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CHAPTER VIII

PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT:
SATISFACTION, IDENTIFICATION AND ACCULTURATION

INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITIONS

The maintenance of Armenian identity does not preclude the psychological adjustment of Armenians to Australian society; nor does the attainment of the latter necessarily mean the cessation of the former. The Jews, among others, have satisfactorily reconciled their Jewish identity with their Australian identity, indicating that identification with Australia is not incompatible with ethnic group membership. Consequently, for immigrants such as the Armenians, psychological adjustment to Australian society must be considered an important component of their overall adjustment process, whether or not it leads to their eventual assimilation.

Research on migrant psychological adjustment was pioneered by researchers in Western Australia, notably Alan Richardson (1957; 1958; 1960; 1961; 1963; 1974), Ronald Taft (1953; 1957; 1960; 1961; 1962; 1963; 1965; 1972; 1973a) and Ruth Johnston (1963; 1965a; 1969). They developed the hypothesis that immigrant psychological assimilation takes place in three stages. First, immigrants must become satisfied with life in their new country, which depends upon the degree to which current or expected future rewards match the level of their aspirations. Also involved are situational determinants. Taft (1965: 64, 66) feels that job success and social acceptance by Australians without prejudice are probably the most important and he equates satisfied immigrants with those who are socially and occupationally adjusted. Nevertheless, he also notes other factors which are related to the level of satisfaction a migrant achieves, such as age, period of residence, knowledge of English and level of education. Once a

---

1 Anderson (1979: 22) feels that Taft has substituted "social and economic adjustment" where Richardson has used "satisfaction". I do not agree. Taft is merely emphasizing the two aspects which he sees as having the greatest influence on migrant satisfaction.
fairly high level of satisfaction is reached it then becomes possible for the immigrant to begin identifying with Australia and thinking of himself as an Australian. This is the second stage which is felt to be central to psychological assimilation (Taft, 1965: 66).

The relationship of the first two stages is clear. Most researchers agree that satisfaction is an essential first step in the process of assimilation or integration and that it invariably precedes identification (Anderson, 1979: 202; McEwan, 1964; Price, 1969; Richardson, 1974; Taft, 1965: 66). However, the relationship of these stages to the third - acculturation - is not so clear; a situation which has generated considerable controversy, especially with regard to whether acculturation precedes the other two or is the final stage in the process. For example, Gordon (1964: 71), who views acculturation as the initial stage in his assimilation system, describes it as "change of cultural patterns to those of the host society" and equates it with "cultural and behavioural assimilation". In his scheme, before identification with the host society takes place it is first necessary for both "structural" and "marital" assimilation to occur. Another view, given by Anthony Richmond (1969: 277), is that personal satisfaction, adjustment and identification in industrial societies are subjective aspects of the assimilation process which are largely independent of the objective aspects of acculturation and structural integration.

These different points of view can be attributed to different interpretations of what is meant by "acculturation". If taken to be changes in the more objective aspects of culture, such as dress and food habits, it is often found to precede the other stages. If equated with acceptance of social and behavioural norms and values of the host society, it generally follows the other two stages. It is the failure to distinguish between these two types of acculturation that has led to confusion about the sequence of the stages of the process. This lack of clarity is well illustrated in Gordon's (1964: 71, 81) use of the term. He tends to mix

---

1 This does not imply that a high level of satisfaction automatically leads to identification. Richmond (1969: 277) has noted, from comparative material, that high levels of satisfaction were compatible with low levels of identification.
both subjective and objective types and sees acculturation occurring before, simultaneously with, or even after structural assimilation - the large-scale entry of immigrants into cliques, clubs and institutions of the host society on the primary group level. He also notes that structural assimilation inevitably produces acculturation. It is argued here that acculturation occurring before structural assimilation is largely the objective type, while that which takes place with, or subsequent to such assimilation is subjective. It is the latter which eventually leads to psychological assimilation with the host society (Gordon's Identificational Assimilation).

Unlike Gordon, Richardson's model (1974: 42-48) makes this distinction by identifying three varieties of acculturation - obligatory, advantageous and optional. The first two are felt to be facilitated by prior identification, but not necessarily related to it in any way. The third variety is that which is associated with prior identification and indicates "a class of behaviour present in the majority of native-born members of the host community but in no way required of a newcomer" (Richardson, 1974: 41). Since it is characteristic of most members of the host society and indicative of full group membership, becoming "optionally acculturated" is conceptualized as the terminal stage in the assimilation process (Richardson, 1974: 47). When the immigrant reaches this stage, he technically becomes indistinguishable from the majority of native-born residents who possess similar characteristics, such as age, sex and socio-economic status.

The aim of this chapter is to examine these three stages of Armenian psychological adjustment in Australia. With respect to acculturation, however, only subjective or "internal" aspects are considered here.

1 Gordon's structural assimilation appears related to Taft's "social and economic adjustment" in that it is the process which leads to satisfaction and identification and eventual acculturation with the host society.

2 There have been various attempts to separate the psychological from the more objective aspects of the acculturation process, although the distinguishing criteria have often been mixed and have contributed to the confusion. For a brief discussion of the development of the concept and its role in psychological adjustment studies, see Appendix VI.
as the objective ones are not felt to show psychological adjustment. Various aspects of the latter, however, have been examined and the findings are presented in Appendix VII.

SATISFACTION: GENERAL

Satisfaction with life in Australia results from a combination of factors which tend to vary as an immigrant's personal situation changes. The first major determinants of his satisfaction are his mode of and motivation for migration (Taft, 1973b: 230). According to Richmond (1969: 269):

"The individual migrant's sense of relative deprivation or gratification is likely to be determined initially by comparison with his circumstances before migration. For example, refugees from political and religious persecution may be very satisfied with their new situation despite low economic status because of the new freedom they have gained as a consequence of migration."

Whether or not the migrant came alone or was accompanied by friends or relatives can also be assumed to influence his satisfaction by providing emotional and social support during the initial period after arrival.¹ The same is true for his social situation upon arrival; if sponsored by friends or relatives his initial confrontation with the host society will probably be less severe.

The immigrant's initial reaction to the host society and any major difficulties encountered shortly after arrival are also important. Often there is a tendency to overevaluate the new country, which results in a relatively high level of initial satisfaction.² However, by the second half of the first year, when the novelty has worn off, the level of satisfaction frequently declines.

¹ There is still considerable controversy surrounding the part played by such factors in the assimilation of immigrants in the host country. For a discussion of the opposing views, see Johnston (1965a: 31-32, 44).
² Richardson (1974: 28-30) refers to this as the "elation pattern".
In other cases the opposite may be found. Unwarranted expectations about life in the new country may result in serious disillusionment, leading many to consider returning home and some to do so. The level of satisfaction of those who remain, however, is often found to rise as they become more adjusted to their new country and their economic and social circumstances improve. No matter what the case, these early experiences are crucial to successful settlement and achievement of satisfaction with life in Australia (Johnston, 1965a: 46; Neiva and Diegus, 1959: 206; Richardson, 1974: 25, 27).

Being successfully settled does not mean the immigrant is highly satisfied with his life in all respects. He may be content with some aspects while dissatisfied with others. This influences his "level" of satisfaction, which has been found to be highly correlated with both his occupational and social situation and his personal characteristics. In other studies of migrant satisfaction, the more satisfied were those in more highly paid jobs appropriate to their training, those who were older and had lived in Australia longer, and those who knew English better and had only a primary education (Taft, 1965).

SATISFACTION OF THE SYDNEY ARMENIANS WITH LIFE IN AUSTRALIA

The fact that most Armenian migration was either family reunion or chain migration, with very few coming outside family units, meant that most had some psychological and social support both during the move and upon arrival. In many cases, they joined earlier arrivals who assisted in their initial adjustment by helping them to find jobs, accommodation, and so on. This relieved them of some of the anxiety associated with settling in Australia. The following remarks are illustrative of this:

"Language was a problem for a couple of weeks. I didn't have any other big problems because my brother was already here." (29-year old Armenian from Israel).

Anderson (1979: 281-282) made a similar finding for the Latin American immigrants in Sydney. Those who were accompanied by family or friends, or came in a "chain migration" were more apt to become satisfied with Australia.
"The language was the only problem. I didn't feel I had any other problems because I had friends here. They found for us the flat, the job and the school." (29-year old Iranian Armenian).

The majority of the Armenians are considered "involuntary" migrants who were leaving life situations which they felt they could no longer tolerate. Consequently, the relative security and personal safety found in Australia exerted a profound influence on their feelings of initial satisfaction with their new life. Out of the 97 interviewed respondents, 28 stated that what they liked the most about Australia during the initial period after arrival was the personal freedom; to be able to say what they wanted, to come and go as they liked. Another 14 referred to similar aspects, such as the greater personal security, the peace of mind they felt because of Australia's greater political stability, more individual rights and the presence of greater social equality in Australia. In the words of some of these respondents:

"When you sleep and get up in Australia there are no problems. It's peaceful." (58-year old Jordanian Armenian).

"[I like] the freedom to express by opinion. There are no hassles over my Armenian nationality. There is no tipping here - no bribing of government officials." (32-year old Egyptian Armenian).

"The police don't ask you where you go all the time." (46-year old Egyptian Armenian).

"I felt very happy. Felt liberated from the political situation. No one is going to tell me 'You European, get out of here'." (34-year old Egyptian Armenian).

Thus, for a significant proportion, improvement in their circumstances over what they were overseas favourably disposed them to become satisfied with life here.

Almost three-quarters (72 per cent) of those interviewed were favourably impressed with Australia when they first arrived. Most mentioned such aspects as the cleanliness of the cities, the friendliness of the
people they met, the orderliness and the quietness. A significant number also commented on the abundance of material goods available. As could be expected, this initial impression was often based on those facets of life in Australia which were perceived to be better than back home. For a number, this favourable impression did not last. Once they were required to come to grips with their everyday existence as migrants in Australia, they began to have second thoughts about remaining. This feeling was compounded by the loneliness many experienced during the first weeks and months after arrival. Thirty-nine per cent greatly missed the social life and friendly atmosphere of their homelands, while another 31 per cent missed family or friends. It was commonly expressed that Australia lacked the warm, close communal life known before migration. The following statements illustrate how these respondents viewed their social life in Australia during the initial period after arrival:

"I missed the unexpected visits we used to have. The social life. Here everyone is confined in his home." (66-year old Egyptian Armenian).

"I missed the night life. Here it was too dull. No fun in going to the pub. I missed the social life. Here neighbours do not associate as neighbours." (45-year old Egyptian Armenian).

"I was very lonely. Just working and going home. I didn't like the social life - just go to the pub and then home to watch T.V." (33-year old Lebanese Armenian).

"I missed the sociability - visiting friends and relatives every day. I missed the closeness of the family. Here everyone is concerned with himself or his job." (31-year old Israeli Armenian).

"In India the social climate was closer. Here people don't have time for you. The way of life doesn't allow it. It was a closer group in India." (32-year old Indian Armenian).

A number found their new lives to be much more different than anticipated - especially those who had been relatively well-off overseas. In Australia it was not possible to have servants to do the housework and menial tasks. Also, the generally higher level of education and training...
here meant that many who had been considered highly trained in their former countries often faced stiffer competition than previously encountered in obtaining suitable employment. This situation was often exacerbated by an inadequate knowledge of English and lack of "Australian experience". For these reasons many began to regret coming to Australia.

Thirty-four per cent of those interviewed had no major difficulties when they arrived. Of those who encountered difficulties, the most common were problems with English (42 per cent) or in obtaining suitable employment (28 per cent). Often the two were linked, with inadequate English prohibiting or hindering many from securing work for which they were trained or in which they had prior experience. Only five respondents had problems finding suitable accommodation, also possibly due to inadequate English. Others mentioned having difficulties with transport or financial problems.

These initial difficulties led many to consider leaving Australia. Although information is limited, it indicates that the number who actually left is quite small. However, 31 per cent of the interviewees thought they might return home or go elsewhere during their first year or two after arrival. They decided to remain for many reasons, including the fact that a number would not have been allowed to return to their former countries. This was especially true for many Egyptian Armenians. For example, one stated that "Even if I had wanted to go back I couldn't. They wrote on the passport that I couldn't return to Egypt. 'Exit - no reentry'. I could only use it to get out." The other main reasons were that: they did not want to make hasty decisions which they might later regret; they had cut all ties with their home country and would be required to reestablish themselves if they went back; they could not afford the fares. For most, increased duration of residence led to the development of a level of satisfaction which resulted in their decision to remain. The following statements are representative of this:

---

1 Anderson (1979: 275) and Taft (1965: 45) made similar findings with respect to the more educated and highly trained migrants. They found no indications that these migrants were more satisfied with their life in Australia.
"I gave myself six months. I didn't want to make a rush decision. After six months I was getting used to the life." (51-year old Egyptian Armenian)

"I didn't go back because I had cut all ties with Egypt. We had sold everything. Also, I didn't know if I could get my job back in Egypt." (39-year old Egyptian Armenian).

"We had given away or sold everything we had in Syria. We had bought a house here. I would have had to start from scratch again." (52-year old Syrian Armenian).

"I started to save to go back right after arrival, but didn't save enough to go back. Got used to it here after a year. By the time I got used to it I got married." (39-year old Lebanese Armenian).

"I didn't have sufficient money at first. Would have felt like a coward if I went straight back. I wanted to face the step of coming here." (29-year old Lebanese Armenian).

"We were leaving and even had tickets sent from Jordan, but by the time the tickets arrived I had found employment. I thought to give it a little more time." (48-year old Jordanian Armenian).

Only six interviewed respondents were genuinely dissatisfied with their lives and all had considered returning home or going elsewhere. For many of the rest, who were generally satisfied, there were still aspects of their lives with which they were unhappy. Most dissatisfaction related to the lack of an adequate social life and the fact that their wives were required to work in Australia. Other complaints concerned the low standard of their present accommodation, the high cost of living, crime and problems with employment. The former can be at least partially attributable to their overseas backgrounds and their migration, while the latter complaints are assumed to be little different from those of the average Australian.

The available evidence suggests that most changes in an immigrant's overall satisfaction occur during the first couple of years after arrival (Richardson, 1974: 27). Since the great bulk of the Armenian immigrants have now resided in Australia for more than a decade it can be assumed that few major changes in their overall satisfaction are likely to occur in
future years. Consequently, any determination of their present level of satisfaction and of those factors which have had the greatest influence on satisfaction, are considered to be valid.

Ninety-three per cent of those interviewed stated they currently feel "generally satisfied" with life in Australia—although, as shown earlier, many are not satisfied with all aspects of their lives here. It is obvious therefore that some are much more satisfied than others, depending on their individual circumstances. To measure these individual differences it was necessary to develop an Index of Satisfaction with Life in Australia based on attitudinal questions on the interview schedule (see Appendix VIII.A). By doing this it was then possible to derive three "levels" of general satisfaction and to identify those respondents who were most and least satisfied. This allowed for an examination of the influence of specific life situations, as well as personal characteristics, on high and low satisfaction.

Those situational variables shown in other studies to most strongly influence migrant satisfaction in Australia are: feelings about present accommodation; economic and occupational position and satisfaction with current job; level of social participation with Australians; experience with prejudice in Australia. To this list are added here initial impression of Australia and whether or not the migrant encountered major difficulties on arrival. Although it is generally assumed that the latter usually affect satisfaction in the first few weeks, months and even years, their possible long-term influence is not often examined. Table 8.1 shows the relationship of the above variables to level of satisfaction of the interviewed respondents. It is apparent that higher satisfaction is correlated with: an initial favourable impression of Australia; lack of major difficulties on arrival; longer residence; no ties with previous country of residence; no experience of prejudice in Australia; higher standard of present accommodation than that overseas; to a lesser extent, satisfaction with current job and greater participation in Australian organizations.

An important point needs mentioning here. Although these situational variables are clearly important with respect to the degree of satisfaction attained, an individual's satisfaction with life in Australia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(N=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Impression of Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encountered Major Difficulties Upon Arrival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Residence in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10 Years</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Years and Over</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered Returning Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Prejudice in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Present Accommodation in Relation to That Lived in Overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same or Worse</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Occupational and Economic Position Due to Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risen</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same or Fallen</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(21)²</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Current Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Australian Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Level</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Level</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
² One respondent in this category did not answer.
ultimately depends on his priorities. One migrant may view his occupational status as the most important aspect of his new life while another considers it of relatively little importance. The same could be said for the other factors discussed. Consequently, it is the total effect of the various situation variables which must be considered important in helping to determine this general level of satisfaction, and not just one or two aspects of his life.

