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ABSTRACT

Nearly three-fourths of the 33,000 Latin Americans in Australia in mid-1976 are from Chile, Uruguay and Argentina. Political and economic "pushes" plus Australia's assistance are the main reasons for that flow, but many unmarried immigrants from those and other Latin American nations are motivated by travel desires. Most come from the metropolitan middle class, but there are wide variations between the migrants. Prior to 1969 the flow was notably "non-Latin" (e.g. Anglo-Argentinian), but over 80% of the total have arrived since then and are "true" Latin Americans. About 70% are in Sydney and many associate in several clubs, but otherwise there is no real "community". This is partly because of socio-economic differences between migrants' Latin American background and current situations in Australia. The Latin American immigrants were mainly selected on the basis of their education, qualifications and employment. However, many of them are employed at levels below their skills.

The theme of migration satisfaction is developed and applied to Australia's Latin Americans. The literature review discusses the related concept of "place utility" and also the use of "satisfaction" in a sequence leading to "identification" and "acculturation". A measurement scale of nine ranked levels of migration satisfaction is developed using a sample of 299 Latin American Independent Decision Makers in Australia. That scale is then used to identify which characteristics of immigrants are associated with migration satisfaction. Those characteristics are organized as pre-migration, post-migration, relative change, and personal variables. Several main ones (marital status, motivation, relative change in occupation level, English ability, and friends/relatives in Australia) are used to complete
a typology of Latin Americans in Australia. Discriminant analysis is used in an attempt to combine the characteristics in order to diagnose the migration satisfaction of immigrants or predict its level in prospective migrants. The results suggest that further work using the discriminant analysis technique and the concept of migration satisfaction would be very fruitful and of great practical value to immigration officials and social workers dealing with any group of immigrants in any nation, not just Latin Americans in Australia. Likewise, there will be benefits from other studies of the Latin Americans who in the 1970's have become and will probably remain Australia's fastest growing non-British immigrant population in both absolute numbers and in rate of growth.
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PART ONE

THE BACKGROUND OF

LATIN AMERICANS IN AUSTRALIA
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

In the mid-1970's the net settler gain for Australia has been greater from Latin America than from any other immigrant source with equal internal similarities. The Uruguayans alone outnumber the Italians or Greeks in net arrivals. A major migration across the Pacific is now well established, although it is a surprise to most people. Immediately, numerous questions are raised: Who are these Latin Americans? Why have they come? Is there any historical background which paved the way for them? Are they young or old, dark or light, educated or not? Where do they live? What are their other characteristics? What do they think of Australia as a place to live? Are they satisfied with the result of their migration? These questions express in simple form the main problems with which this study is concerned. (An explicit statement of the research problems is at the conclusion of this first chapter). The answers to these and many other questions have until now been lacking or incomplete in the sparse literature on Latin Americans in Australia.

SECTION I.A. STUDIES OF LATIN AMERICANS IN AUSTRALIA

The main reason that so little has been written previously about the Latin Americans in Australia is simply that the migration has, until recently, been too small. Even in early 1972, when the thought of doing this study first occurred, several advisors questioned if there was sufficient material or merit in the topic. The comment now is that the topic requires several major studies.

The first written materials were some minor notes based on a few interviews or social work (e.g. Whitehead, 1972; others are possibly in the files of the Good Neighbour Council and similar organizations).

1 The references, methods, and rationale associated with the statements in this introduction are found in the appropriate sections of later chapters.
My A.N.Z.A.A.S. paper in 1973, the first generally available material, was superficial and contains nothing not included in this study. However, one unintended benefit of that paper was to encourage others studying Latin Americans to contact me. Two studies (Causby, 1974, and Haile, 1977) were undergraduate efforts limited by time, experience and not speaking Spanish. Other studies have possibly been done by the students of Latin American Studies at La Trobe University and the University of New South Wales. One from the latter university is Joan Levett who wrote her B.A. Honours thesis in Sociology (1977) on the professional assimilation in Australia of Latin American professionals. Based on detailed histories of employment, her work is a useful addition to the topic, but limited by its small, non-random sample of 33 professionals.

A study in progress concerns the adjustment of immigrant school children. The sample in Melbourne involves South American, Maltese, and British children. Ronald Taft is conducting the project for the Australian Department of Education and the Child Migrant Education Subcommittee of the Academy of Social Sciences.

The Latin Americans themselves and particularly their clubs are naturally interested in studying their own communities, but their methodology and objectivity are suspect. One survey was conducted by the Grupo Comunitario de Habla Hispana (P.O. Box 121, Wahroonga, N.S.W.) in 1975, but I am unaware of any printed results. A woman from Spain, Monica Alvarez de Cardellino (contact via her husband at the University of New South Wales) also prepared a detailed questionnaire in 1975, but again, no results have been seen.

Latin Americans are also mentioned occasionally in recent major studies of immigrants in general (Price, 1976, and Australian Population and Immigration Council, 1976). Because they are now an important immigrant group, the Latin Americans will also attract increased
attention and more tabulations, etc. in the wealth of raw statistics from the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Immigration.

There is only one other source of major studies on Latin Americans. The Survey Section of the Australian Department of Social Security has conducted three surveys of South Americans and has prepared three reports (1973, 1975, and 1976). However, the reports are only available to specialist readers who agree not to quote from them. They are mentioned several times in this study as supporting my own results. Without divulging their content, I can say that I found nothing in them that is derogatory or prejudicial about any Latin Americans as individuals, groups, or nationalities. Nor do they contain information which I feel could not be generally released, especially because the study here says most of it already. The three reports, all written in short, numbered paragraphs, give a great deal of descriptive results, but almost no interpretation. The reports are as dry as an almanac, but the results are based on statistically proper random samples which are therefore of great value. Unfortunately, the Survey Section is small, on a limited budget and cannot fully analyse its surveys. Also, Government regulations at present prevent outside users from analyzing these excellent surveys. If the restrictions can be overcome, these surveys would be very good material for the re-testing of the results of my survey and for amplifying the early story of Latin Americans in Australia. However, neither these surveys nor other reports have attempted to present the important background for the migration.

1 No other major studies are completed or known to be in progress on the topic. However, this present study points out many areas for future work, both specifically about Latin Americans and also about specific themes that can be studied using Latin Americans as the sample. Information about the progress and results of other studies involving the Latin Americans in Australia would be appreciated and could be sent to the following address: Paul S. Anderson, Department of Demography, Australian National University, Canberra, A.C.T.
SECTION I.B. METHODOLOGY

Since none of the earlier studies attempted to present or analyze the important background to the migration and migrants, that information is presented in Chapters II, III and IV. Chapter II is a basic coverage of the migrants' Latin American roots and includes selected information on the sociology, economics, politics, history and geography of the area from northern Mexico to southern Chile. The history of the flow of migrants from Latin America to Australia is covered in the third chapter. The major characteristics of the Latin America-born population in Australia before the major flow began in 1969 are examined in Chapter IV to determine the extent to which that population was "non-Latin" in character. These first chapters are mainly based on census data and arrival statistics. They constitute PART ONE, the aim of which is to provide background for the second and third parts.

The chapters in PART TWO focus on aspects of the life of Latin Americans in Australia in the early 1970's. Again the literature is deficient, although the reports of the Survey Section (1973, 1975, and 1976) give some valuable statistics. In its attempt to overcome this problem, the present study concentrates on Sydney where over 70% of the Latin Americans live. The topics of demographic characteristics, geographic distribution, housing, family, qualifications/employment, and motivations (Chapters V through VIII) provide the basic picture of these Third World immigrants in their first few years of residence in an Anglo-Saxon society. Both pre-migration and post-migration characteristics are examined to form a basic typology which is summarized at the end of Chapter VIII.

The general picture and typology in PART TWO on contemporary Latin Americans in Australia is in some ways background information in the sense that it helps keep in context the case histories in this and future
studies, including journalist interviews. PART TWO also helps place in perspective any future specialist reports on Latin American immigrants (e.g. the study of migration satisfaction in PART THREE) which need to be viewed in the full context of the migration.

Apart from census data and a few minor sources, the bulk of the data on which PART TWO is based is from a survey conducted in Sydney in December 1972 and January 1973.

SECTION I.B.1 Questionnaire Design

The basic format of the questionnaire is arranged by topics with the general trend being from the least personal data to the most sensitive. The major headings in order of occurrence are housing, basic personal data, employment, and motivation/satisfaction. Table 1-1 gives a more detailed list of headings. A copy of the actual questionnaire and its English translation with tabulations of answers are included in Appendices I and II. Two questions which deal with organized social activities were placed at the end so that any heated discussion on satisfaction would be cooled by less sensitive questions. Such a precaution was found to be unnecessary. An additional constraint on the format was the age limits on the questions to separate the under-five and the under-15 year old respondents after a minimal number of questions. The housing section was printed separately on green paper and was asked only once for the entire household.

Efforts were also made to produce a questionnaire which would yield results comparable to other studies already completed or in progress. While the limitations of time, space and differing purposes prevent complete comparability, the results of several major studies can be used as mutual checks of different aspects of this study:

1. Studies involving migration satisfaction, as reviewed in Chapter IX. Those studies did not include any Latin Americans.
2. The studies by the Survey Section, Australian Department of Social Security, of newly arrived Latin Americans. The results have not been made available for general discussion.

3. The Australian Population and Immigration Council, in conjunction with the Australian Department of Immigration, conducted a major survey in 1973 of immigrants. The focus was on their settlement and employment. Although the sample of 7700 households included only about 40 Latin American ones, the results in *A Decade of Migrant Settlement* (Council, 1973) give valuable comparative material.

4. Comparability with the 1971 Commonwealth Census is also useful to assess the precision of the sample of Latin Americans. Eleven comparable questions were included; several are more complete than the census in listing the possible responses. For example, in the birthplace question the Ecuadorians, Costa Ricans and others have been coded separately instead of in a group of "Other Latin Americans". Several other questions are similar to those in the census. In spite of this comparability of questions, several of the topics cannot be used to determine the precision of the sample because the Australian Bureau of Statistics did not run cross-tabulations of those questions against birthplace. Furthermore, some of the tabulations run for "Other America" included only the persons from the ABCMP nations (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Peru), omitting nearly a third of the Latin Americans.

As was recommended by Professor Caldwell, Professor of Demography at the Australian National University, the questionnaire was pre-coded to lessen the interviewing time and the eventual coding time. However, each interviewee was free to give other answers which were noted, hence the adjustment and corrections of some additional codes in the final tabulations. The English version of the questionnaire in Appendix II gives the basic tallies of the responses. The results are discussed in Chapters IV-VIII.
TABLE 1-1

TOPICS INCLUDED IN THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer Coded Item Numbers</th>
<th>Question Code on schedules</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Housing Questions (Green Sheet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic housing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Decision to live in this neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Income of the household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Opinion of housing situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Zones of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual (Personal) Questions (White Sheet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic demographic data plus assisted passage data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-45</td>
<td>A-M</td>
<td>Residence shifts before and since coming to Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-48</td>
<td>N-Q</td>
<td>Percentage of life lived in rural, urban and metropolitan areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-51</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Knowledge of English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-54</td>
<td>S-U</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-58</td>
<td>V-Y</td>
<td>Number of children or military service (depending on sex).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Employment and income in Australia and country of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-74</td>
<td>A2-I2</td>
<td>Sending to or receiving money from country of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>J2</td>
<td>Reason for migrating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-78</td>
<td>K2</td>
<td>Chain migration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>L2-M2</td>
<td>Attitude toward Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-84</td>
<td>N2-Q2</td>
<td>Problems and assistance in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-96</td>
<td>R2-V2</td>
<td>Leadership and Membership in Organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although given a short pre-test with a dozen Latin Americans in Armidale, N.S.W., the questionnaire contained several problems which were not realized before the time of major interviewing. Some ordering and wordings could have been improved. The most difficult problem was with the wording "country of origin" and "birthplace". In practice these could be considered synonymous since the migration began in Latin America and all intervening moves were recorded. Because these migrants could have originated from 19 Latin American countries, specific names of countries could not be printed. This problem was overcome by the interviewer who inserted the name of the country of origin/birthplace as required. The flexibility of the interview situation greatly helped to prevent errors of misunderstanding of the printed questions. A more serious difficulty was with the selection of the sample.

SECTION I.B.2. Sample Selection

There has never been anywhere a complete and accurate list with addresses of the Latin America-born population in Australia, New South Wales, Sydney nor in any significant sized area. This fact lead to the early recognition that a thoroughly random sample was impossible to obtain with the resources available. A judgement sample (Deming, 1950, 1960) was required to gather meaningful data. It was decided that an approximate quota sample would be the best way to approach the community. The key variables considered were countries of origin, age, period of residence in Australia and neighbourhoods or areas of Sydney where these people were living. The names and key characteristics of individuals were obtained principally by referrals of one person to another, although some names were obtained from lists provided by several groups in Sydney which were dealing with Latin Americans. In order to minimize the danger of only contacting referrals coming from
one original interview, deliberate efforts were made to start lists
of referrals from as many points or individuals as possible. Jean Martin,
in her studies of refugees in Adelaide, has also used several networks
in an attempt to avoid the selection bias inherent within a single
network.

The sampling procedure here used *multiple* networks which, following
the network or chain approach, lead from each interviewee to his friends
and acquaintances and on to their relatives and associates\(^1\). By
beginning new networks with discrete sources, much of the bias in the
single network approach is overcome. Networks were initiated through
the following sources of contacts:

a. Churches with Spanish congregations
b. Consulates of Latin American countries
c. Hostels for migrants
d. Spanish speaking clubs
e. Chance encounters - i. People who were speaking Spanish or
   Portuguese on the streets.
   ii. Different residents than the ones
       expected.
f. Deficient referrals where the source has little or no contact
   with the referee, e.g. "I think a Latin American works at ...".
g. Social welfare organizations
h. Notices in the Spanish language newspaper "*El Español en Australia*".

Quite frequently people referred the interviewers to passing
acquaintances, opponents in political beliefs and some whom they considered

\(^1\) Other methods of sampling did not appear to offer any better ways of
obtaining a reasonable sample precision. The 1971 census tabulations of
birthplace by collector's districts (C.D.'s) or even by Local Government
Areas (L.G.A.'s) were not available at the time of interviewing, so the
actual concentrations of the Latin Americans in Sydney were unknown.
As anticipated the census data has subsequently shown an inadequate
concentration of Latin Americans for cluster sampling to have been
applied as done by Teo (1971) in his study of Chinese in Sydney.
to be unfriendly, anti-social or "stuck-up". Such characteristics were generally not demonstrated in the interviews. Unless permission had been given, the source of the referral was not released to the interviewee.

Through this variety of network sources it is believed that the biases are placed in balance to yield a realistic cross-section of the population. This cross-section was further improved through the interviewer controlled selection of interviewees from each network since the net result of the multiple network system of interviewing was a rapidly growing list of potential interviewees. With the name, address, country of origin and time in Australia frequently known for each of these people, I was able to select arbitrarily interviewees from under-represented segments of the population to further balance the sample. The sample was therefore essentially based on quotas to achieve a reasonable representation of the Latin Americans by location in Sydney and country of origin for migrants with varying periods of residence in Australia.

Concerning the sampling by length of residence, interviewees were increasingly hard to find as length of residence increased. This was expected because proportionately, the longer the period of residence the smaller the numbers of Latin Americans in Australia (see Chapter III). And the longer the period of residence, the more assimilated/integrated the migrants usually become, making them more difficult to find. An additional factor which heightened the problem of finding the longer-term residents was that a high proportion of the pre-1966 migrants are in a group referred to in this thesis as the "non-Latin" Latin Americans1 (see Chapter IV and Appendix VII).

1 "Non-Latin" Latin Americans are Latin America-born migrants who were raised in British or other non-Latin households and who upon arrival are as much if not more at home in Australia's Anglo-Saxon society than in their parent Latin American society.
The size of the sample taken in the questionnaire study is 704 individuals from 309 households or family units. From these were separated the children, spouses and parents not born in Latin America, leaving a sample of 649 persons. This amounts to a sample size of approximately 6 to 7% of the total Latin America-born population of Sydney in January, 1973.

SECTION I.B.3. Interviewing Techniques

The necessity of personal interviews became evident when relatively small numbers (90) responded to the attempt to handle the questionnaire in September 1972 by mail, through distribution by friends and acquaintances, and from organizations such as the Good Neighbour Council and the Chilean Club.

In the subsequent interview period in December-January 1973, several interviewees produced partially completed questionnaires they had received in the mail. It was found that the reluctance to respond to the questionnaire by mail had no relation to the willingness of the people to be interviewed. The implication of this is that the people were not interested in remaining anonymous as far as their personal data was concerned. Although this anonymity was assured at each interview, most respondents volunteered to have their situations mentioned in the final report. With few exceptions, the people were enthusiastic about giving responses to a questionnaire concerning themselves and their problems; many wanted to be able to discuss these matters with an interested person who spoke their native language (Spanish or Portuguese).

The area of interviewing was defined as the Sydney Metropolitan Area (SMA), in which 70% of all Latin Americans in Australia reside. The interviewing period was set for December 1972-January 1973 in order to include the major school and employment holiday period. It was hoped that complete families including working and school-age members would be found at home during the interviewing period. Although interviewing
Australians at such a time can result in a large number of "no contacts" because of vacations outside of the city, it was correctly assumed that these recent migrants would be staying close to home. Most of them were enjoying their first or second holiday period in Australia by going to the beach and visiting friends. In many cases they did not have the resources for more elaborate vacations which, in Australia, involve travelling major distances to places where they did not know anyone and would not find other Spanish speakers. Although this was not an issue of this study, I believe that this situation of stay-at-home holidays would be very prevalent in most groups of recently arrived migrants, particularly those with dependants.

Three interviewers were involved in the field work. They all had similar characteristics:

1. high proficiency in Spanish and English (my wife and I are also proficient in Portuguese for interviewing Brazilians);
2. age 25-35;
3. migrated to Australia 10-12 months before the interviewing;
4. had previous experience of living in South America; but
5. to the best of our knowledge, were not provocative of any national rivalries within Latin America such as between Argentina and Chile. The third interviewer, Mr. Allen Portell of Armidale, N.S.W., and I are from the United States. My wife's fair complexion, blond hair and slightly accented Spanish disguises her Brazilian origin to both Australians and Hispanic Americans. In general we were received as fellow immigrants to Australia, experiencing and understanding the same problems encountered by the Latin Americans.

Each interviewer worked alone. The interviewers all lived in a flat in Redfern so that discussions of any problems and the setting of interviewing itineraries were done daily. With two vehicles for three people, there were few transport problems; one of the interviewers
worked on foot and by bus in the inner city area or two went to an outlying area where they worked from two ends of a geographically organized list of addresses and met at a home or rendezvous point.

Because it was occasionally necessary to return to a home at an interview time set in the first contact, it was necessary to have continuity of the interviewers in the major areas of the city. My wife covered the central area while Mr. Portell handled the western suburbs from Burwood to Fairfield. I went to both of these areas on occasions while also covering the northern suburbs from Whale Beach to Hornsby. The areas less densely settled by the Latin Americans, e.g. the southern suburbs, were visited on special trips by my wife and myself.

Interviews were conducted every day of the week, generally from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. On numerous occasions pre-arranged interviews started earlier, while it was not infrequent for interviews to last until midnight or later.

The interviewing atmosphere was informal. A typical sequence was as follows: The interviewer knocks on the door (if he has not already approached one of the family members whom he has identified in the yard or foyer by their accent). A member of the family opens the door (usually not fully opened) and says a heavily accented "Yes?". The interviewer immediately asks in Spanish if the listener speaks Spanish. An affirmative answer\(^1\) leads to an introduction of himself and a brief explanation that a special survey of Latin Americans is being done by Señor Pablo Anderson from an Australian university and that the answers to a few questions would be appreciated. Very frequently this was sufficient to have the interviewer invited inside; if the family would not answer the questions then, arrangements would be made for the interviewer to return. No interviews were conducted on the doorstep.

---

\(^1\) There were a few negative answers when the person with the heavy accent happened to be a Greek or other non-Latin American migrant who had moved into the residence since the departure of the Latin American.
Once seated in the migrant's home and amid the small talk and compliments on the interviewer's ability in Spanish, the schedule of questions was shown. Designed to fit onto one sheet of paper, the questionnaire size did not cause any signs of alarm. Where several adults were present as in the cases of larger families or families with visitors, the interviewees were given copies of the schedule. There was no apparent need to maintain an aura of mystery about the questionnaire. On several occasions the migrants filled in their own answers as the discussion proceeded through the schedule.

As the discussion became increasingly more friendly, there were frequent and sometimes lengthy digressions by the interviewees. Often these asides touched upon issues which appeared later in the questionnaire. The interviewer made marginal notes in the appropriate sections and eventually obtained an answer to the questions as stated on the schedule. Additional notes on interesting cases and from well-informed individuals were written down and provided depth for several of the case studies. These notes are used at various places throughout the chapters where individual case histories and incidents are presented to illustrate the points made. Because of confidentiality, some names and irrelevant facts are changed or two similar cases are combined. Most are from the sample, but a few are from outside of Sydney.

The length of time for interviewing a household varied with the number of inhabitants and the migrant's desire to express himself on what were probably the most crucial issues he faced at that period of his life. All three interviewers occasionally heard case histories of problems ranging from why they left South America to shady automobile "deals" in Sydney. As far as this information was relevant to the questionnaire, the interviewers made notes; for the extreme cases, the interviewers gave casual advice based on their own experiences and directed the migrant to the appropriate service organizations which provide free professional assistance.
At the conclusion of the interviews, typically Latin in their warmth, there were well-wishes for success in the research and friendly assurances of seeing each other again, possibly at the social functions being held during the holidays. In no instances were there ill feelings towards the interviewers after the interviews. Even the few refusals were polite and courteous.

There were only five refusals by heads of households to participate in this questionnaire. Conversation with these people prior to and after the refusal, which was always courteous, indicated that those refusals did not represent a particular group. Those refusing included a man with children who feared unfavourable reactions because of family and political problems in Chile. An elderly couple of non-Latin American birth who lived in Latin America before coming to Australia also refused; the man indicated that he in no way considered himself Latin American and his wife would not participate because her husband did not participate in the interview. Another refusal came from an Ecuadorian who felt that the questionnaire pried too much into his personal affairs; this man also negatively influenced his brother and therefore amounted to two refusals. The fifth refusal came from an Uruguayan who with his family had been here since 1966. Although the wife was more than willing to participate, her husband's refusal kept her from doing so. The point which he made cordially, although quite pointedly, was that he had not been helped by the Australian government, that people had never been interested in him before and that it was a little late now that he did not need help. His refusal indicated one possibility whereby a slight bias might have appeared if a larger number had refused. That is that they are possibly a group of dissatisfied immigrants who are reacting against Australia but for one reason or another are persevering in Australia. They are possibly persisting because they are too proud to go home and say that they did not adjust well, or that the situation
at home is not better than Australia and they realize it. Another possibility is that some who refused may have been illegally residing in Australia and did not want any exposure on their status.

Several points about the interview results need emphasis here. With 649 persons born in Latin America, the sample represents 6 to 7% of their number in Sydney. Nearly half of the sample were "Independent Decision Makers" who were either heads of households or independent persons within a household, but all of the "Independents" were persons able to decide for themselves if they would migrate to Australia AND if they would leave Australia. To minimize the influence of period of residence, the Independent Decision Makers were further divided: 51 were in Australia less than six months when interviewed; 248 were here more than six months. This latter group is the focus of the analyses.

Although in many aspects the sample appears to represent the population very closely, it does not have the property of equal probability of selection. Therefore, whenever biases appear and are important, they are mentioned in the discussion. Being non-random, the sample is not used in this study to calculate percentages and make statistical estimates for the population at large, but it does point to the trends. Moreover, it is quite adequate for pointing out differences between different divisions within the sample itself. Therefore, by considering the sample to be its own universe, it is acceptable to use statistical techniques on that sample (universe) to determine the probability that observed differences within the sample are not merely the result of the size of the sample. This technique is used extensively in the third part of this study.
SECTION I.C. THE CONCEPT OF MIGRATION SATISFACTION

PART THREE examines two interesting questions: 1) Are some characteristics of Latin American immigrants associated with the immigrants' satisfaction with their migration?; and 2) Is it possible to predict the degree to which an immigrant is (or will be) satisfied? These questions deal with "migration satisfaction", the concept of which is presented below as an introduction. The answers to the questions and methodological details are found in Chapters IX to XIII where the measurement of migration satisfaction and its application to Australia's Latin Americans are presented.

SECTION I.C.1. Several Approaches to Satisfaction

We can say that satisfaction is an individual's subjective perception of the adequacy of his situation for the fulfilment of his needs. It is therefore related to his expectations and his past experiences and conditions. The perceived level of adequacy can range from strongly dissatisfied to strongly satisfied. We can also state the obvious, that satisfaction is something intangible, known only by experience. It can be "felt" by a person, but cannot be touched, seen, or heard as a first-hand experience.¹ It is a personal impression and therefore a subjective matter. Satisfaction can vary between persons in what appear to be identical situations and can change over time within an individual. Furthermore, there are various types of satisfaction.

¹ The verbal or manifested expressions of satisfaction which are observed by others are second-hand experiences, i.e., received from the person who "feels" satisfied or dissatisfied.
Satisfaction comes with the fulfilment of some need or desire; but without specifying what need or desire, the concept is meaningless. Maslow (1954 - concisely presented in Taylor, 1972) has identified a five step hierarchy of needs which, by his definition, also includes desires. The lowest, most basic needs which must be satisfied before higher needs can assume importance are **physiological needs** such as food, clothing and shelter. **Safety needs**, e.g. security and order, are second followed by **belongingness and love needs**, e.g. affection and identification. The fourth step includes success and self-respect, which are **esteem needs**. The final and highest type of needs are **self-actualization**, that is, the desire for self-fulfilment. When one type of need is satisfied, the person can proceed to the next higher level, but with the understanding that he must continue to maintain the adequacy of fulfilment of his more basic needs. In other words, if a man's source of livelihood is threatened he will be pre-occupied with his need for safety and security and forego his drive for esteem and success. Extreme cases, such as a business executive who is fired, illustrate this quite clearly. What is less clear is in the mild cases where a person can try to fulfil his higher needs while patching up the problem areas of his more basic needs. Maslow's hierarchy of needs is useful but not crucial to this study; it does help to structure the following discussion of satisfaction of various needs and desires.

We frequently use or hear the word satisfaction and its close synonyms in our everyday conversation. We often speak of satisfaction at the dinner table. We also hear the word satisfaction in discussion about purchases, or trips, or sexual behaviour. In 1973-74 the National Opinion Research Center in Chicago was monitoring attitudes on "financial satisfaction", i.e., how people feel about their economic position (Time, 4 November 1974, p.65). Recently the Gallup Poll has conducted a survey of happiness to determine "the extent to which
people's satisfaction is dependent on material goods, ... hopes and fears, their religious beliefs" and other issues (Canberra Times, 6 December 1974, p.4). The Australian Government also commissioned a study which found ages forty-six to fifty-five to be the unhappiest years of life (Sydney Sun-Herald, 15 August 1976, p.27). There is also work being done on "life satisfaction", particularly with regard to special groups or situations such as people in nursing homes for the aged.

This work on satisfaction has primarily been conducted by psychologists and, judging by the increase in entries on satisfaction in Psychological Abstracts, it appears to be a growing area of interest. It is not possible to identify precisely why this interest has developed, but it is probably related to the interest by psychologists in "job satisfaction" and the apparent increase in mental illness in our highly mobile, depersonalized, technological society.

SECTION I.C.2. Job Satisfaction

The most widely known and recognized topic of inquiry in satisfaction concerns employment. With the assembly line and mass production came problems of monotony and lack of interest by the workers. As labour became more expensive and management realized that happy and motivated employees were more efficient, industrial psychologists were called in to increase job satisfaction and job enrichment (Paul and Robertson, 1970, pp.11-12).

One innovative and significant piece of research into job satisfaction was conducted by Professor F. Herzberg and his colleagues (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1950). Their idea was to ask people to describe what their work situation was when they felt particularly satisfied and unusually
dissatisfied. This approach has since been replicated numerous times with various nationalities, ages, job types, educational backgrounds and levels of seniority. The results, which have been remarkably consistent, (Paul and Robertson, 1970, p.13), show that "the most satisfying [situations] are almost invariably related to a motivating activity or task while dissatisfying situations generally arrive from displeasing environmental conditions such as poor pay or objectionable supervision."

These two sets of factors, the task and the environment, are not opposite nor independent of each other. Neither can be successful by itself and this is what Paul and Robertson (p.15) consider to be the main message of the work stemming from Herzberg's theory.

The major limitation is that while "it is concerned with differences between various kinds of events [i.e. the satisfying versus the dissatisfying situations] ... Herzberg's theory is not concerned with the differences between various kinds of individuals, groups or cultures. ..." (Paul and Robertson, pp.14-15). This limitation is most severe where, away from the uniformity of the environment and task in a factory, a diverse group of people are doing different tasks in an uncontrolled environment. Such is the situation with most immigrants. Therefore, although this poses an interesting challenge to find a situation where there exists the necessary uniformity within a migrant group, Herzberg's theory and methodology cannot be directly applied to migration studies or many situations outside of the factory. However, Herzberg's findings, especially the division into motivational (task) and hygiene (environment) factors, can be of some use in studies of migration satisfaction.

SECTION I.C.3. Previous Definitions of Satisfaction of Immigrants

Alan Richardson, a psychologist at the University of Western Australia, has done considerable work on satisfaction of immigrants and
describes satisfied people as having a "contented state of mind" (Richardson, 1968, p.46). Contentment is a quite useful concept but in itself it is not adequate. In his most recent book, Richardson (1974, p.25) does not use the words "contented" or "contentment", nor does he really define satisfaction\(^1\). Instead he and others in the field let the method of measurement define satisfaction as used in their analyses. Those methods, which essentially involve asking the interviewee if he is satisfied with his various conditions, are examined in Chapter IX.

SECTION I.C.4. Migration Satisfaction as Place Utility

Julian Wolpert (1965) has used "utility" to link satisfaction with the spatial science of geography. In his consideration of migration from a behavioural point of view, he cites numerous psychological studies and says (p.161) that an individual "differentiates between alternative courses of action according to their relative utility or expected utility" for meeting his needs at particular times and places. To the degree that these needs can be associated with and occur at the

\(^1\) Richardson does vaguely link satisfaction to "success" - "if the initial period of resettlement is successful, this period concludes with the migrant experiencing a general state of satisfaction with life in Australia." But Richardson, a psychologist, never tries to equate success with satisfaction. Success and its antonym, failure, are much stronger and value loaded words than are satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Ronald Taft (1967, p.22) has substituted "social and economic adjustment" where Richardson used and still uses "satisfaction". There are other forms of adjustment besides the admittedly important social and economic ones, e.g. mental (psychological) and physiological adjustment. Simply the word "adjustment" does not replace satisfaction. For example, someone might have adjusted or "adapted" without feeling that his wants and desires have been fulfilled to an adequate level, i.e. being satisfied. To me, in the context of migrants in a new land, adjustment carries the connotation of acquiescence or the compromising of one's wants and desires. Certainly adjustment plays an important part in the process of finding one's level of satisfaction, but I do not believe that adjustment and satisfaction are synonyms. Richardson's continued use of "satisfaction" suggests his agreement.
individual's past, present and future locations, each location is considered to have some ability to meet those needs and therefore has a level of utility which Wolpert calls "place utility". Place utility (p.162, italics added) is "the net composite of utilities which are derived from the individual's integration at some position in space. ... place utility may be expressed as a positive or negative quantity, expressing respectively the individual's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with respect to the place"... having regard for that place's ability to fulfill needs. Thus, Wolpert uses an individual's satisfaction/dissatisfaction with a place as a measurement or quantification of place utility. Wolpert neither defines nor uses the concept of satisfaction in his "proposed operating model" (pp.166-167). This may be because he was not familiar with the concept but more likely because he was concerned with migration at the macro level of aggregate data. His model called for the indirect calculation of place utility from census tabulations and is therefore quite distinct from our approach here. However, he has left us with an interesting idea that satisfaction, as long as it is related to locations which are being considered by a potential migrant, is directly related to place utility. And place utility is one of the crucial concepts in the behavioural approach to migration.

From this we can define migration satisfaction as one form of place utility: Migration satisfaction is a migrant's perceived relative utilities of places as they relate to his past, present and future migrations. Since the places involved in a migration are the origin, destination and any alternative locations, the migrants' perception of these places relative to each other forms the basis for determining migration satisfaction. His considerations and comparisons of these places may be conscious or subconscious, but they must be in relation to the migration or the person's migrant status. An illustration will help
to clarify this distinction between simple satisfaction and migration satisfaction.

Jean Martin (1965, pp.87-89) saw this confusion in the light of distinguishing assimilation from psychological adjustment. She points out that in an employment situation it is common and almost expected that the average native-born Australian would become upset if he were fired from his job. He might say "This would not have happened to me if it wasn't for that supervisor or government/management incompetence". This is part of the individual's psychological make-up. Likewise, an immigrant worker would also be upset, but he may feel he was fired because he is a migrant and therefore, I would add, that his firing is one of the consequences of his migration. If he says "Back in my home country this would not have happened to me", he is not assimilated in Martin's opinion. I agree, but emphasize that his dissatisfaction goes beyond the job situation; it also influences his migration satisfaction. His assimilation and migration satisfaction as well as his job satisfaction and psychological adjustment have been adversely affected by the incident. And as is shown in Chapter IX, there is reasonable evidence that satisfaction and assimilation of migrants are related.

★★★★★★

Of all the possible specific issues which could have been selected, migration satisfaction is especially appropriate for Latin Americans in Australia, an immigrant group noted for recent arrivals and a wide range of backgrounds. The aim is to develop the concept, its measurement and application further than previously done. The hope is to find something which will assist the immigrants and their hosts in better understanding and greater well-being and benefits. One step towards the accomplishment of that hope is found in Chapter XII where the typology developed in PART TWO is used and refined in relation to satisfied, neutral and dissatisfied Latin American immigrants.
The final chapter (XIV) includes a summary, an interpretive synthesis, and a discussion on the need for further research. It also points out how the migration from Latin America to Australia has several characteristics which make it representative of many international migrations.

SECTION I.D. CONCLUSION TO CHAPTER I

There are two main problems with which this study is concerned. The first is the lack of a major study on the background and current situation of Australia's major immigrant group of the 1970's, the Latin Americans. The chapters of PART ONE and PART TWO fill this gap in general, but with various degrees of completeness for the specific aspects of the topic. For example, Chapter III is a nearly exhaustive study of the flows from Latin America to Australia; only updating beyond 1976 will be needed in the future. Similarly, the pre-1969 immigrants are well covered in Chapter IV. On the other hand, the topic of the Latin American background to the migration (Chapter II) could not be completely covered even in an entire book. Between these extremes of coverage are the chapters of PART TWO on the contemporary situation. Although the chapters cover a broad range of issues with considerable detail, the breadth limits the depth. All of the issues ranging from distributions and housing to education, employment and motivations are in constant need of further applied and theoretical research on the Latin American immigrants as well as on other migrant groups.

The second primary problem with which this study is concerned is the need to develop further the study of migration satisfaction. The approach used in PART THREE is exploratory and methodological, i.e. it was not known at the beginning if the methods developed in this study would yield worthwhile results. The only guide was an intuition that
migration satisfaction does exist and can be measured and that certain types of migrants are more likely to be satisfied than others.

The attempt to handle the two primary problems resulted in the coverage of innumerable secondary problems which now constitute the various chapters, sections and sub-sections of this study. Of all of the secondary problems, one predominates and keeps reappearing throughout this study as a synthesizing element. That problem is the need for a classification of the Latin American migrants to Australia. The typology which resulted in Chapters VIII and XII is not the only one possible, but it does tie together the various elements of this study and is possibly a useful basis for further research. The typology clearly points out the tremendous diversity of immigrants who have come to Australia from Latin America. If for no other reason that their diversity, the Latin Americans in Australia merit detailed study.
CHAPTER II
THE MIGRATION'S LATIN AMERICAN BACKGROUND

To claim or imply that this chapter is the full background to the migration of Latin Americans to Australia would be presumptuous and incorrect. The objective here is to summarize and highlight some points which will aid us in understanding the Latin Americans in Australia. Many of the statements are generalizations which fit the majority of the population but which cannot be extended to individuals or small groups. Other parts of the discussion concern individual cases which are "typical" of many people but do not cover all Latin Americans. It is also a dangerous assumption that any group of people overseas resembles its parent population, at least not in all respects. In brief, this chapter is a summary of data and impressions which I believe have relevance to the migration and the migrants from Latin America to Australia, particularly in the 1960's and 1970's. The approach is towards people at all levels of aggregation, i.e., as individuals, classes, nations, and the total region inhabited by Latin Americans.

SECTION II.A. LATIN AMERICA'S HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY

It may be true of other regions also, but it is certainly true about Latin America: to really understand Latin Americans is impossible without studying the region's history and geography. —

1 My experience in Latin America is mentioned in Section II.D.4.

In demographic terms we can divide the historical and geographic story into two parts on the basis of the presence or absence of major Indian populations. Figure 2-1 roughly separates the two areas, viz. the major Indian areas of Middle America and north-west South America, and the remainder of South America.

A very important historical fact is that the conquerors of the Indians were within one generation of the triumph over the Moors in Spain in the early 1490's. What the Spaniards brought to Latin America was tempered by the centuries of Moorish influence (Anderson, 1976). Catholicism was imposed with a vengeance; social rank coupled with authoritarian control was rigidly applied to the Indians first and then also to the poor Mestizos (mixed European/Indian) at the bottom of the social scale. The pre-Colombian cultures of the Indians matter very little today; they were very thoroughly conquered by the Spaniards. The culture developed by the Spaniards in the major Indian areas of Latin America lasted for centuries; in many ways the Spanish colonies preserved numerous features long after they had changed in the mother country.

A major element of the culture was the importance of social status often linked with social characteristics (e.g. speaking Spanish or an Indian language) or with physical appearance as well as economic position. The Conquest and Colonial periods placed the wealth and political power in the hands of a few. This was true at all geographic levels ranging from the latifundios (large, inefficient ranches) up to the vice-royalties and republics. The middle class was small; social mobility was very difficult; illiteracy and isolation in a tradition-bound agricultural economy were almost institutionalized over the centuries. With the major
FIGURE 2-1
MAJOR HISTORICAL DIVISIONS OF LATIN AMERICA

Areas of Main Indian Populations Conquered by Spaniards

Areas with Few Indians in Relation to Europeans

N.B. 1) Major Negro Influence in N.E. Brazil and Caribbean Coastal Zones.
2) Other areas have sparse population.
exceptions of the non-Iberian immigrant areas in southern Brazil, south-central Chile and pockets elsewhere, this situation prevailed until the 1940's. There still exist some areas with nearly feudal socio-economic conditions in the Spanish-conquered areas with large Indian populations.

In the eastern and southern parts of the continent, the cast of players was dramatically different. The Indians were less numerous; they generally retreated as the frontier of Europeans advanced, not altogether different from the story of the Indians in North America or the Aborigines in Australia. In their place came mainly Spaniards and Portuguese who found better land than in the Andes and Mexico but without labour to exploit it. Three solutions emerged: a) Negro slaves were brought in, mainly to northeastern Brazil, but also on the coastal lowlands around the Caribbean. Although an important element in the Latin American population, the Negroes are of little importance to our study. b) very extensive (spatially extravagant) cattle grazing followed the frontier which, in the case of Brazil, was first pioneered mainly by adventurers and miners. These were acceptable activities for the Iberians. c) farming of newly opened lands was frequently done by Italian, German, and other European immigrants who were invited and sometimes assisted to migrate to Latin America in large numbers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Their story has an important bearing on the flow to Australia. Argentina and Brazil received over 5 million and 3.5 million European immigrants, respectively, between 1850 and 1924 (from tables in Ferenczy, 1929). Their characteristics and contributions to Latin America are described in Willcox (1931).

The immigration continued after the 1920's but with a few differences. The first one was the end of frontier homesteading on good land in most of Latin America. The second was a change in the nature of the immigrants. The Depression, World War II, and Communist control over eastern Europe sent fresh streams of migrants throughout the world. Immigrants to Latin America
were essentially the same people as those to Australia, the major exceptions being the Iberians and British who tended to go to their former colonies for reasons of language, culture and some government preferences. Since quotas and more rigorous selection procedures came into effect in most migrant receiving nations, preference has been for more skilled migrants. This has generally meant the more educated or trained urban dwellers. In Latin America as in Australia, post-World War II immigrants have concentrated in the large cities.

In many ways Latin America has been in competition with Australia. Both areas (and also North America) have desired to receive the most qualified immigrants available. But the differences between these migrant destinations are great. Latin America is much less developed and is part of the Third World. Its need for skilled people is greater, but its incentives and abilities to satisfy the needs of the skilled are generally less than those of other areas, although this can vary dramatically between the Latin American nations and with time. The difference between their levels of development is a major influence on contemporary Latin American and Australian immigration and also on their emigration.

One interesting characteristic which has a minor effect on our study is the mixed origin of the immigrants to Latin America and their further mixing there. This is particularly the case in Argentina, Uruguay and southern Brazil. In large part they have adopted the Spanish (or Portuguese) language and the host nation's customs, while making their own contributions to the cosmopolitan environment. Their impact has been felt in every aspect of the national life, as evidenced by the Brazilian presidents named Kubitschek and Geisel.
Although the basic historical and geographical facts are important for understanding Latin America and its people, they do not explain the migration to Australia. No single fact or circumstance explains that movement. Australia's acceptance of the immigrants (see Section III.C.) has been necessary but not by itself sufficient to establish and maintain the flow; nor have the necessary "pushes" from Latin America been sufficient on their own to explain the flow. There are a variety of possible "pushes" which have different amounts of influence on each of the potential migrants. Some are individual circumstances; they are mainly discussed in the later chapters. On the other hand, some of the "pushes" are the political and economic situations of particular nations in Latin America; these are reviewed in Section II.C. But there also exist certain "push" situations which exist throughout Latin America. Two which are very important to this study are urbanization and socio-economic classes.

SECTION II.B. CONTEMPORARY LATIN AMERICAN URBANIZATION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLASSES¹

Although urbanization has a long history in Latin America, its main importance to this study is its rapid increase in the past thirty years. Urban proportions (as well as absolute numbers) have risen rapidly

¹ As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the coverage here is for general background. A great amount of detail has been written about Latin America's sociological, economic and political situation, e.g. Heath (1974), Wolf and Hansen (1972) and Lipset and Solari (1967) or works cited in Bayitch's (1967) bibliography or Gropp's (1968 and 1971) Bibliography of Latin American Bibliographies. But much of the literature is not greatly relevant because the immigrants to Australia are a small and selected group. A suggestion for a further study is to compare the immigrants' social and psychological characteristics with a carefully matched group which did not migrate.
in Latin America since the Second World War. Argentina, Uruguay and Chile are the most urbanized nations in Latin America, with nearly 60%, 40% and 30%, respectively, of their populations in cities larger than 100,000 inhabitants. On a world comparison, Latin America is urbanizing faster and to higher proportions than the other Third-World regions; by the year 2000 its percentage urbanized is expected to exceed Europe's (United Nations figures in Davis, 1969). This is ironic considering that Latin America has favourable amounts of land per inhabitant: 8.1% of the world's population with 15.4% of the total land and 8.5% of the arable land (F.A.O. Production Yearbook - 1973, Tables 1 and 3). In actual fact, Latin American urbanization and general development are the closest of any Third-World region to the North American, Western European, and Australian models.

With this geographic urbanization there also occurs a sociological or behavioural urbanization, i.e. the acquisition of the traits of urban dwellers in the various sizes of cities. Latin America has a complete range of city sizes. The metropolitan population of São Paulo (7.9 million), Buenos Aires (8.4), and Mexico City (8.5 million) are among the world's largest, especially for the Third World. In Uruguay, Argentina, and Peru the capital cities accommodate 45%, 35% and 25% respectively, of their nation's total population (Brooks, 1976). These are all world-class cities whose inhabitants have available to them the experiences of metropolitan life. Although mainly "Latin" rather than "Anglo", much of that urban experience is transferable with those who migrate, facilitating their adjustment to their new city of residence.

There is also an economic or structural dimension of urbanization involving skills and specialization of labour. Much of this is associated with industrialization and is a cause as well as a result of urbanization. Latin America still has a fairly large proportion of the population in rural areas and small towns. They are the reservoir from which the
urban-bound migrants flow. As these people and their children move into the cities and move upward socio-economically, they build up the numbers of skilled workers and also replace those who departed through international migration. However, the influence of the rural population on international migration is only indirect through its impact on the nation's prosperity and stability. Very few rural residents have either the qualifications or desires to cross the Pacific to Australia. For them, to move to their capital city is the greatest change ever considered. But as long as the national situations do not change dramatically and the nations have the educational and other resources to train replacements, there will be a limitless source of emigrants from the cities of Latin America.

Of the sampled 248 Independent Decision Makers resident in Australia for more than six months, 60% have lived all their lives in metropolitan areas of a quarter of a million persons or more (Item 49, 50 and 51 on Questionnaire). An additional 15% had lived more than half (but not all) of their lives in such metropolitan areas. Only 17% did not have any experience with big city living before emigrating and only five persons (2%) had spent all of their lives in rural areas or small towns. The 29 people with some rural/small town experience had lived there mainly in their childhood and young adult years; their most recent residence was in the urban or metropolitan areas. This is the typical pattern of internal migration in Latin America. One exception was a mining engineer, who after his education, worked in rural mining camps and exploration areas. Although the majority of these migrants are from the middle classes, the Latin Americans in Australia come from a wide variety of socio-economic backgrounds.

Latin Americans as individuals are not homogeneous in their homeland nor in Australia. In addition to coming from diverse nations (which are considered in the next section), the Latin Americans can be divided along
the following lines: ability to speak English, education, skills, income, race, reasons for migrating, and all of the basic characteristics such as age, sex, marital status, and length of residence in Australia. Each of these and other characteristics are examined in later chapters of this study. The issue of socio-economic class illustrates the importance of these characteristics as they interact together.

Although class is an important characteristic in every society, including those in Australia and Europe, class assumes disproportionate emphasis in the developing regions of the world. Although Latin America does not have its maharajas and untouchables, there exist tremendous disparities between the wealthy, politically powerful aristocracy, and the landless peasants and urban slum dwellers. As we would normally suspect, the poorest of the poor have not migrated to Australia. Literally, their situation is often so pathetic that any improvement in their country is welcome relief; in fact, in most areas of Latin America there is some improvement of conditions for the very poor. In many ways their situation is analogous to that of Australia's Aborigines. They have few resources and their immediate aspirations involve rural-to-urban but not international migration.

The very rich, powerful and influential members of the highest elite class are few in numbers and usually have sufficient resources, etc. to isolate themselves from the "pushes" which cause others to migrate, e.g., their wealth is in the land and industry which usually increases in value faster than the rates of inflation. Any exception to this is where possible or actual radical political and economic change threatens their freedom and wealth, as in the case of Chile in the early 1970's. For the elite, visas are usually easier to obtain because of their economic independence; they are more likely to invest and create employment wherever they migrate rather than take jobs from local workers. Other Latin American countries, Europe and North America are more traditional host nations
than Australia for these highest class migrants. Nevertheless, the aristocratic and prestigious families of Chile now represented in Australia include the names of Balmaceds, Echenique, Talavera and Yrarrazaval. These migrants are usually young single adults or married couples with children, but (albeit infrequently) the older generation is also represented (Personal communication from Prof. C. Veliz, La Trobe University).

Between these high and low extremes there exists a complete socio-economic spectrum of people with potential for migration to Australia. Warner's (1949) famous six classes of society basically differentiates the people of Latin America:

a. Upper-upper: Elite landholders/politicians; often related to the "super-upper-upper" elites.

b. Lower-upper: Non-elite landholders and professionals who have the capacity of earning a good living and eventually getting ahead. It is considered mainly an urban class, but some landowners are also included.

(Lawyers, an extremely popular profession, blend through these upper groups, primarily based upon the individual's family background and political skills).

c. Upper-middle: Shop-keepers and skilled office workers (including technical people). They are caught in the crunch of inflation and political uncertainty, and find it difficult to accumulate savings. There is almost no rural middle class except for the comparatively few middle-size farmers, school teachers, and others who have some personal skill or assets.

d. Lower-middle: Skilled labourers and manual office workers.

(Secretaries constitute a wide profession crossing class lines. Success is very often related to being bilingual and attractive.)

e. Upper-lower: Labourers within the economy, both in urban activities like factory work and bus driving and in rural labour.
f. Lower-lower: Labourers essentially on the edge of the economy - Campesinos and urban-slum class. And a "sub-lower-lower" class of subsistence farmers with minimal contact with national and economic events.

These classes are not exactly comparable with those in North America where Warner initially used these class names, nor to Australia where class differences are comparatively minor. Also, for the immigrants being studied, the selection process for admission to Australia has reduced the class range, especially at the lower end, but a wide spectrum still exists from the upper-lower to the upper-upper classes that have come to Australia.

By combining the three concepts already discussed, i.e. race (Indian/Mestizo/Negro/European), geographic locations (rural/urban/metropolitan) and classes (lower/middle/upper) we are able to cover most of Latin American society. The result is not altogether different from a highly regarded "Typology of Latin American Subcultures" by the anthropologists Charles Wagley and Marvin Harris (1955). They list nine subcultures, of which one has particular interest to us.

Wagley and Harris wrote more than twenty years ago that anthropologists had paid little attention to the metropolitan middle class of Latin America. The intervening years have provided considerably more details (e.g. Ratinoff, 1967), but not such succinct expression. One qualification to their description is that classes and subcultures are actually part of a continuum from the highest to the lowest. With reference to the emigrants who have come to Australia, the following description overlaps from the middle classes into the "lower-upper" and the "upper-lower" classes. It also relates to the "other urban" sector as well as covering the "metropolitan" middle-class.

The middle class in the large cities of Latin America is made up of a rapidly increasing group of first-generation professionals and of white-collar workers in business and government. Most observers tend to agree that this middle class maintains standards of material consumption and prestige closely patterned after those of the metropolitan upper class. Its members place a high value on freedom from manual labor and in matters of housing, clothing, and etiquette consciously strive to reduce the gap between themselves and their
wealthier models. The presence in the cities of a vast substratum of marginal wage earners, constantly replenished by rural emigration, permits the metropolitan middle class to employ domestic servants and to avoid the stigma of menial labor. But there is intense competition for white-collar positions, and salaries are often insufficient to maintain leisure-class standards in other respects. One result noted by many observers has been the multiplication of the number of jobs held by each middle-class wage earner. Some high-school teachers in Rio de Janeiro, for example, teach in as many as five or six different schools and have to rush from one place to the next with split-second precision in order to arrive at their classes on time. Caught between low incomes and high standards of consumption modeled after those of the upper class, the middle class is forced to devote a large part of its income to items of high display value such as fashionable apartments, stylish clothing, and greatly overpriced automobiles. Thus, in contrast to the middle classes of other world areas, the Latin American metropolitan middle class appears not to have developed an emphasis on savings nor as yet to have distinctive "middle-class ideology". (Wagley and Harris, 1955, p.48).

Naturally enough, there are all sorts of variations and levels within this middle class which slowly blends into the upper and lower classes.

This class from which most of Australia's Latin Americans come is a product of the urbanization discussed earlier. Its continued growth and also its problems stem in large part from the continuation of the urban-ward flows and the associated pressures from the various classes of society.

A principle result of the continued urban growth is the rise of an urban lower class, a vast pool of semi-skilled, semi-educated, semi-satisfied people. They are in contact with each other in contrast to the isolation of the rural peasant class. This urban lower class has a chance for social and economic mobility; the people are aware, via radio, television, cinema and close observations, of what they can hope to achieve. Many have aspirations to join the rising middle class of the skilled or white collar workers who can own a decent home, maybe get a car, and launch their children to higher levels via education. Education is seen to have almost magical powers and is available up through tertiary studies in the large cities. Urbanization means hope, and hope is the "pull" side of the basic migration model. Once a person starts to move,
both physically and socio-economically, the momentum favours movement, not stagnation.

The other side of the model is "push". It essentially exists as the opposite of the above and promotes the exodus from the rural areas and smaller towns. Also, and most important for this study, once hope has begun to stimulate migration, it must be satisfied, at least to some minimal level and within some unspecified time which varies from person to person. If not, hope can change to frustration. When this happens, as it easily can in Latin American cities, there are four possible actions.

1. Stay where you are and essentially do nothing. This is the "rough-it-out" response. It may be linked with changes in objectives and interests, i.e. rationalization. The three remaining courses of action are possibly the end products of much rationalization.

2. Return to where you came from (if possible). This may be "quitting" or merely "realistic action" which can avoid the frustrations of the "Peter Principle"\(^1\).

3. Do something to improve your situation by first changing the larger situation. This is "reaction"; the results are strikes or "revolt" with physical activities. One effect of this is to generally make the situation less hopeful and more frustrating for other segments of the population.

4. Move on to a larger city with the hope that there things will be better. This is the "migrate again" response. Within a nation this usually culminates in the national capital or a city of over one million inhabitants. There, close to the seat of government and with the anonymity

\(^1\) "In a hierarchy, every employee tends to rise to his level of incompetence" was how Dr. L.J. Peter said it (Peter and Hull, 1969). A corollary here is that in a hierarchy of urban centres and socio-economic levels and sections within those centres, people tend to migrate to a position where they are overextended and susceptible to being frustrated, i.e., incompetent to handle well the circumstances into which they have moved.
of large masses, is where the pressures become the greatest.

To imply that all of Latin America is like a faulty pressure cooker ready to explode is incorrect. However, among its nineteen different nations, there are frequently one or two on the brink of economic or political collapse or radical change. In such a situation the powerful upper classes, sometimes in conjunction with the military, hold the lid on while the numerically superior, rapidly growing, and increasingly more demanding lower classes build up the pressure. Whether it explodes or not is almost immaterial to our topic. What is important is that the squeeze is on the new middle class. They cannot react or revolt themselves, nor do they want to return to the quieter, smaller towns. Most sit and are squeezed and, in fact, enjoy a reasonably good life, better than they previously had before coming to the major cities. But if it gets too hot, or if something starts to go wrong in the pressure cooker, their only final outlet is to emigrate. Emigration depends on IF's; they may make a hopefully "upward" migration if they can find a place that will accept them and if their motivation finally reaches a high level to overcome family ties, fear of the unknown, etc. It is an individual thing, and it does not occur in all nations to the same extent. Yet it is the story of thousands of Latin Americans who have emigrated. Undeniably, much of the flows from Argentina, Chile and Uruguay in the late 1960's and 1970's have resulted from frustrated hopes and increased push on the urban middle class.

SECTION II.C. MAJOR MIGRANT SOURCE AREAS

We may question the validity of speaking of a single migration from Latin America's nineteen nations (excluding countries with British, French and Dutch ties) which occupy South America plus Middle America. We may also question whether that flow can be compared with flows from single nations like Italy or Greece (see Chapter III). However, Latin America has many characteristics which make it much more unified than "Southern Europe"
or almost any other area comprised of three of more nations. Over two hundred million Latin Americans speak Spanish and another hundred million speak the related tongue of Portuguese. They share a common culture involving religion, social customs, and a long history which links the various nations. When they are overseas they are much more inclined to associate with others from the region and to even call themselves Latin Americans than do Southern Europeans, Southeast Asians or "Middle Easterners".

This is not to say that there are no differences between individuals or between nations in Latin America. However, there are similar or greater differences between northern and southern Italians, urban and rural Greeks, and German-speaking people in Austria, Germany and Switzerland. Some of the differences between Latin Americans are quite marked, as discussed in this chapter and later. It is precisely these differences which need study and explanation and which make sub-groups of Latin Americans reasonably typical of other migrants. In some ways they are a good representation of migrants from the emerging Third World.

Although there are unifying similarities and uniformities in Latin America which permit us to speak of that region and its people, the similarities can be over-simplified and carried too far. Within the region there are considerable variations. Of fundamental importance is the fact that the Latin Americans come from 19 independent countries. No single set of political, social or economic conditions applies to all at the same time.

Foreshadowing the information in Chapter III, we can distinguish four divisions of Latin America which are also major migrant source areas: Chile, La Plata, Tropical Andes, and Other (see Figure 2-2). Within each of these there are further subdivisions. The Chileans are conspicuous as a single group not only for their large numbers but also for their migration in response to the Allende and post-Allende periods in Chile. The second group,
with total numbers exceeding the Chileans, is made up of the Argentinians and the Uruguayans from the "La Plata Republics". Chile and the La Plata Republics form the geographical entity of the "Southern Cone" of South America. For decades this region had the greatest development and best image of Latin America.

SECTION II.C.1. Chile

Chile has been one of Latin America's star performers in economic development. Its central area is the population heart settled by families who developed a sense of self-sufficiency because of their isolation from the gold and Indian rich tropical Andes. The "Mediterranean" climate there is similar to that of Spain; the area was established with an agricultural base. The earliest Australia-Latin America trading came from this area and consisted of shipments of wheat to Australia (Bader, 1972).

As the frontier moved to the south of the central valley of Chile and the bellicose Indians were finally defeated in the 1880's, these cool forested lands were particularly attractive to German immigrants who have continued to immigrate in the post-World War II period.

Perhaps the most revealing feature of Chile has been its tradition of democratic government. The military played a role of observer and quiet guardian of the constitution while the politicians, mostly from the upper class, administered the nation. All of this changed in the 1960's and 1970's.

The 1964-1970 administration of President Eduardo Frei, a politician from the upper-middle class, was distinctive for its recognition of needed social and economic reforms. Reforms were begun that were highly regarded in the United States. Frei was releasing some steam from the pressure cooker.

1 Throughout Latin America the constitutional governments are primarily modelled after the United States system with a president, two houses of legislature and an independent judiciary.
Progress for the masses was gaining momentum that would need to be continued in the next administration.

Dr. Salvador Allende, M.D., is probably best described as a perennial socialist presidential candidate from the upper-middle class. The election of 1970 was his year of triumph. His story is now well known: elected with a minority; confirmed by congress; formed a coalition left wing government; began ambitious social and economic reforms within his constitutional powers; reaped the economic wrath of the United States; was limited by the conservatives in congress; was pressured by the masses who wanted faster reforms; died in September 1973 in a military coup d'etat that established an ultra-right-wing military junta most noted for its repression of any opposition.

What this has meant to Australia's immigration is the arrival of distinctive waves of mainly middle class and lower-upper class families with economic and political motivations. The first ones came (or at least applied for visas) before the 1970 election. In the second wave of the flow, most were rejecting President Allende's political possibilities. The final flow has involved many pro-Allende Chileans and others who oppose the junta and/or do not see much chance for economic progress. The mixture of Chileans in Australia was clear in the interviews in January 1973:

1) "Communists", he repeated, "They are all communists. Allende is determined to destroy freedom in Chile. That is why I brought my family to Australia. Even if a democratic government was in power next week it will take five or ten years to undo the damage Allende has already caused. I have no intention of going back to Chile."

2) "It was a mistake to leave Chile when I did (1970). Allende is making great progress and I could be helping. Instead I am sitting here." His lament was followed by a lengthy, detailed criticism of his situation in Australia. A year later, after the fall of Allende, I was not able to recontact him, but I learned that his depression had increased considerably and was aggravated by family problems.
SECTION II.C.2. The "La Plata" Republics

In many ways Argentina and Uruguay are similar to Chile with equally serious but less dramatic changes. The La Platan people are mainly descendents of Spaniards and Italians with sizeable communities of other Europeans and Middle Easterners. The military has frequently entered the political arena in both nations. Recently in Argentina the military stepped down in 1973 and was replaced by ex-general and former president/dictator Juan Peron who was succeeded after his death by his politically inept wife Isabel. They were basically left-wing. In 1976 the military again assumed power and has adopted a more central or slightly rightist platform. In Uruguay, the president and his military supporters (or controllers) allow no opposition to their right wing regime. In neither country can the situation be considered stable.

The La Plata Republics in the 1970's have suffered inflation rates rivaled only by the inflation in Chile. Their three year (1972-74) average per annum increases in cost-of-living indices are: Argentina 47%; Uruguay 93%; Chile 349%. The respective figures for 1975 are 313%; 67%, and 341% (Bolsa Review 10; 1, 1976, p.55). This inflation has been a particularly important driving force, especially when considered together with the insecurity of the political situation, although not as radical as the political picture in Chile.

The result has been emigration from Argentina and Uruguay mainly because of political and economic "push", as in Chile. Because of its small population of three million, the exodus from Uruguay is the most dramatic. About 0.2% of Uruguay's population at present live in Australia.

1 The name "La Plata" comes from the large bay/estuary called "Rio de La Plata" (River of the Silver) which separates Argentina from Uruguay. The Anglicized name "The River Plate" is as non-descript and out of usage as is the term "The Argentine". The watershed of the river which flows into the Rio de La Plata includes Paraguay and much of southern Brazil. For this reason some authorities consider Paraguay another "La Plata" republic.
and other thousands are spread around the world. Many are from the aspiring middle class. Their departures seem permanent, as suggested by the following incident:

As a passenger ship left the docks in Montevideo a group of emigrants displayed a large banner over the ship's side. In rather vulgar terms they indicated their disgust with Uruguay. The port authority ordered the ship to return, but it continued out to sea. (Latin America Political and Economic Report, 1973).

In brief, the Southern Cone of South America is in the 1970's a much less attractive home than in previous decades, relatively speaking. The power of economic and political disruption for promoting emigration is clearly evident.

SECTION II.C.3. The Tropical Andean Nations

The third major group of Latin Americans in Australia are immigrants from Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and Colombia. In this study they are referred to as the "tropical Andean" group. Many of the Andeans are mestizos, i.e. persons of mixed Indian and Caucasian blood, frequently in unknown proportions. In spite of mineral wealth, their nations are not noted for prosperity.

Of primary importance to this study is the lack of opportunities for young single adults and married men in their thirties, especially those who are trained or semi-skilled. Jobs are frequently lacking for the ambitious because of insufficient capital to initiate an enterprise or insufficient purchasing power of those for whom the goods and services are intended. Most Andeans sooner or later accept the fact that their prospects for social and economic mobility are rather limited (but not non-existent). Others wish to try their luck overseas, especially in the United States, but increasingly in Australia. A few do obtain visas. They are usually young, single males and (from Peru) females or heads of households who leave their

---

1 The Andes mountains also run through Chile and Argentina, but in those cooler latitudes the people live in the valleys and along the coast instead of in the mountains as in the tropical areas. In Venezuela the mountains are much lower, the population does not include highland Indians, and the oil economy creates a different situation.
wives and children behind until they have earned enough to pay for their dependants' passages to Australia (if they decide to stay). Coming from countries with a generally lower per capita income than the La Plata Republics or Chile or most of Australia's other migrant sources, the financial burden for migrating to Australia is considerable and is magnified because, except for families and single females from Peru, the Andeans generally do not receive even partially assisted passages. As a result, these migrants commonly incur considerable debt to migrate to Australia. Their almost unanimous objective is to find suitable employment and a higher standard of living, both of which are difficult to obtain in their home countries. The Andean migrants are attracted or "pulled" to Australia (and the U.S.A.) whereas many of the other Latin Americans feel a strong "push" because of the deterioration of their home situation.

SECTION II.C.4 Other Migrant Source Areas in Latin America

The fourth grouping of the migrants combines those nations which provide comparatively fewer immigrants and which were not included in the previous groups. This miscellaneous group ranges from Mexico to Paraguay, Brazil to Cuba, and Costa Rica to Venezuela. Each of these nations has special characteristics which we will have to consider at appropriate times. The main similarities between them are reasonably stable governments with modest opportunities for individual advancement, although some have more chances than others. Brazil, with 110 million people, as much land as Australia, and rapid economic growth, is a major nation in the region. Mexico and Venezuela are also large nations and among the richest and most progressive. Costa Rica, although small, has stability and one of the highest standards of living. Cuba is an exception and the only origin of true refugees (except for a few individuals expelled from Chile).
other nations are quite small in size and population and have not contributed noticeably to Australia's immigration. However, El Salvador with over 4 million inhabitants and Guatemala with 6 million, have more (but less "urbanized") people in smaller areas than does Uruguay, a major migrant source.

Future developments could stimulate flows from anywhere within Latin America and change any of these nations into a major source of immigrants for Australia. Those immigrants would not be a new ethnic group but a continuation of the Latin American group. For although Mexico City is over 7,000 kilometres from Buenos Aires, the inhabitants of both places speak Spanish and have many more similarities than do those in Rome, Belgrade and Athens which are about one-tenth that distance from each other.

SECTION II.C.5 Conclusion of Section II.C

Latin America has over 300 million inhabitants in nineteen different nations. Already the Latin Americans are the fastest growing non-English immigrant group in Australia in both percentage terms and, since 1974, in absolute numbers (see Chapter III). In accomplishing this, the three nations in the Southern Cone, with less than 15% of the total population, at present account for over two-thirds of the Latin America-born persons in Australia. Such figures suggest that a continuous flow from Latin America would be possible if the Australian immigration policy and assistance are carefully implemented and if the present immigrants are satisfied with their immigration to Australia and indicate that further development of the flows is warranted.

Although the usefulness of dividing Latin America into four areas by nations is evident because of the Australian census data organized by country of birth, I do not want to imply that birthplace is the key to
understanding the Latin Americans in Australia. Birthplace relates to motivation, background, opportunities and even social and economic status, but only as far as national averages are concerned. There are individuals in different nations with more characteristics similar to each other than they share with their own compatriots. This leads us to the final issue in this chapter: "Who is a Latin American?".

SECTION II.D  DEFINING LATIN AMERICA AND LATIN AMERICANS

SECTION II.D.1  A Census Definition of Latin America

Australian censuses have never used the name "Latin America". One reason is because the region consists of more than the continent of South America.

By convention and for this study, Latin America consists of the Spanish and Portuguese speaking areas south of the United States. It therefore includes Mexico, Central America, most of South America and the Spanish speaking Caribbean islands of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Dominican Republic. With the exception of a few small "non-Latin" enclaves, the cultural region of Latin America corresponds exceptionally well to the physical area of South America plus Middle America, which consists of Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. Using this well accepted terminology, the U.S.A. and Canada constitute North America. There are a few small "non-Latin" enclaves which are not really part of Latin America. They are the present and former colonies of England, France and the Netherlands in the Guianas and the Caribbean. Because British subjects from these areas in the past have shared the same language and citizenship with the Australians, the flow has been sufficiently large to require separation in the censuses. However, changing definitions from "Other British Possessions" to "British West Indies" to "West Indies
Federation" have meant some minor imprecision. The areas with French and Dutch traditions have not sent very many migrants to Australia in the past. In brief, whenever the present and former British possessions and the United States can be identified, the remainder is "Latin America" for purposes of immigration to Australia. This provides us with the basis for our first definition of a Latin American.

SECTION II.D.2 A Latin American is someone born in Latin America

With the region of Latin America previously defined as the Spanish and Portuguese speaking nations of the Americas, this definition suits our needs very nicely. Birthplace is immutable; birthplace is a key characteristic collected in census and other statistics. For comparison with those data sources we must use "place of birth" as our definition; it is the standard definition used in the analyses in this study.

But in Sydney there is a man born in Spain who was taken by his parents to Argentina when he was eight years old. "I feel Argentinian", he said when interviewed. His wife was also born in Spain and raised in Argentina. They are part of Australia's Latin American population, but they are "thru-migrants"¹; only their children meet the birthplace criterion. Other interviewed immigrants were born in Europe but had Latin America-born parents. By all characteristics except place of birth they are Latin Americans. Clearly, there must be other considerations besides birthplace.

¹ The term "thru-migrant" emphasizes the intermediate location; in this case it is Latin America. Latin American "thru-migrants" can originate anywhere and can have a final destination any place other than their first origin or Latin America. Their only requirement was an established residence in Latin America. A synonym is "indirect migrant" which emphasizes the final destination and the original origin. This latter term is defined by C.A. Price (1963b, p.10). Further comments on "thru-migrants" are found in Appendix VII and Section X.B.4.b.
SECTION II.D.3  A Latin American is a citizen of a Latin American country

This definition is fine, especially for comparison with naturalization records or with the census tables of nationality.

But there are some rather European "thru-migrants" from behind the Iron Curtain who adopted a Latin American citizenship quickly and without much assimilation. There is also a growing pool of Latin Americans who have become naturalized Australians. Dual citizenship, especially among the Latin America-born persons with British passports through parentage, also limits the usefulness of a citizenship definition of Latin Americans.

SECTION II.D.4  A Latin American is a person whose last residence before immigration was in Latin America

These people have some amount of Latin American experience, but their degree of "Latin-ness" cannot be determined. This is the case with many of the "thru-migrants" already mentioned. It is also my own situation. My last residence of more than twelve months before immigrating to Australia was in Bogotá, Colombia. I have lived nearly four years in Latin America and have visited thirteen of the nineteen Latin American Republics. I speak both Spanish and Portuguese, savour Latin American food, enjoy Latin American parties, and was a founding member and first president of the Spanish-language Club in Armidale, N.S.W. I teach the geography of Latin America to Australian tertiary students, have co-authored a secondary school text with an emphasis on Latin America, and am committed to promoting in Australia a better understanding of Latin America and her emigrants. I do not mean these words to be self-serving; rather they serve both as an example of a somewhat "Latin-ized non-Latin"

---

1 "Latin" as used here does not refer to Italians or Iberians, although they were the original source of the "Latin-ness" which has evolved in Latin America.
and as a "position statement" for the author of this study. Being neither a Latin American nor an Australian except by residence in both places, I do not feel obliged to unquestionably defend either; likewise I acknowledge that at best I am only a participant observer in the two cultures, not totally belonging to either one nor able to avoid acculturation into both. Previous residence does have some bearing on the "Latin-ness" of immigrants, but it is not a perfect criterion.

