relation to the major European immigrant groups, that there is no evidence of the attainment of the second generation being constrained by structural factors in society. He found full convergence in occupational distribution with the host society for Greeks, Italians and Yugoslavs within the second generation. What is most significant about these findings is that social mobility has been achieved in some cases despite no great change in the residential patterns of second generation southern Europeans from those of their parents. Thus, Park's generalization about the relationship between social distance and spatial distance was not borne out by this study.

Though some significant differences exist between the current concentrations of Indochinese and the earlier clusters of southern Europeans, mainly due to high unemployment and a greater dependence on public housing, there is every likelihood, given their entrepreneurial spirit, that they will achieve considerable social mobility within the next ten years. It is also likely that such mobility will result in outmovement from their existing concentrations (Wilson, 1990; Dunn, 1990).

CONCLUSION

It is ironic in some ways that the tradition of spatial analysis of residential patterns in urban social geography has been so strongly influenced by sociologists such as Park in the earlier stages and later by the work of Duncan and Lieberson in the analysis of immigrant patterns. The overemphasis on residential patterns at the expense of processes of social interaction has seriously retarded the development of immigration theory. A great deal of geographical analysis of immigrant groups to date has been based on unproven assumptions and inferences drawn from statistical correlations of socioeconomic variables from residence-based census data. Thus, the level of explanation of immigrant adaptation has frequently been found wanting. There have been a few exceptions, such as the work of Burnley which incorporated extensive fieldwork in his analysis of residential patterns.

The emphasis on residential patterns, however, has resulted in a preoccupation with segregation of particular immigrant groups from the "host" society. Clearly, this approach has been strongly influenced by assimilationist ideology, which reflects the popular view of immigrant settlement in Australian society. Immigration policy also reflected this assimilationist perspective until a nondiscriminatory approach finally took over from the White Australia policy. The enormous influx of southern Europeans into the major Australian cities during the 1950s and 1960s provides a useful case study for assessing the significance of immigrant residential patterns using a longitudinal perspective. While southern European immigrants were soon characterized by high levels of residential segregation, the evi-

dence suggests that these patterns had little effect on the prospects for social mobility of the second generation. In fact, despite their residential patterns, which were significantly different from those of the Australian born, there is evidence which suggests that some sections of the second generation may achieve higher average levels of attainment than their counterparts in the Australian population. Such findings, therefore, seriously question the significance of "segregated" residential patterns when considered within a longitudinal perspective.

Despite the current high levels of unemployment which characterize the ethnic concentrations of Indochinese refugees, who arrived during a period of economic recession, the experience of the southern Europeans augurs well for their future. Their spirit of enterprise is evident in the highly visible clusters of ethnic businesses, which have given rise to adverse reactions from some sections of the Australian born. Given a reasonable period of time for adjustment to their new cultural environment, their increased social mobility will no doubt lead to greater residential dispersal.

REFERENCES

Boal, F.
1978 "Ethnic Residential Segregation." In *Social Areas in Cities.* Vol. 1. Edited by D. T. Herbert and R. J. Johnston. John Wiley and Sons. London. Pp. 41–80.

———
1969 "Territoriality on the Shankhill-Falls Divide, Belfast," *Irish Geography,* 6(1):30–50.

Burnley, I. H.
1989 "Settlement Dimensions of the Vietnam-Born Population in Sydney," *Australian Geographical Studies*, 27(2):129–154.

———
1988a "Italian Community Life in Sydney." In *The Australian People.* Edited by J. Jupp. Sydney: Angus and Robertson. Pp. 626–630.

———
1988b "Population Geography," *Australian Geographical Studies,* 26(1):116–131.

———
1988c "Settlement Patterns in Sydney." In *The Australian People.* Edited by J. Jupp. Sydney: Angus and Robertson. Pp. 949–952.

———
1985 "A Comparative Analysis of First and Second Generation Immigrants: Residential and Occupational Mobility in Metropolitan Sydney," *Australian Geographical Studies*, 23:269–290.

———
1979 "British Immigration and Settlement in Australian Cities, 1947–1971," *International Migration Review,* 12(3):341–358.