Those who are more highly satisfied are also those who: were older at arrival; are older at present; are fluent in English; occupy white collar positions; have only secondary education (Table 8.2).

Other background characteristics also influence level of satisfaction, as shown by the relationship of country of origin to satisfaction (Table 8.3). Those who came from Europe and North America are the most satisfied with life in Australia, while those from the non-Arab Middle East are the least. Moreover, seven of the 13 interviewees who feel into the low satisfaction category came from the latter region— all but one from Iran—and four of the remaining six migrated from Lebanon.

The explanation for these differences lies in the variation in motivation for migration from the different countries. The fact that the majority of the Armenians were "involuntary" immigrants who emigrated to escape unsatisfactory situations overseas means that, as a group, their satisfaction in Australia is primarily a function of their improved circumstances. An examination of the 14 most satisfied interviewees supports this explanation. First of all, the two principal source countries of these migrants— Iran and Lebanon— were, until recently, countries where Armenians generally enjoyed favoured status and where Armenian communities had thrived. Secondly, most who came from these countries did not emigrate because they were dissatisfied with their lives overseas, but for economic or personal reasons, or simply for adventure. The following two cases are examples of the migration histories of those least satisfied:

Hagop migrated to Australia in 1967 at age 29, simply because he did not have a job at the time and friends in Australia
Table 8.2
Satisfaction Level by Personal Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Level of Satisfaction with Life in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Arrival in Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>(6) 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>(10) 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and Over</td>
<td>(6) 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>(8) 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and Over</td>
<td>(14) 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Very Well</td>
<td>(20) 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(2) 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>(12) 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>(10) 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>(4) 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>(15) 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>(3) 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22) 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

kept telling him how much work was available here. When he first arrived he found that all his friends were going to work but because he didn't speak English very well he could not get a job. Most of his first weeks in Sydney were spent alone in his friends' house waiting for them to finish work. He continued to miss his friends in Lebanon.
### Table 8.3
Satisfaction Level by Country of Last Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Country of Last Residence</th>
<th>Level of Satisfaction with Life in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N=) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Middle East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>(7) 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>(4) 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan (+ Israel)</td>
<td>(1) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab ME</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>(12) 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Arab Middle East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>(2) 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Armenia (+ USSR)</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>(2) 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, East and Southeast Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>(1) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>(3) 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asia</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>(4) 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and North America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(22) 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
and the active social life he had led - especially the
night life. The few people he met when he did go out
he found to be unfriendly and unconcerned that he had
only recently arrived and didn't know his way around.
After some weeks he managed to obtain a labouring job
and immediately began to save money to go back to
Lebanon. The reason he did not go back was that he
was not able to save enough money. However, even today
he feels that Armenians are better off in Lebanon and
if he had the choice again he says he would never have
left.

Mackertich came with his family from Iran in 1966. At
that time he was 40 years old. Although he had had a
very good job in Iran and had built a new house in a good
suburb of Tehran only a few years earlier, he was afraid
that his daughters might marry Iranian Moslems so he
decided to leave and come to Australia. On the trip
to Australia there was a shipping strike which required
the entire family to spend over a month in Bombay in a
hotel. This used up much of the money which they were
bringing with them. The day they arrived in Sydney it
was raining very hard and they had great difficulty
locating a hotel. They also found it difficult to find
suitable permanent accommodation in Sydney, since there
were four children in the family. For a number of
months they were required to rent a holiday flat which
was much more expensive than regular accommodation.
During this period Mackertich kept searching for a job
which was similar to what he had done overseas. Every­
where he applied he was asked if he had "Australian
experience". He eventually obtained a poorly paid
clerical job which he is still doing today. He con­
siders himself much worse off in Australia than he was
in Iran and is bitter about having left. Although he
has thought seriously about going back, he knows he cannot
since he has no possessions there now and the cost of
returning would be too great.

Although factors such as poorer living conditions, less pay or
problems with English have all contributed to the lower satisfaction of
these immigrants, there was only one reason which was common to all - the
lack of any "true" social life in Australia. These Armenians generally
found their new social existence to be void of the warmth and friendliness
which they had known overseas. This, as much as anything, has resulted
in their dissatisfaction, or lack of satisfaction, with life in Australia.
IDENTIFICATION WITH AUSTRALIA

As stated earlier, identification with Australia appears to be the central aspect of the psychological assimilation process, generally correlating with satisfaction and social and economic adjustment, which are deemed to precede it, as well as acculturation, for which it appears to act as a prerequisite (Taft, 1965: 66). This "identification level of assimilation" is considered reached when immigrants begin developing a sense of attachment to Australia which, according to Richardson (1974: 25), is only possible when they feel more satisfied than dissatisfied with their new life. In isolation, satisfaction with life in the new country has no logical or theoretical implications for any changes in the migrants' feelings of national identity, but is merely the necessary foundation upon which a changed identity can be built. Many migrants reach a relatively stable stage of satisfaction and do not continue up the assimilation ladder. They remain as recognizable "aliens" to both themselves and the host society members (Richardson, 1974: 39). For those who come to identify with Australia there are relative degrees of identification; a situation which is equally true of native-born Australians. According to Taft and Doczy (1961-62: 33), this situation results in the first major difficulty in trying to measure identification and makes necessary the acceptance by the researcher of some arbitrary level of identification as the threshold. In their study of Hungarian migrants in Western Australia, they attempted to resolve this problem by assuming that the subjects' national identification concerned only Hungary and Australia. This allowed them to compare the migrant's identification with Australia and his identification with Hungary to determine which was the stronger. An added advantage of this approach was that it made possible an examination of change or shift in the individual's identification over time.

Taft and Doczy (1961-62: 33) noted two other problems with respect to measuring identification: the difficulties arising from the unconscious element involved; the relative importance which different migrants give to the various institutions of the society. The first point draws attention to the fact that immigrants are not always fully aware that they have begun
identifying with their new country, or how strongly. Consequently, it is necessary to resort to "oblique" measures of identification, such as naturalization, in addition to the migrant's own perception of his identity.

The second point concerns identification with all or some of the host society's institutions. By examining identification at the different societal levels, it is possible to make a more valid determination of its overall strength, regardless of the importance placed on the various institutions. Those societal levels examined by Taft and Doczy (1961-62: 33-39) were the nation, formal groups, informal groups and Australian ideology.

These levels of institutions are closely related to those variables which Taft (1965: 66) found to be valid identification measures in his later work: identification of self with Australian society; perceived similarity between self and Australians; social participation with Australians, both informally and in formal organizations; the desire to become a naturalized Australian.

These same four variables are used here as a basis for determining the strength of Armenian identification with Australia. As in the previous discussion of migrant satisfaction, an index has been devised to measure the individual's level of identification so that the very highly identified and the least identified can be determined (see Appendix VIII.B). In formulating this index an attempt was made to include questions and other indicators which take into account: the immigrant's own perception of his identity; indirect or oblique measures of his identity; measures of his identity with regard to the various levels of the society's social institutions.

Unlike Taft and Doczy, who distinguished identification with Australia in relation to the migrant's original national identity, the principal concern here is simply the strength of the individual's identification with Australia. There are four reasons for taking this approach. First, as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the assumption that psychological assimilation involves changes in an immigrant's identity along a continuum from identification with his immigrant group to identification with the host society is not always valid. A strong ethnic
identity does not necessarily imply weak identification with the host society. Second, the Armenians are such a diverse immigrant group that other identifications, such as with the country of last residence, may be as important as their Armenian identity in relation to the development of an Australian identity. Third, by analysing levels of identification in the same manner as was done for satisfaction, it is possible to relate the two with much greater accuracy. Fourth, the present study is not concerned with making comparisons of the Armenians' level of identification with those of other migrant groups.¹

As was found by Taft (1965: 66) for various migrant groups, the level of identification with Australia appears highly correlated with the level of satisfaction (Table 8.4). Only one of the highly satisfied was in the "least identified" category and none of those with low satisfaction were highly identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>Level of Identification with Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High (N=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(5) 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(13) 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>(18) 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

The relationship of personal characteristics to level of identification shows that, in most cases, those respondents most identified with

¹ This would require not only the same measure to be used in both cases, but also the same arbitrary "threshold" level of identification.
Australia are those who: were in the middle age categories at arrival and are the older immigrants today; have resided longer in Australia; have only a primary education; are fluent in English; are in the lower income categories (Table 8.5).

Four other factors assumed to influence identification with Australia were also examined (Table 8.6). It is clear that the more highly identified are those who have not experienced prejudice in Australia, know (or feel they know) a fair amount or great deal about the Australian way of life, are not concerned with maintaining the Armenians as a distinct people 1 and have cut all ties with their former countries of residence.

Because of its strong relationship with level of satisfaction, country of origin was also examined (Table 8.7). Although a measure of correspondence exists between the patterns of satisfaction and identification for a number of the country groups - notably the Iranian group - there are significant differences. An examination of the migration histories of both the highly identified and the least identified indicate that country of origin is not as important with respect to level of identification as it was for level of satisfaction. The more important factors appear to be the individual's predisposition either to change his self-identification to that of an Australian, or else to continue identifying as an Armenian or other, and the perceived differences in customs or behavioural norms. Two cases of both those who exhibit high and low identification with Australia will help to illustrate this:

(1) Those who are the least identified with Australia:

Ohannes is a 65 year old Indonesian Armenian who migrated to Australia in 1951 at the age of 39. He had been well educated at Dutch schools and had taught school in Indonesia. When he first arrived in Australia he encountered few difficulties

---

1 Taft (1965: 68) has also recognized the importance of these "... historically based national attitudes regarding assimilation to other nations". He feels this factor is probably the most important in explaining ethnic group differences in identification level.
Table 8.5

Relation of Personal Characteristics to Level of Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Level of Identification with Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Arrival in Australia</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and Over</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Present</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and Over</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Residence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 Years</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Years or More</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Proficiency at Present</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaks Very Well</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
Table 8.6
Other Factors Assumed to Influence Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Level of Identification with Australia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N=)</td>
<td>Medium (N=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Experienced Prejudice in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(5) 28%</td>
<td>(33) 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(13) 72%</td>
<td>(30) 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18) 100%</td>
<td>(63) 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Knowledge of Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way of Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Great Deal</td>
<td>(6) 33%</td>
<td>(20) 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Fair Amount</td>
<td>(9) 50%</td>
<td>(26) 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows a Little</td>
<td>(3) 17%</td>
<td>(17) 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18) 100%</td>
<td>(63) 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Maintain Armenians as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(3) 17%</td>
<td>(24) 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(15) 83%</td>
<td>(39) 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18) 100%</td>
<td>(63) 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains Strong Ties with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Country of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(2) 11%</td>
<td>(9) 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(16) 89%</td>
<td>(54) 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18) 100%</td>
<td>(63) 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

as he was fluent in English. He did, however, have problems in receiving recognition of his teaching qualifications. Because of this he seriously contemplated going to Holland to live. His qualifications were eventually recognized after a number of months in Australia and Ohannes obtained a position as a teacher. He remained in this position for the next 25 years. Today he feels very satisfied with his life and is active in the Armenian Apostolic Church, yet he says he would
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Country of Last Residence</th>
<th>Level of Identification with Australia</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N=) %</td>
<td>Medium (N=) %</td>
<td>Low (N=) %</td>
<td>Total (N=) %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>(4) 22</td>
<td>(19) 30</td>
<td>(2) 13</td>
<td>(25) 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(4) 6</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(6) 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(12) 19</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(13) 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan (+ Israel)</td>
<td>(4) 22</td>
<td>(5) 8</td>
<td>(2) 13</td>
<td>(11) 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(1) 2</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(2) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab ME</td>
<td>(3) 17</td>
<td>(1) 2</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(5) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>(13) 72</td>
<td>(42) 67</td>
<td>(7) 44</td>
<td>(62) 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Arab Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(2) 3</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(3) 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(8) 13</td>
<td>(6) 38</td>
<td>(14) 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Armenia (+ USSR)</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(1) 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(10) 16</td>
<td>(7) 44</td>
<td>(18) 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, East and Southeast Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(3) 5</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(4) 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(3) 5</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(5) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asia</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(2) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>(3) 17</td>
<td>(6) 10</td>
<td>(2) 13</td>
<td>(11) 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Other Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(3) 5</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(4) 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(2) 3</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(2) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(18) 100</td>
<td>(63) 100</td>
<td>(16) 100</td>
<td>(97) 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
not encourage others [Armenians] to come to Australia because "Australians have a different way of thinking. They won't visit each other or come to your home but they will meet one another at the pub. Their friendship only goes skin deep". His assertion that he is not Australian - only an Armenian with an Australian passport - sums up his attitude concerning identifying himself as an Australian.

Garo arrived in Australia from Egypt in 1968 when he was 23. He knew when he left Egypt that he could never return so he came with the idea of staying. Although he initially had problems with English and in finding a job as a welder, the job he had done overseas, he still liked Australia and was impressed with the look of Sydney. He has worked mainly with Australians since he has been in Australia but has had very little contact with them outside of working hours. Most of his leisure time is spent with other Armenians. He admits that he knows very little about Australia, but has no desire to learn more. Garo considers his life today to be very satisfactory, but does not think of himself as an Australian. The principal reason for this is that "Australians have different habits from the Armenians".

(2) Those who are the most identified with Australia:

Frank is a 29 year old Indonesian Armenian who was 14 when he arrived with his parents in 1962. Although he had a few minor problems with the language and it took him a while to adjust to life in Australia, after the first year he was well settled. Upon finishing high school Frank joined an Australian bank and shortly thereafter he was posted overseas for two years. During this time the few ties he had with Armenians his own age were broken and upon returning to Sydney he made no attempt to renew the friendships. Today he has no real contact with Armenians except the occasional visit with his parents. All his friends are Australian and he says he would never contemplate ever going out with an Armenian girl - much less marrying one! As far as he is concerned he is "100 per cent Australian"!

Zaven is a 46 year old Egyptian Armenian who migrated to Australia in 1963 when he was 32. He left Egypt
because of the political strife and because of the treatment received from government officials. When he first arrived in Australia he had few problems and managed to become established relatively easily. Today he is married, has a family and is very satisfied with his existence, but still says he would not encourage others to come to Australia unless they were well trained in a trade or were well-educated. The reason is that "The competition for good jobs is too hard today". Although he wants his children to know about their Armenian heritage, he also feels that a person must "adapt" to his new circumstances. For this reason he sees himself as both an Australian and an Armenian.

Migrants are often not aware they have begun identifying with the host society. Nevertheless, it is considered relevant to examine their perceptions of their identification with Australia for comparison with the Index of Identification findings. Table 8.8 shows that a very high correlation exists between the two. Comparing the personal and migration characteristics of those who tend to identify as Australians, as opposed to those who identify as Armenians or other nationalities, shows the former to be older upon arrival, less educated, more proficient in English and in less well-paid jobs. Also, they participate more with Australians in Australian organizations, are less opposed to their children intermarrying and have taken Australian citizenship in a shorter period of time. Their duration of residence does not appear to be significant.

It is obvious that the respondent's own perception of his identity is a fairly good measure of his overall level of identification with Australia. In a number of cases, however, individuals identify themselves as Armenians or other nationalities, but appear highly identified with Australia on the index. As these are mainly the more educated respondents who have resided in Australia for more than 10 years it can be safely assumed that either they are not fully aware that they are identifying with Australia, or else they perceive no conflict in identifying as both Armenians, or others, and as Australians.¹

¹ Other researchers have made similar findings of such "dual identification" (Encel et al., 1972: 137; Mapstone, 1966: 316-319; Medding, 1973d: 53; Taft, 1973a: 68).
Table 8.8
Comparison of the Armenian's Self-Identification and His Level of Identification with Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Identification ¹</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>Level of Identification with Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High (N=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies as an</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Identification (Dual Identification)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies as an</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Combining columns 2 and 3, \( x^2 = 62.9202, \) df = 2, sign. at .0001 level.
² All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

An interesting finding was made with respect to naturalization and the speed with which Armenians have taken citizenship.¹ Of those 11 interviewees who have not taken Australian citizenship, although eligible, all identify themselves emphatically as Armenians. This contrasts with those who have become naturalized, 28 per cent of whom identify as Australians and 41 per cent of whom still identify as Armenians or other nationalities. However, comparing only those who identify as Australians with those who identify as Armenians or other nationalities, reveals that speed of naturalization does not vary significantly between the two groups. This indicates that self-identification is not associated with the speed with which the Armenians have become naturalized, even though it is highly correlated with whether or not they have become naturalized in the first place.