SECTION II.D.5 A Latin American is a person who by virtue of certain characteristics is a "Latin"

This fourth and final definition is noticeably imprecise; "Latin-ness" is what Latin Americans have as distinguishing features. In part this definition involves "identification", i.e., if the individual considers himself to be a Latin American. It is therefore subjective, personally biased, and not verifiable. It is also subject to frequent changes in a person on the borderline between two cultures. But the specific characteristics of an individual can be observed, revealing something of his cultural position. Language, religion, temperament, race, leisure activities, life style, family ties and friendships as well as birthplace, citizenship and previous residences combine to form a Latin the same as they combine in other ways to form Greeks, Germans, Italians and Englishmen. Later chapters show us the attributes of the Latin American "Latins" in Australia. At the moment it is sufficient to say that Latins are of different types and are identifiable; even the combinations and borderline cases like Anglo-Argentinians reveal the degree of their mixtures.

This fourth definition is the best one, but it is too subjective and multi-faceted to be easily applied. In this study it is used along with the other three in trying to make the best use of all possible data sources.
All of these definitions play a part in forming the typology of Latin American immigrants developed in this study. An example of the simultaneous usage of the definitions is in Chapter IV where a determination of the "Latin-ness" of the historical and contemporary immigration to Australia is made. The volume of that immigration is the subject of Chapter III which follows.
CHAPTER III

THE FLOWS OF LATIN AMERICANS TO AUSTRALIA

SECTION III.A AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The arrival of the first Latin American in Australia in no way foreshadowed the surge in the 1970's. His arrival, probably in the early 1800's as a sailor on a trading ship, is undocumented. The earliest documented contact was the announced intention to bring experienced cattlemen and horse handlers from Chile as indentured workers (The Australian, 16 April, 1840, p.4). Although we could speculate about the background, employment and assimilation of these earliest immigrants, it would be of little consequence.

The Australian gold rushes in Victoria and New South Wales stimulated a flood of 554,000 migrants who more than doubled the total 1851 population. Undoubtedly many young men in Latin America considered going to Australia. Those actually making the journey apparently fitted easily into the mining communities, escaping the records of that period which were preoccupied with the highly visible Chinese migrants. Extrapolating from data and trends in the last quarter of that century, I estimate the Latin America-born population in Australia in 1861 to have been less than 500 persons.

It is interesting that Charles Price (1960, pp. 91-92) mentions Chile when he discusses chain migration and the nineteenth century family links of "the Dalmatians of Australia [who] have relations in such places as New Zealand, Chile, California and New Orleans ...". As family members flowed between these places they married locally born wives and had children in places like Santiago. If these family units eventually joined others in

---

1 For short summaries of Australia's immigration history and associated policies, see Borrie (1954), Geyl (1963) and Price (1971b).
Australia, the spouses and children formed part of the early Latin America-born settlers.

The 1871 Census of Queensland (1901, p.120) is the earliest enumeration of Latin Americans in the Australian colonies. There were 56 persons born in "other states in America" excluding Canada and the United States. Of these, 45 were males (Table 3-1). In the next ten years their numbers nearly tripled and then dropped to 67 persons. By 1881 the number had increased by eleven people, but then jumped to nearly 500 persons. It is possible that either the 1876 or 1881 figures reflect an error or anomalous situation.

Table 3-1

QUEENSLAND'S POPULATION FROM "OTHER STATES IN AMERICA": 1861 TO 1901
(Exclusive of Canada, and Other Parts of British America and U.S.A.. Therefore essentially Latin America)

(Source: Queensland Census 1901, pt. 4, p.120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census period</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1881 Victoria also enumerated the Latin Americans. The 94 males and 29 females were double the numbers in Queensland but with almost exactly the same sex ratio.

The Latin Americans were not tabulated separately in the other colonies until the 1891 censuses. The total of 1,201 persons\(^1\) may represent the peak in the nineteenth century numbers of Latin Americans in Australia (Figure 3-1). However, an extrapolation from the 1901 census suggests that a peak of nearly 1,500 persons might have occurred earlier in the middle of the gold rushes. A gold rush environment invariably influences both international and inter-colonial migrations.

Table 3-2 shows the population in Australia from all of the Americas between the 1891 and 1971 censuses. Three points are immediately evident. First, the Latin and non-Latin segments are fairly clearly divided except for "Other West Indies" (line E). That category was collected only from 1911 to 1954, inclusive. In recent years it has probably not exceeded 100 individuals and could easily have dropped below 50. There is not much expected migration to Australia from Haiti, Martinique, other French islands in the Caribbean or the Netherlands Antilles. The trend in the earlier years suggests that a few hundred "Other West Indians" could have been included in the "Other America" (line R) category in the 1891 and 1901 census results.

Second, there are not any name changes in the "Latin"section. These nations were independent from Spain and Portugal by 1830. Territorial changes

---

\(^1\) Queensland accounted for nearly half of the 1891 tally of Latin Americans. Although its 1881 and 1901 numbers were much lower, the census of 1886 included 484 Latin Americans (Table 3-1). It is unlikely that on two successive censuses five years apart that an error or an anomolous situation could occur such as ships with Latin American crews being in Queensland at the time of the enumerations. There are insufficient data to clarify this issue. The full figures for Latin Americans in Australia by state of enumeration are given in Table 5-1.
FIGURE 3-1
SEMI-LOG GRAPH OF AUSTRALIA'S LATIN AMERICA-BORN POPULATION:
LATE 1800'S TO 1976

*1976 figures are approximations based on arrivals and departures.
**From 1947 to 1971 there were no separations of individual birthplaces. The lines on this graph are interpolations. The lines for "other" are not extended because different nations are included at different times.
**TABLE 3-2**

**POPULATION IN AUSTRALIA FROM THE AMERICAS: 1891-1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A U.S.A.</td>
<td>7,472</td>
<td>7,448</td>
<td>6,642</td>
<td>6,604</td>
<td>6,066</td>
<td>6,232</td>
<td>8,289</td>
<td>10,810</td>
<td>17,412</td>
<td>21,920</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Canada (incl. Newfoundland)</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>3,663</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>4,488</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td>10,121</td>
<td>yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Other British in Americas</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D British W. Indies W. Indies Fed.</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Other W. Indies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Cuba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Mexico</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Other Central America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Argentina</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Paraguay</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Uruguay</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Chile</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Peru</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Other Andean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Venezuela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Brazil</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Other South America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Other America</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Total Latin America</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>3,199</td>
<td>11,361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Total Americas</td>
<td>13,409</td>
<td>12,507</td>
<td>11,278</td>
<td>12,072</td>
<td>11,579</td>
<td>11,630</td>
<td>14,538</td>
<td>19,018</td>
<td>29,651</td>
<td>44,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Costa Rica 1; Guatemala 3; C. Am. Undef. 6; Honduras 4; Nicaragua 1; San Domingo 2.

N.B. Blanks indicate that the birthplace was not enumerated separately in some years.
mainly involved sparsely populated areas.

Third, the number of nations and subregions listed varies from year to year. This means that the birthplaces called "other South America", etc., do not always include the same countries and therefore fluctuate somewhat.

The 1911 through 1947 censuses have eight main nations listed. These are graphed in Figure 3-1. Most of the lines for the individual birthplaces are fairly horizontal, meaning that immigration approximately equalled emigration and deaths. The exception is Argentina. The Argentina-born residents in Australia more than doubled in size every ten years from 1901 to 1921, reaching a peak of 267 persons. Although that number represents 28% of all Latin Americans in Australia in 1921, it is not a large number of people and can be explained fairly simply. Argentina has always had reasonably strong links with the English. As early as 1810 the British Navy helped Buenos Aires become independent from Spain. More British investment has consistently gone to Argentina than to other Latin American nations. The same is true for company employees and emigrants from Great Britain. The British segment of the Argentina population has been quite substantial, even in the 1970's. Its members usually maintain British citizenship, speak English at home and send their children to private schools similar to those in England. They have traditionally not assimilated even after several generations in Argentina. I therefore suggest that with the events surrounding World War I, maybe as many as twenty-five Anglo-Argentinian families shifted to Australia. Also, some Argentina-born British soldiers might have moved to Australia after that war.

The reason why Paraguay was even included separately in the early census tabulations can be attributed to a unique period in Australian-Latin American relations. In the 1890's a small band of Australians decided to establish a utopian society based on "mateship" and the ideals of the Labour
movement. Their story is well documented in the book *A Peculiar People* by Souter (1968). This group, led by a writer/organizer named John Lang, eventually decided to migrate to Paraguay. Ultimately about 300 men, women and children made this migration. They did not find utopia and the migration died, but they did have children born in Paraguay. Some of those children were in the counterstream of 20 to 25 persons in the early twentieth century. Even in the 1950's and probably in the 1970's an occasional Paraguay- or Argentina-born person of Australian descent migrated to Australia.

The Argentina and Paraguay examples, if my interpretations are correct, raise an interesting question about the nature of the Latin Americans in Australia. My hypothesis is that prior to the 1960's the Latin America-born residents in Australia were distinctly "non-Latin". A large proportion were probably more European in lifestyles than Latin American. Many others were former sailors or transferred international employees of businesses, that is, people with international experience or cosmopolitan attitudes before settling in Australia. The remainder, who could be called "true" Latin Americans, numbered only a few hundred persons spread around Australia. Some of them arrived as children and/or had already spent many years, perhaps decades, in Australia when enumerated in the successive censuses. Their small numbers and long periods of residence effectively assured their assimilation or exceptionally low profile in Australian society. Essentially, the pre-1966 Latin American presence in Australia is almost non-existent and is unrelated to the recent migration. In Chapter IV we will see the extent to which the data sources support or refute the idea of the "non-Latin" Latin America-born population of Australia prior to 1966.

The 1954, 1961 and 1966 data on the Latin Americans are given in Table 3-2 and Figure 3-1. Unfortunately the conversion to computerized tallies for the 1954 and subsequent censuses had the initial effect of
severely limiting the quality of the census data on the Latin American community and other migrant groups with small numbers. Instead of eight, only two subdivisions of Latin American birthplaces were given, leaving gaps in the data from 1947 to 1971.

A comparison of statistics of various census years (particularly Vol. 1., pt. 3, page 13 of the 1966 census) has helped clarify some of the census definitions used in this 1947-1971 period. "West Indies Federation" actually includes all of the West Indies (British, Dutch and French possessions) plus independent islands and probably the Dominican Republic (no clear indications for that country), but excludes Cuba (treated separately through 1947 and thereafter as part of "Other North America"), and Puerto Rico (always included in the U.S.A. figures). All of this supposes that the various persons making these classifications for the 1954 through 1966 censuses maintained continuity. (To date, no records have been found to support or refute the above supposition.)

The "Other South America" classification (Table 3-2, row Q, 1954-66) includes the immigrants born in British Guiana (present-day Guyana) plus any from the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. The latter group is considered insignificant and the former group is also of minor importance. The data from 1947 and earlier indicate a steady decline of migrants born in British Guiana: 62 persons (1911); 53 (1921); 46 (1933); and 27 (1947). The number from Surinam and French Guiana are estimated to be considerably smaller still or even non-existent. This means that the "Other South America" category is a true representation of the numbers of Latin Americans from South America with an estimated less-than-one-percent of the group being from non-Latin countries.

The same can be said about the quality of the figures in the "Other North America" category. The great number of island territories with British, French, and Dutch traditions have essentially been lumped together as the West Indies for the 1954, 1961, 1966, and 1971 census figures. As
a result, the migrant populations in Australia from eight Latin American
countries (Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala,
the Dominican Republic and Cuba) were called "Other Central America" in 1971
and were combined with Mexico to form "Other North America" in 1954-66.
The 1971 census finally revived the pre-1950 practice of giving several
key birthplaces in Latin America; the nine used are:\n
Argentina
Uruguay
Chile
Peru
Other countries in North
and South America [Colombia, 
Ecuador, Bolivia, Paraguay,
(Guianas negligible)]
Brazil
Venezuela
Mexico
Other countries in Central America

These individual birthplace codes have been plotted on Figure 3-1
with approximate slopes as suggested by the slopes for the total Latin America-
born population in Australia and the recent arrival and departure figures.

1 Also on the list of the Americas in 1971 are the United States and Canada
which are almost always separated in the census tabulations. The final
birthplace code from the Americas is the West Indies which in 1971 contributed
999 migrants to Australia's population; 480 of them were in New South Wales.
Unfortunately when only Canada, the USA, and "Other America" are differen-
tiated, as is frequently the case in the census tallies, the "Other America"
group is not the nine Latin American birthplaces plus the West Indies.
Instead, it is only five nations: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and
Peru (abbreviated ABCMP nations). The remainder, including Uruguay with
nearly 2000 residents in Australia, have been placed in the "All other"
category with thousands from Oceania and other places. The result is that
although many published and unpublished census tabulations give figures for
"Other America", those figures are only for the five ABCMP nations and there-
fore understate by approximately one-third the true totals of Latin Americans.
In summary, this section points to a nineteenth century peak of possibly 1500 persons born in Latin America. By 1911, deaths and departures had depleted the numbers to only 670 persons. From 1911 to 1933 there was a slight increase in the Latin America-born population, indicating that immigration slightly exceeded emigration and natural decrease. The decline from 1933 to 1947 was caused in large measure by the lack of replacements for an aging population.

After 1947 the lines in Figure 3-1 take a sharp turn upwards. Since it is a semi-logarithmic graph, the slopes of the lines indicate the rates of growth, which have been continually increasing from 1947 to 1971. Although accurate for its purposes, the graph conceals the major change after 1966. The arrival and departure data show the change most clearly.

SECTION III.B LATIN AMERICANS IN POST-1947 AUSTRALIAN IMMIGRATION

The post-1947 trend in Australian immigration has been a decline in non-British migrants from the traditional sources, mainly in northern Europe, with a compensating rise in flows from southern Europe. Price (1971b & 1976) gives a detailed discussion of these changes. Keeping in mind that there are some yearly fluctuations and anomalies as pointed out by Pyne and Price (1971), we see this trend in Figure 3-2. Briefly, in the 1947-51 period, the non-British migrants were dominated by World War II refugees. The line for Poland shows this most dramatically. The Italians were the most important group in the 1951-61 period, but there was also a sizeable flow from Germany, the Netherlands, and other northern European countries. However, the average annual total for northern Europe of twenty-two thousand dropped to less than one thousand in the 1961-66 period when the European Common Market was progressing rapidly. Similarly, the Italian flows were cut in half to 8,600 net immigrants in the early 1960's.
Although this period included a resurgence of United Kingdom migrants who numbered 45,500 net per year, (an increase of 20,000 persons per year over the 1957-61 period), the most significant shift was to the east to Greece and Yugoslavia which provided 13,000 and nearly 5,000 persons per annum, respectively.

Developments after 1966 produced a general decline from the previously named non-British countries excluding Yugoslavia. This was in spite of an increase in assisted passage to Italians and Greeks. Partly to counterbalance the decline, Australia's "restrictive immigration policy" has been continually modified to suit national interests. Immigrants from Turkey and Lebanon, with mixed or quasi-European descent, became acceptable. The rise in numbers from Africa in the 1960's were mainly (84%) from the United Arab Republic. Most of the other 2285 Africans were probably Africa-born Caucasians who were leaving South Africa and Rhodesia and the former British colonies as they became independent. This same reason also explains part of the Asian flows, but the majority, especially in the most recent years, were highly skilled Asians. The majority of the highly skilled non-Europeans came from the Commonwealth or former British controlled areas of Africa and Asia.

Figure 3-2 shows the Latin American flow to be the latest starter of all. It also shows the relative importance of the Latin American migration in terms of net flow per year. In the early 1970's Latin America was in the same category with Italy, Greece, United States, Turkey, Lebanon, and India, all of which sent Australia 2-5,000 net settlers per year. All other countries sent fewer migrants with the exceptions of Yugoslavia (6-9,000 per year) and the United Kingdom plus Ireland (~30,000 per year). In 1973, Latin America was the third ranked source with 4,015 net settlers, almost double the number from Italy¹. In 1974, while most other groups were continuing to decline in net immigration, the Latin American net settler gain rose to 8,956, making it

¹ These numbers for calendar years are slightly different from the July to June financial year data in Figure 3-2.
the largest non-English speaking migrant group in that year. The net flow of 3490 from Uruguay alone was larger than from many "traditional" sources.

In 1975 and continuing into 1977 there has been a marked reduction in intake of settlers by Australia because of the world economic downturn. However, the Latin Americans have remained the largest non-British intake, and the three nations in the Southern Cone of South America supply 90% of all Latin American migrants to Australia in the mid-1970's. Only on a single nation basis did Yugoslavia in 1975 and Cyprus in 1975 and 1976 provide more than Chile, Latin America's largest single source of migrants.

These net settler figures plus other arrival and departure data permit reasonably accurate running totals to be kept. Allowing for a small number of deaths, the total Latin America-born permanent and long-term population in Australia at mid-1976 was approximately 32,500 persons (excluding 800 visitors)\(^1\). Of them, about 90% were in Australia less than seven years.

The estimates for the individual birthplaces have been marked on Figure 3-1. The ten thousand Chileans are the largest group, followed by eight thousand Uruguayans, and six thousand Argentinians. The Peruvians now outnumber the Brazilian group which stopped growing at the end of 1974. No other Latin American birthplace was represented by over one thousand residents in Australia in 1976\(^2\). Given Australia's reduced intakes in the

---

1 These figures are based on A.B.S. publications ref 4.1 and 4.23. The 1976 census figures will not be available until early 1978. Any discrepancies can be the result of a variety of causes.

2 In 1974 the Australian Bureau of Statistics began tabulating on a quarterly basis six categories of arrivals and six of departures for all (over 200) birthplaces. As of the data from July 1975, this was modified, but the full tables are still produced for the Statistical Section (Mawson) of the Australian Department of Immigration. The data are valuable but almost excessive, except for very specific inquiries, i.e., there are over 1200 figures per year for only the Americas. The limitations on the data are 1) no column nor row totals; 2) visitors are only based on a sample of arrival and departure cards; and 3) because there are only very small numbers for most birthplaces, sampling error for visitors or changes from long-term to short-term residence (or vice versa) can invalidate the results. However, figures such as the net immigration of 222 Ecuadorians and 51 Costa Ricans and net emigration of 17 Cubans in 1974 are the only available statistics for some sources of migrants.
mid-1970's and its probable continuation into the late 1970's, my estimate is that the figures presented above plus a .10% increase per annum will represent the population until 1980.

The sharp rise in net settlers from Latin America after 1968 raises three main questions. The first is whether or not the post-1968 immigrants are different from the earlier ones. Specifically, is it true that the earlier settlers were "non-Latin", and if so, what does it mean? This question is answered in Chapter IV.

The second question is the opposite of the first one, i.e. what are the characteristics of the post-1968 Latin Americans in Australia? That topic naturally occupies the majority of this study in PARTS TWO and THREE.

The third question is why the flow increased so sharply when it did, and what was the role of the Australian Government in that increase?
SECTION III.C  AUSTRALIA'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES REGARDING LATIN AMERICA

There has never been a special Australian policy for immigration from Latin America; instead, there have been variations of the prevailing general immigration policies of the time. Several special circumstances initially tended to keep the Latin American flow small. They were all in force as late as the 1950's. The main one is the distance and high cost of travel between Latin America and Australia, to which we shall refer later. Another factor was the racial criteria of the "White Australia Policy"; the indigenous mixture of unknown proportions was sufficient to prevent much interest by Australia in most Latin Americans. Those who were 100% European were in three main categories. First, those of Spanish and Italian descent were like the southern Europeans, i.e. not exactly what Australia sought. They were required to have a sponsor in Australia, so few qualified. Others were northern European refugees, many of whom migrated to Latin America as settlers assisted by I.C.E.M. (Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration). Australia did not want to be accused of disrupting the I.C.E.M. migration to Latin American receiving nations. And since most of these migrants were too poor to pay for the trip from Europe to Latin America and were unlikely to afford the trans-Pacific fares, the denial of assisted passage to them virtually closed the door for many. Exceptions included the reunification of families, some of whose members were settlers in Australia after World War I.

The third group were the British subjects in Latin America; they were permitted

---

1 The majority of information in this section is from an "on the record" briefing by officials of the Australian Department of Immigration. They reviewed the Department's 20 centimetre thick files for me in accordance with the 1970 Prime Ministerial Directive which limits access to official files for thirty years. All of my questions were answered and I have no reason to believe that information was withheld on the topic. I thank the Department of Immigration for its assistance. See also the studies mentioned at the beginning of this chapter.
entry into Australia at any time. In 1958 the General Assisted Passage (G.A.P.) programme was extended to include British subjects anywhere in the world. But the assistance of only £71 (about $150.00) did not cover much of the cost.

Australia's government representation in Latin America was a combination of service from the various British Consulates and only one Australian Legation in Rio de Janeiro. It is the correspondence with these officials that provides the bulk of the Department of Immigration's files. The first entries were from 1955 and were typical of many for the next ten years. In an eight month period the legation in Rio received over two hundred inquiries (cases) about migrating to Australia and ninety persons were granted visas as government sponsored migrants; ten others were "special cases". This was "a large number of inquiries" in response to an article that appeared in the press mentioning Australia's immigration programme. Such articles have appeared occasionally throughout Latin America without the encouragement or even desire of Australian officials. The articles were usually based on immigration material from Europe and not very applicable to Latin America; they usually prompted a call from the closest British Consulate for assistance or directions. The directions stated the requirements of European race, upbringing and outlook, and ability to assimilate into Australia, something difficult for an Englishman who had never seen Australia to assess. Also, the final approval for visas was granted in Australia and any request for sponsorship or assistance required an interview by an Australian official. This last part required a trip to Rio which was considerably more costly than the partial assistance offered. The presence of the Legation in Rio helps explain why the earliest Australian censuses had greater proportions of Brazilians, or why other areas provided so few migrants.
The lack of any policy toward Latin Americans who could not prove they were but appeared to be predominantly European prompted a ministerial decision in 1957 that Latin Americans were to be treated under the same criteria as southern Europeans, i.e. only dependents nominated by residents in Australia and single women between 18 and 35 years of age. The same memo noted that if there was a demand for more migrants, then the Latin American source could be developed.

The increase in migration inquiries was noticeable with each political upheaval and Australian trade commission. A member of a trade mission in 1962 saw Latin America as "a reservoir of untapped skills for Australian needs" (The Bulletin, 24 November 1962, pp.29-30). Also, the opening of the Australian Embassy in Buenos Aires generated interest. In 1963 that embassy reported approximately 100 inquiries weekly. The dissatisfaction of post-World War II settlers in Latin America was noted, but again concern about I.C.E.M.'s reaction prevented any active recruitment of them. Nor was there active recruitment of any other migrants, as noted in a question in the Australian Senate (Hansard, 20 May 1964, p.1313).

In the mid-1960's the G.A.P. assistance of up to $144 per adult was in effect and extended to most suitable applicants who would represent a "gain to Australia", but the required interview in Rio or Buenos Aires still (for many) cost more than the assistance offered. So when the Special Passage Assistance Programme (S.P.A.P.) was initiated in late 1967, it was also made available for Latin Americans. S.P.A.P. was designed to pay as much assistance for all migrants as was traditionally paid for U.K. migrants, i.e. $335 with the migrant paying the $25.00 (£10.00) balance for the full fare from Europe to Australia. However, from Latin America, one adult ticket was over $750 and the route was usually via the United States because there
were no trans-South Pacific airline routes. Nevertheless, S.P.A.P. gave sufficient assistance to make the migration financially possible for many Latin Americans.

S.P.A.P. was not applied uniformly. It was available throughout South America, but only to British Europeans in Central America and Mexico. G.A.P. aid was available for Central Americans willing to go to the Consulate in Mexico City (i.e., it was not an economical proposition), but no aid was offered to Mexicans. The reason was concern over the predominance of mixed races in Mexico; Australia did not want to be seen discriminating racially between Mexicans, whereas the discrimination on a national basis went unnoticed.

To avoid difficulties over the I.C.E.M. sponsored settlers in Latin America, those migrants were only offered passage assistance if they had resided in Latin America for over five years. A minimum period of only two years was thought to be insufficient by the Australian Minister for Immigration, however it was noted that of the 322,270 persons moved by I.C.E.M. to Latin America between 1 February 1952 and 31 October 1967, 93% were in Latin America more than five years and could be eligible for the Special Passage Assistance Programme to re-migrate to Australia. Many did re-migrate, as shown by the considerable number of "thru-migrants" discussed in Appendix VII.

At the same time, i.e. January 1968, Australia's first immigration officer to Latin America, Mr Guy Cotsell, took up the position of a First Secretary at the Australian Embassy in Buenos Aires. Cotsell's instructions were to develop a flow from Argentina and elsewhere as time permitted. There were no announcements, publicity or recruitment programme, but word of mouth apparently spread the message quickly among persons interested in emigrating. Soon Cotsell was conducting interviews in Argentina, Uruguay and Chile.
Preceding Cotsell's arrival, the British consulates in Chile were reported to have had the equivalent of one full-time officer handling Australia's immigration work, although only forty visas per year were issued in 1965 to 1967. With the opening of the Australian Embassy in Santiago in mid-1968, an immediate and considerable increase in interest in Australia was anticipated and one full-time immigration officer was requested, but not provided. Instead, the inquiries of almost a dozen per day were initially handled by embassy personnel with periodic visits by Cotsell. Also in 1968 the Australian Trade Mission in Lima, Peru, began conducting interviews of applicants, under Cotsell's supervision.

The answer to one of the main questions is now clear: Australia stimulated the major flow of Latin Americans that began in 1969 by opening its door and facilitating selection and financial assistance. Also, that action pre-dates and was independent of the political events that brought Allende to power in Chile.

There was considerable concern and efforts by Cotsell and his staff to present a realistic picture of Australia. One letter refers to complaints by some professional and technical applicants because Cotsell was requiring them to be in contact with the appropriate professional organisations in Australia. But such careful counselling was difficult to maintain when the numbers of applicants was growing so fast. Average monthly figures in 1968 were 65 Argentinians, 130 Uruguayans (and increasing), 70 Chileans and 20 Peruvians, with many more general inquiries. However, these figures vary greatly with local political problems and, in Uruguay, with occasional newspaper articles and television films about Australia.

With the political events surrounding the election of Allende in Chile, there was a rush of inquiries and applications at the Santiago office. The fears that Allende would stop the emigration were unfounded and the number
of applications remained at three thousand per year in the early 1970's. The Chilean Ambassador in Canberra did officially express concern about the emigration, especially of highly skilled persons, but no changes occurred.

In fact, events beyond Australia's control actually facilitated the exodus. In early 1970, Lan-Chile Airlines opened the Santiago to Tahiti route which lowered the fares by approximately $150 per adult. This meant that S.P.A.P. assistance covered approximately half of the fares, but the assistance was not collected until after arrival in Australia. Therefore, most migrants faced a heavy financial problem aggravated by high inflation in Latin America. They sometimes acquired the money from savings, loans from relatives, and loans from reputable sources like airlines. But frequently the only source was loans at high interest rates with unrealistic security. These loans resulted in many problems and abuses for the migrants and stimulated the introduction of charter flights for migrants.

The charter flights from Lima and Santiago to Sydney and Melbourne began in late 1973 and were as frequent as one flight of 160 persons per month in 1974. These flights brought sudden rises in applications at all Australian embassies in South America; the flights were not limited to Chileans or Chilean refugees from the September 1973 military coup d'etat, as one parliamentarian implied that they should be (Hansard, 30 October 1974, pp. 3087-3089). They included numerous 'thru-migrants' as well as other Latin Americans who paid their way to Santiago or Lima before boarding the charter flight.

The major event of 1972 was the controversy over the Peruvian girls in Sydney (discussed in Chapter V). It received considerable unfavourable publicity in Peru, for example a two page article on "Australia: the Paradise of Deception" (Informe 4:74, 8 June 1972, pp. 22 & 23). The
question is why was the flow from Peru so dominated by single females?

Until 1974, Australia was always seeking single females from all around the European world to counterbalance the single males who spontaneously immigrated. There is no evidence of an international recruitment policy toward Peruvian girls. But when the information networks passed the word that secretaries, school teachers, and less qualified girls were being accepted and assisted, there was no shortage of applicants. Instead, the question is why there were so few single Peruvian males or married couples. I believe this is one of the last instances of Australia's racially discriminative policies. The social mixture which made many of the Peruvian and other Andean females strikingly attractive was a barrier for accepting the males who were less European than the Chileans or La Platans and without exceptionally high skills needed by Australia. As the information networks encouraged the females to apply, the same networks discouraged the males. But these and many other selection practices changed in 1974.

The election of a Labor Government in Australia with Whitlam as Prime Minister and Grassby as Minister for Immigration brought dramatic changes to Australian immigration policies (see Price, 1976). One was the end of official discrimination on the basis of race, colour or creed. It was replaced with kinship and employment qualifications. Other changes included the introduction of the "easy-visa" programme to facilitate visitor entry to Australia. The programme was subject to abuses, most notably by Fijians as individuals and by Colombians as groups misled by dishonest travel agents (Hansard, 22 November 1973, pp. 3678-3679, and 12 December 1973, p. 4590). The entire programme was discontinued "in January 1975 on the grounds that between 30,000 and 50,000 short-term visitors from other countries were
working illegally in Australia, so taking jobs from unemployed Australians."
(Price, 1976, p. A7). This was occurring during the dramatic rise in
Australia's unemployment which also prompted the reduction of the total
immigration intake.

Major changes in selection procedures were also introduced, more,
I feel, because of the unemployment problem than because figures released
in July 1974 (Immigration, 1974) revealed that migrants were employed in
jobs below their level of skills and qualification even in mid-1973 when
there was no unemployment problem. There was also in 1974 a Tripartite
Mission from Australia to South America to study the training and
qualifications of skilled workers in the metal and electrical trades
(Tripartite, 1976). Its recommendations plus the posting of an Australian
official in Buenos Aires to review the occupational qualifications of

These selection changes came after the data collection which is the
basis for the later chapters in this study. However, these changes affect
only the post-1976 arrivals who as of September 1977 are only about 5% of
the total Latin Americans in Australia. Furthermore, it remains to be
shown that these changes do in fact improve the situation of migrants
selected under these procedures. As laudable as these procedures appear,
there is no reason to dismiss the findings of this study as not being
applicable to the present situation of Latin Americans in Australia.
CHAPTER IV
THE NATURE AND BASIC CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE PRE-1969 LATIN AMERICAN IMMIGRANTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present in detail the basic characteristics of the Latin America-born population in Australia before 1969. Our approach here is to answer one of the questions raised in Chapter III: Was the pre-1969 migration to Australia from Latin America mainly a flow of non-Latin people?

SECTION IV.A  A LATIN FLAVOUR

On several occasions in the early 1970's the cover picture on Australia's main Sunday newspaper, the Sydney Sun Herald, has shown a pretty stewardess, traveller or resident from Latin America, usually with some distinctive clothing. Also in the 1970's, Latin American restaurants have opened in Sydney. Although staffed by immigrants, they mainly do not cater for the Latin Americans. Instead they give a different type of food to the Australians. These signs of the Latin American presence are not dependent on large numbers of migrants. They are more dependent on a few people with a knowledge of and a flair for Latin American clothing and cooking. We cannot argue that Australia has just recently gone international; it has been strongly influenced by Italians, Greeks, and others throughout its history and especially during the past quarter of a century. Instead, the implication is that the thousands of Latin America-born residents in Australia over the decades preceding 1969 did not bring much of Latin America with them. However, the lack of Latin American restaurants and newspaper articles only suggests and does not prove the absence of "Latin-ness" in Australia's immigrants. We have to turn to the censuses and other data for
a better answer; the 1966 census is taken as the division to separate the recent settlers.

SECTION IV.B SIGNS OF LATIN AMERICAN ETHNICITY IN AUSTRALIA

Our earlier discussion (Section II.F) about defining a "Latin American" pointed out the difficulties with each of the definitions. However, those difficulties can be turned partly to advantage for identifying the non-Latin element in the pre-1969 data. Because of its immutable nature and prominence in census tabulations, the person's place of birth is our starting point. Against it we can examine various key demographic issues that give us information about the ethnic types of the Latin America-born population. The issues to be considered are the size of the population, period of residence, age on arrival, sex, marital status, nationality, naturalization, race, religion and geographic concentrations. The nine censuses between 1891 and 1966 provide voluminous data. The data have been analyzed and with meticulous detail demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that the pre-1969 immigration of persons born in Latin America had minimal ethnic impact on Australia and was in fact dominated by "non-Latin" persons. However, such a "proof" of the hypothesis would be tedious and boring. Instead, the following is a summary of the relevant data with the purpose of describing one of the types of Latin America-born persons in Australia, i.e. the "non-Latins". They are still residing in Australia and continue to immigrate as part of the recent flow from Latin America.

SECTION IV.B.1 Size of Population and Period of Residence

We have already seen in the previous chapter that the total of Latin America-born persons in Australia was approximately 1000 persons until the
1950's and barely exceeded 3000 in 1966. They were therefore never more than 0.03% of Australia's population. Even if they were all truly Latin in their habits, they would not contribute much ethnicity to Australian society. This is especially true if they were long-term residents, because a population of 1000 long-term residents become less Latin than a population of 1000 short-term residents who keep changing every year. The period of residence data from the successive censuses show the grand total of Latin Americans who have come to Australia and remained for at least one census enumeration. Only 1090 males and 935 females arrived in the fifty years from 1911 to 1961, i.e. less than 40 persons per year, hardly enough to inject fresh ethnicity into a long established community. In comparison, 70 to 100 Latin Americans have arrived every week in the 1970's. Clearly, we are dealing with rather small numbers before the 1960's.

SECTION IV.B.2 Age, Sex and Mixed Marriages

A strong influence on anyone's character is the environment in which he or she is raised and/or has lived for many years. Young children born in Latin America but raised and educated in Australia will hardly be wholly Latin. Also a great deal depends on the individual's parents and their assimilation into Australian society. Although some will remain distinctly Latin, others will become very Australian quite quickly, if in fact they and their parents were not non-Latin themselves even before arriving. On the average for the total population, the children will be more like a reflection than like true images of Latin America1. Unfortunately, a cross-tabulation of birthplace by both age and period of residence is not

1 The Australia-born children of Latin American parents would counterbalance this to a limited extent. However, our purpose here is to discuss the extent to which a small migrant population, as defined by a census tally of birthplace, is not constituted of people typical of that birthplace.
available until the 1971 census. That data (Table 4-1) plus the population pyramids in Figure 4-1 give only minimum numbers since an unknown proportion of the 1037 persons who were above age 19 and either were in residence before 1947 or did not state their period of residence arrived as children or teenagers. For example, a ten year old who arrived in 1920 is in the same category with a 30 year-old who arrived in 1940: both were in 1971 aged 60-64 and in Australia before 1947. Also, some youths were not in Table 4-1 because they had passed age 20 in the period between arrival and the next census. Because of the five or seven years interval of tabulated residence periods, most of these would be counted in the next higher cohort. Therefore, approximately half of the youths aged 15-19 would have arrived when they were between ages 10 and 14 years. However, since others in the 15-19 cohort could have arrived as Independent Decision Makers (as evidenced by the increase in the proportion of females), not all of the youths (age 15-19) can be considered to have spent any "formative years" in Australia. Nevertheless, Table 4-1 shows us that at least 35% of the pre-1966 immigrants who were still residents in Australia in 1971 were younger than 15 years old when they arrived. This proportion was probably not as high as 50%, as it was for the migrants who arrived between 1961 and 1966. If we assume that large proportions of minors indicate migrations of families, the 1954-66 period was the most family oriented.

The population pyramids (Figure 4-1) reveal no major imbalance of the sexes since the gold rushes. The male dominance from that period was still evident in the 1911 pyramid (sex ratio 2.03:1). We would expect most of the Latin American women to be married to Latin American men. However, a 1911 census table (No. 83, pp. 2141-2143) of relative birthplace of husbands and wives reveals otherwise. Of the 101 wives and 216 husbands born in Latin America and with their spouses in Australia, only four (two
### TABLE 4-1

**MINIMUM NUMBERS OF LATIN AMERICA-BORN RESIDENTS OF AUSTRALIA WHO ARRIVED AS CHILDREN OR TEENAGERS AND WHO WERE STILL IN AUSTRALIA ON 30 JUNE 1971.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>In Residence</th>
<th>Pre-school 0-4</th>
<th>Primary 5-9</th>
<th>Late Primary &amp; High School 10-14</th>
<th>Youths 15-19</th>
<th>Totals 0-19</th>
<th>% of total arrivals in the period who were still in residence 1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M   F</td>
<td>M   F</td>
<td>M   F</td>
<td>M   F</td>
<td>M   F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-1947*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17  14</td>
<td>16  18</td>
<td>18  19</td>
<td>56  52</td>
<td>108 16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-1954*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30  33</td>
<td>17  12</td>
<td>15  8</td>
<td>64  57</td>
<td>121 32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-1961</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48  53</td>
<td>30  31</td>
<td>20  9</td>
<td>143 116</td>
<td>259 50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1966</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>101 96</td>
<td>81  72</td>
<td>41  35</td>
<td>271 248</td>
<td>519 60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1971</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>534 509</td>
<td>371 365</td>
<td>217 280</td>
<td>1502 1514</td>
<td>3016 38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTALS</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>480 433</td>
<td>730 705</td>
<td>515 498</td>
<td>311 351</td>
<td>2036 1987 4023</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOT STATED</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52  65</td>
<td>60  77</td>
<td>55  44</td>
<td>39  33</td>
<td>206 219</td>
<td>425 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>532 498</td>
<td>790 782</td>
<td>570 542</td>
<td>350 384</td>
<td>2242 2206 4448</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The five year age cohorts do not coincide with the periods of residence of 24 and 17 years.*
FIGURE 4-1
POPULATION PYRAMIDS FOR LATIN AMERICA-BORN PERSONS IN AUSTRALIA: 1911-1971
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couples) were married to Latin Americans. Of the remaining Latin American husbands, 139 had wives born in Australia, 66 in Britain or its colonies, 5 in Europe and one each in Japan, the United States, Samoa and "unspecified". However, the wives of 76 other Latin American men were "absent", presumably most were in Latin America, even though the gold rushes were finished by 1911. The Latin America-born wives in Australia had husbands born in Australia (39), New Zealand (2), British Isles and Ireland (45), elsewhere in Europe (8), and South Africa, Canada, the United States, at sea, and "unspecified" (one from each). Twenty-four other Latin American women had absent husbands, who were most likely not in Latin America. The total of 125 women had given birth to 569 children before the 1911 census (Table 86, pp. 2146-7). However, given the overwhelming proportion of mixed marriages, we can imagine that those children were not very Latin themselves and without any cultural impact on Australian society. Unfortunately, neither of these two tables have been produced for subsequent censuses. The only available evidence is from the distribution maps (to be discussed later) which show very few instances of a Latin America-born male and female residing in the same geographic area. The conclusion is that Latin American households were extremely uncommon in Australia until the 1960's.

SECTION IV.B.3 Nationality and Naturalization Data

Nationality is a two way indicator. The common usage of nationality data focuses on people who give up their Latin American nationality (which they usually have by definition of being born in one of those countries). When they become Australians, they have made a major step towards
assimilation\textsuperscript{1}. The detailed examination of the abundant naturalization data is in Appendix VII. In brief, those data strongly support the other results in this section.

The other side of the nationality indicator is that some people born in Latin America have a nationality from a third nation, which is usually the origin of their parents, grandparents or even great-grandparents. Since Latin America is mostly inhabited by immigrants and their descendants, this is not an infrequent occurrence. In our study these two sides of the nationality indicator merge when the Latin American immigrant to Australia arrives with the British nationality of his ancestors.

The pre-Federation and 1911 Commonwealth census data for nationality of residents in Australia are given in Table 4-2. Eighty-three percent of all Latin America-born persons in Australia in 1911 were British Subjects, mainly by parentage. In other words, they were decidedly non-Latin. Those who were British by parentage were so before coming to Australia; those who were naturalized probably, but not necessarily, changed citizenship in Australia. It is interesting and unexpected that the proportion of migrants from Argentina who have British parentage is not higher than for those from the other nations.

Separating the sexes, we see that 90\% of all females were British subjects, with 90\% being so by parentage, the corresponding figures for the males were 79\% and 77\%, respectively (1911 census, pp. 184-187). This

\textsuperscript{1} Jean Martin (1965, p.73-74) points out that experts disagree on whether naturalization is a good indicator of assimilation. Her conclusion is that it depends on the nation and the particular circumstances at the time, e.g. Communist control over Eastern Europe after World War II. With the exceptions of the Cubans in the 1960's and some Chileans (who only became eligible to naturalize in 1973), the Latin Americans in Australia have not had unusual circumstances promoting naturalization prior to a reasonable amount of assimilation.
TABLE 4-2
BRITISH AND OTHER NATIONALITIES OF LATIN AMERICA-BORN PERSONS IN AUSTRALIA IN 1911. (Source: 1911 Census, p.188).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>Non British</th>
<th>British Parentage</th>
<th>Naturalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|              |               |             | **SUB TOTALS:**   |               |
|              |               |             | 372              | 76            |
|              |               |             | 241              | 55 (64%)      |

|              |               |             | **OTHER AMERICA** |               |
|              |               |             | 559*             | 81            |
|              |               |             | 390*             | 88 (70%)      |

|              |               |             | **TOTALS***      |               |
|              |               |             | 931*             | 157*          |
|              |               |             | 631*             | 143* (68%)    |

*Includes persons from "Other (non-British) West Indies", who total 261 persons in total Australia, of whom 89 plus one "unknown" were in NSW.
probably is not because of differences between British men and women born in Latin America; rather, it indicates a difference between the non-British men and women, the latter not being as free or eager to sail across the Pacific as were the British women born in Latin America. In fact, only 56 non-British women had done so and remained to be counted in 1911. The majority of those were probably wives or maybe a wealthy family's maid; in other words, they were attached before arrival. If we can say that in general it is the women who bring and maintain the ethnic culture, it is clear that the early migrants would hardly have left any ethnic Latin flavour in Australia. After adjusting for the non-British West Indians (mainly French and Dutch) there were only 135 non-British Latin America-born persons in Australia in 1911.

The few immigrants from Latin America between 1911 and 1947 continued to be mainly British subjects. After 1947, numbers who were British subjects rose in both yearly intake and cumulative totals. However, that rise was not as fast as the numbers of persons with Latin American nationalities who finally became numerically superior in the new arrivals of 1962-63 when they contributed 109 persons (about 60 adults) out of 209 Latin America-born persons coming to Australia (1966 census, unpublished Tabulation 241). By 1966, Australia had 428 British subjects who were born in Latin America.

SECTION IV.B.4 Race and Religion

Throughout its history, Australia has been a very race and colour conscious nation. The story of its contacts with the major races is well documented [Price, (1975), Rivett (1975), and the references in the bibliographies edited by Price (1966, 1971, and 1976)]. One result from this contact and preoccupation has been very detailed (sometimes excessive) census tabulations on race; fifty-six different races or half-castes were
listed in 1954. Yet mainly because of minimal contact with Latin America, there has never been a clearly distinguishable category for the descendants of the Incas, other Latin American Indians, or the mixed-blood Mestizos who number between 50 and 100 million people in Latin America (depending on the definition used). Nevertheless, using all possible categories including "American Indian" and "Other and Indefinite", the total number of Latin American immigrants who were Indigenous Americans (Amerindians) did not possibly exceed a dozen before the 1960's.

In Latin America most of the people are Catholics. Those who are not are usually Europeans associated with ethnic/linguistic churches such as the German speaking Lutherans, or they are converts to the missionary oriented churches such as the Mormons and Seventh Day Adventists, or they are Pentecostals or spiritualists. It is therefore revealing that in 1911 only 16% of Australia's Latin America-born population were Catholic and that the Church of England was dominant with 29%. By 1954 the figures had risen to 24% and 36%, respectively. The proportions were nearly equal in 1961, with 29% Catholic and 31% Church of England. However, by 1966 the Church of England had dropped to 18%, in part because of a 15% (90 person) decrease in membership, but mainly because of the dominance of Catholics who were 76% of the 1961-66 net increase in this immigrant population. In 1966 the Catholics were 43% of the total, and rising fast.

SECTION IV.B.5 Distributions of Latin Americans in the Divisions of Australia and New South Wales

Because the censuses of Australia have a geographical basis of collection, there is a tremendous amount of geographical data available. The major divisions are naturally the six states and two territories with further divisions in terms of metropolitan, other urban, rural and migratory,
and still further, splitting into 'statistical divisions', 'statistical areas' and 'local government areas'. One may at times even work with unpublished material on collectors districts, equivalent to a few city blocks. The state tallies from the various census years from 1861 to 1971 are given in Table 4-3. Except during the Queensland gold rush in the late nineteenth century, New South Wales has always had the largest number of Latin American residents, and its proportion of the total has been constantly rising. Seventy-nine percent of the net increase of 8502 persons between 1966 and 1971 settled in New South Wales. Although since 1971 a number of government charter flights of immigrants from South America have been intentionally directed to Victoria (Melbourne), there is little doubt that the New South Wales community of Latin Americans will remain dominant throughout the 1970's. For this reason, our tables, etc. will focus on New South Wales. Between the other states, the distribution of the remaining Latin Americans is approximately proportional to each state's total population in 1971.

The distribution according to the sectional divisions of New South Wales and the nation between 1911 and 1971 (Table 4-4) shows the Latin Americans to be increasingly more urbanized over the decades. Even in 1966, before the main influx of Latin Americans, when Sydney contained 20.3% of all Australia-born persons, and 25.2% of Australia's total overseas-born population, that city held 33.1% of those born in Latin America. In 1971, 88% of the Latin Americans lived in the combined capital city metropolitan areas and 92% of those in New South Wales were in Sydney. The concentration in the Sydney statistical division had increased to nearly two-thirds (63.4%) of the Australian total in 1971. That figure most likely passed 70% by 1976. In comparison with Burnley's (1974, p.4) figures, these proportions in the metropolitan areas from 1947 to 1971 are higher for the
### TABLE 4-3
TOTAL LATIN AMERICA-BORN POPULATION IN AUSTRALIA
BY BIRTHPLACE BY STATE FOR YEARS 1861 THROUGH 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1911 (p.118)</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1933</th>
<th>1947</th>
<th>1954 (v.8, pt.1 p.181)</th>
<th>1961 (incl. visitors in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38% 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>No return</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>611 (52 males)</td>
<td>141 (103 males)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(incl. in SA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>3199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Official Estimate
2 ACT figures included in NSW figures
3 Extrapolated estimate based on general trends prior to the decline of southern gold fields
### TABLE 4-4

**LATIN AMERICA-BORN PERSONS IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW SOUTH WALES BY SECTIONS OF STATE BY CENSUS YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan (Sydney)</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>9726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Provincial</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>541e (major urban, not capital cities)</td>
<td>706 (other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>3174</td>
<td>11,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be:</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NEW SOUTH WALES |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                           |
| Metropolitan (Sydney) | 154  | 186  | 204  | 211  | 371  | 543  | 1059 | 7208                      |
|               | 48.3%| 68.8%| 54.0%| 60.1%| 68.6%| 73.8%| 81.6%|                           |
| Urban Provincial | 69   | 50   | 48   | 82   | 108  | 153  | 401 (Newcastle, Wollongong) | 142 (Other) | 543 |
| Rural        | 158  | 103  | 122  | 88   | 80   | 74   | 79   | 106                       |
| Migratory        | 23   | 2    | 4    | 8    | 11   | NU   | 2    |                           |
| TOTAL N.S.W.    | 312  | 381  | 378  | 351  | 541  | 736  | 1296 | 7859 (* 180 visitors 8039) |
| Should be:    | 223  | 355  |      |      |      |      |      |                           |

1. 1911 totals include 261 and 89 non-Latin Americans, i.e. from "Other West Indies" in the National and N.S.W. totals, respectively. Because of the groupings in the tabulations they cannot be separated from the Latin Americans in the sectional divisions.

2. 1921 total for Australia includes 81 persons from the non-British West Indies. There were 99 such persons in 1933.

e = estimate: In 1971 the metropolitan areas were changed to "Major Urban" area including Newcastle, Wollongong, Geelong, etc. Those non-capital city areas contained approximately 5% of the Latin Americans in Major Urban areas.

NU = Migratory classification Not Used in 1966.
Latin Americans than for the total population of Australia (50.7% in 1947 to 63.1% in 1971). The focus of this study is therefore on the Latin Americans in New South Wales, particularly those in Sydney. (N.B. All of the findings in the preceding sections apply equally well for that state and city as well as for the nation.)

The series of maps (Figure 4-2) of the distribution of Latin America-born persons in New South Wales between 1891 and 1966 yields clear but no unexpected conclusions. First, although their number has been fairly constant around 90 persons, over the years a gradually smaller proportion of Latin America-born persons in New South Wales have resided outside of the state's major urban area of Sydney and, in the 1960's and 1970's, Newcastle and Wollongong. Second, outside of the major urban area, there has never been a sufficiently large cluster of Latin America-born persons in New South Wales to constitute an ethnic community where the members could live semi-insulated from the Australian host society. In fact, in most cases they were not even living with other Latin Americans. Third, few of the immigrants appear to have remained long periods (10 to 20 years) in one country town or rural shire. This is not too different from the mobile Australia-born population, but the period of residence data indicate that if they did move they probably remained within the non-metropolitan divisions of the state.

The 1966 period of residence data for Latin Americans by geographic divisions of New South Wales reveal that two-thirds of the rural population were residents in Australia for more than twelve years (pre-1954), compared with 44% of the "Other Urban" dwellers and only 28% of those in Sydney. These values are all within three percentage points of the totals for Australia, supporting the idea that an analysis of New South Wales is generally applicable to Australia as a whole and that the vast majority of the story of Latin American immigration into Australia is found in Sydney.
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LATIN AMERICA—BORN PERSONS IN NEW SOUTH WALES (EXCLUDING SYDNEY) 1933

LATIN AMERICA—BORN PERSONS IN NEW SOUTH WALES (EXCLUDING SYDNEY) 1947
Throughout Australian history, there have never been more Latin America-born persons in one area than there have been in Sydney. Although numbering only 112 in 1891 (and 154 in 1911) with a density of 2.9 per 10,000 Sydney residents (total: 383,283), they could have had an ethnic impact if they chose to or if they were living close together. This was not the case. With the "non-Latin" characteristics described earlier, there was little cohesiveness, especially in light of the unbalanced sex ratio of 2.6 males to 1 female. With their dispersion across the city (Figure 4-3), there was little contact in those horse-and-buggy, pre-telephone times. There were minor concentrations in the Sydney Local Government Area and in Glebe, but they amounted to only a handful of persons who were not necessarily in contact with each other.

Although their number had nearly doubled by 1947, Sydney's total population had risen to 1,756,611 persons and expanded to approximately three times its 1891 occupied area. The result was a relative dilution of the Latin Americans, especially of the males because the females had increased to almost equal the number of males. Across the city their density was only 1.2 Latin America-born persons per 10,000 inhabitants. In the Local Government Areas with four or more Latin America-born persons, the range of densities was from 0.8 per 10,000 in Canterbury to around 2.0 in Bexley, Glebe, Redfern, Ryde and Sydney (central), to over 3.0 in Woollahra (3.1), Ku-ring-gai (3.3), and Leichhardt (3.4). Given the large variety of immigrants in terms of birthplace, period of residence and social characteristics, the lack of any concentration in the city is not surprising.

By 1961 the number of Latin Americans in Sydney had more than doubled to 482 persons while the metropolitan population rose to nearly 2.2 million, giving an overall density of 2.2 Latin America-born persons per 10,000
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inhabitants. The density variations of the dispersion shown in Figure 4-3 range from zero to 7.7 per 10,000, i.e. up to 3.5 times the overall density. The highest value was for Woollahra. The changes between 1961 and 1966 are minor and can be attributed to the increasing proportion of "true" Latins in the mid-1960's.

SECTION IV.C ILLUSTRATIVE CASES AND SUMMARY

The indicators of Latin American ethnicity discussed in this section all point in the same direction for the pre-1969 immigrants. The overwhelming majority have several or all of the characteristics, as mentioned in the following composite interview with a Latin American woman: "Yes, I was born in Latin America but I have not been back there since I came to Australia twenty-two years ago. My children were also born there, but only the eldest (now age 30) remembers much. We entered on my British passport; my grandfather was an English merchant in Buenos Aires. But my husband has become a naturalized Australian. He was born in Germany and moved with his parents to Latin America at the end of World War II. They naturalized there so his father could get a government job. He was Catholic for many years, but now he attends the Church of England when I can get him to go. Since we all spoke English fairly well when we arrived we were not dependent on anyone to translate for us. We have never really had any Latin American friends in Australia, but then in Latin America most of our friends were not typical Latin Americans. We have probably seen others from Latin America around Sydney, but if they are like us we could not pick them by looks or even speech. You would have to ask everyone on the street if he was born in Latin America. And I understand that we were few and far between until the 1970's. We have some Latin American records, those wall hangings, a mate cup, and I cook a Latin American meal occasionally, but none of that influences anyone
outside our home."

The members of this one family represent nearly 20 percent of the Latin American immigration in any year of arrival before the 1960's. The migration in each of these years certainly included similar families plus some single "non-Latin" men and women who eventually married Australians. These people represent one major type of immigrant, the "non-Latins". They can be further divided into sub-types based on the strength of their characteristics, e.g. those of British stock (Anglo-Argentinians, etc.) vs. those who are neither British nor Latin (particularly Germans). Other sub-types separate the very long-term residents from the other non-Latins. Each of these sub-types is interesting but becoming relatively less important as the numbers of "true" Latins increase in the 1970's. It is this latter major type which requires the main attention of this study. Prior to the 1960's, no more than ten "typical" Latin Americans arrived each year to impart a Latin flavour to the continent of Australia. I estimate that there were no more than 300 "true" Latin Americans in Sydney in 1966, and some of them would have weak ties with Latin America and/or little desire to appear different from the majority of Australians. One exception is the case of Carlos Zalapa, an exporter/importer in Sydney. His story illustrates how the small flows of "true" Latins meant isolation of the Latins at a personal level and considerable assimilation.

Born in 1894, Señor Zalapa was raised in a well-to-do Mexican family. He earned a Bachelor of Economics degree and entered the export/import trade as a company agent in Tahiti. On one of his trips between the islands he met a man who extolled the virtues of Australia. The desire to see Australia remained with Sr. Zalapa after he left Tahiti in 1923 to do post-graduate studies at the Sorboune in Paris; two years later he immigrated to Australia. As evident by his education and background, Sr. Zalapa is an exceptional individual. Although not representative of the early Latin Americans in
Australia, his story is illustrative and will be mentioned in appropriate chapters. The issue at present is his early experiences. "I did not know even one other Latin American in Australia until after the Second World War", he said when interviewed in 1973. But he had considerable contact with Spaniards and was a founding member of the Hispanic Society in Sydney. From 1948 to 1968 Sr. Zalapa was the Consul for Brazil, an honorary post exclusively dealing with commercial trading. Certainly his status insulated him from the more "typical" Latin Americans who were few and far between in the first half of the century. His experiences in Australia at first increased his "international" character and later, after marrying an Australian girl in 1932, established his devotion to his chosen residence. Through his export/import company and consular post, Carlos Zalapa was probably the most well informed and active Latin American in Sydney for several decades. But the lack of contact with other Latin Americans decreased his "Latin-ness".

The one other interviewed long-term resident from Latin America was Raul Gomez, a 1950 arrival who had visited Australia three times before as a ship's officer. He did not like his first job as a rabbit skinner, but he stayed, married an Australian girl, studied wool classing for four years and has risen to be an assistant manager in a wool company. Like Carlos Zalapa, he still has a distinct accent in his otherwise excellent English. He is now an Australian citizen and very satisfied with the result of his migration. Both of these men, by virtue of their long residences and assimilation into Australia, are atypical of recent arrivals. They and others in the small, dispersed, increasingly more assimilated early population of Latin Americans in Sydney had negligible ethnic impact on Sydney or Australia.

No other pre-1960 arrivals were located during the interviewing. From
the census data already discussed, we expect them to be highly assimilated into Australian life and exceptionally difficult to locate. This bias is against the sample being representative of all Latin America-born persons in Sydney, but not as far as the recent arrivals and the "typical" Latin Americans are concerned. Conversely, the pre-1969 non-Latins bias the vital registrations and census tables against representing accurately the characteristics of the "true" Latin Americans on whom the future flows from Latin America depend.

In the 1971 census, approximately one quarter of the Latin America-born population in Australia were atypical of the immigrants from Latin America.

The 1961-66 period finally put the true Latins in the majority in the yearly arrivals, but still their numbers were relatively small. We can safely assume that if the rate of arrivals had stabilized at a hundred or so per year there still would not have been any noteworthy Latin American presence in Australia. The census of 1966 is, therefore, a good base on which we can make comparisons with data from the 1970's. Perhaps up to 200 migrants per year still arrive with the non-Latin characteristics of the pre-1966 flows; since only their period of residence differentiate them from the earlier immigrants, they are best classified with that type.

In the interviewed sample of 299 Independent Decision Makers there were seventeen non-Latins. Three arrived in the early 1960's, two between 1966 and mid-1968, eleven between July 1968 and June 1972, and one in the final six months before the interviewing. Most had Anglo-Argentinian or Anglo-Chilean backgrounds, but German, Danish, French, Swiss, Czechoslovak, Lebanese and Turkish backgrounds were also found. All except two spoke very good or excellent English on arrival. The two exceptions were young single girls who spoke very good English by the time they were interviewed. These seventeen plus the two very long-term residents, Zalapa and Gomez, form a special sub-group in the typology of the immigrants. They are 6% of the total Independent Decision Makers and 7% of those in Australia more
than six months when interviewed. Since they represent a very real part of the total population of Latin American immigrants, they are included in the analyses which follow, but are separated from the sample where it is important to describe and analyse the more "typical" Latin American immigrants.

The sample also includes nine "true" Latins who arrived before 1969. After examining their interview schedules I have decided not to treat them as a separate group for several reasons. Firstly, they are all basically recent arrivals; the earliest was in 1965, and two were within one month of 1969. Secondly, they are as varied in their responses to key questions as the arrivals in 1969 and after. That plus their small numbers means that any analysis would be very limited. Nevertheless, they are a few years older, have slightly more experience in Australia, and are individuals. Therefore, their differences from the more recent immigrants will be noted at appropriate points in later chapters as we examine the qualifications, motivations, experiences and other characteristics of those "true" Latin Americans who have recently arrived in Australia.
PART TWO

THE CONTEMPORARY SITUATION OF
LATIN AMERICANS IN AUSTRALIA
CHAPTER V
AUSTRALIA'S CONTEMPORARY LATIN AMERICAN POPULATION

SECTION A. INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Thus far we have examined some key characteristics of Australia's total Latin America-born population prior to 1969. In this chapter we want to examine those same characteristics for the total recent arrivals from Latin America and also for the individual birthplaces as grouped together in Chapter II, i.e., Argentina, Uruguay and Chile in the Southern Cone, the tropical Andean nations, and Other Latin America. Our attention focuses on the data for Sydney from the 1971 census and the interviewed sample; the objective is to provide a firm foundation on which later, more personal chapters can be built.

With our focus on the 1966-1971 period, we must somehow separate the pre-1966 arrivals. There are two main ways of doing this; each has difficulties. Sometimes we are fortunate enough to have a census tabulation giving period of residence. The drawback is that in the 1971 census, 919 Latin America-born persons (8.1%) did not state their period of residence. Table 5-1 gives the percentages of persons who did not state their period of residence for each birthplace code and each age cohort. The bias slightly favours the immigrants with longer periods of residence because 1) those migrants are more accustomed to the census format, which is in English, and 2) because the proportion of young children without a stated period of residence is higher but their time in Australia cannot be greater than their age. Therefore, they must be recent arrivals. There is no objective way of distributing the "not stated" into the various periods of residence; the approach used here is to distribute those people using proportions slightly
favouring the more recent arrivals but in effect roughly equal to the proportions of the population who stated their residence period. Doing that for the Latin America-born population as a whole, we find that nearly 80% of the 1971 total arrived between 1966 and 1971.

### TABLE 5-1
PERCENTAGES OF LATIN AMERICA-BORN PERSONS WHO DID NOT STATE THEIR PERIOD OF RESIDENCE AT THE 1971 CENSUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. BY BIRTHPLACE</th>
<th>B. BY AGE COHORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries in North &amp; South America</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries in Central America</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LATIN AMERICA (average)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A way to determine the post-1966 population, when period of residence is not given, is to subtract the 1966 census results from those of 1971. The difficulty here is not only from changed definitions but also from deaths and departures and the fact that in 1966 there was no distinction between visitors and residents. The best way to illustrate the resultant discrepancies and appreciate their magnitude is by comparing the population pyramid from 1966 with one for the pre-1966 arrivals still resident in Australia in 1971. These have been superimposed on each other with the cohorts aligned in Figure 5-1. Both pyramids include the "Other Commonwealth" (Bermuda, etc.) persons who numbered 412 in 1966. Estimates of the "period of residence not stated" persons from 1971 have been made. The remainder, which includes visitors in 1966 is the net change (deaths and departures) in the pre-1966 population between the years 1966 and 1971. In our calculations of the recent arrivals, the basic formula is:

\[ R_{66\rightarrow71} = C_{71} - \left( C_{66} - DD_{66\rightarrow71} \right) = C_{71} - C_{66} + DD_{66\rightarrow71} \]

where \( R \) is the recent arrivals, \( C \) is the appropriate census total for the subscripted year, and \( DD \) is the deaths and departures in the subscripted period. (\( DD \) may also be called "replacements" needed to maintain levels.) For the 1966-71 period, the "deaths and departures" were approximately 580 persons distributed among the sex and age cohorts as shown in Figure 5-1.

---

1 The reconciliation of the 580 persons with the three components of "death and departures" (visitors, deaths, and departed residents) lead to a questionable result. Firstly, deaths in calendar years 1966 through 1970 totalled 144 persons, but period of residence was not given. The 1966-68 average before the major immigration began was 26 per year, or 130 for five years (source: A.B.S. Death Tables PRD 13). Secondly, departures of residents during the five year period totalled 319 persons (Consolidated Statistics, 1973, p.58) but certainly up to half of them may have arrived after June 1966 and then departed before June 1971. The 1965-67 average was only 35 per year, or 175 for the five years. This leaves approximately 275 visitors who were 9% of the total population, compared with 333 visitors in 1971 who were only 3% of that population. The reason for this (or its accuracy) is unclear.
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The four way tabulation by birthplace by period of residence by age by sex for 1971 (Figure 5-2) shows the demographic impact of the post-1966 arrivals. These immigrants are youthful. The modal age cohort is the 25 to 29 year olds followed by the 20-24 and 30-35 cohorts; over 40% are between the ages of 20 and 34 years. Thirty-two percent (2752 persons) of the net increase are dependants below the age of 15. Very few are aged 15 to 19. These dependants' children indicate that young families have migrated. It is not possible to identify dependent wives nor working wives from this data. There is a net decrease (-48) in persons aged 50 and over, indicating deaths (and a few departures?) of the pre-1966 elderly population with few elderly replacements coming from immigration. The sexes are equally balanced with a sex ratio of 1.03:1 for the net increase between 1966-1971. This is in part because of the arrival of families, but also because of the apparent effort of the Australian government to balance the sexes of the single, independent migrants.

The 1971 population pyramid for Latin Americans in Sydney is almost identical to the national pyramid for Latin Americans. The main difference is that Sydney has a slightly higher proportion of migrants in the main economically active cohorts (20-39 year olds) but a lower proportion of those 40 years old or over. This is because Sydney has received such a large proportion of the post-1966 migrants who are concentrated in the cohorts for less than 40 years of age.

SECTION V.B IMMIGRANTS FROM THE MAJOR SOURCE AREAS

SECTION V.B.1 The Southern Cone: The La Platans and Chileans

Although similar in many ways as indicated in Chapter II, the Argentina and Uruguay-born immigrants are strikingly different in two of the issues we are examining in this chapter. The first is in their periods
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Source: Unpub. Tab.6
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Note: For the number of persons
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for cohorts age 50 and above,
consult the source table in
the 1971 census.
of residence. The migration from Argentina has been established longer; the Argentina-born migrants were 25-30% of the total Latin America-born from the 1920's to the mid-1960's.

In contrast, the Uruguayans numbered only slightly more than 100 persons as late as 1968 and only 8-10 of them did not live in Sydney; over 95% of all Uruguayans in Australia in 1971 had a period of residence of less than three years (1971 Census, Unpublished Table 6). This goes a long way towards explaining why a higher proportion of Uruguay-born persons are in Sydney (see Appendix III.B.1). The Uruguayan who refused the interview (see Section I.B.3) plus his wife and at least two Uruguay-born children represented almost 10% of Sydney's Uruguayans in 1971; his isolation very possibly contributed to his disenchantment with Australia.

The flow from Chile was between the Argentina and Uruguay extremes just described. Its surge of migrants has already been mentioned in Chapters II and III.

The second major difference between the flows from the nations in the Southern Cone is in their nationalities (1971 Census, Unpublished Table 11). The recently arrived Uruguayans were the least British (0.7%) of the nine tabulated birthplaces. However, the Argentina-born immigrants between 1966-71 include 14.4% British subjects, one of the highest proportions from the major migrant sources in Latin America. Of course these percentages depend on the total size of the flow from each nation because there is only a limited pool of British subjects. When a large increase occurs in a flow, the population with a different nationality has difficulty increasing in similar proportions. For this reason the small flow from Venezuela contains only 27 British subjects but they are 22.7% of the immigrants while 99 British from Chile are only 3.1% of that flow. In general, the smaller the flow, the more British it is.

The data on nationality in 1971 yield three further observations.
Firstly, the "Other Countries" grouped birthplaces include some present and former British possessions which overshadow the results from the Latin nations with which they are combined. Over half of all immigrants from "Other Countries in Central America" are British subjects, even for those in Australia less than the minimal five year period before naturalization was permitted.

Secondly, of the longer term residents in Australia (pre-1961 arrivals), 85% of the Argentina-born are British, as are 72% of the Chileans; the average percentage for the seven nations listed individually is 80%. Only Uruguay is below 70% and it is a most surprising 39%. Although possibly only because of its low numbers (38 persons) from the pre-1961 period, it indicates a less British flow, or a lack of willingness of these persons to adopt British nationality, or probably both.

The third point concerns the migrants who had nationalities from a third nation, i.e., not British nor the same as their birthplace. They mainly obtained these other nationalities from their parents. Nearly 1400 such immigrants entered and stayed in Australia in the 1966-71 period. That represents a six-fold increase over the previous five years, but only a quarter as fast as the 24-fold increase of those with matching birthplaces and nationalities. Argentina contributed 12% of these "other nationals" while Uruguay and Chile contributed 20% and 25% respectively. For Argentina that represents less than a three-fold increase, but for Uruguay and Chile the increases were dramatic. The implication is that as times got tougher, those "other third nationality" people, with less emotional ties to the "patria", were more ready to leave their country of birth (or they were brought out by their "thru-migrant" parents). It is not altogether certain, but quite probably similar results will be seen for post-Peron Argentina when the 1976 Australian census results are available.
SECTION V.B.2  The Tropical Andeans

It is unfortunate that of the tropical Andean nations, only Peru is listed in the census tabulations. However, that data plus some survey results gives us a reasonably detailed picture of the Andeans. Only 21% of the 1966-71 arrivals from Peru are not Peruvian citizens, a fairly low percentage for a medium sized flow of over 400 persons. Also, three-fourths of the total were post-1968 arrivals. But those are not the most interesting features.

Of the Peruvian nationals who migrated to Australia between 1966-71, over two-thirds were females of whom most were between 20 and 29 years of age. The population pyramids for the Latin Americans in Sydney (Figure 5-3), which are very similar to the ones for Australia, shows this striking Peruvian female dominance. The reason was the Australian Government's deliberate policy until 1974 to try to balance the male dominance from other immigrant sources.

One outcome of this migration was the infamous and totally erroneous "South American girls scandal" of 1972. On 10 April the Australian carried an article claiming that initial settlement difficulties had led some single South American migrant girls into prostitution. A Department of Immigration response on 14 April to a press inquiry made the statement that "there is no evidence to suggest that" the report was true. But neither did the response dispel the rumour. Mr. Grassby, the Opposition spokesman on immigration in Parliament, investigated and attended a meeting in Sydney in early May where Peruvian girls, Australian social workers and others discussed the problems of single South American girls in Sydney. He reported his results, opinions, etc. in his "flower of South American womanhood" speech (Hansard, 18 May 1972, pp. 2843-2845) which attracted considerable attention overseas (see Section III.C). Grassby mentioned the problems of "marriage fodder", under-utilization of skills, insufficient language courses, and other difficulties (but nothing about the alleged prostitution) as he criticized Australia's immigration programme.
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The Minister for Immigration, Dr. Forbes, replied with arguments not unlike those used by Grassby on other topics when he became the Minister at the end of 1972. Both men had aired their views in the public political arena of Parliament, but the issue of prostitution remained unanswered.

Grassby, social workers and Immigration officials again met a group of single South American girls in early June (Immigration, 1977) and some steps were taken to meet the requests of the girls. Also, the minutes of that meeting recorded discussions about the YWCA and other hostels fulfilling some "substitute mother" functions to help the attractive but socially naive girls who were unaccustomed to so much freedom. This was considered nonsense by some of the girls, but on the other hand, the girls at that meeting were probably more self-reliant than many others. Grassby mentioned this meeting briefly, in his own defense, in Parliament (Hansard, 30 August 1972, p.879). On the previous day Forbes had reported that Grassby's "flower of South American womanhood" statement has "proved to be completely unfounded in every single particular. In that case all that he did was to cause a great deal of embarrassment and suffering to his innocent victims" (Hansard, 29 August 1972, p.812). Such a statement by Forbes was completely unjustified and purely political (or misinformed?) because Grassby never mentioned the prostitution question. Nevertheless, Forbes' statement was accurate about the prostitution. His press statement (No.17 of 1972) on 30 August reported that the prostitute ring did exist, but it was an international group whose main Latin American element was a Bolivia-born pander. This international troupe was in business long before it came to Australia on visitor's visas. Unfortunately the correct information that the South American single girls were not turning to prostitution did not receive as much press coverage as the initial incorrect report.