———
1976 "Southern European Populations in the Residential Structure of Melbourne, 1947–1971," *Australian Geographical Studies*, 14:116–132.

1974 "Immigration and Metropolitan Growth in Australia," In *Urbanisation in Australia: The Post War Experience*. Edited by I. H. Burnley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 99–118.

1972 "European Immigration and Settlement Patterns in Metropolitan Sydney, 1947–1966," *Australian Geographical Studies,* 10:61–78.

Castles, S., M. Morrissey and B. Pinkstone
1988 *Migrant Employment and Training and Industry Restructuring*. Policy option paper prepared for the Office of Multicultural Affairs, Canberra.

Clyne, M. G.
1988 "Language Policy and Community Languages." In *The Australian People*. Edited by J. Jupp. Sydney: Angus and Robertson. Pp. 893–898.

Duncan, O. D. and S. Lieberson
1959 "Ethnic Segregation and Assimilation," *American Journal of Sociology*, 64:364–374.

Dunn, K.
1990 "The Vietnamese Community in Cabramatta." Unpublished BA (Hons) Thesis in Geography and Sociology, University of Wollongong, NSW.

Galvin, J.
1980 "Indices of Social Change in Ethnic Studies," *Australian Geographical Studies,* 18:155–168.

Grimes, S.
1989 "Postwar Irish Immigrants in Australia: The Sydney Experience." In *The Irish-Australian Connection*. Edited by S. Grimes and G. O. Tuathaigh. Dublin: Irish Academic Press. Pp. 137–159.

Holton, R.
1990 "Social Aspects of Immigration." In *Australian Immigration: A Survey of the Issues*. Edited by M. Wooden *et al.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Hugo, G.
1986 *Australia's Changing Population: Trends and Implications*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Jones, F. L.
1967 "Ethnic Concentration and Assimilation, An Australian Case Study," *Social Forces,* 43(3):412–423.

Jupp, J.
1990 "Ghettoes, Tribes and Prophets." Paper for the National Outlook Conference, Nov, 1990.

1988a "Settlement Patterns in Melbourne." In *The Australian People*. Edited by J. Jupp. Sydney: Angus and Robertson. Pp. 942–949.

1988b "Postwar English Settlers in Adelaide and Perth." In *The Australian People*. Edited by J. Jupp. Sydney: Angus and Robertson. Pp. 429–434.

O'Loughlin, J.
1986 "Introduction." In *Foreign Minorities in Continental European Cities*. Edited by G. Glebe and J. O'Loughlin. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlog Wiesbaden GMBH.

Park, R. E.
1926 "The Urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and a Moral Order." In *The Urban Community.* Edited by W. E. Burgess. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peach, C.
1981 "Conflicting Interpretations of Segregation." In *Social Interaction and Ethnic Segregation.* Edited by P. Jackson and S. J. Smith. London: Academic Press.

———
1975 *Urban Social Segregation.* London: Longman.

Poole, M. E.
1985 "Australian Multicultural Policy: Future Prospects." In *Australia in Transition: Culture and Life Possibilities.* Edited by M. E. Poole, P. R. de Lacey and B. S. Randhawa. Sydney: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Pp. 59–69.

Price, C. A.
1988 "The Ethnic Character of the Australian Population." In *The Australian People.* Edited by J. Jupp. Sydney: Angus and Robertson. Pp. 119–128.

Stimson, R. J.
1970 "European Immigration Settlement Patterns in Metropolitan Melbourne, 1947–1961," *Tijschrift Voor Economiche en Sociale Geografie,* 61:114–126.

Timms, D.
1969 "The Dissimilarity between Overseas-born and Australian-born in Queensland—Dimensions of Assimilation," *Australian Journal of Social Issues,* 4:41–56.

Viviani, N.
1984 *The Long Journey.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Walmsley, D. J. and A. D. Sorensen
1988 *Contemporary Australia: Explorations in Economy, Society and Geography.* Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Wilson, W.
1990 "Residential Relocation and Settlement Adjustment of Vietnamese Refugees in Sydney," *Australian Geographical Studies,* 28(2):155–177.

Zubrzycki, J.
1977 *Australia as a Multicultural Society.* Canberra: The Australian Ethnic Affairs Council, Australian Government Publishing Service.