¹ There is considerable controversy surrounding the use of naturalization to measure migrant identification with the host society. In some cases it is seen as an index of overall assimilation, while in others it is given no significance at all. Probably one of the best statements on the subject has been made by Martin (1965: 75) who wrote "... for the individual immigrant, the significance of becoming naturalized varies according to the total pattern of adaptation". Also see Borrie (1954), Mapstone (1966) and Taft and Doczy (1961-62: 33-34).
An examination of the reasons why respondents have taken Australian citizenship shows no discernable pattern with respect to self-identification (Table 8.9). Even when these reasons are grouped into two categories showing predisposition to identify with Australia and other reasons for naturalization, no significant variation is found. Therefore it can be concluded that their reasons for taking Australian citizenship are not associated with whether or not they perceive themselves as identifying with Australia.

Why then is self-identification with Australia highly correlated with naturalization? The answer appears to be that many only begin identifying with Australia once they become Australian citizens, i.e., they would not call themselves Australians unless it was legally the case. This assumption is supported by the fact that eight of the 11 who are eligible for citizenship, but have not taken it, are Iranian Armenians who would be barred from ever visiting Iran again if they became Australians. Although they identify themselves as Armenians, over half are in the medium identification category and it seems very likely that they would identify with Australia to some degree if they were Australian citizens. Thus, the act of becoming naturalized is assumed to contribute to their self-identification with Australia, rather than being simply an indicator of such identification.

In summary, the Armenians, like the Jews, are a people who have traditionally maintained loyalty to both their ethnic group and to the countries in which they have lived. This was possible so long as there was no conflict between the two identities. When conflict did develop, they tended to follow one of three courses: they fled to other lands where their identity was not threatened; they sought to maintain their identity clandestinely; they became assimilated into the larger society. Many of those who migrated to Australia can be placed in the first category, although, as shown in Chapter Three, their motivations were somewhat more complicated.

---

1 Reasons one, three and four were taken to show predisposition to identify with Australia while the other seven reasons were considered as other reasons. The relationship of these groupings to self-identification was not statistically significant ($x^2 = 2.04$, df = 2, not sign. at .05 level.)
Table 8.9
Reasons for Becoming Naturalized Australians\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Identify as Australian (N=)</th>
<th>Identify as Intermediate Identification (N=)</th>
<th>Identify as Armenian/Other (N=)</th>
<th>Total(^2) No. of Replies</th>
<th>%(^3) of All Replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Planned to Settle Permanently</td>
<td>(4) 13</td>
<td>(7) 21</td>
<td>(16) 31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Didn't Want to Return to Former Country/Didn't Want to Remain Citizen of Former Country</td>
<td>(6) 19</td>
<td>(4) 12</td>
<td>(8) 16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Wanted to Become a &quot;Part&quot; of Australia/To Belong to Australia</td>
<td>(4) 13</td>
<td>(8) 24</td>
<td>(4) 8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Felt Obliged to Take Australian Citizenship since Was Living in Australia</td>
<td>(1) 3</td>
<td>(1) 3</td>
<td>(1) 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Wanted to Have the Same Rights and Benefits as Other Australians</td>
<td>(4) 13</td>
<td>(2) 6</td>
<td>(3) 6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) For Better Job Opportunities/To Get Government Jobs</td>
<td>(5) 16</td>
<td>(4) 12</td>
<td>(2) 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Afforded More Security and Protection</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(2) 6</td>
<td>(4) 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Needed Citizenship Since Was &quot;Stateless&quot;</td>
<td>(1) 3</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(2) 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Australian Passport Was Better For Travelling Overseas</td>
<td>(4) 13</td>
<td>(3) 9</td>
<td>(8) 16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Could See No Reason for Not Becoming Naturalized</td>
<td>(2) 6</td>
<td>(3) 9</td>
<td>(3) 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(31) 27</td>
<td>(34) 29</td>
<td>(51) 44</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Based on replies of the 81 interviewed respondents who have become naturalized Australians.

\(^2\) Total number of replies is greater than 81 as some respondents gave more than one reason.

\(^3\) All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
Upon arrival in Australia they entered an environment which had developed a tolerance for "dual loyalties". The great number of migrants who came after World War II made such a situation almost inevitable. Because of this, overt measures on the part of the Armenians to maintain their ethnic identity have proceeded largely unopposed (see Chapter Six).

The same tolerance which has facilitated the maintenance of Armenian identity has fostered the development of an identification with Australia for many. The lack of outside pressure has allowed greater contact with Australians in almost every sphere of life. Regardless of the nature of this contact, such a situation must have affected practically all the Armenians to some degree. Depending upon background and characteristics, the development of identification with Australia varies between individuals. The Identification with Australia Index was an attempt to measure these differences in order to ascertain those factors which have exerted the most influence on very high and very low levels of identification.

For the Armenians, the degree to which they have come to identify with Australia appears to be largely attributable to their personal and background characteristics and the level of satisfaction they have achieved in Australia. The changes they have undergone since arrival appear to have had relatively little impact on the identification process, with the possible exception of an improvement in their knowledge of English. Thus, their predisposition to accept Australia as their new country and to become satisfied with it must be considered the most significant factors in the development of this identification. In other words, the individual's personality, formed before arrival in Australia, must be considered to be a major determinant.

ACCULTURATION

Subjective, or internal, acculturation is considered to be an unconscious, and generally unintentional change in values, norms and attitudes, usually accompanied by a consequent change in behaviour. It is almost always "long range" change which occurs gradually over an extended
period of time, compared to external acculturation which can occur very rapidly.\(^1\) Of central importance in such change is the role of the immigrant family. Not only does it serve as a bulwark against internal acculturation by fostering the continuation of traditional values and norms, but it is also the principal arena where such change takes place.\(^2\) Because of this, it is possible to assess internal acculturation by measuring both the adoption of new cultural patterns as well as the retention of old ones within the immigrant family. Where immigrants are a homogeneous group with a common culture and traditions, such measurement poses no great problems. However, for others, such as the Armenians, who have been exposed to a variety of cultures and for varying periods of time, measurement is much more difficult. Internal acculturation in such a case can best be assessed by measuring the degree to which family values reflect "traditional" cultural patterns and values or the extent to which these patterns and values "converge" with those of the larger Australian population. The assumption here is that the Armenians are much more likely to change toward the Australian norms and values than the reverse. Thus, if their family values appear to be more those of the traditional Armenian family, then they are considered not to be internally acculturated; while if they "converge" with those of Australian society, they are assumed to have become internally acculturated.

It should be recognized that, because of their diverse backgrounds, some Armenian immigrants probably held values upon arrival which were similar to, if not the same, as those held by the average Australian. Consequently, it is unlikely that settlement in Australia and contact with Australian culture has resulted in any significant change in the values of these individuals. Nevertheless, since their values "converge" with those of Australians, it is not improper to consider them "internally acculturated" to Australia.\(^3\)

\(^1\) See Appendix VI for a discussion of the concept of acculturation in studies of psychological adjustment.

\(^2\) Spiro (1955: 1247) made this point when he noted that parents are the agents of cultural continuity, while the children become the agents of cultural change.

\(^3\) Taft and Doczy (1961-62: 42-43) have made this assumption concerning the measurement of the convergence of norms of Hungarian intellectual refugees with those of Australian norms.
The Armenian Family in Sydney

The traditional Armenian patriarchal family largely ceased to exist with the World War I dispersions and massacres and was replaced, in some instances, by "modified extended families" and, in other cases, by nuclear families.¹

This demise of the traditional family is well illustrated by the household structure of the families of origin of the interviewed respondents. Sixty-two per cent lived in nuclear family households overseas, while all but two of the rest resided in households which contained only their parents and siblings and one or more close relatives. In the greatest number of cases these other close relatives were grandparents. The average size of these households was 6.5, although they ranged from two to 29 persons, excluding one respondent raised in an orphanage.

Settlement in Australia has increased the trend to nuclear family households. Two-thirds of the respondents now reside in such households, while another 23 per cent live in households which contained a nuclear family and other related adults.² The remaining respondents lived alone, with other single relatives or with friends. The mean household size at the time of the survey was 3.7, with actual household size ranging from one to seven persons.³

As far as family type and household structure are concerned, the Armenians in Sydney do not appear to differ significantly from Australian families (Encel, 1970: 273-274). However, there are significant differences in household composition due to the Armenian parents' residential aspirations for their children. It is not uncommon for unmarried adult children to remain in the parental home, at least until they marry. This is true even

¹ For a discussion of the traditional family and the changes which have occurred to it since World War I see Appendix IX.
² In many of these cases the related adults were residing only temporarily and were planning to move out to their own accommodation.
³ Mean household size for married respondents is 4.0.
where they have completed their education and are self-supporting. Sixty-five of the 97 interviewed respondents stated they did not want their children to leave home before marriage and many preferred them to remain even after marriage. Their reasons involved both their concern for their children's welfare and the family's reputation in the Armenian community. Many respondents did not feel their children would eat properly, or be able to take care of themselves, should they live on their own. They also were afraid that they might be led astray and become "involved in bad things like smoking drugs and things". At the same time, for children to leave home before marriage is generally felt, in the eyes of the respondents, to indicate that parents have done a poor job of bringing up their children. Why else would the child want to leave home? This feeling was especially strong with respect to daughters. Sons were allowed greater freedom to leave home when they became self-supporting or reached a certain age, usually 18 or 21, while the general feeling concerning daughters was that they should remain home until married - indefinitely if necessary.

This greater concern for daughters was a direct result of the parental desire for the daughters' sexual purity. Should they reside alone they would probably lose their virginity and, even if they didn't, all the Armenians would think they had. The family would be shamed and the girl would probably not find a nice reputable Armenian boy to marry her. The following comments are indicative of the importance most Armenian parents place on their daughters remaining at home:

"With daughters you must be more cautious. They are more gullible. They are more easy to give way." (41-year old Egyptian Armenian who arrived in 1963).

"It is not safe for a girl to move away from home. She might have a boyfriend who would dump her one day. We would be ashamed if she should move away. It would ruin our name. A girl should stay a virgin. If she moved away we would disown her and not allow

---

1 Young Armenian men place a great deal of importance on virginity as a qualification for marriage. While enjoying the sexual freedom they found with Australian girls, most indicated that their potential marriage partners should not have "been around" very much.
her to return home." (66-year old Armenian from Israel who arrived in 1968).

"It is a question of virtues. If a girl moves out she is not considered a good girl. A girl has much more opportunities to lose her virginity if she lives alone. If she is not a virgin she is considered a harlot. The family would be shamed if a daughter moved out and lived on her own." (35-year old Egyptian Armenian who arrived in 1964).

"Daughters should stay at home until marriage. She is considered loose if she moved out on her own. It would damage her chances of getting married to a nice Armenian." (40-year old Egyptian Armenian who came in 1963).

This attitude towards Armenian womanhood is found in other areas of family life as well. Table 8.10 gives the responses of the 97 interviewees to the question "When do you think your children should start making their own decisions without first consulting you?" Eighteen of the 97 qualified their responses by stating that daughters should be older than their brothers, or else married before they began to make their own decisions. Two respondents felt that girls could make decisions earlier than boys because they matured faster. In most cases where respondents indicated that their children could make their own decisions they still "preferred" that they be consulted. This is shown by the following remarks made in reply to the above question:

"Boys can make decisions at about 18 or 20 but they should still always ask me. Until she is married a daughter is under my control. As long as she is in my house she will obey her parents." (45-year old Jordanian Armenian who arrived in 1963).

"My children can begin making their own decisions when they are 21 but I prefer them to consult me till 40." (30-year old Lebanese Armenian who came in 1965).

The respondents' views concerning the characteristics of the ideal daughter-in-law and son-in-law also reflect these perceived differences in the positions of men and women in the family. Sixty-nine per cent of the interviewees gave "traditional" characteristics of the girl they would like
Table 8.10
When Respondents Felt Their Children Should Be Allowed to Make Their Own Decisions Without First Consulting Them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>No. of Respondents Who Feel Condition Does Not Apply to Daughters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When Starts to Work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Finishes School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 17-19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 20 or More</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Considered Mature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Married</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Children Want to</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Three gave no answer.

a son of theirs to marry. In general terms, she should be a good housewife, not very independent, a virgin at marriage and submissive and obedient to her husband. Also she should not be very outspoken. The ideal son-in-law, on the other hand, was expected to be first and foremost a good provider and a good "family man". At the same time he should look after his parents and respect them. The more traditional respondents felt that he must also be the strong independent one of the family, who is always "the boss". Overall, the interviewed respondents appeared to have a much better idea about the desired characteristics of the ideal daughter-in-law than they did about the ideal son-in-law. This is probably due to the fact that the woman's role in the Armenian family is much more precisely defined today, signifying that it has probably changed less than that of the man.

With respect to the selection of marriage partners by their children, none of those interviewed felt they have a direct say in whom their children
choose, although many still wanted or expected to be consulted in the matter. None actually entertained any hopes that they would be able to effectively deter them from marrying someone of whom they disapproved. Such an attitude on the part of the respondents is not surprising, however, since two-thirds stated they would have married their choice of mate regardless of whether they had received their parents' approval. Nevertheless, 38 per cent of the men had either asked their parents' permission before marrying, had consulted with them, or, in a few cases, had had their marriages arranged for them by their parents; 59 per cent of their spouses had asked their parents' permission.

The increased freedom of the respondents' children in deciding whom they will marry, when they will leave home, and so on, is indicative of greater personal freedom in other areas of life. Nine-tenths of the interviewed respondents with children feel that their children have much more individual freedom than they themselves had as children. They are felt to have greater freedom of movement and more freedom in their social life, more choice in how they spend their own money and what they buy, and greater independence in doing whatever they want to do at much earlier ages. For a number of the parents, this increased freedom is synonymous with a lack of discipline and is considered bad. According to a 35 year old Egyptian Armenian, "Children today are taking more freedom than we had. They ignore suggestions of their elders. There are much less restrictions now - less discipline". However, for most, the greater freedom enjoyed by their children is just "the way of the times" and if felt to have its benefits in a more relaxed parent-child relationship. Fifty-two per cent of those with children feel that they have a closer, more intimate relationship with their children than they had with their parents. This perceived change in the parent-child relationship is illustrated by the following remarks:

"We could not talk with our parents. We used to fear them. We can sit and discuss things with our kids now.

1 The actual number of "arranged" marriages was very small and was found only for those who had married before World War II.
Kids have more say in things now." (41-year old Jordanian Armenian who came in 1963).

"We are more friendly with our son than our parents were with us. He's not afraid to tell us his problems. We feared our parents." (56-year old Egyptian Armenian who arrived in 1963).

The change in this relationship is also seen in the perceived obligations which children have to their parents. Although the majority (64 per cent) of those interviewed felt that children had obligations to their parents, in all but a few cases these obligations were seen as only moral ones; to love and respect them when they were old. Only a tenth of the respondents felt that their children should financially support them in their old age. Nevertheless, three-fifths indicated that when they retired they expected to live with their children and to be cared for by them. The traditional custom of living with the eldest son, or with sons, no longer seems to prevail; rather, it is felt today that whichever child is in the best position to care for elderly parents should be the one to do so.

Overall, the relationship between parents and children in the Armenian family in Australia is apparently becoming less rigid than in the past, as children assume greater control over their own lives. Children, especially boys, are exercising more freedom in most spheres of life and are attaining greater independence than was allowed their parents. This increase in independence is accompanied by a change in the perceived obligations to parents, especially in financial terms. Parents, however, still expect a commitment from their children to care for them in their old age. The position of daughters in the family is probably the least changed since they are still considered to need greater protection and guidance from their parents.

The relationship between the Armenian husband and his wife is also significantly different from what it was in the past. Wives have become less dependent upon their husbands and there is a strong tendency towards egalitarianism in the relationship. This is especially true with respect to a sharing of parental authority. Table 8.11 is an illustration of who
Table 8.11
Decision-Making in the Armenian Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who Makes the Decisions Concerning:</th>
<th>Husband %</th>
<th>Wife %</th>
<th>Both %</th>
<th>Other %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money Expenditure</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Control and Care</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Leisure Activities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where the Family Will Reside</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of Children</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or Not the Wife Works Outside the Home</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or Not to Have Another Child</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are based on the 83 interviewed respondents who are, or have been, married. All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
2 In cases where the spouse of the respondent has died the question was phrased "Who had made the decisions?".
3 In cases where there were no children the question was phrased "Who would make the decisions?".

makes decisions in various spheres of family life. It is obvious that, with the exception of the decision concerning the wife working outside the home, in most cases the husband and wife share the responsibility for decisions. This does not mean that in all families there is a tendency for parental authority to be shared. Herbst (1952: 24), in a study of the relationship between husbands and wives in Australia, identified four basic interaction patterns in the family: husband dominance; wife dominance; autonomic, husband and wife make separate decisions in different spheres of family life and act separately; syncratic co-operative, both spouses decide together and act together in the various spheres of family life. Although in his study these four patterns were based upon an examination of three

1 These were chosen because in the traditional Armenian family the husband would have generally made all major decisions in these various spheres of family life.
variables - the activity relationship, the power relationship and the degree of associated tension - it is still proper to examine these patterns with regard to only one of the variables. In this study, only the "power" relationship is of concern, as this bears upon the change in the authority structure within the family.