Another result of large numbers of single girls, but unrelated to the one just mentioned, has been a few unwanted pregnancies. I do not wish to imply that this was the case with many of these girls; however, their situation
attracts attention because single females are a high proportion of the total migration from Peru. The exact numbers of ex-nuptial births to all mothers born in Latin America is not available. One social worker indicated that 8 or 9 ex-nuptial children of Latin American mothers were in one central Sydney nursery in late 1972. The situation is not unique to Peruvians; two of the three unwed mothers interviewed were Chilean. Only one of the three said she would like to remain in Australia.

A more pleasant result of the immigration of single girls from Peru and elsewhere has been one to two hundred marriages per year. The statistics and discussion of that story is reserved for the next chapter on family structure.

The Andeans other than Peruvians are not too numerous and are clumped into the "Other North and South America" birthplace. The data on these migrants comes mainly from the interviewed sample; the results therefore, probably reflect a bias in the selection process against those who are less Latin, more assimilated, longer residents, and with less contact with the people in the networks used to find the sample.

The Ecuadorian and Colombian flows are male dominated, but not just because of single men. A common practice is for the husbands to come ahead of their wives and children, as was frequently done by southern European migrants before they were eligible for passage assistance. The only passage assistance to Andeans is through Peru; several cases were encountered of Ecuadorians who went to Peru specifically to seek passage assistance. It is not known how many tried this, but only that some were successful.

The other main issue which focuses mainly on the Andeans is that of race. The racial origin question asked of the sample referred to the two racial groups which can be combined to form the "Mestizos" or the "Latinos", as some prefer to call themselves. Some respondents could not put percentages on their origin, but they usually indicated a mixed but mainly European origin.
A few (13) did not wish any answer to be recorded; their appearance generally indicated European background. The survey results (Appendix II) show no difference between the males and females. Only two people considered themselves to be other than European or Indigenous American; one was an Argentinian of Arab descent and the other was a Brazilian who was part Negro. The 109 persons who were fully or more than half Indigenous Americans were mainly from Ecuador (50 persons), Peru (15 persons), and Chile (12 persons) and represented 17% of the sample. As shown in Appendix III.B.1 the sample over-represents the Ecuadorians, of whom 70% were less than half European. Their numbers should be reduced by approximately 40% while the Uruguayans (of whom 90% of those interviewed were more than half European) should be increased. With that adjustment, the not-totally-European proportion drops to 10-12% which I believe has been fairly constant or possibly lower throughout the 1970's.

SECTION V.B.3 Others from Latin America

Portions of this final "catch-all" composite group have already been touched upon lightly: in the census results some Andeans are included and the migrants from the "other Commonwealth countries" inflate the proportions which are British subjects in the nationality data. The main observation is male dominance, especially among the "true Latins" as indicated by a person's nationality being the same as his birthplace. An uneven sex ratio generally indicates migrations of unmarried persons; we will examine this closely in Chapter VI on households. Here we can foreshadow that discussion by pointing out that the interviews included many young males out to see some of the world. Given the lack of "push" from many of the smaller and/or less troubled Latin American nations, a few such migrants from each would quickly account for much of the observed flows.

In the three individually listed "Other" sources, i.e. Brazil, Mexico
and Venezuela, about 40% of the migrants are British or with a third nationality. They total less than 300 persons coming from three nations which have a combined population around 175 million people. They probably came as family units, judging by the near balance of the sexes. If the average family size was three persons, they amount to fewer than 100 families, or part of up to 200 families.

SECTION V.C DISTRIBUTION IN THE 1970's

SECTION V.C.1 Distribution Among the States and Within New South Wales

When we look at the state by state distribution of the nine individual birthplaces for Latin America-born residents in Australia in 1971 (Table 5-2), we see that in general each birthplace is represented in each state in proportion to the total number of Latin Americans in the state. The exceptions are few but interesting.

One exception is that Argentina-born persons are less concentrated in Sydney. Although in 1971 they numbered less than half of the Chilean count, they had numerical superiority in Victoria, Queensland and the A.C.T. and had similar numbers to the Chileans in three other states. I suspect that this is because of their longer period of residence (which encourages greater dispersion) or possibly because of a larger non-Latin element in the Argentinian flow to Australia, especially in the pre-1966 period. Unfortunately, the censuses between 1947 and 1971 did not tabulate separately the Argentina-born residents. From the discussion in Section III.A, we know that until recently they were the numerically dominant group from Latin America. The detailed census tables show the distribution of Latin Americans by birthplace by state of residence in 1911 and 1947 to be reasonably proportional to their total numbers, especially for the largest groups, including the Argentinians.
## Table 5-2

**Latin America-Born Residents in Australia: 1971 Birthplace by State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Major Urban</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th></th>
<th>Vic</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>W.A.</th>
<th>Tas</th>
<th>N.T.</th>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Aust</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Central</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2983</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other N &amp; S America</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Latin America</td>
<td>7609</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**

1. "Standards" of 1971 Census
2. 1971 Census, Table 6, p.300, gives Sydney's residents.
   N.B. Sydney Statistical Division includes some rural land not included in the "Major Urban" classification.
A second exception is the Brazilians who are over-represented in Western Australia. The apparent reason for this is that Brazil is the only nation in Latin America which is closer to Australia via the South Atlantic and Indian Oceans than across the Pacific, i.e. it costs slightly more for a Brazilian to fly to south-eastern Australia than to Western Australia.

Table 5-2 also reveals the exceptionally high concentration of Uruguayans in Sydney in 1971. This is mainly because there were so few of them elsewhere in Australia before the recent flow began.

There are limitations on the data for geographic areas smaller than a state and its capital city. The computer programming of the Australian Bureau of Statistics only included the immigrants from the ABCMP nations (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Peru) in the "other America" birthplace on all tabulations of Local Government Areas and Collector's Districts. Approximately one-third of the Latin America-born residents (including all Uruguayans) are not included in "other America". They are inseparable from the "Other" category which includes "born-at-sea" and Pacific Islands.

Therefore Figure 5-4 is an understatement of the Latin America numbers in New South Wales. An assumption which is probably true for the most part is that the other Latin Americans are similarly distributed throughout the state outside the major urban area from Newcastle to Sydney to Wollongong. There are only a few noteworthy aspects of the 1971 distribution of ABCMP-born persons in New South Wales. Armidale has the largest concentration outside of the major urban areas. This is because of students at the University of New England (see Section VI.C). Small groupings occur in the Leeton-Griffith area, on the far north coast, and at Queanbeyan which adjoins the major urban centre of Canberra. Newcastle has comparatively few of the Latin Americans
FIGURE 5-4

DISTRIBUTION IN NEW SOUTH WALES (EXCLUDING SYDNEY) OF PERSONS BORN IN THE AFRICAN NATIONS OF LATIN AMERICA 1971

LEGEND

- Male
- Female

SCALE

0 50 100 150 200 250 KILOMETRES
while Wollongong has nearly two thirds of all ABCMP-born persons in New South Wales outside of Sydney. Yet even the Wollongong concentration is minor compared with Sydney which contains 92% of all Latin Americans living in New South Wales.

The main conclusion from the data in this section is that most of the story of Latin Americans in Australia occurs in New South Wales and particularly in the Sydney area. Of course the Latin Americans in other states and non-metropolitan areas all have interesting stories which are uniquely personal. Some aspects of those situations are given in Section VI.C on the "community". However, their major types are basically covered within the variety of living environments in New South Wales. For example, there is not any evident reason why one or two Latin American individuals or families living in an Australian country town in Western Australia or Tasmania would be different from a similar number in a similar sized town in New South Wales. Also, while the second largest agglomeration of Latin Americans in Australia is in Melbourne, the 1976 census will probably show it to be smaller than that in Sydney at the 1971 census or during the interview period in 1972-73.

SECTION V.C.2 Distribution Within Sydney

The exceptional concentration of Latin Americans in Sydney is contrary to trends set by other non-British migrant groups which have tended to concentrate in Melbourne.\(^1\) However, the pattern of Latin Americans is

\(^1\) See A.B.S. Census figures and Burnley, 1972, Table 1, who shows that seven main non-British birthplaces provided 12.6% of Melbourne's population compared with only 7.6% of Sydney's in 1966. However, for the smaller immigrant groups like the White Russians, Chinese, South-east Asians, Middle-Easterners and Pacific Islanders, Sydney has higher concentrations. The apparent reasons are related to those given for the Latin Americans.
logical for two reasons. First, there was not a significant group of Latin Americans in Melbourne to influence the flows. Secondly, Sydney is the closest port of disembarkation when coming from Latin America. Many interviewed Latin Americans stated 1) that they wanted to be in Sydney where the largest group is living; 2) that they did not have much information about cities other than Sydney; or 3) that Sydney was the least expensive destination and, in the case of assisted migrants, that they were unaware that the Australian government would pay 100% of the ticket from Sydney to Melbourne or any other Australian city. Several also stated that they thought they were going to Melbourne, but after they went through customs in Sydney they were taken to local hostels. In the excitement of an international migration to an almost totally unknown destination, the first major port-of-call usually seems like a good place to start.

The distribution and relative densities of ABCMP-born Latin Americans in Sydney in 1971 focus on the eastern suburbs, central Sydney, a band from Ashfield to Auburn, and the major immigrant hostels in Randwick, Cabramatta, and Fairfield (Figure 5-5). Almost all of the outer areas to the south, north and the far western panhandle have densities much less than half of the metropolitan average; many areas had no or only one Latin American, and these were primarily the non-Latins and long-term residents. The exception is Ku-ring-gai which attracts the more well-to-do immigrants because of its high socio-economic status, as does Woollahra. However, the socio-economic status of the L.G.A.'s does not correlate with the densities, very

---

1 Each L.G.A. was given a socio-economic status classification based on the Socioeconomic Factor Map (No.48) in the social atlas of Sydney at the Census: 1971 by Davis and Spearritt (1974). The basis for Figure 5-5 was computer drawn like the maps in the atlas. Richard Davis was most helpful in setting-up the programme to generate the distribution maps.
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probably because of wide ranging status levels within the immigrant population. Neither is the distribution of ABCMP-born Latin Americans like any of the fifty maps in the social atlas of Sydney (Davis and Spearritt, 1974). This is probably as much because of diversity between the Latin Americans as it is because of differences between Latin Americans and other groups.

The interviewed sample cannot be used for very detailed geographic analysis because there were relatively few respondents in each Local Government Area (L.G.A.) and they were not randomly selected. However, the distribution of the sample was very close to the 1971 distribution described above. Some comments are in the next chapter on housing where we discuss the different household types, e.g. many single Latin Americans in the central suburbs.

Taken as a whole, the sample revealed that the proximity to work was the main reason (40%) for choosing to live in a particular neighbourhood. Cost of housing, convenient transport, and friends/relatives nearby each accounted for 15-20% of the stated reasons. Only 6% mentioned the desirability of the neighbourhood. Over all, the respondents considered their neighbourhood to be almost equal or worse than where they lived in Latin America. Twenty percent said their neighbourhood in Australia was much worse, but another twenty percent said it was better. Naturally this is a reflection of their ability and willingness to pay more for the preferred neighbourhoods in Sydney.

Two attributes, nationality and period of residence, are tabulated against the immigrant population in each L.G.A. (A.B.S. 1971 Census, Bulletin 7 and unpubl. tab 5CD). The tabulations do not tell us much about the post-1966 immigrants but are useful for understanding
and separating the pre-1966 population, of whom about half were "true" Latins. The nationality data only indicate whether or not the immigrants born in the ABCMP nations are British subjects (including naturalized Australians).

We can partly standardize the British/non-British nationality data by using the 1971 census data for period of residence greater than five years. Percentages are obtained by dividing each L.G.A.'s ABCMP-born British subjects by the ABCMP-born total of persons with more than five years of residence. It is not a perfect standardization because some of the ABCMP-born persons could have been post-1966 arrivals who were British subjects before arrival or who naturalized before the normal five-year waiting period. Nor do we know the number nor location of the very long term residents who are the persons most likely to be British subjects. These limitations are the probable reasons why the resultant percentages have such a wide range and no clear trends. Although a maximum of 45% of the entire Sydney metropolitan area's ABCMP-born immigrants with more than five years residence in 1971 were British subjects, the range is from 0.0% to 190% in the L.G.A.'s. The three values over 100% are for anomalous situations with low numbers, e.g., in Baulkham Hills only six were in Australia more than five years, but nine (of fifteen total) were British, indicating the presence of some post-1966 Anglo-Latin American migrants. The majority of the L.G.A.'s are between 10% and 100% British. Four-fifths of the L.G.A.'s in which over 70% of the ABCMP-born persons are British have densities of ABCMP-born persons less than the average for the Sydney Metropolitan Area. Similarly, almost all of the L.G.A.'s in which fewer than 30% are British are in the higher than average density group. In spite of this trend, a detailed plot of density vs. percentage British does not indicate much correlation between them. If we had further data a strong negative correlation (which may in fact exist) might become evident. If so, it could mean either that ABCMP-born migrants move out of the more ethnic areas after they naturalize or that the
areas of greater ethnic densities inhibit naturalization. The former would be a positive contribution of the initial immigrant receiving neighbourhood while the latter is an argument against such ethnic areas. It is also possible that those people have the longest periods of residence, i.e. greater than 10 years, but that is partially refuted by the newness of some of the L.G.A.'s. The other possible explanation is that they had their British nationality from birth, i.e. that they are actually Anglo-Latin Americans who probably never lived in a predominantly migrant suburb. I prefer this latter explanation, but it cannot be proved with available data. However, it is supported by the fact that Sydney's British- and Irish-born residents are most concentrated in the outer suburbs (Davis and Spearritt, 1974, map 30). Whatever the case, if we use nationality as an indicator of Latin-ness, we find that the densities of Latin Americans (i.e. persons born in Latin America and not British subjects) are even lower in the peripheral suburbs than what was shown in Figure 5-5.

Another way that we can use the available data on period of residence is to compare for each L.G.A. the number of ABCMP-born persons in Australia for more than five years in 1971 with the number of Latin America-born persons in the same L.G.A. in 1966, i.e., five years before 1971. By subtracting the latter from the former, we obtain the net change of the pre-1966 migrants. These values indicate net movements which I believe are mainly movements of the "true" Latins who arrived in the mid-1960's and were still settling in after 1966. Our first observation is that although the L.G.A.'s in 1971 are underenumerated there was a net increase

---

1 The obvious deficiency of comparing the ABCMP-born data of 1971 with the total Latin America-born data of 1966 results is an underenumeration of one-third in 1971. That is, the 1971 figure should be higher by 50% and that amount should be added onto the net change numbers.
between 1966 and 1971 in the number of pre-1966 arrivals living in the Sydney Metropolitan Area (S.M.A.). These 53 persons are 5.4% of Sydney's 1971 total of pre-1966 arrivals, but that number would be close to 400 persons if we had figures on those who were not enumerated, i.e., the Uruguayans, Venezuelans and other non-ABCMP Latin Americans in Australia before 1966. The net increase means that those pre-1966 residents who died or emigrated either out of Australia or at least out of the S.M.A. have all been replaced and there is still a surplus of nearly 400 persons. It is possible that the situation is an anomaly caused by the return to Sydney of a number of pre-1966 arrivals who were on short-term trips outside of Sydney or Australia on 30 June 1966. A similar examination of New South Wales shows an out-migration of similar size from the rest of the state, most likely to Sydney.

There has been an exodus from the L.G.A.'s north of the harbour between 1966 and 1971. It is possible that status conscious Latin Americans found the cost-of-living in these higher status suburbs to be too great a burden on their Australian income and subsequently shifted to less expensive neighbourhoods. Since we only have net figures, we cannot say if those who left the north shore moved into Bankstown and Liverpool, the major growth areas. However, I believe it is likely that there was a progression of moves and replacements through the ranks of the L.G.A.'s. The upper status suburb of Woollahra had a modest gain, but that was possibly from the adjoining areas of Sydney City and Waverley which had losses. The other large gainers were Randwick, Botany and Ashfield which almost ring the south side of the inner city area. Since each of these L.G.A.'s contain a mixture

---

1 It is also possible that a disproportionately high number of the pre-1966 residents in those areas were not from the ABCMP nations. Being omitted in the 1971 figures for the L.G.A.'s, they result in apparent losses. I have no evidence nor reason to believe that this was the case.
of older housing and new apartment buildings and in other ways are not homogeneous, we cannot draw further conclusions from the census data because further cross-tabulations are not available.

* * *

From this discussion based on the census data we can conclude that in regard to the major demographic characteristics of age, sex, and birthplace, the population of Latin Americans living in Sydney in 1971 is quite similar to the total of Latin Americans in Australia. However, as far as their geographic distribution is concerned, we recognize that although over 70% live in Sydney, a further 20% in other major urban areas, and less than 10% in country urban and rural areas, differences between these geographic areas are significant in terms of the environment (especially for those in country urban and rural areas) and in density, i.e. in the physical proximity of one Latin American immigrant to another. We cannot predict how these locational differences would affect their other characteristics, including migration satisfaction. The immigrants may have had special motives for selecting those locations or may prefer to live away from the main group of Latin Americans. Whatever the case, they are excluded from most analyses in subsequent chapters which focus on the census data and the sample interviewed in Sydney. Nor are the Sydney results applicable to Melbourne's Latin Americans, although with the growth of Melbourne's Latin American population it could well be that the situation there becomes progressively more like that in Sydney.

This chapter has discussed many aspects of the Latin Americans such as age, geographic origin and geographic distribution in Australia. Although regional differences exist in Latin America, to use them as a major stage of the typology would deny any sense of unity or similarity among the Latin Americans. However, one aspect does seem worthy of a major place in the
typology: those in metropolitan areas in Australia are most probably different from those in country towns and rural areas. But for most studies, including this one, its position in the typology is immaterial because the sample only includes Latin Americans in metropolitan centres. This bias, like the biases associated with each successive narrowing of the typology, must be taken into account in the findings. But by making these initial divisions we eliminate some of the background "noise" caused by small, special types within the population.

Thus far the typology (see summary at the end of Chapter VIII, and Figure 8-1) has focussed our attention onto persons born in Latin America, residing in the Sydney metropolitan area, who are Independent Decision Makers about their migration and who come under the three headings of non-Latins, long-term Residents, and Contemporary Latins. One further step in the typology is to separate out the very recent arrivals who have been in Australia less than six months. Some of their key attitudes and perceptions are different from the longer residents. The resulting group contains 248 persons called Independent Decision Makers resident in Australia for more than six months. They form the main focal group used in this study to represent Latin Americans in Australia. Of course we cannot assume that the proportions in this non-random sample are correct (although it is equally difficult to show them to be incorrect). However, there is ample evidence in the following chapters that all of the diverse characteristics of the Latin Americans in Sydney are present in the sample. The most important of these characteristics are used to continue the typology in the remaining chapters.
CHAPTER VI
HOUSING, HOUSEHOLD AND COMMUNITY

The preceding chapter has told us where the Latin Americans are residing in Sydney, but not of their living conditions. In this chapter, our purpose is to discuss and analyse three major aspects of living: A. housing (including neighbourhood environment); B. households (including family structure), and C. the "Community" of Latin Americans.

SECTION VI.A. HOUSING

SECTION VI.A.1. The Housing Conditions of the Immigrants in Latin America

There is a complete range of housing in Latin America. At one extreme are the thatched huts in the jungle, adobe hovels in the mountains, and shanties in the urban slums. The occupants of housing at this extreme have not come to Australia. The other end of the range consists of majestic homes often filled with antiques, surrounded by well manicured gardens and enclosed by a guarded, three-metre-high wall. They are not simply large houses; they are urban estates. The best known Australian equivalent is "The Lodge" of the Prime Minister. Very few of the Latin Americans in Australia are from this extreme either. The immigrants are generally from the various types of middle class housing with a few coming from lower class housing of the urban areas.

Although considered in the planning stages of this study, questions about the immigrants' pre-migration housing in Latin America were not included in the questionnaire because it was becoming too large. In light of the final results of this study, which show the importance of socio-economic status, some pre-migration housing questions should have been included (and are advisable for further studies) since data on housing in Latin America censuses cannot be quantitatively applied to the selected individuals who have migrated to Australia. However, it is possible to divide the non-elite migrants' pre-migration housing into three overlapping
types which are at least partially related to socio-economic status, education, income, profession and other characteristics of the individual respondents.

At the upper end of this Latin American non-elite housing are the modern, recently built apartment houses, condominiums and detached houses, not unlike many upper middle class homes in Sydney. Those homes found in the "better neighbourhoods" are appropriately more lavish and more expensive. The life style within these homes is a reflection of the differences between Anglo-Saxon and Latin American situations. As a substitute for labour saving appliances there are usually one or more maids constantly in attendance. The housewife directs the maid(s) and, depending on her stage in the life cycle and her family needs, raises children, seeks outside employment or becomes active in social and cultural groups. The husband is a white collar worker. His major possession after the house is his automobile, a great status symbol which allows him to be separated from the masses who use the overcrowded public transport.

In the lower middle class situation the apartments and houses are usually smaller and older, with the houses often attached to each other like terrace houses without any garden, as found in the inner suburbs of Sydney. Inside, they are less lavish, but a maid is probably in the house and an old automobile may be in the garage.

The housing of the lower class aspirants to the middle status is sometimes like the homes previously described, but with fewer amenities, no maid, and no automobile. Others are in neighbourhoods on the fringe of the urban slums. This lower class housing does not have a Sydney equivalent.

Being from urban areas of Latin America, most immigrants into Sydney have encountered a selection of housing types similar to, or better than, those they left in Latin America. However, this does not mean that, in Sydney, they have been able to afford the housing equivalent to that to which they were accustomed in Latin America.
SECTION VI.A.2  The Immigrant's Housing in Sydney

There is very little relevant information available from the censuses on the housing of Latin Americans in Australia or in Sydney. There are no usable cross-tabulations from the 1971 census.¹ The 1961 and earlier data are very limited in quantity and are not really relevant to the contemporary situation. The one useful tabulation from 1966 (Table 6-1) enumerates Latin America-born heads of households according to the class of housing and the nature of occupancy for private dwellings (excluding hotels, dormitories, institutions and the like). Females were 18% of the household heads for all of Australia and 22% of those in Sydney. Since a woman is almost always not married if she is a head of a household, this indicates that the single working woman from Latin America (in 1966) had a preference for the big city life, and Sydney in particular. The table shows that the proportions of the total heads of households, as tenants, or in self-contained flats, are modestly affected by the slightly higher proportion of females in Sydney.

Half of the Latin American heads of households in Sydney were residing in private houses that they owned or were buying. Since these heads are more likely to have families than are those in flats, we can say that at least half of the Latin America-born persons (including dependents) in Australia before 1966 were living in their own homes.

¹ The tables of birthplaces against the housing variables have an "Other America" category with all American nations except the United States, i.e., the Latin Americans are listed not only with the West Indians but also with the Canadians.
# TABLE 6-1

LATIN AMERICA-BORN HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS (PERSONS) BY NATURE OF OCCUPANCY
BY CLASS OF PRIVATE DWELLINGS IN AUSTRALIA IN 1966

(From Unpublished Tab.116, codes 89 & 90) Numbers in brackets indicate Female Heads of Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Tenant(0) (not Gov't housing)</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Sydney Total</td>
<td>N.S.W. Private Dwellings</td>
<td>Metro.Aust. Private Dwellings</td>
<td>Australia Private Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Private House</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Self-Contained Flat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Sydney Total Private Dwellings</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. N.S.W. Total Private Dwellings</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Metro. Aust. Total Private Dwellings</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Australia Total Private Dwellings</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
There is no comparable evidence from the 1971 census, but the results from the interviewed sample, who were asked the same questions as on the census, suggest a considerable change by the beginning of 1973. Since the interviewees were not chosen with an equal probability of selection, the results of my sample cannot be used to give statistically precise estimates for Sydney's, or Australia's, Latin America-born population in various types of housing. In particular, the long-term, highly assimilated persons, who are the ones more likely to own their own homes, were very difficult to find. Therefore, the following data should be used only in its exploratory and qualitative capacity.

The sample of the interviewed Latin Americans in Sydney used in this study consists of the 248 Independent Decision Makers who have lived in Australia for more than six months.\(^1\) These immigrants are essentially heads-of-households. As in the 1966 data in Table 6-1, half of the pre-1966 interviewees owned their own accommodation. However, of the post-1966 arrivals, less than 4% owned or were buying their homes in 1973. Over half were living in self-contained flats or home units while another third were in separate or attached houses. Only 10% were still in hostels or in shared, non-self-contained accommodation.

The biases in the sample, as discussed in Chapter I, have a minor but overall net unfavourable effect on the housing data collected. Those migrants living closest together and in rented accommodation (which tends to encourage out-of-home activities and club memberships) are possibly

---

\(^1\) This sample is described in Chapter I. The tallies of responses to the questionnaire are given in Appendix II.
overrepresented. However, the greatest influence is in the period of residence of these exceptionally recent arrivals. We expect that their housing situations will improve as greater proportions have longer periods of residence. Therefore, the data for this sample only indicates the conditions of housing for these recent arrivals.

The results of the sample reveal that there is a larger number of persons in each house than the average Australian household. There are fewer total rooms in the houses and fewer bedrooms. In the Australian household there is an average of 3.3 persons per home, having 5.0 rooms and 2.6 bedrooms, compared to 3.8 persons, 3.5 rooms and 2.0 bedrooms in the Latin American household.

Similar arguments can be presented about the other attributes of the sample in comparison with the 1971 Australian census results. For example only 75% of the sampled Latin Americans have television sets while the Australian average is 98%. However, considering their comparatively short time in Australia and that there are other appliances, furniture, cars, etc. to purchase, the difference between the Latin Americans and the Australian average regarding T.V.s is small. Television is well established throughout the Latin American urban centres from which these immigrants have come. Many were accustomed to owning a T.V. set; most found that Australia's comparatively lower prices for appliances permitted them to make an early purchase. Television is seen as an aid for learning English, a way of occupying the children (since there are no maids to look after them), and an inexpensive form of entertainment which does not require migrants with language difficulties to face people at ticket offices, etc. Thus, there is the "necessity" of acquiring a T.V. set as soon as possible.
Between these two extremes of television ownership and home ownership are a variety of other possessions which are purchased on the basis of need, status and ability to pay. Automobiles and furniture are the two most important items. Half of the sampled Latin Americans own or have access to a vehicle. This is compared with the Australian average of 81% and the N.S.W. major urban average of 76%.

Of the high proportion who are renting their accommodation, three-fifths live in furnished dwellings. Many cannot afford to purchase these furnishings; others do not wish to be "tied down" with bulky possessions such as furniture. In both cases, this situation leads to less settled immigrants. The furnished dwellings seen in the interviews usually left much to be desired unless the apartment is in a recently completed block of flats or in one of Sydney's better neighbourhoods.

The unfurnished rented flats or houses are usually less than ten years old, brick, and with plastered interior walls. They would be basically the same as the functionally cold furnished flats except that the tastes of the immigrant are evident in the furnishings and decorations.

The immigrants who are more capable of paying or willing to pay, live in more lavish units which they usually furnish themselves. These dwellings are characterized by pleasant views, proximity to the beach, or in the forested hills of the northern suburbs. One Latin American's penthouse apartment overlooking the Sydney harbour was tastefully furnished with wall-to-wall carpet, tapestry covered lounge chairs, an ornate dining room suite, and well-chosen wall decorations. The rental of nearly $100 per week (in early 1973) was shared with an Australian companion.
The hostel is the final housing type considered, but is usually the first one that the immigrants experience. Hostels serve a valuable "halfway house" function by giving the new arrival security of housing and food for up to two years plus easy access to language training and other immigrant aids. The hostels provide a necessary service which is much appreciated by most of the Latin Americans interviewed. However, people who have not experienced hostel life usually imagine it to be better than it really is.

Immigrants face many difficulties upon arriving at the hostels. One of the problems is the different qualities of the accommodation, usually depending on the age and condition of the hostel. The now infamous quonset huts that served well after World War II have been phased out and replaced by more pleasant dwellings to accommodate the more discerning immigrants of the 1960's and 1970's. The communal dining hall is a great money saver, but the food can never fulfill the desires of the hostels' international mixture of migrants. Turks, Yugoslavs, British, Uruguays, Chileans, etc. are hard to please from just a few serving pots. Although language classes and other services are more easily provided at the hostels, the immigrants are somewhat insulated from the Australian society in which they must learn to live. Therefore, the policy of the hostels, as well as the general desire of the migrant, is to move as soon as possible into their own accommodation. The exceptions to this are the YWCA hostel and other special hostels where single girls are able to stay as long as they wish.
A hostel official told me that the Latin Americans tended to stay in the hostel for longer periods than other immigrant groups, frequently up to the two year limit. Although not specifically testing this, the sample does not support his statement. Of the 51 Latin America-born Decision Makers who were in Australia less than six months, only 29 were in government hostels. And of 188 interviewees who were in Australia from six to twenty-four months, only seven were in hostels. Of these seven, only two had been there over one year and both of these had been there less than 18 months. In general the Latin Americans are anxious to move into their own accommodation. Among the many Latin Americans interviewed in the government hostels, only one, an elderly fellow about fifty years old and without any family, was content to remain there waiting for a job and accommodation to be found for him.

Of course, not all Latin Americans are allowed or even want to stay in the hostels. Several of the more well-to-do interviewees who had assisted passage said that they either declined the housing offer or moved out of the hostel after only a couple of days. A more common story is that of the unassisted immigrants. Excluding the unassisted immigrants who are very wealthy or sponsored by a relative or friend already in Australia, there still remains an appreciable number of unassisted Latin American heads of families who arrived without a place to stay, a job, or money to live on, and frequently in debt for their passage. They are mainly from the tropical Andean Republics and Central America, countries for which assisted passage programmes are less readily available. The males usually come alone or with brothers or cousins. They intend bringing
their wives, children and other family members to Australia later when they have become established. Sometimes a cousin or a friend meets them on arrival, but others arrive with no one to meet them. They find their way to minimally furnished flats or terrace houses in the inner suburbs which four to six people will share to keep the rent per person low. They find jobs, mainly as unskilled labour, and save their money to repay their air fares and to bring other family members to Australia. In this way their cases are more like the pre-World War II migrations than like the contemporary ones.

This study has encountered in Sydney a complete range of migrant housing from lavish, harbour view, high quality homes, to cramped, stark, shared, terrace houses in Redfern. As in the pre-migration housing situation, the post-migration housing also reflects the migrants' socio-economic position. However, given the relatively short periods of residence in Australia before being interviewed, the post-migration housing is subject to substantial changes when improved English ability or recognition of employment qualifications lead to new jobs with higher salaries. Nevertheless, the housing and household (next section) characteristics at the time of the interviews are important and are related to the migration satisfaction of the Latin Americans in Australia.

SECTION VI.B. THE HOUSEHOLD
SECTION VI.B.1 The Latin American Background of the Immigrant Households

Latin America correctly has the image of large families and the population explosion. This is mainly a result of the fertility of the large, very low classes. Most of the Latin Americans who have come to Australia are accustomed to reasonably good medical care, low infant mortality and are aware of methods of birth control. They are from the
middle classes which are making the transition to smaller families with three or four children. (This is nevertheless, higher than the Australian average).

On one hand they feel the responsibility to care for their parents while at the same time wanting to acquire something for their own children's benefit. Thus they are an example of a transition group where the traditional flow of wealth from children to parents is reversing to a flow from parents to children (see: Caldwell, 1976).

The family, regardless of size, has considerable importance to Latin Americans. The "machismo" of the males is a strong force for wanting the continuation of his line. However, the bonds between children and their mothers are in general stronger than those with the fathers. The children normally remain in the parental home until they marry. Also, elderly parents often live with their children and grandchildren and the traditional values of respect for parents are observed.

In these and probably in other ways the Latin American family structure in the central classes is similar to that of the southern Europeans. Of course, there are individual exceptions in the Latin American as well as in the southern European cultures, and the number of exceptions is increasing. This is partially the result of increased urbanization, mobility, and the mixing of cultures in the immigrant receiving areas like Sydney.

SECTION VI.B.2 The Latin American Household in Australia

Most of the Latin American immigrants in Australia came from the rising middle class of South America. The family composition has some similarities to that from which they come. However, just as the middle class is emerging in South America so is the life style of the Latin Americans in Sydney. Circumstances have caused them to adjust to life in Australia while holding on to many of the traditions and household/family structures of their homeland. The "household" is a more appropriate term for this study than is "family".
Sometimes the members of a household constitute a family, yet I found during the interviews a variety of combinations of Latin and non-Latin Americans, brothers, cousins and other relatives, a couple of unrelated full families living together, and married men living singly or with other men until their wives and children can join them. We will examine the household and family structure from the point of view of stages of the life cycle, beginning with young unmarrieds.

SECTION VI.B.2.a Single Latin Americans

The young men sharing a furnished flat in the inner city is one type of household. Their social life is clearly based not within but rather outside the household with soccer clubs and parties. Those activities will be discussed in the next section on the community. Households of single females have an equivalent situation except that they generally have sought out better accommodation, better neighbourhoods and have put more attention into the cleaning, meals and other household duties. Another option open to the single females is to live in the hostels, in particular the YWCA facing Hyde Park in Sydney. The protection, security, meals and companionship of other single girls, including a dozen or more Latin Americans, are strong incentives for them to remain at the YWCA for extended periods. However, as they adjust to Australia the desire for personal freedom becomes stronger.
Of the sampled 31 single female Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months, none were here before 1970. Half were from Peru, a quarter from Chile, and three from Uruguay. Four were over thirty years of age, but only one was over thirty when she arrived. Three were in the YWCA Hostel and two in another private hostel. A quarter had shared lodging in someone else's home where they were essentially alone; only one lived in a flat by herself. The remaining half were sharing accommodation with other Latin Americans, the most being four in one flat; only three were living with relatives. Only one did not receive passage assistance; she had been in Europe for over a year before arriving in Australia.

One of the most common desires expressed even among the single immigrants was to be able to send for their parents. One of the single Peruvian immigrants, a girl twenty-three years old, who lived with a flatmate and who had only a minimal income, told me that she was saving a portion of her paycheque each fortnight in the hope that she could send for her mother.

Another interviewee already had her mother with her. The mother spoke no English and worked as an office cleaner on the night shift. Although it was good to be together, they now both felt isolated and wanted to return to Latin America. The reunion of family members does not always bring the expected happiness.

Concerning their parents, young married couples face a conflict of interests. On the one hand the filial obligations to parents and traditional family ties are strong. On the other hand they enjoy the independence of being free from the burden of parents and in-laws. The balance frequently depends on whether or not there is a widowed parent willing and able to make the journey. These young couples often have an easy-going life with two incomes and freedom of movement. Their household may be shared with another
couple or a single relative, but usually there is plenty of room although it is only a small flat. This tendency towards independence is becoming more characteristic of the new Latin American immigrants; they increasingly tend to break away from traditions and family structures of their homeland.

This observation is supported by a news report (Sydney *Sun Herald*, 26 June 1977, p.19) about the "bitter tragedy of lonely and elderly in a strange land". The problem is cultural clashes between immigrants and their parents resulting in neglect of dependent parents not eligible for full social assistance in Australia. Social workers consider the difficulties to be more pronounced among the Latin Americans than among other immigrant groups because the more recently arrived Spanish-speaking ethnic groups are not so well organized to cope with the problems themselves. The problem is probably even more pronounced for immigrants who marry after arrival, especially if the spouse is not a Latin American.

There are an increasing number of mixed marriages. In the three years of 1972-74, 61% of all Latin America-born persons who married in Australia did not marry another Latin American. In that period about ninety Latin Americans per year married Australians, being over a third of the mixed marriages. Interestingly, more of those Latin Americans were the grooms (i.e. the brides were Australian). In most other cases of mixed marriages the Latin Americans were mainly the brides: 81% of the marriages with non-British Europeans and 72% with U.K. and Irish immigrants. The reasons for this are not clear; perhaps there are shortages of single females from the other sources of immigrants. A larger study specifically on mixed-marriages with all immigrants may provide interesting interpretations.

Of the interviewed immigrants, there were 13 marriages after arrival of Latin Americans with non-Latin Americans. Three of them were with Australian grooms and three (including the two very long term residents) with Australian brides. Of the other seven, in three cases the Latin Americans were the husband
and in four cases they were the wives; two spouses were born in the United States and one each in England, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Malta and Spain. There were also ten marriages after arrival in which both partners were from Latin America. In six cases the bride and groom were from the same country. One further case was a marriage by proxy after arrival for the husband but before the wife's arrival.

Of those who married after arrival, eighteen were in the key sample of Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months. Eight were in Australia more than 2.5 years, a logical bias given that they had extra time to settle and find wives. After separating the two very long-term residents and one non-Latin we have fifteen "true" Latin Americans, hardly enough for detailed analyses. However, rather than setting them aside, they have been included in later analyses with the males who are still single, with whom they share many characteristics including youthfulness, no school-age children, similar motivations for migrating, and employment experience in Latin America. These males who married after arrival, the still single males, and the single females form a sub-group of 103 "true" Latin American interviewees who were single on arrival.

SECTION VI.B.2.b Married Latin Americans

The 1966 and 1971 census tabulations of marital status give no indication of length of marriage nor of the birthplaces of the spouses. In 1966, 58% of all Latin America-born males and 59% of the females over the age of fifteen were married. The percentages in 1971 for Sydney were 62.5% and 66.5%, respectively. The increase is mainly a result of the proportionate decline in the widowed/divorced/separated category and in the single migrants aged 15 to 19 years. In Sydney, 35% of the males and 29% of the females over 15 years old were single; they are a major part of the Independent Decision Makers. Since marital status is an important characteristic indicating the
immigrants' family responsibilities, we will use it with additional census cross-tabulations in later chapters.

The immigrants married after arrival and those married before migrating but still increasing their family size have Australia-born children who are raised in bi-cultural environments. With the rapid immigration of Latin Americans mainly in their reproductive years, the eleven-fold increase in nuptial confinements from 1966 to 1974 (Unpublished Table from A.B.S.) is not surprising. More interesting is the number of mixed couples involved. Using the averages for the 3-year period 1966-68, we find that only 9% of the children born (assuming one per nuptial confinement) had both parents from Latin America and nearly half had one Anglo-Saxon parent. If this is a true reflection of the pre-1966 Latin American population in Australia, it further strengthens our conclusion that it had a decidedly non-Latin character. Although the numbers of births to mixed marriages quadrupled by 1974, there was no change in the proportions of the birthplaces of the non-Latin American parent. However, the births to the families where both parents are Latin Americans have risen to over four hundred per year in 1974. These children are in many ways as Latin American as their older brothers and sisters who crossed the Pacific in their parents' arms.

Whether or not the small children arrive with the immigrant couple or are born in Australia, there are thousands of Latin American families in Australia; their problems are different from those of the single immigrants. Without the assistance of grandparents or maids, the young, growing families experience the greatest forces against maintaining the traditional features of Latin American homes. The main impact on the household centres on whether or not the wife cares for the children herself or keeps her employment. If she works, someone must be found and paid to care for the children. Frequently several families pool their children. Whatever the case, the maternal influence is diminished. If the wife stays home to care for the children, the loss of
income can seriously lower the family's standard of living. From observation, the tendency is for the wife to remain working because young parents either do not see or do not object to their children having less Latin American maternal influence.

The process of "Australianization" of the children accelerates in the primary schools. The three interviewers did not observe any preoccupation by the immigrants with the children's assimilation. None of the parents with primary school children said that their children could no longer handle Spanish well enough, were not interested in their native culture or were adopting bad habits that they attributed to Australian society. Such comments have been made by other immigrants, e.g. the Turks, as described on several television programmes about migrants. Perhaps the Latin Americans have not been in Australia long enough, feel that their culture is less threatened by Australian assimilation or, more likely, hold Anglo-Saxon society in higher regard than do others\(^1\). This is partly shown by the motivation of some migrants to come to Australia to obtain a better education for their children. Most of the Latin American immigrants are aware that public education in Australia is different and in general better than that in Latin America, especially in the sciences and in technical colleges.

There are two basic education categories for immigrant children arriving in Australia: those of pre-school and primary school age less than ten years old, and teenagers of secondary school age. The academic and social success of both groups depends greatly on their ability to cope with English. The children of primary school age usually learn English rapidly and are able to cope with their studies. The secondary school teenage group faces a more serious problem. Their ability to cope in English with subjects at their level is usually less than their knowledge of the subject at the same level. This situation leads to frustration and embarrassment at having to start over at a lower level and being in classes with much younger students. For families

\(^1\) This issue could be the topic of a future cross-cultural sociological study.
where the parents can assist the child with English, e.g. by speaking it at home, the problems are surmountable. Sometimes the school's intensive "English as a Second Language" programme can save the day. But especially with children age 15 or over, there is not enough time to learn English. They are old enough to leave school and frequently do, with or without the approval of their parents. The result is the termination of their education for which the parents had high hopes and which in many cases was one of the reasons for emigrating to Australia. One family in this situation had a son collecting fares on a Sydney bus. Another had a daughter packaging cigarettes. Although the children find some good in earning their first incomes, the parents are profoundly disillusioned.

For the families with teenage children, education is not the only problem. Teenagers everywhere have a way of thinking and acting for themselves and adopting the ways of their peers instead of their parents. This is particularly disconcerting for immigrant parents because the "generation gap" is accentuated by the "culture gap". Teenage sons frequenting the pubs and daughters exposed to different moral standards cause anxiety and tensions. Several sets of interviewed Latin Americans with teenage children indicated they feared that instead of helping their children, they have harmed them by bringing them to Australia at that crucial time of their lives. That comment in one household brought an objection from a twenty year old son. During the ensuing argument which the father won by volume and default, I sensed that a little of that family's unity was destroyed. The only households interviewed with teenage children who have grown up in Australia were of non-Latin background, e.g. Anglo-Argentinians. The children were highly assimilated and a credit to both cultures, but cannot be taken as representative of the Latin American children who will be coming through the high schools in the late 1970's.

Families at later stages in the life cycle were seldom found among the Latin American immigrants. Parents in their 40's and 50's whose children
have recently left home are not inclined to emigrate overseas. The exceptions are those where the parents and their independent children decide to go together. This is an uncommon occurrence, however, especially for families with three or more children, some of whom have already married. Instead, it is more common for one or two of the newly independent children to emigrate, i.e. young single or married couples which were described at the start of this section.

The only remaining stage in the life cycle to discuss has been touched upon already, namely the reunion of parents with their emigrant children. They also frequently desire to be with their grandchildren. Although there are exceptions in this as in all cases, there are two basic types. The first are the widowed parents who no longer desire or are not able to maintain a separate home. Instead, they live in their children's home, a very common occurrence in Latin America. They perform useful functions there, frequently caring for their grandchildren and the house or sometimes taking employment to supplement the family's total income. The second basic type is where these older parents have few children and one or two have emigrated. Frequently these overseas children have, in a few years, become the most well-to-do members of their families and the ones best able to care for the parents. Because of the newness of the Latin American migration, only four households in the sample included aged parents. Three of the four households had one widowed parent, the other couple were in their early fifties and came to Australia three months after their son. The husband was working in Sydney as a shoe salesman and the wife was taking care of the house. Both the son and daughter-in-law worked. One of the widowed parents, aged fifty, was living with her daughter and working as a cleaner. The other two aged 62 and 79 were supported by their children. The parent age 79 was born in Chile but with an Italian background; Italian was spoken in their home in Australia. Only two of the four households contained grandchildren. Three of the four
were content living in Australia but in one case the household was considering
returning to Latin America. Overall, the impression gained was similar to
that of southern European households where the parents give a more traditional
influence, and maintain the old language longer.

With the assimilation of the Latin American households, the influence of
the grandparents and their ability to maintain the old traditions will
become less and less. This is particularly true as the grandchildren reach
high school age, become more independent, and more orientated into Australian
traditions.

Conflict may possibly occur in a household where grandparents try
desperately to hold on to the old traditions as the grandchildren try to
break away from them. However, with the more urban background, higher
educational qualifications, and familiarity of Anglo-Saxon culture through
television and movies of the U.S.A. and England, even the grandparents in
Latin American households will probably be less inclined to hold rigidly to
old traditions than would three-generation migrant families from more rural
origins of Southern Europe. As more of these cases of three-generation families
occur, a separate study specifically of grandparents' impact on immigrant
household may yield interesting results.

One further issue which affects the household is "chain migration". T.R. Lee (1970, pp.60-61) says that "strong migration chains are largely
drawn from small areas, rather than on a regional basis, which reflects the
fact that family, village and local loyalties are very strong amongst
Italians...". The migration from Latin America is neither local nor regional,
but continental; the migrants are not from villages but from metropolitan
areas where local loyalties and even family ties are weakened. Coupling that
with the newness of the migration, there is little reason to expect to find
chains as with other immigrant groups. Only 17% of the interviewed sample of
Independent Decision Makers said they were preceded by close friends or
relatives, mostly the latter. The line of questioning needed to unravel chain migrations was considered unproductive and not implemented. Only two possible examples of a "traditional" chain migration were found: one young man from the town of Ambato, Ecuador, started a minor chain migration of brothers, cousins and friends from that town. The second example is a part of the Latin American community in Perth and is presented in the next section.

SECTION VI.C. THE LATIN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

SECTION VI.C.1 A Note on the "Community" in Latin America

With the increasing industrialization of South America, there are more job opportunities at higher wages, particularly in the urban centres. The higher wages make it possible for families to have better housing, clothes, education and recreation. Together with the economic betterment comes a new corresponding social status. From the ranks of the "obreros" (workers) emerged the middle class which is gradually filling the social vacuum between the rich and the poor of South America.

For those without social status or private transport, the principal social activity centres around family gatherings. But as they acquire a family car these people drive out of the city for picnics in the country. The upper-class clubs have been out of bounds for these people who are considered socially inferior. For example, the "Country Club" of Lima, Peru, is exclusively upper-class and a large conspicuous sign reads: FOR MEMBERS ONLY. However, within recent years, twenty miles from Lima, near Chaclacayo, a "Country Club for Empleados" (white collar and skilled employees) has been opened. Here middle class families can join. There are facilities for family picnics, a swimming pool and rides for the children; dances are organized for the adults. Membership gives prestige and status to a class of people who had formerly been excluded. Such social and sporting clubs are the most important "community" focus of many middle-class Latin Americans,
after the immediate family. Yet many would not see themselves as part of a "community" in Latin America, the same as Australians in Australia do not see themselves as part of a community except in the geographical sense of a neighbourhood. It is only when a group of immigrants, unknown to each other previously, find themselves in a foreign society that any spirit of "community" becomes important.

SECTION VI.C.2 The "Community" of Latin Americans in Australia, particularly in Sydney.

The community of Latin Americans in Sydney, in the sense of a "body of persons", has a rather fragmented spirit. There are several reasons for this: the scattering of the migrants across the city, the variations in social status, the recent arrival of the immigrants, the national rivalries among the different Latin American countries, and the numerous small differences between Latin Americans which are hardly noticeable to outsiders. All these contribute to disrupt any lasting unity within the Latin American community. There is not one person or organization which can claim to speak for even a quarter of the Latin American immigrants. Therefore, the story of the community, as far as it does exist, is segmented.

The largest "body" of Latin Americans in association with each other is the Chilean Club Ltd. This was the first Latin American club to be established as a legally registered association. Earlier attempts to form a Latin America-wide club failed, largely because of national rivalries. So a group of Chileans decided to form the "Club Chileno" in the early 1970's. With the organizational control of the club firmly in hand, they opened the membership to all Latin Americans and interested Australians. The club's stated (and advertized) objectives are "exclusively social, cultural and for sport. It has no religious discrimination and DOES NOT PERMIT POLITICAL ACTION IN
ANY FORM" (Their emphasis). The club's first major success was the celebration of the arrival in Sydney Harbour on 21 May 1972 of the Chilean Navy's training frigate, Esmeralda. On that occasion a big reception for the crew took place. Typical foods, dances and performances of musical items helped to make the party a great success, not only for the Chileans, but also for those of other nationalities who were present there. Dancing and sporting events, especially soccer, are regular occurrences.

At first the club met in a two storey building. This old store-front building in Newtown was not far from the homes of some of the founding members; larger halls were hired for the dances. Two years later the club was relocated to a large hall in the more centrally located suburb of Strathfield. Latin American foods, especially Chilean "empanadas", are sold nearly every Saturday and Sunday. The club stays open until 2AM which is a typically Latin American custom. The club, its decorations, the dances, music and social customs are typically Latin. Frequently families or groups of friends take a table together. The parents enjoy watching the dancing and visiting friends at other tables, while the younger members dance, laugh and talk.

The membership of the club fluctuates with the periodic drives for new members and major activities which bring new people to the club. Many join but do not attend the club regularly, so they let their membership lapse. Therefore, the numbers can range from nearly three hundred in early 1973, which included numerous unfinancial members, to a more consistent membership of 150.

The main rival group is the Uruguayan Social and Sport Club Ltd. which began in August 1972 and obtained its own permanent site in Marrickville in July 1975.

The other Latin American clubs in Sydney are less structured and very dependent on the enthusiasm of a few key persons. Some, such as the Club
Quito (Ecuador), started mainly as a soccer team. The Ecuador Social and Sporting Club now represents that nation. The informal Los Ticos (Costa Ricans) Club is located in a Redfern flat with a large (but plain) living room. It is visited frequently by the Costa Ricans and their friends. My wife and I enjoyed their Christmas festivities during the months of interviewing. The Brazilian "community" is brought together in a similar way. The Peruvian Centre is unique because so many of the Peruvian immigrants are single females. The Mexicans are so few in number they have difficulties keeping a cultural group going (Sydney Morning Herald, 19 March 1977, p.15). The Argentinians and other nationalities have also formed clubs. They meet for special occasions such as the Christmas holidays and national holidays of their countries. The most frequent venue for these celebrations is the Paddington Town Hall. In all cases these clubs are open to persons of other nationalities; some people are members of several clubs. Because of the close national ties of the individual groups, there is little chance that outsiders could gain control of any club. Non-Latin Americans are invited to attend the functions of the different clubs but most of these people are friends of the members.

During the survey, one interviewer (Mr. Portell) wanted to attend the Christmas social of the Argentinian group; this would also help to know them for future interviews. He gave the following account: "That afternoon the hall was being decorated for the evening's activities; the sounds of Spanish conversation and happy laughter were contagious. But as I, an outsider, entered, the laughter ceased, the conversation stopped and all was replaced by a hushed mumble with suspicious side glances, then silence. Approaching the group, I smiled and said in my best Spanish "Buenos tardes". Smiles flickered from face to face as if a pane of glass was shattered letting in a flow of friendliness. I attended the function in the evening amid an atmosphere of happy festivities, friendliness and complete acceptance". This attitude of initial suspicion and caution was a general reaction of most
Latin Americans approached for an interview. However, speaking Spanish with them produced almost instant rapport (see Appendix Section I.C).

Of course, many of the Latin American immigrants belong to none of these clubs. One group conspicuously absent is the higher class immigrants, especially those who are fluent in English. Others who do not associate with the clubs are the longer term residents whose social spheres have already been established. Others not attending are those with extreme political views of the Right and Left. Many of them believe that the clubs support ideologies different from their own. Others believe the clubs to be seedbeds of discontent and complaining about Australia. Although I was not specifically checking on this aspect, I did not observe or hear anything to support the idea that clubs breed discontent. On the contrary I have found them to be places where social activities and Latin American tradition is carried on in an atmosphere of good will and harmony.

The tradition of the Australian pub is readily accessible to the new Australians and has an influence on the family. Although it can be an attraction separating the father and husband from his family, it may also serve as a melting pot for meeting new friends and sharing ideas with his Australian mates. Although Australia also has its exclusive clubs which appeal to the more affluent (and fluent) Latin Americans, the R.S.L. Clubs provide a middle ground. They give the status of belonging to a club to some of the middle class Latin American immigrants who do not want to participate in the Latin American organizations. No social distinction is made of their members, it costs little to join and the social activities such as dances and entertainment give the new immigrants a sense of being part of the Australian "community". While interviewing Latin American families in Fairfield, Sydney, one lady said her husband was at the local R.S.L. Club. I went by there and found the husband with several of his friends, which included Australians, playing the poker machines. Like other immigrants,
the Latin Americans will progressively find their way into the mainstream of Australian clubs.

The community, or better said, the communities of Latin Americans are also evident in their religious life. Their involvement with Catholicism is in large measure nominal, as is the case in Latin America; less than one third of the Catholics in the Independent Decision Makers who were asked about religious activities said that they at least occasionally attended Mass. The Catholics who were active churchgoers usually attended the Spanish Masses in Surry Hills where they have been held for many years for the immigrants from Spain. There were also Spanish Masses and religious functions at the major migrant hostels, most notably at Westbridge Hostel in Villawood where an Argentinian priest was working in 1972-73. Much of the religious life of the Catholic Latin Americans depends upon the availability of Spanish speaking priests. However, certainly some Latin American Catholics in Australia attend the English Masses, but they are in general not functioning as part of the Latin American community.

The non-Catholic Latin Americans also form part of the community with regular church services and other activities in Spanish. They mainly attend "mission minded" churches and find that Sydney is fertile ground for their attempts to bring other Latin Americans into their churches. The breaking of family ties in Latin America and the desire to socialize in Spanish in their new homeland makes the immigrants particularly receptive to missionary activity. The Mormon Church has enjoyed great success and has two self-contained Spanish speaking branches, one in East Lakes and one in the Fairfield area.

A further element of the "community" is the Spanish newspapers. There are a couple of minor ones like El Faro (the Lighthouse) which are small and difficult to find at newsagents. The major one, El Español en Australia,
was originally published for immigrants from Spain but has increasingly been serving the recent influx of Latin Americans. It comes out weekly and has from 20-30 pages with all of the major newspaper features including world and national news. It also includes summaries of news from Spain and Latin America, a women's page, announcements, classified ads, advertisements, letters to the editor and editorials. With a weekly circulation of 4-6,000 it is perhaps the best means of following the development of the various aspects of the Latin American community in Sydney. It also serves the Spanish speaking community in Melbourne, for which a special page is included.

The Melbourne community of Latin Americans has not been studied here in detail. However, from discussions with some migrants who have lived or visited there, comments in the Spanish newspaper and results from the Survey Section's 1973 study of 36 respondents, it appears that the Latin American community in Melbourne is developing along lines similar to those in Sydney a few years earlier. Melbourne, however, has an advantage in that the situation in Sydney has produced a recognition of the many needs of the Latin Americans. As a result, improvements in migrant services in Spanish continually become available relatively sooner (in terms of community size) in Melbourne than they did in Sydney. This will also be true for any other area in Australia, e.g. Adelaide and Brisbane, as a Latin American community develops there.

On a visit to Hobart in January 1974 I inquired about the Latin Americans in the area. Two families were contacted and information was gained about nine Latin Americans living there. This was a sizeable percentage considering that only 28 were in Hobart in 1971. Essentially, they are too few and too different from each other and too involved with non-Latin Americans to present any image of a community whatsoever. The situation I observed in Perth in August 1973 was similar to that in Hobart except for the influence of one individual, Mr. F.G. Prochelle, the honorary Consul for Chile. In 1965
he foresaw problems in Chile, left his business there, and came to Australia. Three years later, after considering other areas of the country, he settled in Perth and became an importer of gift items. He influenced relatives and friends from his former hometown of Valdivia to migrate. This is the best example of chain migration of Latin Americans I have encountered anywhere in Australia. With many of the Chilean immigrants knowing each other before arrival, and with their purposeful selection of Perth as their new home, it is not surprising that this Chilean nucleus with a variety of other Latin Americans does function in some ways as a community. At a social "housewarming" one evening there were about fifty Latin Americans present, mainly Chileans. A third of them were also together at a birthday party I attended the next evening. Since many are from the high middle class or lower upper class and speak very good English, it is not surprising that the social functions also include a scattering of non-Spanish speaking Australian friends. There is no Latin American club in Perth, mainly because early attempts revealed conflicts of personalities and contrary views on social and political issues in Latin America. The Spanish Club in Perth has been adjourned indefinitely because of lack of interest, but at least one part of the "community" is alive. There are certainly other Latin Americans in Perth, most likely of a lower middle class. Attempts to locate them were unsuccessful.

Armidale has one of the largest concentrations of Latin Americans in country areas of New South Wales. The reason is the scholarships given to some Latin Americans to do graduate studies at the University of New England, particularly in rural science and agricultural economics. Two professors (Dillon and Butland) have lived and worked in Latin America as have several other staff members who have spouses, children, or a domestic maid born in Latin America. With the academic community as a common bond, the interaction between these Latin Americans (by birth or by spirit) was sufficient to
sustain the Spanish Speaking Club of Armidale, of which I had the pleasure of being the first president (1972-74). The club's one rule was that Spanish was to be spoken at our social gatherings so that the Australians who were studying Spanish could have conversational experience. The driving forces of the group were the non-native Spanish speakers, who offered their homes for meetings. Although some club members taught or promoted the teaching of Spanish in the local high schools, the club's impact on the Armidale community was negligible. The true Latin Americans lead busy lives as students or mothers (without maids for the first time), so their time available for the club was quite limited. They did get together occasionally, but in general the longer their period of residence, the less contact they had with other Latin Americans. Several other persons/families born in Latin America, but not connected to the university, were also found in the Armidale area. However, they usually did not attend the club and indicated rather pointedly when invited that they did not desire to associate with other Latin Americans nor to speak with Australians learning the language. The net result was that even where there were a few Latin Americans close together and a group of others interested in Latin American culture and language, their combined presence was almost unnoticed even in a country town of fewer than 20,000 residents. The only meaningful impact will possibly be from the dozen or so students in two private high schools who studied Spanish and who will hopefully take an increased interest in Latin America. However, when the idea of teaching Spanish was suggested at the public Armidale High School, it was rejected without discussion. The language mistress who held on tenaciously to the traditionally small elite language classes was afraid that Spanish would aggravate the steadily decreasing interest in French and German. Unfortunately this problem also occurs in the larger cities and with other languages spoken by large numbers of immigrants.
At times it is difficult to distinguish between an activity by a fragment of the community considering themselves a club and a social gathering of friends. The latter certainly occurs frequently in Sydney and is quite important to the small segment of the community at the gathering. This is true particularly of the upper class immigrants who do not associate with the majority. Their social gatherings are seldom visible to the Australian public or even to uninvited Latin Americans.

* * * * * *

Is there anything that does or could unite the whole community? I doubt it. Even in the early 1970's when the numbers were small, there was too much diversity in background and motivations and too little communication within the community to get a response from the majority. Even a front page news release about the immigrants themselves by the then Minister of Immigration, the Honourable A.J. Grassby, in April 1974, did not produce much discussion. That news, which is examined in the following chapter, stated that hundreds of Latin American immigrants were living in a "state of poverty". But the community did not make much effort to use that report to obtain more English classes or other government assistance.

Perhaps all immigrant groups (except a single chain migration) are too fragmented from the very beginning. When small, there is no community. Only when there are sufficient numbers in a major fragment of the population, does it take on the attributes of a community. But by then it can never be the community.

The typological criteria which emerge in this chapter are not the housing nor the community. Although important, those criteria are not compatible with the earlier and subsequent parts of the typology which focusses on individuals. Rather, the important criteria centre on the family,
namely marital status and sex. For the defined Independent Decision Makers who are "true" Latin Americans and in Australia more than 6 months, there are five key types. The smallest type consists of the widows, divorcees and permanently separated persons (5 males and 5 females) who are "noise" which we separate from the remaining 220 Contemporary Latin Independents in Australia more than six months. The second and largest type includes those who were married before arriving in Australia (117 males). The sixteen males who married after arrival are the third type. The fourth and fifth types are the 57 males and 30 females who were still single when interviewed. These females are the only ones remaining in the key sample. The third, fourth and fifth types are sometimes combined in later sections to form the 103 persons who were single on arrival.
In the Parliamentary Debates the honourable member from Henty, Mr Fox, who had recently returned from a visit with immigration officials in Latin America, said:

"I believe very strongly that the quality of some of the prospective migrants that are offering from a number of South American countries is far superior to that of some of the migrants [from other areas] who are presently coming to Australia to become permanent residents." (Hansard, 20 November 1973, p. 3509).

Similar comments about the Latin Americans already in Australia have been made by senior officers in the Australian Department of Immigration, social workers for the Good Neighbour Council, and others familiar with immigrants from the various source nations. The qualities to which they refer are based on formal education, acquired language ability, formal and informal job training, and occupational experience. These pre-migration qualifications have important effects on the immigrants' post-migration employment and income in Australia. In this chapter we examine the three interrelated facets of education, employment and income of the Latin American immigrants who have come to Australia.

SECTION VII.A. EDUCATION

Although all of life is an education and each individual learns and is able to use different bits of information and experience acquired, our focus is on formal education. It is more "tangible", and able to be certified, and therefore plays an important part in the selection
procedure. No 1971 census tabulations on education are of any use because all of the Commonwealth countries in the Americas, including Canada, are lumped with the Latin Americans as "Other America." The 1966 census data (Table 7-1) pre-dates the major flow of Latin Americans to Australia and, therefore, serves only as a reference point. It does reveal that with the exception of those with university education, Sydney's resident immigrants are similar in education to those in the rest of New South Wales, other Metropolitan areas, and the remainder of Australia. Over 25% have completed at least high school and 5-6% have tertiary education. Of those aged 20 years and above, 42% of those in Sydney in 1966 have completed high school or higher education. This figure would be considerably higher if the earlier immigrants (e.g. the pre-1947 or pre-1961 migrants) could be identified and separated. Three-fourths of Sydney's tertiary trained Latin America-born residents in 1966 are in the 25-49 year age cohorts.

Of the sample of 248 Independent Decision Makers in Australia for more than six months, only 17 (7%) did not study in secondary school while 65 (26%) had attended a university. Fifty (20%) attended a technical school, but because of variations in education in the different Latin American nations, some of those were only at the level of an upper secondary education.

The vast majority of their studies were done in Latin America. The average formal education per respondent is 11½ years. Although the non-random nature of the sample prevents any direct applications or calculations for the entire population of Latin Americans in Australia, it is highly likely that by the mid-1970's the migrants in Australia represented a Latin American investment of several hundred thousand school years.

Another aspect of education already considered (Section VI.B.2) is the continuing education of the immigrants and of their children in Australia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Tertiary Level</th>
<th>High School Leaving</th>
<th>Secondary &amp; Intermediate</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Never Attended School &amp; Not Stated</th>
<th>Sydney Total</th>
<th>N.S.W. Total</th>
<th>Aust. Metro Total</th>
<th>Australia Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75-95+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SYDNEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL N.S.W. (minus Sydney)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL METRO. AUST. (minus Sydney)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AUSTRALIA (minus Sydney)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>2787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education in Latin America varies in quality. We will not concern ourselves with the literacy programmes and basic primary education in the remote areas; the immigrants to Australia have not received that type of education. Their education is mainly from two streams: either the traditional education or the foreign-influenced education in private schools.

The traditional primary and secondary education is characterized by much memorization and little required thinking. This harsh stereotype has many exceptions, but in general is supported by Tropp's article (1968, p.716). Unfortunately this tendency continues into technical and university education, which, with few exceptions, is "purely utilitarian" (Lauwerys 1968, p.721). In many Latin American universities the physical and social sciences are quite weak. The educational system is often hindered by lack of equipment, out-of-date texts and inadequate libraries. Also, the lecturers frequently teach only part-time and are repeating the education they received ten to twenty years earlier. Their lectures may be improved with what they have learned at their major employment, but that new information, while practiced, is not usually derived by their own thinking. They re-teach what they learned in a matter-of-fact manner, rather than with a questioning approach to stimulate the students' thinking. The results are students who can repeat a fact, but cannot innovate easily. Lauwerys (p.725) summarizes this by saying:

"If the aim is simply to turn out competent professional men there is little reason why the students should not be taught or lectured to by competent professional men. It is a system which turns out good lawyers but few jurists, adequate pharmacists but few discoverers of new drugs, satisfactory agronomists but few agricultural scientists. And the system is crystallized and structured by the existence of faculties which are most often only professional - laws, engineering, medicine, etc. It is rare to find a faculty of arts or of science."
The other major stream of education in Latin America is private. Instruction in private primary and secondary schools is closely modelled after standard public education in Europe and North America, to which it is essentially equivalent. In these private schools the student becomes proficient in English (or another language) as well as Spanish. Since the schools are private, there are high tuition fees which the average Latin American cannot afford. Also, there are quotas and strict selection procedures. The graduates from these schools are well prepared for university studies either at home or abroad. Their language ability also helps them in their professions because they can read trade journals and instructions as well as serve as intermediaries in foreign-owned companies.

Education is very important to Latin Americans. They see it as an avenue for advancement. A few of the Independent Decision Makers have enrolled for regular studies in the universities in Australia. One interviewee (No.152) said that at his selection interview the Australian immigration official assured him of a place as a student in an Australian university. Although there was probably a communication problem, the immigrant definitely believes he understood correctly. He is quite upset at not being accepted by a university here even though he spoke very little English on arrival and could not write easily in English when interviewed. He is one of the immigrants most dissatisfied with his migration to Australia.
My personal observation is that, in general, the formal education of Latin Americans is tempered by life experiences and personal abilities. The result is a group of individuals at a given educational level who are as varied as are their Australian hosts at the same level of formal education. And for the practicalities of finding a job, the migrant's years of formal education are often insignificant in relation to language ability, practical experience, a personal recommendation, appearance and luck.

SECTION VII.B. EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

SECTION VII.B.1 The Pre-migration Situation of the Immigrants

Once again it is necessary to point out that the immigrants to Australia are not typical of all Latin Americans. The general image of Latin America includes high levels of unemployment or under-employment, even in the cities from which most of the migrants come. However, the unemployment is concentrated in the lower class population from which few are migrants to Australia. The selection procedures of the Australian immigration officials also screen out most of those with employment problems. Of the interviewed Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months, only 4 (1.6%) were unemployed and looking for work prior to departure. Approximately 5% of those working were employed less than 35 hours per week while 20% were working fifty or more hours per week. This latter group includes most of those who had their own businesses. In terms
of hours worked and employment status, the emigrants from Latin America are from an industrious segment of the population.

Their former employment is much different from the agricultural and unskilled jobs of most Latin Americans. Only eight (3.5%) of the 248 independent respondents in Australia more than six months were involved in primary industry as farmers before coming to Australia. Excluding the farmers and 20 who were students or unemployed or not seeking work leaves the main group with 220 interviewees. Of them, less than 13% (28 respondents) were unskilled or semi-skilled while 37% (84 respondents) were skilled labourers, technicians or tradesmen. A quarter were salesman or office workers, while the other white collar workers (administrators, managers, and professionals) accounted for the final quarter. Whether by individual motivation, immigration policy, or both, a very high proportion was from the cream of Latin America's workforce. If these proportions remain unchanged and the volume of the migration stays high or increases, the impact on the sending and receiving nations will be of considerable importance. In Parliament, Mr Fox (M.P.) said "these people would benefit Australia...with great advantage to ourselves." (Hansard, 20 November, 1973, p. 3509).

The average income levels in Latin America are typically low, as in other Third World regions. The data collected from the interviewees supports this, especially when we remember their higher than average qualifications and employment. The average income earned per year by the immigrants before coming to Australia was only between two and three thousand dollars. Unfortunately we cannot analyse the pre-migration income data in detail because of several shortcomings. First, inflation and the devaluation of Latin American currencies makes the income figures appear low for immigrants who arrived more than a few years before the interviews. Most of those immigrants had not kept track of the relative changes between the Australian
currencies and that in their country of origin, especially since there were frequently two or more exchange rates: official, black market and tourist. Secondly, the purchasing power of a dollar's worth of local currency varies greatly between countries and even according to the individual's standard of living. That is, a dollar buys a lot of beans and rice, but not much in canned goods, quality meats and automobiles. Also, Venezuela, Chile and Argentina have costs of living much higher than those of Ecuador and Peru.

The third problem with the data on incomes in Latin America is that because of the above reasons, a quarter of the respondents did not answer the question and many commented on the unfairness of any comparisons. The net result is that detailed analyses of the results of the question on income in Latin America must be examined with caution.

SECTION VII.B.2 Employment and Income in Australia

SECTION VII.B.2. a. Income

There are no surprises in the basic employment and income data for the Latin Americans now in Australia. Considering that the interviewing was done during a minor economic slump in 1972-73, the 3% of the Independent Decision Makers in Australia for more than six months who were unemployed is an expected and acceptable level. As Henderson (1970, p.124) points out, there is very little unemployment among migrants. The Latin Americans, like other immigrants, find employment of some kind in Australia. Ninety percent have one full-time job without a part-time job, but a quarter usually work overtime. The Latin Americans' earnings
averaged around $4,500 per year in January 1973. Although an increase over the incomes in Latin America, the cost of living difference takes a large part of that gain. By Australian standards the figure is low. It was approximately $700 (13%) less than the average adult male earnings in N.S.W. in 1972 (A.B.S. 1977, ref. 6.18). Furthermore, the figures are even lower (less than $4,300) when the non-Latinos (over $7000) are separated. Although the figures are low in part because many were here only six to eighteen months, by that time most were in the jobs they will probably hold for several years (see next section). Furthermore, the figure is nearly $1000 higher than the income of the employed Latin Americans who had been in Australia less than six months, as found in my survey, and the Survey Section (1973) study conducted at the same time of South Americans who had been in Australia for an average of 3 to 6 months. That latter survey was the basis for the previously mentioned (Section VI.C.2) newspaper report about the Latin Americans living in a state of poverty in Australia (El Español, 24 April, 1974, p.1, and News Release No. 56/74 from the Minister for Immigration). Not only was their short period of residence overlooked, but the incomes were compared with the average incomes in April, 1974, over a year after the interviewing. And that year was marked by high increases in wages in Australia.

1 The income figures of the three surveys of Latin Americans in Sydney in 1973 are comparable with limitations. The Survey Section (1973) study of arrivals mainly less than 6 months in Australia approximates the modal and median income of the respondents in this study who were here less than six months. The Council's (1976,p.67) Immigration Survey found a median net income of $85 per week (about $5-5,500 per annum gross). This is higher than my median result which is even lower than the mean income given above. Furthermore, my figure is for Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months. Although randomly selected, the small sample of about 40 Latin Americans in the Council's Immigration Survey leads me to prefer my own results for the income data and for the few other topics where the Council's report names the Latin Americans.
My interpretation of the data and impressions during the interviews is that the Latin Americans are not in a state of poverty, but most live from hand to mouth. Many have few or no reserves; any misfortune such as a loss of income because of an accident or strike or an unexpected expense, e.g. medical, could place them on welfare without much assistance from relatives or an established community.

Some of the Latin Americans come to Australia with excessive expectations. The following anecdote told to me by one interviewee illustrates the point: "A new immigrant from Latin America had just landed at the Sydney airport and he was walking down the corridor towards the customs inspectors when he spotted a ten-dollar-bill on the floor. He started to bend over to pick it up when he changed his mind. 'No', he thought, 'I'll wait until I'm officially in Australia before I start picking up the money in the streets.'" Although exaggerated, this story would not be told by the migrants if it did not have an element of truth. Some immigrants expected to receive high incomes, and the expectations can last for several months for an optimist. In that time he can make a number of purchases on credit and entrap himself with debts. The temptation to spend too much catches an unknown number of Latin Americans, especially soon after arrival. Cars are less expensive in Australia and the need for individual transportation when job hunting leads to many hasty purchases on credit. One observant, well-to-do Latin American said "if you want to buy a car at a cheap price, go to a migrant hostel. There is always someone (not necessarily Latin American) selling a car for merely the amount of the unpaid loan." Another Latin American with minimal income said "I have two cars. Neither one will run." The one I saw in front of the home was old, with one flat tyre and hardly suitable for a vehicle
inspection. Unfortunately, too many Latin Americans are not the most discerning or frugal shoppers. Cars, appliances, and furniture on credit are great temptations to anyone who wants to get ahead or at least appear and feel that he is getting ahead.

Other major expenditures are rent, food and, for some, sending money overseas. The average rent for the Latin Americans in Sydney in early 1973 was $30 per week, over one-third of the average weekly net wage after tax. What they received for their rent has been described in Appendix IX. Basically, the rents are high, a common problem for migrants in general, as discussed at the January 1970 meeting of the Australian Citizenship Council. Henderson (1970, p.132) noted: "There is a great deal of evidence in the [Poverty Inquiry] Survey of poverty [among migrants] caused by high housing costs..." Except for those who find employment commensurate with their higher qualifications, there is no reason to doubt that the Poverty Inquiry findings about non-British migrants and their housing (Henderson, Harcourt and Harper, 1970, pp. 130-142) apply equally for the Latin American immigrants.

Food costs are not excessive for the migrants, but the rises in prices during the inflationary 1970's caused problems for the Latin Americans as well as for all residents of Australia. An expression of their concern for inflation and also of their background is seen in a cartoon in El Español en Australia (13 Feb. 1974, p.8, by Ester): Nick-the-Newcomer from Latin America is in an Australian supermarket with his family looking at the prices. He says to his wife: "What galloping inflation. I don't know if they do it to make us leave Australia or to remind us where we came from."

Many of the immigrants send money back to Latin America. Our survey found that of these a quarter regularly send more than $20 per month and another tenth send less than $20. They were primarily the more recent arrivals who were repaying loans for their trip to Australia or supporting dependants in Latin America. The 1973 survey of South Americans by the
Survey Section, Australian Department of Social Security, found a much higher proportion sending money back. That sample included no one more than a year in Australia. That questionnaire asked numerous specific questions about finances and included persons who sent money only occasionally. Therefore I am inclined to prefer their results for indicating the situation of the migrants soon after arrival: 64% of married males, 45% of single males and 31% of single females had loans to pay off (Survey Section, 1973, p.19). Although the amount of debt was not specified, it must represent a considerable drain of resources for many of the migrants at a time when their resources and incomes are at a low point.

The importance of these expenditures is, of course, relative to the immigrants' savings and salaries before and after migration. Considering the employment difficulties of the more skilled immigrants (discussed in the next section), many of them do not gain much, monetarily, by coming to Australia. Eighteen percent of the sampled Independent Decision Makers in Australia actually considered that their income in Australia was worse than what they earned in Latin America. A further 24% said that the two incomes were about the same. On the other hand, unskilled immigrants and/or those from the countries with low wages (and often low cost of basic living) earn substantially higher wages in Australia even though they are still doing unskilled labour. Since there are few Latin American immigrants in this category, they are only a portion of the remaining 58% who consider their income to be better or much better in Australia than in Latin America. Some of the reasons for the immigrants income fluctuations, as compared to their earning capacity in their country of origin, will be discussed in the following section on employment.
SECTION VII.B.2.b. Employment and Occupational levels

There are several notable features on the available census tabulations of Latin Americans in the major occupational groups. Comparing the figures for Sydney with the total for Australia at the 1971 census (Table 7-2), we note basic similarities. Over half of the work force is in the "Trades, production-process workers and labourers" group, with Sydney having a slightly higher percentage (58%). That is compensated by slightly lower percentages in the other occupation groups, excluding "Sales Workers" where the percentages are 6% and 4% for Sydney and Total Australia, respectively. Almost the same basic relationship occurs in the 1966 census data, but with 37.5% and 31% for Sydney and Australia, respectively, in the "tradesman and labourers" group and higher percentages in the professional and managerial occupation groups. One conclusion is that in both 1966 and 1971, the Latin Americans in Sydney closely represent those throughout Australia in occupation.

The comparison of the 1966 data with that of 1971 reveals a substantially higher occupational status in 1966 when the immigrants were less Latin and with longer periods of residence than those in Australia in 1971. However, we cannot conclude from this data that their occupational status improves with increased period of residence because we do not know what qualifications the pre-1966 arrivals possessed. Almost certainly their English ability on arrival was greater than that of the recent immigrants.

To make the comparison of the 1971 census data on occupation of Latin Americans in Sydney with that of our sample, Table 7-3 has been prepared. Because the sample is dominated by recent arrivals, the truest comparison is the difference or change between the 1966 and 1971 populations. The figures have not been corrected for mortality because the age structure
## TABLE 7-2a

**LATIN AMERICA-BORN PERSONS IN AUSTRALIA'S WORK FORCE (CODES 89 & 90)**

**MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUPS BY FOUR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS: 1966**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Codes</th>
<th>Major Occupation Group</th>
<th>Sydney (Metropolitan N.S.W.)</th>
<th>Total N.S.W.</th>
<th>Metropolitan Aust.</th>
<th>Total Aust.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 001-082</td>
<td>Professional, Technical &amp; Related Workers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 100-118</td>
<td>Administrative, Executive &amp; Managerial Workers, (Incl. Self-Employed)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 150-163</td>
<td>Clerical Workers</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 200-214</td>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 300-356</td>
<td>Farmers, Fishermen, Hunters, Timber Gatherers &amp; Related Workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 400-425</td>
<td>Miners, Quarrymen &amp; Related Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 500-561</td>
<td>Workers in Transport &amp; Communication</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 600-785</td>
<td>Tradesmen, Production-Process Workers &amp; Labourers</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 800-852</td>
<td>Service, Sport &amp; Recreation Workers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 855</td>
<td>Members of Armed Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 860</td>
<td>Inadequately Described or Not Stated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 001-860</td>
<td>TOTAL IN WORK FORCE</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7-2b
LATIN AMERICA-BORN PERSONS IN AUSTRALIA'S WORK FORCE:
MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUPS BY FOUR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS: 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Census Codes</th>
<th>Major Occupation Group</th>
<th>Sydney Metropolitan N.S.W.</th>
<th>Total N.S.W.</th>
<th>Metropolitan Aust.</th>
<th>Total Aust.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>001-082</td>
<td>Professional, Technical &amp; Related Workers</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>100-118</td>
<td>Administrative, Executive &amp; Managerial Workers, (Incl. Self-Employed)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>150-163</td>
<td>Clerical Workers</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>200-214</td>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>300-356</td>
<td>Farmers, Fishermen, Hunters, Timber Gatherers &amp; Related Workers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>400-425</td>
<td>Miners, Quarrymen &amp; Related Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>500-561</td>
<td>Workers in Transport &amp; Communication</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>600-785</td>
<td>Tradesmen, Production-Process Workers &amp; Labourers</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>2183</td>
<td>2472</td>
<td>2684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>800-852</td>
<td>Service, Sport &amp; Recreation Workers</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>Members of Armed Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>Inadequately Described or Not Stated</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>001-860</td>
<td>TOTAL IN WORK FORCE</td>
<td>3665</td>
<td>3804</td>
<td>4687</td>
<td>5271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 7-3

A comparison of occupation groups of the census data and the sample of Latin America-born persons in Sydney's workforce.

### a. Census Data: 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Census Codes</th>
<th>Major Occupation Group</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>Change 1966-1971</th>
<th>Percentage of (C)</th>
<th>Combinations from (D)</th>
<th>From Sample</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Codes Used With Sample (Col. F-J)</th>
<th>Independent Decision Makers (All)</th>
<th>Percentage of (I)</th>
<th>Percentage of (L)</th>
<th>Approximation of Independent Decision Makers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>001-082</td>
<td>Professional, Technical &amp; Related Workers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8. Professional</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>100-118</td>
<td>Administrative, Executive &amp; Managerial Workers (Incl. Self-Employed)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7. Administration Management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>150-163</td>
<td>Clerical Workers</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6. Office Work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>200-214</td>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5. Salesman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>300-356</td>
<td>Farmers, Fishermen, Hunters, Timber Gatherers &amp; Related Workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9. Farmer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>400-425</td>
<td>Miners, Quarrymen &amp; Related Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9. Miner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>500-561</td>
<td>Workers in Transport &amp; Communications</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3. Skilled</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>600-785</td>
<td>Tradesmen, Production- Process Workers &amp; Labourers</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2. Semi-skilled</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>800-852</td>
<td>Service, Sport &amp; Recreation Workers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1. Unskilled</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>Members of Armed Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>Inadequately Described or Not Stated*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. Sample Data: 1972-73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Total in Work Force</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>001-860</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>001-860</td>
<td>3665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>001-860</td>
<td>3205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>001-860</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>001-860</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>001-860</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>001-860</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>001-860</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>001-860</td>
<td>2863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Category not used in survey
by occupation for the 1966 population is not known. The resultant percentages (columns D & E) can be compared with the results from the sample (Col. F). The results are quite similar, especially when the "inadequately described or not stated" group from the census is added to the workers and labourers groups (6 - 9). The breakdowns by sex are also very similar.

There is no sure way of applying the census definitions of "work force" to the "Independent Decision Makers", which is our focal group for detailed analyses. One of the major differences concerns the married women who are 23% of the workforce; however, they are dependants, not Independent Decision Makers. The number of married women in each occupation group was subtracted from the 1971 Census figure for each group giving the occupation of an approximation of the Independent Decision Makers. Columns J and K of the preceding table reveal the close agreement of the sample to the population. The sample gives a slightly higher percentage in the "blue collar" tradesman and labourer category. This difference would probably disappear if we could control for the period of residence as we did in column C of that table.

Another factor influencing the comparison of the census data and our sample is that the definition of Independent Decision Makers does not include those who were dependants on arrival. The children born in Latin America who became independent after arriving in Australia are therefore not included in the sample but are part of the census work force. Because of their better English, Australian education and general assimilation, they are different from their parents in employment and other opportunities. Their inclusion in the labour force and occupation tabulations makes those census figures difficult to compare with the Independent Decision Makers. Considering the overall accuracy of the survey and the comparatively small numbers of children who had gained independence by June 1971, I did not
attempt to make corrections and comparisons.

There are also differences in the proportion of unemployed persons who are excluded from the tables of major occupation groups. Unemployment is probably not proportionate to the various occupations nor for all the birthplaces. One difference observed in the proportions is that 21% of the Chileans in the work force were unemployed in 1971 and they were 51% of all unemployed Latin Americans in Sydney. This situation was probably only temporary or because of the arrival of a large number of Chileans just before the census date. There was no indication from our survey data that immigrants from Chile or any other Latin American birthplace had a higher unemployment rate than all others from Latin America.

The low average income of the Latin Americans in Australia is in large part a result of their employment. Nearly 60% of the Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months were working as unskilled or semi-skilled labourers. Not only does this mean that their salaries are low, but also that they have taken a severe loss in employment status. Table 7-4 of the pre-and post-migration employment levels has several interesting features. First we will eliminate the farmers from the discussion. Six of the eight in the sample are unskilled labourers in Australia. One of the exceptions has a skilled repairman's job, the other is in his mid-thirties, has a degree in agriculture, a good command of English and has become a fitter in a factory. Since the sample was limited to Sydney, we cannot say anything about a Latin American farmer who enters farming in Australia. But for those who move into city life, there is a strong likelihood that they will be unskilled labour in an Australian factory.
TABLE 7-4
OCCUPATION LEVELS OF 248 SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENT
DECISION MAKERS IN SYDNEY: PRE-MIGRATION LEVELS BY POST-MIGRATION LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Level in Australia (Item 73)</th>
<th>Unempl. or Student</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
<th>Semi-Skilled</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Technician</th>
<th>Salesman</th>
<th>Office Worker</th>
<th>Admin. Manag.</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Total 6 mo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Farmers and Unempl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (No Defaults)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excluding the farmers, the remaining eight employment levels are essentially in a ranked order with some overlap between adjoining levels. Methodologically, this ranking of occupations is open to debate. In the Australian context, Broom, Jones and Zubrzycki (1965), Zubrzycki (1968, p. 10), and Broom and Jones (1969) all deal with the topic; the Council's (1976 pp. 28-29) Immigration Survey modifies their findings into only four levels: a) Professional/Technical (not a trade technician) and managers, workers on own account, etc.; b) Skilled workers and clerical workers on separate streams; c) Semi-skilled workers; and d) Unskilled workers. Essentially, the Council has two top levels where I have six. Frequently in the analyses that follow I have combined the professionals and managers, but I have not placed "workers on own account" in the top categories unless the respondent was managing his business rather than simply being his own employee repairing cars, making shoes, etc. The latter, small time "businessman" is common in Latin America and several were included in the sample. The same rule was applied to a couple of respondents who were self-employed in Australia.

Concerning the ranking of skilled, technical, sales and office (clerical) workers, in Australia there are only minor (and overlapping) differences in these categories, but in Latin America and to Latin American immigrants, the differences are greater. Recalling the discussion (Section II.D.2) of the Metropolitan middle class in Latin America which strives "to avoid the stigma of menial labor" (Wagley and Harris, 1955, p.48), there is a higher ranking of the white collar position. Furthermore, the selection procedures emphasizing education and experience almost insure that a former salesman was trained or skilled with his product and that a clerical worker
was an accountant, trained secretary etc., instead of a file clerk or photocopy boy. Therefore, although there are a few individuals who are exceptions or difficult cases to classify, the eight ranked occupational levels are used with reasonable confidence and condensed to four levels when sample numbers are small.

Only seven (3%) of the remaining 220 employed interviewees in Table 7-4 have reached an employment level in Australia higher than what they had in Latin America. Only two of those seven are more than one level higher; their cases are unique because of personal attributes such as language abilities which are not held by most of the other immigrants; they are both non-Latin and young. We note also that 65 (30%) have reached the same levels they had in Latin America. The remaining two-thirds have all suffered some loss of employment status, most of them by more than one level. Down to the level of the unskilled and semi-skilled had fallen half of the professionals, a third of the managers/administrators, nearly half of the office workers, almost three fourths of the salesmen and over half of the technicians and skilled workers. This situation is reflected in the responses to the comparative question (Item 70 on the interview schedule) where two thirds said that their employment in Australia was worse or much worse in status than what they did in Latin America. The following cases illustrate the point.

One of the immigrants interviewed was a Cuban officer in the War Ministry under Fidel Castro. As a friend of the family he had often dined at the Castro home. But when his mother had a heart attack, Raul Castro, his commanding officer, refused him leave to visit her and in the process insulted both him and his mother. After his mother's death, he made his way to Spain, then to Australia. When interviewed, he was a salesman...
among the Latin American immigrants in the eastern suburbs of Sydney.

Another example of this is an Argentinian who was an electrical engineer. In Sydney he was sweeping the floors of a railway station. He was optimistic about the future of his family in Australia, particularly for his children; he saw no future for his family in Argentina because of the political and economic situation there. However, he was unable to practice his profession in Australia.

One Peruvian girl, not included in the sample, was living with an Australian family in Sydney. She was not home when I called to interview her, but as I was waiting, the lady told me that she had been in Australia about six months. Formerly a primary teacher who spoke English quite well, she was now working as a shop assistant. Although satisfied with her job, this girl was very unhappy. She would not go out; she sat at home all the time. Although attractive, pleasant and intelligent, she had a great fear of the Australian male.

There are thousands of stories like these three and others in PART THREE. And they are not limited to the Latin Americans; the Council's (1976, Chapter 3 and p.123) Immigration Survey shows the under-utilization of skills to be a major problem for migrants from other nations.

Extensive underemployment of migrants was found by the survey. Many migrants with work qualifications and experience obtained overseas were found working at a lower level than that for which their training overseas had prepared them. Even amongst migrants whose qualifications were recognised by official organisations in Australia, some nineteen thousand family heads were nevertheless working at unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. Thirty per cent of

---

1 The word "underemployment" appears to be incorrectly used. It usually applies to a person who works less than the normal full-time employment, regardless of qualifications being utilized or not. For example, unskilled labourers in Third World countries are underemployed because there is insufficient work available. The word "under-utilized" seems to be more appropriate for the situation where people are working at jobs below the level of their occupational qualifications.
migrant family heads who had worked both overseas and in Australia accepted less skilled occupations in their first full-time jobs in Australia than the jobs they had held overseas, and of these more than half had not made up the lost ground by the time of the survey. In all, twenty-three per cent of migrant family heads (seventy-one thousand) were working in Australia in occupations at lower levels of skill than the ones they had held overseas. (p.123).

Among migrants and specialists on immigrants this condition has been widely known and almost considered common knowledge. Yet as late as 1975 the authoritative "Borrie Report" (p.128-130) said "The extent to which [immigrants] have been upwardly or downwardly mobile [in occupation] is not known, but...comparing the arrival and census statistics immigrants seem to have remained for the most part in the occupational grouping in which they were classified on arrival." Clearly, the occupational groupings are misleading when they place tradesmen, production-process workers, and labourers into one category including skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled.

Referring back to the Council's results, those figures are the most favourable ones possible. First, nearly half of the Immigration Survey respondents were native speakers of English. Although that is no guarantee against being employed at a lower occupation level, we hypothesize that the proportion is lower (and therefore higher for the non-English speaking immigrant). Second, no allowance has been made for the thousands of unskilled and semi-skilled immigrants who could hardly be working at lower levels. Third, the limited number of occupational ranks used in the Immigration Survey cannot detect under-utilization of technicians, clerical workers and other educated migrants who are doing manual but "skilled" work that was outside their main line of training or interests. And fourth, the ten years of that study covers a period of residence long enough to allow the departure of some who were frustrated by their lower occupational levels.
The Council's report *A Decade of Migrant Settlement* sheds some light on the issues of concern but does not explicitly answer the questions raised above. Therefore, these issues are not yet objectively "proven" and can be ignored by all who regard "self-evident or common knowledge" as unacceptable arguments. Only very high quality multi-ethnic studies like that of the Immigration Survey can answer the questions fully, but some points can be supported by data from our survey of Latin Americans. Let us consider the three factors which most affect the immigrants' employment: period of residence in Australia, qualifications and English ability.

SECTION VII.B.2.b.1) Period of Residence

The immigrants' length of residence is important because most migrants are willing to take a reduction in employment status for a while. Many of the more qualified expect to regain all or most of their employment status, usually within a year, or at least be making some progress in that direction.

The breakdown of Table 7-4 according to four periods of residence (0-\(\frac{1}{2}\)yr; \(\frac{1}{2}-2\frac{1}{2}\) yrs.; \(2\frac{1}{2}-4\frac{1}{2}\) yrs.; >\(4\frac{1}{2}\) yrs.) gives interesting results. Figures 7-1a, b, c and d are the same in that farmers/miners and student/unemployed in Latin America are excluded from all. The difference between "a" and "b" is that Figure 7-1b also excludes Latin America's unskilled and semi-skilled because they bias the results in favour of the immigrants reaching the level of employment held in Latin America; any employment in Australia of an unskilled worker must be at the same level (there is none lower) or higher than what he held before migrating. Still both graphs
FIGURE 7-1

PERIOD OF RESIDENCE AND CHANGE IN OCCUPATION LEVELS OF THE 248 SAMPLED
LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENT DECISION MAKERS
(EXCLUDING FORMER FARMERS)

(a) ALL OCCUPATION LEVELS 1-8
(b) OCCUPATION LEVELS 3-8
(c) ALL OCCUPATION LEVELS 1-8
(d) OCCUPATION LEVELS 3-8

- same or higher
- 1 or 2 levels lower
- 3 or more levels lower
show that a migrant who takes employment which is three or more levels lower than what he previously had is highly likely (greater than 80% chance) to remain three or more levels lower, even after many years in Australia. Similarly, unless an immigrant reaches his previous level of occupation within a year of arrival, he is unlikely to reach that level in the next two to four years.

Figures 7-1c and d are identical to the previous ones except that the non-Latins and two very long-term residents are removed, i.e. essentially the fluent speakers of English. These graphs confirm that most average Latin American immigrants in Australia do not progress upwards in occupational level during their first five years in Australia.1 Although experience, qualifications, language ability, personality, etc. are important considerations which can lead to individual successes, the immigrants who do better than the graphs show are exceptions. Furthermore, they are counter-balanced by others who do worse.

---

1 Although I find these results and similar ones by the Council (1976, pp. 22 - 27) to be consistent with the expressions, mainly of frustration, from the interviewees, I also urge caution and further testing. The data are not longitudinal for individuals and it is incorrect to assume that early arrivals are necessarily similar to recent arrivals. Also, over an extended period, those who do not succeed in regaining their pre-migration occupational level are probably more inclined to leave Australia, thereby biasing the population. But in general those biases tend to make the graphs in Figure 7-1 appear more favourable than what actually is the case. This cautionary footnote also applies to the survey results relating to language ability and period of residence. (Section VII.B.2.b.3).
The qualifications for employment of an individual come in two main forms; experience and formal training. Experience is reflected in the levels of occupation already discussed. For two-thirds of the independent decision-makers, experience is the only starting point for regaining their previous levels of employment. The value of their experience depends on their ability to use it in Australia. That ability in turn frequently depends on the immigrants' level of fluency in English, and if the job experience is relevant to work in Australia. Some jobs are done differently in Latin America where the relationship between labour and capital is sometimes almost the reverse of that in Australia. One example is with automotive mechanics. In Latin America, where equipment is expensive, there is less of it and it is generally older and not the latest type. To compensate, the mechanic frequently improvises. He is also a jack-of-all-trades, knowing all parts of the vehicle; he usually does not specialize in one aspect like transmissions, electrical, or smash repairs.

Another example is the office worker or salesman who knows his accounts and files, or produce and territory very well. Although the language barrier is his biggest problem, the changes of systems, procedures and techniques in an Anglo-Saxon culture greatly reduce his effectiveness and hence his employability.

On the other hand, these immigrants have been selected largely on the basis of their skills. Also, by virtue of having decided to migrate, they have indicated a willingness to work and adjust in a different cultural

---

1 This proportion is confirmed by the Survey Section (1973) which found that 60% of the Latin American heads of households do not have any formal qualification.
setting, but not, according to what many interviewees said, to take lower status jobs where they can see little chance of regaining their previous level of occupation.

The one-third with a formal qualification are both blessed and cursed. The blessing is that an accepted qualification can mean entrance into the higher paid trades and professions. The curse is that until accepted by the appropriate authority or trade union, the certificate or degree is not worth the paper on which it is written. This can lead to great frustration. Even if Australia needs Spanish speaking doctors, nursing sisters, teachers, and other professionals, and if the qualifications are of an acceptable standard, can the immigrants practice their professions if they cannot read medical journals in English, handle emergencies working with English-speaking staff, or communicate with the school authorities, parents and non-Spanish speaking students? Australia's answer appears to be "no", and Australia's professionals and unions, not the immigrants, will decide when their qualifications and English are good enough. Judging from the results in Table 7-4, this is also the case for experienced administrators, office staff, salesmen, technicians, and skilled workers. I have several comments about this situation, but have reserved them until the evidence on migration satisfaction has been presented. For the moment, our attention is directed toward the English abilities of the Latin Americans in Australia.

SECTION VII.B.2.b.3) Knowledge of English

Numerous studies have indicated that the inability to use English is one of the greatest barriers to an immigrant's adjustment and advancement
in Australia. Nothing was found in this study to contradict that conclusion. On the contrary it heavily supports it. Many Latin Americans stated that language difficulties had been or were still their major problems.

On arrival, their median level of English knowledge on a seven point scale was only 2.4 (between "very little" and "little" ability). Forty-one interviewees (17%) claimed to be at levels 5, 6 and 7, i.e. to be able to at least carry on a conversation with ease and to write letters easily in English, but that included 15 non-Latins with very good or excellent English. Excluding them, the median was 2.3, identical to the median of the 51 recent arrivals in Australia less than six months.

At the time of the interviews of the Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months, their practice and study of English raised the median to 4.0 (a "fair" or basic ability adequate for most work situations). Nearly half said that they were at the three upper levels.

The improvement in language ability as period of residence increases varied markedly with individuals. One exceptional single girl arrived with almost no knowledge of English but reached a very good proficiency (able to easily study in English) in less than two years with the government intensive language programme. She obtained recognition of her teaching credentials, was employed as a high school teacher and was accepted to do a Masters degree at a university in Sydney. Another single girl who was a kindergarten teacher and had recently completed full-time language study in Sydney, was unemployed and had not reached a "fair" ability in English. Several men said they had learned very little English, but were becoming

---

1 The Council's (1976) Immigration Survey also concludes this, but its results are marred by a methodological flaw that prevents detailed analysis. Although the interviewee's level of English on arrival was classified into only three levels, his English at the interview was not classified at all if the interview was conducted through an interpreter (p. 85).
very fluent in Italian, the language of most of their fellow employees in the factories. These examples illustrate the extremes and the variability depending on circumstances, ability to learn languages, hard work, and a certain amount of luck.

The sample (excluding the non-Latins) reveals the trends. On arrival, the median level was only 2.3 (between "very little" and "little" English). Forty-nine respondents in Australia less than six months (average time of three months) had a median of 3.1 ("little" English). The medians rose to 3.7 and 4.0 ("fair" or "so-so" ability) during the next two intervals of six months. For the 88 averaging two years in Australia, the median held at 4.0, then rose to 4.5 (between "fair" and "good") for those with 2½ to 4½ years of residence, and also for the pre-1968 true Latin American immigrants. Although these data have limitations (see previous footnote), the steady improvement of English ability is evident. But the slowness and rather low levels are disappointing, especially because these results are for the Independent Decision Makers. Given that a reasonable proficiency in English is almost essential for the recognition of many qualifications and the regaining of higher occupational levels, the above results support the earlier finding (Figure 7-4) and suggest why an immigrant is unlikely to rise above the occupational level he has at the end of his first six months in Australia.

* * *

For the typology, English ability at interview is an important characteristic. Three prime levels are sufficient: none to little (codes 1-3); fair (code 4); and good to excellent (codes 5-7). Education and formal qualifications are not important enough to place in the typology. But employment in Latin America and relative loss of occupational status appear to be exceptionally important, especially in light of different motives for migrating, our next topic.
CHAPTER VIII

MOTIVATIONS, ATTITUDES, AND A TYPOLOGY

This last chapter in PART TWO deals with the intangible and subjective motivations and attitudes of the immigrants. The motivations relate back to the origins of the immigrants and to many of their other attributes which we have been discussing. At the same time, their attitudes are a crucial portion of PART THREE where we examine migration satisfaction.

SECTION VIII.A. REASONS LATIN AMERICANS COME TO AUSTRALIA

This study of the Latin Americans included a question (Item 76) asking the respondent to name the reason or reasons for his migration. Only one respondent, a Chilean who mailed in his questionnaire, did not state his motivation. Half of the respondents named a second or more motivations for migrating and that proportion was maintained for each of the individual birthplaces in Latin America. Some respondents could not say which motivation was more important, while others indicated the combined motives of political and economic problems which aggravate each other in Latin America. The lack of distinction between the main and secondary motives led to the combination of responses for analytical purposes; if a respondent considered a second or third motive important enough to mention, it was taken into account.

There are two methodological problems associated with motivation. The first is that the 248 key interviewees have given over 400 responses, i.e. some people will be counted in two or more groups. Therefore, the
dichotomies and divisions are not mutually exclusive as in sex, language ability and all the other characteristics. The second problem is the subjectivity of motivation. Subjectivity introduces errors because the respondent may not be aware of his true motives and because intentional misrepresentation is difficult to detect. The subjectivity problem is enhanced when we try to determine which of two or more motives is more important, and how much more important it is. Also, it is extremely difficult to compare the strength of one respondent's motive with that of another respondent, even if the stated motives are the same. To adequately handle these two methodological problems is a massive task beyond the scope and aims of this study, but quite possibly one avenue for future work. The results which follow suggest that simple, stated motives are sufficient for our examination of migration satisfaction, but are so important in the results that greater attention should be given in subsequent studies.

In light of the results of the earlier chapters, the sixteen non-Latins, the two very long-term residents and the ten widowed/divorced/separated respondents were isolated. Their motives were varied, but economic/employment and political factors were the main ones for the non-Latins while family problems were frequently mentioned by the divorced and separated.

For the remaining key group of 220 "true" Latin American Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months, the most important motive was economic/employment factors, closely followed by the desire to travel (Table 8-1). Political reasons were a weak third; no other reasons assumed much importance.

Marital status is important in understanding the motives. Over half of the married respondents named economic factors and less than a third indicated the desire to travel; the opposite proportions apply to those
### TABLE 8-1

**STATED MOTIVATIONS OF 220 "TRUE" LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENT DECISION MAKERS IN AUSTRALIA MORE THAN SIX MONTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated Motives</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married After Arrival</th>
<th>Single on Arrival</th>
<th>Married Before Arrival</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Travel (No economic or employment motive)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Travel and Employment (Did not say economic motive)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Travel and Economic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Economic (No travel or employment motive)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Employment (Did not say economic motive)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Politics and Economic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Politics and Travel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Politics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Miscellaneous Reasons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Default</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 TOTALS (Rows 1-5 and 8-10)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Sub-Totals**

(N.B. A respondent can name more than one motive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Travel (Rows 1-3)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Economic and/or Employment (Rows 2-5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Politics (Rows 6-8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
who were single on arrival, especially for the females. This reveals
the underlying difference between the more youthful, adventure seeking
single immigrants and the older, stability seeking married immigrants.
This is supported by the political motive where over 80% of the respondents
mentioning politics were married.

As expected, the push of politics is focused on a couple of Latin
American nations: Chile and Uruguay. A quarter of the Chileans and a
third of the Uruguayans named politics as one of their main motives
for migrating. Together they account for 70% of the times
"politics" was named. The remaining percentage was spread mainly between
Argentina, Peru and Cuba.

The prospects of "employment opportunities" in Australia accounted
for only 10% of the motivation. Apparently, the general push
of economic factors was more important than the pull of employment
opportunities. Other motives which are primarily pulls are "climate and
health" and "friend/relatives/parents in Australia". Together they account
for less than 10% of the stated motives.

When combined, half of the stated motives were primarily based upon
"pushes" and half on "pulls". However, the main "pull" of travel is
notably weak and probably after an extended stay, quite easily changes into
a "push" from Australia, a topic examined in PART THREE. Of those who
gave two or more motives, nearly half named one push and one pull reason
for migration. These findings are not surprising, but do illustrate that
the Latin Americans have come for a variety of reasons. They are not
all political or economic refugees nor adventurers. Rather, their mixture
of motives suggests that within the Latin American population in Australia
are found examples of migrants from all areas of the world and especially
from the middle class in the developing nations which is broad in
scope but comparatively small in numbers.
Motives for migrating can also be cross-tabulated with other characteristics such as English ability, qualifications, employment and assisted passage, but the results are descriptive and of limited value. The cause/effect relationships between motivation and other characteristics are not clear and are not the aim of this study. Motivation is a filter which colours the immigrant's perception of his situation and is probably an important explanatory variable when we examine satisfaction in the final chapters. The combinations of motivation with other characteristics are examined there.

SECTION VIII.B. ATTITUDES

The attitudinal questions are divisible into two types: one on problems faced and the other on indicators of migration satisfaction.

The first type of attitudinal question asked about the problems faced by the Latin Americans. Three-fourths of the respondents felt that immigrants from their home country do not have different problems from other Latin Americans (Item 86). Those who said that there are fewer or more problems for their fellow countrymen are proportionately distributed across the birthplaces with one exception. Thirty-five percent of the Ecuadorians felt that they had more problems than did other Latin Americans. This was almost entirely because so few Ecuadorians received assisted passage and accommodation in hostels after arrival.

On the other hand, when asked if the problems of Latin American immigrants are different from those of other immigrants (Item 85), half said that the problems are different and are more numerous.¹ The most

¹ Note that the question asks for problems which are different from those of other immigrants. Therefore, the language and employment problems shared by most non-British immigrants are not named as frequently as they would have been if the question asked the Latin American to name any problems they have.
frequently mentioned problems were social. The young and single felt they did not have sufficient friends, especially for dating; the older and married immigrants said their social life was limited to only a few families and, in many cases, no relatives. These problems will hopefully diminish as the number of Latin Americans grows, but are likely to remain as long as there is not a specific concentration in Sydney to act as a receiving area. Likewise, the smaller Latin American community in Melbourne (or elsewhere) faces these same social problems.

The second most frequently mentioned problems concerned employment and wages, which have already been discussed in the preceding chapter.

Language ranked third among the problems named. This is possibly influenced by the wording of the question which focused on what problems the Latin Americans had that were different from those of other immigrants. This data therefore, does not allow any fine distinction as to the importance of the problems named, especially because of the influence of language ability in solving the problems mentioned before, i.e. social life and employment.

The criticism of government assistance (Item 89) revealed two interesting attitudes. First, fewer than 10% of the half which named criticisms complained about the language training programmes. However, nearly 40% found fault with the administration of the immigration policies and assistance. The bureaucracy was a hindrance to assisting the immigrants. Those who faulted the inadequacy of the assisted passage were mostly those heads of households who did not receive any such assistance, i.e. mainly those from the minor sources like Ecuador, Colombia, Brazil and Mexico where the Australian Department of Immigration was not actively represented. Furthermore, the Latin Americans were well aware that the Special Passage Assistance Programme (S.P.A.P.) paid only about
half of the high air fares on the South Pacific routes. (The charter flights did not begin until a year after the sample was interviewed; see Section III.C.). A few (28) mentioned inadequate assistance in obtaining employment matching their qualifications. The other criticisms were primarily isolated cases, although assistance in purchasing housing may become increasingly important as their period of residence increases.

Five other attitudinal questions have been used as indicators of migration satisfaction. The explanation and application of the concept of migration satisfaction are presented in PART THREE of this study.

SECTION VIII.C. A TYPOLOGY OF LATIN AMERICANS IN AUSTRALIA

The identification of the major types of Latin Americans in Australia has involved the isolation and separation of small and unique minor types which introduce "noise" into the classification procedures (Figure 8-1). These include the Australia-born children of the Latin Americans and the "thru-migrants" (see Appendix VII) who lived many years in Latin America but were not born there.

Since there are innumerable possible typologies depending on the objectives, the final typology here reflects our focus on migration satisfaction. For this study it is important to identify immigrants who can make their own decisions on whether to migrate, and then to re-migrate if they wish. Therefore, the dependents and the transition cases who either lost or gained independence after arrival are separated as distinct types, leaving the sample with 299 Independent Decision Makers, all of whom are residing in the Sydney Metropolitan Area. They could be treated as one type except that analyses in PART THREE show that the 51 immigrants with less than six months residence in Australia have a marked difference in migration satisfaction.
FIGURE 8-1
A TYPOLOGY OF LATIN AMERICANS IN AUSTRALIA

STAGE ONE

Total Population of Australia

"Aussies" Latin Americans Other ethnic groups in Australia

Children born in Australia Born in Latin America "Thru-Migrants"

Residing in Australian country towns and rural areas Residing in Sydney, N.S.W. Residing in other major urban areas

Independent Gained Lost independence Dependents
Decision Makers independence in Australia in Australia Dependants

Very recent arrivals In Australia more than Very long-term residents
less than 6 months in Australia six months but less than ten years [pre-1961]

non-Latin "True" Latins "True" Latins non-Latins no longer
(1) (50) (230) (16) "typical" Latins (2)

widowed, divorced, Married before Married after Single
separated arrival arrival

Occupation level in Unskilled Semi-skilled Skilled Technician Clerical Administration/ Management Professional Farmers Unemployed or Student

English ability at interview None to little Fair Good to excellent

Motivation Politics Travel Economic factors and employment Combinations of above Other

Friends or relatives in Australia Yes No

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA

CRITERIA OF DIVISIONS AND ROW TOTALS

1. General ethnic background

2. Birthplace

3. Geographic residence

4. Independence to make a migration decision

5. Period of residence

6. "Latin-ness"

7. Marital Status and Sex
The remaining 248 respondents are the focal group for the majority of the analyses. Although the sample is not randomly selected, these people are the group most representative of Latin American immigrants in Sydney. From that group can be separated two very long-term residents and 16 non-Latins, all of whom are not as representative as the remaining 230 persons who are "true" Latin Americans who arrived in Australia in the 1960's and early 1970's.

By removing the ten widowed/divorced/permanently separated respondents from the 230 contemporary Latin Americans in Australia more than six months, a second focal group is formed for a continuation of the typology. Thus far, the typology has really been eliminating the "noise" of special but small types. From here the typology can again take many directions; the selected direction involves the issues of qualifications, employment, relatives/friends in Australia, English ability and motivations. At this point it is not evident that one of these issues is above the others in the typology. Rather, they are very interrelated with each other and with migration satisfaction. For this reason the conclusion of the typology in Chapter XII must come after we have examined the theme of migration satisfaction in PART THREE.
PART THREE

THE MIGRATION SATISFACTION OF
LATIN AMERICANS IN AUSTRALIA
CHAPTER IX

THE USES AND MEASUREMENT OF MIGRATION SATISFACTION

Migration satisfaction was introduced in Chapter I as a concept used by researchers in Western Australia, and defined in relation to place utility. The present chapter examines the uses and importance of migration satisfaction and then presents a methodology for its measurement, an important pre-requisite for the analyses in the remainder of PART THREE.

SECTION IX.A. THREE REASONS FOR STUDYING MIGRATION SATISFACTION

There are three basic but interrelated reasons for studying migration satisfaction. Migration satisfaction is considered to be:

1. A stepping-stone to assimilation/integration;
2. A factor influencing return migration; and
3. A consideration in the selection of migrants.

Each of these three reasons involves meaningful concepts and issues which are important to demographers, social historians, economists, geographers, sociologists, psychologists and other social scientists. Social scientists from all these disciplines have considerable interest in initial and return migration, who moves, reasons for the movement and the impact of those movements on the host, the origin and on the migrants themselves. The discussion which follows refers to the contemporary situation. A comment on how the importance of migration satisfaction has changed over the decades and centuries is given in Appendix VI.

SECTION IX.A.1 Migration Satisfaction in Relation to Assimilation/Integration

One of the reasons for studying migration satisfaction is that it appears to be an essential first step in the process of assimilation/integration. The evidence for this comes from the work of Alan Richardson
who has proposed a theory of assimilation involving satisfaction, identification (the migrant feels that he is Australian), and acculturation (the migrant adopts the attitudes, beliefs and behaviours of Australians). This theory is explained most fully in Richardson's book (1974, pp.24-48) and is summarized here only as it relates to our topic.

Price (1969, p.224) succinctly restates Richardson's work as follows:

The theory simply states that a certain measurable level of satisfaction is a necessary pre-requisite of a certain measurable level of identification and, in turn, that specified measurable levels of satisfaction and identification are pre-requisites of a relatively high level of acculturation.

Figure 9-1 illustrates the interrelationship of these three stages. The sequence can occur at different rates, stop at any stage, and may even regress if discrimination arises or socio-economic conditions deteriorate. Richardson indicates that there is less likelihood of regression from the acculturation stage than from the identification stage. It also follows that there is increased ease of regression from a satisfied condition to one of dissatisfaction. Richardson suggests that dissatisfaction may be another stage, the lowest one in the sequence, but that it does not necessarily have to occur. However, since dissatisfaction
is measured the same way as satisfaction, it appears that dissatisfaction is best treated as a low or negative level of satisfaction. They are simply two ends of one continuum, the lowest portion of which is not used by some migrants. This leaves Richardson's theoretical three stage theory as a more firm, definite sequence where there is a progression from satisfaction to identification to acculturation.

A. H. Richmond (1969, p.277) opposes Richardson's theory, saying that "personal satisfaction, adjustment and identification...[which are] subjective aspects, are largely independent of the objective aspects of acculturation and structural integration. ...the most acculturated migrants may also be the most critical and dissatisfied." This disagreement occurs because of two misunderstandings. Firstly, Richardson does consider acculturation to be subjective, but with some objective measures. Secondly, Richardson does not give a clear definition of migration satisfaction as compared with general satisfaction. General satisfaction is distinct from migration satisfaction, as shown in the previous section. It remains to be shown if the dissatisfaction of acculturated migrants is the same type of dissatisfaction as that of migrants who have never fully identified or integrated into the host society. In other words, would not the dissatisfaction of an acculturated, possibly naturalized migrant be more akin to the dissatisfaction of a native-born Australian than with the dissatisfaction of a new arrival? The distinction is between migration satisfaction and other forms of satisfaction outside of the locational context. Finally, even if Richmond's comments cast doubt on Richardson's theory, those criticisms do not invalidate any of the three stages when taken singly. Therefore, with or without the possibility of the sequential relationship, the need exists for increased attention to the relatively neglected concept of satisfaction.

The disagreement between Richmond and Richardson highlights the
diversity of viewpoints on assimilation (see Price, 1969, pp. 181-237) and raises questions about the migration satisfaction to identification to acculturation sequence. Perhaps the measurements could be better; but the work of Richardson has been replicated by colleagues using other migrant groups. This evidence, reviewed in Taft (1965), strongly indicates that there is some form of sequential relationship with satisfaction at a very basic stage of the migrant's progression "from stranger to citizen". Richardson's theory is both logical and supported by reasonable evidence. The conclusion is that migration satisfaction is of considerable importance to Australia and its society insofar as the assimilation/integration of migrants into the host society is desirable.

SECTION IX.A.2  Migration Satisfaction in Relation to the Departure of Former Settlers

SECTION IX.A.2.a.  Significance of Migrant Departures

Apart from cases of hardship and pre-planned transience, the departure of former settlers represents an inability of the host to hold its migrants who see something more important elsewhere. If the number of departures is large, it may result in improvements of the holding conditions at least to an acceptable level in the eyes of the receiving nation, considering the time and circumstances of the migration. According to the *Inquiry into the Departure of Settlers from Australia: Final Report* by the Committee on Social Patterns of the Immigration Advisory Council [1973, p.1], the migrant-receiving nations "generally accept [some] departure movement as an inevitable ingredient of any migration programme". But that report also pointedly states that Australia is an exception to that statement and cites Australia's elaborate migration statistics as evidence of its greater concern; the report itself is further evidence of concern.
The most refined calculations of Australia's "settler loss" show a 23% loss for the period 1966-1971 and nearly 28% for the ten year period ending in 1971 (Committee, 1973, pp.3 and 4). If this "compares favourably with that of other migrant-receiving countries" (p.1) we have a rough idea of the magnitude of the departure of settlers on a world-wide basis. Price (1974b, p.A22) estimates that the cost to the Australian taxpayer was possibly well over one hundred million dollars for the nearly 420,000 settlers who have departed Australia between 1947 and 1970. Although that cost is probably much less than the economic contribution of those migrants to Australia, it is money that could be saved by reducing departures. Despite the magnitude of the problem, little work on departures has been done. He cites three reasons why:

1. statistics which have "inadvertently concealed the extent of settler loss",
2. the difficulty in assessing the loss in monetary terms, i.e., the language best understood by policy makers and administrators, and
3. the problems and costs of following and finding those who have departed.

The Committee's final report on departures concludes that "... every effort should be made to reduce the number of 'integration risk' cases in the migrant intake and to assist those who do come to settle successfully..." (1973, p.15). The first report (1967, p.23) states the Committee's concern in a different way: "... whether the numbers of settlers departing were high or low, if they included people who failed for 'preventable' reasons, this was a matter of concern and hence the Committee's additional inquiries into the causes of migrant departures and ways of counteracting or alleviating them". These statements carry the message of the significance of studying departures and their causes.

Unfortunately, the 1967 statement equates some departures with failures. I feel that 'failure' is too strong a term. As it is used there, it is 'failure' only for the migrant. However, the migrant might easily see
his departure as the result of Australia's failure to offer suitable employment or some other failure in the host environment. In actuality, departures probably result from a combination of failings which are better called unsatisfactory combinations of people and situations. Since the people are migrants and the situations are associated with places (e.g. doing manual labour in Australia), we will discuss in the following section how a variety of reasons for departures can be viewed in terms of migration satisfaction.

SECTION IX.A.2.b. Reasons for Migrant Departures

The Committee concludes that "a fairly large proportion" of the departing migrants do so for five main reasons "other than dissatisfaction with Australia" (1973, pp.7-8). These are a) mobility of highly-skilled migrants, b) commitment to homeland, c) aged migrants "retiring" to their country of origin, d) intention to stay only a limited time and e) international mobility, including refugees. I can agree with the Committee that while migrants leaving for these reasons are not dissatisfied in the sense of disliking or not finding an adequate life in Australia, I would say that changes in the origin and destination or relative migration satisfaction (as perceived by the migrants) has meant that other locations are considered more favourable than the Australian host at the time of departing. It is the old idea of the "pull factor" operating while there is no or very little "push" from Australia. Also, the influence of time is paramount. As time passes, places and perceptions change. For the highly skilled and mobile, the crucial time period may be short, e.g. only until a better position becomes available. For the migrant ready to retire the time period is close to maximum. Vanderkamp (1972, p.460) says that some departers are only following a deliberate career plan which requires
the migrants to be at different locations at different times. After one place has served its purpose, the migrant desires another location. This would indicate that over time one place has declined in usefulness relative to another which has increased. This does not mean that the migrant comes to hate or despise his host location, but the individual's perception of the location's relative usefulness has changed over the time interval. Vanderkamp says (p.460) that there must be controls on the time span in any study of departures. This also applies to studies of migration satisfaction. The emphasis on time is most important; if not considered, the factor of time and associated stages in the individual's career cycle could disrupt and invalidate the findings. Unfortunately, time, and therefore relative changes in the area of origin, have not always been controlled in studies of departures. Therefore, while in the long term picture "a fairly large proportion" (whatever that means) are not dissatisfied when they depart, they are possibly more satisfied with another location. For understanding departures, these relative differences, as perceived by the migrant, merit greater consideration. In short, low or negative levels of migration satisfaction seem to play a greater role in departures than previously acknowledged.

In comparison with the above motivations for departing, settler loss for reasons of true dissatisfaction with the host environment is less clearly understood. The final report (1973) of the Committee on Departures, which summarizes thirty-nine sources of evidence, gives official and documented support to what many readers might consider as obvious causes of dissatisfaction which lead to departures. The Committee's two broad categories are situational factors (employment, accommodation, and social services) and social and personal reasons which include homesickness and medical problems. We can observe that the underlying major causes of the
dissatisfaction are economic factors, personal problems or migrant/host conflict. But beyond that, little can be said because the research into the departure of migrants has either only assumed that certain motivations for leaving mean dissatisfaction or have examined merely a dichotomy of dissatisfied versus satisfied migrants.

The question of time is as important with these dissatisfied motivations as with those discussed at the beginning of this section. The first five years are the vital ones concerning migrant departures; the lowest levels of migration satisfaction generally occur in the middle of the first year (Richardson, 1968, p.43). Those migrants who do not recover sufficiently from this period of negative feelings about their migration and eventually depart usually do so in their third year, i.e. after completing their two year obligations as assisted migrants.

To summarize this section, we can say that various things are known about departed migrants (see Richardson, 1974, p.117ff), but very little about the influence of migration satisfaction on departures. We know that some migrants do leave because of the push of dissatisfaction while some satisfied migrants leave because another location offers something extra or different, i.e., the effects of a pulling force. Perhaps this seems simplistic. It is. But not much more is known. This is in large part because the data available is based on (1) inadequate methods of measuring satisfaction of (2) samples of migrants who varied on too many insufficiently understood characteristics, especially period of residence. The methods of measuring migration satisfaction discussed later in this chapter will help overcome the problem of inadequate measurement of migration satisfaction. Concerning the control of the characteristics of the migrants being studied, that control has been very difficult not only because of costs but also because very little is known about which
migrant characteristics are related to migration satisfaction. This problem is reviewed in the following section on the third reason for studying migration satisfaction.

SECTION IX.A.3 Migration Satisfaction as a Consideration in the Selection of Migrants

The third reason for studying satisfaction is that it has been or should be taken into account in migrant selection, i.e. getting the 'right' migrant to Australia. At the national or macro level, migration satisfaction should influence selection policies. At the micro-scale of the individual, a person who would be potentially discontented and potentially unhappy with his migration could be made aware before he migrates of the probability of the "failure" of his migration. This would help to avoid individual problems and save considerable expense by people paying the passage over and then back again.

A few researchers, e.g. Elizur (1972), have included a satisfaction question or two in their studies of departing migrants, but not much use of the concept has been made. The researchers in Western Australia have made some pioneer contributions in the attempt to relate satisfaction and the characteristics of migrants. Taft (1966, pp.44-46) gives a comparative summary of the findings of those researchers who have examined satisfaction in relation to their work on Richardson's theory. Their findings are inconclusive and sometimes contradictory. Only Heiss has tried to cover a large number of characteristics. None have tried to combine significant characteristics. None have gone beyond a simple satisfied versus dissatisfied dichotomy in their examination of the migrants' characteristics. In fact, some have used the slightly different concepts of "satisfaction with life" or "adjustment" rather than migration satisfaction. Even the
research done at the University of Western Australia has brought in different questions to determine satisfaction. But in the main the immigrants' satisfaction has been judged on a yes or no answer to a question starting "Are you satisfied with...?" Because of these problems and inconsistencies, concrete conclusions are difficult and would be rather tenuous if attempted. Too many characteristics and circumstances vary between the immigrant groups. However, further investigation specifically on migrant characteristics related to migration satisfaction appears to be warranted. If we know what characteristics to look for in the selection and advising of migrants, we could influence the general level of migration satisfaction in the host area and consequently reduce the amount of departures which, as shown in the previous section, at least in some minimal way result from low levels of satisfaction. Therefore a systematic comparative analysis of the variables affecting migration satisfaction will be one step toward filling this gap in our knowledge about migrants.

*   *   *

To summarize these three reasons for studying migration satisfaction, we can say that Richardson's theory is fairly well tested and gives us a basic understanding of the concept and how satisfaction relates to assimilation/integration. Almost any contribution on satisfaction will help broaden the base of those pioneering ideas. We can also say that the understanding of departures in relation to satisfaction is exceptionally simplistic at the present. At the moment there are too many unknowns and methodological problems for an adequately controlled examination. One major unknown is which, if any, characteristics of migrants are significantly related to migration satisfaction. This is actually the third reason for studying migration satisfaction. Some of Richardson's associates have taken
some initial steps. This study attempts to enlarge our knowledge of which migrant characteristics are significantly related to migration satisfaction. We will do this as we examine the characteristics of the Latin American residents in Australia in Chapters X and XI. But before that is possible we must have a way of measuring migration satisfaction and analysing the results.

SECTION IX.B. MEASURING MIGRATION SATISFACTION

"What cannot be measured may in fact not exist."
Blaug, 1970

"If it can be measured, does it therefore exist?"
P.S.A., 1974

Measurement has long been both hell and heaven to science. The hell is the difficulty and often "apparent" impossibility of measuring some object or experience; the heaven is when, once something is measured by an accepted method, the magic of quantification refutes almost all opposition. Between these extremes is the purgatory of fledgling sciences trying to make a transition from the phenomenological to the positivist approach to investigation (ref. Cubbon, 1973, and Lally and Preston, 1973). These two schools of thought mix and are interrelated but the emphasis and preference seems to be on as much positivism as possible. Hence in this section I try to push the quantification of migration satisfaction to a higher level.

A topic as subjective as satisfaction is elusive of measurement and often provides more hell than heaven for the researcher. Undoubtedly, further improvements will be forth-coming, but this is to be expected, as Harvey (1971, p.319) writes: "measurement models are merely filters through which we monitor complex messages. Over the years these filters become more refined and better adjusted to our needs." Harvey's discussion of
measurement (1971, pp.306-324) is quite useful. Several of his thoughts, particularly on scale, validation and errors, have been incorporated at various points in this investigation.

Having linked the two concepts of migration satisfaction and place utility in the previous section, we must now consider their relative merits for measurement and quantification. Wolpert suggested quantifying place utility from census data or arrival and departure figures. This would be valid, but there are two limitations. The first is that his macro-scale method suffers from a time lag in the rather dynamic, constantly changing context of migration. The second limitation is that each movement he measures is actually a composite of movements by many individuals who are uniquely different from each other. Therefore his measurements would show the main trends and gross place utilities but lack the precision of micro-scale measurements. These limitations plus the frequent incompatibility of data from different data sources probably explain why the concept has not been quantified with much success. I suggest that the micro-scale approach of migration satisfaction will assist in the measurement of place utility. This section examines the methods of measuring migrant satisfaction.

SECTION IX.B.1 Previously Used Methods and Questions

The measurement of migration satisfaction through questionnaire responses has been used since Richardson's early work in 1953 and possibly earlier. However, as noted above, its use has been concentrated in Western Australia. The result of this has been the use of only a few indicators of satisfaction. There is as yet no comprehensive study of satisfaction indicators; such a study would most properly fall to psychology. None has been done largely because a dichotomy of satisfied
versus dissatisfied migrants has been considered sufficient for previous studies. Certainly no one system of measuring migration satisfaction has been adopted or considered optimal.

The greatest uniformity in assessing satisfaction of migrants is in the approach by the Western Australian group who were testing Richardson's theory. That group almost invariably followed Richardson's lead and used his six satisfaction indices (Richardson, 1967, p.18):

Six Satisfaction Indices based on the immigrants' response to:
1. On the whole do you feel fairly satisfied or dissatisfied with your life in Australia? (a) dissatisfied (b) satisfied
2. Would you say that on the whole you are satisfied or dissatisfied with your present accommodation? (a) dissatisfied (b) satisfied
3. Except for possible holidays would you like to spend the rest of your life in Australia? (a) yes (b) no (c) undecided
4. On the whole would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with living in Newtown? (a) satisfied (b) dissatisfied
5. On the chart below, indicate with a tick (✓) as accurately as you can remember, the way you felt about Australia from the time you arrived, up to and including the present moment:
   - Felt very satisfied
   - Felt fairly satisfied
   - No feeling either way
   - Felt fairly dissatisfied
   - Felt very dissatisfied
6. On the chart below, indicate with a tick (✓) how you feel about your life in Australia at the present time:
   - Feel very satisfied
   - Feel fairly satisfied
   - No feeling either way
   - Feel fairly dissatisfied
   - Feel very dissatisfied

Taft (1961, pp.269-270) used the same questions in his study of Dutch immigrants in "Newtown", Western Australia\(^1\), but added additional "satisfaction questions" which, if they had not been listed in an example questionnaire in Taft (1965, pp.96-99), would not have appeared in the

---

\(^1\) Newtown, a Perth satellite established in the early 1950's accommodates employees of a nearby oil refinery. Ethnically the town is 34% British, 44% Australian, 20% Dutch and 2% others.
literature (see Table 9-1). These questions were found to correlate with Richardson's six indices but did not significantly improve upon them. In short, they indicate that satisfaction can be measured in a variety of ways and "that it would be possible to extend the satisfaction scale to include further items representing satisfaction in a diversity of life spheres" (Taft, 1961, p.272).

It should be noted that the Western Australian researchers examined satisfaction mainly as a stepping-stone to acculturation. As a result, although they were conducting psychological studies, their analyses of satisfaction were rather basic; only a means of separating migrants into satisfied or dissatisfied groups was needed.

The six variables in "the Richardson scale" (Taft, 1961, p.269) are here considered to be somewhat repetitious and not necessarily comprehensive. Three of his questions (1,5 and 6) essentially cover the same ground three times, i.e., "Are you satisfied with your life in Australia?", although the fifth question does ask for comparisons over time. While it is often desirable to double (and triple?) check responses, it means that only four indicators were used. Of those four, numbers 2 and 4 ask about "accommodation" and "neighbourhood", respectively. These two are also closely related and, because only one of Perth's satellite towns was studied, there is to be expected a certain amount of conformity in the answers. That again can be desirable, especially because of the relatively small samples used; Richardson used ninety British male immigrants and their wives while Taft studied forty Dutch male householders (Taft, 1965, pp.46-47). However, their findings are strictly limited in geographic terms to other places like Newtown, of which there are few. Taft (1961, p.270) states that in his replication of Richardson's study the poorest predictor of satisfaction, in the general sense, was question number 4 on satisfaction with the neighbourhood of Newtown, W.A.
**TABLE 9-1**

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE IN "NEWTOWN" DUTCH STUDY  
(Taft, 1961, as given in Taft, 1965, pp.97-99)

Part III-Satisfaction

14. Are you on the whole satisfied or dissatisfied with your present job?  
   (a) Dissatisfied  
   (b) Satisfied

15. (If dissatisfied) What job would you prefer?  

16. Would you say that your wife is fairly satisfied or fairly dissatisfied with her life in Australia?  
   (a) Dissatisfied  
   (b) Satisfied

17. Would you say that on the whole you are satisfied or dissatisfied with your present accommodation?  
   (a) Dissatisfied  
   (b) Satisfied

18. On the whole would you say that you are satisfied or dissatisfied with living in "Newtown?"  
   (a) Satisfied  
   (b) Dissatisfied

19. (If dissatisfied) Where would you rather be and why?  

20. With the exception of possible holidays abroad, would you like to spend the rest of your life in Australia?  
   (a) Yes  (b) No  (c) Undecided

21. How strongly do you feel about this opinion?  
   (b) Very strongly  (b) fairly strongly  (c) not strongly

22. Since living in Australia have you achieved as much in life as you expected to do?  
   (a) as much  
   (b) even more  
   (c) somewhat less  
   (d) little  
   (e) practically nothing

.............................................................................................................................
TABLE 9-1 (cont.)

23. How satisfied are you in regard to job and occupational prospects in Australia?
   (a) completely satisfied  (d) a little dissatisfied
   (b) very satisfied        (e) very dissatisfied
   (c) fairly satisfied

24. How satisfied are you in regard to the education and future of your children in Australia?
   (a) completely satisfied  (d) a little dissatisfied
   (b) very satisfied        (e) very dissatisfied
   (c) fairly satisfied

25. How satisfied are you in regard to the general standard of living in Australia?
   (a) completely satisfied  (d) a little dissatisfied
   (b) very satisfied        (e) very dissatisfied
   (c) fairly satisfied

26. How satisfied are you in regard to the number of your close friends in Australia?
   (a) completely satisfied  (d) a little dissatisfied
   (b) very satisfied        (e) very dissatisfied
   (c) fairly satisfied

27. Compared with your life in Holland (and not counting the war period) could you indicate how happy you are with your life in Australia?
   (a) much happier than in Holland
   (b) a little happier
   (c) about the same
   (d) not quite as happy
   (e) much happier

28. With the exception of possible holidays abroad, would you like your children to grow up and spend the rest of their lives in Australia?
   (a) Yes  (b) No  (c) Undecided

29. How strongly do you feel about this opinion?
   (a) very  (b) Fairly  (c) not

30. How satisfied do you feel with life in Australia in general?
   (a) completely satisfied
   (b) very satisfied
   (c) fairly satisfied
   (d) a little dissatisfied
   (e) very dissatisfied
In the Latin American study where the interviewees are scattered across Sydney, the "satisfaction-with-neighbourhood" indicator has not been used in determining the migrants' level of satisfaction. For recent arrivals mainly in rented accommodation, the change of neighbourhood is almost as easy as repacking their suitcases.

The other satisfaction index used by Richardson concerns the migrants' expression of desire to "spend the rest of your life in Australia". Even with Richardson's allowance for vacation trips abroad, it is an extremely difficult question for some people to answer in the prescribed "Yes" or "No" manner, especially for recently arrived immigrants like the Latin Americans. Richardson (1960, p.41), in response to a discussion about the people having difficulty in answering the questions, stated: "There are significant differences in reaction here. Some people are very upset by questions of this sort where a simple all or none answer is required". I feel that this is particularly difficult when answering whether or not one would like to spend the rest of one's life (perhaps fifty years) outside one's native land. Many migrants think in terms of eventual retirement back in their home country. This does not mean that the question is invalid; Richardson's question in conjunction with the other indices does yield an apparently adequate means of classifying the migrants as satisfied or dissatisfied. But other questions could also be used, especially if an ordinal ranking of satisfaction levels is desired.

SECTION IX.C.2 Questions Used in This Study

For the study of the migration satisfaction of Latin Americans in Sydney, several of the questions are related to those asked in previous studies; however, all the questions allow for the ordering of the response instead of the straight yes/no dichotomy generally used in earlier studies.
The five questions used were intuitively selected to cover different aspects of migration satisfaction (Table 9-2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Indicator</th>
<th>Acronyms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101: Advise others to come</td>
<td>ADVISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102: Desire to leave Australia</td>
<td>LEAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103: Realization of expectations</td>
<td>EXPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104: Government assistance</td>
<td>ASSIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105: Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>JOBSAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The numbers are those used on the computer and on the questionnaire tallies in Appendix II).

These questions were analyzed for the sample of Latin Americans taken in Sydney, of which 299 persons were identified as "Independent Decision Makers at both the time of migration and when they were interviewed". These "Independents" are the focal group in the analyses of migration satisfaction. They have been divided into two groups of 51 and 248 persons on the basis of their period of residence in Australia being less than or greater than six months when interviewed, respectively. (The reasons for this division are given in Section IX.B.3 c.)

While these and other, previously mentioned questions can be used individually to indicate migration satisfaction, they compound their reliability when combined. That is, if a migrant indicates satisfaction on four out of five indicators, he can be more reliably classified as satisfied than if only one or two indicators are considered. This does not, however, mean that he is twice or four times as satisfied as a person judged by only one or two indicators. This system for classifying the migrants' levels of satisfaction was also used by the Western Australian group as indicated by Richardson (1960, p.41). In his study of British migrants in Newtown/Medina, W.A., the "immigrants were classified as satisfied or dissatisfied according to the general trend of their answers to [Richardson's] six questions." To go beyond a dichotomy additional care
### TABLE 9-2

**SATISFACTION INDICATORS USED IN THE STUDY OF LATIN AMERICANS IN AUSTRALIA**

(The codes indicate order, not weightings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>(Codes used)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>ADVISE: Would you advise other members of your family or close friends to migrate to Australia?</td>
<td>1. Yes 2. With conditions of knowing English 3. With other conditions (mainly pre-arranged employment) 4. Indifferent 5. No</td>
<td>5 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>LEAVE: Would you now like to emigrate again (leave Australia)?</td>
<td>No Yes, to the USA Yes, to another English speaking country Yes, to Europe Yes, to Asia, Africa Yes, to a Latin American Country (not home country) Yes, to your country of origin Other answers (mainly &quot;Unable to decide&quot; and &quot;not yet long enough in Australia&quot;)</td>
<td>5 3 3 3 3 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>EXPECT: Before leaving your country of origin you had some idea of how your life in Australia was going to be. How have you found Australia?</td>
<td>Much better than expected Better than expected Equal to expectations Worse than expected Much worse than expected Other answer</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 104</td>
<td>ASSIST: Are you satisfied with the Australian Government's help for immigrants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it is more than enough</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it is sufficient</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but it does not lack much</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, it lacks a great deal to be sufficient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other answer</td>
<td>Default</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 105</th>
<th>JOBSAT: Compared with your occupation in your country of origin, rate your satisfaction with your occupation in Australia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much worse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is required. Also, an ordinal ranking of responses is preferable for each question, as done with the satisfaction indicators applied to the Latin Americans in Sydney.

As in the earlier studies of migration satisfaction, the investigation of the Latin Americans in Sydney asked about the migrants' desire to stay in Australia, but in terms of the present. Satisfaction Indicator 102 (LEAVE), (see Table 9-2), allows in its answers an expression of satisfaction. Those migrants desiring to remain for the present are considered satisfied. Those wanting to depart to other English-speaking and non-Latin American countries are considered neutral. If they could secure visas to North America or Europe, they would essentially get "more of the same" of what they had in Australia, that is, a non-Latin American environment. This indicates that they are "looking for greener pastures", but that what they have in Australia is preferred to their homeland situation. Such thinking was quite evident and often explicitly stated in numerous interviews. The final group, which is considered dissatisfied, desires to return to Latin America, usually to the migrant's country of origin. The motivation for desiring to leave was expressed in the interviews as dissatisfaction with various aspects of living in Australia. One main reason as revealed in the answers to Item 103 (EXPECT), was the failure to realize the expectations of the migration.

Assessment of "fulfilment of expectations" is difficult and more involved than the other questions. There are four basic methods for assessing "fulfilment of expectations": (1) asking retrospective questions; (2) conducting a sequence of interviews; (3) asking questions before arrival and then observing the realization of expectations; and (4) asking relative questions. The first method is self-explanatory and often subject to considerable distortion by the respondent. The second method requires
a longitudinal survey and does not really obtain the information before arrival. The third method, a logical extension of method two, was used by Appleyard (1964, pp.179-206). He asked, shortly before the emigrants left the United Kingdom, what the migrant expected to find and then compared that answer with the national norms and some other general measures. In this way, especially when followed up by interviews later in Australia, he could comment on the likelihood of the achievement of their expectations. That method is the best one, but unfortunately the most time consuming and costly.

One example of the fourth method was found and subsequently used in a modified form in the Latin Americans study. Taft (1961) tried to assess achievement of expectations with this question: "Since living in Australia have you achieved as much in life as you expected to do? (a) as much; (b) even more; (c) somewhat less; (d) little; (e) practically nothing". (Question printed in Taft (1965, p.98) ). The results of this question in a survey of Dutch migrants found that it "approached significance (significant at 10 per cent level)" when correlated against the migrants' satisfaction level as determined by the six-question Richardson scale (Taft, 1961, pp.271-272). This work by Taft gives an indication of the potential of "fulfilment-of-expectations" questions. However, that specific question had only moderate success and also would not be as valid for migrants who have been in Australia for only a short time. (75% of Taft's Dutch sample had lived in Australia between five and ten years (p.268) ).

A question felt to be more suitable for relatively recent migrants (less than three years residence) was used in the Latin Americans survey: "Before leaving your country of origin you had some idea of how your life in Australia was going to be. How have you found Australia?" This question on the fulfilment of ones expectations served to identify the
most and the least satisfied migrant but should not be used alone to distinguish various levels of satisfied and dissatisfied migrants. This is because of the variability in the migrants expectations resulting from differing quantities and qualities of pre-migration information. This variability in information is further enhanced by personal factors and situations. For example, wives and other dependents often have erroneous pre-migration conceptions of Australia. Some of the dependents reading travel literature and hearing inflated stories (to convince them to migrate?), thought it would be an earthly paradise; they expressed disappointment. Others, imagining a sparsely settled country and hearing stories of difficulties, expected hardships of every type; some of them were pleasantly surprised. Still others just came with few expectations because they were brought. These dependents therefore give a wide variety of answers to the question of fulfilment of expectations. This also applies to some of the heads of households, but in general the decision makers had more reasonable expectations. These were sometimes too low. Therefore, for these migrants with reasonable expectations, answers of finding Australia to be "much better", "better" or "about the same as expected" indicate levels of satisfaction which comes from the fulfilment of the migration expectations. Answers of "worse" and "much worse than expected" indicate different levels of dissatisfaction. Since perception is such a basic and important aspect of migration satisfaction in terms of relative place utility, the responses were taken as stated and coded one through five for subsequent calculations.

Satisfaction Indicator 101 (ADVISE), advising others to come to Australia, indirectly asks the migrant to assess Australia as a satisfactory place to live. The migrant answers in terms of his close friends and family, people most likely to be similar to the migrant and to whom he would want to give a frank and accurate answer.
Most of those interviewed answered immediately with a very firm yes or no, indicating well formed opinions. Those who hesitated usually ended up giving a conditional answer which could not be justifiably included in the satisfied or dissatisfied groups. It is believed that although not directly comparable with Richardson's questions about satisfaction with life in Australia, the satisfaction indicator ADVISE performs the same function of providing a general index of migration satisfaction.

There are still two satisfaction indicators to be assessed: Item No. 104 (ASSIST) and Item No. 105 (JOBSTAT). Migration satisfaction with the Australian Government's assistance for immigrants is not an indicator of over-all satisfaction and is therefore given secondary importance in determining the migrant's general satisfaction. However, it is quite important when considering assisted versus unassisted migrants and also the attitudes of migrants who are on the verge of leaving Australia. It is a very direct question which is self-explanatory and is useful as a supplementary indicator of satisfaction.