The pattern of decision making within each household was examined and each respondent was grouped into one of four types of authority structure using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Authority Structure in the Family</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband Dominated</td>
<td>Husband makes decisions on at least four out of seven items in Table 8.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife Dominated</td>
<td>Wife makes decisions on at least four out of seven items in Table 8.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomic</td>
<td>Both spouses make decisions on at least four out of seven items in Table 8.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syncratic Co-operative</td>
<td>Husband and wife each make at least two decisions, but neither makes four or more in Table 8.11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.12 shows the frequency of occurrence of these four patterns. Although the distinguishing criteria are not rigorous, it is clear from this distribution that a strong tendency exists today within the majority of Armenian families towards a sharing of authority between the spouses. Moreover, with only seven of the 83 families being characterized as dominated by the husband, it is fairly safe to say that the tradition of husband dominance within the Armenian family has largely disappeared.

Although it is obvious that much of the change in family relationships - especially between husbands and wives - must have taken place prior to their migration to Australia, it is apparent that settlement in Australia has led to an acceleration of this change. The principal catalyst of this change has been the employment of wives outside the home. Though quite
substantial overseas, as shown in Chapter Five, there was a significant increase in the proportion of Armenian wives who worked outside the home for the first time in Australia. As found by Martin (1965: 95) in her study of Displaced Persons in Australia, the employment of wives, in itself, tends to result in a decline in male authority, in a greater recognition of the woman's economic independence and in an increased sharing of household tasks and decisions between husbands and wives. This alteration of the relationship of spouses must be considered, in turn, to lead to a change in the relationship of parents - particularly fathers - to their children.

In conclusion, it is apparent that, even though the major changes in Armenian family structure and values occurred prior to most Armenian migration to Australia, changes are continuing in Australia and leading to convergence of Armenian and Australian family values. Today, most of the Armenian families are nuclear in configuration and the father's authority is being shared with the mother and the children. This decline in the rigidity of family relationships has decreased the dependence of children and wives on the male head of the household, which, while making for more relaxed
relationships, has also resulted in less dependence of elderly parents on their children. Although, at present, Armenian children are still kept more closely tied to the home than Australian children, this will probably change as more young Armenians avail themselves of the greater personal freedom of their Australian contemporaries. The most apparent survival of the more traditional Armenian family values centres around the young girls and women of the family. Unlike their Australian counterparts, they continue to be much more restricted and sheltered, a direct result of the importance to the family honour of daughters remaining virgins until marriage.

Measurement of Armenian Acculturation to Australia

Various attempts have been made quantitatively to measure the acculturation of immigrant or ethnic groups and a number of scales have been devised.¹ For the present study a quantitative Index of Acculturation has been developed which, like those derived for satisfaction and identification, is felt to not only show the individual's level of acculturation, but also to allow for a determination of those most and least acculturated (see Appendix VIII.C). This permits comparisons to be made between this and the two previous stages of the psychological adjustment process and makes possible the ascertainment of those factors which contribute to high and low acculturation. A qualification needs to be made with respect to this "Index of Acculturation" however. It is based solely on those family values discussed earlier and does not include other indicators of internal acculturation.

¹ Two of the earliest attempts to measure acculturation quantitatively were made by Mead (1926) and Hoffman (1934) who used indices of bilingualism. Later attempts were made by Ruesch, Loeb and Jacobson (1948), who developed a scale based on the "cultural distance" from the core culture of the host society, and Campisi (1947), who devised a scale based on a self-descriptive inventory in which a person describes the extent to which he conforms to the way of life of the host society and the degree to which he maintains his former ways. One of the most recent measures, which was found by Taft (1965), Johnston (1972) and Richardson (1974) to be an extremely sensitive and reliable measure of acculturation, was the immigrant's use of the slang terms of the host country.
An examination of the relationship of the level of acculturation of these respondents to those factors assumed to have the greatest influence on acculturative change shows that the more highly acculturated are those who: are both very satisfied and identified with Australia; are more educated; were younger at arrival; have resided in Australia the longest (Table 8.13). The apparent lack of influence of Australian-born children in the household can be attributed to the fact that only nine of the interviewed respondents had Australian-born children who were aged 10 years or more.

It is also apparent that the respondent's level of acculturation is related to other background factors (Table 8.14). Those from the Middle East are the least acculturated, while those from the Asian countries and Europe and North America, and from countries where there were no Armenian communities as such, are the most acculturated. This indicates that there are probably two other main factors which contribute to differences in level of acculturation - contact with Westerners and Western style of life and lack of interest in the maintenance of Armenian ethnicity. The first factor would very likely have resulted in the development of, or a change in values to ones which more closely resemble those commonly held in Australia, while the latter would have meant that they placed relatively little importance on the maintenance of traditional Armenian values. This view is supported by the fact that 15 of the 19 respondents in the high acculturation category were not opposed to their children marrying non-Armenians and did not feel it was of great importance to maintain the Armenian heritage in their children.

Another factor which must be considered significant with respect to acculturative change is that, in many cases, some of the family values at the time of their arrival in Australia were not radically different from those of Australians. For this reason, these values have not tended to come into conflict with those held by Australians - a fact which is indicated by the relatively little inter-generational conflict in Armenian families in Australia. Moreover, the institutions which serve to support the maintenance of Armenian family values in Australia can be considered to have developed
Table 8.13
Relationship of Selected Variables to Level of Acculturation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Level of Acculturation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Satisfaction with Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>(7) 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>(9) 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>(3) 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(19) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Identification with Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>(7) 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>(10) 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>(2) 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(19) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>(6) 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>(10) 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>(3) 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(19) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Arrival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 Years</td>
<td>(8) 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>(7) 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Years or Older</td>
<td>(4) 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(19) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4 Years</td>
<td>(1) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Years</td>
<td>(6) 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Years</td>
<td>(9) 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More Years</td>
<td>(3) 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(19) 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Australian-Born Children in Household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(9) 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Aged &lt;10)</td>
<td>(9) 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Aged ≥10)</td>
<td>(1) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(19) 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Country of Last Residence</th>
<th>High (N=)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
<th>Medium (N=)</th>
<th>Medium (%)</th>
<th>Low (N=)</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>Total (N=)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan (+ Israel)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab ME</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Arab Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Armenia (+ USSR)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, East and Southeast Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asia</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and North America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and North America</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
very rapidly because of the large influx of Armenians in a short period of time. Nelson (1954b: 138-139) points out that the principal motivating factors behind the American Armenians' struggle to maintain old values was twofold, an intense concern with the family and the fear of being gossiped about. In the group he studied, sanctions from Armenian society were still strong and the fear of being talked about led parents to avoid change. All indications from the present study are that the same motivations are present for the Sydney Armenians.

In summary, based on specific aspects of the family, the degree to which Armenians are acculturated to Australian society does not appear to arise from the effects of living in Australia, as from the degree to which the individual's values "converged" with those of Australian society at the time of arrival. This is understandable since value change is a slow process and is only likely to occur over a long period. Nelson (1954b: 103) found that the slow but steady changes in the family values of first generation Armenian immigrants in the United States were due to two processes - influences of older children on parents and their younger siblings and the cumulative effect of the non-Armenian culture. For most of the Australian Armenians, neither of these processes can be considered to have had a great deal of impact on their family values, since the majority have resided in Australia for 15 years or less and only about a tenth have Australian-born children in the household who are aged 10 years or more. Moreover, the fact that the Armenian community developed very rapidly must be assumed to have curtailed the impact of the Australian environment on the more traditional Armenian values, thereby slowing down the change even more.

If Nelson's study of first generation Armenian families in America can be taken as a guide, most of the future acculturative change will occur through the children who grow up in Australia. Nevertheless, it is likely that some of the more traditional values, such as family values, will continue to remain vigorous for most of the first generation Armenian immigrants.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT: CONCLUSIONS

Most of the Armenian immigrants can be considered psychologically
adjusted to Australian society today. They are generally satisfied with their new life in this country and have made those changes in habits, customs and values which were either "obligatory"—required by their new environment and circumstances—or else those which they saw as "advantageous" (see Appendix VII). Relatively little "optional" change appears to have taken place. Even that which does appear to have come about in Australia, while not being the result of conscious decisions, is generally recognized by the immigrants concerned. Likewise, in most cases they perceive the principal causes of these optional changes. The alterations in the parent-child and husband-wife relationships in the family are the best illustrations here. Consequently, these first generation Armenian immigrants in Sydney cannot be considered to have become psychologically assimilated into Australian society to any significant degree—only to have "accommodated" themselves where necessary.

Although the hypothesis of "stages" of psychological assimilation does appear to be supported by the Armenian findings, in many ways a too strict adherence to this approach conceals as much as it reveals. While these stages are generally applicable to the Armenian immigrant group as a whole—that is, there was a strong correlation found between satisfaction and identification and acculturation—there were many immigrants who did not fit this pattern. It is precisely the investigation of these cases which helps to reveal many of the underlying factors that affect the observed pattern of psychological adjustment.

One other point needs to be made here. This concerns the relationship of the Armenians' background characteristics to their adjustment, especially their countries of origin. It was shown that this factor, which was closely related to their reasons for emigrating in the first place, was mainly significant with respect to their satisfaction with life in Australia. It had much less importance in the changes which have occurred since arrival. Regardless of country of origin, settlement in Australia appears to have had a similar effect on the Armenian immigrants and has given rise to like changes. The predominant influence of these background factors, therefore, appears to be the degree to which they have predisposed the Armenians to undergo change.
after arrival in Australia. It is postulated here that, at least for the first generation immigrants who arrived as adults, this predisposition, combined with individual personality traits, is very likely the major underlying determinant of much of the acculturative change which has occurred.¹

¹ Martin's (1965: 88-91) findings for the Displaced Persons in Australia support this conclusion. In developing her typology of different categories of immigrant adaptation she discovered that those who fell into different categories also tended to have different personality characteristics.
CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This has been a study of the immigration and settlement of the Armenian population of Sydney. It has attempted to chronicle the background to their emigration, their movement to Australia and their settlement and adjustment in Sydney. Because very little published information was available and there were no official statistics on the Armenians in Australia, the basis of the study was a postal "census" of the Sydney Armenian population, followed by a field survey. In addition to intensive interviews with a selected sample of the study population, information was obtained from background literature, naturalization records and church records; also from Armenian organizations and participant-observation. The thesis was basically in the form of a history of the Armenians in Sydney, which begins with the ancient origins of the Armenian people in the Caucasus and ends with their present-day adjustment to life in Australia.

Designed in the framework of an immigrant adjustment study, the principal aim of the thesis has been to unravel and explain the patterns of Armenian migration and settlement and the various aspects of their adjustment. Although it considers the degree to which Armenians have assimilated with Australian society it does not emphasize this, largely because of the assumption that no first generation immigrant group, like the Sydney Armenians, is likely ever to be completely assimilated, however long it may have resided in Australia. They will change, yes, some more than others but, with a few exceptions, they will never enter the mainstream of Australian society.¹

¹ This particular viewpoint is not new to the present study. Gordon (1964: 242) made the point that first generation immigrants of peasant background who enter the host country in numbers large enough to develop a communal life of their own cannot be expected to become structurally assimilated. Mapstone (1966: 364) agreed with this view by noting that "it must be expected that first generation settlers with firsthand knowledge of two cultures (or two societies) will remain, to some extent, marginal to both". Richmond (1969: 275) took it one step further when he stated "There can be no question of complete 'assimilation', either cultural or structural, in an industrial society because the latter is itself quite heterogeneous, stratified and pluralistic".
The approach was largely exploratory - in the sense that, with the exception of the above viewpoint regarding assimilation, no preconceptions regarding expected findings were entertained and no particular hypotheses were formulated for testing. This meant that a very broad approach was necessary in order to examine the many different aspects of the Armenians' migration process. In actual fact, a variety of types of analysis felt to be appropriate and likely to shed light on particular topics were used.

Even before the data collection phase of the study, it became obvious that the Sydney Armenians were an extremely diverse and complex entity - not in reality a single integrated group, but a number of sub-groups of different sizes and with different characteristics, which had migrated to Australia from different parts of the world and at different times. This posed an important methodological problem - how to examine them as a single ethnic group composed of more-or-less distinct sub-groups, and also how to do them justice as both sub-groups and individuals within these sub-groups. Being very much in agreement with Price's (1969: 237) attitude that immigrants "are not just things of various sexes and ages, who arrived as part of a recruitment target", but "human beings grappling with the anxiety and pleasure of life in a new world", the study was concerned not only with discovering what was generally true about the Sydney Armenians as an ethnic group, but also with portraying them as individuals who exhibit a myriad of differences. This was no easy task.

The method used to accomplish this was to integrate the analytical and explanatory parts of the study in the same manner in which the survey information was collected - that is, by always using the intensive interview information in conjunction with the much larger, more statistical data derived from the questionnaire. Wherever possible an attempt was also made to examine not only the overall Armenian population and major sub-groups, but also to present at least some of the individual differences found within these groups. Although this attempt was not always completely successful, it nevertheless allowed for a depiction of at least some of the reality of the lives of the Armenian immigrants.
Factors Affecting Armenian Migration, Settlement and Adjustment in Australia

Armenian migration to Australia has been predominantly an "involuntary" movement from the Middle East, principally from the Arab countries and Iran. Most of this migration was stimulated by the political upheavals which accompanied the rise of Arab nationalism during the 1950's and early 1960's and by the destabilization of the Arab Middle East which accompanied the establishment of Israel. Prior to 1963 Australia had received only a few hundred Armenian immigrants, divided between Middle Eastern Armenians and those who came from the countries of South, East and Southeast Asia. Many of these latter migrants could also be considered "involuntary", in the sense that the nationalistic governments which developed after World War II in many of the countries in these areas made life increasingly difficult for them.

Beginning in 1963 large numbers of Armenians began arriving, mainly from Egypt, Syria, Lebanon and Iran, increasing the Armenian population tenfold and firmly establishing an Armenian community in Sydney. Most of this movement, like that earlier, was predominantly family reunion and chain migration. In fact, the principal "pull" factor of Australia for the majority of the Armenians was the presence of family members, relatives or friends already living here.

Almost all of these immigrants were urban dwellers who had been employed in typical urban occupations as skilled, semi-skilled and white collar workers, and who were accustomed to minority group status, to learning and using languages other than their mother tongue and to maintaining social networks in urban situations.

Their settlement patterns in Sydney were principally influenced by the location of those who arrived before 1963, by the location of the early Armenian institutions in Sydney - especially the Apostolic Church - and by the location of the government's migrant hostels. Chain settlement resulted in the growth of many clusters of immigrant settlement, although no solid Armenian neighbourhoods or enclaves developed. Nevertheless, a number of relative Armenian concentrations did develop in three major areas of Sydney.
While the Sydney Armenians have tended to become more widely dispersed, both within and outside the areas of concentration, the basic pattern of settlement has changed relatively little. Home ownership, which roughly equates to residential adjustment for the Armenians, is rapidly becoming universal for the Sydney Armenians, resulting in considerable residential stability. Residential change today tends to follow the general pattern of the greater metropolitan population.

The occupations Armenians have entered in Australia are largely a function of their work experience prior to migration, their level of education and their proficiency in English. As a group they have been occupationally very mobile since arrival, but mainly in pursuit of their pre-migration occupational status. As this status has been regained their occupational mobility has abated, a fact which is likely to prevent their economic assimilation into the Sydney occupational structure, due to the differences between their former occupational distributions and those of the greater Sydney population.