The last Satisfaction Indicator 105 (JOBSAT) is structured as a differential and is therefore relative to the migrant's job satisfaction in his home country. To have asked another question on the migrant's job satisfaction in his home country would have introduced errors of recall and would reflect strong bias from the migrant's Australian experiences. Analyses involving the migrant's motivation (Item 76) and his past and present employment situations (Items 64-74) would be needed to give a thorough consideration of this question using the five levels of the responses. However, during the interviewing it was found that, with few exceptions, in their home countries the migrants had at least moderate job satisfaction but not necessarily income satisfaction. That is to say, they were working in their home countries in what they considered either
by training and/or experience to be their occupation. This indicator of satisfaction did not appear to be strongly influenced by long range aspirations or "pipe dreams" about employment opportunities. However, short range aspirations for the coming year or two were expressed by some of the newer migrants who considered their present employment as only temporary. Therefore these people were inclined to be satisfied with employment which they would not desire for any length of time. This helps explain why immigrants in Australia less than six months may accept lower status employment more readily than the longer residents.

In conclusion, this chapter on concepts, uses and measurement of migration satisfaction, has tried to show that, although intangible, satisfaction is valid as a concept and that it exists in a geographic context: satisfaction with one's migration results from the consideration of the relative utility of different places. Since this consideration of the fulfilment of one's needs is internal within individuals who are not even necessarily aware of how they formulate and demonstrate their satisfaction, it is helpful to consider actual case histories to illustrate the working and influences of migration satisfaction. At appropriate places in the analyses, various examples are given to illustrate particular personal situations. The case history which follows demonstrates the concept and power of migration satisfaction.

SECTION IX.C. CASE STUDIES

SECTION IX.C.1 An Illustration of Migration Satisfaction: The Migration of Maria Camerón

Maria Camerón has already completed a series of migration steps, so we are able to look at this illustration with the perspective of time.
Maria, or Mary as most of her English-speaking friends called her, made an Australian/Latin American international migration and she joined a small group of her compatriots. She was about thirty-one years old when she migrated - not too young nor too old as far as migration is concerned - and she was very eager, a willing worker, and she seemed to fit exceptionally well into her new surroundings. She wrote encouraging letters back to her friends and tried to encourage them to come over, to migrate to her newly found land of equality and opportunity. But eventually Maria became disenchanted and in the end she did not seem to have a nice word to say about the place.

She wrote quite a bit and so a lot of her thoughts are recorded in her diaries as they took place. Would she encourage her friends back home to migrate? Absolutely not. The young folks were taking on the drinking habits of the locals. Would she like to leave? Definitely yes, because there were scandals and all types of problems such as loose morals. Were her surroundings what she had expected? Hardly; possibly she expected some of these hardships when she first arrived, but socially it was a disaster, even though she did marry while she was a migrant. She married a man named Gilmore and this should have helped her with her migration. But Maria definitely did not find what she expected to find. She wrote back that there was little progress as she had expected. Job satisfaction was not so important because after she married she started raising a family. Based on her answers to these questions, is there any alternative to assessing her as being highly dissatisfied with the outcome of her migration?

Among her other characteristics was that she apparently had a rather acid tongue, at least at that stage, judging from her writings. Maria disagreed with her neighbours, some of whom were at least mildly satisfied.
She caused disharmony among the group of migrants, and generally left things in a little bit of turmoil. However, she would not explicitly encourage other migrants to return home, although after three years she herself did leave. She was lost from her host society. Her round trip transportation fare was essentially lost, although it can be said that she gained international experience in those years. Many years later, she wrote of fond memories of her sojourn in a foreign land, but she did not have such generous thoughts then nor any regrets about leaving.

Was she just another fickle, homesick migrant in Australia or, to say it in the vernacular, a "whinging wog", a complainer, a misfit? Not really, because Mary Cameron Gilmore was an Australian who migrated to Paraguay in 1896 (Souter, 1968). Maybe she was a little bit more than just the average migrant; she eventually wrote numerous books of good standing in Australian literature and became a Dame of the British Empire. But her case illustrates the influence of migration satisfaction on a migration. Her dissatisfaction undoubtedly caused stress and hardships to her fellow migrants, her family, and to herself. To migrate and remigrate again was not easy in the days of sailing ships and ox carts\(^1\).

SECTION IX.C.2 Further Comments and Case Studies Showing the Determination of Levels of Migration Satisfaction

While there is always the possibility of misclassification of a migrant's answer to a satisfaction indicator through error or unique circumstances, no migrant is classified as satisfied, neutral or dissatisfied on the basis of only one response. Therefore, when taken in combination with each other, the five satisfaction indicators are

\(^1\) For a comment on the changing importance of migration satisfaction, see Appendix VI.
considered to provide an accurate means of separating the migrants into
distinct levels of satisfaction. Nine ranked levels of migration
satisfaction were identified\(^1\). The methods used are explained in Appendix
IV. The results of the classification are shown in Table 9-3. There are
three main levels (dissatisfied, neutral and satisfied) with three
sub-levels within each. The discussion of the frequency distribution of
the respondents in these nine levels is postponed until Section X.A.1
because the influence of period of residence must be taken into account.

In all cases each person was examined to see if he or she might better
fit into the next higher or lower category, especially when it could mean
a shift between levels 3 and 4 (D+ and N-) or between levels 6 and 7
(N+ and S-). Whenever there was an anomalous situation with an indicator
in sharp disagreement with others, the final decision was based on the
responses to the other indicators, with preference given to Items 101, 102
and 103. The comments written on each interview schedule plus the
interviewer's recollections of the situation were also considered. Although
background knowledge of the Latin American situation was helpful in
deciding some cases, the subjective element was kept to a minimum. Some
case studies illustrate the procedure and results.

Humberto L. (311) is an example of a highly dissatisfied
immigrant. In response to the five satisfaction indicators
he always gave the worst response. Would he advise others to
immigrate? "No, not even my worst enemy", he said. "Not even
dead people". (Item 101: score 1 point). He wanted very much to return
to Chile (Item 102, score 1 point) and was making travel arrangements at the
time. Australia is much worse than he ever expected (Item 103: score 1

\(^1\) Based on one question, Richardson (1967, p.18, question 6) ordered
satisfaction into five levels. However, neither he nor others using
the data did analyses with more than a satisfied/dissatisfied dichotomy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Main Levels</th>
<th>Sub-Levels</th>
<th>Level or Rank</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Total Number of Persons</th>
<th>Division by Period of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(See Section X.A.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≤6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 299 51 248
point) and the government's assistance lacks a great deal, especially in education for his teenage children and in assistance in employment (Item 104: score 1 point). Having exchanged his office job for an unskilled position, his satisfaction with his job in Australia was much worse (Item 105: score 1 point). From the five indicators with a score of only five points, Humberto is at the lowest end of the scale at level 1, highly dissatisfied or D-.

Since the highest score on five indicators is 25 points and since the first three questions are better indicators than the other two, a person can have a total score higher than five and still be highly dissatisfied. An example is Hector A. (No. 204) from Argentina who differed from Humberto on the third indicator, saying that Australia was worse, but not much worse than he expected. He wanted to return to Latin America, but to Brazil instead of Argentina. He said "I think it is a lie that each migrant costs the government $10,000." This reaction was given by several interviewees who could not see the costliness of the bureaucracy behind the immigration programme.

A third highly dissatisfied migrant is Dulce (No. 229) who scored 1, 1, 1, 1, 3 = 7. With two years of university education plus travel experience in Europe, she arrived with a firm upper middle class background. She was disappointed in the low class housing that she saw and shared in Sydney's inner suburbs; she found life in the Salvation Army hostel (since closed) to be depressing. Her lack of English ability was her major problem: "The English classes are bad in Australia". She responded with "What help?" when asked about government assistance. This latter response was heard frequently from immigrants who did not have assisted passage.

One of Dulce's friends and flatmates is Mariana from Peru who scored 1, 3, 2, 3, 1 = 10 and was classified at the second level, i.e. dissatisfied (D).
Her major difference from Dulce was her desire to go to the United States. She also had a less critical attitude toward the government assistance (she received assisted passage), but worse job satisfaction. Mariana was a former school teacher who, after nearly two years in Australia, was waiting on tables in a restaurant.

Horacio C. (No. 239) had a higher total score of twelve (scores 3, 1, 2, 5, 1) but was nevertheless classified as dissatisfied. This was because he would only recommend Australia to immigrants who speak English, but he himself arrived with no English ability and had learned very little in nearly a year in Sydney. "Nearly everyone I work with speaks Spanish or Yugoslav (Serbo-Croatian)". He also gave the Australian government good marks for helping migrants, "but the assisted passage only covered about half or a third of the tickets" (for three persons). More important were his comments that he did not see any future for himself in Australia; he wanted to return to Argentina where he could work in his specialty as a skilled lathe worker. He was self-employed before migrating; now he is an unskilled cutter in a steel mill. He finds the work very heavy for a man nearly forty, so his comparative job satisfaction shows his Australian situation to be "much worse", and his numerous trips to the employment agencies have not produced anything better. The response by Horacio illustrates how the individual must be considered, even to the point of overriding the numerical score of migration satisfaction if that score is affected by the less important indicators like satisfaction with the Australian government's assistance. This problem can be overcome, however, when the indicators are refined and weighted scores are used in later studies.

Interviewee No. 180, whom we will call Rafael, scored 3, 1, 3, 1, 2=10 and was called midly dissatisfied (D+). He had a few good things to say about Australia. He would recommend it to single people without any
profession (he has a family and is a graduate engineer) or to professionals who know English very well, which he did not. He is now doing electrical process work but has less job satisfaction than before. He would like to return to Chile even though Australia is about as he expected to find it. In short, he is not as dissatisfied as the earlier cases, but since his wife had to go to work and his eldest daughter has quit school, he does not see much future for his family in Australia. With his profession, he will not have too much difficulty getting accepted for another Latin American nation if post-Allende Chile does not appeal to him. Since he is an articulate man, a number of quotes from Rafael will be given in appropriate sections later.

From the people interviewed, eighty-eight other examples of dissatisfied Latin Americans can be given. But to avoid the impression that all Latin Americans in Australia are dissatisfied, we will shift to the other end of the spectrum. The strongly satisfied (S+) examples are few. The highly successful Carlos Zalapa who was introduced earlier (Section III.B.) is naturally in this group who scored 23 to 25 on the satisfaction indicators. Another was Raul Gomez, the former ship's mate who turned rabbit-skinner and hated it, but after many years in Australia has the highest praise for his adopted country. Still another is a divorsee whose "new life" in Australia seems ideal. Six others were in Australia less than six months when interviewed. Their high scores reflect in part their initial enthusiasm (see Section X.A.1).

It appears to be difficult to score the highest satisfaction level, but a compensating number were at the "considerably satisfied" (S or eighth) level. Esteban Lopez (No. 206) had a score of 5, 5, 4, 5, 2=21. Although he dropped from an administrative position to one on an assembly line (where French and Italian are the main languages spoken) and he was not able to join the Rotary Club in Australia although he had
been a member in Uruguay, he still had a highly favourable attitude towards Australia. "Australians try to understand and they are helpful", he said in sharp contrast to Rafael's statement that the Australians are abusive to those who do not speak English well.

Victor Truan was also a satisfied immigrant when interviewed in early 1973. He did not paint a rosy picture, but a realistic one for his situation. His defense of Australia extended to a "letter to the Editor" of a Chilean magazine Paula (No. 118, July 1972, p.5). In response to an earlier letter from a Chilean complaining about Australia, he quoted an old Spanish adage, "Every lame man blames the stoney road". Victor's letter did not deny the stones, but emphasized the importance of English to smooth the way. He agreed that the life is very hard, but one should expect to put in a full day's work for a day's wages. About the high costs of various items, his reply was that at least the items are available in Australia, not just illusions; and the inflation rate is much less than in Chile. His conclusion was that just because the one Chilean who wrote the first letter was lame and blaming the stoney road in Australia does not mean that they are all limping nor blaming the stones.

Others who are satisfied include several who went to English or American schools in Latin America. They are professionals who have no language problems. One is a mining technologist who worked in an American company. Another (No.200) is a manufacturer whose new business in Australia is less than a tenth the size of the one he rather hastily left in Chile. But he is not complaining. "Australia is the side of the apple that hasn't rotted yet." He also feels that the government assistance for immigrants "is good for what it is meant for, namely labourers". He paid for his family's tickets and clearly had no need for the usual services for immigrants. He recommends Australia for others like himself; he has no intention of moving again.
Augusto E. (No. 223) recommends Australia to others, does not plan to leave, and has found it equal to his expectations because his brother told him about Australia in realistic letters. However, as an Ecuadorian, he did not receive assisted passage, and he did not receive much of the specialized migrant services. Also, he went from being a self-employed mechanic to an unskilled door maker; his job satisfaction is much worse, but his income is much better in Australia. With those characteristics and a score of 5, 5, 3, 1, 1 = 15, he was classified as level 7, mildly satisfied, with the first three satisfaction indicators being the predominant ones. Again we see the need to examine each interviewee as an individual.

The subjective element in the determination of levels of migration satisfaction is, I believe, evident and reasonable. With a sample of two hundred and ninety nine persons it has been possible to maintain a personal element in the process; future work with larger samples will need to consider weighted or more complex methods of scoring. The importance of this is especially evident in the three levels of neutral migration satisfaction.

For the most part the neutrals are simply persons who qualified their responses and showed neither great enthusiasm nor great regrets about being in Australia. Most had doubts about recommending Australia to their families and friends. "It depends on their situation [in Latin America]", "Only if they speak English", and "They [including the wives] must be prepared to work very hard", were frequent answers.

The second satisfaction indicator revealed many who wanted to leave Australia but did not want to return to Latin America. Most of those persons wanted to go to the United States; several had visited the U.S.A. earlier, had relatives there, or knew about it through films and television. Some had thought that Australia would be like America and
were disappointed. It is possible that, because I am from the United States, their answers were biased, but I do not think so. By the time this question was asked there was usually a very good rapport established. What is probably more important is that they did not feel the need to say nice things about Australia to Australian interviewers. (Taft, 1965, p.28 supports this interpretation).

The brother of Augusto (above) is an example of one of the neutrals. He did recommend Australia to Augusto and would do so again. But for himself he would like to migrate again, preferably to Germany. He has no complaints, but he would be inclined to go if the opportunity arises. His score of 5, 3, 3, 3, 3, is neutral (N+). If he married and/or gets a better job he could easily move up into the satisfied group.

Is there a difference between Augusto and his brother? I maintain that there is (or at least at the time of the interview). Why they are different is probably related to their differences in marital status and motivation, but we cannot draw conclusions from only two individuals. We will do that in Chapters X-XIII where we use our total sample of Independent Decision Makers.

The migration satisfaction of Marcela G. is neutral. She had no difficulty finding a seamstress job in Sydney where she earns much more than in Peru. Although higher costs of living take much of that increase, she has a better standard of living and some money to occasionally send home. However, her job satisfaction is slightly lower because language problems limit her contact with people at work. She is well satisfied with the Australian government assistance which made her migration possible. Most of her expectations were correct, but she did not realize before how important her family and former friends were to her. Her recommendation of
Australia to others like herself is conditional on migrating with someone. When interviewed she did not wish to leave Australia, but her feelings were subject to change. There were two mitigating circumstances. One is that Marcela had recently had a couple of dates with a Chilean and is interested in continuing the relationship. The other is the possible migration of a younger brother in two years. Marcela had not yet inquired about nominating him. At that time (January, 1973), the family reunion criteria for migrant selection placed close non-dependent relatives in the second highest category, but changes made in October 1974 require any close non-dependent relatives to meet the same occupational criteria as independent applicants (Council, 1977, p.33). If Marcela's brother did not obtain a visa before then or if he does not have the right qualifications, Marcela would continue without relatives in Australia and her neutral migration satisfaction might change to dissatisfaction. But former friends or relatives joining her and/or her marriage could lead to satisfaction. Marcela and many others who are neutral are not firmly so.

One difficulty with classifying immigrants' satisfaction is that twenty-eight persons (9% of the two hundred and ninety-nine interviewees) gave ambivalent answers to the major questions, e.g. that they recommend Australia to others but want to go back to Latin America, or vice-versa. In those cases the other indicators had to be considered very carefully, especially seeing how the person's motivation, social, financial, occupational and other conditions relate to his migration satisfaction. The result was thirteen persons in the dissatisfied levels, eleven neutral and four in the satisfied brackets. This uneven distribution was mainly because some immigrants with approximately six months in Australia were dissatisfied but did not want to leave Australia because they wanted to
try longer and/or because they still faced a year and a half before release from the assisted passage two year obligation. Perhaps the second indicator, i.e. to LEAVE Australia, should be discounted or weighted less for recently arrived interviewees.

Because they scored at least one high value and one low value on the five satisfaction indicators the ambivalent interviewees are not at the extreme ends of the nine levels of migration satisfaction. Also, we suspect that, because of ambivalence, they are the immigrants most likely to make rapid changes in satisfaction, either for the better or for the worse.

Richardson also faced this problem (1960, p.42). He called them "anomalies" with conflicting or improbable answers which were nevertheless considered the migrant's true response. I support Richardson's suggestion that a separate study of "anomalies" or "ambivalent respondents" will eventually be needed as the work becomes more precise. Of course, part of this may be because of response or coding errors. For this survey of Latin Americans in Sydney, my considered opinion is that such errors are few.

My assessment of the reliability of the classification method is that no more than 20% of the sample are one category above or below their true ranked positions. In fact, I believe that further divisions into groupings with between ten and twenty respondents in each would be possible with this data and definitely possible if additional satisfaction indicators or ones with more divisions of answers are used. There is also the possibility of refining the measurement to an internal scale and using parametric tests. In short, for the exploratory purpose of this thesis, the classification of the respondents according to nine ranked levels of migration satisfaction is considerably further than what has been done previously, but is still well within the limitations of the data.
In the words of Harvey (1969, p.305), measurement is the "temporary codification of experience according to certain rules" which in this case refer to the use of five set questions for determining migration satisfaction. Further improvements in measurement will make the use of the concept increasingly more acceptable. In the meantime and for the remainder of this study, we have stepped from the amorphous concept of migration satisfaction to the unambiguous but less precise, artificial construct of migration satisfaction as measured using the five stated satisfaction indicators. That step gives us the means for putting migration satisfaction to use for identifying which characteristics of the Latin Americans are associated with migration satisfaction.

The test results which follow in Chapters X and XI have been organized into four types according to where each variable or attribute of the migrants fits into the total migration picture. Some variables refer to the immigrant's situation and behaviour before leaving his country of origin; they are called pre-migration variables and include his former employment and education. Similarly we can identify post-migration variables such as the immigrants' housing in Sydney or his present income. By pairing some of these pre- and post-migration variables and/or by asking the interviewee to make comparisons of his origin and destination, we obtain a third type called "relative change variables". The fourth and final type includes age, race, religion and birthplace, i.e., variables unlikely to change within each person during the migration process. These "personal variables" include many of the standard demographic characteristics. These four types each have a relationship with the dependent variable of migration satisfaction as shown in Figure 9-2.

I acknowledge that there exist two-way flows between these variables, especially since satisfaction can influence behaviour and attitudes in the post-migration situation. However, this "feedback" mainly serves to
reinforce the behaviour or characteristic which is being considered, making for sharper distinctions in the analyses. Therefore, I have concentrated on the stronger one-way relationships in this basic model, i.e., from the independent variables onto satisfaction. This is similar to the procedure in the studies reviewed by Taft (1966, pp.44-46). This one-direction approach permits examination of the effects upon satisfaction of a large number and variety of variables, a necessary step in identifying which characteristics of Latin Americans are related to their migration satisfaction. The results of this rather exploratory examination of the characteristics taken one at a time are given in the next two chapters. In addition, preliminary attempts were made to combine two or more of the significant variables and to hold others constant, but this was not continued because of three limitations. First, the number of possible tests are in the thousands. Second, there was insufficient time and pages to accommodate those tests. Third, the continual sub-dividing of the sample produces very small groupings which limit the conclusiveness of the tests. To overcome those limitations, the typology is used in Chapter XII and the multivariate technique of discriminant analysis is used in Chapter XIII. The typology and discriminant analysis each combine the variables to permit the prediction of an immigrant's level of migration satisfaction.
CHAPTER X
THE IMPACT OF BASIC IMMIGRANT CHARACTERISTICS ON
MIGRATION SATISFACTION

This chapter and the next one present the results of over two
hundred statistical tests to identify the characteristics which influence
the migration satisfaction of the sampled Latin Americans. The sample
used is the two hundred and forty-eight Independent Decision Makers in
Australia more than six months, i.e., the same respondents who were
described in PART TWO. The principal application of statistical techniques
is for the identification and testing of differences between the median
levels of migration satisfaction of two groups with different
characteristics. The test calculates the probability that the differences
resulted merely from chance selection. Keeping in mind the limitations
of the non-random sample, the results of these tests must be interpreted
with attention to any sampling bias which may cause the observed
difference. For this reason, the possible biases are referred to regularly,
as are the levels of significance of the test results. The results will
have increasing importance as the probability (p) of chance occurrence
decreases toward the p = .001 level.

When the respondents are divided according to a variable or
characteristic, tests for two independent samples are appropriate;
Chi-squared and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests are used throughout this study
for the nominal and ordinal level data, respectively (Siegel, 1956, Chapter
6). To be able to interpret clear meanings, the tests are conducted on
all reasonable divisions and groupings of each independent variable.
Therefore, in several instances one variable is split into numerous divisions.
An example of this is Item 52, knowledge of English on arrival in
Australia. The respondents can be split at a low level of knowledge
(responses 1 and 2 versus responses 3-7), at a high level (responses 1-5 versus responses 6 and 7), at the extremes (responses 1 and 2 versus responses 6 and 7), or in any other way felt to be meaningful. The examples in this chapter illustrate the procedure.

Another statistical method used is to test for a correlation between the migration satisfaction scores and a second variable. If the second variable has a nominal scale, the contingency coefficient is used; with ordinal scales, the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is used (see Appendix V).

SECTION X.A.  TWO DETAILED EXAMPLES

This section has two objectives: a) to examine the relationship of migration satisfaction to two important characteristics, namely period of residence and birthplace, and b) to illustrate the steps of analyses which are used but not repeatedly explained in each test in later sections. We have already discussed in PARTS ONE and TWO the important variables of place of birth and period of residence in Australia. How do these two variables relate to the migration satisfaction of the 248 Independent Decision Makers who were in Australia more than six months plus the 51 here less than six months, i.e. 299 persons in the survey sample.

SECTION X.A.1  Period of Residence

We begin with the computer compiled matrix of Item 41 (year of arrival) X Item 106 (Migration Satisfaction Index), which is shown in Table 10-1.

The relationships (if any) between these variables are not clearly visible and even if they were, we would want to check them for statistical significance, keeping a close watch on possible sources of bias in the
TABLE 10-1
SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENT DECISION MAKERS:
ITEM 41 (YEAR OF ARRIVAL) BY ITEM 106 (MIGRATION SATISFACTION INDEX)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Period of Residence</th>
<th>Year of Arrival</th>
<th>Levels of Migration Satisfaction</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>More than 4 1/2 yrs</td>
<td>Pre-June 1968</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 2 1 2 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 1/2 yrs to 4 1/2 yrs</td>
<td>July-June 68-69</td>
<td>1 2 1 3 0 1 1 3 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 1/2 yrs to 3 1/2 yrs</td>
<td>July-June 69-70</td>
<td>3 4 5 4 5 6 5 4 0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 1/2 yrs to 2 1/2 yrs</td>
<td>July-June 70-71</td>
<td>11 21 4 8 14 6 8 23 2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 yr to 1 1/2 yrs</td>
<td>July-Dec 71-71</td>
<td>7 7 0 4 5 2 4 10 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 months to 1 yr</td>
<td>Jan 72 to June 72</td>
<td>5 9 4 6 7 3 4 13 0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 months to 6 months</td>
<td>July 72 to Sep 72</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 8 0 3 6 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>less than 3 months</td>
<td>Oct 72-Dec 72</td>
<td>2 2 2 1 2 1 1 14 4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 47 18 28 42 21 27 75 11</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
selection procedures. To examine this table, there are two main approaches to the selection of the dichotomies or divisions to be tested. First, we could test any specific hypotheses we have in mind; second, we could make a "reasonable" number of exploratory tests. There are a couple of hundred possible dichotomies and divisions within the eight classes of period of residence, but not all of them are meaningful. In this examination of period of residence, both approaches are used.

The hypothesis stems from Richardson's writings (1968, p.43) that individuals typically have initial enthusiasm "followed in the middle months of the first year by frankly negative feelings...". Checking Table 10-1 for the median score in each row, we see that it is quite close to the index value 5 (middle neutral) in all cases except for the very recent and very early arrivals. Those here for 0-3 months have a median index value 7.8 (considerably satisfied). This table supports the case about initial enthusiasm waning in the first six months of residence. However, it also indicates that at least on the average there is little recovery after the initial decline; the longer term migrants are only slightly more satisfied as period of residence increases. I felt that the medians perhaps did not do justice to the data, so I made the assumption of equal intervals between each index value and calculated the mean satisfaction score for each row. These values are given in Figure 10-1 which graphs the median and mean migration satisfaction scores against a constant time interval. The only point where the medians and means disagree is in the $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $4\frac{1}{2}$ year period of residence. Because of the distribution of the satisfaction levels of the thirteen people in that period, i.e., without any respondent in the fifth level of satisfaction, I am inclined to favour the mean value.

My interpretation of this graph is that the valley of neutral to slightly unfavourable attitudes has a very broad bottom lasting several
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years. The initial side of the valley has a very steep descent in the first nine months. The graph suggests an almost exponential decline in satisfaction starting with the first disillusionment or negative experience after the airplane lands in Sydney or Melbourne. This does not say anything about its causes. In fact it could be argued (but hardly believed) that persons arriving between June and December 1972 are truly more satisfied migrants; only a longitudinal survey could prove otherwise.

The exit from the valley is slow and begins after three years of residence. The studies review by Taft (1965, p.45) support these results. Two points are important here. Firstly, since the assisted passage obligation is for only two years, we would expect the rise earlier because of the probability of departure of dissatisfied migrants. Perhaps they stay around for an extra year, perhaps they cannot afford to leave immediately, or perhaps only during the third year do their attitudes mellow slightly. The second and more important point is that in the sample and in the population, the arrivals prior to June 1969 include a higher proportion of "non-Latin" persons who were born in Latin America.

Of the eleven respondents with the longest period of residence, six arrived before July 1966 and five afterwards but before July 1968. The mean satisfaction scores for these two groups are 6.2 and 6.0, respectively. These support the trend show in Figure 10-1. However, after removing three Anglo-Latin Americans and the two highly satisfied very long-term residents, the median (and mean) satisfaction level for the remaining six "true" Latins in Australia before June 1968 was only 5.5. But with such small numbers the results are at best inconclusive.

Referring back to the raw data in Table 10-1, we want to check if these observed differences are in fact statistically significant. The first dichotomy to be tested was rows 7-8 versus rows 1-6, the division point
being six months of residence. The observed difference is 2.4 on the migration satisfaction index. Using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample one-tailed test (abbreviated the "K-S test"), we can reject the null hypothesis \(H_0\) at the .01 level of significance and accept the hypothesis \(H_1\) that residents less than six months have higher scores of migration satisfaction than do residents > six months. A variety of other divisions were also run (Table 10-2). These results all support the idea of an

**TABLE 10-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row versus Row</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

important division at six months of residence, but reveal no other meaningful differences in the data.

The non-parametric Spearman's rank correlation test was also applied to the data in Table 10-1. Using the whole table as an 8x9 matrix, the values for Spearman's coefficient was \(r_s = -.11\), significant at the .05 level. This means that although there is very little correlation, it is negative, i.e. satisfaction decreases with increasing length of residence. Noting our earlier discussion on the events in the first six months of
residence, correlations were run separately on the top and bottom portions of the table, giving two conclusions. First, the correlation of satisfaction with rows 6, 7 and 8 in a 3x9 matrix is $r_s = -0.310$, significant at the $p=0.005$ level. This confirms the findings on Figure 10-1 and does so without any assumptions of equal intervals between the satisfaction levels. Second, a 6x9 matrix of migration satisfaction against rows 1-6 shows virtually no correlation ($r_s = 0.04$) either positive or negative, i.e., period of residence is not associated with migration satisfaction of Latin American Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months.

The conclusion from these tests and data is that in further analyses of migration satisfaction it is important that the recent arrivals, namely those in Australia less than six months, are separated from the main group. This is done throughout the remainder of this study, i.e., the focal group for analyses consists of two hundred and forty-eight Independent Decisions Makers in Australia more than six months.

Having separated the recent arrivals, we now use Table 10-1 (and its summary on Table 9-3) to describe the migration satisfaction of the focal two hundred and forty-eight interviewees. The median level of migration satisfaction for the two hundred and forty-eight Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months is 4.9, i.e., virtually identical with the 5.0 mid-point of the nine levels identified. The three main levels (dissatisfied, neutral and satisfied) are nearly equal in size, however, the middle sub-level is the largest in each main level, resulting in the tri-modal distribution in Figure 10-2a. This suggests three methodological considerations. Firstly, the five satisfaction indicators cannot completely separate a main level into its three sub-levels, or secondly, that the implementation of the five indicators was slightly biased toward the middle sub-level in all three main levels. Thirdly, it is possible that some adjacent levels are separated too far apart and
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others are too close together. Based on working with the data, I believe this to be true, particularly that the true differences between levels 3 and 4 and between levels 6 and 7 are less than between the other levels. In fact, it is possible that the true differences between levels 3 and 4 and between levels 6 and 7 are not too important. When they are combined the result is bimodal, as shown in Figure 10-2b. We note that the spacing of the bars on the X-axis of histogram "b" is no longer equal. This suggests an interval scale of migration satisfaction. I am confident that migration satisfaction will some day be measured on an interval scale. And if all the levels from 4 through 7 are all found to be basically neutral, the results will be as in Figure 10-2c. But at present there is no evidence that the distribution curve of migration satisfaction scores is normal, nor is there any apriori reason for that curve to be normal. Not wishing to base subsequent results on a possibly invalid assumption, the unaltered data as shown in Figure 10-2a is used in the remainder of this study: stated simply, the sample of Latin Americans has nearly equal numbers in the three main levels, with the middle or neutral main level being the lowest, and with each main level divided into three sub-levels. When converted to an ogive (Figure 10-2d), the data reveals a close approximation of the diagonal line of equal representation of respondents according to migration satisfaction levels.

There are some biases in the sample selected which possibly influence the observed distribution of migration satisfaction levels. The seeking out of higher status immigrants in order to have sufficient numbers for analyses has favoured that group which is possibly more likely to be satisfied. On the other hand, the long-term residents who are notably less "Latin" in characteristics, are under-represented. Although the results already discussed show no real difference in migration satisfaction levels
for the long-term residents, that conclusion is based on a small sample which might not be representative of the long-term residents who could not be located (because of greater assimilation?). Likewise, an under or over representation of persons with a characteristic influencing migration satisfaction will bias the distribution of levels observed in the sample. The analyses in the sections which follow will point out which characteristics are important. However, even after they are identified, their actual frequency of occurrence in the total population of Latin Americans in Sydney is not known, forcing us back to estimates or, more likely, guesses. In my considered opinion, the broad trends of migration satisfaction in the sample reasonably reflect the situation of the population, and the results of the Survey Section (1973, 1975, 1976) loosely support and do not contradict that opinion. It is not possible to say any more than that. Fortunately, the objective of identifying characteristics which are related to or influenced by migration satisfaction is not dependent on a random sample nor on accurately knowing the characteristics of the population. Those characteristics are identified in the sections which follow.

SECTION X.A.2 Birthplace

The second issue we will look at as an example of the methods of analysis in this study is the birthplace of the Latin American immigrants. Birthplace is essentially the origin of the migrant, the place best known to him. It is also the alternative location most open to him if he decides to leave Australia. Any relationship between place of birth and migration satisfaction would be interesting and potentially quite useful. If it can be shown then that migrants from country "X" are distinctly more likely to be dissatisfied than those from other countries, we have a basis for establishing a broad guideline for immigration policy. If, however, there are no differences or only ones which can be explained by some third
variable such as motivation or qualifications, the preference for any birthplace in the immigrant selection procedures or eligibility for passage assistance should be rejected. I emphasize that these results are between Latin American nations and do not involve comparisons with immigrants from other nations.

The analyses of birthplace were conducted on the two hundred and forty-eight Independent Latin America-born Decision Makers residing in Australia for more than six months when interviewed. A cross tabulation of birthplace (Item 38) by the migration satisfaction index (Item 106) gives the data in Table 10-3.

The calculated median and means indicate a difference between the various birthplaces, most of which have some people near both ends of the satisfaction scale. The medians and means were not calculated for Bolivia and Panama because each had only one respondent. Of the other nations, the range of the medians is from 2.1 (considerably dissatisfied) for Costa Rica to 8.0 (considerably satisfied) for Cuba. The means range from 3.2 to 8.0. Rankings (which we will use later) of the nations on the basis of their medians and means were the same except that Colombia and Argentina have tied means while Brazil and Mexico switched ranks two and three. The correlation between these two ranking, i.e. by median and mean scores, is \( r_s = .985 \).

The size of the birthplace sub-samples is an important consideration. The median and mean values and the actual distribution of respondents for Chile are based on eighty Independent Decision Makers while Cuba had only four. The size of each sub-sample is taken into account when the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test is applied.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) two-sample one-tailed tests were run on eleven birthplaces listed in Table 10-3 and also on two regional groupings,
### TABLE 10-3

**SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENT DECISION MAKERS:**
**ITEM 38 (PLACE OF BIRTH) BY ITEM 106 (MIGRATION SATISFACTION INDEX)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Levels of Migration Satisfaction</th>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>4 4 1 2 0 2 2 2 2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>3 7 2 2 1 0 3 1 0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>7 13 6 7 9 7 8 22 1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2 1 0 2 2 1 0 2 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>4 4 0 0 3 1 0 1 0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2 6 2 8 7 5 4 6 0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1 4 2 1 5 0 1 7 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2 1 2 2 5 3 4 7 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>27 44 15 26 32 20 23 55 6</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Platanos:</td>
<td>6 5 3 4 5 5 6 9 3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Arg. &amp; Uru.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andeans:</td>
<td>5 12 4 11 14 6 5 15 1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bol., Col., Ecu. &amp; Peru)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the La Platans of Argentina and Uruguay, and the tropical Andeans of
Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia (results in Table 10-4). Only two
of the tests of a birthplace versus the remainder of the Latin Americans
in the total sample indicated statistically significant differences at
the conventional p < .05 level. Those two are Brazil and Cuba. The test
values for Costa Rica and Uruguay were just short of the .05 level and
are considered to indicate "trends". The values greater than .10 indicate
that the migration satisfaction of people from those birthplaces is not
different from the rest of the sample except as it can be attributed to
chance in the sample selection. In other words, the sample of seven from
Mexico, which has a very low median score of 2.3 and the distribution
shown in Table 10-3 could have had the observed amount of difference
(2.7 levels of satisfaction) once in every two samples of seven Mexicans.
Therefore, we have no evidence from this study that Mexicans are less
satisfied than other Latin American Independent Decision Makers in
Australia more than six months, even though I suspect that given a larger
sample we would find the Mexicans to be less satisfied. But that would
require another survey. Essentially, the conclusion about the migration
satisfaction of the Mexicans is a non-result i.e., what appeared to be a
low level of migration satisfaction can be explained in terms of chance
in the selection of a small sample of seven Mexicans.

For an example of more conclusive findings, we can examine the case
of the very small sample of only four Cubans. They were not all from only
one or two networks; only two had any connection with each other. Although
they are such a small part of the sample, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test
detects and assesses their uniformly high migration satisfaction as a
chance occurrence less than one time in one hundred samples. Part of the
reason for their satisfaction is because of the unique situation in Cuba.
They have no thoughts of returning there. Three of the four named politics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Migration Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Calculated Value to be Tested (on table at $x^2$ = 2)</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>.05 Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.98 Exceptional Similarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>.10 Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>.01 Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.10 Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Platanos</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andeans</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as their reason for migrating; the fourth one, who had left Cuba for Brazil 9 years before Castro's take-over, said economic factors were his reason for coming to Australia in 1968. The question which this discussion raises is the extent to which motivation rather than birthplace explains the Cubans' satisfaction. We will examine this and the other possible explanatory characteristics in detail in later chapters.

The Uruguay-born migrants showed a trend (significant at .10 level) towards being more satisfied than the other Latin America-born migrants. That trend is technically not significant according to our convention of using the .05 level as the crucial level of significance. It may merely be because of sampling bias: the Uruguayan who refused the interview (Appendix I) probably was below the median for Uruguayans. Or possibly the Uruguayans are more homogeneous in some characteristic which is positively related to migration satisfaction. However, the severity of the economic and political situation in Uruguay suggests that they benefit more by being in Australia than do most other Latin Americans. This argument also relates in reverse to the Brazilians and Costa Ricans.

The Brazil-born migrants in the sample are significantly less satisfied (.05 level) than the other Latin Americans, as are the Costa Ricans who just miss the .05 level. We might say that these may just be spurious results (error type α) where we reject null hypotheses that in fact may be true. (In this case there is a chance of approximately one-in-twenty of this having occurred.) However, there are three other explanations we can consider:

1) While Uruguay in 1972 was experiencing serious difficulties, Brazil was enjoying one of the greatest success stories in Latin America, and Costa Rica was continuing with prosperity greater than most of Latin America. They are also very stable nations. Therefore, in terms of relative differences between homeland and Australia, the Brazilians and Costa Ricans
are among those least likely to be benefitting from their migration. The Mexicans, discussed earlier, might also be influenced by relative national development and stability. It is interesting to note that when the migrants from Brazil, Costa Rica and Mexico are grouped together, their migration satisfaction median is 2.3, (mean=3.2) and that this difference from the other Latin Americans is significant at the .001 level.

2) The Brazilians and Costa Ricans interviewed may be different from the other Latin Americans in terms of some variable which we have yet to identify as being significantly related to migration satisfaction.

3) The sample collected from each had special considerations:

a. About half of the Costa Ricans were contacted through the informal "Club Los Ticos" in a flat in Surry Hills. "Ticos" is the national nickname for Costa Ricans. Countering this bias is the fact that the sample of thirteen could easily represent half of the Costa Ricans in Sydney.

b. There is a bias in the interviewing of the Brazilians that does not exist in the responses of the other Latin Americans. Because of the language difference (Portuguese instead of Spanish), 90% of the Brazilians were interviewed by my wife who is Brazilian. Taft (1961a and 1965, pp.27 and 28) conducted a controlled study of the effects of interviewers' birthplace on Dutch migrants and found that the Australia-born interviewer received more favourable responses than did the Dutch interviewer. Although Australian interviewers were not used with the Latin Americans, Taft's result suggests that in the present situation with Brazilians, a less favourable attitude towards Australia might be expected, as did actually occur. Since the Brazilians are only a small percentage of the sample which could not be divided into matched halves, no
control group was used. However, this bias may in fact not exist or be eclipsed by the other possible explanations for the lower median of satisfaction. Another factor is that because of their linguistic insulation from both the Australian and Spanish American communities, the recently arrived Brazilians are closely linked to each other and therefore were from one larger but tighter network. The total (including dependants) of forty-three persons represents approximately 10% of all Brazilians in Sydney at the time of interviewing.

Our conclusions about the influence of birthplace on migration satisfaction must be preceded with a note of caution. Within each nation there are a wide variety of people, some of whom perceive or actually have better opportunities than do others. Therefore, whatever we can conclude about the migrants in general from a nation does not necessarily apply to those migrants as individuals nor does it necessarily apply in later years or after the various circumstances have been modified. Essentially, the conclusions refer to probabilities or tendencies evident in the aggregated group and not to the group's individual members. Also, other variables such as marital status and motivation might override the importance of birthplace.

Keeping in mind that the immigrant's birthplace is usually his best known and most accessible alternative to staying in Australia, I interpret the data and tests to suggest the following hypothesis: As a birthplace improves in economic attractiveness, the satisfaction of migrants from that birthplace decreases. Politics and stability are important modifiers to this generalization. To test this idea we can look at various economic indices and correlate them with the ordinal ranking of the median migration satisfaction score for the migrants from ten Latin American nations. (Cuba is excluded because of its unique political situation and the lack of figures comparable with the other nations.) In this situation,
migration satisfaction is the dependent variable and has been ranked by two criteria, i.e., by medians and by means. The economic measures used were from The Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) Report of 1975, (Table 10-5).

The inverse relationship is clearly evident. What is equally important is that stronger correlations are given by the "growth rate" indices (b and d) than by the corresponding "total" figures (a and c). In other words, relative change is more important than absolute amounts. Tests d, e and f, indicate that for the respondents in this sample, the economic situation in their country of birth for the single year preceding the interview (1972) is more strongly correlated to their migration satisfaction than is the situation average over two or three years.

These findings suggest that further work on this topic would be merited. I do not pursue it here for two reasons. The first is that a detailed examination should more properly be done with a larger sample involving migrants from more nations and correlated with a migration satisfaction index (which preferably has an interval scale) derived from additional questions. The second reason is my suspicion that other variables affect an individual's satisfaction and that distinct types of migrants come from the various source nations. It is therefore important to be able to hold constant these other variables whenever anyone undertakes an in-depth study such as the one suggested here for birthplace. Our task in this present study is to identify these "other variables" which affect migration satisfaction.

SECTION X.B. "PERSONAL" DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

The immigrants' personal characteristics which are not subject to much variation in the immediate pre- and post-migration situations centre on marital
### TABLE 10-5

**CORRELATIONS OF THE MIGRATION SATISFACTION OF THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN MIGRANTS IN AUSTRALIA WITH THE ECONOMIC INDICATORS OF THE MIGRANTS' BIRTHPLACES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Tests</th>
<th>With Migrant Satisfaction ranked by Medians</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (GDP) - 1972 (p.27)</td>
<td>$r_s = .62$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Growth rate of GDP - 1972 (p.28)</td>
<td>$r_s = .59$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Per capita GDP - 1972 (p.29)</td>
<td>$r_s = .32$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Growth rate of per capita GDP - 1972 (p.30)</td>
<td>$r_s = .71$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Average growth rate of per capita GDP - 1971-1972</td>
<td>$r_s = .51$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Average growth rate of per capita GDP - 1970-1972</td>
<td>$r_s = .55$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Gross national savings coefficients in terms of GDP (percentages) - 1972 (p.38)</td>
<td>$r_s = .59$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Annual rates of change in consumer prices (inflation) - 1972 (p.41)</td>
<td>$r_s = .35$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
status, sex, age, nationality, religion and race. The analyses of these key demographic variables are similar to those previously discussed for birthplace, but the results are presented in an abbreviated form. A summary of the tests is presented in Table 10-7.

SECTION X.B.1 Marital Status (Item 35 on the Questionnaire)

A cross-tabulation of the migrants' responses to marital status (Item 35 on the questionnaire) and migration satisfaction (Item 106) gives the matrix in Table 10-6. The main and logical pairs and combinations of the six marital status codes were tested. The row or rows indicated by a letter are "half" of the division. The other "half" is either the remainder of the Table or is indicated by the same letter in parenthesis, as in "e" (code 2) versus (e) (code 3) in Table 10-6. The lettered divisions are the same as on summary Table 10-7.

First, code 1 (single when interviewed) was compared with the combined codes 2 through 6. This is called "division a". It tests the observed difference of 1.1 levels of migration satisfaction between the single versus the non-single immigrants at the time of the interview. The result, significant at the .05 level, was that single migrants have a lower median level of migration satisfaction than do non-single migrants. The second test, "division b", found that the eleven migrants in the combined group of widowed, divorced or permanently separated (codes 4, 5 and 6) did not have levels of satisfaction significantly different from the single and married migrants (codes 1, 2 and 3). The married migrants in "division c" (codes 2 and 3 versus codes 1, 4, 5 and 6) were more satisfied than the others and the result was significant at the .01 level. The level of significance was improved even further, to the .001 level, in the test of "division d" which found that those migrants who were single when they
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Totals</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Column Totals | 27 | 44 | 15 | 26 | 32 | 20 | 23 | 55 | 6 |

TABLE 10-6
SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENT DECISION MAKERS:
MARRITAL STATUS AND MIGRATION SATISFACTION

Divisions

(a) 
(b) 
(c) 
(d) 
(e) 
(f)
migrated to Australia (codes 1 and 3) are 1.6 levels of satisfaction lower than the other Latin Americans. Tests on two other reasonable divisions found that they could not equal either the difference between the satisfaction levels or the .001 level of significance of "division d". The results of these tests were entered in Table 10-7 which summarizes the findings about the relationship of the personal variables to migration satisfaction.

SECTION X.B.2  **Sex (Item 33)**

There are two hundred and nine males and thirty-nine females in the sample of Independents in Australia more than six months. Their levels of migration satisfaction are almost identical; the females have a very slight tendency towards the neutral level of five. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test reveals that this small difference could occur by chance eighty to ninety times out of a hundred random samples of the same sizes. There are no evident selection biases in the sample with regard to sex. However it is notable that by the definition used to determine independence, the women must be single or separated from their husbands. Several special three-way tabulations revealed minimal differences between males and females when marital status is held constant. Only the unwed mothers, divorcees and those with elderly parents have dependants. Since they are few in number in the population and sample, no comment can be made now about variations in migration satisfaction among the thirty-nine females. Acknowledging the possibility of some unknown influence, the conclusion is that no meaningful difference in migration satisfaction exists between male and female Independent Decision Makers.
SECTION X.B.3  Age (Item 34)

Four exploratory divisions of age were tested with the K-S test. None yielded a statistically significant result; the lowest probability of the observed difference being a chance result was still greater than the .25 level. The results of others (Taft, 1965, p.45) are similar. The only indication from the four tests is that migrants in the twenty-five to thirty-four age cohort are possibly less satisfied than the younger and older migrants. Age by itself does not explain migration satisfaction; too many characteristics of people are linked with their age and stage in the life cycle.

SECTION X.B.4  Nationality (Item 39)

a. The Latin America-born Sample

Only thirteen of the two hundred and forty-eight Independents in residence more than six months did not have their nationality matching their birthplace in Latin America. Two had become citizens of other Latin American countries: the Brazilian citizen was at satisfaction level eight (considerably satisfied) while the Uruguayan was strongly dissatisfied (level one). This is just the opposite of the trends we noted earlier about birthplace. Individual circumstances more strongly effect migration satisfaction than does a change in nationality.

Five of the thirteen were naturalized Australians and another, a pre-1947 arrival, was granted an Australian passport. The two longest residents in the sample are in this group and both scored the highest level (9). The four others scored levels 3, 4, 8 and 8. The data indicate that Latin Americans who become Australians are more satisfied, thus supporting the argument that naturalization indicates adjustment. However, this is a result rather than a cause of being satisfied with one's migration.
The final five were British subjects when interviewed. In all cases they were British by parentage, but some were the second- or third-generation born outside of Britain and the Commonwealth. Three were born in Chile and one each in Argentina and Paraguay. One was a descendant of an Australian who migrated to Paraguay in the 1890's. Their English was very good or excellent before arriving in Australia, having been educated in English private schools in Latin America. Their ties to England were quite strong; two even joined the British forces to fight in the Second World War.

Their satisfaction levels were 2, 6, 7, 8 and 8. In general their scores are high; if it was not for the small sample sizes, these high migration satisfaction scores would certainly be statistically significant. "I read a lot [about Australia] and most has been true", said a 1972 arrival. "It hasn't been as tough as I expected. The country and people are fine. I like the Australians; they aren't so "Latin" [in friendliness] but they're not cold fish either".

The one Anglo-Latin who was dissatisfied illustrates that success and happiness are not assured. Commenting on the literature available in the early 1960's, he said it "had not presented a true picture. We didn't get a square deal in Australia even though we spoke English [when we arrived]. If I had the money I'd leave; maybe to South Africa or some other English-speaking country". Part of the reason he had not left was because some family members were quite happy to stay in Australia.
SECTION X.B.4. b. "Thru-Migrants".\(^1\)

Nineteen Independent Decision Makers separated from the main sample were "thru-migrants" (see Appendix VII). Four had been in Australia less than six months when interviewed; their average satisfaction score was eight while the remaining ones averaged six. These results directly parallel but are a level or two higher than the average scores of the Latin America-born sample (cf. Table 10-1). As before, women are not different from men nor does age affect migration satisfaction. The three naturalized Australians averaged a migration satisfaction level of five. The six independents who were resident in Australia more than six months and who maintained the nationality of their birthplace averaged only 4.5 in contrast to 7.0 for the four naturalized Latin Americans (and one stateless) who had terminated the citizenship of their birthplace but who had not become naturalized Australians; i.e., their only nationality was the one they had adopted in Latin America when living in a country other than their birthplace. Although this difference is not statistically significant (p <.20), a larger sample might reveal that migrants who have severed their ties once with their birthplace and then move on to a third nation are more satisfied than those who cling to their homeland nationality even after decades overseas.

SECTION X.B.5 Birthplace of Parents (Item 42)

It was originally hypothesized that migrants with parents born in a different and possibly non-Latin American country would have less-deep roots in their country of birth and would therefore be more satisfied with their migration to Australia. The data do not support this idea.

---
\(^1\) For a definition and discussion of the characteristics of "thru-migrants", see Appendix VII.
Religious organizations were among the starting points for the networks. Therefore, the proportion from each church is not representative, and the numbers who stated that they were active in their church (43% of males and 55% of females) are biased in favour of church-goers. Only seven of the six hundred and forty-nine Latin America-born persons interviewed chose not to answer the religion question. Of those who answered, three-fourths were Catholics. The other quarter over-represents the non-Catholics, especially the Mormons and Baptists since their specific congregations were visited. One purpose of this approach was to have sufficient numbers to test the hypotheses that members of mission-oriented churches are more satisfied with Australia and that active church-goers are more satisfied.

The comparison of Independents in Australia more than six months who are active versus those inactive in their religion showed no meaningful difference in their migration satisfaction. The inactive ones were on the average very slightly less satisfied, but a difference this small could have resulted from sampling error in half of any samples of the same size. An almost identical result came from a Catholic versus non-Catholic dichotomy of the migrants. Only one of the other divisions of the data gave a result below the .20 level of probability. That one indicated that the eighteen respondents from Baptist (9), Pentacostal (2) and Mormon (7) churches had a lower level of migration satisfaction (mean equals 3.8) than did the other respondents (K-S test yielded p < .20). This is the opposite of what I expected; I thought that members of mission-oriented, theologically conservative, activist churches would be more satisfied with their migration. One possible explanation is that because of their language limitations and very small congregations they are not involved
in as many church activities as they would be in Latin America.

SECTION X.B.7 Race (Item 43)

Is race related to migration satisfaction? Yes, but not in the way that we would first expect. Each of the two hundred and thirty-eight respondents placed himself into one of four racial classes ranging from 100% or near 100% pure European to 100% or near 100% Indigenous American. The middle two classes were divided according to being greater than or less than 50% Indigenous or European. Although the K-S test results approached the .10 level and indicated that the Indigenous Americans were less satisfied, the tests were rejected because there was a sign change (positive to negative) in the D values (differences) calculated. The respondents who were more than 50% European were predominantly at the extremes (D=1, 2, 3 and S=7, 8 and 9). The histograms in Figure 10-3 show this distribution. A 2x2 Chi-squared test of the neutrals versus the combined extremes (dissatisfied plus satisfied respondents) gave a result significant at the .01 level: immigrants with greater than 50% Indigenous American racial origin are less dissatisfied, less satisfied and more neutral than are Latin America-born immigrants with predominantly European racial origin. The reasons for this are not altogether clear.

1 In spite of these inconclusive results, my personal opinion based on contact with the migrants is that a person's religion and associated attitudes are important to migration satisfaction. I do not advocate religious discrimination in selection, but knowledge of one's likelihood of being satisfied is something of which potential immigrants should be aware. Further, more detailed research on the influence of religion is needed.

2 One Arab and nine others who did not answer the question were not included in the tests. These ten had an almost uniform distribution over the levels of migration satisfaction.
FIGURE 10-3
HISTOGRAMS OF MIGRATION SATISFACTION LEVELS OF 238 LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS RESIDENT >6 MONTHS ACCORDING TO EUROPEAN OR INDIGENOUS AMERICAN RACIAL ORIGIN

ACTUAL FREQUENCIES

GREATER THAN 50% EUROPEAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENTAGES

GREATER THAN 50% EUROPEAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GREATER THAN 50% INDIGENOUS AMERICAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENTAGES

GREATER THAN 50% INDIGENOUS AMERICAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 186

n = 52
I suggest that since most of the Indigenous American migrants are from the Andean countries where development is lower than in most of Latin America, these people have more to gain by being in Australia. Therefore they are not as dissatisfied. On the other hand, they may feel slightly "out of place" because of their racial characteristics and therefore do not attain high levels of satisfaction. The only other explanation I can suggest (apart from sample selection bias which I do not believe is a major factor here) is that another or several other variables might account for this observed difference in satisfaction levels.

SECTION X.B.8 Summary of Chapter X

We have not found a great deal in the way of positive results. Table 10-7 summarizes the findings. Sex, age, nationality and religion do not explain much of the variation in levels of migration satisfaction. However, we have succeeded in eliminating them from consideration (unless we uncover other variables which somehow affect them). The positive result for race really only helps identify neutrals and only concerns 10% of the population and 22% of our sample. The results on period of residence, birthplace and marital status are interesting, but not sufficient to justify any changes in immigrant selection criteria.

As this point we might question whether any real results are possible in an examination of such an individualistic thing as migration satisfaction. The material that follows in the next chapter suggests that positive results are possible. If every variable were significant, including such basic demographic characteristics as age and sex, it would be as impossible a task for explanation as it would if no variables were related to migration satisfaction. Separation of the relevant from the irrelevant is one of the tasks of this inquiry.
TABLE 10-7
PERSONAL VARIABLES (REASONABLY STATIC AT TIME OF INTERVIEW)
RELATED TO THE MIGRATION SATISFACTION OF THE SAMPLED
LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS

Unless otherwise indicated
in parentheses, only one
half of the dichotomy/division
is given. The other half is
the negative of the stated
half, but excluding non-
responses.

**KEY:**

- T: Trend
- N: Not significant
- S: Significant

+ or - Indicates if the named half of the
dichotomy is more satisfied (+) or
dissatisfied (-) than the other half.

**Selected Notes**
(see also text)

### Significance of relationship to migration satisfaction (Item 106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>DICOTOMIES/DIVISIONS</th>
<th>Not Trend</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Sample size: S</th>
<th>V.S. V.V.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Position in household:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Not used with this sample of &quot;Independent Decision Makers&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Male (vs. female)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 15-24</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 25-34</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 35+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 45+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Marital status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Single</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Widowed, divorced or separated</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Married</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Married prior to arrival</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Married prior to arrival (vs. after arrival)</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Married prior to arrival (vs. single on arrival)</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Birthplace:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Uruguay</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Brazil</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Cuba</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Costa Rica</td>
<td>T-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Mexico</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Brazil, Costa Rica, Mexico</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Six other dichotomies showed no significant differences: Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, La Plata (Argentina &amp; Uruguay), Tropical Andean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. British</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Latin American [same as country of birth]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Australian (including dual nationality)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Birthplace of parents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Both L. Am. same country as subject</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Both are Latin American</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. One or both not from Latin Am.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Racial origin:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. &gt; 50% European</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. = 100% European (vs. &gt; 50% indigenous)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Special (see text)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICHOTOMIES/DIVISIONS</td>
<td>Not Trend</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Catholic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conservative Protestants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Non-religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active in religion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Notes
(See also text)
One of our objectives is to screen a large number of attributes to identify which ones are associated with migration satisfaction. Thus far we have looked at less than one-sixth of the over two hundred Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests run. Clearly, space does not allow a detailed discussion of each as was done for the personal attributes in the previous chapter. Instead, the results are summarized here for a) the pre-migration attributes, b) post-migration attributes and c) relative change attributes.

The methods of analysis are the same for each of the tests, unless otherwise stated. "The sample" refers to those two hundred and forty-eight Latin America-born migrants contacted in Sydney whose period of residence in Australia was greater than six months and who were judged to be "Independent Decision Makers" concerning their migration to Australia.

One final note before presenting the test results is that although the discussion contrasts various groupings of Latin Americans and may at times place certain groups in a favourable or unfavourable light, no comparative tests have been made between Latin Americans and other migrant groups. In other words, it would be erroneous to use these results to draw conclusions that the Latin American migrants to Australia are better or worse, more satisfied or less satisfied, etc. than are other migrant groups. The issue being studied is levels of migration satisfaction within a population which, in this case, happens to be the Latin Americans in Sydney.
SECTION XI. A. PRE-MIgrATION VARIABLES

Twenty-two items were examined as pre-migration variables which might be related to migration satisfaction (Table 11-1). Because they are essentially "pre-arrival in Australia" items, these variables include the conditions of migration, i.e. passage assistance, intervening opportunities and chain migration. Unlike the personal variables presented in the previous chapter, over half of the pre-migration characteristics help us to separate the respondents on the basis of migration satisfaction. None of the biases in the non-randomly selected sample appear noteworthy for these analyses, so statistical significance levels are used to help identify the most important characteristics. The non-significant pre-migration variables are discussed first.

SECTION XI.A.1 Non-significant Pre-migration Variables of Minor Importance

The four variables in this section were thought to possibly have some impact on migration satisfaction. The test results revealed none, and these variables have been eliminated from further consideration.

The observed differences between respondents who applied to other countries and those who only applied to Australia (Item 82) were negligible. This suggests that people who gave serious consideration to alternative locations (intervening opportunities) and actually applied were not inclined to be more or less satisfied than those who did not apply to other possible destinations.

Migrants who moved directly from their origin to Australia (Item 47) were 0.4 levels of satisfaction lower than those who spent at least six months in the third nation before arrival in Australia. Although not statistically significant, this difference suggests that experience in some
third nation might help the migrant adapt to life in Australia. That suggestion is supported by the result from the "thru-migrants" in the previous chapter.

Migrants who were club or group members in Latin America (Item 99) were not different in satisfaction from those who were not members.

Military experience of males (Item 60) was thought to possibly teach self-reliance and independence from one's family, and that this may have some influence on a migrant's adjustment and satisfaction. The data did not support that idea.

SECTION XI.A.2  Non-significant Pre-migration Variables with Potential Importance

Education data were collected in three items (Nos. 55, 56 and 57). As shown in Table 11-1, none of the tests indicate statistically significant differences in satisfaction levels in relation to education attained, formal qualifications, or number of years of education in Latin America. The observed differences of the medians were in all cases less than one level of migration satisfaction. There was therefore no support nor even trends to suggest that more educated or formally qualified migrants are likely to be more satisfied. Three out of six other studies support this result, (Taft, 1965, p.45). However, some third variable, e.g. a loss in occupational status by half of the highly qualified, may be masking over the relationship of education to satisfaction. Therefore we will again examine education in the multivariate tests in Chapter XIII.

Surprisingly, the respondents' degree of employment, workload and income in Latin America (Items 66, 67 and 72) did not reveal any relationships with migration satisfaction that were statistically significant. Nor are there any apparent biases in these characteristics
of the sample to permit us to override the statistical tests. Nevertheless, the data reveal differences between the medians of up to 1.6 levels of satisfaction (see Table 11-1). The best we can point out are the following "suggestions" of relationships which might prove significant with a larger sample:

a. Degree of Employment in Latin America (Item 66) suggests that fully employed persons are likely to be less satisfied than those who are under-employed or unemployed. This is logical but potentially in conflict with migrant selection preferences for people with stable histories of employment. Those who in Latin America were unemployed but not looking for work or were students are likely to be more satisfied with their migration, possibly because their resumption of income earning or first employment is a welcome change.

b. These same arguments apply to the workload data (Item 67) which suggest that those who worked thirty-five or more hours per week in Latin America are slightly less satisfied with their migration. This is probably not because they were unaccustomed to the workload here, but because they gave up more in terms of income, full-time employment, etc. than did those who worked less than thirty-five hours. However, those working fifty or more hours per week, mainly the self-employed, did have a higher than average level of migration satisfaction.

c. Income in Latin America (Item 72) reveals a slight trend for earners of higher incomes in Latin America to have higher migration satisfaction. One reason this result is weak is probably the influence of other variables, e.g. motivation and present income in Australia. These will be checked later.
SECTION XI.A.3 Statistically Significant Pre-migration Characteristics with a Geographic Basis

SECTION XI.A.3.a. Prior Experience with Metropolitan Living

Questions 49, 50 and 51 were used to determine each interviewee's basic living environment in his home country. The results (see Section II.B.1) were cross-tabulated with migration satisfaction and nine different dichotomies/divisions of the respondents were subjected to Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. Four of those tests show differences in levels of migration satisfaction at the .05 level of significance or better. In several ways these results support each other and are further supported by some of the results which were not statistically significant. The people who had only lived in metropolitan areas were about one full satisfaction level more satisfied with their migration to Australia than were the others ($p < .02$). The level of significance dropped to .05 when the dichotomy was shifted to include those with 75-100% of their lives in metropolitan areas, but the difference was still approximately one satisfaction level. Similarly, the five persons with 100% rural/small town experience were even more satisfied (median level was 8) than the remainder of the sample. This difference was significant at $p < .05$. In other tests where the percentages of rural/small town living were reduced, the differences were not significant but this was mainly because of one dissatisfied respondent who lived more than 50% of his life in a rural/small town environment. He was a unique "non-Latin" case whose dissatisfaction stemmed from many reasons not connected with his environmental history. The one test where the significance level was $p < .01$ showed that people with no experience in urban areas (20,000 to 250,000 persons) were more satisfied than those who had lived some time in such places; the difference between the median satisfaction levels of the two divisions was 1.7 levels.
My interpretation of these results is that Latin Americans who have experienced predominantly rural living and who have the desire for an international migration to a developed metropolitan area such as Sydney will find satisfaction in such a move. They might have been equally or even more satisfied with life in any other metropolitan city, even in their home country, but they do not have any or very much metropolitan experience with which to compare their life in Sydney. In other words, in a comparison of Sydney with their rural/small town in Latin America, the immigrant considers living in Sydney to be better. This is as expected; the conveniences and attractions of a major city which can attract people from within its own developed nation are impressive to a person from a small town or rural zone in Latin America. We cannot conclude, however, that this satisfaction will last a lifetime; the immigrant may eventually desire to raise his children in the clean country air of his youth.

The immigrants who have always lived in metropolitan areas and who shifted from their Latin American city to Sydney are more satisfied than the others possibly because they find greater rewards and attractions in Sydney and/or because they are accustomed to the problems of metropolitan living. The greater attractions are self-evident; these include income and housing which will be examined later. The problems of metropolitan living are also well known to the immigrant, e.g. transportation congestion, air pollution and high housing costs. But the problems are all relative to non-metropolitan areas, i.e., congestion, etc. are mainly perceived by people who come in from outside of the metropolitan area. The case here is the difference in migration satisfaction of two groups of Latin Americans in Sydney, Australia. One group is exclusively from major Latin American cities; the other group of basically similar people has experience beyond such source cities. We have found that members of the former group are more satisfied (or are better able to cope with
metropolitan life?). I believe that this is the correct interpretation. It also helps explain why people with no medium size urban background are more satisfied than the others.

We can ask the question of why immigrants who have had a varied background of rural/urban/metropolitan life are not clearly more or less satisfied. A simplistic but probably true answer is that several different types of migrants are involved. Some are like the above-mentioned people who have found something in Sydney which satisfies them to a degree. Others are movers or climbers searching for something that may be too idealistic and non-existent. They may have started on a sequence of moves from country towns to intermediate cities, to their nation's metropolis, and then to an overseas destination, always seeking but never finding satisfaction. Such persons complicate the picture and should be given special attention in any further work on this topic. A further comment on the frequent movers is in the following section.

SECTION XI.A.3.b. Residential Mobility Prior to Migration

The sample of Independent Decision Makers in Australia for more than six months was asked how many times each had changed residences in the five years prior to leaving their country of origin. Nearly 60% had not moved while 20% and 13% had moved only once or twice, respectively. Only three persons had moved five or more times, with the most moves being seven. The tests on this data found no significant difference between the non-movers and the movers, but found that one-time residential movers were more satisfied with their migration to Australia than were either the non-movers who were about one satisfaction level lower (but not statistically significant $> .30 \ p > .25$) or the multiple-movers who were nearly three satisfaction levels higher, $p < .01$). As this was not evident
at the time of these interviews, there were no follow-up questions to determine the reasons. A possible explanation of the results is that people who have changed residence once within five years prior to emigrating do not have such strong ties to friends and neighbourhood as do the longer term residents, i.e., the non-movers. On the other hand, the multiple movers may not be able to settle down easily or hold their jobs. Similarly, they might be the unmarried persons whom we have already identified as exhibiting less migration satisfaction. Three-way cross-tabulations were run to test this hypothesis.

Controlling for marital status, I found that the number of residential moves prior to migration of single persons is immaterial (median value around 4 in all cases). However, the median level of migration satisfaction of migrants who were married before arrival is 6.5 for the non-movers and the one-time movers, but is only 3 for the twenty-seven persons who made multiple moves (p < .01). That is, by combining marital status with pre-migration residential mobility, we can improve our abilities to foresee the migration satisfaction of married persons but not of unmarried persons.

SECTION XI.A.4 Statistically Significant Pre-migration Variables with Socio-economic or Psychological Bases

Latin American migrants given assisted passage (Item 33A) by the Australian government have 0.8 higher levels of migration satisfaction (significant at the .05 level) than do the unassisted migrants in the sample. This, however, does not prove any cause-effect relationship since the Australian immigration authorities may in practice offer assistance to migrants with personal or pre-migration characteristics which are the cause of the higher levels of satisfaction. Therefore, it will be
necessary to examine passage assistance in the multivariate analyses in Chapter XIII. But a more definite conclusion is that if a migrant is not offered assisted passage, he is slightly less likely to be highly satisfied and he should give further thought as to whether or not he should migrate.

Knowledge of English on arrival (Item 52) is also related to migration satisfaction. The extremes, i.e. no knowledge of English and a very good level of fluency, both reveal higher levels of satisfaction than do the "very little" to "fair" abilities in English on arrival. The fluent ones are explained easily because of the advantages they had on arrival for coping with problems and finding good jobs.

The relatively higher satisfaction of migrants without any prior knowledge of English is harder to explain. Apart from an unknown selection bias or the possible influence of other variables such as education, the following reason appears to best explain the observed results: people who know nothing of a language may be more realistic about the difficulties in the host society than those with a little knowledge. Based on personal experience and observations, I suggest that a little foreign language ability in one's home country, in this case English in Latin America, has the appearance of greater ability than what one finds upon arrival in the host society. Several interviewees indicated that when they arrived they found "that the Australians speak English differently from the American English studied in Latin America". While this is undoubtedly true and does contribute to their problems, it is also an easy excuse to explain why they understand less English in the streets and factories of Sydney than they understood in a classroom filled with non-English speaking fellow students where possibly even the instructor was not a native speaker of English.

The position of the migrant's arrival in relation to the arrival of his friends and relatives (Items 79 and 80) can also be called "chain migration". Since the migration of Latin Americans to Australia is a
new phenomenon, the chains frequently associated with international migrations are not nearly as developed as with more established groups. The tests show that for this relatively recent immigrant group there is significantly greater satisfaction for those migrants in the sample who arrived within three months of close friends or relatives (median level=7.2). That group was dominated by those migrants who were accompanied by dependents who were not eliminated by a filter question. Removing these migrants from the analyses, we find that those who arrived alone and are still not with any close friends or relatives from Latin America are much less satisfied (median level=3.9) than those who were subsequently joined by close friends or relatives (median level=5.8). This, however, may be partly a reflection of the advice sent home by the migrant who arrived alone.

Level of occupation in Latin America (Item 74) does reveal statistically significant relationships with migration satisfaction. However, those relationships are not by macro groupings of skilled versus semi/unskilled nor of white collar versus blue collar workers. There was only one noteworthy difference in satisfaction within the blue collar group. The six Latin American farmers interviewed in Sydney had a very high median level of satisfaction (7.8), but their small number prevented that test from being statistically significant.

All of the statistically significant differences were within the white collar group. The twenty salesmen and twenty-eight professionals had the lowest median levels of satisfaction, (2.5 and 3.1 respectively). The thirty-six office workers (5.4) were close to the overall median of 4.8 while the median for the twenty-six administrators and managers was a very high 7.5. The reasons for these differences are not simple, especially when we note that in all of the types of employment the range
of scores includes at least seven levels of satisfaction. Since other variables influence employment and migration satisfaction, further analysis of employment types is left until Chapter XII.

Motivation (Items 76 and 77) is an attitudinal or perceptual variable which has received considerable attention in its own right. When examined in relation to the migration satisfaction of Latin Americans in Sydney, several important relationships emerged in the single variable analyses.  

As expected, political motivation was favourably related to migration satisfaction with a difference of 1.8 satisfaction levels (.005 level of significance). Latin America's political problems were the third most frequently mentioned reason for migrating (after economic factors and travel); they were cited mainly by the Chilean and Cuban migrants.

Surprisingly, neither economic factors nor employment possibilities were related to differences in satisfaction. However, there is the possibility that a third variable is masking the relationship between satisfaction and these major motivating forces.

The proverbial sunny climate and healthiness of Australia was a motivating factor for ten Latin Americans in the sample. They evidently are satisfied with the climate/health in Australia because the tests showed their median levels of migration satisfaction to be 2.9 levels higher than for other respondents (.02 level of significance).

The immigrants motivated by the "desire to see other parts of the

---

1 Methodologically, this question was treated slightly differently in that each respondent was allowed to indicate as many reasons as he wished for his decision to migrate and then to rank them in order of importance. Less than half (one hundred and fifteen of the two hundred and forty-seven who responded) named a second reason, but some of them said they could not distinguish which was the primary reason, in which case it was done by the interviewer on the basis of the discussion. This was actually of minor consequence since the final analyses took all reasons into account. Each motivation was tested twice: if it was a primary reason and if it was a primary or secondary reason, hence the double listing in Table 11-1.
world" i.e. to travel, had a median satisfaction 1.6 levels lower than
the remaining respondents. The desire to travel (p < .005) is not a
motivating force which fosters satisfaction, at least not as defined in
this study where migration satisfaction includes the desire to settle.
This suggests that many people on the move to see the world are not
easily converted into stayers, even though they arrive as "settlers".

The other motivations indicated that joining friends or family in
Australia had a negative effect, coming with one's parents (although
still independent) raised satisfaction, family problems at home had
minimal influence and "other reasons" raised satisfaction 1.1 levels.
However, these differences could have resulted merely from chance sample
selection.

SECTION XI.A.5 Summary of the Pre-migration Variables (Table 11-1)

In this section of Chapter XI we have found three types of pre-migration
variables concerning their relationship to migration satisfaction. Those
without any significant relationships can be eliminated from the discussion.
Those with significant relationships must be noted for further examination.
They are:

a. passage assistance
b. residential mobility
c. rural, urban and metropolitan backgrounds
d. knowledge of English on arrival
e. "chain" migration (relatives or friends in Australia)
f. types of employment, and
g. motivation, which actually has three different and
   significant aspects:


**TABLE 11-1**

**PRE-MIGRATION VARIABLES RELATED TO THE MIGRATION SATISFACTION OF THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS**

*Unless otherwise indicated in parentheses, only one half of the dichotomy/division is given. The other half is the negative of the stated half, but excluding non-responses.*

**KEY:**
- **T** Trend
- **N** Not significant
- **S** Significant
- **+ or -** Indicates if the named half of the dichotomy is more satisfied (+) or dissatisfied (-) than the other half.

**Significance of relationship to migration satisfaction (Item 106)**

**SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>DICOTOMIES/DIVISIONS</th>
<th>Significance of relationship to migration satisfaction</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Difference between median rank of division</th>
<th>Sample size:</th>
<th>Sample size:</th>
<th>Sample size:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33A</td>
<td>Passage Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Age at time of Migration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Residential Mobility in the Five Years Prior to Migration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Intervening Opportunities Utilized:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Rural Background and small town:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Urban Background:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Metropolitan Background:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Knowledge of English on arrival:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 11-1 Contd

**PRE-MIGRATION VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Education:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Primary or less</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Secondary or less</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Some or full university (Incl. grad.)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Four or more years university</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Secondary &amp; Technical (vs. Primary and university)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Qualifications:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Degrees and diplomas requiring recognition in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No specific qualifications</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years of Education in L.Am:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. More than 10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Experience:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Did not serve</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Employment in Country of origin:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Fully employed (codes 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Border employed &amp; seeking work (4, 5, 7 vs. 1, 2 - fully employed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Unemployed not looking for work (incl. students)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. More than 35 hr/wk</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Less than $5,000</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Less than $2,000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Employment:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Unskilled and semi skilled</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. White collar worker (vendor, routine office administration and professional)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Farmer</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Office worker</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Salesman</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Admin/Management</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Professional</td>
<td>T-</td>
<td>T-</td>
<td>T-</td>
<td>T-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Politics (push) (76 alone)</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Economic (push) (76 alone)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Employment possibilities (pull) 76 alone</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment possibilities (pull) (76 plus 77)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance of relationship to migration satisfaction (Item 106)**

**SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between median values of each part of division</th>
<th>Sample size:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S = very small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ns = &lt; 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3.1 V.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0.8 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.3 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2.9 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.9 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1.8 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11-1 Contd

PRE-MIGRATION VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>DICHOTOMIES/DIVISIONS</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT AT LEVEL</th>
<th>Selected Notes (see also text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76/77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Desire to see other parts of the world (adventure) (pull) (76 alone)</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Family or friends in Australia (76 alone)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Other (push &amp; pull) (76 alone)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Climate/health (pull &amp; push) (76 alone)</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>+3.1 V.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Family problems at home (push) (76 alone)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-0.6 V.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Migrated out with parents (but not as a dependant) (76 alone)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>+1.6 V.V.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Economic or employment (76 alone)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Arrived before them (vs. after them)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Leader or still alone</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Arrived after others</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Arrived with others</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Alone then and still</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Arrived before others (vs. still alone)</td>
<td>N+</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Applied to Other Countries besides Australia (Intervening opportunities):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Yes, U.S.A., or Canada</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Member of Organizations in L. Am:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. political  
2. travel  
3. climate/health

The third type of variables are those which did not give significant results but are still felt to merit further consideration because of their fundamental importance to pre- and post-migration life styles. These are:

a. education  
b. income, and  
c. economic/employment motivation.

Judging from the diversity of the seven significant variables, it appears that combinations of those variables may explain a major portion of the variation in levels of migration satisfaction of these Latin Americans. Since each potential immigrant's answer to these seven variables can be obtained at the selection stage, the understanding of how these pre-migration variables interact and combine to explain or predict migration satisfaction will help avoid migrations which end in unhappiness and possible departures. The combining of these variables is done in Chapter XII and XIII.

Several of the pre-migration characteristics have post-migration equivalents which we will examine in the next section.

SECTION XI.B. POST-MIGRATION ATTRIBUTES

The post-migration variables include fourteen attributes of the respondent, twelve of his housing, transportation etc., and five attitudinal questions about the problems experienced by Latin Americans. These three types of characteristics give the sub-headings for this section. Because of the number of attributes, the less important ones are only briefly mentioned. All of the tests are summarized in Tables 11-2 and 11-4.
SECTION XI.B.1 Characteristics of the Individual

Six of these attributes have statistically significant relationships with migration satisfaction. One, period of residence, was discussed in Chapter X. The results of the other tests are summarized in Table 11-2.

The various levels of English when interviewed (Item 53) have median satisfaction scores which, with minor fluctuations, rise from 3.0 for those with "very little" English ability up to 7.6 for the "excellent" or fluent migrants. A Spearman's correlation on this data is only $r_s = .20$, but it is statistically significant. The better the migrants' English ability, the more likely he is to be satisfied. This finding helps clarify the conflicting results from other researchers (Taft, 1965, p.45).

The income in Australia data (Item 71) reveal higher levels of satisfaction for those with higher incomes, a result supported by most of the work reviewed by Taft (1965, p.45). The dichotomy which gave the best level of significance ($p < .001$) was the splitting of the respondents at $5000.00$ per year.

The respondents who send money overseas (Item 75) are more dissatisfied than others, but not by more than 1.1 satisfaction levels on the average. The sixty-two persons (25%) sending more than $20.00$ per month were the least satisfied. Whether paying back travel loans or supporting parents or wives, they have less money for themselves in Australia.

The final significant variable is the level of occupation in Australia (Item 73). The unskilled and semi-skilled are less satisfied, but only by one satisfaction level (significant at $p < .05$). The five who have become salesmen and the ten administrator/managers have satisfaction more than three levels higher than the median for the other respondents.
TABLE 11-2
POST-MIGRATION VARIABLES RELATED TO THE MIGRATION SATISFACTION
OF THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS

*Unless otherwise indicated in parentheses, only one half of the dichotomy/division is given. The other half is the negative of the stated half, but excluding non-responses.

**KEY:**
- **T** Trend
- **N** Not significant
- **S** Significant

*or - Indicates if the named half of the dichotomy is more satisfied (+) or dissatisfied (-) than the other half.

Selected Notes
(see also text)

Significance of relationship to migration satisfaction (Item 106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Dichotomies/Divisions</th>
<th>Not Trend</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>.10</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
<th>.005</th>
<th>.001</th>
<th>Difference between median values of each part of division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Major Activity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(21) S &lt; (79) N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Status in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Resident immigrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Period of Residence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Chapter X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Residential Mobility in Australia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>No changes in residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>One change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>One or two changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>More than three changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>More than six changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>One or two changes (vs. 3+ changes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Knowledge of English at Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>None or very little</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Average/&quot;so-so&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Very good or excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Very little, little or average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Improvement of English in Past Six Months:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Some or much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Studying at present:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>English courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Not studying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Degree of Employment in Australia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Fully employed</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.8</td>
<td>V.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Unemployed seeking work</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>V.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Workload:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>More than 35 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Income in Australia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Less than $3,000 (vs. more than $8,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Type of Employment in Australia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Semi-skilled or unskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>White collar</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>V.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Administration/management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Send/Receive Money Overseas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Send</td>
<td></td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Send more than $240 per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11-2 Contd

POST-MIGRATION VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>DICHOTOMIES/DIVISIONS</th>
<th>Not Trend</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>.10</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
<th>.005</th>
<th>.001</th>
<th>Difference between median values of each part of division</th>
<th>Sample size: ( n = ) very small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91-96</td>
<td>Use of Services for Migrants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-f Six tests; all not significant (see comments this chapter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Member of Organizations/Clubs in Australia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Not a member of any.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professionals were again below the median while those who have obtained skilled or technician jobs are at the median level.

None of the other attributes gave any meaningful differentiation of migration satisfaction. The respondents' majority activity (Item 37) and resident status in Australia (Item 40) were biased by the sample which focused on Independent Decision Makers (mainly in the work force) who were resident immigrants. Studying (Item 58), and workload (Item 65) were not significant, as were the education and workload attributes in the pre-migration situation. Although degree of employment (Item 64) had no statistically significant results, the very small number (7) of unemployed respondents were nearly two satisfaction levels lower than the other respondents. I am certain that further surveys with larger sample sizes will support the hypothesis that unemployed immigrants are more likely to be dissatisfied than employed ones.

Membership in organizations and clubs (Item 97) revealed no influences on satisfaction.

The results from the questions about the use of services for migrants (Items 91 to 96) showed no statistically significant results, but are affected by some special circumstances. To analyse the data, several assumptions which appear reasonable need to be made. The first two are: a) migrants use the services of the Good Neighbour Council, employment agencies, etc. because they have problems, and b) problems often produce dissatisfaction of various degrees. Therefore, we expect less satisfied migrants to use the services. But if the problem is solved, the level of satisfaction should rise. Therefore, our first conclusion is that for a full analysis, the respondents' satisfaction must be measured at the beginning of his first visit and then at some later time. This is not the case with this survey of Latin Americans, so all further conclusions must be suspect because of this bias and because of another assumption.
needed: c) for this data on Latin Americans, assume that none of the respondents is still visiting any of these service organizations, e.g., that a person who has made one, two or more visits, is not going to return for another visit about any of the factors which have contributed to his present level of migration satisfaction.

With these limitations, we can analyse the results in Table 11-3. Although small numbers of respondents lead to suspect medians and percentages, the trends are evident except for employment agencies. Firstly, the larger the organization, the greater is the percentage of the population using it and, in general, the closer the satisfaction level of the users approximates the median for the entire sample. That is, the Good Neighbour Council (G.N.C.) has comparatively few users and those users are the more dissatisfied ones while the Department of Immigration, with its multitude of services which include the granting of visas, has been used by nearly 40% of the sample and the users have a median satisfaction similar to the entire sample.

Another assumption: d) respondents who used a service only once are not likely to have lower satisfaction because of that visit, but they may have higher satisfaction because their problem might be solved. Assuming this, the median satisfaction levels of the one-time users show that the Good Neighbour Council gets a disproportionate number of the less satisfied cases. The high median for one-time users of the Catholic Migrant Centre (C.M.C.) is surprising; I doubt that one visit could produce so much satisfaction. Because of the small sample size I am inclined to pass over the C.M.C. data. Bank Advisory Services and Employment Agencies attract a range of migrants who need problem solving

1 A slightly different assumption which might be preferable to some readers is that each organization has an equal chance of having a migrant return for another visit and an equal chance of solving the problem. However, this is definitely not supported by the data which follow.
### TABLE 11-3

**MIGRATION SATISFACTION AND USE OF SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS BY SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Number of Persons Ever Visited &amp; % of Sample</th>
<th>Median Satisfaction Level of Users</th>
<th>Number of Once-only Users &amp; % of Users</th>
<th>Median Satisfaction Level - Once-only Users</th>
<th>Number of Several-times Users &amp; % of Users</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Many-time Users &amp; % of Users</th>
<th>Median Satisfaction Level - Many time Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Neighbour Council</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Migrant Service</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulate</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Advisory Service</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Agencies</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Immigration</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
services ranging from automobile loans, translations and initial jobs (which are rather neutral "problems"), to very serious financial, employment and personal difficulties. On the other hand, the Department of Immigration and especially the Consulates have unique services, e.g. visas for relatives and official forms, which attract the satisfied migrants; for these government organizations, the median for the one-time users is slightly above the median for the entire sample.

Naturally, our major question is which, if any, of the service organizations is most effective, keeping in mind that they specialize in different problems. There are two criteria: high satisfaction levels of the many-time users and/or the best net change in satisfaction levels between the "one-time" and the "many-time" users. By both criteria, the Good Neighbour Council and the Bank Advisory Services come out first and second, respectively. For social and psychological problems, the G.N.C. is probably better equipped for personal attention. For financial problems, e.g. air fares for dependants, the banks have an obvious advantage, but loans, etc. often need several visits to arrange.

Employment agencies give a mixed result: the "one-time" users might get a better job the first time, while those using the service "several times" have a better chance to be more selective and improve their position; their median score is slightly higher. However, the "many-times" users possibly have unrealistic aims or special problems that employers avoid or they are the migrants who cannot find work at their level of skills and qualifications; their median score is exceptionally low.

By these criteria, the Consulates are the worst performers. In many cases their hands are tied by government policies or bureaucratic red tape. Whatever the reason, Latin Americans using these organizations several or many times are the ones with low levels of migration satisfaction. The same applies to the Department of Immigration.
I have been intentionally cautious in this section not to offend any organization. Although it appears that the Good Neighbour Council is doing something right, we do not know nor can we speculate what it is. Nor do we know if the same problems are not handled equally well by the appropriate section of the Department of Immigration. Therefore, the final and strongest conclusion from this analysis of service organizations for immigrants is that they merit a detailed study of their impact on migration satisfaction.

The geographic attribute of residential mobility after arrival in Australia (Item 47) presented difficulties because of the different periods of residence of the sample. After those in Australia six months or less were separated, the tests indicated statistically significant differences (p < .05) between those moving three or more times compared with those moving only once or twice. The former were less satisfied; the lowest median value of satisfaction was 2.9 for the twenty-three persons who moved six or more times. Those who had not changed residence showed no difference from the rest of the sample. These twenty-one persons were usually the most recent arrivals and some were still in the migrant hostels, a factor to be examined in the next section which deals with housing.

SECTION XI.B.2 Characteristics of Housing and Transportation

Nearly every housing and transportation characteristic showed some statistically significant relationship with migration satisfaction. The listing in Table 11-4 gives the details of the tests. The types of housing associated with low satisfaction are non-self contained flats and

---

1 Because of their unique housing situation, the residents of hostels are excluded from these tests except for Item 4 on House Types.
TABLE 11-4
POST-MIGRATION HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION VARIABLES RELATED TO THE MIGRATION SATISFACTION OF THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS

*Unless otherwise indicated in parentheses, only one half of the dichotomy/division is given. The other half is the negative of the stated half, but excluding non-responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>DICHOTOMIES/DIVISIONS</th>
<th>Not Trend</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
<th>.005</th>
<th>.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hostels (incl. YWCA)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separate house</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duplex &amp; terrace houses</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>One or two</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six or more</td>
<td>T*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>One bedroom</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or no bedroom</td>
<td>T-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six or more</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Renter (not subsidized)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buyers and owners</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Close to work or transport</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close to friends or relatives</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Total Household Income: (Inaccurate question; not valid)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$10 or less</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25 or less</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$35 or less</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unfurnished</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Notes (see also text)
TABLE 11-4 Contd

POST-MIGRATION HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>DICOTOMIES/DIVISIONS</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>.10</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
<th>.005</th>
<th>.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>a. No electricity</td>
<td>T-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>V.V.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>b. No gas</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>c. No television</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>d. No radio</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>e. No internal running water</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>V.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>f. No hot water</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>g. No heater of any type</td>
<td>T-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/</td>
<td>h. No private bath</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPECIAL CASES - ATTITUDBINAL VARIABLES

85 Problems for Latin Americans:
   a. More than for other migrants

86 Problems for fellow countrymen:
   a. More than for other Latin Americans

87 Types of Problems Named in 85/86:
   a. Employment (vs. other problems named)
   b. Language training (vs. other deficiencies named)

89 Named Deficiencies in Govt. Assist.:
   a. Employment (vs. other deficiencies named)
   b. Language training (vs. other deficiencies named)

90 Assistance from Established Latin Americans:
   a. Some give help
   b. Some or most give help
one or two room rented furnished flats in terrace houses with low rents. These are all characteristics of the accommodation which the respondent accepted when he moved in.

Other characteristics over which the migrant has more short term control are also related to satisfaction. A large family or group of friends in one dwelling are more likely to be satisfied. The importance of friends and family is again evident. Also, those with an automobile, radio, television or furniture (i.e. in an unfurnished dwelling) have higher satisfaction. The cause/effect relationship is not clear: Do material acquisitions promote a feeling of satisfaction with the migration and make the migrant less inclined to leave? OR Do the more satisfied migrants make more purchases and is this because of better incomes? OR Is there a combination or interactive effect between satisfaction and purchases, i.e. do satisfied migrants acquire more material possessions which in turn give them a more comfortable life which leads to greater satisfaction with the migration? The reciprocal sounds equally plausible: Dissatisfied migrants purchase fewer cars, appliances and homes because either they do not have the money (or are saving their money for a return trip), or because they do not want to tie themselves in any way to Australia. They therefore have fewer comforts which leads to greater dissatisfaction. I prefer this interactive explanation and feel that further work (possibly J. J. Nightingale's forthcoming book) will justify government assistance to get the immigrants started earlier with purchases of appliances, furniture, cars and housing.
SECTION XI.B.3. Special Cases of Post-migration Variables

Five of the questions (Items 85, 86, 87, 89 and 90) asked in the post-migration context of the interview were attitudinal. The answers were not specific to the respondent's individual situation, but dealt with his viewpoints on the experiences and problems facing Latin American migrants in general. The analyses necessitate the assumption that the responses strongly reflect the migrants' own experiences and those of their friends. The test results are in Table 11-4; two questions revealed statistically significant differences in migration satisfaction.

The half of the sample that thought that Latin Americans had more problems than other immigrants had a lower median satisfaction level. Also, the respondents who felt that at least some of the "established" or long-term Latin Americans help the newcomers are less satisfied. This is the opposite of what was expected but supports the trend evident in all these attitudinal variables. The trend is that migrants who perceive, experience or are otherwise pre-occupied with "problems" are the ones with lower levels of migration satisfaction on the average.

SECTION XI.C. RELATIVE CHANGE IN MIGRANTS' ATTRIBUTES

Relative change is the difference in position, attitude or condition from the pre-migration starting point to the post-migration moment of the interview. For example, if two migrants have average incomes in Australia but one earned little in Latin America while the other earned a high salary, the first one's relative change is favourable while the second man's relative change is unfavourable. Relative change can be determined for any characteristic which has a rank-order, like job status, or a known interval scale, like income, provided that both the pre-migration
and post-migration answers are known. Only with difficulty or assumptions of order (e.g., that single people are less secure than married migrants) can relative change be determined for a nominally scaled characteristic such as marital status or house type.

A comparative judgement by the respondent can also indicate relative change without specifically asking for the pre- and post-migration answers. The biases of recall and emotions are obvious, but a case can be argued that the respondent is the only true judge of his individual situation and attitudes. People are affected in different ways by the same amount of change. Also, the immigrant could misrepresent his pre-migration situation as deliberately and easily as he could misrepresent his personal assessment of the relative change; only the most meticulous (and well funded) surveys could eliminate such bias. A further reason in favour of comparative judgements by the respondents is illustrated by the income data in this survey. While the post-migration Australian incomes are comparable with each other, the pre-migration incomes in Latin America are not. The respondents come from a score of nations with different rates of inflation and over a period of several years or decades. To adjust those values is a mammoth task with minimal rewards. For these reasons, five questions and one satisfaction indicator were phrased as comparative judgements to be made by the respondents. The results were among the most important in this study of migration satisfaction.

The five relative change questions were on house construction (Item 25), house comfort (Item 26), neighbourhood (Item 27), income (Item 68) and job status (Item 70). The responses were coded at five levels: much worse, worse, about the same, better and much better. All of these questions yielded statistically significant relationships with migration satisfaction (Table 11-5), and usually in the direction expected. Figure 11-1 graphs the median satisfaction levels for these variables. Only the question about relative change in income differs from a positive correlation.
### TABLE 11-5

**RELATIVE CHANGE VARIABLES RELATED TO MIGRATION SATISFACTION OF THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS**

*Unless otherwise indicated in parentheses, only one half of the dichotomy/division is given. The other half is the negative of the stated half, but excluding non-responses.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>DICOTOMIES/DIVISIONS</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>.10</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
<th>.005</th>
<th>.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Comparative Housing Construction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worse or much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Better or much better in &quot;</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Comparative Housing Comfort:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worse or much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Better or much better in &quot;</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Comparative Neighbourhood Quality:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worse or much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Better or much better in &quot;</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Comparative Income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worse or much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Better or much better in &quot;</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Much better in Australia</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. About the same in both countries</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Comparative Occupational Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Much worse in Australia</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worse or much worse in Australia</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Better or much better in &quot;</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Much better in Australia</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance of relationship to migration satisfaction (Item 106)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>DICOTOMIES/DIVISIONS</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>.10</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.02</th>
<th>.01</th>
<th>.005</th>
<th>.001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Comparative Housing Construction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worse or much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Better or much better in &quot;</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Comparative Housing Comfort:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worse or much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Better or much better in &quot;</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Comparative Neighbourhood Quality:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worse or much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Better or much better in &quot;</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Comparative Income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worse or much worse in Australia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Better or much better in &quot;</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Much better in Australia</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. About the same in both countries</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Comparative Occupational Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Much worse in Australia</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Worse or much worse in Australia</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Better or much better in &quot;</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Much better in Australia</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected Notes**

(see also text)
FIGURE 11-1

GRAPH OF MEDIAN MIGRATION SATISFACTION LEVELS FOR THE FIVE DEGREES OF THE SIX RELATIVE CHANGE QUESTIONS ASKED TO THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job Satisfaction* is one of the five Satisfaction Indicators and is therefore not independent of the nine levels of migration satisfaction.
My interpretation, based on the fully cross-tabulated tables, is that many Latin Americans in Australia work in jobs for which the wages are comparable to their former jobs in Latin America, especially after noting Australia's higher cost of living. In short, they are not better off financially although many were expecting a better standard of living.

Those who have worse income in Australia have a nearly average median because they are bimodally split. Only 20% are in the middle three neutral satisfaction levels, most are at the extremes. The dissatisfied respondents are understandably so; they earn less in developed Australia than they did in less-developed Latin America. The satisfied respondents with worse incomes in Australia include the Chilean high income earners who came to Australia for reasons other than financial gains. The data also reveal high satisfaction for those whose incomes are "much better".

Figure 11-1 also shows a slight decline in satisfaction by those who answered "much better" to the housing questions. Those declines are not statistically meaningful because of small numbers in those groupings. However, I would interpret it to indicate that as much migration satisfaction is derived from simply "better" housing and neighbourhoods as from "much better" situations.

These five relative change questions are only a few of what could be asked. For example, it is possible to ask about health, diet, automobile, happiness, political or economic security and friendships; it is possible to ask "How do the number and closeness of friendships you have in Australia a) compare with those you had in Latin America when you left" or b) "compare with those you would be able to re-establish if you returned

---

1 It is also possible that some people devote so much of their income to (excessively) higher status housing that their migration satisfaction suffers because other needs are not adequately fulfilled.
to Latin America?" Although not an objective of this study the pointing out of the relationship between migration satisfaction and relative change is perhaps one of the most important findings. While it may seem simplistic and even obvious once it has been said, I have not found in the literature the equivalent of this statement: "The relative improvement of the situation, characteristic, feelings or whatever the respondent considers to be important at the moment is the major determinant of migration satisfaction or any other form of satisfaction." In other words, it is not simply how much one earns, etc. but whether it represents an improvement over or at least maintenance of what one had in the previous situation in regard to what the respondent considers to be important. For example, a well-to-do Chilean who emigrated because of what he considered to be the political and economic deterioration of Allende's Chile may easily be unperturbed by his much lower occupational status in Australia because he is enjoying the political and economic stability here. The development of the theoretical and methodological implications of relative change appears to be an exceptionally fruitful field for future work.

These findings and possibilities were not foreseen at the beginning of this thesis. Furthermore, the data permit only partial testing. Therefore, the development and examination of relative change indicators is left to later papers.
SECTION XI.D. SUMMARY OF CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO MIGRATION SATISFACTION

In this chapter and the previous one, a number of single attributes and relative change questions were found to have meaningful relationships with migration satisfaction. In the chapters they were organized and presented as personal, pre-migration, post-migration and relative change characteristics. Table 11-6 lists them according to the strength of the level of statistical significance for each test. This table is much larger but comparable with the table by Taft (1965, p.45). We can also list the results according to the size of the observed differences or whether each characteristic is attitudinal, behavioural, situational or personal. Other criteria are also possible, but no single category encompassed all or even a majority of the most important characteristics. Nor do any one or two variables appear dominant for explaining migration satisfaction. Therefore, although this study has examined migration satisfaction far beyond the coverage by Richardson, Taft or any others, the results are, thus far, not conclusive nor able to be applied to the selection or assistance of immigrants. Clearly, we need to discover if the results of the single variable analyses can be combined in meaningful and useful ways. The attempts at combining are discussed in the two chapters which follow.
### TABLE 11-6

**LIST OF SINGLE VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH MIGRATION SATISFACTION, IN DESCENDING ORDER OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV TEST RESULTS, FOR THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS**

**A. Characteristics of Individuals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Variable</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Dichotomies/Divisions</th>
<th>Direction and Difference Between Medians</th>
<th>Levels of Significance</th>
<th>Notes on Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rel = Relative change</td>
<td>(*)&amp;=first time appears on list</td>
<td>Unless otherwise indicated in parentheses, only one half of the dichotomy/ division is given. The other half is the negative of the stated half (but excluding non-responses)</td>
<td>(-)=dissat. (+)=sat. of the named division</td>
<td>(contd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre = Pre-migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post = Post-migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers = Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pers | 38 | Born in Brazil, Costa Rica or Mexico | -2.9 | .001 | S |
| Pre/Post | 79/80* | Arrived with others | +2.6 | .001 |
| Rel | 70 | Much loss in occupation status | -2.2 | .001 |
| Rel | 68 | Income not better in Australia | -2.0 | .001 |
| Pre/Post | 79/80 | Family or friends in Australia | +1.8 | .001 |
| Pre | 35 | Married before arrival | +1.6 | .001 |
| Pre | 76/77* | Motivation - Political | +1.8 | .005 |
| Pre | 76/77* | Motivation - Desire to travel | -1.8 | .005 |
| Post | 71 | Low income in Australia | -1.7 | .005 |
| Pre | 35 | Single on arrival (vs. married on arrival) | -1.6 | .005 |
| Post | 53* | Very little on average English at interview | -1.3 | .005 |
| Rel | 70 | Much gain in occupational status | +3.5 | .01 | VS |
| Pers | 38 | Born in Cuba | +3.2 | .01 | VS |
| Rel | 70 | Better or much better occupation status | +2.4 | .01 |
| Post | 90* | No help from established Latin Americans | -1.5 | .01 |
| Pre | 50* | None of life in urban (medium size) cities | +1.4 | .01 |
| Pre/Post | 75 | Married when interviewed | +1.3 | .01 | |
| Pre | 76/77 | Motivation - climate/health | +2.9 | .02 | VS |
| Pre | 51* | 100% of life in metropolitan areas | +1.1 | .02 |
| Pre/Post | 35 | Single when interviewed | -1.1 | .02 |
| Post | 71 | Very lowest incomes in Australia (vs. highest income) | -3.7 | .05 | S |
| Pre | 49* | 100% of life in rural/small town | +3.0 | .05 | VS |
| Post | 48* | Six or more residential moves in Australia | -2.8 | .05 | S |
| Pers | 38 | Born in Brazil | -2.6 | .05 | S |
| Pre | 52* | Very good or excellent English on arrival | +2.3 | .05 |
| Pre | 46* | None or one residential move in Latin Am. | +1.9 | .05 |
| Post | 73 | White collar employment in Australia | +1.8 | .05 |
| Rel | 68 | Income much better in Australia | +1.7 | .05 |
| Post | 48 | Three or fewer residential moves in Aust. | +1.4 | .05 |
| Post | 54 | English has improved in past six months | +1.4 | .05 |
| Pre | 51 | More than 75% of life in metropolitan areas | +1.2 | .05 |
| Rel | 70 | Moderate or much loss in occupation status | -1.2 | .05 |
| Post | 53 | Very good or excellent English at interview | +1.1 | .05 |
| Post | 75 | Send money to Latin America | -1.0 | .05 |
| Post | 73 | Unskilled or semi-skilled work in Australia | -1.0 | .05 |
| Pre | 35 | Received passage assistance | +0.8 | .05 |

(contd)
### TABLE 11-6 (contd)
**LIST OF SINGLE VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH MIGRATION SATISFACTION, IN DESCENDING ORDER OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV TEST RESULTS, FOR THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS**

#### A. Characteristics of Individuals (contd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Variable</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Dichotomies/Divisions</th>
<th>Direction and Difference Between Medians</th>
<th>Levels of Significance</th>
<th>Notes on Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rel = Relative change</td>
<td>(*) = first time appears on list</td>
<td>Unless otherwise indicated in parentheses, only one half of the dichotomy/division is given. The other half is the negative of the stated half (but excluding non-responses)</td>
<td>(-) = dissat. (+) = sat. of the named division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre = Pre-migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post = Post-migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers = Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pre 49 | More than 60% of life in rural/small towns | +2.9 | .10 | VS |
| Pers 38 | Born in Costa Rica | -2.8 | .10 | S |
| Pre 72 | Low income in Latin America | +2.7 | .10 | S |
| Pre/Post 35 | Married before (vs. married after arrival) | +2.0 | .10 | S |
| Post 89 | Named employment as a problem of Latin Americans in Australia | -1.9 | .10 | S |
| Post 48 | One residential move in Australia | +1.5 | .10 | |
| Pers 38 | Born in Uruguay | -1.3 | .10 | S |
| Post 85 | Latin Americans have same problems as other migrants | +1.2 | .10 | |
| Pre 74 | Office worker in Latin America | +0.8 | .10 | S |
### TABLE 11-6 (contd)

**LIST OF SINGLE VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH MIGRATION SATISFACTION, IN DESCENDING ORDER OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV TEST RESULTS, FOR THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS**

#### B. Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Variable</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Dichotomies/Divisions</th>
<th>Direction and Levels Difference Between Medians</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Notes on Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rel = Relative change</td>
<td>(*)=first time appears</td>
<td>Unless otherwise indicated in parentheses, only one half of the dichotomy/division is given. The other half is the negative of the stated half (but excluding non-responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre = Pre-migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post = Post-migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers = Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction and Levels Significance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Variable</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Dichotomies/Divisions</th>
<th>Direction and Levels Difference Between Medians</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Notes on Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 6 *</td>
<td>No or one bedroom</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 22 *</td>
<td>Has room heater</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 17 *</td>
<td>Has gas</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 5</td>
<td>6+ rooms</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rel</strong> 27</td>
<td>Worse or much worse neighbourhood</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 4</td>
<td>Attached house</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>S=small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 15</td>
<td>Furnished dwelling</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>VS=very small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 14</td>
<td>Rent ≤ $25 per week</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 20</td>
<td>Has running water</td>
<td>+3.2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rel</strong> 27</td>
<td>Better or much better neighbourhood</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 25</td>
<td>House construction not better</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 10</td>
<td>No vehicle</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 11</td>
<td>Travel by car</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 11</td>
<td>Use public transport</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 7</td>
<td>6+ occupants</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 5</td>
<td>1-2 room dwelling</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 21</td>
<td>Has hot water tap</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 23</td>
<td>Has private bath</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 16</td>
<td>Without electricity</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>VVS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rel</strong> 27</td>
<td>Much worse neighbourhood</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rel</strong> 26</td>
<td>House comfort not better</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 8</td>
<td>Buying own home</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong> 6</td>
<td>One bedroom</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER XII

THE COMBINATION OF MIGRATION SATISFACTION AND KEY CHARACTERISTICS INTO A TYPOLOGY

Of the characteristics identified in the preceding chapters, none by itself provides much basis for diagnosis or prediction. Perhaps by combining them the explanation of migration satisfaction can be improved. There are two approaches to combining the attributes. One is the use of the multivariate technique called discriminant analysis; that is the topic of Chapter XIII. The other approach, used in this chapter, is the application and completion of the typology developed in PART TWO. Unfortunately the main problem with the combining of the variables, i.e. that the number of respondents in each cell soon becomes too small for detailed analyses, limits the number of characteristics that can be included in the typology. And if a characteristic with only minor importance is selected by mistake, the numbers in each cell can become too small before the main characteristics are introduced. The results here have been guided by the earlier single variable analyses and by intuition (or hypotheses) as to which variables are most important. Several minor, trial combinations were checked with a hand-sorting of the questionnaires.

SECTION XII.A. TYPES OF LATIN AMERICAN FEMALES WHO WERE SINGLE ON ARRIVAL

The types of females were reasonably clear. Excluding the dependents on arrival, the widowed/divorced/separated, and the non-Latins, there were 44 independent females who were single on arrival. The fourteen of them who married after arrival were very similar in
migration satisfaction, motivation, employment and ability in English to the thirty who were still single. Therefore, they were combined to keep the sample numbers sufficiently large. Only a quarter did not have a travel motive, and none of the other motives showed any influence on migration satisfaction even when additional characteristics were held constant.

Three women were removed because each had a child. One was definitely married. Very possibly the other two migrated because they were pregnant (one claimed she was married after arrival, but the husband was not available). Ironically, the satisfied unwed mother was returning to Peru "because of the health of my child" while the dissatisfied one was staying because of personal reasons (social pressures?) preventing her return. Four other women unemployed in Australia were removed from the sample; they were studying (satisfaction level 7), recovering from an operation (level 8), recently completed a language course (level 2), and looking for work (level 2). Of the remaining thirty-seven women, the employment background in Latin America included two unskilled, one semi-skilled, three technicians, twenty office workers, six professionals and five students or unemployed.

The characteristics which were important included 1) attainment of employment equal to what they had in Latin America, and 2) at least one relative or friend from Latin America also in Australia, and 3) at least "fair" English when interviewed. None of the ten respondents who had all three of these characteristics was dissatisfied; their median level was very high (7.5); the difference was statistically significant at the 0.02 level. Those with only two of the three favourable characteristics were less satisfied (median=5.2), as were those with only one (median=2.4) and with none (median=1.5). The data reveal that at least good English is required for an office
position and that this assists satisfaction. The eleven office workers who regained that occupational level arrived in Australia with only slightly more English ability than the nine who did not regain office jobs, but they had become competent in English. This suggests that the key to a Latin American office girl's success in Australia is English competence either before migrating, or time and financial provision for extensive study of secretarial and accounting English after arrival. Learning good English in a factory and/or classroom for conversation is difficult, even for those gifted in learning foreign languages. Therefore a favourable result on a test of ability to learn a foreign language should be a minimum requirement for an immigrant seeking an office job.

The sample of professional women reveals a darker picture. Only two of seven professional women (both teachers) regained their status. One spoke very good English on arrival and the other was an outgoing individual who studied English very hard and was in contact with immigration officials ranging from the Good Neighbour Council to the then Minister for Immigration, Mr. Al Grassby. Two former social workers and an English teacher were doing unskilled labour. Apparently their lack of typing, shorthand, or accounting skills barred their entry into office work.

Nearly half of all Latin American independent females who were single on arrival were engaged in unskilled or semi-skilled labour two years after arrival even though 90% had training and experience above the semi-skilled level when they arrived.

Finally, the single women who arrived alone and were still not joined by any relatives or close friends they knew in Latin America were very likely to be dissatisfied or at best neutral [median=2.4]. Those who are not alone have a median satisfaction of 6.5; although half
are satisfied, others have found that being with friends or relatives does not by itself prevent dissatisfaction. These results are summarized in Figure 12-1.

SECTION XII.B. FARMERS AND SINGLE MALES

Of the males, the first type to be identified was the farmers. Although there were only eight of them, the results are clear. Six of the eight were satisfied (levels 7 and 8) and the two dissatisfied ones were distinct individuals\(^1\). One had a university degree and stated a desire to travel (none of the others continued beyond secondary school nor were motivated by travel). The other was the only one below the age of 25 on arrival and to marry in Australia, but he married a Spanish-speaking immigrant from the United States, so his desire to re-migrate to the USA has a real possibility of happening. All eight have relatives or close friends who have also migrated either earlier or at the same time, so that factor is constant for all. At least six of the eight farmers (including the dissatisfied ones) were working either their own or their family's land, and one had a lucrative poultry ranch. It was therefore not the land tenure problem of Latin America that stimulated their migration. Six were from Chile (including one dissatisfied) and named either political (5) or economic (4) motives. Interestingly, the two dissatisfied former farmers were the ones with the most urban and metropolitan experience in Latin America; the other five have made successful transitions from rural Latin America to metropolitan Australia even though they spoke no English (five of the

\(^1\) This split of six versus two is statistically significant at the 0.05 level, using the Fisher exact probability test (Siegel, 1956, pp.96-104).
FIGURE 12-1

CONTINUATION OF THE TYPOLOGY OF LATIN AMERICANS IN AUSTRALIA: FEMALES SINGLE ON ARRIVAL (INDEPENDENT)
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six) on arrival and poor or "fair" English when interviewed two years later. In other words, these migrants are most of the explanation of why rural living indicated satisfaction. Also, their low English ability was a counteracting "noise" which worked against the trend that better speakers were more satisfied. The conclusion from this analysis is that Latin American commercial (not subsistence) farmers, regardless of marital status, who seek better political and/or financial security and who accept doing unskilled factory labour in an Australian metropolitan area are highly likely to be satisfied with the results of their migration (Figure 12-2). This description is sure to fit many thousands in Latin America.

Motivation has a strong influence in the typology of males who were single on arrival. The first type is simply the 59% (forty out of sixty-eight) who came to "see another part of the world", i.e. for travel, regardless of mentioning additional reasons. Of these, only five were satisfied, only thirteen were neutral, and twenty-two were dissatisfied. This result is clearer still for those who named only the travel motive (two satisfied; five neutral; and seventeen dissatisfied). When those who found wives in Australia are separated, the proportions are further but not dramatically accentuated.

Furthermore, the satisfied few included some special situations like the well-to-do youth with an administrative job who migrated in part "to gain freedom from his family" and a former student enjoying his first income (although other former students were neutral or dissatisfied). It was also notable that the satisfaction scores were on the low side of each main level, i.e. there were no level nines among the satisfied, most neutrals were at level four (tending toward dissatisfied), and there were no level threes (the most favourable of the three dissatisfied levels).
Two of five satisfaction indicators used to determine the levels of migration satisfaction are revealing for these men, but we must note that satisfaction is not independent from these indicators. Most of these men would not recommend Australia (Indicator 101) to other members of their family or to close friends: "I am the first and the last of my family and friends to come to Australia" said a disgruntled Costa Rican. This will not assist the recruitment of additional single male immigrants.

The majority wanting to leave (Indicator 102) were thinking of returning to their country of origin, indicating that the desire to travel had been fulfilled. Many of the neutrals said they would like to go to North America or to Europe where some had been "guest-workers". But since they have little chance of being accepted into those countries, the choice remains between Australia and their origin. (A question about the relative desirability of Australia is needed in later studies). Certainly not all prefer Australia over their country of origin.

Other characteristics are not needed to identify this type of immigrant. Their wide range of employment in Latin America and in Australia, their regaining of previous occupation levels, and the presence of relatives or friends they knew in Latin America did not greatly contribute to explaining their migration satisfaction. The evidence indicated that their motive for migrating, i.e., to see Australia, had been fulfilled, and was not a sufficient motive to maintain their satisfaction with their migration.

Of the remaining males who were single on arrival, a priest and three farmers already discussed were separated as atypical. The four with "other" motives were not notably different so they were combined with the twenty-five who named either employment possibilities or economic factors. This type of Latin American immigrant was markedly
different from the type motivated by travel. There were eleven dissatisfied, ten neutral and eight satisfied respondents, i.e. insufficient in each of the main levels for much analysis. None of the key characteristics clearly explained the satisfaction differences within this type\textsuperscript{1}. It is therefore left as one type with mixed levels of migration satisfaction.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure12-2}
\caption{Continuation of the Typology of Latin Americans in Australia: Farmers and Single Males}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{1} The best explainer was the level of English when interviewed; two of the eleven dissatisfied and five of the eight satisfied had English ability of at least a "good" level when interviewed. However, that result was not statistically significant.
Motivation is the first key to the typology of Latin American males who were married before arrival (Table 12-1). The push of political uncertainty is associated with satisfaction for nine out of ten Chilean and Cuban respondents whose stated motive was politics without mentioning employment/economic factors or travel. The tenth was neutral. An Ecuadorian was also neutral. Two similarly motivated Uruguayans were dissatisfied, but two others were satisfied, indicating a less powerful purely political push. However, when politics is combined with employment/economic factors or with travel (1 respondent), the Uruguayans are clearly more satisfied (nil dissatisfied, two neutral and four satisfied). However, respondents from all other birthplaces (including four Chileans) are decidedly more neutral, indicating that employment/economic factors and probably travel motives decrease the satisfaction associated with the purely political motive. Therefore, the respondents with mixed motives cannot be easily placed in the same type with purely political motivation. Nevertheless, the decreased satisfaction of those with mixed motives does not go lower than a neutral position. The grouping toward neutrality may be because one satisfaction indicator asks about re-migration, but these partially politically motivated immigrants are not inclined to return to their country of origin nor can they easily get visas to North America or Europe. Therefore, they stay in Australia; even if not truly satisfied they are relatively satisfied. These migrants are in a state of captivity, not by Australia but by political circumstances. It is best called a voluntary captivity; the vast majority could return to their homeland without facing arrest, but few are likely to do it unless their circumstances in Australia deteriorate dramatically. It is important to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Dissat.</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politics (and not Economics or Employment)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics and Economics, Employment or Travel (1 who was neutral)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics only</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and something other than Travel or Politics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (excluding Economics, Travel, Politics)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics or Employment and Travel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and other than Economics or Employment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel only</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed birthplace but many neutral Ecuadorians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis.+Neut.+Sat. = Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total =</th>
<th>Dissat. =</th>
<th>Neutral =</th>
<th>Satis. =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Default                                                               | 1      | 0        | 1        | 0       |
Five farmers                                                          | 5      | 1        | 0        | 4       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total =</th>
<th>Dissat. =</th>
<th>Neutral =</th>
<th>Satis. =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
note that the sample was collected nine months before the overthrow of President Allende in Chile. Although Chile's political direction has since changed, I believe that these findings apply equally to the pre-Allende, during-Allende and post-Allende immigrants. However, I am certain that there will be strong objections to the previous statement by politically motivated immigrants who see the political Left and Right as different. The point, however, is that both extremes cause political uncertainty. And there is no doubt that Australia offers political security at an exceptionally high level.

At the opposite end of Table 12-1 are the seventeen married male migrants motivated by travel and not by politics, employment or economic factors. Travel is associated with dissatisfaction of married respondents as it is with the single immigrants. However, the married ones motivated only by travel are not younger (mean age thirty-five years) than the other married respondents. Notably the seventeen do not include any Uruguayans or Argentinians and only five Chileans, i.e. those with unique political and economic situations. No additional characteristic improves the results, but this is partly because the number of interviewees in this type is already small.

The results thus far for political and travel motives are exactly as we observed in the analyses of single variables in the preceding chapter. In that chapter we noted that employment/economic factors were not related to migration satisfaction. Table 12-1 still supports that finding. But we suspected that some further characteristics are obscuring the issue. We will now search for those additional influences with a sample of sixty-eight male married, "true" Latin American Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months who were living in Sydney and who named economic factors or employment possibilities among their motives for migrating. Of these, forty-one did not also name
politics or travel motives, and of them, only two named a second reason which was non-economic: an Uruguayan (satisfaction level 6) came because he felt Australia was a better place to raise his two pre-teenage daughters; and an Ecuadorian (level 8) migrated because he already had one friend living in Australia. Since only three of the forty-one named employment possibilities alone and there were not evident differences, the motives of "employment possibilities" and "economic factors" were combined as simply economic reasons.

The distribution of the sixty-eight interviewees in an 8x8 matrix of occupations in Latin America and Australia (like the one in Table 7-4) and according to nine levels of migration satisfaction results in small numbers even when occupational levels are combined. Therefore, the following results are considered trends and all require further testing.

Of the five who were unskilled or semi-skilled in Latin America, none were dissatisfied and three were satisfied. Not speaking fair or better English when interviewed was immaterial. This trend is supported by the three married men with only political or travel motives, but is not supported by the single males or females regardless of motives. At the other end of the spectrum, the nine married professionals and administrators/managers from Latin America were notably dissatisfied. The only satisfied one was a Chilean bank manager over fifty years old with Spanish-born parents (on the fringe of being "non-Latin") who also named the motives of politics and a future for his children. This trend is supported by the married respondents who did not name economic reasons and by the single men and women. In the main the cause appears to be the loss in their occupational positions; nearly three-quarters were doing manual labour below the level of a technician. Whether this is because of weak English, poor or unrecognized qualifications, some other reason, or all of these reasons is not known. Nevertheless, the administrators
and professionals from Latin America are dissatisfied or at best neutral about their migration to Australia. The exceptions are the politically motivated, those speaking good English on arrival and the non-Latins, who by no small coincidence are usually very good English speakers with fewer nationalistic ties to their country of birth. Perhaps with time this general dissatisfaction will change, or someone might show that the measurement of migration satisfaction used here is biased against the professionals and administrators (or other groups), but I doubt it. The conclusion is to discourage the migration of administrator/managers and professionals to Australia if they are not exceptional cases.

The trend for the seventeen married males motivated by economic reasons who were involved in sales or office work in Latin America is toward the neutral levels of migration satisfaction. All are doing blue collar labour in Australia. Since their loss in occupational position is proportionately less than the loss by the professionals and managers, perhaps that explains why the sales and office workers are less dissatisfied.

The final occupational group includes thirteen technicians and twenty-four skilled workers. The group has a wide variety of individuals, the full range of satisfaction levels and a median of 5.2, i.e. almost mid-neutral and almost identical to the median for all sixty-eight of the married interviewees who named an economic motive. The technicians appear to be more satisfied than the skilled workers, but the difference is not statistically significant and there was no precise distinction between technicians and skilled workers during the interviewing. Therefore, they are combined into one group. Within that group of thirty-seven persons there was almost a trend (just failing to be significant at the .10 level in this conservative run of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) that the thirteen who only spoke a little or less English were less satisfied.
Also, when divided according to having attained at least a skilled position in Australia, the fifteen who had attained it were slightly more satisfied (by 1.0 level) than those who were doing unskilled or semi-skilled work, but this was only a trend \((p=.10)\). Although these differences are not sufficient to identify distinct types of technicians and skilled immigrants for the typology, the results fit a general pattern.

The general pattern for the economic motivated married, male, migrants from Latin America is an inverse relationship between the level of occupation in Latin America and migration satisfaction. The Latin American professionals and administrators tend toward dissatisfaction while the office workers are notably neutral. The technicians and skilled workers are also quite neutral as a group, but with more individual variation in migration satisfaction. The unskilled and semi-skilled are neutral or satisfied. The decidedly satisfied nature of the former farmers seems to fit into this sequence if we note that farm work is distinctly manual, has long hours and exposes the farmer to the weather. This suggests that the underlying element in the ordering of the occupations is not the qualifications, but rather is the immigrants' experience with manual versus mental labour. This is, of course, very much related to the fact that about half of the true Latin Americans have unskilled jobs while only 6% of the sixty-eight married with an economic motive, obtained a position above that of a skilled labourer. All of these migrants were in Australia at least six months, and many for two years or more. I do not expect that longer residence will improve this situation very much.

Figure 12-3 shows the typology for the married true Latin American Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than six months.

The typology is now complete. Essentially it is functional and can be used in immigrant selection and counselling. It has weaknesses, the
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main one being the low numbers of interviewees in each final type. That weakness is partially overcome by using the multivariate technique called discriminant analysis. That technique is discussed and used in the next chapter.
CHAPTER XIII
DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS OF
MIGRATION SATISFACTION

SECTION XIII.A. METHOD

In Chapters X and XI we examined the theme issue of migration satisfaction in relation to the migrants' characteristics taken one at a time. Although that gives us information about those attributes of the Latin Americans, the analyses do not let us simply combine those attributes for purposes of identifying other migrants' probable levels of satisfaction with their migration. Essentially, the construction of an identification scheme is a problem for one of the two types of discriminant analysis. Discriminant analysis aims to identify groups of individuals (by combinations of attributes) who are associated with a specified main attribute (in our case migration satisfaction) so that another individual outside the sample can be assigned to its correct group or class.

The literature on discriminant analysis, which has eighteenth century Bayesian antecedents (Van de Geer, 1971, pp. 258-9), began with Fisher in 1936, and includes mathematical explanations by Anderson (1958), Tatsuoka (1971) and Cooley and Lohnes (1971). Hope (1968) discusses the technique in less involved terminology. They are all discussing the first type of

1 M.G. Kendall (1966, pp.165-167) clearly distinguishes between discrimination and classification; the latter aims to subdivide a sample into appropriate but not pre-defined groups or classes. In our case we already have determined the groups, namely dissatisfied and satisfied immigrants. Rao (1965, pp.413-414) suggests that "identification" is a more appropriate term for discrimination.
discriminant analysis. Those calculations are related to linear regression and the discussions are based on variables with normally distributed linear values. The objective of that type of discriminant analysis is to have minimum distances between members of a group and maximum distances between groups. The technique can be useful for identifying a previously unknown group as well as for describing the known groups (Rao, 1965, p.491). Rao calls this "discriminant analysis for research", the more common and more complex type of discriminatory analysis.

The second type is what Rao (p.488) calls "discriminant scores for decision", i.e. where an observed individual is identified as belonging to one of a given set of groups. "The decision rule is ideal where individuals have to be identified in a routine manner as in vocational guidance and medical diagnosis". It follows that it is also useful for immigrant selection. The procedure entails the calculation of a mathematical formula for each of the groups, e.g. for dissatisfied and satisfied immigrants. It is possible to obtain a formula for each of the nine levels of migration satisfaction. Each formula has the form

\[ DS_g = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \ldots + \beta_i X_i \]  

(Equation 12-1)

where

- \( DS_g \) = Discriminant Score for each group \( g \)
- \( \alpha \) = a constant
- \( \beta_i \) = the coefficient to be multiplied with
- \( X_i \) = the actual value for a respondent for the variable \( X_i \)

The calculation of the values of \( \alpha \) and each \( \beta \) for each formula is based on the sample, in our case, the 248 Independent Decision Makers. Then a discriminant analysis score can be calculated for each group \( g \) for each person. That person is then identified as belonging to the group for which he has the highest score. If that DS identification matches his predetermined classification, that is, if it matches his migration satisfaction as measured
by the five satisfaction indicators, we say that he is correctly identified.
If not, we say he is mis-identified by the discriminant score method. Note
that there is no suggestion that his predetermined classification is incorrect.
The discriminant analysis method assumes he is correctly classified. We can
consider the possibility of incorrect classification in the discussion of the
results, but any changes to the original method of classifying the sample
must be done outside of the discriminant analysis technique, (i.e. back in
Chapter IX and Appendix IV).

By the above method, we find out whether or not each individual in the
sample is correctly identified. The higher the percentage correctly
classified, the better is the discriminant procedure, keeping in mind the
number of groups being used. If there are only two groups, a 50% correct
identification is accomplished by chance of guessing. Similarly, the correct
identification by chance is only 33.3% with three groups, 25% with four
groups, 11.1% with nine groups, etc.

The paramount question is: What is the meaning and usefulness of
1) knowing the formulae for discriminant scores for "g" groups and 2)
knowing that y% of the sample are correctly identified by the discriminant
process? (We will use g=two groups and y%=80% in this example.) First,
the formulae for the discriminant scores can be used on any other individual
outside the sample who answered the questions for the variables or characterist-
ics in the formulae. That person can therefore be identified as to which of
the groups he belongs, e.g. satisfied or dissatisfied. This is possible even
though he has not been classified, i.e. he has not been asked the five
satisfaction indicator questions, which in fact cannot be answered until after
arrival in Australia.

By identifying the person's group, the discriminant scores also give his
classification within a known probability of error caused by mis-identification.
If the person is similar to the original sample, i.e. born in Latin America and no more neurotic, criminal, etc. than the original sample, and he is identified as, for example, a dissatisfied immigrant, it is known that there is only one chance in five that his classification is really "satisfied" (based on $y\%=80\%$ in this example). If that person is a potential immigrant, the consulate official has predicted his dissatisfaction and can discourage or prohibit his migration. If that person is an immigrant being interviewed in Australia, the social worker has diagnosed his dissatisfaction and can take corrective action. If it were possible to obtain census data, old surveys, or retrospective questions which answer the required variables, the determination of migration satisfaction at an earlier time period is called the recovery of lost information, a very useful technique for an historical perspective, but subject to the biases of changes over the time period\(^1\).

The two types of discriminant analysis are well founded in theory and practice, but have limitations on the types of variables that can be used. Most work has been done with variables with continuous interval scales, which most of our variables are not. Lachenbruck, Sneeringer and Revo (1973) have shown that even if our variables were on interval scales, they would need to have nearly normal distributions, another characteristic which our variables do not have. Work on discrete distributions, such as our data, is briefly reviewed by Lachenbruch et al (1973, p.40). Their summary is that apart from some recent findings by Revo (1970) which have not yet become established practice, discriminant analysis is not used with discrete or ordered variables

\(^1\) These three uses of discriminant analysis for prediction of the future, diagnosis of the present, and recovery of lost data of the past are discussed by Kendall (1966) for issues other than migration satisfaction.
except when they meet the requirements of Bernoulli variates\textsuperscript{1}.

Bernoulli variates are dichotomous splits of a variable, one part being "attribute present", e.g. male or income below $4,000, the other being "attribute absent", e.g. not male or income not below $4,000. Bernoulli variates have a value of 1 for the "attribute present" and 0 (zero) when it is not present. This means that in the equation for calculating the discriminant scores for each group (as in Equation 12-1), whenever a variable has a value of 1, i.e. "attribute present", such as married, we multiply the appropriate β value times 1, which then equals β, which we add to the other β values plus α to give us the discriminant score. If, however, the variable has a value of zero, i.e. "attribute absent" such as not married, when zero is multiplied by the appropriate β value, the result is zero, which means nothing is added into the discriminant score. This unique property of zero, i.e. that any amount times zero is zero, permits two or more Bernoulli variates to progressively split one of the main variables into several parts. For example, to split the seven levels of knowledge of English on arrival into three parts, we need two Bernoulli variates in the equations for discriminant scores: for variate $V_1$, Codes 1, (no knowledge) is recoded as 1, all others (2-7) are zero; for variate $V_2$, codes 5,6 and 7 (good to excellent ability) are recoded as 1, all others (1-4) are zero. A third variate $V_3$ could be used to separate codes 2,3 and 4 (low to average knowledge) but it is redundant because the persons who are not $V_1$=1, nor $V_2$=1, must be $V_3$=1 (defaulters having been eliminated earlier). Computation time and one degree of freedom are saved by not using $V_3$

\textsuperscript{1} Gilbert (1968) found Bernoulli variates to be satisfactory with linear discriminant functions, i.e. the first and main type of discriminant analysis. It follows and is supported by Dr. S. Wilson, a consultant statistician at the Australian National University, that Bernoulli variates are satisfactory with the second type, i.e. the calculation of discriminant scores for identification.
to represent the remaining codes. The equations obtained are as follow (the values are fictitious and accentuate the differences, but the outcomes are consistent with the results of the tests in Chapter X):

\[
DS_g = \alpha + \beta_1 \cdot V_1 + \beta_2 \cdot V_2 + \ldots \beta_i \cdot V_i \quad \text{(general equation)}
\]

\[
DS_{\text{dissat}} = -0.5 + 2 \cdot V_1 + 3 \cdot V_2 + \ldots \beta_i \cdot V_i \quad \text{(equation for dissatisfied)}
\]

\[
DS_{\text{sat}} = -2 + 3 \cdot V_1 + 6 \cdot V_2 + \ldots \beta_i \cdot V_i \quad \text{(equation for satisfied)}
\]

Consider the case where all other variables from \(V_3\) to \(V_i\) have been controlled. Since they therefore have equal influence on both DS values, we can say that the extra variables add zero to the two DS values. Therefore the prediction of the potential immigrant's satisfaction depends on his language ability. There are three applicants (A, B & C), one in each of the three levels of knowledge of English before arrival. The two discriminant scores are calculated for each applicant with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of English on arrival</th>
<th>DS (_{\text{dissat}})</th>
<th>DS (_{\text{sat}})</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant A (no knowledge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore (V_1 = 1, V_2 = 0)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant B (low to average)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V_1 = 1, V_2 = 0)</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant C (good to high)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V_1 = 0, V_2 = 1)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If only one potential immigrant is to be selected, the choice is clearly Applicant C; if three are needed (e.g. to meet a quota of bricklayers) all are selected. (Of course, if Applicants A and B found out their chances of success in terms of migration satisfaction, they might decline to migrate.) But what if two are needed (or if C declines and one is still needed)? Which
one, A or B, is to receive the visa? Applicant B knows more English, but there is a bigger difference (1.5) between his two discriminant scores than there is for A (0.5). Applicant A, who speaks no English, comes closer to being identified as satisfied than does B. Given that there is a chance (e.g. 20%) of having been misclassified, Applicant A might still make the migration and be satisfied. Even more likely, he might be in the neutral classification of migration satisfaction. If three classes, i.e. dissatisfied, neutral, and satisfied, are used, all that is needed is a third equation for DS_{neutral}. Similarly, discriminant analysis is perfectly capable of making nine equations, one for each of the nine levels of migration satisfaction.

The value of discriminant analysis is hardly appreciated from these simplistic examples. Its value is more evident when we see how it has handled our sample of 248 Independent Decision Makers, each with several dozen variables.

SECTION XIII.B. RESULTS FROM DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES

With the aid of computers it is possible to run hundreds of discriminant analyses, each with one or two variables changed slightly. This may indeed be needed if the technique is to be practically applied to determining a migrant's satisfaction level via surrogate measures. Our purpose, however, is to determine if there is sufficient justification for further work on the discriminant analysis of migration satisfaction. To that end this study is merely exploratory; the sample of Latin Americans is not random, there are many other questions the migrants can be asked, and the coding methods and

---

1 The tests were run using the DISCRIM programme, version 3.06, revision 3B, of the P-STAT package at the Computer Centre of the Australian National University.
scales here are almost exclusively Bernoulli variates, i.e. they are of a yes/no or attribute present/absent type. These limitations can be overcome with relative ease once we determine if the result would merit the effort and expenditure.

SECTION XIII.B.1  An Exemplary Test

From the results of the variables tested individually in Chapters X and XI, we select those most likely to separate the respondents according to their level of migration satisfaction. The ten used in this exemplary run are listed in Table 13-1. From the sample of Latin America-born Independent Decision Makers in Australia for more than six months were excluded one non-Latin and ten "true" Latin persons who were widowed, divorced or separated, thus reducing the sample size to 237 respondents.

The respondents were placed into three groups of migration satisfaction: levels 1, 2, 3 are dissatisfied; 4, 5, 6 are neutral; and 7, 8, 9 are satisfied. The numbers of respondents in each group were reasonably balanced at 82, 74 and 81, respectively.

There are three basic questions to be answered by the discriminant analysis printout:

a: To what extent can we predict migration satisfaction based on the selected surrogate variables?

b: If the degree of prediction is high enough, what can we say about those variables individually and as a group?

c: What does the discriminant analysis tell us about which variables are the most important?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>BERNULLI VARIATE ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE CODES</th>
<th>ITEM NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VAR 01 Assisted Passage</td>
<td>Assisted</td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VAR 02 Marital Status</td>
<td>Single on arrival</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VAR 08 Education</td>
<td>Secondary or technical</td>
<td>21 + 37</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VAR 09 Change in Income</td>
<td>Much worse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VAR 10 Change in Occupation Status</td>
<td>Much worse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VAR 11 Income in Australia</td>
<td>(Interval scale using original codes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VAR 15 Main reason for migrating</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VAR 17 Family/friends in Australia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A 19 Change in Income</td>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A 20 Change in Occupational Status</td>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION XIII.B.1.a The Extent of Prediction

The first of those questions is the most important one for the exploratory aspect of this survey. The answer comes almost at the end of the printout where we find out how many of the respondents had their migration satisfaction identified correctly based on the variables (ten in this case) as compared with their level of migration satisfaction determined by the five satisfaction indicators. For this exemplary test, 130 out of 237 (54.9%) were correctly identified. That result is encouraging but not
exceptional since by random chance we expect 33.3% to fall into their correct satisfaction group. The DA of this particular group of ten variables has improved our predictability by 32%, that is, 21.6 percentage units of the 66.7% which is misclassified purely on random chance. (We will see in the next section that a better percentage of correct classification can be obtained even using these same 10 variables.)

There are four points worth mentioning here. Firstly, all of the respondents had been screened and selected by Immigration officials to come to Australia. The difficulty of our task is therefore increased: we are separating the dissatisfied from a group which was at least in part selected because of their likelihood of being satisfied with Australia.

Secondly, only 11% are grossly misclassified, i.e. ten satisfied respondents were identified as dissatisfied and sixteen dissatisfied ones were judged to be satisfied on the basis of the ten variables used in this exemplary test. Although an even better result is preferred, the ability to get 89% of the respondents into their correct or adjoining migration satisfaction group indicates that discriminant analysis can be useful for establishing methods to identify satisfied, neutral and dissatisfied migrants.

Thirdly, acknowledging that improvements can be made in assessing migration satisfaction, a portion of the "mis-identified" may in fact be identified correctly by discriminant analysis and be classified incorrectly by the five satisfaction indicators. Recalling that the differences between levels 3 and 4 and between levels 6 and 7 are not great, some error from original mis-classification is quite possible.

The fourth point is the tendency that the more satisfied a migrant is, the more likely he is to be assigned to his correct group: 48.8% of dissatisfied, 54.1% of neutrals, and 61.7% of satisfied respondents were correctly identified. (This trend was not always evident in subsequent DA
tests). In general it means either that the use of surrogate variables (e.g. the ten in this test) is less efficient or accurate for dissatisfied migrants than for satisfied ones or there are more errors in the original classifications (i.e. from the five satisfaction indicators) for the dissatisfied than for the satisfied respondents. The latter errors will probably be overcome through improvements in measuring migration satisfaction. The former may never be overcome if dissatisfaction is more complex psychologically than is satisfaction, i.e. if more issues, rationalizations, etc. affect a dissatisfied person than a satisfied one.

To conclude, there is, in my opinion, ample evidence to justify further use of discriminant analysis in studies of migration satisfaction.

SECTION XIII.B.1.b The Discriminant Functions

Having decided (at least for the moment) that the DA which assigns 54.9% of the respondents to their correct satisfaction group is worthy of further consideration, we turn to the other values on the computer printout. The discriminant functions give an equation for each of the three discriminant scores. For example, the equation for $D_{\text{satisfied}}$ is:

$$D_{\text{satisfied}} = -9.0328 + 4.8560 \ (\text{VAR} \ 1) + 2.6447 \ (\text{VAR} \ 2) + 3.0165 \ (\text{VAR} \ 8) + \ldots + 2.3956 \ (\text{A20})$$

Therefore, if we know the characteristics of a Latin American who was not in the sample, we can identify his satisfaction level with about 55% confidence of being correct, instead of only a 33.3% chance of guessing his satisfaction level correctly.

For example, consider a Latin American (Migrant X) who had passage assistance (Var 1=1), was married before arrival (Var 2=0), had a secondary education (Var 8=1), ...., and did have a change in occupation status of "much better" (A 20=1). Processing this information, the
following determinations are obtained for Migrant X: (The fourth through
ninth variables are all assumed to be zero (attribute not present) )

Migrant X (Dissatisfied) = 10.4928 + 5.4795(1) + 3.3874(0) + 2.8296(1) +

........ + (0-8370)1 = -3.0207

Migrant X (Neutral) = -9.2319 + 5.6363(1) + 2.6610(0) + 2.2719(1) +

........ + (-1.4587)1 = -2.3353

Migrant X (Satisfied) = -9.0328 + 4.8560(1) + 2.6447(0) + 3.0165(1) +

........ + 2.3956(1) = +1.2353

Taking the highest of the three scores, we classify Migrant X as
"satisfied" and say that we are nearly 55% sure that he is correctly
classified as satisfied and 89% sure that he would not be dissatisfied.

The objectiveness of this discriminant analysis technique based on
the responses of Latin Americans already in Australia is evident. Coupling
it with the experience and judgement of social workers and immigration
officials should produce better advice and assistance for the immigrants.

SECTION XIII.B.1.c Analysing the Effect of the Variables Used

In addition to giving the percentage of correct identification and
the discriminant functions, the computer printout provides two useful
tables for assessing the contribution of each variable in the discriminant
analysis. The first one (Table 13-2) gives the means for each variable for
each of the three migration satisfaction groups and also for the three
groups together. The usefulness of this table is limited because all but
one variable are of the Bernoulli type, i.e. score 1 if the attribute is
present and score zero if absent. The means are therefore between zero and
one.1 Their value is in the trends across the three satisfaction groupings.

1 A key-punch error resulted in unassisted respondents being coded as 2
instead of zero in VAR 01, hence those means are between 1 and 2. This
error, which went undetected until after completion of this section,
causes only minor variations in these exploratory and exemplary tests.
It does not in any way alter the conclusions.
TABLE 13-2
MEANS OF EACH VARIABLE FOR ALL GROUPS TOGETHER (COMMON)
AND FOR EACH GROUP SEPARATELY FOR 10 VARIABLES
USED IN THE EXEMPLARY DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMMON</th>
<th>DISAT</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>SATIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VAR 01</td>
<td>1.4177</td>
<td>1.4634</td>
<td>1.4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VAR 02</td>
<td>.4641</td>
<td>.5854</td>
<td>.4730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VAR 08</td>
<td>.6709</td>
<td>.6951</td>
<td>.6081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VAR 09</td>
<td>.0802</td>
<td>.1098</td>
<td>.0270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VAR 10</td>
<td>.3333</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.2432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VAR 11</td>
<td>4.7089</td>
<td>4.2927</td>
<td>4.5135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VAR 15</td>
<td>.2194</td>
<td>.3293</td>
<td>.2432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VAR 17</td>
<td>.4051</td>
<td>.5122</td>
<td>.4865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A 19</td>
<td>.1435</td>
<td>.0732</td>
<td>.1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A 20</td>
<td>.0211</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, if the means for a variable $V_i$ are the same for all three groups, we should consider omitting that variable in the future tests. If the means progressively increase, a trend is observed which probably supports an earlier hypothesis that variable $V_i$ is positively correlated with increasing satisfaction. A decrease indicates a probable inverse correlation. But what we sometimes find is that the mean increases (or decreases) between two groups and then levels off, as in VAR 10 (fifth row). This is interpreted as follows: dissatisfied migrants are more likely to have a "much worse" change in occupational status than are neutral or satisfied groups of migrants, but the latter two groups are not different from each other in that attribute.

Most interesting are the means for VAR 8 (Secondary and Technical Education) and VAR 9 ("much worse" income). For both of those variables
the three means are U-shaped. Respondents with secondary/technical education and those with much worse incomes in Australia are less likely to have neutral satisfaction. However, neither of those two variables as used in this exemplary test do much for separating the dissatisfied from the satisfied respondents. That conclusion is also supported by the second table in the print-out. The second table from the computer (Table 13-3) is of univariate and multivariate F values and probabilities for each variable. We desire high F values and low probabilities that the differences observed could be merely the result of chance selection. Those variables are the ones which contribute most to the success of the discriminant analysis. From the printout we can identify them readily.

In general, by keeping the strongest variables and replacing the weak ones with better variables we can improve on the accuracy of the discriminant analysis. Because two or more variables may measure the same or mutually caused attributes, the multivariate F values and probabilities are more important than the univariate F scores. The table from the exemplary test reveals that variables VAR 10, VAR 17 and A 20 are the most important; Variables VAR 9, VAR 11 and A 19, (all of which deal with income) contribute the least to the DA in their present form. Income will have to be treated in a different way or else be deleted from the discriminant analysis. We will examine that question in the next section.

* * * * * *

The preceding exemplary test of discriminant analysis has been described in detail. Its results suggest that further use of DA is warranted, at least for the data on the Latin Americans. The exemplary test is the first one in the following set of tests in which a few variables were systematically changed while others were held static.
### TABLE 13-3

**UNIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE F VALUES**

(AND PROBABILITIES) FOR 10 VARIABLES

USED IN THE EXEMPLARY DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

Univariate degrees of freedom are 2 and 234
Multivariate degrees of freedom are 2 and 225

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNIV. F</th>
<th>UNIV. PROB.</th>
<th>MULT. F</th>
<th>MULT. PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VAR 01</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.1664</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VAR 02</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.0051</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VAR 08</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.3834</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VAR 09</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.1242</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VAR 10</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VAR 11</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.0080</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VAR 15</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VAR 17</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A 19</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.0445</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A 20</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.0070</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERALIZED MAHALANOBIS D SQUARE** = 89.15
WITH 20 DEGREES OF FREEDOM.