Most Armenian social adjustment represents an attempt to reestablish in Australia the same, or similar, social groupings as the immigrants had overseas. Social interaction has thus been confined principally to Armenians, particularly to persons known overseas, or at least from the same country. There has been only limited contact — and that of a largely superficial kind — with Australians and other non-Armenians. This predominance of social interaction with Armenians is due to the rapid reestablishment of their primary social groups in Australia, which was a direct result of family reunion and chain migration, and to the proliferation of Armenian institutions in Sydney, which occurred with the large increase in population after 1962. It is also attributable to the commonly perceived differences between the Armenians and Australians in social customs and friendship behaviour, and to the efforts of the more active members of the community to maintain their Armenian identity. These latter efforts are directed at ensuring that the primary social, as well as marital, relations of both the first generation Armenian immigrants and their Australian-born and Australian-raised children are restricted to other Armenians.
Like their social adjustment, the Armenians' basic psychological adjustment to life in Australia is very much a function of background factors - in particular, the differences between their circumstances overseas and those faced in Australia. Those who are more satisfied with life in Australia are generally those who emigrated because of unpleasant situations overseas. The least satisfied are the "free-flow" migrants who have not realized their expectations in Australia. Overall, most Sydney Armenians are satisfied with their life in Australia and can be characterized as having a "contented state of mind". With respect to the other stages of the psychological adjustment process - identification with, and acculturation to Australia - background factors and personal characteristics also appear to be very influential and there are definite causal links between the three stages. Nevertheless, most of the psychological change which has occurred in Australia is mainly that which was either required by the new circumstances or desired by the individual. The extent of psychological change appears related principally to the individual's predisposition to change.

Of all the factors which have influenced the patterns of Armenian adjustment in Australia the predominant ones are background factors relating to country of origin, motivation for emigration and mode of migration. In the occupational and social spheres especially, the Sydney Armenians have sought to reestablish their pre-migration existence. The major differences noted in the patterns of adjustment relate largely to the nature of their communities overseas and to the differences in the experiences of the individual Armenians, such as their exposure to Western society or prior relationships with non-Armenians. Thus, the ways in which most have adapted to Australian society were, in large part, determined before they arrived.

Theoretical and Methodological Implications of the Study

Although this study was designed neither to determine the extent of Armenian assimilation into Australian society, nor to test any theories or hypotheses concerning immigrant assimilation, the findings still have some theoretical and methodological relevance for the study of assimilation. Firstly, by contributing a descriptive work on an immigrant group not hitherto studied in Australia, this study provides another "foundation stone" upon
which general statements about immigrant assimilation can be made and widens our understanding of assimilation studies generally (Price 1969: 236).

Secondly, the approach and the findings support Martin's (1965: 89) contention that "No one facet of the immigrant's adaptation is necessarily linked to his adjustment, because each facet gains its significance from its place in the total pattern". For example, by regaining his pre-migration occupational status an Armenian may have achieved occupational adjustment in Australia but confined his social interaction to other Armenians and reinforced his tendency to identify himself as an Armenian. He may also be dissatisfied with his life in Australia because he has not obtained a higher status job or because the social relations he has here are not the close communal kind he knew overseas. If only one of these aspects of his adaptation to Australia is considered, a very distorted picture of his adjustment in Australia is likely to emerge. In other words, no particular item of behaviour can be properly evaluated unless it is examined in the light of the total pattern.

Along similar lines, this study shows than an understanding of immigrant adjustment and assimilation can only be derived from "a knowledge and understanding of the whole process of migration" (Germani, 1964). This is especially true of the immigrant's history and life experience prior to migration. Although it is commonly assumed - not without empirical support (Cronin, 1967; Huber, 1972) - that background factors affect assimilation in the host country (Price, 1969: 185-186), these factors are seldom adequately covered and their influence properly interpreted in research on immigrants. Had the present study concentrated only upon the life histories of the Armenian immigrants after arrival in Australia, the explanation of the changes which they have undergone in Australia would have been quite erroneous.

The present study underscores the dangers inherent in attempting to derive general conclusions concerning immigrant assimilation from the study of a single immigrant group. For the most part, these groups are simply too diverse. The study also calls into question the application of many of the more common "measures" of assimilation used in comparative studies of this phenomenon. For example, a group such as the Armenians who are
accustomed to an urban existence may be able to carry on an active social life although fairly widely dispersed, while another group with rural origins may require greater residential propinquity. Different measures of ethnic concentration in this case may actually indicate more about their backgrounds overseas than about the comparative extent to which they have assimilated.

The principal theoretical implication, therefore, which comes out of the present study is that we cannot hope to make much progress in formulating really valid general statements concerning immigrant assimilation without first achieving "a rich understanding of the complexity and subtlety of migrant experience" (Martin, 1965: 98).

What the Future Holds

Predictions concerning what people are likely to do are no more than attempted foresights based on hindsight - a risky proposition at best. Nevertheless, we have no choice if we are to try to see what tomorrow holds.

Like any population group the present-day Sydney Armenians will not cease changing simply because they have reached a satisfactory level of adjustment to their Australian environment. New stimuli for change are introduced every day and change which occurs in one area of life will invariably lead to alterations in other areas. Thus, in attempting to answer the question of "what does the future hold for the Armenians?", the real concern is whether or not they will continue to change to the point where they cease being a distinct ethnic group.

The findings of the present study suggest that the first generation Armenian immigrants in Sydney will maintain, and may even strengthen, their distinctiveness. The fact that they are becoming more vocal publicly concerning their historical grievances - and thus forcing themselves, as a group upon the general populace - is an indication of this. Moreover, the current estimated arrival of about 40 new families a year (150-200 individuals), if it continues will undoubtedly serve to enhance this distinctiveness.
Most of the Armenian immigrants in the study were shown to have only "accommodated" to Australian society. Future movement towards assimilation for the first generation is therefore likely to occur principally through their young children as they grow up in Australia. As in the past, however, such change is likely to be of the order of "forced" or "required" change, made simply to maintain relations with these children.

What will happen to the second and subsequent generations in Australia is hard to say. The forces of assimilation, including intermarriage, are aided by the divisiveness of the community into so many sub-groups based on different country origins, religious faiths and political persuasions. Also, there is a general failure on the part of most Armenians to consider a shared ethnic identity a satisfactory basis for mutual assistance beyond the boundaries of their individual primary groups, or in the pursuit of specific goals for the Armenian community in general.

The forces making for the continued existence of the Armenians as a distinct ethnic group emanate largely from the emotion-charged controversy surrounding the "Armenian Cause", and from the Armenian Apostolic Church which serves as an historic link with the past. Those Armenians most concerned today with the perpetuation of the Armenian identity in their children are those who are the most involved in this controversy. They are also the members of the community who are attempting to ensure that the Armenian mother tongue remains a functional language by teaching it to their children. These efforts appear to be paying dividends at the present time, although the eventual success of this endeavour is far from being assured, as can be seen in the experience of a number of immigrant groups in the United States - including the Armenian-Americans. Based on comparative data, it is highly probable that by the third generation in Australia, Armenian will cease being used as a functional language by all except a very few. This does not mean, however, that Armenian ethnicity will also disappear, although the basis of this ethnicity will almost certainly be greatly altered. For example, it may go the way of many American ethnic groups, i.e., become the basis of a special interest group, or it may become no more than a recognized link based on a common cultural heritage or religion. However, if the strong emotional attachment to Armenian identity can be maintained -
whether by the "national" Apostolic Church or by focusing attention on the internal political controversy in the Armenian community - it is possible that the individual's ethnic self-awareness and identification, and consequently the distinctiveness of the group could be perpetuated by this alone. It is predicted here that unless the latter happens, or, unless the Sydney Armenians evolve into a functioning interest group within Australian society, persistence as a distinct ethnic group is unlikely to continue for more than two to three generations in Australia.
APPENDIX I

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS AND RELATED MATERIALS

A.1. Letter of Introduction from Demography Department Head to Leaders of Armenian Organizations in Sydney.

A.2. Letter of Introduction from Academic Registrar, Australian National University, to Members of Sydney Armenian Community.

B.1. Cover Letter in English for Postal Questionnaires.

B.2. Cover Letter in Armenian for Postal Questionnaires.

B.3. Armenian Survey Postal Questionnaire.

B.4. Follow-up Letter in Both English and Armenian to Postal Questionnaire.

C.1. Armenian Survey Interview Schedule.

D.1. Armenian Associations/Organizations Questionnaire.
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Dear [Name],

I am writing to you because of your acknowledged position of leadership within the Armenian community of Sydney.

A member of our Department, Mr Ray Kirkland, is conducting a study of the patterns of migration, settlement and adjustment of the Armenians of Sydney to their new home here in Australia. He has selected the Armenians from among a number of national groups because of his interest in their history and their achievements throughout the world, and for the fact that the Armenians are one of the national groups most deserving of Australian knowledge and understanding.

The proposed study will have a dual aim. It will first attempt to collect some facts concerning migration, living and working conditions, family life, social activities and other general aspects of Armenian life in Australia; and second, it will attempt to portray the contributions which the Armenians have made, and are making, to Australian society.

It should be noted that this study will be conducted entirely within the Demography Department of the Australian National University, and will have no connection whatsoever with any government office or private organization.

I would like to emphasize that a study such as this relies very strongly upon the support of the community and its leaders. It is for this reason that I sincerely hope you will be sympathetic and will lend your support and guidance to Mr Kirkland in this study.

Mr Kirkland plans to come to Sydney for the period of 4-8 October in order to meet various members and leaders of the Armenian community. If it is convenient he would very much like an appointment with you to discuss this study. If this is suitable could you notify him at the following address:

Mr James R. Kirkland,
Department of Demography,
Research School of Social Sciences,
The Australian National University,
Canberra, A.C.T. 2600.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

John C. Caldwell,
Professor and Head of Department
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

This letter introduces Mr James Ray KIRKLAND, a Research Scholar working in the Department of Demography of The Australian National University, Canberra.

Mr Kirkland is presently engaged in a study of the Armenian Community of Sydney. In this study he will attempt to determine and to understand the role played by the Armenians in Australian society, how they have adjusted to their new life in Australia, and the contribution they are making here.

Your assistance is sought in order that the most accurate portrayal of the Armenian Community may be made. Any information, help, or guidance you can give Mr Kirkland will be greatly appreciated.

Any information which you may supply to Mr Kirkland will be kept in the strictest confidence.

G. E. Dicker
Academic Registrar
Dear Mr/Ms,

As you might well know, most of the immigrant groups in Australia, such as the Greeks and Italians, have been studied and have had books written about them—and are thus recognised by both the Australian Government and the average Australian citizen as being "national" groups. This is not the case with the Armenians in Australia, however, since they are grouped according to place of birth or country of previous citizenship rather than ethnic origin.

In order to determine and to understand the contributions of the Armenians to Australian Society a study is being conducted by Mr James Ray Kirkland of the Department of Demography, The Australian National University, CANBERRA, concentrating primarily on the Armenian Community of Sydney. The enclosed questionnaire will form the basis of this study by providing information of a general nature on the Sydney Armenians. The names and addresses of Sydney Armenians were obtained from a directory of Armenians living in Australia and New Zealand.

I want to emphasize that this study is being conducted entirely within the Demography Department of The Australian National University, and is in no way connected with any government office or private organization. Also, any and all information supplied to Mr Kirkland in this study will be kept in the STRICTEST CONFIDENCE.

If this study is to be a success, with the possibility of having a book published on the Armenians of Australia, it is very important that these questionnaires be filled in as completely as possible.

I want to thank you in advance for participating in this study. If you have any questions concerning the study, or if you would like to participate more fully, please contact either me or Mr Kirkland at the above university address, or telephone Mr Kirkland at CANBERRA 49-4351.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Professor John C. Caldwell
Head of Department
B.2. Cover Letter in Armenian for Postal Questionnaires.

The Australian National University

The Research School of Social Sciences

Post Office Box 4 Canberra ACT 2600
Telegrams & cables NATUNIV Canberra
Telex AA 62694 SOPAC
Telephone 062-49111

The Reference:

Post Office Box 4 Canberra ACT 2600

The Research School of Social Sciences

Reference:

Date: 

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to apply for the position of Research Assistant to the above named institution. I have been recommended for this position by Dr. John Smith, who is currently a lecturer in the Social Science Department at the Australian National University.

I have completed my undergraduate degree in Sociology at the University of Sydney and have since worked as a research assistant at the University of Melbourne. My experience in research has included both qualitative and quantitative methods, and I am familiar with a variety of statistical software packages.

I am available to start work immediately and would be happy to discuss my qualifications further at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

[Your Name]
The attached questionnaire is intended to be completed by the MALE HOUSEHOLD HEAD, if at all possible. If there is no person whom the household regards as the Male Household Head, would the Female Household Head fill it in instead.

The questionnaire asks about your life before coming to Australia, as this is very relevant in determining why and how you came here, and asks questions concerning your adjustment to Australian Life, such as your settlement, your job situation, your educational experience, changes in family size, etc. All of these questions are necessary if we are to know how, and in what manner, Armenians from so many countries have settled in Australia and made contributions to Australian Society.

All the questions have been prepared in such a way that the MAJORITY can be answered simply by TICKING (✓) the appropriate answer. In every other case one or two words should be enough.

A GREAT EFFORT has been made to keep the questionnaire AS SHORT AS POSSIBLE in order to insure that it can be completed in the short span of ONLY 15 to 20 minutes.

If you object to answering any question would you leave it blank and write "object" by the question.

PLEASE NOTE: Your completed questionnaire is ABSOLUTELY CONFIDENTIAL. Your name will not appear anywhere on the completed questionnaire. The RESULTS of the questionnaire will appear only in STATISTICAL SUMMARIES.

IT WOULD BE GREATLY APPRECIATED IF YOU WOULD COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND RETURN IT AS SOON AS YOU POSSIBLY CAN. If you would like to have a personal copy of the results of the survey please indicate so below and give an address to where they should be sent.

☐ I would like a personal copy of the results sent to me at: ..........................
FIRST, A FEW BACKGROUND QUESTIONS ON YOURSELF AND YOUR MIGRATION TO AUSTRALIA.

1. WHERE were you born? ............................................ (city or town and country)

2. WHEN were you born? 19 ___

3. WHEN did you first arrive in Australia? 19 ___

4. WHERE did you first arrive in Australia? (City) .................

5. In which CITY/TOWN and COUNTRY were you living just before coming to Australia? ..........................................................

6. Were you a CITIZEN of that country (as reflected by your PASSPORT)? YES NO
   If NO, what CITIZENSHIP did you hold? (For Example, Syrian, Lebanese, STATELESS, etc.) .............................................

7. HOW LONG (years) had you lived in THAT country? .................

8. In which city and country did you live BEFORE this LAST country? ............................................................. Not applicable .......
   HOW LONG (years) did you live THERE? ..........................

9. Please list below any OTHER countries where you have lived for AT LEAST one year, and the TIME PERIOD you lived each place (For Example, EGYPT, 1940-55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Did you already have FRIENDS and/or RELATIVES living in Australia before you came? Friends Relatives Neither •

11. Did someone SPONSOR you to come to Australia?
   YES NO DON'T KNOW •
   If YES, was he/she a relative or friend?
   Relative Friend Neither •

12. Did you pay your fares to Australia?
   YES, fully YES, partly NO •

13. Did the Australian Government provide any assistance with your FARES? YES NO •

PLEASE TURN OVER
14. Did your family (Wife and Children) ARRIVE WITH YOU in Australia?

YES NO NOT MARRIED ON ARRIVAL

If NO, how long AFTER YOU ARRIVED here did they come? ..........

15. Did you plan to settle PERMANENTLY in Australia when you FIRST ARRIVED?

YES NO WAS UNDECIDED

16. Are you NOW a NATURALIZED Australian? YES NO

If YES, WHEN did you become naturalized? .........................

17. What was the FIRST THING you had wanted to do when you first arrived in Australia? (Please TICK only one)

Learn English ......
Buy a house ......
Get a job ......
Meet other Armenians ......
Meet friends and/or relatives here ......
Other (Please Specify) ....................

18. Have you SPONSORED any friends or relatives to come to Australia?

If YES, HOW MANY? ........................................

NOW FOR A FEW QUESTIONS ON YOUR SETTLEMENT IN AUSTRALIA.

19. WHERE did you first live in Australia when you first arrived? (Please TICK the one most appropriate)

Migrant hostel ......
With relatives already living here ......
With friends already living here ......
Other Armenian family ......
Found own lodgings ......
Other (Please Specify) ....

WHERE was this LOCATED? (Please give ADDRESS or STREET and SUBURB) ........................................

HOW LONG (Months or years) did you live THERE? ................

20. HOW LONG have you been living at your present address? (Months & Years) ........................................

21. WHERE in SYDNEY did you live before that? (Please give ADDRESS or STREET and SUBURB) ........................................

................................. Lived Nowhere Else ....

HOW LONG did you live there? (Months or Years) ................

22. How many OTHER PLACES have you lived in SYDNEY? ................

PLEASE GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
B.3.

23. WHY do you live where you do NOW? (Please indicate in order of importance the THREE MAIN REASONS: Most Important=1, Second Most Important=2, etc.)