INTERPRETED AS A CHI SQUARE, THIS D SQUARE VALUE
INDICATES A PROBABILITY OF .0000 THAT THE MEAN
VALUES ARE THE SAME IN ALL THE GROUPS FOR EACH OF
THE VARIABLES.
SECTION XIII.B.2  A Set of Eight Discriminant Analyses

This set of discriminant analyses consists of eight computer runs with slight changes in the same ten variables used in the exemplary test. Table 13-4 summarises those tests. The results are mainly methodological and are briefly stated below:

SECTION XIII.B.2.a To Include or Exclude Missing Data, i.e. Defaults

Four pairs of tests were run: 1 & 2; 3 & 4; 5 & 6; 7 & 8. The only difference was that the first test in each pair included all 237 respondents while the paired test omitted those who defaulted on any of the ten variables. Omitting the defaulters reduces the sample size but also removes the ambiguity of placing the defaulter into the "attribute absent" side of the Bernoulli variates when in fact he might have had the attribute. The overall results were improvements of 1% to 2.5% in the percentages correctly identified by the DA when the defaulting respondents were excluded. By excluding the defaulters the percentage correctly assigned in the exemplary test is increased to 57.4%. The defaulters were distributed proportionately between the three groups of migration satisfaction; there are no evident biases in the defaulting to suggest that the defaulters should be included.

SECTION XIII.B.2.b Alteration or Exclusion of the "Income" and "Change in Income" Variables

In the ten variables used, income in Australia appears directly or indirectly three times. The first two tests suggest we exclude them all. However, since only 37 persons said their income was "much better" (code 5), they were combined with those who said their income
### TABLE 13-4

**SUMMARY OF EIGHT DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES OF SELECTED VARIABLES RELATING TO THE MIGRATION SATISFACTION OF THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENTS IN AUSTRALIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run Number</th>
<th>A19 Change in Income</th>
<th>A20 Change in Status</th>
<th>Missing Data (Defaults)</th>
<th>Included or Excluded</th>
<th>Percentage Correctly Classified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>28.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8*</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>31.3*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Runs 7 and 8 used all nine levels of migration satisfaction. The percent that would be correctly identified by chance is 11.1%.
was "better" (95 persons). When run in DA tests 3 and 4, the multivariate F value rose from 0.49 (test 2) to 6.64 (test 4), making that question the best discriminator in that test (multivariate probability of .0016). At the same time it drove upwards the probabilities of the other two income variables. The "income in Australia" variable, which was on an interval scale rather than on a dichotomous Bernoulli division, had an unacceptable multivariate probability of 0.588. It will be deleted from future tests. Similarly, the "much worse" income in Australia does not merit further use.

SECTION XIII.B.2.c Alteration of "Change in Occupational Status" Variable

When "much better" occupational status was used in tests 1-4, all five of the respondents with that attribute were in the satisfied group. With such a small size, the shift of one respondent to the neutral or dissatisfied groups would entirely change the F values. Therefore the attribute was expanded to include the twenty respondents whose occupational status was "better", i.e. codes 4 and 5 were combined as the "attribute present" portion of the dichotomy. That lowered by an almost negligible 0.5% the percentage correctly assigned, but at the same time improves the multivariate F value slightly. The decision was to keep the "better" and "much better" respondents together because larger numbers make the results less susceptible to chance errors from sample selection.

SECTION XIII.B.2.d Using the Nine Levels of Migration Satisfaction instead of the Three Main Satisfaction Groups

Briefly, there were no major improvements from using the full range of nine levels of migration satisfaction as in test 8. It did show that 31.3% were correctly assigned (only 11.1% would result from random
chance). However, the detail given for the nine levels complicated the interpretation for these still exploratory tests of discriminant analysis. Therefore, it is considered adequate to use only the three main groups until a more refined group of variables with a higher percentage of correct assignment has been found.

SECTION XIII.B.3 Further Testing Needed

The preceding results are most encouraging, especially in light of all the interviewees having been approved immigrants, i.e. accepted by experienced immigration officers. Yet, of those accepted migrants we can, after only a few exploratory discriminant analyses, correctly predict the main satisfaction level of nearly two of every three persons from the same population as our sample. And there are many very probable ways of improving the proportion correctly identified (see below). Clearly, further testing is warranted¹.

There are three main ways of improving the proportions correctly identified. One is the previously mentioned improvement of the original classification of migrants, i.e. to improve upon the five satisfaction indicators. The second way is to use different variables, e.g., English levels, actual change in occupational status (instead of or together with the relative change variable), and non-Latin-ness. A similar effect to selecting different variables is accomplished by the third way of improving the proportions. That way is to separate the key groups, e.g. the single migrants and political migrants, and calculate discriminant functions for each group. In effect, this is either a reduction of "noise" in the sample or a determination of which groups are best described by the discriminant equations. This is

¹ The testing is not conducted here for several reasons, the main one being a confusion about possible computer programme errors. The version used has recently been judged free of the suspected errors.
consistent with Martin's (1965, p.99) statement that "... the search for gross relationships within the total migrant population is likely to prove less rewarding than the search for relationships within sociologically meaningful categories". A small scale example clarifies this situation.

For each of the eight farmers in the sample, the three discriminant equation scores were calculated using the results of Run No. 5 of the previously described analyses. Seventy-five percent of the farmers were correctly identified by the equations, compared with 56% of the non-farmers. However, small numbers meant that the difference was not statistically significant. Identical results were also found for the four non-Latins who had British passports before migrating. These are fair indications that special groups can be separated or that another variable in the equations (e.g. farmer vs. non-farmer) will improve results. Of course, only a limited number of variables (depending on the sample size) can be included in one run, otherwise the results are based on too few respondents for each type and are not statistically significant. However, the indications here are that quite high proportions of correct identification can be obtained using less than ten key variables. One of those key variables is probably having friends or relatives from Latin America also in Australia. But this is an individual or family issue, not one related to a large flow from a source nation. In other words, there is no indication that because there are many migrants from, say, Chile, that they are more satisfied than those from Mexico who are fewer in number. Therefore, there is no apparent substantiation for the "Borrie Report" (1975, p.736) statement that "concentration on a few focal points rather than spread will almost certainly yield better results in terms of ... satisfaction for the migrant after settlement."

There are two final comments about further testing. First, a variety
of surveys already exist which have asked sufficient questions to replicate at least in part the results on the Latin Americans. Satisfaction questions have been included in the studies by Richardson and Appleyard (British settlers), Taft (Dutch), Heiss (Italian), Johnston (Polish), Survey Section (South Americans) and the Council's Immigration Survey which includes all immigrant groups being asked the same questions at the same time period in Australia.

Second, since discriminant analysis apparently works with migration satisfaction, it will probably also work with identification, acculturation, assimilation, integration or with whatever other aspect of immigrant adjustment one may wish to investigate. This technique should have very fruitful applications to immigrant studies and elsewhere in the social sciences in the near future.

SECTION XIII.C APPLYING AND INTERPRETING THE TYPOLOGY AND DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES

SECTION XIII.C.1 General Comment

The results of the typology in Chapter XII and of the discriminant analyses in this chapter all suggest that migration satisfaction is linked with a few attributes and that these attributes can be combined to provide an increasingly more accurate estimation of any immigrant's present migration satisfaction. But one question must be answered if either the typology or the discriminant analyses is to be used in immigrant selection: How can post-migration characteristics be used in selecting migrants who, by definition, have not yet migrated? Although the answer is that they cannot be used, there appears to be no reason why surrogate measures cannot be substituted. For example, if English ability after six or twelve months in Australia should be used, we can substitute a composite score derived from
the following pre-migration characteristics: 1) pre-migration English ability; 2) ability with other languages; 3) score on a test of ability to learn a foreign language, particularly English; 4) previous contact with English speakers (e.g., a trip to the United States); 5) likelihood of being enrolled in an intensive English course soon after arrival in Australia; 6) level of English spoken by the people with whom the prospective migrant will be a) living and b) working; 7) proximity to other Spanish/Portuguese speakers in Australia; and 8) other items which specialists on this topic will suggest.

Another example concerns the occupation the prospective immigrant will have in Australia. Apart from his pre-migration experience and qualifications, the factors to consider include: 1) pre-arranged recognition of qualifications in Australia; 2) a pre-arranged position for employment on arrival; 3) unfilled job vacancies in that field in the region of Australia where the migrant will be living; 4) further factors which influence occupational levels such as English ability (N.B. this is not duplicating the influence of English ability any more than it was inherently duplicated in the post-migration attributes used in the typology and discriminant analyses); 5) other factors found to relate to regaining one's occupation in Australia (possibly the degree of mechanization in the country of origin(?)).

Some post-migration characteristics such as marriage after arrival are harder to replace with surrogate measures. However, they seem to be of lesser importance and can possibly be replaced by introducing statistical chance and the laws of probability. This is not a serious deficiency since the final results are all subject to statistical limitations. The system will never be 100% perfect because individuals are unique. The objective is to improve the system as much as possible so that it will be a useful addition to the present methods of migrant selection and assistance.
To bridge the gap from this exploratory study to practical application at each location where migrants are selected is no small task. But neither is it a large nor a difficult task for the Department of Immigration which has many resources, including prior surveys, at its disposal. It is also an evolutionary task which can start small and be allowed to grow as needed; it can be phased in region by region. Furthermore, for each main type of immigrant the procedures are progressively self-refining as the pool of correctly classified respondents grows larger. Also, it does not require expensive random sampling to set up the system. Once operative, the system is applicable to all applicants, not just those who are approved, i.e. to hundreds of thousands of people per year. The use of the system is as simple as multiplication and addition. It can even be used by the applicants themselves. This raises two conflicting viewpoints.

Should a system used for immigrant selection be available to applicants? One side says "no" because then an applicant can answer the questions in ways to ensure acceptance. But there can be simple checking of marital status, age, sex, occupation, etc., cross-examination on motives, scores on language tests, etc. These checks are all available to immigration officials who are already using them for selection in less objective ways and who will always be the final deciding authority. The typology and equations are to assist, not to replace immigration officers. Finally, "cheating" by applicants is very difficult where the numbers of possible attributes and questions are so large and where no single item is the sole criterion for selection. Also, an applicant who gives false information will in fact probably be less satisfied, i.e., he has done a disservice to himself and his family.

The opposing conflicting viewpoint concerns whether potential migrants (and their home government) can be excluded from knowing the criteria on which
their future is based? For example, if Australia (or any selecting nation) needs electrical or other skilled workers, the temptation is to accept qualified applicants even though they might have a high probability of being dissatisfied. There is nothing wrong with accepting migrants who will probably be dissatisfied as long as the migrant is fully aware before migrating of the probable results of his move.

My conclusion is that most of the selection procedures, or at least the results as applied to that person, should be available to interested applicants, accepted migrants, and present immigrant residents. Furthermore, the governments of source nations should have 100% access to the full procedures (but not individual results(?) ) because the procedures have relevance to the future wellbeing of their citizens for whom they have a responsibility. For these reasons I do not hesitate to state my results and recommendations openly.

SECTION XIII.C.2 Recommendations for Migrants from Latin America

The recommendations presented here must be viewed with reservations. The interviews were conducted in early 1973 when Sydney's Latin American community was smaller and before various changes in the ever changing immigration procedures and assistance programmes. At that time there was a minor economic slump, but not totally unlike the situation in late 1977. The sample was small, the questions need refining, and the analyses were explicitly exploratory. I trust that further work will be stimulated by these results, even if only to contradict these initial recommendations. The recommendations are for mutually exclusive types; persons in two or more groups should decide accordingly.

a. Non-Latins, particularly Anglo-Latin Americans and others fluent in English, regardless of occupation, will very likely find a good and satisfying life in Australia. Their only concern need be about giving up
their present situation which for many is certainly higher than the solid middle and upper-middle class life they should anticipate in Australia.

b. Young single males and females, regardless of qualifications, willing to do manual labour for many years, will find a good life in Australia, especially if they are outgoing individuals able to make new friends quickly. Not many will be outright satisfied, but that may be a characteristic of being young and not settled. If motivated by travel, they will be more disillusioned than others after the novelty of Australia gives way within 6 to 12 months to the realistic awareness (pro and con) of living in an Anglo-Saxon environment. Those with skills which they expect to use are likely to be rather dissatisfied.

c. For the politically motivated, Australia is a haven of security. If the political motivation is strong, it overrides most other problems. But if political motivation is weak or non-existent, the migrant's other basic motives (except travel) are not a basis for predicting satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

d. Those strongly interested in education for themselves or their children over the age of ten should not immigrate unless they already have a good knowledge of English. The language difficulties can prevent many from accomplishing their educational goals, in spite of intellectual abilities.

e. Skilled and technical workers are as likely to be satisfied as dissatisfied; the overall trend is toward neutral satisfaction. The difficulties in re-entering their fields in Australia appear to be less cause for dissatisfaction than for white collar workers, but more detailed examination of their employment is needed because of a range of levels within the skilled and technical workers category.
f. Most white-collar workers in Latin America can expect to do blue-collar work in Australia regardless of their qualifications. Therefore, unless they have special circumstances such as strong political motivation, fluency in English, pre-arranged recognition of qualifications, or a pre-arranged position, Latin America's professionals, managers, office staff and salesmen are courting dissatisfaction if they migrate. Perhaps more so for these higher trained immigrants than for others, there are exceptions because of individual differences. There are also numerous modifiers like friends and family members in Australia and an element of luck.

g. Unskilled and semi-skilled workers and probably farmers (all accustomed to manual labour) are very likely to be satisfied, more likely from an improved standard of living and willingness to do manual labour in Australia, than because of other characteristics. However, immigration of these people to Australia is quite limited.

Although generalized, there is ample evidence (Chapter XII) to justify these recommendations. They also coincide with my tentative observations on class and satisfaction presented at the 1973 A.N.Z.A.A.S. Conference in Perth.

SECTION XIII.C.3  Socio-Economic Class and Migration Satisfaction

At the August 1973 Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science (A.N.Z.A.A.S.), I presented a premature paper on the Latin Americans in Australia. A representative from the Department of Immigration politely challenged my paper as not being supported by evidence. Some supporting evidence is now in this present study, so I will restate more clearly and with minor modifications the hypothesis put forth in the conference paper and its discussion.

Socio-economic class or status, too large a topic to discuss here in
detail, is essentially a complex, multi-dimensional continuum (Cuber and Kenkel, 1954, p.292 and pp. 303ff) which covers the range from lower to upper classes as described in Chapter II for Latin Americans. Its main elements used here are occupational levels and education. Migration satisfaction is also a continuum which, like class, is not measured on an interval scale. Therefore the statistical description of the relationship in the following hypothesis and figure is very approximate:

**HYPOTHESIS:** Socio-economic class (measured primarily by occupation) has a curvilinear influence on migration satisfaction, and that relationship is less distinct for the higher classes because of greater variability in individuals, especially in language ability.

Graphically, the relationship is shown in Figure 13-1; the lettered areas on the graph correspond to the lettered types of Latin Americans in Australia presented in the recommendations in the preceding section.

The results of this study support but do not conclusively prove the hypothesis. Much work remains to be done for refining and testing the hypothesis with Latin Americans and with other immigrants in Australia, not only from developing countries but also from English-speaking nations. It also needs to be tested overseas and/or in non-metropolitan areas to see how variations in the host environment influence the curve.

The implications of this now partially supported hypothesis are fundamental to Australia's immigration programme and its immigrants. The hypothesis is individual-based, not nation-based. It goes against some policies while supporting others.

The two upper ends of the curve are opposites. One end has the high status English-speaking, educated, skilled non-Latins. They are not the same as British immigrants because their origin (Latin America) is so different from the United Kingdom. If they were pushed enough to leave Latin America they are unlikely to want to return there. On the other hand,
FIGURE 13-1

A DIAGRAMMATIC HYPOTHESIS OF THE CORRELATION BETWEEN MIGRATION SATISFACTION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO TYPES OF LATIN AMERICA-BORN MIGRANTS IN AUSTRALIA

KEY

ZONES OF STRENGTH OF CORRELATION

- Main trend of the correlation (the zone with the majority of migrants)
- Secondary or fringe zones parallel to the main trend
- Zones with few or no migrants

TYPES OF LATIN AMERICA-BORN IMMIGRANTS (PRE-MIGRATION CHARACTERISTICS)
(see recommendations in Section XIII.C.2.)

a - Non-Latin
b - Young single males and females
c - With strong political motivation
d - Strongly interested in education
e - Skilled and technical workers
f - White-collar workers
g - Unskilled and semi-skilled workers and farmers
the non-Latins are possibly quite similar to "non-Asians, or "non-Africans", i.e. persons of European descent from the developing nations of Malaysia, Kenya, etc. Streams of these migrants have certainly been coming to Australia much the same as the non-Latin flow from Latin America to Australia has continued throughout the past hundred years. I consider them as optimal migrants, but ones which Latin America does not like to lose. Also, their numbers are not sufficient for Australia's immigration needs.

At the other consistently satisfied upper end of the curve are the migrants Australia least wants but of which there is an unlimited supply. They will be there whenever Australia wants experienced manual workers to fill vacancies for manual labour, as done in North America up to fifty years ago, and still being done in the form of illegal Mexican "braceros" willing to work for low wages.

Unfortunately, the migrants Australia wants most are the ones who become most dissatisfied or tend to be neutral. It does not mean that these migrants will depart, at least not immediately. Although a third of the sample was dissatisfied, a relatively small number of all Latin American settlers have left Australia. Only 1030 left from the beginning of the main flow in mid-1969 until mid-1976, i.e. about 3% (Consolidated Statistics, 1977, Table 24). There are many reasons for this, two main ones being their still relatively short periods of residence and the fact that dissatisfaction does not necessarily lead to departure (see Richardson, 1974, pp.97-101 and the studies reviewed by Taft, 1965). There are also other factors like travel costs (about $3000 for a family of four to cross the South Pacific), reluctance to admit a "mistake", hope for improvement in Australia, and fear of indefinite situations which may deteriorate in Latin America, especially in the major source nations of Chile, Argentina
and Uruguay. So they stay although not satisfied; and they are frequently the problem cases which require social work and employment assistance. These are often the skilled, the technicians, the white collar workers and the managerial/professional people who frequently suffer from under-utilization of their skills, which in turn is strongly influenced by English ability and by acceptance by Australian unions, professional associations, employers and the general public. There are other factors, but a loss in one's occupational level is a prime factor which also has international repercussions. The proverbial "brain drain" is bad enough in the eyes of developing nations without adding insult to injury by not employing the migrants at their levels of capability. That also negates the argument that the flow of skills is often a release of a surplus of some skills in Third World countries. An example is primary teachers in Peru (Levett, discussions in 1977). More correctly, the surplus is in Lima and major cities; the rural areas are less desirable (as in Australia) and short of teachers. So a qualified primary teacher is accepted by Australia and works packing cigarettes in Sydney where the likelihood of entering a teaching position is far less than in Peru. Bluntly, Latin America's loss has not been any gain for Australia.
CHAPTER XIV

CONCLUSION

This is a study about people from Latin America who are living in Australia. It is also a study about migration satisfaction as a concept and measurable characteristic. Each of these two studies (PARTS TWO and THREE, respectively) builds upon the other and upon the background to the migration covered in PART ONE.

There is abundant historical material in the censuses about the pre-1960 settlers who were born in Latin America. However, as shown in Chapter IV, they were distinctly "non-Latin" in character, being predominantly descendants from British migrants to Latin America, i.e. Anglo-Argentinians, etc.. Others like them are continuing to emigrate to Australia, but they are now a minority and can be separated as one type of Latin Americans in the typology in Chapter VIII. Another interesting but peripheral group are the "thru-migrants" who came from but were not born in Latin America (Appendix VII). Both the "thru-migrants" and the "non-Latins" (including the very long-term residents) provide contrasts with the "true" Latin Americans who are the focus of the study.

The main flow of migrants was a slowly growing trickle in the early 1960's. Then in 1969 the Australian Department of Immigration facilitated selection, visa issuing and passage assistance (approximately half of the air fares), thereby overcoming the obstacles to the migratory flow (Section III.C.).
Since 1974 (and continuing in 1977) the Latin Americans in Australia are the fastest growing immigrant group in both yearly intake and rate of growth. The cumulative total of about 33,000 persons (mid-1976) equals or surpasses the numbers from the slightly earlier and present source areas of Turkey, Lebanon, Cyprus and Egypt and from the much earlier source areas of Hungary, the Baltics and Scandinavia. Apart from Yugoslavs and British immigrants, the only immigrant groups which exceed the Latin Americans in total numbers are those with much longer periods of residence, i.e. the Poles, Dutch, Germans, Maltese, Greeks and Italians. And more important, all indications are for the continuing growth of the Latin Americans faster than any other non-British group. These indications reflect the situation in Latin America (Chapter II) where the aspiring middle class is confronted with the problems of Third World nations and experience various political and economic pressures which promote emigration from time to time. The political and economic motives are the main ones for married migrants, but the motive of travel is very important for single migrants regardless of birthplace (Section VIII.A.). These middle class people with experience and qualifications are precisely the type sought by Australia and the type now difficult to obtain from many other past and present sources. Latin America's base population of over 300 million persons with basic uniformity of history, culture, religion and languages, a growing middle class with experience in metropolitan living, and divided among nineteen political - economic entities, virtually ensures as many immigrants as Australia is likely to desire. At present nearly three-fourths of all these immigrants have come from only three nations: Chile, Argentina and Uruguay. The potential is quite clear.

The above mentioned findings are part of the background to the flow and are covered mainly in PART ONE. That background focuses our attention
onto the contemporary Latin Americans in Australia, the topic of PART TWO.

Over 70% of the contemporary Latin Americans in Australia have settled in Sydney, mainly along a dispersed band from the eastern suburbs to Fairfield, with a notable concentration in Ku-Ring-Gai. This spread through the high status, average, and poorer suburbs is indicative of the wide variations in the immigrants themselves and their achievements in Sydney. Of course, the variations within the group of Latin Americans can also be found in other immigrant groups and in the Australian population in general. Apart from the obvious differences of language, food, etc., a well-to-do Latin American in Sydney is not vastly different from a well-to-do Greek immigrant or native Australian. In some ways they are closer together than are the well-to-do Latin American and his poorer compatriots.

The immigrants' stages in the life cycle are also closely related to their situations in Australia. For example, many of the single migrants live together in flats. Other important groups are the young married couples and the families with children in primary school. All of these types are noted for being younger than 35 years old; this is a characteristic of Australia's immigrant selection as well as a trait of migrants in general. There are comparatively few middle aged and elderly migrants in these initial years of the flow.

All of the above findings point to a conclusion easily overlooked or taken for granted in immigrant studies: these immigrants are human beings trying to live normal lives. The Latin Americans have many similarities with other residents of Australia. They get up each morning, eat breakfast, take a car or train to work, talk to people, hope for a wage increase, go shopping, try to make ends meet, spend evenings with their families and friends, laugh, cry, watch television and in general do the everyday things that make them
no different from other men and women. Being people, they are unique individuals and diverse. It is therefore not surprising that a single "community" of Latin Americans does not exist in Sydney. Attempts at forming all-encompassing clubs in Sydney failed in the early 1970's, but as numbers have grown, it has been possible to establish several clubs mainly along national lines. Nevertheless, the recentness of the flow has meant an absence of services, resources and communication within the population of Latin Americans in Sydney. In this sense Latin Americans as a whole are less able to cope with difficulties than are the longer established Greek and Italian populations with their various ethnic and welfare organizations. However, with time this problem will probably be resolved.

A more serious problem for which there is no easy solution concerns their education, qualifications and employment (Chapter VII). The Latin Americans have been selected largely on the basis of their qualifications and experience, but many are working at levels below their previous occupations. This situation does not seem to improve much with longer periods of residence. English language ability is an important factor in the under-utilization of skills, but again, after the first six months, there is only slow improvement. This finding is based on median scores on a seven-point scale; therefore, although some individual cases have greater than average improvement, they are counter-balanced by those with less than average improvement. Also, this and many of the other results are based on a sample of 299 Latin America-born Independent Decision Makers in Sydney during the interview period from December 1972 to January 1973. A few aspects of the situation and some immigration policies have changed since then, but the vast majority of the immigrants were selected before the policy changes. Although the sample was not randomly selected and therefore should not be used to determine percentages and details for all Latin Americans in Australia, another survey (Survey Section, 1974) and the 1971 census suggest that the sample is reasonably
representative. Regardless, the sample is useful for identifying the key types of Latin Americans in Australia. The net result of PART TWO is a typology (Figure 8-1) which eliminates the "noise" of minorities in the Latin American population in Australia and which identifies a focal group for the analyses of their migration satisfaction.

Although PART THREE on migration satisfaction is based on a sample of Latin Americans, it is really the development of a topic of interest with application to all immigrant populations, whether originating in the Third World countries or elsewhere and regardless of their destination. However, the Latin Americans in Australia are particularly well suited for its study. These immigrants share a common background, but between individuals there is a wide range of types and socio-economic levels. They also have the advantage of a relatively uniform period of residence. These are critical factors when dealing with the theme issue of migration satisfaction.

The concept of migration satisfaction is reviewed in Chapter I and defined as follows:

1 The broad framework of migration studies involves various combinations of origin, destination, obstacles, and migrants as individuals (see E.S. Lee, 1969, p.285ff. on "A Theory of Migration"). Within that framework, this research concentrates upon a group of migrants and their expressed satisfaction while trying to hold their origin, destination, and transport obstacles relatively constant. The destination, Sydney, represents the urban world in industrial societies. With its various facets, Sydney typifies many modern migrant destinations. In this study, obstacles to transportation to or from the island continent of Australia are quite constant although subject to different perceptions by the various Latin Americans. The origin, Latin America, represents a "developing area" and is at least as homogeneous as any other major developing area of the world, being united by language, tradition and numerous customs. The variability of this migrant source area has been controlled and included by considering many of the relevant heterogeneous socio-geographic aspects of Latin America to be variables in the migrants, as in the case of ethnic origin, social status and birthplace. It is therefore considered that the origin, the destination and the transport obstacles of this migration are relatively constant so that the migrants' socio-demographic characteristics may be studied, especially as they relate to migration satisfaction.
Migration satisfaction is a migrant's perceived relative utilities of places as they relate to his past, present and future migrations.

It is closely akin to place utility, a concept discussed by Wolpert (1965). However, migration satisfaction has some conceptual and methodological advantages which should permit its development in theoretical and applied ways in geographical and most other studies of migration. Satisfaction has already been shown to be the start of a progression to "identification" and "acculturation" of immigrants (Richardson, 1974).

Migration satisfaction is relative between locations as perceived by each immigrant. It is therefore a micro-scale approach involving individuals and is best understood in the light of actual immigrants. In the case of the Latin Americans in Australia, their migration satisfaction is relative between two known locations, i.e., Australia and the migrant's home country to which most are free to return at any time. However, it is also applicable to prospective migrants who are comparing their known origin with impressions of a comparatively unknown destination (or several destinations).

It is possible for a person who is very happy and contented in one location to perceive that he would prefer another place for some compelling reason, e.g., family problems, "homesickness", or a fantastic job offer. Therefore, he is relatively more satisfied with what he anticipates he will find if he migrates (or remigrates). He may migrate or he may not; that is of great interest to us, but it is really immaterial to our discussion of his migration satisfaction. Also, it is clear that migration satisfaction is distinct from general satisfaction/dissatisfaction which is in all people and not specific to migration desires nor immigrant status.

This study of Latin Americans in Australia found, in a non-random sample of immigrants, that about equal thirds of the respondents were satisfied,
neutral or dissatisfied according to this relative measurement. Dissatisfaction is not necessarily detrimental, but it does indicate that the respondent considers that he would be better off somewhere else, usually back in his home country. Likewise, satisfaction is not necessarily advantageous, but it does indicate a preference for the present location over any alternative ones. Therefore, if migrations are a response to fulfil one's needs as best as possible, migration satisfaction is a valuable concept of use to both immigrants and hosts.

The subjective element is very evident and is a difficulty in transforming a concept into a measured "reality". Previous methods are discussed (Chapter IX) and then a composite index score is presented which refines the measurement of migration satisfaction into a nine-level ordinal scale from strongly dissatisfied through neutral to strongly satisfied. This scaling is acknowledged to be imperfect and able to be improved, but it holds up quite well when used in the search for characteristics associated with different levels of satisfaction, i.e. differentials.

1 Being based on a non-random sample, the results are not to be used to calculate percentages and proportions for the total of Latin Americans in Sydney or Australia. Therefore the number of respondents in each main level of migration satisfaction and in each type of motivation, employment, etc. is of value mainly for the typology in Chapters VIII and XII and for understanding the sample used for the analyses of migration satisfaction in PART THREE. Since only Latin Americans were studied, no statements comparing their migration satisfaction with that of other migrants are valid, neither favourably nor unfavourably.

2 There are dangers in pushing scales further than previously used, but the increased clarity of results tends to justify the risks. Nevertheless, with academic caution the main results are based on shortened rankings of only three main migration satisfaction levels and four occupation levels (Chapters VII, XII and XIII).
Of the several hundred tests conducted, many revealed statistically significant differences in levels of migration satisfaction (see Table 11-6). Latin Americans with these characteristics have an increased likelihood of being dissatisfied or satisfied. The most important characteristics were used in Chapter XII to complete the typology of Latin Americans in Australia.

In a general descending order of importance, the keys to the typology are marital status, motivation, relative change in occupation level, English ability, and friends/relatives in Australia. For some types, one or two factors are sufficient, e.g. single males motivated by travel are strongly inclined to be dissatisfied. On the other hand several factors are needed to show that married males motivated by economic and employment reasons who were white collar workers unaccustomed to manual labour in Latin America, and who did not regain in Australia their previous occupation level, are likely to be dissatisfied, especially if they do not speak good English. Other types are identified in Chapter XII.

Another approach to combining the important characteristics was the discriminant analyses in Chapter XIII. The exploratory tests indicate that the combination of the discriminant analysis technique with migration satisfaction is highly likely to provide a valuable aid to immigration officials and social workers.

The significance of this research into migration satisfaction centres upon four aspects, the first one being that it helps us understand the behaviour and qualities of immigrants more clearly. The other aspects involve improvements in a) assistance for present migrants, b) prediction of prospective migrants' satisfaction, and c) immigration policies. These are all intricately related to each other. These areas of application are also important to the basic elements of migration: the origin, the
destination, the obstacles, and the migrants themselves.

With regard to "on the spot" assistance at the destination, the significance of this research is that its methods could possibly lead to improvements in the type of administration of help supplied to the various classes of migrants. This help may come from official organizations, migrant groups, or individuals. Whatever way it comes, the assistance might well be more effective through the identification of the crucial areas of dissatisfaction and the individual's characteristics associated with that dissatisfaction. This should not only be true for handling serious problem cases which surface after a period of residence in the host country. If developed and implemented, these improvements may also forestall the occurrence of some problems by proper preventive action at all stages of the migrant's settlement process. Also, modified migrant selection procedures mentioned next could result in fewer serious problem cases which at present are a heavy drain on the assistance services provided.

Prediction of a successful migration is important to the migrant and his country of origin as well as to the governments and people at the destination. The findings of this research suggest an improved selection of the applicants for migration. Using methods such as those presented here, the country of origin should be better able to forecast the chances of satisfaction of its different classes of potential migrants and thereby discourage the migration of those groups least likely to "succeed". Similarly, countries of destination should be able to predict the probability of satisfaction and better selection should follow. This selection process serves as "preventive" assistance for the migrants in that it screens out those most likely to be dissatisfied with the results of their migration. However, to utilize the criteria of prediction to the fullest extent will probably require policy revisions.
Four main areas of future work are apparent. One is with discriminant analysis, the statistical technique useful for improving migrant selection overseas and counselling after arrival (Chapter XIII). Another is the refinement of the measurement of migration satisfaction and the examination of the migrant characteristics associated with it. Third is the linking of migration satisfaction with migration theories and models. The fourth area for future work is the broadest, i.e. additional studies of the growing and changing population of Latin Americans. The monitoring of some issues covered in this thesis is warranted, but also there need to be studies of many themes such as the migrants' children in school, the impact of political and economic changes in Latin America, "community" development of the immigrants in Sydney and elsewhere, assimilation/integration, and economic contributions. Australia's Latin Americans are a nearly ideal group for such studies for the same reasons they were well suited for the study of migration satisfaction; they are a wide variety of people from a comparatively uniform area with growth potential. The Latin Americans are on the threshold of becoming one of Australia's great immigrant groups.
INTRODUCTION TO THE APPENDICES

As stated in Chapter I, there are two objectives to this study. The first is to write the basic story of Latin Americans in Australia. A wide range of topics is covered to give breadth to the picture which mainly focuses on the contemporary situation (Chapters III and V through VIII). Unfortunately it is not possible to develop every theme to the fullest extent. Many other studies on specific themes and using the Latin Americans as the focal group will be forthcoming. One of those themes forms the second objective, i.e., to do exploratory work on the "migration satisfaction" of the Latin Americans in Sydney. This rather new concept is examined in PART THREE (Chapters IX through XIII).

To accomplish both objectives it was necessary to gather specific data and analyse it. The methods of data collection and analysis are presented in the appendices along with some additional insights, results, sidelights, and tables which did not fit into the flow of the main chapters. However, these appendices are no less important than the main text. Rather, they are complementary and also reveal some additional information about the Latin Americans in Australia and about the focal theme of migration satisfaction.
The Spanish version of the questionnaire consists of three parts: the individual data sheets (large white page); the green sheet for housing data; and a cover-letter that was only used during the attempt to obtain results by mail and via distribution through clubs and service organizations.
CUESTIONARIO INDIVIDUAL
POR FAVOR LLÉNE UN CUESTIONARIO POR PERSONA EN SU HOYAR. MARQUE SU RESPOSITA CON UN CIRCULO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>¿Cuál es su situación legal en Australia? (según su visa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Con pasaporte australiano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residente (Vida de inmigrante)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visa estudiante temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Visa diplomática</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Visitante (cuánto tiempo ha estado en Australia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B. | ¿En qué año llegó a Australia? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.</th>
<th>Lugar de nacimiento de sus padres en relación a suyo:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mis dos padres nacieron en el mismo país que yo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mi madre nació en el mismo país que yo, pero mi padre nació en ______.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mis dos padres nacieron en distintos países que yo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Padre nació en ______.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Madre nació en ______.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.</th>
<th>¿Cuál es su nivel de educación más alto al que llegó?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Secundaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Escuela técnica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Universidad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| E. | ¿Cuántos de estos años de estudio fueron hechos en Latinoamérica? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.</th>
<th>¿Cuál es su conocimiento actual del inglés?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ninguno conocimiento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Muy poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bueno, puede llevar una conversación y escribir cartas fácilmente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Muy bueno, puede estudiar con facilidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excelente</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.</th>
<th>¿Cuál es su religión?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Católica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bautista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anglicana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adventista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pentecostés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mormon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hebreo/judío</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Otro cristiano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sin religión</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.</th>
<th>¿Cuál es su conocimiento de inglés al salir de su país natal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ninguno conocimiento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Muy poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bueno, podía llevar una conversación y escribir cartas fácilmente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Muy bueno, podía estudiar con facilidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excelente</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.</th>
<th>¿Cuál es su conocimiento del inglés al salir de su país natal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ninguno conocimiento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Muy poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bueno, puede llevar una conversación y escribir cartas fácilmente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Muy bueno, puede estudiar con facilidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excelente</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J.</th>
<th>¿Cuál es su conocimiento del inglés al salir de su país natal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ninguno conocimiento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Muy poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bueno, puede llevar una conversación y escribir cartas fácilmente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Muy bueno, puede estudiar con facilidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excelente</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| K. | ¿En qué año llegó a Australia? |

| L. | ¿Cuál es su nivel de educación más alto al que llegó? |

| M. | ¿Cuál es su nacionalidad o ciudadanía actual? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>¿Cuál es su conocimiento de inglés al salir de su país natal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ninguno conocimiento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Muy poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bueno, puede llevar una conversación y escribir cartas fácilmente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Muy bueno, puede estudiar con facilidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excelente</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F2

Por favor mire la lista abajo y indique la categoría de su ingreso anual de todas sus funciones antes de impuestos.

- Salario por semana ingreso anual pre-post impostos

- $0-10

- $10-20

- $20-50

- $50-100

- $100-200

- $200-500

- $500-1000

- $1000-2000

- $2000-5000

- $5000-10000

- $10000-20000

- $20000-50000

- $50000-100000

- $100000-200000

- $200000-500000

- $500000-1000000

- $1000000-2000000

- $2000000-


G2

¿Cuántas horas trabajaba normalmente en los trabajos que tenía durante la última semana de Agosto de 1972?

Trabajo principal, horas.

Otros trabajos, horas.

Total horas por semana.


H2

Por favor indique el tipo de empleo principal que tiene en Australia.

- Empleado principal: ( )

Indique la categoría de su ingreso anual de todas sus funciones antes de impuestos.

- $0-10

- $10-20

- $20-50

- $50-100

- $100-200

- $200-500

- $500-1000

- $1000-2000

- $2000-5000

- $5000-10000

- $10000-20000

- $20000-50000

- $50000-100000

- $100000-200000

- $200000-500000

- $500000-1000000

- $1000000-2000000

- $2000000-


I2

Indique el tipo de empleo principal que tiene en su país natal.

- Empleado principal: ( )

Indique la categoría de su ingreso anual de todas sus funciones antes de impuestos.

- $0-10

- $10-20

- $20-50

- $50-100

- $100-200

- $200-500

- $500-1000

- $1000-2000

- $2000-5000

- $5000-10000

- $10000-20000

- $20000-50000

- $50000-100000

- $100000-200000

- $200000-500000

- $500000-1000000

- $1000000-2000000

- $2000000-


J2

¿En qué se enfocaba el dinero a su país de origen?

- Envío dinero, menos de $20 por mes, ($240 por año).

- Envío dinero regularmente, $20 por mes (más de $240 por año).

- Recibo dinero en moneda, menos de $20 por mes.

- Recibo dinero (más de $20 por mes).

- No recibí el envío del dinero del país de origen.


K2

Indique la razón principal o las razones por las cuales emigró.

- Cima/muerte

- Problemas

- Emigración

- Inmigración

- Salud

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigración

- Emigra...
CUESTIONARIO DE VIVIENDA

LLENE UN CUESTIONARIO POR HOGAR, MARCANDO SU RESPUESTA CON UN CIRCULO. PUEDE SER LLENADO POR EL JEFE DEL HOGAR, LA ESPOSA O CUALQUIER OTRO ADULTO DEL HOGAR.

1. De lo siguiente, qué es lo que mejor describe su vivienda actual?
   1-Casa aislada
   2-Casas pareadas (2 ó más casas unidas entre sí)
   3-Departamentos con baño y cocina propio.
   4-Casa improvisada (galpón, carpa, garage, etc., ocupado en forma permanente)
   5-Acoplado, bote u otro tipo de vivienda móvil
   6-Otros (____________) (describa)

2. Cuántas piezas tiene su vivienda?(no cuente baños, lavaderías, bodegas, pasillos o piezas compartidas o usadas principalmente por otra vivienda)
   1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 ó más

3. Cuántos dormitorios tiene su vivienda?
   Ninguno (un departamento de un ambiente)
   1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 ó más

4. Cuál es el número normal de habitantes de su vivienda?
   1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 ó más

5. Bajo que condiciones habita su vivienda?
   1-Arriendo housing commission
   2-Arriendo - subvencionado por su empleador
   3-Arriendo - contrato de más de 4 meses
   4-Arriendo (sin ninguna de las restricciones mencionadas arriba)
   5-Comprando con hipoteca
   6-Dueño
   7-Vivo con amigos, parientes, padres, no pago arriendo
   8-La casa viene con el empleo

6. De que material son los muros exteriores de su vivienda?
   1-ladrillo
   2-imitación ladrillo
   3-Piedra
   4-Concreto
   5-Madera
   6-metal
   7-Adobe
   8-totora, paja, etc.
   9-otro (____________) (describa)

7. Cuántos vehículos poseen o conducen los miembros de su hogar?
   (no incluya vehículos de 2 ruedas)
   Ninguno
   1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

8. Cuál es su medio habitual de locomoción?
   Auto, bus, tren, caminando, moto, otro (____________) (describa)

9. Por qué decidieron vivir en este barrio?
   1-costo de la vivienda
   2-amigos, parientes viven cerca
   3-cerca del trabajo
   4-conveniente para locomoción

10. Estime el ingreso total anual de todos los miembros de su vivienda antes de impuestos, en dólares australianos. Indique con una X el monto en la línea debajo.
   $0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8000
   $9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 000

11. Cuánto paga por semana por hogar?
    (Incluya arriendo ó hipoteca y otros gastos, como ser agua, gas, electricidad)
    $___________.00

12. Si es arrendatario, arrienda con ó sin muebles?
    1-No soy arrendatario
    2-Amoblado
    3-Sin muebles

13. ¿Cuáles de los siguientes servicios tiene su vivienda?

14. Comparado con su vivienda en su país de origen, su vivienda en Australia es:
   1-mucho peor
   2-peor
   3-casi igual
   4-mejor
   5-mucho mejor
   (conteste 3, una en cada columna)

15. En qué zona(s) de la ciudad trabajan los miembros de su hogar quienes trabajan?

16. Fin del cuestionario de vivienda.

Por favor siga al cuestionario individual, notando que puede saltar algunas preguntas si le conviene. Si por algún motivo no quiere participar de ninguna manera de este censo (si tiene hojas extras), por favor pase adelante los cuestionarios a otros latino-americanos.

Un otro censo semejante a éste pero más pequeño, podrá realizarse en algunos años para verificar el progreso de la comunidad. Desea Ud. que su hogar sea incluido?

1-Sí
   2-No

Dirección

Zona Administrativa
Local (como Hornsby, Ashfield) (código postal si conocido)
Appendix I.A.3.

Cover-letter in Spanish for Mailed Questionnaires

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND
ARMIDALE, N.S.W.

Estimados latino-americanos en Sydney,

Como latino-americano en Australia, Ud. es miembro de un grupo muy especial. Desafortunadamente este grupo no es bien entendido por los australianos nativos y la poca información disponible ha venido de entrevistas con muy pocos de los inmigrantes. Por lo tanto, ahora me acero a Ud. para que tenga la oportunidad de que su información y sus opiniones sean tomadas en cuenta en este estudio especial.

Los objetivos de este son brevemente contar, agrupar y analizar la comunidad latino-americana en Sydney, para encontrar medios de ayudar a la comunidad, a través de sus propias organizaciones y aquellas de Australia.

El censo consiste en una hoja verde por hogar y una hoja blanca por persona (incluyendo niños, pero ellos tienen solamente la primera decena de preguntas, Jóvenes tienen 24 preguntas) Con objeto de ahorrarle tiempo, el cuestionario es de respuesta múltiple. Ud. solo necesita elegir y marcar con un círculo la respuesta más adecuada. De este modo las respuestas no serán marcadamente personales, pero su combinación de respuestas será una parte precisa y muy importante del estudio. Se ha tenido gran cuidado de hacer adecuadamente las preguntas, así estas significarán lo mismo para un chileno que para un mejicano, etc. Pero, como nada es perfecto, por favor, no tome a ofensa ninguna pregunta.

Todos los latino-americanos que se enteraron de este estudio han mostrado entusiasmo acerca del censo, y han visto el gran valor que tendría. Muchas de estas personas se lo han estado contando a sus amistades, para que puedan dar sus opiniones. El cuestionario nos es realmente tan largo como parece, porque debido al espacio que se necesita para las respuestas múltiples, como de hacerlo rápido que lo terminará especialmente si decide hacerlo pronto, hoy si es posible. (Plazo final: 30 de septiembre.)

Esperando su respuesta, le agradezco su atenta colaboración.

Cordialmente,

Pablo Simon Anderson
Departamento de Geografía

P.D. Por supuesto este estudio es completamente confidencial. Es un estudio privado de la Universidad de New England, Armidale, N.S.W., coordinado por un geógrafo inmigrante con muchos años de experiencia en América Latina y una esposa latina.

También como es confidencial, se espera que todas sus respuestas serán 100% verídicas. Cualquiera alteración de edad, educación, calificaciones, vivienda, daría un resultado incorrecto y de menor ayuda para representar la comunidad. Esta investigación será tan real como reales sean los datos que Ud. proporcione.
APPENDIX II
ENGLISH TRANSLATION AND RESPONSE TALLIES OF QUESTIONNAIRE
(Tallies are of the 248 Independent Decision Makers in Australia more than 6 months)

INDIVIDUAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE
For persons born in Latin America or with a Latin American nationality, or descendent from Latin Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer Item</th>
<th>Questionnaire Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. A.</td>
<td>What is this person's relationship to the head of the household?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallies</td>
<td>Coded Response</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 1. head</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 2. wife</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 3. son/daughter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 4. grandchild</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5. brother/sister</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 6. mother/father</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 8. boarder</td>
<td>9. other (co-tenants - equal status) (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. B. What is this person's sex and did he (she) come to Australia on assisted passage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer Item</th>
<th>Questionnaire Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 1. male, came on assisted passage - by Australian Govt.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. male, came on assisted passage - by Aust. Company</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. male, did NOT come on assisted passage</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 4. female, came on assisted passage</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5. female, did NOT come on assisted passage</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. C. What is this person's age in years (on date of interview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer Item</th>
<th>Questionnaire Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1. 65+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 2. 60-64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3. 55-59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4. 50-54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 5. 45-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 6. 40-44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 7. 35-39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 8. 30-34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 9. 25-29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 10. 20-24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11. 15-19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 12. 0-14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mailed responses: Both approx. 25-30, 1m & 1f, 1 SAT & 1 DISSAT, both University graduates and "fluent" in English. (person codes 53 & 56)
35. D. What is this person's marital status?

1. never married
2. now married and married before coming to Australia
3. now married but married after coming to Australia
4. widowed
5. divorced
6. married but permanently separated

Default = 0

36. E. If married, what was the birthplace of this person's spouse?

see the attached code for birthplaces (next page)

Defaults = 0

37. F. What is this person's usual major activity?

1. working on a job, trade, business or profession
2. engaged in home duties
3. child not yet attending school
4. child at primary or secondary school
5. other full-time studies
6. other (specify)

Defaults = 2

38. G. Where was this person born?

see the attached code for birthplaces (next page)

39. H. Is this person's nationality or citizenship the same as for his country of birth?

1. yes
2. no, now is Australian
3. no, other but not British
4. no, British
5. no, British and country of birth
6. no, Australian (Native born)
7. no, other (special cases)

Defaults = 3

40. I. What is the legal status of this person in Australia? (according to his visa)

1. has an Australian Passport
2. resident (immigrant visa)
3. temporary student visa
4. diplomatic visa
5. visitor. How long have you been in Australia?
6. other (special cases)

Default = 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIRTHPLACE CODE LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM CODE 38 ITEM CODE 36 ITEM CODE 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00 - Not Stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 - Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 - Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 - Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - Other &quot;Latin&quot; countries in Central America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - Other &quot;Latin&quot; countries in the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - Commonwealth countries in the Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - USA - Lived in Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - USA - Not lived in Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - Northern Europe - lived in Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - Northern Europe - not lived in Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - Southern Europe - lived in Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - Southern Europe - not lived in Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - [Code not used]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - Soltero, (single) therefore no spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 - Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. J. In what month and year did this person arrive in Australia?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 38</th>
<th>Code 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49 - pre-June 1949</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - July, 49 to June, 50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-63 - July, 50 to June, 63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 - July, 63 to June, 64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - July, 64 to June, 65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 - July, 65 to June, 66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 - July, 66 to June, 67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 - July, 67 to June, 68</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 - July, 68 to June, 69</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - July, 69 to June, 70</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 - July, 70 to June, 71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 - July, 71 to Dec., 71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 - Jan., 72 to June, 72</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 - July, 72 to Sept., 72</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - Oct., 72 to Dec., 72</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

299
42. K. Parents' birthplace: in relation to this person's birthplace:

1. Both mother and father born in the same country as this person
2. Mother born in the same country as this person, but father born in another Latin American country
3. Father born in the same country as this person, but mother born in another Latin American country
4. Neither mother nor father born in the same country as this person; mother born in _______ Latin American Countries
5. Mother born in the same country as this person, but father born in Europe
6. Mother born in the same country as this person, but father born in another country
7. Father born in the same country as this person, but mother born in Europe
8. Father born in the same country as this person, but mother born in another country
9. Neither mother nor father born in the same country as this person; mother born in _______ European or other country
10. Father born in the same country as this person, but mother born in _______ European or other country

Default = 0

43. L. What is this person's racial origin?

1. 100% or almost 100% European origin
2. 100% or almost 100% Indian origin
3. Mixed origin, but more than half European
4. Mixed origin, but more than half Indian
5. Mixed origin (specify)

Defaults = 9

Optional Question:

44. M. What is this person's religious denomination?

1. Catholic
2. Baptist
3. Church of England
4. Seventh Day Adventist
5. Pentacostal
6. Mormon
7. Hebrew
8. Other non-Christian
9. No religion
10. Other Christian

Defaults = 3

45. MC. Is this person active in his (her) religion?

1. Active
2. Not Active

Defaults = 127 (were not asked)

PERSONS UNDER 5 YEARS OF AGE HAVE NO MORE QUESTIONS
46. N. In the five years prior to your leaving your country or origin, how many times did you move, that is, how many times did you make a major change in your residence?

1. None
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4
6. 5
7. 6
8. 7
9. or more times

Defaults = 7

47. O. From the time you left your country of origin until you arrived in Australia, how many times did you "settle" in a place to live?

1. None, this person came directly to Australia
2. Once. This person lived in (country) for (months/years)
3. Twice. This person lived in (country) and (country) for (time)
4. This person "settled" more than twice. Please give details below.

Defaults = 5

The following section is quite important. Please answer it carefully and fully.

P. After arriving in Australia, how many times has this person moved?

1. None
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4
6. 5
7. 6
8. 7
9. or more times

Defaults = 21

48. Q. Please list this person's residences since arriving in Australia, beginning with the most recent (if you prefer, only give the district or local government area of each residence. (for example, Fairfield or Hornsby)).

(Not coded for computer) Month/year when moved in

Present residence

Previous residence

First residence in Australia
was/was not in a hostel
date of arrival in Australia
R. Mark the approximate percentage of this person's life spent in each type of area in his country of origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>9. ( 0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1. (1-19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2. (20-29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3. (30-39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4. (40-49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5. (50-59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6. (60-75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7. (75-99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8. (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Default = 21

50. Urban 9. ( 0%)

| 2 | 1. (1-19%) |
| 2 | 2. (20-29%) |
| 0 | 3. (30-39%) |
| 1 | 4. (40-49%) |
| 18 | 5. (50-59%) |
| 7 | 6. (60-75%) |
| 8 | 7. (75-99%) |
| 34 | 8. (100%) |

Default = 24

51. Metro 9. ( 0%)

| 40 | 1. (1-19%) |
| 5 | 2. (20-29%) |
| 11 | 3. (30-39%) |
| 0 | 4. (40-49%) |
| 22 | 5. (50-59%) |
| 4 | 6. (60-75%) |
| 8 | 7. (75-99%) |
| 138 | 8. (100%) |

Default = 18

52. S. At what level was this person's knowledge of English when he/she left his country of origin?

| 51 | 1. no knowledge of English |
| 82 | 2. very little |
| 35 | 3. poor |
| 38 | 4. fair |
| 20 | 5. good (able to carry on a conversation and write letters comfortably) |
| 11 | 6. very good (able to study easily) |
| 10 | 7. excellent |

Default = 1

53. T. At present, what is the level of this person's knowledge of English?

| 3 | 1. no knowledge of English |
| 27 | 2. very little |
| 44 | 3. poor |
| 75 | 4. fair |
| 53 | 5. good (able to carry on a conversation and write letters comfortably) |
| 26 | 6. very good (able to study easily) |
| 18 | 7. excellent |

Default = 2
54. U. Has this person's knowledge and use of English improved noticeably during the past 6 months?

   98 1. very much
   78 2. some
   37 3. little
   34 4. no

Default = 1

55. V. What is the highest level of education this person has ever attended?

   1 1. never attended school
   2. Primary -
      - 1
      - 2
      - 3
      - 4
      2 5
      14 6
   3. Secondary
      4 1
      10 2
      22 3
      22 4
      19 5
      29 6
      1 7
   4. Technical school
      15 1
      15 2
      11 3
      10 4
      2 5
      5 6
      1 7
   5. University
      12 1
      12 2
      11 3
      11 4
      11 5
      11 6
      *graduate training

Default = 0

56. W. Please state what diplomas, degrees, certificates, etc. this person has received

   24 1. University or teachers degree
   4 2. Diploma, Certificate, not requiring recognition in Australia
   54 3. Diploma, Certificate, requiring recognition in Australia
   2 4. Diploma, Certificate, received in Australia
   0 5. (Code not used)
164 6. No Diploma or Certificate

Default = 28
57. X. How many of those years of study were done in Latin America?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>A. No. of Years</th>
<th>B. No. of Student-Years</th>
<th>A x B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Default = 22

PERSONS UNDER 15 YEARS OF AGE HAVE NO MORE QUESTIONS

58. Y. Is this person now doing a course leading to a trade or other qualifications?

38 1. Yes, English
3 2. Yes, Regular Studies
11 3. Yes, Special Studies
177 4. No

Default = 19

59. Zf FEMALES: How many children has this person ever had?

23 1. None
4 2. 1
4 3. 2
0 4. 3
0 5. 4
2 6. 5
0 7. 6
0 8. 7
0 9. or more

Default = 209 males and 6 females

Zm MALES: Has this person ever done military service?

91 1. Yes, in Australia
2 2. Yes, in home country
2 3. Yes, in another country
109 4. No

Default = 46
64. $A_2$ What is your present employment situation?

1. Employed with one full-time job for the entire month (even if on paid vacation, sick leave, or strike)
2. Employed with one full-time job PLUS extra part-time work for the month.
3. Employed full-time, but for only part of the month. (how many working days)
4. Employed with one part-time job or helping without pay in family business.
5. Employed with more than one part-time job.
6. Unemployed (or doing only unpaid housework) NOT looking for work.
7. Unemployed, looking for work.
8. Student

Default = 0

65. $B_2$ How many hours per WEEK does this person usually work in the job or jobs held during this time?

(hours)
1. Nil
2. 1 - 9
3. 10 - 19
4. 20 - 29
5. 30 - 34
6. 35
7. 36 - 39
8. 40
9. 41 - 45
10. 46 - 49
11. 50 - 59
12. 60 - 69
13. 70+

Default = 6

66. $C_2$ During the month BEFORE this person stopped working in order to migrate to Australia, his employment was:

1. Employed with one full-time job for the entire month (Even if on paid vacation, sick leave, or strike)
2. Employed with one full-time job PLUS extra part-time work for the month.
3. Employed full-time, but for only part of the month. (how many working days?)
4. Employed with one part-time job or helping without pay in family business.
5. Employed with more than one part-time job.
6. Unemployed (or doing only unpaid housework) NOT looking for work.
7. Unemployed, looking for work.
8. Student

Default = 4
67. \(D_2\) How many hours per WEEK did this person usually work in the job or jobs held during the last weeks of employment before stopping work in order to migrate to Australia?

1. Nil
2. 1-9
3. 10-19
4. 20-29
5. 30-34
6. 35
7. 36-39
8. 40
9. 41-45
10. 46-49
11. 50-59
12. 60-69
13. 70+

E. \(^2\) Compared with your occupation in your country of origin, is your occupation in Australia:

A) IN INCOME

1. much worse
2. worse
3. about the same
4. better
5. much better

Default = 21

B) IN SATISFACTION [SATISFACTION INDICATOR - CODE 105]

1. much worse
2. worse
3. about the same
4. better
5. much better

Default = 22

C) IN STATUS

1. much worse
2. worse
3. about the same
4. better
5. much better

Default = 24

71. \(F_2\) Please look at the list below and mark the category of this person's annual income from all sources before taxation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly Salary</th>
<th>post-tax</th>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>post-tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre-tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>pre-tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. 0-19</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>0-999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2. 20-39</td>
<td>19-35</td>
<td>1000-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3. 40-59</td>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>2000-2999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>4. 60-79</td>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>3000-3999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>5. 80-99</td>
<td>65-77</td>
<td>4000-4999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>6. 100-119</td>
<td>78-89</td>
<td>5000-5999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7. 120-139</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>6000-6999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8. 140-159</td>
<td>101-111</td>
<td>7000-7999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9. 160-179</td>
<td>112-121</td>
<td>8000-8999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10. 180-199</td>
<td>122-131</td>
<td>9000-9999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11. 200-219</td>
<td>132-140</td>
<td>10000-10999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>12. 220-239</td>
<td>141-149</td>
<td>11000-11999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13. 240-259</td>
<td>150-157</td>
<td>12000-12999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14. 260-279</td>
<td>158-166</td>
<td>13000-13999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15. 280-299</td>
<td>167-174</td>
<td>14000-14999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16. 300+</td>
<td>175+</td>
<td>15000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Defaults = 20
72. \( G \) Look again at the above list, determine this person's annual income in his country or origin when he was living there. Be sure to convert to Australian dollars, and mark the correct category here ___

54 1.
39 2.
35 3.
21 4.
5 5.
8 6.
(See previous question)
3 7.
3 8.
3 9.
1 10.
2 11.
1 12.
0 13.
0 14.
0 15.
4 16.

Defaults = 69

73. \( H \) Please indicate the type of principal employment that you have in Australia? (Principal employment is not necessarily the position with the highest salary)

110 1. unskilled laborer
35 2. semi-skilled laborer
46 3. skilled laborer
11 4. technician
6 5. salesman
18 6. office worker
10 7. administration; management
7 8. professional (doctor, teacher, etc.)
0 9. farmer, miner (primary industry)
5 10. unemployed (incl. students)

74. \( I \) Please indicate the type of principal employment that you had in your country of origin. (Principal employment is not necessarily the position with the highest salary)

12 1. unskilled laborer
16 2. semi-skilled laborer
42 3. skilled laborer
42 4. technician
22 5. salesman
38 6. office worker
23 7. administration; management
25 8. professional (doctor, teacher, etc.)
8 9. farmer, miner (primary industry)
20 10. unemployed (incl. students and not seeking work)

75. \( J \) Do you send money to, or receive money from, your country of origin?

27 1. Send money, less than $20 per month (less than $240 per year)
62 2. Send money regularly, more than $20 per month (more than $240 per year)
2 3. Receive money (less that $20 per month)
1 4. Receive money (more than $20 per month)
148 5. Neither send nor receive money from country of origin.

Default = 8
K2 Indicate below the major reason why you decided to migrate. Indicate also the second most important reason.

76. Major Reason
   9 1. climate/health factors
   33 2. politics
   87 3. economic factors
   12 4. friends and/or relatives live here
   23 5. employment opportunities
   2 6. my husband or parents migrated
   54 7. desire to see other parts of the world
   6 8. family problems at home
   21 9. racial problems in home country or other reasons

   Default = 1

77. Second Reason
   1 1. climate/health factors
   13 2. politics
   18 3. economic factors
   2 4. friends and/or relatives live here
   16 5. employment opportunities
   2 6. my husband or parents migrated
   37 7. desire to see other parts of the world
   7 8. family problems at home
   19 9. racial problems in home country or other reasons

   Default = 133

79. L2 Have other members of your family or close friends also come to Australia?

   39 1. Yes, 1 person
   32 2. 2 people
   25 3. 3
   16 4. 4
   8 5. 5
   6 6. 6
   4 7. 7
   12 8. 8 or more
   99 9. No, none have come

   Default = 7

80. M2 If YES, when was their arrival in relation to your arrival?

   41 1. Almost all of them arrived before (more than 3 months before)
   34 2. Almost all of them arrived after (more than 3 months after)
   50 3. Almost all of them arrived at the same time as this person
   12 4. Some arrived before and some arrived after.

   Default = 111

81. N2 Would you advise other members of your family or close friends to migrate to Australia?

   [SATISFACTION INDICATOR - CODE 101]→
   
   CODE
   TRANSFORMATIONS

   87 1. Yes
   88 2. No
   49
   3. with conditions of knowing English
   4. with other conditions
   5. indifferent

   Defaults = 24
82. O2 Did you ever apply for migration to any other country besides Australia?

186  1. No
     3  2. Yes (please state which countries in your order of preference)
     49  3. First Choice U.S.A. or Canada
     3  4. First Choice Europe
     2  5. First Choice Latin America

Default = 4

83. P2 Would you NOW prefer to migrate again?  
    [SATISFACTION INDICATOR - CODE 102] £ CODE

TRANSFORMATION

89  1. No  5
58  2. Yes, back to my country or origin  1} 65
7  3. Yes, to some other country in Latin America  1
55  4. Yes, to some other country where English is  3
    the official language (U.S.A.)
17  5. Yes, to some other country where English is  3  85
    the official language (NOT U.S.A.)
11  6. Yes, to some European country  3
2  7. Yes, to some other country not in the above groups (specify)  3
9  8. Other answers (e.g. "haven't decided") and  0
    defaults

84. Q2 Before leaving your country of origin you had some idea of how your  
    life in Australia was going to be. How have you found Australia?  
    [SATISFACTION INDICATOR - CODE 103] £ CODE

TRANSFORMATION

17  1. Much better than expected  5
33  2. Better than expected  4
89  3. Equal to expectation  3
69  4. Worse than expected  2
29  5. Much worse than expected  1
11  6. Other answer and default  0

85. R2 Do you think that the problems of Latin American immigrants are  
    different from those of other groups of immigrants?

88  1. No, the problems are the same
18  2. Yes, but the Latins have fewer problems
111 3. Yes, but the Latins have more problems
    7  4. (Just a "Yes" answer)

Default = 24

86. S2 Do you think that migrants from your country have different problems  
    from other Latin Americans?

174 1. No, the problems are the same
9  2. Yes, but those from your country have fewer problems
41  3. Yes, those from your country have more problems
2  4. (Just a "Yes" answer)

Default = 22
87. SP₂ (Problems named in R₂ and S₂)

13 1. Language
6 2. Employment and Wages
37 3. Social Problems
11 4. Combination of problems, but excluding employment
18 5. Combination of problems, including employment
8 6. Other

Default = 155

88. T₂ Are you satisfied with the Australian Government's help for immigrants?

[SATISFACTION INDICATOR - CODE 104]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>TRANSFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Yes, it is more than enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes, it is sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>No, but it does not lack much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No, it lacks a great deal to be sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other answer and defaults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89. TP₂ (Problems with Government assistance named in T₂)

6 1. Housing
22 2. Assisted Passage
28 3. Employment
5 4. Language Training
12 5. Combination excluding language training
5 6. Combination including language training
49 7. Others, which includes administrative problems

Default = 121

90. U₂ Do the recently arrived Latin Americans receive help (e.g. counselling and social help (not monetary) from the more established Latin American so that the "new ones" are able to establish themselves more rapidly?

10 1. Yes, the majority help and are organized.
42 2. Yes, the majority help but lack organization
74 3. Regular (So-So), some help and others don't
72 4. No, the established ones almost don't help at all
4 5. No, the established ones treat the others badly
13 6. Don't know any "long-time" (established) Latin American migrants

Default = 33

91. V₂ Which, if any, of the following organizations has this person used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>NOT USED</th>
<th>ONCE</th>
<th>SEVERAL TIMES</th>
<th>MANY TIMES</th>
<th>DEFAULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Neighbour Council</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Migrant Centre</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulate of this person's country of origin</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Services in the Banks</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Agencies</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Immigration</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
97. $W_2$ In Australia, in how many organizations (Social, religious, work, etc.) are you a member?

169 1. None
48 2. 1
5 3. 2
2 4. 3
0 5. 4
0 6. 5
1 7. or more

Default = 23

98. $W_3$ (Types of organizations named in $W_2$)

11 1. Social
9 2. Sport
3 3. Religious
16 4. Work
2 5. Other
13 6. Leadership positions in some organizations

Default = 194 (25 defaults and 169 not applicable)

99. $X_2$ In Latin America, in how many organizations (Social, religious, work, etc.) were you a member?

105 1. None
65 2. 1
30 3. 2
13 4. 3
9 5. 4
4 6. 5
2 7. or more

Default = 20

100. $X_3$ (Types of organizations named in $X_2$)

19 1. Social
37 2. Sport
7 3. Religious
5 4. Work
6 5. Other
34 6. Leadership positions in some organizations.

Default = 140 - of whom 105 were not applicable.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION
HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

N.B. Most "defaults" are for residents in hostels and special accommodation.

COMPUTER
ITEM QUESTIONNAIRE
CODE CODE

4) 1. Which of the following best describes your dwelling:
   42 1. Separate house
   48 2. Attached house (2 or more houses attached to each other)
   131 3. Self-contained flat or self-contained home unit
   3 4. Improvised home (shed, tent, garage, etc. occupied on a permanent or semi-permanent basis)
   0 5. Caravan, houseboat, or other mobile unit
   9 6. Other (describe)
   7 7. Hostel (Commonwealth)
   3 8. Y.M.C.A. Hostel

Default = 5

5) 2. How many rooms are there in your dwelling (do NOT count bathrooms, laundries, storerooms, halls, or rooms shared with but mainly occupied by another dwelling)

   23 1. 1
   49 2. 2
   43 3. 3
   49 4. 4
   29 5. 5
   15 6. 6
   8 7. 7
   1 8. 8
   3 9. 9 or more

Default = 28

6) 3. How many bedrooms are there in your dwelling?

   5 1. None (a one-room apartment)
   69 2. 1
   93 3. 2
   35 4. 3
   14 5. 4
   1 6. 5
   2 7. or more

Default = 29

7) 4. What is the usual number of occupants in your dwelling?

   14 1. 1
   48 2. 2
   56 3. 3
   42 4. 4
   23 5. 5
   8 6. 6
   12 7. 7
   10 8. 8 or 9
   4 9. 10 or more

Default = 31
5. What is the basis of your occupancy in this dwelling?

1. Renting housing commission
2. Renting - subsidized by employer
3. Renting - lease of over 4 months
4. Renting (without any of the above restrictions)
5. Buying on mortgage
6. Owner-occupier
7. Live with friends, parents, or other relatives, pay no rent
8. Home free with job

Default = 26

6. What is the material of the outer walls of this building?

1. Brick
2. Brick veneer
3. Stone
4. Concrete
5. Timber
6. Other

Default = 30

7. How many motor vehicles are owned or driven by members of your household?
   (do not include motor cycles, scooters, etc.)

1. None
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4
6. or more

Default = 30

8. What is your usual means of transportation?

1. Car
2. Bus
3. Train
4. Walking
5. Motor cycle/scooter
6. Other
7. Combination bus/train

Defaults = 26

9. Why have you chosen to live in this neighbourhood?

1. cost of housing
2. friends/relatives live near here
3. close to work
4. convenient for transportation
5. desirable neighbourhood
6. combination of above reasons including No.2 (friends/relatives)
7. combination of above reasons excluding No.2 (friends/relatives)
8. other

Default = 34
13) 10. Please estimate the total annual income from all members of this household before taxes (Australian dollars) and make an X mark in the corresponding part in the line below.

0 1. $0
0 2. $1000
6 3. $2000
21 4. $3000
28 5. $4000
29 6. $5000
13 7. $6000
8 8. $7000
8 9. $8000
5 10. $9000
11 11. $10000
1 12. $11000
2 13. $12000
1 14. $13000
1 15. $14000
2 16. $15000
0 17. $16000
1 18. $17000 +

Default = 117 (was to be calculated from the individual incomes)

14) 11. What is the weekly rent? (Include the weekly equivalent of any rates you pay separately, such as garbage & water rates)

3 1. $0-5
19 2. $6-10
25 3. $11-15
24 4. $16-20
28 5. $21-25
51 6. $26-30
29 7. $31-35
17 8. $36-40
8 9. $41-45
10 10. $46-51+

Default = 34

15) 12. If rented, is this dwelling rented furnished or unfurnished?

15 1. Not rented
119 2. Furnished
83 3. Unfurnished

Default = 31

13. Which of the following does your household have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes No</th>
<th>Defaults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16) 216 3</td>
<td>1. Electricity 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) 114 98</td>
<td>2. Gas 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) 164 52</td>
<td>3. Television 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) 146 69</td>
<td>4. Radio 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) 204 14</td>
<td>5. Running Water (internal) 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) 196 23</td>
<td>6. Hot running water 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) 91 123</td>
<td>7. Room heater of some kind (gas, steam, elect., etc.) 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) 166 49</td>
<td>8. Private bath 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) 3 160</td>
<td>9. Bath shared with another household 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Compared with your housing in your country of origin, your housing in Australia is:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25) In Construction:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1. Much worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2. Worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3. Almost Equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4. Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5. Much better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Default = 31

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26) In Comfort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1. Much Worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2. Worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3. Almost Equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4. Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5. Much better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Default = 32

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27) In Neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1. Much Worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2. Worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3. Almost Equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4. Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5. Much better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Default = 38

15. In what zone(s) of the city do the working members of your household work? [NOT CODED FOR COMPUTER]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone (L.G.A)</th>
<th>How many from your family work there?</th>
<th>Estimate of distance from home.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX III

TECHNIQUES OF ANALYSIS

A. OVERVIEW

In this study the analyses of both the sample and total population attempt to cover descriptive and explanatory aspects of the Latin Americans in Australia and their migration satisfaction. Description and explanation are intricately related and both require interpretation, a rather individualistic and potentially subjective element in research. One way I endeavour to make my interpretation more objective is through the use of descriptive and analytical (inferential) statistics. The descriptive statistics are quite straightforward. However, the other statistical techniques require further comments. Four sections of this study use statistical analyses. One is the determination of the index of migration satisfaction. This is presented in Chapter X and Appendix IV. Another use of statistics is to determine which characteristics of the migrants are related to migration satisfaction. That methodology is presented in Chapter XI. Discriminant analysis in Chapter XIII is another statistical technique. The fourth use of statistics is for an assessment of the precision of the sample.