- Close to work
- Prestigious neighborhood
- Close to relatives
- Close to Church
- Inexpensive housing
- Contact with neighbors
- Good schools in area
- Social life of area
- Close to friends
- Other (Please Specify)

24. Do you OWN or RENT the house or flat in which you now live?

- OWN
- RENT
- PRESENTLY BUYING
- LIVE WITH RELATIVES
- OTHER (Please Specify)

25. If you bought a house or flat in Australia, HOW LONG after arrival did you buy it?

26. If you had a job BEFORE COMING to Australia, what did you do?

27. What was your VERY FIRST JOB in Australia?

- HOW LONG did you work at this job?
- WHERE was this job LOCATED?

28. Who helped you to find this first job in Australia? (Please TICK only one)

- Your SPONSOR
- Armenian Organization
- Friends
- Australian Government Agency
- Relatives
- Found it yourself

29. HOW LONG after arrival in Australia did you obtain your first job?

- Job offered before arrival in Australia
- Few days
- More than a week
- A few weeks
- More than a month
- Other (Please Specify)

30. What job do you do NOW, if you are not retired?

- I am retired
- I am presently unemployed
- I am self-employed (Please Specify)
- Other (Please Specify)

31. HOW LONG have you been working at your present job?

32. If your WIFE works, what does she do?

33. Where were your FATHER and MOTHER born? (Please give City/Town and COUNTRY)

- Father:
- Mother:
34. Were BOTH your parents ARMENIAN? Father: YES ..... NO ..... 
Mother: YES ...... NO ..... 

35. HOW MANY children did your PARENTS have, including yourself:
(Please CIRCLE)

Boys: ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 )

Girls: ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 )

36. How many BROTHERS and SISTERS did your FATHER have?

Brothers: ...... Sisters: ......

37. How many BROTHERS and SISTERS did your MOTHER have.

Brothers: ...... Sisters: ......

38. How many ADULTS and CHILDREN live in your house or flat, whether related to you or not?

Adults: ...... Children: ......

39. If you are MARRIED, please give your WIFE's:

Place of BIRTH: ......................... Age: ......

Ethnic Origin (Armenian, Australian, Etc.) ................

40. WHEN did you marry? 19 ______

41. WHERE did you marry? ____________________________________________

42. What is the TOTAL NUMBER of children EVER BORN to you?

Please indicate the number of LIVING children you have:

Boys: ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 ) Girls: ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 )

43. How many of your children were born in Australia? ..............

44. What do you think is the IDEAL NUMBER of children for an ARMENIAN couple living in Australia to have? (Please circle)

( 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 )

45. How many children do you think are TOO MANY children? ..............

46. IF you have any children that are MARRIED, how many are married to NON-ARMENIANS? (Please circle)

Sons: ( 1 2 3 4 ) Daughters: ( 1 2 3 4 )

47. To which RELIGION do you belong?

ARmenIAN Apostolic ..... ARMenIAN Evangelical ..... 

ARmenIAN Catholic ..... Protestant ..... 

Other (Please Specify) ........................................

NOW, SOME QUESTIONS CONCERNING LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION.

48. What languages do you speak? ........................................

........................................................................

49. Did you speak ENGLISH before coming to Australia:

Very well..... Fair..... A little..... Not at all.....

50. Did you have difficulty with English when you FIRST ARRIVED?

YES ...... NO .....
51. If you NOW speak English, how well do you speak it?
   Very well.....  Fair.....  A little.....
   How did you learn it?
   At School.....  Taught yourself.....  Other
52. How well do you READ English?
   Very well.....  Fair.....  A little.....  Not at all.....
53. Which language do you USUALLY speak at home?
54. Which language do your children use AMONG THEMSELVES?
55. Do you feel it is important for ARMENIANS living in Australia to be able to speak and read the ARMENIAN LANGUAGE?
   YES.....  NO.....
56. Do you REGULARLY read any publications in Armenian or listen to the Armenian portion of Ethnic Radio?
   Read Armenian Publications:  YES.....  NO.....
   Listen to Armenian Ethnic Radio:  YES.....  NO.....
57. Do you REGULARLY read any publications in ENGLISH?
   YES.....  NO.....
58. What is the HIGHEST LEVEL OF SCHOOLING you have ever attended?
   (Please CIRCLE)
   Primary  Secondary
   School: ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 ) ( 9 10 11 12 )
   Undergrad,  Post-gra
   College/University: ( 1 2 3 4 ) ( 5 6 7 )
   Highest qualification/degree held
59. What about your WIFE?
   Primary  Secondary
   School: ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 ) ( 9 10 11 12 )
   Undergrad,  Post-gra
   College/University: ( 1 2 3 4 ) ( 5 6 7 )
   Highest qualification/degree held
60. In which category would you place yourself with respect to the TOTAL combined incomes of you and your wife:
   Under $150 per week (Under $8000 per year) .....  
   Between $150-$250 per week ($8000-$13000 per year).....
   Between $250-$350 per week ($13000-$18000 per year).....
   Over $350 per week (Over $18000 per year).....

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION. NOW PLEASE PLACE THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE PROVIDED, AND POST IT BACK AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

Department of Demography
Australian National University
P.O.Box 4, CANBERRA,A.C.T. 2600.
COMMENTS: Please use this page to comment on anything which you feel should have been included in this questionnaire, or to expand upon any of the topics covered.
Dear Sir/Madam,

About 10 days ago a questionnaire was sent to you in connection with a study of the Armenian Community in Sydney. If you have already returned the questionnaire, thank you very much for your assistance; please ignore the rest of this letter.

If you have not returned the questionnaire, I urge you to take the time to fill it in and post it in the envelope provided. At most it should not take you more than about 15 to 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire, and by doing so you would be making a very important contribution to the study of the Armenian Community by insuring that the study is as representative as possible. If you have misplaced the questionnaire, please notify me at the above address or telephone me at Canberra 062-494351, and another one will be provided.

You are reminded that all replies will remain anonymous and will only be used for statistical summaries.

Yours sincerely,

James R. Kirkland
Date: ________________
Time interview commenced: __________________________
Time interview terminated: __________________________

PERSONAL BACKGROUND DATA

1. Where were you born? Subject ________________________
   Spouse ________________________

2. When were you born? Subject 19 __________ Age ________
   Spouse 19 __________ Age ________

3. What is your religion?
   Subject: Apostolic ________
   Armenian Catholic ________
   Armenian Evangelical ________
   Protestant ________
   Other (Specify) ________
   Spouse: Apostolic ________
   Armenian Catholic ________
   Armenian Evangelical ________
   Protestant ________
   Other (Specify) ________

4. Of which country were you a resident just prior to coming to Australia?
   Subject ________________________
   Spouse ________________________
   How long did you live there?
   Subject ________________
   Spouse ________________
5. What citizenship did you hold upon arrival in Australia (as reflected in your passport)?
   Subject ___________________
   Spouse ___________________

6. At what age did you leave school?
   Subject ___________________
   Spouse ___________________
   How many years of FORMAL education did you have?
   Subject __________
   Spouse __________
   Do you hold any academic diplomas or degrees?
   Subject: yes ___ no ___
   Spouse: yes ___ no ___
   If YES, what are they? Subject ___________________
   Spouse ___________________

7. What was your age when you FIRST ARRIVED in Australia?
   Subject _________
   Spouse __________

8. What year did you FIRST ARRIVE in Australia? Subject _________
   Spouse _________

HOUSING AND HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION

1. Housing type: House _______
   Share of House _______
   Flat _______
   Other (Specify) _______
   How many rooms (excluding bathroom and laundry)? _____________
2. Is this the kind of dwelling you lived in before coming to Australia? Yes _____ No _____
   If NO, what kind? House ________
   Share of House ________
   Flat ________
   Other (Specify) ________

3. Which kind of housing type would you MOST like to live in?
   House ________
   Share of House ________
   Flat ________
   Other (Specify) ________
   If you don't live in such a dwelling now do you ever plan to move to one? Yes _____ No _____

4. Considering both housing and other facilities in your house/flat, would you say that your present accommodation is BETTER, the SAME or WORSE than before you migrated?
   Better ________ Same ________ Worse ________

* 5. Do you own, rent, or are you presently buying this house/flat?
   Own ________
   Rent ________
   Presently Buying ________
   Other (Specify) ________
   If you own it, or, are presently buying it, HOW LONG after arrival did you purchase it? ________
   In buying this house/flat, did you receive any financial help from friends or relatives?
   friends ________ 'Relatives ________ Neither ________
6. What was the MAIN REASON you chose this particular house/flat?

________________________________________________________________________

7. From whom did you obtain information about this house/flat BEFORE you bought/rented it? Real Estate Agent ________
   Relative ________
   Friend ________
   Other (Specify) ________

8. Who actually lived in your home when you were growing up?
   Father ________  Grandmother ________
   Mother ________  Cousins (numbers) ________
   Brothers (numbers) ________  Aunts (numbers) ________
   Sisters (numbers) ________  Uncles (numbers) ________
   Grandfather ________  Other (specify) ________

   What about your spouse's home?
   Father ________  Grandmother ________
   Mother ________  Cousins (numbers) ________
   Brothers (numbers) ________  Aunts (numbers) ________
   Sisters (numbers) ________  Uncles (numbers) ________
   Grandfather ________  Other (specify) ________

9. Besides you and your spouse, who else lives in this house/flat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Head</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Country of Previous Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MIGRATION

1. Did you spend MOST of your childhood,
   On a farm          Subject  Spouse
   In a country village
   In a town or medium sized city
   In a large city

* 2. Besides your last country of residence before migrating to
    Australia, what other countries have you lived in for at least
    one year, if any? (Chronological order)
    Lived nowhere else  
    Country  Time Period (From - to)  Principal Reason for Leaving
    1)  
    2)  
    3)  
    4)  

3. Did you have to leave the LAST country of which you were resident,
   or was it your choice to leave and come to Australia?
   Had to leave  Own choice 

4. What was your MAIN reason for wanting to leave this country?
   
   
   
   

5. Was Australia your FIRST CHOICE as a country to migrate to?
   Yes ______ No ______
   If NO, what was your FIRST CHOICE? __________________________
   Why didn't you migrate there? _________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   Why did you come here instead? ________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________

6. HOW MUCH did you know about Australia before you decided to migrate here?
   Nothing at all ______
   A little ________________
   A fair amount __________
   Very much _____________
   What KIND of things did you know? _____________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   Where did you obtain MOST of your information? ________________
   ___________________________________________________________

7. Did you already have friends and/or relations living in Australia before you came? (IF relative, give relationship)
   Friends ______ Relative ______ Neither ______

8. Did someone SPONSOR you to come?
   Yes ______ No ______ Don't know ______
   If YES, was he/she a Friend _____ Relative _____ Neither _____?

9. Did you pay your fares to Australia?
   Yes, fully _____ Yes, partly _____ No _____
   If NOT ALL, who helped you pay them?
   Aust. Govt. _____ Friends _____ Relatives _____ Other _____
10. If you were married before coming, did your family (spouse and children) ARRIVE WITH YOU IN AUSTRALIA?

   Yes _____  NO _____  Not Married on arrival _____

   If NO, how long after you did they arrive? _____

11. Would you encourage or discourage your friends/relatives to come here, and sponsor them if necessary?

   Encourage _____  Discourage _____  Neither _____

   Other ________________________________

12. Have you sponsored any friends or relatives to come to Australia?

   Yes _____  No _____

   If YES, how many and what relationship? ______________________

   ________________________________

   Did you help any of them financially?

   Yes _____  No _____

13. Were you able to bring any money, valuables, etc., with you when you came? Yes _____  No _____

   If YES, approximately HOW MUCH was it worth in Australian terms? $____________

14. If you could make the choice again would you still migrate to Australia or would you choose to go to another country?

   Would come here ________  Would go elsewhere ________

SETTLEMENT

1. WHERE did you FIRST ARRIVE in Australia?

   Sydney _____  Melbourne _____  Perth _____  Other _____
2. Did you plan to settle here PERMANENTLY when you FIRST ARRIVED, or were you undecided?
   Yes ____  No ____  Undecided ____

3. What impression did Australia make on you when you FIRST ARRIVED?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

4. What was the FIRST THING you had wanted to do when you FIRST ARRIVED?
   Learn English __________
   Buy a house __________
   Get a job __________
   Meet other Armenians __________
   Meet friends and/or relatives here __________
   Other (specify) __________

5. What did you miss MOST about the country you left in order to come to Australia?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

6. What was the thing you liked the BEST about being in Australia?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

7. Did you have any MAJOR difficulties of any kind when you arrived here?  Yes ____  No ____
   If YES, what were they?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
8. At any time after you arrived here, did you seriously consider returning to your former country to live? Yes _____ No _____

If YES, why didn't you? ____________________________________________________________

9. Do you consider that your life here is generally SATISFACTORY now? Yes _____ No _____

Comments: ____________________________________________________________

12. In general, if you had the choice would you live in,

   a rural area _______
   a small town or city _______
   The outer suburbs of a city _______
   The inner suburbs of a city _______

   Why this particular choice? ________________________________________________

11. Do you feel that it is important to live near, or in the vicinity of,

   Relatives: Yes _____ No _____
   Friends: Yes _____ No _____
   Other Armenians: Yes _____ No _____
   Armenian shops, clubs, etc.: Yes _____ No _____
   Armenian Church: Yes _____ No _____

12. Why did you choose to live in Sydney rather than somewhere else in Australia?
   Just arrived here _______
   Relatives were here _______
   Friends were here _______
   Greatest number of Armenians live here _______
   More employment opportunities _______
   Other _______
13. Where did you FIRST LIVE in Sydney when you FIRST ARRIVED?

____________________________________________________

For how long? ________________________________________

14. Did you live with anyone at this FIRST address? Yes ____ No ____

If YES, who? Relative (give relationship) __________________

Friend _______ Other Armenian family _______ Other _______

15. What was the PRINCIPAL reason you chose to live at this FIRST ADDRESS?

Relatives ______

Friends ______

Close to employment ______

Economical accommodation ______

Government Hostel ______

Other _____________________________________________

16. What other places have you lived in Sydney?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>REASON FOR MOVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)_______</td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)_______</td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)_______</td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)_______</td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)_______</td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Why do you live where you do now?

Close to work _______ Close to church _______

Close to relatives _______ Contact with neighbours _______

Inexpensive housing _______ Social life in area _______

Good schools in area _______ Housing was available _______

Close to transport _______ Other ______________________

Close to friends _______ ____________________________
18. In which suburb would you live if you had the choice?

Why this one?

19. Do you think you will move again?

Yes  _____  No  _____  Undecided  _____

If YES, WHERE do you think you might move?  ________________

When do you think you might move again?

Within the month  ________

Few months time  __________

Within the year  _________

Other  ________________________

20. In which areas of Sydney do MOST of the Armenians live?  ______

OCCUPATIONAL ADJUSTMENT

* 1. If you had a job BEFORE COMING to Australia, what did you do?

Was this the kind of work you had wanted to do?  Yes  _____  No  _____

If NO, what kind of job would you have preferred?  ________________

2. Did you obtain any information or advice about employment in
Australia before you came here?  Yes  _____  No  _____

If YES, where or from whom did you obtain MOST of this information?

Did you find this information to be CORRECT or INCORRECT?
3. Did you register with the COMMONWEALTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE upon arrival? Yes ________ No ________

If NO, why didn't you?

Job promised before arrival ________

Didn't know it existed ________

Felt could find own job ________

Other __________________________________________

4. Did you seek any particular kind of job when you first arrived? Yes ________ No ________

If YES, what kind? __________________________________________

5. What was your VERY FIRST job in Australia? ________________

How long did you work at this job? ______________________________

Where was this job located? ____________________________________

6. Was this FIRST job related to any work you had done BEFORE coming to Australia? Yes ________ No ________

7. Did anyone help you to find this FIRST job? Yes ________ No ________

If YES, who helped you?

Friend ________

Relative ________

Armenian Organization ________

C.E.S. ________

Other __________________________________________
* 8. HOW LONG were you in Australia before you found your FIRST JOB?
   Job offered before arrived ________
   Few days ________
   More than a week ________
   A few weeks ________
   More than a month ________
   Other ________________________________

9. Was your FIRST employer Armenian, Australian, or a member of another ethnic group? Armenian _____ Australia _____
   Other ethnic group (specify) ________________________________

10. What about MOST of the people you worked with at this FIRST job, were they Armenians, Australian, or members of other ethnic groups?
    Armenian ________ Australians ________
    Other ethnic group (specify) ________________________________

11. Do you feel that, as a result of your migration here, your occupational and/or economic position in the world has risen, fallen, or remained about the same as before coming here?
    Risen ________ Fallen ________ Same ________
    Explain? __________________________________________
    __________________________________________

12. Did you think or know that when you arrived here you might be required to do a lower status job and/or one less well paid than the one you had before migrating here?
    Yes ________ No ________
13. Did you hold any qualifications - academic or otherwise - when you first arrived?  Yes ____  No ____

If YES, what were they?  ________________________________________________________________

Were they recognised on arrival in Australia?  Yes ____  No ____

If NO, are they recognised now?  Yes ____  No ____

14. Had you had any OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING before coming here?  

Yes ____  No ____

If YES, what was it?  ________________________________________________________________

15. Have you had any occupational training since arrival in Australia?  

Yes ____  No ____

If YES, what?  ________________________________________________________________

16. What other jobs have you had in Australia?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>REASON FOR CHANGING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. If SELF-EMPLOYED what is your business?  ____________________________________________

How long were you in Australia BEFORE you became SELF-EMPLOYED?  