B. ASSESSMENT OF THE PRECISION OF THE SAMPLE

Statistical tests are used to check the sample's similarity (precision) to the total population of Latin Americans in Sydney and across Australia. The 1971 census figures are used as the "expected" or "theoretical" values against which are tested the tallied responses to the comparable questions on the thesis questionnaire. Siegel (1956, Chapter 4) outlines and discusses the procedures for testing one-sample cases for "goodness of fit". The
tests utilized are chi-squared for data with a nominal level of measurement and Kolmogorov-Smirnov for ordinal level data. Examples will illustrate the procedures.

We discuss in Chapter III a couple of very important variables of the Latin Americans in Australia, namely their place of birth and their year of arrival, which gives us period of residence. Concerning these two variables we want to know how accurately our sample compares with the actual population or universe of all persons who could have been included in the sample. For most tests of "goodness of fit" in this study, the "universe" (expected values) is the population covered by the 30 June 1971 Australian Census, while the sample is based on the 31 December 1972 population.

B.1 Example 1: Place of Birth

To test the goodness of fit of the birthplace data with the chi-squared one sample test, we arrange the data from the sample (observed values) as in Table App.3-1. The corresponding census figures are adjusted to the sample's size by the formula:

\[ E_i = \frac{n}{N_t} \times N_i, \]

where

- \( E_i \) = expected value for the \( i^{th} \) code (the codes in this case are specific places of birth).
- \( n \) = sample size.
- \( N_t \) = total size of the census population covering from 1 to \( i \) codes.
- \( N_i \) = census population for code \( i \)

---

1 Not even through the use of the arrival and departure data for Australia is it possible to up-date the census tallies because the sample was limited to the Sydney area. Also, because so many of the interviewees arrived after the census date, there was no value in testing only the interviewees in Australia at the census vs. the census data.
### TABLE APP. 3-1
**COMPARISON OF THE BIRTHPLACES OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF LATIN AMERICA-BORN PERSONS AND THE 1971 CENSUS DATA (RESIDENTS) FOR AUSTRALIA AND SYDNEY**

#### a. For Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>MEX.</th>
<th>OTHER C.Am.</th>
<th>ARG.</th>
<th>URU.</th>
<th>CHI.</th>
<th>PERU</th>
<th>VEN.</th>
<th>BRA.</th>
<th>OTHER N &amp; S Am.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Census Data</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>3691</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>11,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expected Value</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>210.8</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Observed (Sample)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ (\chi^2 = 29.99, \text{ at df}=8) \]

\[ (\therefore \text{ reject } H_0 \text{ at p}<.001 \text{ level}) \]

#### b. For Sydney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>MEX.</th>
<th>OTHER C.Am.</th>
<th>ARG.</th>
<th>URU.</th>
<th>CHI.</th>
<th>PERU</th>
<th>VEN.</th>
<th>BRA.</th>
<th>OTHER N &amp; S Am.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Census Data</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>2780</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>7,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expected Value</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>152.4</td>
<td>250.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Observed (Sample)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ( \frac{(0 - E_i)^2}{E_i} )</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>+ .6</td>
<td>+ 2.2</td>
<td>+ 14.8</td>
<td>+ 2.6</td>
<td>+ 2.9</td>
<td>+ 8.6</td>
<td>+ 5.3</td>
<td>+ 29.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ (\chi^2 = 29.99, \text{ at df}=8) \]

\[ (\therefore \text{ reject } H_0 \text{ at p}<.001 \text{ level}) \]

#### c. For Sydney - Adjusted to Dec. 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>MEX.</th>
<th>OTHER C.Am.</th>
<th>ARG.</th>
<th>URU.</th>
<th>CHI.</th>
<th>PERU</th>
<th>VEN.</th>
<th>BRA.</th>
<th>OTHER N &amp; S Am.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Estimates of population Dec. 1972*</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>2284</td>
<td>3665</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>10,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expected Value</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>139.6</td>
<td>223.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>167.7</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Observed (Sample)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ( \frac{(0 - E_i)^2}{E_i} )</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>+ **</td>
<td>+ .70</td>
<td>+ 8.59</td>
<td>+ 0.0</td>
<td>+ .55</td>
<td>+ **</td>
<td>+ 5.61</td>
<td>+ 5.97</td>
<td>21.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ (\chi^2 = 29.99, \text{ at df}=8) \]

\[ (\therefore \text{ reject } H_0 \text{ at p}<.01 \text{ level}) \]

#### Footnotes:
- *The estimates are based on the assumption that 80% of the net recent arrivals remain in Sydney during the first years of residence.
- **Other Central America and Venezuela are combined with Other North and South America.
The calculated $\chi^2$ values indicate a high probability that the difference between the sample and the census would not be due to chance if the sample had been randomly selected. This is not altogether surprising since the sample was not randomly selected and since the census figures were not available at the time of the interviewing. What is more surprising is that the sample size is within 15% of the expected value for Sydney (Table App.3-1b) for each birthplace except Uruguay, Venezuela and Other North and South America, even though the sample was taken 18 months and 4260 (37.5%) net arrivals after the census. The first notable difference is that no Venezuelans are included in the sample. A network of Venezuelans was never found; the only Venezuelan I met had visitor status.

The second main difference is an under selection of Uruguayans in Sydney by 47 persons even though the sample of 105 persons was accurate to within two persons (0.3% of the total sample) for the proportionate number from the Total Australia figures shown in part "a" of Table App.3-1. The unexpected concentration of 90% of all of Australia's Uruguayans in Sydney has adversely affected the precision of the sample as far as birthplace is concerned.

The third major reason for the high $\chi^2$ value is an over representation in the "Other North and South America" category of birthplaces. This was mainly caused by the interviewing of seventy-four Ecuadorians in order to have a sufficient number of them for detailed analyses. They are distinct in racial composition, lack of assisted passage, and concentration in the inner city area.
These biases in the resultant sample number need to be kept in mind in the analyses. However they only become truly important if and when we find that the birthplaces of Uruguayans and Ecuadorians have an influence on other variables. It is important to note here, and with reference to all further analyses of the precision of the sample, that this study is aimed at identifying differentials between migrants and to amplify census results rather than to only statistically describe a population. When such a description is necessary, it is done with reservations and with the incorporations of needed corrections as shown by these tests of the precision of the sample. As far as birthplace is concerned, corrections of plus and minus 40% (i.e. weightings of 1.4 and 0.6) for the Uruguayans and "Other North and South Americans", respectively, would greatly improve the precision without changing the total sample size.

B.2. Example 2: Period of Residence

As with birthplace, the period of residence of the sampled Latin Americans in Australia is different from that of the universe. The sample and census data for Sydney are shown in Table App.3-2, part "a" based on the census data of 30 June 1971 and part "b" based on the survey date of 31 December 1972. The results show an over sampling of the more recent (post-July 1970) arrivals. The difficulty in finding earlier migrants has already been mentioned (Appendix I.B). As stated in the discussion of place of birth, this non-random sample with a bias in the sample in favour of the recent arrivals cannot be used in an inferential way to give quantitative results for the whole of Sydney's Latin American population. However, some generalisations can be made and types can be identified. Also, this bias in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Residence (years)</th>
<th>24+</th>
<th>17-23</th>
<th>10-16</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Arrival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 1971 Census Data (excluding 635 not stated)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>6,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Expected Value (4.975%)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>178.8</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cumulative proportion</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Observed (Sample)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cumulative proportion</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. C-E</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Max. Diff. reject H₀ at p<<.01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Residence (years)</th>
<th>25%+</th>
<th>18%</th>
<th>14%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>D&gt;1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Arrival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>10,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Arrivals/Departures to adjust and extend 1971 Census Data (Estimates)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>223.4</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Expected Value (6.382%)</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cumulative proportion</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Observed (Sample)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cumulative proportion</td>
<td></td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. C-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Max. Diff. reject H₀ at p<<.001**

*a* based on assumption that 80% of arrivals will stay in Sydney.
no way diminishes the value of the sample for analyses between portions or dichotomies of the sample itself. In other words, if the sample is divided into pre- and post-1971 arrivals, i.e., as if two separate groups were collected, it can be examined in relation to a second variable for differences between the two arrival periods. This is the method used in the exploratory tests on migration satisfaction as explained in Chapter X.

Because the sample is all from Sydney, is biased toward the recent arrivals, and only approximates the birthplaces of the population, it cannot be used for statistical estimations of the total Latin America-born population of Australia. On the other hand it is basically similar to the population of post-1966 Latin American arrivals residing in Sydney in the early 1970's. Throughout the study the biases of selection and also the similarities between the sample and the population are noted when data are available for comparisons. The similarities do not make the sample statistically precise, but they do justify the qualitative results and typology for describing the immigrants. Although a probability sample would have allowed the inclusion of other objectives, the non-probability judgement sample collected has proved adequate for the purposes of this research. (For comments on judgement samples, see Deming, 1950, p.9ff and, 1960, p.31ff).
APPENDIX IV

ANALYSES OF THE SATISFACTION INDICATORS AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF IMMIGRANTS ACCORDING TO THEIR MIGRATION SATISFACTION

The task is to take the results of the five satisfaction indicators and obtain a reasonably reliable sequence of levels of migration satisfaction. During the interviewing I observed that while all of the indicators seemed reliable and reasonably accurate for their specific questions, indicators 101, 102, and 103 (ADVISE, LEAVE and EXPECT, respectively) seemed to agree with each other more frequently than they agreed with indicators 104 and 105 (ASSIST and JOBSAT). To check this after the data was collected and cross-tabulated, a series of tests were run to calculate the contingency coefficients and the Spearman rank correlation coefficients for each possible pairing of the satisfaction indicators.

The contingency coefficients have interpretation problems when using contingency tables of different sizes and become invalid if the sample size requirements of the chi-squared test are not met. It also does not take into account the rank position in ordinal scales. For these reasons the results of these tests were given less emphasis (Table App.4-2). Our discussion will focus on the Spearman rank correlation values calculated on the same data.

Spearman rank correlation coefficients were calculated (Table App.4-1) for (a) the total sample of Latin American Independent Decision Makers (299 persons) and for two divisions based on periods of residence, (b) greater than, and (c) less than or equal to six months in Australia at the time of the interviews. The reason for the division at six months is that tests in Chapter X and earlier studies found that very recent arrivals have

1The questions used as the five satisfaction indicators are discussed in Chapter IX.
TABLE APP. 4-1

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE FIVE SATISFACTION INDICATORS PLUS THE COMPOSITE INDICATOR OF OVERALL MIGRATION SATISFACTION (ITEM 106) OF THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENT DECISION MAKERS IN AUSTRALIA

A. Sample: Latin America-Born, Total Sample of Independents
(239< N < 286)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM No.</th>
<th>(No. of Codes)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item No. (No. of Codes) 101 102 103 104 105 106

NOTES: a. Matrix sizes depend on No. of codes e.g. item 102x104 is a 3x3 matrix.
b. Because of defaults, N varies slightly.
c. All values significant at .0005 level except those marked: @ = .01
* = .05
[ ] = fails to reach .05

B. Sample: Latin America-Born, > 6 Months in Australia
(203< N < 237)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM No.</th>
<th>(No. of Codes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item No. (No. of Codes) 101 102 103 104 105 106

C. Sample: Latin America-Born, < 6 Months in Australia
(33< N < 49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM No.</th>
<th>(No. of Codes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item No. (No. of Codes) 101 102 103 104 105 106
### TABLE APP. 4-2

**CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENTS OF THE FIVE SATISFACTION INDICATORS PLUS THE COMPOSITE INDICATOR OF OVERALL MIGRATION SATISFACTION (ITEM 106) OF THE SAMPLED LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENT DECISION MAKERS IN AUSTRALIA**

#### A. Total Independent Latin America-Born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM No.</th>
<th>NOTES:</th>
<th>101 (81)</th>
<th>102 (83)</th>
<th>103 (84)</th>
<th>104 (88)</th>
<th>105 (69)</th>
<th>106 (Over-all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Main values given are from a 3x3 matrix. Values from larger matrices (when possible) are given in brackets with matrix size given below.</td>
<td>0.4952</td>
<td>0.4961</td>
<td>0.4234</td>
<td>0.3472</td>
<td>0.3451</td>
<td>0.6330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.5146)</td>
<td>(.4326)</td>
<td>(.5146)</td>
<td>(.3589)</td>
<td>(.4445)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3x5</td>
<td>3x5</td>
<td>3x3</td>
<td>3x3</td>
<td>(.2635)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4952</td>
<td>0.4961</td>
<td>0.4234</td>
<td>0.3472</td>
<td>0.3451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Values could not be calculated for the &lt;6 months residents because of insufficient numbers.</td>
<td>0.2954</td>
<td>0.2635</td>
<td>0.1913</td>
<td>0.1998</td>
<td>0.2635</td>
<td>0.1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.4284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.3397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3x5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Latin America-Born Independents, >6 Months in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM No.</th>
<th>NOTES:</th>
<th>101 (81)</th>
<th>102 (83)</th>
<th>103 (84)</th>
<th>104 (88)</th>
<th>105 (69)</th>
<th>106 (Over-all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4655</td>
<td>0.5063</td>
<td>0.3319</td>
<td>0.6388</td>
<td>0.2596</td>
<td>0.6388</td>
<td>0.1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.5206)</td>
<td>(.4202)</td>
<td>(.4202)</td>
<td>(.5206)</td>
<td>(.4202)</td>
<td>(.4202)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3x5</td>
<td>3x5</td>
<td>3x5</td>
<td>3x9</td>
<td>3x5</td>
<td>3x9</td>
<td>3x9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4083</td>
<td>0.2628</td>
<td>0.1779</td>
<td>0.1779</td>
<td>0.1779</td>
<td>0.1779</td>
<td>0.1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.3589)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.3589)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.3589)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.3589)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2628</td>
<td>0.2628</td>
<td>0.2628</td>
<td>0.2628</td>
<td>0.2628</td>
<td>0.2628</td>
<td>0.2628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.2769)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.2769)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.2769)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.2769)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NOTES:

101 (81) 102 (83) 103 (84) 104 (88) 105 (69) 106 (Over-all)
considerably more favourable views about Australia. The method of calculating Spearman rank correlation coefficients from matrices (contingency tables) is presented in this paper in Appendix V.

(continued)
As seen in Table App. 4-1A, the correlation coefficients support the hunch that there is more internal agreement between indicators 101, 102, and 103 than there is between any of the other pairs of indicators. The correlation coefficients are all positive as expected and a few key ones are above $r_s = .50$, but several others indicate quite weak relationships. Considering the diversity of the questions, this is neither alarming nor fatal to the methodology, since no single or pair of variables constitute the sole determination of migration satisfaction. Essentially, the indicators relate to several different aspects of migration satisfaction.

For example, the strongest correlation ($r_s = .553$) is between indicators 101 and 102, ADVISE and LEAVE, respectively. Given that each of those two indicators has only three possible codes which result in a 3x3 contingency matrix, the positive relationship is quite pronounced. An example at the other extreme is 104 (ASSIST) and 105 (JOBSAT) with a coefficient of $r_s = .199$ (essentially .2). We cannot assume that migrants without assisted passage (who usually were dissatisfied with the government assistance) would necessarily have lower job satisfaction. What I find to be quite meaningful and useful is that indicator 101 (ADVISE) is the one most highly correlated with each of the other four indicators; its average correlation is 0.449. Number 102 (LEAVE) is second most correlated with an average of 0.393, but is essentially the same as indicator 103 (EXPECT) which had an average of 0.387. Fourth was 104 (ASSIST) and fifth was 105 (JOBSAT) with averages of 0.298 and 0.268 respectively. This essentially gives an order of importance to these five indicators.

A further analysis of these coefficients was done by calculating Kendall's $W$, the coefficient of concordance (ref. Siegel, 1956, pp.229-238).
Each satisfaction indicator was taken to be a separate "judge" which looked at each of the 299 persons. All of the Spearman's rank coefficients ($r_s$) have already been calculated, so from them can be calculated the average $r_s$ value ($r_{sav}$) for any group of three or more satisfaction indicators by using the formula:

$$W = r_{sav} + \left(1 - r_{sav}\right)\frac{1}{K}$$

where $K$ is the number of judges. The result of these calculations for all possible combinations of three or more of the satisfaction indicators are given in Table App. 4-3. Interpreting these results, we can say that:

a. The greatest concordance is between the three indicators 101, 102, and 103 (ADVISE, LEAVE, and EXPECT, respectively).

b. Whenever indicator 101 is included, the "W" value is almost equal to or is higher than if it is omitted, even though it is expected that greater concordance is possible if fewer "judges" are used.

c. The inclusion of indicator 105 (JOBSAT) tends to depress the concordance.1

It is noteworthy that since the indicators look at different (but related) aspects of satisfaction, perfect or very high correlations are not expected. High correlations would, in fact, indicate that migration satisfaction could be measured adequately with one indicator.

1 At the present exploratory level of measurement and use of migration satisfaction, it was thought best to retain indicator 105 (JOBSAT) in the determination of the migration satisfaction index. Although its removal would have resulted in greater internal consistancy in determining the final index, its removal would imply that relative job satisfaction of a migrant was not an important consideration in overall migration satisfaction. On the contrary, it is important, as shown in Appendix Table 4-1. Furthermore, its removal would mean that the final index is based on only four indicators, while in fact it is advisable that future studies increase the number of indicators. It would then be possible to choose the best indicators and/or to use different combinations of indicators to observe if they yield different final indices. Also advisable would be selected questions to determine which of the issues covered in the satisfaction indicators are considered by the interviewee to be most important to him in general and which issues contribute most to his satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with his migration. The methodology of Herzberg (reviewed in Section I.C.2) may be adaptable to such studies.
### TABLE APP. 4-3

VALUES OF KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE "W" FROM FIVE SATISFACTION INDICATORS ASKED OF THE SAMPLE OF LATIN AMERICA-BORN INDEPENDENT DECISION MAKERS IN SYDNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Indicator Numbers</th>
<th>$K$</th>
<th>$r_{av}$</th>
<th>$W$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ value for test of significance at $N-1=279$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101, 102, 103</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>101, 102, 104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>101, 102, 105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101, 103, 104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>101, 103, 105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>101, 104, 105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>102, 103, 104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>102, 103, 105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>102, 104, 105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>103, 104, 105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>101, 102, 103, 105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>101, 102, 103, 104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>101, 102, 104, 105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>101, 103, 104, 105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>102, 103, 104, 105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>101, 102, 103, 104, 105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Because of a few defaults in each cross-tabulation, the size of $N$ was taken as .280 instead of 299. $N$ is used only in calculating the test of significance. In all cases the values are statistically significant.
We should also note that although the "W" values indicate quite reasonable concordance, especially for the first three satisfaction indicators, they do not in any way say anything about what the indicators agree upon. It is therefore dependent upon our interpretation of the responses if we wish to say that a person is satisfied if he 1) would advise his relatives to come to Australia, 2) plans to stay in Australia, and 3) says he found here what he expected to find.

Although the above analyses of the correlation coefficients and concordance values give a meaningful ordering of the five indicators, the data do not allow the placing of fixed, totally objective weightings on each one. I did not attempt to weight them and calculate an interval type value for each migrant's composite score on migration satisfaction. (However, I feel that this will someday be possible after a standardized test has been formulated and tested). Nevertheless, I did take an unweighted tally of each person's scores. They ranged from five to twenty-five if they did not default on any of the questions. ¹ To arrive at the "composite indicator of overall migration satisfaction" (Item 106), I examined each of the 299 Latin America-born Independent Decision Maker's combination of responses to the five indicators and their numerical unweighted score. The first step was to divide the interviewees into three groups which I called dissatisfied (D), neutral (N), and satisfied (S). Basically, scores of 5-11 were dissatisfied, 12-18 were neutral, and 19-25 were satisfied. Unintentionally, that division gave approximately equal numbers in each group, i.e. 95-D, 91-N, and 113-S. Reviewing the data again I saw three clear levels which I called favourable (+),

¹ For the 248 Independent Decision Makers in Australia for more than six months, there were 82 defaults on the satisfaction indicators, i.e. 82 out of 1240 (7%) answers were not given. The figure is actually lower when we note that a student or unemployed person (e.g. a young female) from Latin America was not able to answer the comparative job satisfaction question. The numbers of persons defaulting on a question were proportionately distributed over the nine levels of migration satisfaction.
average, and unfavourable (−) within each of the three groups. Each person was reexamined and classified, yielding the results in Table 9-3. The case studies in Section IX. D. 2., illustrate those levels of migration satisfaction.
APPENDIX V

A METHOD FOR CALCULATING SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT FROM A CONTINGENCY TABLE

The two parts to this appendix say the same thing in different ways. Ironically, for a topic as important, as basic and actually as simple as this, nothing equivalent has been found in the literature. I think this is because professional statisticians a) do not deal much with non-parametric problems, b) are aware that the parametric test of Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation, if performed on the rankings of the grouped data, gives the same statistical result, and c) do not know that the test mentioned in "b)" above is not known to most social scientists and other users of non-parametric statistics. Nevertheless, the Spearman's test as described here has greater clarity, ease of appreciating, and a computational advantage over the Pearson's test. The version in Appendix V.B. is the original. The one in Appendix V.A. is the second, the shorter, and the more statistical version, for which I am indebted to Mr. Graham Pollard for his assistance.
APPENDIX V.A.

A METHOD FOR CALCULATING
SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
FROM A CONTINGENCY TABLE*

Paul S. Anderson and Graham H. Pollard
CANBERRA COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper shows a convenient method for calculating Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, $r_s$, when only a limited number of levels within each variable are distinguishable and the data is represented in the form of a contingency table. Kendall (1970; pp 45-48) shows a method for calculating another coefficient of rank correlation, $\tau$, when the data is in matrix form. That method and the one presented in this paper fulfil analogous roles. As with $\tau$ for grouped data, the method presented here for calculating $r_s$ is most useful when the number of observations is large and hence the number of ties within each level of each variable is also large. Without this method the researcher would have to generate the $n$ ordered rankings on each variable from the contingency table and then calculate $r_s$ (adjusted for ties) using these $n$ pairings. Such a process would be clumsy. Alternatively, for ease of calculation, he may have preferred to resort to the less powerful contingency coefficient even though the data was ordinal.

* An earlier, less statistical version was given as an unpublished paper by P.S. Anderson at the 13th Annual Conference of the Institute of Australian Geographers, August 1975, Wollongong, NSW.
It is known that Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient, \( r \), and \( r_s \) are equal. Care must be taken in using this fact in order to calculate \( r \) rather than \( r_s \). To calculate \( r \) using equal intervals of one unit between the levels of each variable is incorrect, even though for some contingency tables it gives the correct numerical value for \( r_s \). The value \( r \) is equal to \( r_s \) if \( r \) is calculated using the average rank value of the tied observations within each level of each variable, i.e. using ranks rather than a set interval. However, in the authors' opinion the calculation of \( r_s \) using the method presented here is in general computationally simpler than calculating \( r \) to arrive at the same numerical result.

2. THE METHOD

Suppose \( n \) observations are ranked according to some quality A, and a second quality B, each ordinal in nature but that only \( a \) (<< \( n \)) levels within quality A and only \( b \) (<< \( n \)) levels within quality B can be meaningfully distinguished. The result is a large number of tied ranks for each quality and the data would be most conveniently represented in matrix form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed frequency</th>
<th>Level of Quality B</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>Marginal Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Quality A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( f_{11} ) ( f_{12} ) ( f_{13} )</td>
<td>( f_{1b} )</td>
<td>( f_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>( f_{21} ) ( f_{22} ) ( f_{23} )</td>
<td>( f_{2b} )</td>
<td>( f_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a )</td>
<td>( f_{a1} ) ( f_{a2} ) ( f_{a3} )</td>
<td>( f_{ab} )</td>
<td>( f_a )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Totals</td>
<td>( f_{.1} ) ( f_{.2} ) ( f_{.3} )</td>
<td>( f.b )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It would be possible to use the contingency coefficient as a measure of the relationship between the level of quality A and the level of quality B, but as this measure makes no use of the ordinal scale of the data, Kendall's tau (τ) or Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, $r_s$, would be preferable. Kendall (1970) gives a method for calculating $\tau$ from a contingency table. He also shows how $r_s$ (adjusted for ties) can be applied when the $n$ observations are listed as raw data, but he does not discuss the calculation of $r_s$ from a contingency table. As it is more likely, especially for large $n$, that the data will be tabulated in matrix form, the method described below is quite useful.

Using the above notation, define $r_1$ and $r_{i.}$ ($i = 2, 3 \ldots \ldots a$) by

$$r_1 = (1 + f_1) / 2$$

and

$$r_{i.} = r_{(i-1) + (f_{(i-1)} + f_{i.}) / 2}$$

if $i = 2, 3, \ldots \ldots , a$

Make similar definitions for $r_{.1}$ and $r_{.j}$ ($j = 2, 3, \ldots \ldots b$). It can be seen that $r_{i.}$ is the tied rank to be used for the level of quality A for each observation in the $i$'th row of the above matrix. A corresponding interpretation is given to $r_{.j}$. Then Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (adjusted for ties) is given by

$$r_s = \frac{2g(n) - \sum_{i=1}^a g(f_{i.}) - \sum_{j=1}^b g(f_{.j}) - \sum_{i=1}^a \sum_{j=1}^b f_{i.j} (r_{i.} - r_{.j})^2}{\sqrt{2\left\{g(n) - \sum_{i=1}^a g(f_{i.})\right\} \left\{g(n) - \sum_{j=1}^b g(f_{.j})\right\}}}$$

where $g(x) = (x^3 - x) / 12$
Alternatively Spearman's rank correlation coefficient above is equal to Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient when the levels of quality A are assumed to be $r_1$, $r_2$, ..., $r_a$. (Not 1, 2, ....,a) and the levels of quality B are assumed to be $r_1$, $r_2$, ....,$r_b$ (Not 1, 2, ....,b). The calculation of $r_b$ using the above method is computationally easier than calculating $r$.

Although this method is most useful when $n >> a$ and $n >> b$, it is still correct, but inefficient when $n = a$ and/or $n = b$.

Example (a) The calculation of $r_s$:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$f_{ij}$</th>
<th>Level of Quality B</th>
<th>$f_i$</th>
<th>$r_i$.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Quality A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 - - - -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 21 1 - -</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 12 4 1 -</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 3 2 1 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>- 1 1 2 7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 37 8 4 8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{ij}$</td>
<td>11.5 41 63.5 69.5 75.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$g(n) = 41080$; $\sum_{i=1}^{5} g(f_{i.}) = 4707$; $\sum_{j=1}^{5} g(f_{.j}) = 5192.5$

$\sum_{i=1}^{5} \sum_{j=1}^{5} f_{ij}(r_{i.} - r_{.j})^2 = 23424.5$ and $r_s = 0.675$.

(b) The calculation of $r$. Assuming the levels of quality A to be the tied ranks for each level, i.e. 2.5, 22.5, 50.5, 64.5, 74 and the levels of quality B to be 11.5, 41, 63.5, 69.5, 75.5, the numerical value of $r$ is 0.675 as obtained when calculating $r_s$ above.
Note, however, that if the levels are at one unit intervals, i.e. -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, then $r = .764$ which is not equal to $r_8$.

APPENDIX V.B

(A paper presented to the 13th Annual Conference of the Institute of Australian Geographers, August 1975, Wollongong N.S.W.)

A METHOD FOR CALCULATING SPEARMAN'S CORRELATION COEFFICIENT FROM A CONTINGENCY TABLE, ESPECIALLY TO TEST LARGE SAMPLES CONSISTING OF GROUPED DATA

Paul S. Anderson
Department of Applied Geography
Canberra College of Advanced Education

Abstract: A Spearman Rank correlation coefficient for a large sample can be calculated from a contingency table or matrix of frequencies.

The test is not changed; only the method for organizing the data has been altered. The method described in full in this paper uses to advantage the large proportion of tied observations (grouped data) in large samples. All that is needed is a cross-tabulation of your data which must be at an ordinal or better level of measurement. All of the values needed come from a matrix as given below. The complete equation is:

\[
rs = \frac{2(N^3 - N)}{12} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} tY_i^3 - tY_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} tx_i^3 - tx_i} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} i_{ij}^3 - i_{ij}}{(N^3 - N) \frac{1}{12} \sum_{i=1}^{n} tX_i^3 - tX_i}
\]

Matrix for Calculating Spearman's \(r_s\) (Table 2 of text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes of X variable</th>
<th>Totals for cumulative row totals (downwards)</th>
<th>Rank order values for rows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) (2) (\ldots) (j)</td>
<td>(tY_1) (tY_2) (\ldots) (tY_j)</td>
<td>(RY_1) (RY_2) (\ldots) (RY_j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) (d) (e) (s) (of) (Y)</td>
<td>(f_{11}) (f_{12}) (\ldots) (f_{1j}) (f_{21}) (f_{22}) (\ldots) (f_{2j}) (\ldots) (\ldots) (tY_1) (tY_2) (\ldots) (tY_j)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals for columns ((j) of codes of X)</td>
<td>(tx_1) (tx_2) (\ldots) (tx_j)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative column totals (across to right)</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{j}) (2) (\ldots) (j) (\frac{j}{j}) (\frac{j}{j}) (\frac{j}{j})</td>
<td>(RX_1) (RX_2) (\ldots) (RX_j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank order values for columns</td>
<td>(RX_1) (RX_2) (\ldots) (RX_j)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The "key" is to calculate the cumulative row and column totals and to use them with the normal row and column totals to calculate the rank order values $RX_j$ and $RY_i$. This is done with the following formulae:

$$RX_j = \frac{tX_j + 1}{2} + \sum tX_{j-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(formula D in text)}

$$RY_i = \frac{tY_i + 1}{2} + \sum tY_{i-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{(formula E in text)}

This technique makes easy work of correlation calculations for data at the ordinal level which in the past were tedious calculations for large samples ($N$ greater than 50) which contain a large proportion of ties in either of the two variables. The ties are increasingly more common as $N$ increases unless there is a corresponding increase in the ability to distinguish differences between the observations. This applies to the responses for both variables. But with semantic differentials and most other non-interval ordered codes for classifying responses on questionnaires, this is not possible because of time and financial restrictions. Therefore, the tendency has been to collect large samples and then use the versatile but less powerful contingency coefficient, $C$, even when our data is at the ordinal level. The method presented here allows us to calculate Spearman's rho from a contingency table.
I. Introduction: The problem

One frequently encountered problem in research is to test two variables to see if there is a correlation between them. With interval data and a normal distribution, Pearson's r can be calculated rather easily using calculators and computers. It is easy because each value has a distinct place on a fixed scale. With nominal data for one or both of the variables, the weak but versatile contingency coefficient is the only selection. Regardless of how large the sample is (as long as it is not too small), all that is needed is a simple cross tabulation showing the frequencies of responses for each combination of the two variables. It is easy because each value need only be put into one of several classes or groups which do not have any fixed relationship to each other in terms of ordering or spacing (intervals). But the coefficient C "is not directly comparable to any other measure of correlation" (Siegel, 1955, p.201).

The tests using ordinal data are in between these two extremes. The data must be arranged in sequential order, but the figures do not have a fixed position until all of the values have been examined and the relative position of each value in relation to every other value is known. In other words, the ordering of three or more numbers cannot be accomplished until the final number is known. For example, if a=23, b=14, and c is not yet known, the ordering would be 'b, a, c' if c is 30, 'b, c, a' if c is 18, or 'c, b, a' if c is 8. This is of minor consequence when there are comparatively few figures or respondents even though each respondent must be ranked twice, once for each variable, in a test of correlation. A further complication occurs when there are a large proportion of tied observations (the same response being given by or coded to two or more respondents). This is not a serious problem with small samples, but is increasingly troublesome as the
sample size increases without a corresponding increase in the number of
distinguishable classes or levels of responses. For example, if as part of
a questionnaire we are assessing basic foreign language ability, we can only
obtain about seven levels from "no ability" to "native fluency" using a
semantic differential. Beyond that we would need to administer a separate
test or mini-test involving several questions which could eventually give you
something with many numerical values which could be ranked or almost used as
an interval scale. But we would seldom have the time, money or inclination
to gather such detailed data. Our efforts would usually be better spent
asking other questions or increasing our sample size. But a larger sample
increases the number of ties and the problems of manipulating the data into a
testable rank-order arrangement for the two variables to be correlated. It
can be done, but we normally revert to the humble but versatile contingency
coefficient for which we only need a matrix of frequencies. In effect, we
waste the "order" of our data because of data handling difficulties. If only
we could use that matrix of frequencies to calculate a rank correlation
coefficient such as Spearman's \( r_s \). That is the problem; the remainder of this
paper discusses a solution.\(^{(1)}\)

II. A Modified Method of Calculating Spearman's \( r_s \) from a Matrix of Frequencies

We have two starting points which must be joined to arrive at
a method of calculating the rank correlation coefficient. One is Spearman's
equation as given by Siegel (1956, p.207, No.9.4):

\[
(1) \quad \text{Kendall (1970, pp.43-48) discusses another test based on tau
to determine correlation between two variables with grouped ordinal data. Yates (1948, pp.176-181) presents another method based on chi-squared. Some readers may prefer those to the method presented here. No other alternative tests have been found unless the data justifies the assumptions needed for the calculation of product-moment correlation from grouped data.} \]


\[ r_s = \frac{\sum X^2 + \sum Y^2 - \sum d^2}{2\sqrt{(\sum X^2)(\sum Y^2)}} \]  
\text{where} \ X = \text{rank of a response in variable X} 
\text{Y} = \text{"""" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" "" 

The second starting point is our data in the form of a matrix (i,j) of variables X and Y which we can represent in Table 1:

**Basic Matrix for Calculating Spearman's r**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes of X variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>Totals for rows(i) of codes of Y tY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>f_{11}</td>
<td>f_{12}</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>f_{1j}</td>
<td>tY_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>f_{21}</td>
<td>f_{22}</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>f_{2j}</td>
<td>tY_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>f_{i1}</td>
<td>f_{i2}</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>f_{ij}</td>
<td>tY_i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals for columns (j) of codes of X tX_1 tX_2 ... tX_j N
Almost every value needed for equation B is found in this matrix. The only value missing is $\Sigma d^2$. The calculation of this value is the key to this method of determining Spearman's $r_s$ from a matrix of ordinal data. Again we approach the problem from two sides, this time using equation B and the matrix in Table 1.

$\Sigma d^2$ means to add together the squared differences in ranks of X and Y of each respondent. But some respondents have the same answers for both the X and Y variables as is evident on the matrix of frequencies. Therefore, $f_{ij}$ tells us how many respondents have the same ranks of X and Y and therefore the same differences (squared) of X and Y. It follows that:

$$
\Sigma d^2 = \sum_{ij} (d_{ij})^2
$$

where $d_{ij} = RX_j - RY_i$, that is

$$
d_{ij} \text{ is the difference between the rank of the } i^{th} \text{ row of variable Y (RY}_i) \text{ and the } j^{th} \text{ column of variable X (RX}_j).$$

Therefore, substituting this into equation B we obtain equation C which is the main one for the test:

Equation C.

$$
r_s = \frac{2(N^3 - N)}{12} \left( \frac{1}{n=1} \frac{tY_i^3 - tY_i}{12} - \frac{1}{i=1} \frac{tX_i^3 - tX_i}{12} \right)_{i,j=1}^{f_{ij}(RX_j - RY_j)^2}
$$

To find $RX_j$ and $RY_i$ we look at the totals for the rows and columns of the matrix respectively. We notice that every respondent who has been counted in a column of the X variable has the same X code as every other respondent in that column. In other words, they are tied observations. Siegel (1956, p.206) says "When tied scores occur, each of them is assigned the average of the ranks which would have been assigned had no ties occurred, our usual procedure for assigning ranks to tied observations". The average of those ranks is actually the median value of those ranks, since they are ordered integers. The median value of such a series of numbers will be $RX_j$ for the number of tied observations.
represented by \( tX_j \).

We know from the matrix how many ties there are in a given column \((tX_j)\). We can also calculate the cumulative total of respondents in the columns preceding the \( j^{th} \) column (i.e. \( j \sum_{j=1}^{j} tX_{j-1} \)) which tells us how many of the ranks between 1 and \( N \) have already been assigned. Therefore we can calculate the median rank value for the respondents in column \( tX_j \) with equation D which gives us \( RX_j \):

\[
RX_j = \frac{tX_j + 1}{2} + \sum tX_{j-1} \quad \text{equation D}
\]

Similarly we can calculate \( RY_i \) with equation E:

\[
RY_i = \frac{tY_i + 1}{2} + \sum tY_{i-1}
\]

These values with the cumulative row and column totals can be entered along side the original matrix to give us Table 2 with all of the values needed to calculate \( r_s \) using equation C.
III. Summary of the procedure:

1. Arrange your data as a cross-tabulated matrix. (The data must be at least at an ordinal level of measurement for both variables).
2. Using your values which correspond to the symbols given in Table 2, calculate the other values needed to complete that table.
3. Insert the calculated values into equation C and calculate $r_s$.

N.B. Since no formulas have been changed, this modified method of calculating Spearman's $r_s$ will give the same results as with traditional calculations. For example, the data on twelve students used by Siegel (1956, pp204-206) was placed in a 12 x 12 matrix. There were no ties and 132 of the cells were zeros. The $r_s$ values were exactly the same.

---

(2) With a programmable calculator you can rapidly do many of the repetitious calculations and speed up the testing. Mr. Phillip White, Department of Applied Geography, Canberra College of advanced Education, has programmed a Hewlett-Packard 9820A calculator to do all of the calculations after the operator enters all of the matrix values into the machine's memory. To run a 5x5 matrix requires one minute from start to finish.

---
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APPENDIX VI

THE CHANGING IMPORTANCE OF MIGRATION SATISFACTION*

A. FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF HISTORY

When settlers travelled in sailing ships and on horseback, the issue of migration satisfaction was submerged beneath the rigors of the journey. The decision to migrate entailed the realization of a high degree of permanence at the destination. The going was rough and return was nearly impossible for the migrant family. Of course some did remigrate, especially young single men, but in general only after many years which tended to mellow any dissatisfaction. When no short-range solution for dissatisfaction was evident in the form of an easy return, the early migrant people who stepped willingly into what became an undesirable situation probably tended to rationalize their position and make do with what they had. This was especially true in what Richmond (1969, p.272) calls the "traditional society" where migrations were characterized by strong "push-factors" which continued to keep the migrant from wanting to return home. The Pilgrims in America are an example; Australia's convicts and soldier-settlers also experienced an initial period of permanence which dissatisfaction would not alter. Many remained after "serving their time" because by then they accepted, became accustomed to, or became satisfied with the result of their migration.

The almost predetermined or required permanence of such migrations was lessened somewhat with the advent of steamships and trains in the

* These comments also apply at sub-national scales such as the state, regional, and city levels. However, at these lower levels there are corresponding changes in the temporal permanence of the migration, thereby gradually merging into transient and temporary spatial movements.
19th Century. As a result, more people were willing to make the journeys with different motivations. They were migrating because of something good they expected to find; they were under the influence of "pulls". However, if they did not find it and became dissatisfied, it was less difficult to make the return journey. This ease of return varied with a person's situation. The affluent were, as always, among the freest movers whereas refugees experienced greater enforced permanence because their origin was often no longer open to them.

Although the migration situation changed significantly in the 19th and early 20th Centuries, even more radical changes occurred after the Second World War. Richmond (1969) calls this the "post-industrial" period which is also referred to as the "technological" period marked by electronic communications and jet travel available to people at all levels of society. Not only are the means of travel greatly changed, the financing of migrations has also been altered. Transportation loans from travel agents and carriers allow the financial costs of migrating to be spread over a long period. The result has been that with improved transport and prosperity, today's migrants are increasingly freer in their movements. If visas are available, jetliner services provide almost instant migration. While this is not undesirable, it does pose new problems for the migrants, for their countries of origin, and particularly for the destinations which receive them.

There have been two major changes which became increasingly evident and important as the 20th Century progressed. The first is the maintaining of the immigration quotas which were established in the 1920's when even steamship travel was simply too easy. These quotas were designed to
prevent the flooding of migrants into the most desirable destinations. Likewise, some of the less desirable origins (e.g. Eastern Europe) have imposed restrictions or bans on emigration of people who would otherwise choose to use the 20th Century's physical ease of movement.

The second major change is that those people who have migrated in the modern period can easily migrate again, either back to their origin or on to a third location. While this remigration is of little importance to many countries in today's world of increasing population pressures, it is of considerable significance to Australia and Canada which desire via immigration to increase their total populations. Other countries are also concerned with the remigration of certain sub-populations, particularly of professionals. When doctors and other professionals are involved, this remigration forms one portion of the "brain-drain" (Beijer, 1969). Beijer's other comments on "Modern Patterns of International Migratory Movements" emphasize that migration patterns have changed dramatically, particularly in the post-World War II period. He considers that old ideas on migration are at present being challenged and new ones need to be considered and tested. An understanding and use of migration satisfaction contributes to improving our ideas on the migration process.

The significance of the changing ability to remigrate is in its impact on the importance of migration satisfaction. In the 19th Century and earlier a migrant usually needed years to build up his resources to return home or remigrate. Those years generally effected a mellowing of his dissatisfaction or an increase in his assimilation. But in modern societies a man can borrow or earn the cost of a ticket home in one month and make a trip in less than a day. Under such conditions of
diminished transport obstacles there is little time for assimilation or even relaxing of a migrant's critical views once he decides to leave the destination. Satisfaction/dissatisfaction is crucial in this context.

B. FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF LOCATION

Various authors who have discussed the issues of migration satisfaction indicate that present contentment is closely related to the migrant's past, present, and expected situation. As mentioned in Chapter IX, Wolpert (1965, p.162) equated satisfaction with "place utility" in that each individual "derives a measure of utility from the past or expected future reward at his stationary [present] position". The person may also assess the place utility for potential future destinations and also for places where he has previously lived. He subjectively determines the degree to which those places are satisfactory for his particular needs. These assessments produce expectations which may be 1) based upon inaccurate or at best incomplete information about unseen destinations, and/or 2) based upon former experiences at the place being assessed. From these there are, therefore, two contexts for considering satisfaction in relation to migration:

1. Satisfaction with present location in relation to an unseen, incompletely understood alternative location.

2. Satisfaction with present location in relation to an intimately known but now remote alternative location.

The first locational context refers to cases of migration from one known location to a second "unknown" location, usually referred to as the
origin and destination, respectively. This is the field of interest for those looking for reasons for migrating (Stea, 1967), migration decision making (Wolpert, 1965), and general population movements (Beijer, 1969 and Lind, 1969). These authors have been mainly interested in "differentials", i.e. differences between areas and between migrants. They also examine the associated motivations (including dissatisfaction) which may prompt the initial migration from an origin to a destination. At the area of origin their studies examine the "mover/stayer" differentials. At the destination the "migrant/host" relationship is emphasised, with little concern for further movement. Although researchers have contributed to the understanding of patterns and distributions within the host area (e.g. Burnley, 1971, a, b, & c), comparatively little has been done on the "mover/stayer" relationship at the destination, of which one part is discussed next.

The second locational context for considering migration satisfaction is in terms of people who have already migrated at least once. The "present location" of these people is what was once their destination. They migrated with certain expectations, which may or may not have been well formed, based on the information available to them at their origin. Whatever the case, these migrants are at some level of migration satisfaction with their present location in relation to alternative locations, particularly in relation to the place they know best, their area of origin. Studies in this category emphasize sub-divisions within the migrant population, particularly along the lines of expressed satisfaction. These studies are generally analogous to the study of mover/stayer differentials, but at the host location, i.e. at the former destination. However, it is not accurate to equate the mover/stayer dichotomy to the dissatisfied/satisfied dichotomy since many dissatisfied
migrants stay at their destination. Also a few satisfied migrants do return to their origin for a variety of reasons such as achievement of objectives or the pressure of family commitments not connected with satisfaction. But as is pointed out in Chapter IX, migration satisfaction in the context of place utility is more pervasive than previously recognized.

Studies centred upon satisfaction differences within a migrant population have essentially been limited to international migrants in North America and Australia (Chapter IX). This is probably because great distances separating these migrants from their homelands prevent quick returns to their origins, thereby allowing adequate time for initial impressions and early levels of satisfaction/dissatisfaction to mature. It is considerably more difficult methodologically to undertake studies of satisfaction of internal migrants where low travel costs and/or frequent returns to the origin are possible for relieving anxieties and "homesickness". However, many methodological and theoretical points stemming from international migrations will be applicable to more localized migrations and to spatial interaction in general. Whether called migration satisfaction, place utility, or fulfilment of needs, the concept and methodology are useful for studying migration.
APPENDIX VII

NATURALIZATION DATA AND "THRU-MIGRANTS"

The act of changing one's citizenship is a registered event with almost as many cross-tabulated tables as births, marriages and deaths. However, naturalizations are definitely biased in favour of people who have less commitment to their homeland, are more assimilated, etc. Nevertheless, the naturalization tables indicate a wide variety of facts about the flows from Latin America to Australia which are not evident from other sources.

As pointed out in Chapter IV, only 135 non-British Latin America-born persons were in Australia in 1911. Forty-eight of them were subsequently naturalized during the period 1911 to 1947.1 That group included 15 Argentinians, 10 Brazilians, 11 Chileans, 7 Mexicans, 4 Peruvians, and 1 Cuban. Of these, the longest resident arrived in 1837 at the age of less than one year. Two others came during the 1850's, two in the 1860's, three in the 1870's, and eleven in the 1880-91 period. Ten others arrived before Federation in 1901. The remaining nineteen arrived between 1901 and 1911, with eight from this group having a period of residence less than two years in the 1911 census.

Of these forty-eight persons with Latin American nationalities who became Australians by naturalization between 1911 and 1947, only twenty-one

---

1 Minor errors of one or two persons occur in this data as a result of incomplete or incorrectly recorded cards. For example, the four persons who arrived in 1911 may have arrived after the census. This naturalization data is from the same origin as that used by C.A. Price in Southern Europeans in Australia (1963a). For a detailed discussion of this data, see that study's Appendix 1 which is published in Price (1963b), The Method and Statistics of "Southern Europeans in Australia".
had definite or probable Spanish surnames. They were proportionately distributed through the years of arrival. Four others had names of unknown but probably not Latin American origin, while the remaining twenty-three had distinctly Anglo-Saxon surnames which included Wilson, Brown, Johnson, Graham, Codd and Edwards. It is equally possible that some non-Latin persons had Spanish surnames by their own or their parents' marriage. The opposite, i.e. Latins with non-Latin surnames, is also possible, but that would mean at least some non-Latin influence in their backgrounds.

Their listed occupations at the time of naturalization need not have any relation to occupation at arrival. Most were unskilled labourers, but an engineer and an opera singer were included. Twelve of the 48 listed work related to oceanic trading such as seamen, ship's mate, and wharf labourer. This suggests that possibly a quarter or more first came in contact with Australia while working on ships or in ports-of-call for ships to and from Australia.

Equally indicative of their international experience before arriving in Australia is the fact that thirty-two of the 108 total naturalizations of Latin Americans before 19471 reported a route from Latin America to Australia via at least one other country. These places were mainly England or English colonies, but the United States, France, Belgium, Italy and Mauritius were also named. The lengths of their stays were not recorded, but the impression given is that in most cases the migrant at least changed ships and quite possibly stayed there for a few months or even years.

---

1 The 48 persons discussed above are combined with 25 who naturalized before 1911 plus 35 persons who arrived after 1911 and then naturalized before 1947. This included 13 "thru-migrants" (see text) but excludes two women born in Great Britain and Australia who obtained Chilean and Ecuadorian nationalities (by marriage?) but who returned to British citizenship (when widowed?).
During the 1911-47 period there were seventy naturalizations of former Latin American citizens who were born in Latin America (excluding "thru-migrants"). We have already discussed forty-eight of those people. The remaining twenty-two, who arrived in Australia after 1911, were from the following countries: Argentina (9); Brazil (2); Chile (6); Mexico (2); Peru (2); and Guatemala (1). Nine had Anglo-Saxon surnames and another three were apparently Italian. Twelve arrived in the period 1912-15, three in 1917, four in the early 1920's, and one each in 1928, 1938, and 1940.

In none of the seventy cases is there any indication of a husband and wife or a parent and child being naturalized from the same family. Only once in the twenty-five pre-1911 naturalizations were two sisters (or cousins) naturalized from the same family.

The age and sex structure of the 108 migrants supports the general picture thus far. Two pyramids (Figure Appendix 7-1) show their sex and ages a) on arrival, and b) at naturalization. Only nine (8.3%) were females; their average age at arrival was in their late teens, about ten years younger than the average for the males. On arrival the males were young and closely grouped around the 20-34 year age cohorts. When naturalized they were spread across the adult age cohorts with only a slight dominance in the ages between 35 and 54. The most interesting feature concerns the thirteen "thru-migrants". Since they were making their second intercontinental migration, their average age on arrival is in 1

---

1 The term "thru-migrant" emphasizes the intermediate location; in this case it is Latin America. Latin American "thru-migrants" can originate anywhere and can have a final destination anyplace other than their first origin or Latin America. Their only requirement was an established residence in Latin America. A synonym is "indirect migrant" which emphasizes the final destination and the original origin. This latter term is defined by C.A. Price (1963b, p.10). Further comments on "thru-migrants" are found in Section II.F and Section X.B.4.b.
FIGURE APP. 7-1
POPULATION PYRAMIDS OF LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS WHO BECAME NATURALIZED AUSTRALIANS BETWEEN 1903 AND 1947

a. Sex and Age on Arrival

b. Sex and Age at Naturalization

107 Persons
N.B. Year of naturalization not known for one male (excluding 2 British females who re-naturalized)
their late 30's, yet their age at naturalization is in their mid-40's. These men had severed their ties with their birthplace once before; it was evidently psychologically easier for them than for the others to change citizenship from the Latin American nationality they had previously adopted.

All of the "thru-migrants" were naturalized after 1911; only three arrived before that year. The group consisted of four Poles, two each from Russia, Italy, and Germany, and one each from Austria, Holland and Spain. Eight (61%) of them were citizens of Argentina; the others were a Mexican, Uruguayan, Honduran, Cuban and Peruvian. Over half of these "thru-migrants" arrived during the 1930's, a sharp contrast to the arrival years of the immigrants born in Latin America. Although "non-Latin", they each certainly brought a little Latin flavour with them, but its contribution was most likely insignificant. Another small contribution certainly came from other pre-1947 "thru-migrants" for whom we have no records. To be recorded they would have had to naturalize in Latin America and in Australia. Nevertheless, in terms of flows between places, they all took part in a migration from Latin America to Australia. Others like them have continued to come to Australia since 1947. The data on them come from several different tabulations.

One indication of the magnitude of the recent non-Latin and non-British flows "thru" Latin America to Australia is in the statistics on the naturalized immigrants' "country of last residence" (Table App. 7-1a). Allowing time for residence requirements before the immigrants are eligible to naturalize, the table reveals hundreds of third-country nationals coming from Latin America to Australia. A few were certainly born in Latin
TABLE APP. 7-1a

PERSONS GRANTED AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP THROUGH NATURALIZATION - BY FORMER NATIONALITY AND RESIDING LAST IN AMERICA (EXCLUDING USA): 1964-1976

NATURALIZED BETWEEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMER NATIONALITY</th>
<th>(4 years) 7/64-6/68</th>
<th>7/68-6/69</th>
<th>7/69-6/70</th>
<th>7/70-6/71</th>
<th>TOTAL 7/64-6/71 Pre-1966 arrivals except for special cases</th>
<th>7/71-6/72</th>
<th>7/72-6/73</th>
<th>7/73-6/74</th>
<th>7/74-6/75</th>
<th>7/75-6/76</th>
<th>TOTAL 7/71-6/76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Communist N.European</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>169*</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Southern European Non-Communist</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total European Communist Bloc</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total African</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other American</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>2534</td>
<td>4517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless Other and Unstated</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>6150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes 135 "UK & Colonies" in 1976

Source: Consolidated Statistics, (1971-73, 1977) Table 33
America, and probably a small proportion of them came from Canada, but the flow is clearly in hundreds per year. Furthermore, the proportions are quite noteworthy. Seventy-nine percent of the 1964-71 naturalizations, (45% of the 1971-73 naturalizations, and 19% of the 1975-76 naturalizations) of persons who came from Latin America did not have a Latin American nationality. This contrasts with 2 for the Netherlands, 12% for Italy, 38% for "Other Asia" and 91% for Africa excluding Egypt. (Consolidated Statistics 1971 and 1977). Small flows bring large proportions of third-country nationals.

This is quite different from the 1964-71 figures of 17% (and 8% for 1971-76) of naturalized Latin Americans who were residing outside of Latin America immediately prior to their migration to Australia (Table App.7-1b). The corresponding figures for other areas are the Netherlands 5%; Italy 3%; "Other Asia" 8%; and Other Africa (excluding Egypt) 58%.

A major part of the explanation of this variation in proportions is in the relative difference between Latin America compared with North America and Europe. There are two points of view to consider. The first is that the Latin American nationals who went to Europe or North America, if they stayed, probably found enough of what they were seeking. If not, they probably returned home. Their likelihood of coming to Australia is very low since they knew they would probably find something not too different from what they were rejecting in North America or Europe. Also, a migrant who is acceptable to Australia is not likely to be forced to leave from North America or Europe.
## Table APP. 7-lb.

**Persons Granted Australian Citizenship through Naturalization—By Country of Last Residence and with a Latin American Nationality: 1964-1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST RESIDENCE</th>
<th>(4 years)</th>
<th>7/64-6/68</th>
<th>7/68-6/69</th>
<th>7/70-6/71</th>
<th>TOTAL 7/64-6/71 Pre-1966 arrivals except for special cases</th>
<th>7/71-6/72</th>
<th>7/72-6/73</th>
<th>7/73-6/74</th>
<th>7/74-6/75</th>
<th>7/75-6/76</th>
<th>TOTAL 7/71-6/76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Communist N.European</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Southern European Non-Communist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total European Communist Block</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total African</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. America Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other America</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>2564</td>
<td>4523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand and Other Oceania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>337</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>167</strong></td>
<td><strong>608</strong></td>
<td><strong>1253</strong></td>
<td><strong>2766</strong></td>
<td><strong>4917</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Consolidated Statistics, (1971-73, 1977) Table 33*
The other point of view concerns the Europeans and Asians (primarily from the Middle East) who migrated to Latin America, mainly to escape the problems of war-torn Europe. What they found was opportunity amidst relative underdevelopment, as mentioned in Chapter II. Although many stayed in Latin America, a large number have obviously come to Australia and naturalized here. Table App. 7-1a gives an impression of the relative importance of those European origins. Italy, Germany, the Netherlands and Greece were major sources, the same as for migrants who came directly to Australia. Also, the Communist nations supplied many refugees. Many of these immigrants to Latin America have re-migrated, some of them to Australia.\(^1\) Price (1970, p.A16) points out how relative prosperity and freedom in the country of origin are directly related to settler loss. The point here is that the relative lack of prosperity and political instability in parts of Latin America can stimulate re-migration, in this case onwards to Australia rather than back to Europe. The effect of the relative "quality" of the initial origin on re-migration and "thru-migrants" is an interesting topic for another study of international migrants. There are a number of data sources on these special migrants.

\(^1\) If we could assume that the rate of naturalization of total persons from a country applies to the "thru-migrants" from that country (i.e. birthplace), it is possible to calculate the proportions and actual numbers of the total migrants who came through Latin America from each original origin-nation (nationality). For example, 42.5% of all Italy-born persons in Australia in 1971 were British subjects. Making the above assumption we can calculate that the 220 Italian citizens who were last residing in Latin America before immigrating represent 42.5% of such Italians who were eligible to become Australians in that time period. The result is that an additional 297 people with Italian citizenship, but last residence in Latin America, arrived and stayed in Australia between 1959 and 1966, giving a total of 517 persons. Although interesting, calculations using this assumption have many possible sources of error. A major one is that the data in Table App.7-1a was not tabulated before 1964. Another is that an unknown proportion (but probably not more than 10-20%) of those Italians were actually born in Latin America and received Italian nationality from their parents.
The total number of "thru-migrants" can be estimated by comparing Australia's arrival statistics (Table App.7-2) in the 1961-76 period; 2113 more settlers had their last pre-migration residence in Latin America than were born there. This figure is the minimum since some people born in Latin America came after residing in other countries outside Latin America (Table App.7-1b). The excess arrivals of Latin America's residents over persons born in Latin America was until the 1970's because of the unassisted settlers, i.e. assisted passage became more readily available in the 1970's to persons in Latin America but not born there. There is a slight indication that the "thru-migrants" are proportionately fewer in recent years. Although this may be caused by many reasons, it reminds us that the "pool" of potential "thru-migrants" is limited. However, their migration to Australia is probably continuing at approximately 150-200 persons per year.

(continued)
### Table App. 7-2


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>1 Latin American Country of Birth</th>
<th>2 Latin American Country of Last Residence</th>
<th>3 Net Column 2 minus Column 1</th>
<th>4 Latin American Country of Birth</th>
<th>5 Latin American Country of Last Residence</th>
<th>6 Net Column 5 minus Column 4</th>
<th>Net Difference (Columns 3 + 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five-year sub-total 61-66</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-67</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>+916</td>
<td>+897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-68</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>+158</td>
<td>+149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-69</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>+182</td>
<td>+182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-70</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>+139</td>
<td>+103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-71</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>+86</td>
<td>+51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five-year sub-total 66-71</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-71</td>
<td>6995</td>
<td>6897</td>
<td>-98</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>2981</td>
<td>+762</td>
<td>+664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-72</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>2286</td>
<td>-150**</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>+132</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-73</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>2464</td>
<td>+78</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>+59</td>
<td>+137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-74</td>
<td>6263</td>
<td>6539</td>
<td>+276</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-75</td>
<td>5064</td>
<td>5167</td>
<td>+103</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>+73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-76</td>
<td>3096</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>+55</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>+67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five-year sub-total 71-76</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-76</td>
<td>19245</td>
<td>19607</td>
<td>+362</td>
<td>3456</td>
<td>3646</td>
<td>+190</td>
<td>+552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-USA and Non-Commonwealth countries in N & S America.

** Sharp rise possibly because of Chilean migrants who left Latin America before they arranged their visas for Australia.

Data on "thru-migrants" also comes through interviewing. Twenty-three were contacted during this study; nineteen of them were Independent Decision Makers. This small number does not permit very detailed analyses, but several trends emerge. The duration of their stays in Latin America before coming to Australia average more than 24 years and ranged from 9 to 50 years. However, they represent the more "Latin-ized" of the thru-migrants; they were able to be contacted through the networks. Others, especially shorter-term residents in Latin America, who do not associate with any Latin American immigrants, clubs, etc., in Australia, are missing from the sample. The numbers arriving after less than 5-10 years in Latin America cannot be determined.

Although only a hunch based on knowledge of immigrant flows to Latin America, I feel that the sample is a fair representation of the birthplaces and Latin American countries of residence for the "thru-migrants" who have come to Australia. The Iberians of Spain and Portugal are the most numerous; their reluctance to adopt Latin American nationalities may indicate the ease of their adjustment to Latin America (as with British settlers in Australia). Or possibly there is a subconscious aversion to shifting allegiance from the "mother country" to the former colonies.

As expected, the Italy-born "thru-migrants" are a major group. The remainder are mainly from nations gravely influenced by World War II and the Communist take-over of eastern Europe. If we consider the voluntary exodus from Chile to be an "anticipatory" refugee movement¹, some of these

¹ "Anticipatory refugee" is a term proposed by E.F. Kunz, 1974
"thru-migrants" are refugees for the second time. One such migrant fled from Communism in Hungary as a young man. He settled in Chile and established himself in the middle class as a technician. The victory of Allende in 1969 brought fears of a Communist take-over. He did not panic to leave, but applied for an immigrant visa to Australia in 1971 and arrived here early in 1972 with his family.

Alfred and Rosa Arndt are other examples of "thru-migrants". Being Jewish, Alfred decided to leave his home in Stettin, Germany (now the Pommern section in Poland) in 1939. At age sixteen, he travelled by ship via Cape Horn to Chile where he worked as an electrician and draftsman. One year later his future wife arrived as a small child with her German Jewish parents. She went to Chilean schools and Spanish became her main language. Alfred and Rosa eventually met, married, and had a daughter, Miriam, in 1962. They prospered as a family and considered themselves very Chilean. In 1968 he naturalized as a Chilean because he wanted a tourist card for visiting Argentina: "I didn't want a German passport. I had left Germany nearly thirty years earlier."

After 1960 Alfred was in a partnership for electrical contracting and he knew the economic fluctuations of Chile quite well: "In the year or two prior to a presidential election in Chile there is a major reduction in investment, including construction. It was especially pronounced before the 1969 election. This adversely affected my electrical business." This slump, plus the possibility of Allende being elected, prompted Alfred to consider emigration to Canada and, seeing no opening there, to Australia. He sold his part of the business at a low price and travelled alone as an assisted migrant to Australia late in 1969. He found work in a few days
and was able to bring his wife and daughter to Australia sixteen months later. During those months, Allende was elected and the scramble to leave Chile began. Twice in his life Alfred Arndt has made decisions to emigrate because of an anticipated "push". The first decision probably saved his life; the second one probably saved his financial security. Similarly, Rosa has twice emigrated as a dependent of someone who anticipated the events.

Alfred was able to become a naturalized Australian in 1972 because of his good command of English. I asked him if he associated at all with Germans: "No way! But I have absolutely nothing against Germans. Maybe it is because of my Jewish background." Initially he had considerable contact with Chileans and other Latin Americans in Australia. He was an early leader in the Chilean Club in Sydney, but has become inactive in the mid-1970's. His social and work contacts are more and more Australian. In several ways he is multi-national and possibly more objective than true Latins in his comparisons of Latin Americans and Australians and their cultures. Some of his insights are found in appropriate sections of this study.

There is a noteworthy sex differential in the interviewed "thru-migrants". Only 35% (eight) are females and half of them came as wives. Two of those wives were married to "thru-migrants"; the other two had Latin American husbands who had one parent born in a third nation.

In terms of age, the women are not much different from the men. The wives had an average age of forty at arrival. Of the others, four were Independent Decision Makers. Three had never been married and averaged only 21 years of age; they had all gone to Latin America when two years old or younger. The two single males averaged 15 years on arrival in
Latin America and 27 years of age on arrival here. When all are taken together, the average age of 34 years for the females is not greatly different from the average male age of 41 years.

My interpretation of the data is that either a) "thru-migrant" females are considerably harder to find than males (which I do not believe), b) there are far fewer female immigrants to Latin America than males, or c) that female immigrants to Latin America are less likely to migrate again, at least not to Australia. Marriage in Latin America probably influences this situation; for "thru-migrants" who are married to a Latin American spouse, (i.e. excluding non-marrieds and married couples where both are "thru-migrants"), the ratio of males to females is 11:2.

Although comparatively few in numbers, "thru-migrants" are very interesting; their aggregate data and case histories provide insights on Latin America, its immigrants and emigrants, and about migrations where one more factor, i.e. the peoples' "attachment to homeland", has been severed years earlier and is thereby partially controlled. The migration satisfaction of these "thru-migrants" is analyzed in Section X.B.4.b.

Thus far we have mostly been speaking of Latin America as a whole. There is also a variety of naturalization statistics which list individual Latin American nations by prior residence and nationalities. Those statistics are not particularly revealing. The most interesting note is that in the 1974/75 fiscal year 11% (129 persons) of the total 1187 naturalizations were of previous residents of Latin America who were not citizens of a Latin American country. In the case of Brazil the proportion was 61% of a total of 93 naturalizations.
The data indicate that the naturalizations of immigrants from Brazil for fourteen years (1961-1975) has averaged 82% non-Latin American citizens. Approximately 30-40% of all naturalized persons coming from Latin America but without a Latin American nationality have come to Australia via Brazil. A further 20-30% come via Argentina. Venezuela was also a major source of such persons before the 1970's. The other nations contribute comparatively few such migrants who have naturalized in Australia but who were not citizens by birth or naturalization in Latin America.

The figures on the flow of British subjects who resided in Latin America before coming to Australia where they subsequently adopted Australian citizenship are limited by changes in Australian naturalization policies. One change allowed citizenship conversions by notification instead of registration; those figures are not tabulated separately, but in total numbers they roughly equaled the registrations. From 1 December, 1973, the policy changed to naturalization and former British subjects are now tabulated with other former nationalities. The result was the inclusion of 134 such persons in 1974/75 (the first full fiscal year) in the "Other America" categories.

Although changed in 1973 to only three years, the normal period of residence required before a person was eligible to naturalize was five years, a convenient figure which matches with the post-1961 intercensal periods. In the 1961-66 period there were 276 arrivals of persons born in Latin America who were already British subjects. By the 1971 census, these persons were in the group with 5-9 years of residence. Changing definitions cause a few interpretation problems here because of the inclusion in 1971 of 152 British subjects and 11 others who arrived in
1961-66 and who came from "Other Commonwealth Countries in the Americas" (excluding Canada and the West Indies). Therefore, the base population is 428 British subjects, of whom an indeterminable number died, departed Australia or were visitors (the 1966 census did not separate visitors from residents). Nevertheless, in 1971 there were 445 such persons, indicating a quite conservative net increase of 17 persons due to naturalization. The actual number of naturalizations between 1966 and 1971 was close to 250 persons.

Another indicator of the continuation of some non-Latin migration from or through Latin America is from the statistics for the Special Passage Assistance Programme (Table App.7-3). In the period July 1970 - June 1974, there were 18,146 arrivals of assisted migrants selected in Latin America. Of those, there were 442 (2.4%) Italians, 235 (1.3%) Spaniards and 127 (0.7%) persons with Portuguese, Yugoslav, Greek or Turkish citizenship. Certainly some of them were not born in Latin America, i.e. they are "thru-migrants". An additional 908 (5%) of the assisted immigrants had nationalities other than their nation of selection, but most of them were probably Latin Americans, e.g. Chileans selected in Argentina.
### TABLE APP. 7-3

**ARRIVALS UNDER SPECIAL PASSAGE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME (SPAP)**

**BY COUNTRY OF SELECTION IN LATIN AMERICA AND NATIONALITY:**

**JULY 1970 - JUNE 1974**

Source: Unpublished Table 5, Australian Department of Immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Selection</th>
<th>Same as Country of Selection</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Yugoslav</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>4,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>5,695</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>5,221</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other America</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,434</strong></td>
<td><strong>235</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>908</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,146</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VIII

SELECTED TABLES - WITH NOTES

The tables in this Appendix contain data of interest but either too detailed, not readily available, or not essential to the topics of this study.
### APPENDIX VIII

**SELECTED TABLES - WITH NOTES**

**APPENDIX TABLE 8-1**

**THE 'STANDARDS' FROM THE 1966 CENSUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Code 86</th>
<th>Code 87 Other</th>
<th>Code 99 Other</th>
<th>Codes 87</th>
<th>Code 89 Other</th>
<th>Code 90 Other</th>
<th>&quot;Latin America&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>C'with</td>
<td>C'with</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indies</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>America</td>
<td></td>
<td>America</td>
<td>America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia (Total)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Males</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>1434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab Females</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>1353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Total</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>2332</td>
<td>2787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New South Wales (Total)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Males</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab Females</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New South Wales (Sydney)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Males</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab Females</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia (Metropolitan)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Males</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tab Females</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Total</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>2102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes for Table 8-1

1. The "Standards" produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (A.B.S.) for the 1971 Census give the basic data (without cross-tabulations) for major characteristics of the population. The A.B.S. uses those "standards" when checking subsequent tables to avoid omissions, errors and to check on defaults. The 1976 Census "Standards" are to be available in January-March 1978. There were no specific "standards" for the 1966 Census, so the preceding table has been prepared. In that Census, as in others, the birthplaces other than the United States and Canada in the Americas are combined in different ways in the various tabulations. For that reason the totals vary on the different tables in this study.

2. (a) Only one-third of Latin Americans lived in Sydney.

(b) 41% of Latin Americans lived in New South Wales.

(c) 75% of Latin Americans were in metropolitan areas.

3. Published statistics don't separate Codes 87 and 88 (Other Commonwealth) from Codes 89 and 90 ("Latin America-born"). This amounts to 412 extra persons or:

- 13% of Australian Total
- 11% of New South Wales Total
- 11% of Sydney
- 13% of Australian Metropolitan
TABLE APP. 8-2

A DEMONSTRATION OF HOW "OTHER AMERICA" IN MOST OF THE 1971 CENSUS TABLES ONLY INCLUDES "ARGENTINA, BRAZIL, CHILE, MEXICO & PERU" (THE ABCMP NATIONS)

I. Persons Born in the ABCMP nations who were in "Major Urban" N.S.W.
   Source: From the Standards for 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>4735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>4839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Persons born in "Other America"
   Source: From Bulletin 7.1 of 1971 Census

| D    | Sydney Statistical Division          | 4557   |
| E    | Newcastle Statistical Division       | 36     |
| F    | Wollongong Statistical Division      | 265    |
| G    | Queanbeyan Statistical Division      | 8      |
| H    | In Major Urban Statistical Division  | 4866   |

III. Difference between I.C. & II.H.

| J    | Line H minus Line C                 | 27     |

IV. Persons born in "Other America" residing in Urban Sydney
   Source: Page 2 of 5 page summary unpublished

| K    | Persons = 4534                      |        |

V. Difference between II.D. & IV.K.

| L    | Line D minus line K = 23 persons    |        |

VI. Difference between III.J. & V.L.

| M    | Line III.J. minus Line V.L. = 4     |        | people who were probably in rural parts of the Statistical Divisions of Newcastle, Wollongong, or Queanbeyan. 1.3% of total in those 3 Statistical Divisions.
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