__________________________________________________________

Did you receive any financial backing from friends or relatives?

Friends:  Yes ____  No ____  Relatives:  Yes ____  No ____

Do you employ anyone in your business?  

Yes ____  No ____

If YES, How many?  ____________________________

How many are Armenian?  ________________________
18. Is your present employer Armenian, Australian or a member of another ethnic group? (If retired, answer for last job)
   Armenian _____  Australian _____  Other (specify) _____

19. Of what ethnic origin are MOST of the people you work with at your present (or last) job?
   Armenian _____  Australian _____  Other (specify) _____

20. Would you prefer to work with other Armenians?
   Yes _____  No _____  Don't mind _____

21. Are you generally satisfied with your present job?
   Yes _____  No _____

22. Do you plan to change jobs?
   Yes _____  No _____  Undecided _____
   If YES, what kind of job do you want to do? ________________
   WHEN do you think you might change jobs? ________________

23. Are there any periods since you have been in Australia that you have been unemployed?
   Yes _____  No _____
   If YES, for HOW LONG were you unemployed? ________________

   Why were you unemployed? ________________________________

   Did you receive unemployment benefits during these periods?
   Yes _____  No _____
24. Did your mother have a job outside the home when you were growing up?  
   Yes ________  No ________  
   What about your wife's mother?  Yes ________  No ________

25. Did your wife work in her previous country of residence?  
   Yes ________  No ________

26. Did she work when she was single?  Yes ________  No ________

27. Has she worked since you have been married?  
   Yes ________  No ________
   If YES, what jobs has she done? ____________________________
   ____________________________

28. Has she worked at all in Australia?  
   Yes ________  No ________
   If YES, what jobs has she done? ____________________________
   ____________________________
What is the MAIN reason she has worked?

________________________________________________________________________

29. How do you feel about your wife working outside the home?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

30. Have you ever assisted any fellow Armenians to find work here?  Yes ______  No ______

If YES, how many have you helped? __________________________

What was their relationship to you?
Friends ______  Relatives (specify) ______

Other (specify) __________________________________________

31. If you were responsible for choosing the occupations your children would have, what would you like them to do?

Sons: __________________________________________________

Daughters: ______________________________________________
SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

1. Consider for a minute your three CLOSEST friends. Could you give the following information on each?

   1) a. ____________  2) a. ____________  3) a. ____________
   b. ____________  b. ____________  b. ____________
   c. ____________  c. ____________  c. ____________
   d. ____________  d. ____________  d. ____________
   e. ____________  e. ____________  e. ____________
   f. ____________  f. ____________  f. ____________
   g. ____________  g. ____________  g. ____________
   h. ____________  h. ____________  h. ____________
   i. ____________  i. ____________  i. ____________

2. Now think of your three CLOSEST relatives, not counting your immediate family. Could you give the following information on each?

   1) a. ____________  2) a. ____________  3) a. ____________
   b. ____________  b. ____________  b. ____________
   c. ____________  c. ____________  c. ____________
   d. ____________  d. ____________  d. ____________
   e. ____________  e. ____________  e. ____________
   f. ____________  f. ____________  f. ____________

3. Are MOST of your neighbours Australian, Armenian or members of another ethnic group?

   Australian _________  Armenian _________  Other _________
   (specify)
4. How many Armenian families do you know in this neighbourhood?

_____________________________________________________________________

Are they the MAJORITY of the Armenian families that you know in Sydney?  Yes _______  No ______________

If NO, in which area(s) of Sydney do MOST of the Armenians you (personally) know live?

_____________________________________________________________________

How many of these Armenian families did you know before coming to Australia?

None ______________

Some ______________

Most ______________

All ______________

5. How many CLOSE friends do you have in this neighbourhood? _______

None ______________

What is their ethnic background?

Armenian _______  Australian _______  Other _______

If any are Armenian, from which countries did they come?

_____________________________________________________________________

6. How much contact do you USUALLY have with MOST of these neighbours who you count as close friends?  Not applicable ______________

See them daily ______________

Few times a week ______________

At least once a week ______________

Few times a month ______________

Only occasionally ______________
7. What kind of contact do you have with neighbours in general?

- No contact at all
- Just to say hello
- Chat with fairly often
- Help with shopping
- Lend/borrow things
- Help with children
- Other (specify)

8. In general, would you say that you had as much PERSONAL contact with Armenians from other countries as those who came from the same country as you?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

9. Since arrival in Australia, have you JOINED or PARTICIPATED in any ARMENIAN clubs, associations or organizations?

- Yes
- No

If YES, could you give

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>How often participate</th>
<th>Paid-up Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Weekly Monthly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Since arrival here have you JOINED or PARTICIPATED in any AUSTRALIAN clubs, associations or organizations?
   Yes ____________ No ____________

   If YES, could you give
   ____________________________

   Name of Organization Location How often participate Paid-up Member
   ____________________________
   1). ____________ ____________ Daily Weekly Monthly Other Yes__ No__
   2). ____________ ____________ __________________________ Yes__ No__
   3). ____________ ____________ __________________________ Yes__ No__
   4). ____________ ____________ __________________________ Yes__ No__

   In these AUSTRALIAN organizations do you USUALLY associate with
   Australians; other Armenians or members of other ethnic groups?
   Australians ____________________________
   Armenians ____________________________

   ____________
   Australian and Armenians ____________________________
   Members of other ethnic groups ____________
   All ____________________________

11. What would you say were your MAIN recreational activities, that is, the principal ways you entertain yourself in your time away from work?
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   Does your family USUALLY participate with you in these activities?
   Yes ____________ No ____________

12. Would you describe your leisure activities today as more Armenian, more Australian, or about half and half?
   Armenian ____________ Australian ____________ Half and half ____________
13. How often do you attend Church?
   Once a week
   Few times a month
   At least once a month
   Few times a year
   Never

   How many times have you been this last month? ________________

*14. Are you now a NATURALIZED Australian?
   Yes ___________ No ___________

   If YES, WHEN did you become naturalized?
   ________________

   WHY did you become naturalized? ________________________________

15. Do you consider yourself a member of an AUSTRALIAN political
    Party? Yes _________ No __________

    If YES, which one?  Australian Labor Party
                         Liberal/Country Party
                         Other __________________________

    Why this party? ________________________________

16. Have you ever voted in an Australian election?
    Yes _________ No _________ Not applicable _______

    If YES, when did you LAST vote? __________________________

    If NO, WHY didn't you vote in the last election? ____________

    ________________________________
17. Are you now, or have you ever been, a member of a labor union in Australia? Yes ________ No ________
   If YES, have you ever voted in a union election? Yes ________ No ________
   If NO, why not? ____________________________________________________

18. With which ARMENIAN ideology would you say you identify with the MOST?
    Dashnakts ________ Hunchako ________
    Ramgavar ________

FAMILY BACKGROUND

1. Where were your parents born?
   Husband: Father ________ Wife: Father ________
   Mother ________   Mother ________

2. Where did your parents grow up?
   Husband: Father ________ Wife: Father ________
   Mother ________   Mother ________

3. How old were your parents when they married?
   Husband: Father ________ Wife: Father ________
   Mother ________   Mother ________

4. Were both parents Armenians?
   Husband: Yes____ No______ Wife: Yes____ No______
   If not, what ethnic origin?
   Husband: Father ________ Wife: Father ________
   Mother ________   Mother ________
5. How many children did your parents have, including yourself?
   Boys: (0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12)
   Girls: (0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12)

What about your wife's parents?
   Boys: (0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12)
   Girls: (0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12)

6. How many brothers and sisters did your father have?
   Brothers _______ Sisters _______
   Your wife's father?
   Brothers _______ Sisters _______

7. How many brothers and sisters did your mother have?
   Brothers _______ Sisters _______
   Your wife's mother?
   Brothers _______ Sisters _______

8. When you were growing up would you have preferred your family to be LARGER? SMALLER, or the same as it was?
   LARGER _______ SMALLER _______ SAME _______

MARRIAGE

1. Where were you MARRIED? _______________________________________

2. When were you MARRIED? 19_____

3. How OLD were you and your wife when you married?
   Subject _______ Wife _______
4. What is the ethnic origin of your spouse?  
Armenian ________  Australian ________  Other ________  
(specify)

5. How many times have you been married in total?  

How about your spouse? ________

6. Where did you and your wife first meet (friend's house, party, church, etc.)?  

7. How did you first meet? Did someone introduce you?  

8. When you first met, how far did you and she live from each other?  

9. How long did you know each other before you got engaged?  

How long were you engaged before you married? ________  

Why didn't you get married earlier than this? Was there any reason you waited this particular period of time before you married? Yes ________  No ________  

If YES, please explain ________________________________  

10. Did you ask your parents' permission before you got engaged?  
Yes ________  No ________
11. Did your wife have to ask her parents' permission before she became engaged to you? Yes _______ No _______

12. If either your parents or her parents had objected to the marriage, would you have married anyway? Yes_______ No _______
Comments: __________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________

13. Who paid the wedding expenses?
Husband ____________________________
Husband's parents ___________________
Wife ________________________________
Wife's parents _______________________
Other _______________________________

14. Could you describe the IDEAL kind of girl you would want a son of yours to marry?

_____________________________________________________________________

How about the IDEAL kind of man you would want a daughter of yours to marry?

_____________________________________________________________________

15. Do you have any MARRIED children? Yes _______ No _______
If YES, how old were your children when they married?
Sons _________ Daughters_________
What was the ethnic origin of their spouses?
Sons: Armenian ___________ Daughters: Armenian ___________
Australian ___________ Australian ___________
Other _______________ Other _______________
16. Are you, or were you, opposed to your children marrying non-Armenians? 
   Yes _______  No _______
   Please explain: ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

17. If you would prefer that your children marry other Armenians, would you also prefer that they be from the same country as you? 
   Yes _______  No _______

18. What percentage, do you think, of the Armenians in Sydney have married non-Armenians? ______% 
   How many Armenians here do you personally know who have married non-Armenians? _______

19. In the cases of intermarriage that you know about are the non-Armenian spouses generally accepted by the Armenian's family and friends? 
   Yes _______  No _______
   Depends: ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   Is the Armenian generally accepted by the non-Armenian's family and friends? 
   Yes _______  No _______  Don't know _______
   Depends: ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

CHILDREN

1. Do you have any children who do not reside with you? 
   Yes _______  No _______
   If YES, please give the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Do any of your children have GIVEN NAMES which are English? 
   Yes ________  No __________

   If YES, why were they given English names?

   ____________________________________________________________

3. What do you think is the IDEAL number of children for an Armenian couple living in Australia to have?

   (0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12+)

4. 'How many would you consider to be TOO MANY children? ________

5. Do you think it is more important to have boys or girls?
   Boys ______  Girls ______  Should have both ______
   Doesn't make any difference __________________________

6. For you what would be the IDEAL family, that is, the number of boys and girls for a family to have?
   Boys:    (0 1 2 3 4 5 6)
   Girls:   (0 1 2 3 4 5 6)

   Why this particular number of boys and girls? ____________________
   ____________________________________________________________

7. Many couples these days prefer not to have children for one reason or another. How do you feel about this? ______________________
   ____________________________________________________________
8. What is the PRINCIPAL thing you would consider before having another child?
   Financial aspect ______________________
   Present family size ______________________
   Ability to adequately look after another child _____________
   Desire not to prolong period of childrearing _____________
   Amount of time involved in raising another child _____________
   Other ______________________________________

9. If money were no object would you have, or be tempted to have, more children? Yes ______ No ________
   Why? __________________________________________

10. Have you ever had any children who have not survived? Yes ______ No ________
    If YES, how many? ______________

FAMILY LIFE

1. Are you bringing up your children in the TRADITIONAL Armenian way? Yes ______ No ________
   Comments: _______________________________________

2. What aspects of raising your children are primarily the responsibility of your wife?
   ___________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________

   What aspects are primarily your responsibility?
   ___________________________________________________
3. If you and your wife, both work, who looks after your children?

- Not applicable
- Relatives
- Friends
- Neighbours
- Day care centre
- Other

4. In your family could you tell me who makes the decisions concerning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where to live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether a wife works or not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have another child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How old were you when you started making your own decisions about things WITHOUT consulting or discussing it with your parents? ________

How old was your wife? __________

6. When do you think your children should start making their own decisions without first consulting you? __________

Would this be the same for both sons and daughters? Yes____ No____

Comments: __________________________________________________________

7. Do your children have more freedom to pursue their own interests than you did when you were their age? Yes____ No____

If YES, in what ways? ________________________________________________
8. Do you feel that you and your wife are closer to your children than your parents were to you?  
Yes ______  No ______

9. In whose name or names is the family property held?  
Husband ______  Wife ______  Both ______  
Other ____________________________

10. When should children be allowed to move away from home and live on their own?  
Never ____________________________  
Once they are married ____________________________  
Once they are ________ years old  
Other ____________________________

Is this the same for both sons and daughters?  
Yes ______  No ______

If NO, what is the difference?  
______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

11. Once children are fully grown do they have any obligations toward their parents?  
Yes ______  No ______

If YES, what are these obligations?  
______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

12. Who looks after parents once they retire?  
No-one ________________  
Sons (specify) ____________________________  
Daughters (specify) ____________________________  
Son or daughter ____________________________  
Other ____________________________

Do parents normally live with their children after they retire?  
Yes ______  No ______
13. What jobs in your home are done ONLY by the HUSBAND? _______

14. What jobs are done ONLY by the wife? __________________________

15. If you have grown children at home who are employed do they contribute to the family finances? Yes ________ No ________

If YES, is this a certain portion of their income or is it all of their income?
Portion ________ All ________

16. Do you and your children have as much contact with your wife's family and relatives as you do with your own?
Yes ________ No ________

17. Have any of your relatives helped you in any way since you have been in Australia? Yes ________ No ________

If YES, in what ways have they helped you? __________________________

18. Have you helped any of your relatives in any way since you have been here? Yes ________ No ________

If YES, in what ways? __________________________

19. Have your children encountered any DIFFICULTIES in Australia? Yes ________ No ________

If YES, what were they? __________________________
20. Have you heard of any conflict of any kind between Armenian parents and their children here in Sydney? 
   Yes ________  No ________

   If YES, what have been the MAJOR causes of such conflict?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

21. Are you bringing up your children in a different way to that of Australian parents? 
   Yes ________  No ________  Don't know ________

   If YES, in what ways?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

22. What are the MAJOR changes that you have seen in Armenian family life during your lifetime? No change ________

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

   ACCULTURATION/INTEGRATION/IDENTIFICATION

1. Do you feel that because you are now living in Australia you should live like an Australian? Yes ________  No ________

   Comments: ________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

2. Do you feel that you should continue to live as before you came here? Yes ________  No ________

   Comments: ________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
3. Would you say that your PRIVATE life was more Armenian, more Australian, or about half and half?

Armenian ________  Australian ________  Half and Half ________

What about your life OUTSIDE your home and your circle of friends/relatives?

Armenian ________  Australian ________  Half and Half ________

4. Since migrating here have you returned to your former country of residence for a visit? Yes_______  No_______

If YES, how did you find it there? ____________________________

Would you have remained there if you had had the choice? Yes_______  No_______

5. Have you or any members of your family adopted English first names since you have come here? Yes_______  No_______

If YES, do your friends and relatives use this name or is it used strictly when dealing with Australians?

Friends and relatives: Yes_______  No_______  
Australians only: Yes_______  No_______
All the time: Yes_______  No_______
Other: ____________________________

Why did you or members of your family adopt an English name?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

6. If you plan to have any more children do you plan to give them English names? Yes_______  No_______

7. Have you changed your SURNAME in any way since coming here? Yes_______  No_______

If YES, why? ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
8. Do you eat different foods since coming to Australia, or do you primarily eat the kinds of foods you ate BEFORE coming here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Different foods</th>
<th>Same as before</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half and half</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you regularly read any publications written in the Armenian language or listen to the Armenian portion of Ethnic Radio?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armenian publications:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian Ethnic Radio:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What about your wife?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armenian publications:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian Ethnic Radio:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Do you regularly read publications written in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What about your wife?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Do you want to preserve the Armenian language and culture by teaching it to your children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Do any of your children attend one of the Armenian Saturday Schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Do you find that your children are interested in learning about Armenian culture and history?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. How much Armenian history would you say that you know?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>A fair amount</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How did you learn this history?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At school</th>
<th>Read history books</th>
<th>Taught yourself</th>
<th>Parents and relatives taught</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
15. Have you ever visited Armenia, or do you ever plan to visit there?
   Visited ________ Plan to visit ________
Would you ever consider migrating there? Yes____ No____

16. Do you see Armenian organizations, schools, etc., as vital in maintaining your and your children's identity as Armenians?
   Yes________ No____
Do you actively support any of these organizations, either financially or by giving some of your time? Yes____ No____

17. Do you ever shop at Armenian stores or eat at Armenian restaurants?
   Yes________ No____
If YES, about how often?
   Daily________________________
   At least weekly___________
   Few times a month_________
   Few times a year___________
   Other _____________________

18. As a rule, would you shop at an Armenian store rather than an Australian one if you had the choice? Yes____ No________

19. Have you ever experienced PREJUDICE or DISCRIMINATION against you as an Armenian in Australia? Yes____ No________
If YES, please describe the situation __________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

20. Do you feel that Australians discriminate against immigrants in general? Yes____ No________

21. Do you feel that an Australian can be just as close a friend as another Armenian? Yes____ No____
Why? ____________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
22. How many Australians do you know personally? __________
   How many of these would you consider good friends? __________

23. Do you ever visit Australians in their homes or do they ever visit you in yours? Yes_______ No__________
   If YES, how often does this take place?
   Daily ___________________________
   At least weekly __________________
   Few times a month _______________
   At least monthly ________________
   Few times a year ________________
   Other __________________________
   How many times during this last month? __________

24. Would you like to have more contact with Australians in their and your home and learn more about how they live?
   Yes_______ No__________ Don't care

25. Do you allow your children to play, to go out with, or to date Australians? Yes_______ No__________
   Is this true for both sons and daughters? Yes____ No_______
   If NO, how does this differ for sons and daughters? __________________________

26. If you do NOT want your children to mix with Australians, why is this?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

27. Would you say that you know NOTHING, A LITTLE _____, A FAIR AMOUNT_____,
    or a GREAT DEAL______, about the Australian way of life?
    How have you obtained MOST of your information about the Australian way of life?
    Personal contact with Australians _________________________________
    News media (TV, radio, newspapers) _______________________________
    What relatives/friends have told you _______________________________
    What your children have told you _________________________________
28. If you were on a trip overseas and someone asked you your NATIONALITY would you tell him you were "An Armenian" _____, "An Australian" _____, "An Armenian living in Australia" _____, or what?

Armenian _____ Australian _____ Armenian in Australia _____

Other ______________

LANGUAGE

1. What languages do you speak and read?
   Speak: ________________________________
   Read: ________________________________

   How about your wife?
   Speak: ________________________________
   Read: ________________________________

2. What language do you usually use at home? ________________________________
   What about your children among themselves? ________________________________
   Which language do you prefer your children to speak at home? ________________

3. Which Armenian dialect do you speak?
   East ________ West ________ Don't know ________
   What about your wife?
   East ________ West ________ Don't know ________
   What about your CLOSEST friends?
   East ________ West ________ Both ________ Don't know ________

4. Did you speak and/or read English before coming to Australia?
   Speak: Very well ______ Fair ______ A little ______ Not at all ______
   Read: Very well ______ Fair ______ A little ______ Not at all ______
   What about your wife?
   Speak: Very well ______ Fair ______ A little ______ Not at all ______
   Read: Very well ______ Fair ______ A little ______ Not at all ______
5. Did you have difficulty with English when you first arrived?
   Yes_______ No__________

   What about your wife?
   Yes_______ No__________

6. Do you have any difficulty with the English language now?
   Yes_______ No__________

   What about your wife?
   Yes_______ No__________

7. How did you learn English?
   School_______ Taught yourself_______ Other__________

   What about your wife?
   School_______ Taught yourself_______ Other__________

8. How well do you speak/read English now?
   Speak: Very well_____ Fair_______ A little__________
   Read : Very well_____ Fair_______ A little__________

   How about your wife?
   Speak: Very well _____ Fair_______ A little_____ Not at all_____
   Read: Very well _____ Fair_______ A little_____ Not at all_____

9. Do you feel it is necessary for Armenians living in Australia to be
   able to speak and read the Armenian language?
   Yes_______ No__________ Is important but not necessary_______

10. What language do your children speak?
    (a) Those born overseas: _________________________
    (b) Those born in Australia: _________________________
    (c) Your older children: _________________________
    (d) Your younger children: _________________________
EDUCATION

1. In which country did you and your wife complete your education?
   Subject____________________ Spouse____________________

2. Have you attended any educational institutions since you have been in Australia?
   Subject: Yes_____ No_____ Wife: Yes_____ No_____
   If so, what did you do?
   Subject:____________________ Spouse:____________________
   How long did you attend?
   Subject:____________________ Wife:____________________

3. Have any of your children had tertiary education? Yes____ No____

4. To what level of education do you want your children to go?
   At least finish school ________________
   Finish university ________________
   As far as possible ________________
   Other ____________________________
   Do you want the same for both sons and daughters? Yes_____ No_____
   If NO, why not? ____________________________

5. What do you see as the PRINCIPAL ADVANTAGE of having an education?

INCOME

1. In which income CATEGORY would you place yourself and your family before tax? A  B  C  D.
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONCERNING INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(1) Information Solicited Under Social Participation Question 1 (Friends):
   a. Relative location to you, i.e., same dwelling, same street, same neighbourhood, same suburb, elsewhere in Sydney, other.
   b. Armenian or Non-Armenian (if Armenian, country of last residence; if non-Armenian which ethnic group)?
   c. Age?
   d. Sex?
   e. Birthplace?
   f. Occupation?
   g. Where you first met?
   h. How frequently you meet, i.e., daily, few times a week, at least once a week, few times a month, at least once a month, few times a year?
   i. Where you usually meet, i.e., your house, his/her house, club, etc.?

(2) Information Solicited Under Social Participation Question 2 (Relatives):
   a. Relationship to you, i.e., cousin, uncle, brother, etc.?
   b. Age?
   c. Where he/she lives in relation to you?
   d. Occupation?
   e. Frequency of contact?
   f. Kind of contact, i.e., home visiting, meet at club, etc.?

(3) Income Category Used:
   a. Category A: Under $150 per week (Under $8000 per year).
   b. Category B: Between $150 per week and $250 per week ($8000–$13000 per year).
   c. Category C: Between $250 per week and $350 per week ($13000–$18000 per year).
   d. Category D: Over $350 per week (Over $18000 per year).
D.l. Armenian Associations/Organizations Questionnaire.

The Department of Demography
The Research School of Social Sciences

The Australian National University
Post Office Box 4 Canberra ACT 2600
Telegram & cables NATUNIV Canberra
Telex AA 62694 SOPAC
Telephone 062-49 3111

5 May 1977

ARMENIAN ASSOCIATIONS/ORGANIZATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name of Association/Organization: ______________________________

2. Number of Paid-Up members? ______________

   If your organization does not have fees or dues please give TOTAL
   number of members: ______________

3. Number of "occasional" members, i.e., those who occasionally attend
   meetings and/or functions but do not pay fees or dues for membership: ______

4. Which single country do the MAJORITY of the Paid-Up members in your
   organization come from? ________________________

5. What about your "occasional" members? ____________________________

6. What other countries do the other members come from? ______________

7. What date was your organization established in Sydney? ____________

8. Is your organization affiliated in any way with any international
   organization, or is it strictly a local organization? ______________

9. Is your organization linked with any other Armenian or Australian
   organizations in the Sydney Community? Yes ____ No _____

   If so, which ones? _____________________________________________

10. What is the PRIMARY purpose of your organization? ________________

11. What is the frequency of your meetings, gatherings, social events, etc.?  

    Daily ____  

    Weekly ____

    Few times a month ____

    At least monthly ____

    Few times a year ____
12. What SOCIAL ACTIVITIES do you engage in? ____________________________________________

13. Does your organization have or support an Armenian Saturday school? Yes ___ No ___
   If so, how many students are in your school(s)? ____________________________
   WHERE is/are your Saturday school(s) located? ____________________________

14. Do you have a YOUTH GROUP in your organization? Yes ___ No ___
   If so, how many Paid-Up members does it have? _________________________
   How many "occasionall" members? ____________________________
   What is its PURPOSE? ________________________________________________

15. Do you provide any SERVICES to your members? Yes ___ No ___
   If so, what are they? ________________________________________________

16. Does your organization provide any SERVICES to the Sydney Armenian Community in general? Yes ___ No ___
   If so, what are they? ________________________________________________

17. How is your organization supported? ________________________________________

18. Do you employ anyone on a FULLTIME basis to handle the affairs of your organization? Yes ___ No ___
   If so, how many people? ________

19. Does your organization REGULARLY publish a bulletin, magazine, newsletter, etc.? Yes ___ No ___
   If so, what is its TITLE? ______________________________________________
   How often is it published? ____________________________________________
   What is its CIRCULATION (number of people reached)? _________________
   Is it written in Armenian, English or in both languages? _______________
   What kinds of information does this publication provide? ________________
20. What would be the percentage (%) of NATURALIZED Australians in your organization? _____ %

21. What kinds of jobs would the MAJORITY of your members fill?
   Unskilled (Labouring) _____
   Skilled Workmen _____
   Semi-skilled Workmen _____
   Professionals _____
   Self-Employed _____
   Other (Please Specify) ________________________________

22. Could you describe HOW your organization is actually organized (its leadership, its offices, etc.)? ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________

23. Do you have any AUSTRALIAN members in your organization? Yes ____ No ____
    If so, HOW MANY? _____

24. Is your organization made up MOSTLY of men, women, families, or a mixture of all three?
   Men only _____ Women only _____ Both men and women _____
   Primarily a family organization _____
   Both single men and women and families _____

25. Are Australians allowed to join your organization? Yes ____ No ____

Additional Comments:

______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
ARMENIAN SURVEY 1977

RANDOM CHECK: INFORMATION ON NON-RESPONDENTS

NAME: ____________________________________________________________

ADDRESS: ________________________________________________________

AGE: ______

MARITAL STATUS: SINGLE ___ MARRIED ___ DIVORCED ___ OTHER ________

OCCUPATION: ______________________________________________________

BIRTHPLACE: ______________________________________________________

COUNTRY OF LAST RESIDENCE: ______________________________________

PERIOD OF RESIDENCE IN AUSTRALIA: ________________________________

AGE AT ARRIVAL IN AUSTRALIA: ______

ETHNIC ORIGIN OF SPOUSE: ARMEANIAN ___ OTHER ___________________

RELIGION: APOSTOLIC ___ ARMENIAN CATHOLIC ___ ARMENIAN EVANGELICAL ______

OTHER __________________________________________________________________

EDUCATION LEVEL: PRIMARY _____ SECONDARY _____ TERTIARY ____________

FACILITY W/ ENGLISH: VERY GOOD _____ FAIR _____ LITTLE _____ NONE _______
During the first 40 years of settlement in Australia only 18 per cent of arrivals were free settlers, the remainder being convicts or government personnel. This percentage increased over the succeeding decades following the introduction of the wool-growing industry, although the number of arrivals tended to fluctuate in response to economic conditions. This period also saw the beginnings of non-British immigration, when German settlers began arriving in South Australia in 1838. The decade 1850-1860 witnessed the first mass influx of immigrants to Australia following the discovery of gold in Eastern Australia. During this decade the population increased from 405,000 to 1,145,000, three-quarters of the growth being due to net migration, and saw the arrival of appreciable numbers of Germans, Scandinavians, and Chinese. This rapid increase in population had two noticeable effects on future immigration: it contributed to the end of the transportation of convicts; it led to the immigration of non-Europeans, particularly Chinese (Price, 1975: 306). Open opposition to Chinese immigration developed, reaching its height in the 1880's it resulted in policies of virtual exclusion. During the 1890's these policies were extended to include all non-Europeans, culminating in the Immigration Restriction Act of 1901, (Opperman, 1967: 6), and the Nationality and Citizenship Act of 1903 (Palfreeman, 1967: 104). The Immigration Act was principally designed to prevent non-European immigration to Australia, while the Nationality Act ensured that those non-Europeans allowed to enter, for whatever reason, could not attain permanent residence status and citizenship. Furthermore, this latter Act supported the exclusion of non-Europeans since it was felt that persons should not be allowed to enter Australia if they were not to be eligible for citizenship and full participation in Australian life.

These Acts were not consistently applied. During the early years of the twentieth century one of the four principal non-European groups present
was the Syrians. They differed from the other non-Europeans in a number of ways: their settlement in Australia was aimed at permanent settlement, rather than a quick enrichment followed by a return to their homeland; they were predominantly of the Christian faith; they themselves emphatically rejected their classification as Asians and continually applied for naturalization as Europeans; and, probably most important with respect to Australian acceptability, they closely approximated the physical characteristics of Europeans, albeit Southern Europeans (Yarwood, 1967: 141-145; 1968: 1). For these reasons a number were allowed into Australia during this period by special authority of the government, leading eventually to their being exempted altogether from the provisions of the Immigration Restriction Act. In 1920 the Nationality Act of 1903 was repealed and a new Nationality Act substituted which did not specify the races excluded from citizenship. In this new Act the government simply explained its intention to broaden the scope of naturalization laws to cover those persons who were considered "fit people" to become citizens of the Commonwealth. In the drafting of this Act the government specifically had in mind the Syrian immigrants who, under the original Act, had not been permitted to become naturalized; it was carefully pointed out, however, that the new Nationality Act in no way implied a change in immigration policy (Palfreeman, 1967: 105). Nevertheless, by abolishing the racial disqualification with respect to the Syrians gaining citizenship, the major bar to their admittance was removed (Yarwood, 1967: 149). It should be noted that it was the Syrians alone who were supposed to benefit from this amendment, although a precedent was set which was to facilitate Armenian immigration after World War II.

During the 1920's more than 300,000 immigrants arrived in Australia, most of whom were of British stock and about two-thirds of whom were assisted. With the advent of the Depression in 1929, Australia suffered a net loss of migrants and assisted arrivals essentially ceased until after World War II (Australian Department of Immigration, 1974: 8; Price, 1971b: A2).

---

1 The Lebanese were considered to be Syrian at this time. In fact, a good proportion of those in Australia were from Lebanon.
World War II and its aftermath brought with it the realization that Australia could not defend itself with its present population and that it needed greatly increased manpower if it was to develop its natural resources and expand its industry. The Government therefore thought it necessary to implement a large-scale immigration programme designed to increase the population by at least one per cent a year (Department of Immigration, 1974: 9; Price, 1975: 306). In the implementation of this programme, certain priorities were to be set with respect to the kinds of immigrants sought. The various peoples of the world were ranked according to their suitability for admission and assistance: (1) top priority was given to immigrants from the United Kingdom, who were to be afforded assistance with fares, jobs and accommodation; (2) next in priority were immigrants from Northern Europe, who were to be allowed entry without restriction, but with no government assistance; (3) third were those from Southern Europe, who were to be allowed to enter in small numbers with no government assistance; (4) last priority were non-Europeans, who were to be allowed in on a temporary basis only and at their own expense (Price, 1975: 306). This ranking of prospective migrants was designed to ensure that the traditional predominance of British immigrants was maintained.

In the early post-War years Australia had no trouble meeting its goals. The economies of Britain and Europe were depressed, while Australia was experiencing a time of prosperity (Ward, 1977: 290-300). As Britain and Europe's post-War prosperity grew, Australia began to have increasing difficulty in attracting immigrants, leading the government to modify its earlier priorities to allow greater numbers of Southern Europeans into the country. Moreover, from 1949 the barriers to non-European settlement and naturalization were slowly dismantled, resulting in a gradual rise in the number of non-European immigrants (Price, 1975: 307).

This gradual change in priorities resulted in changes in the ethnic origins of the immigrants arriving in the post-War period. The 1940's, which had seen predominantly British and East European immigration, were followed by a shift to predominantly Northern and Southern European immigration in the 1950's. The 1960's, which began with a recession in Australia in 1961–62, were marked by a sharp decline in immigration from
Northern Europe and a new upsurge in British immigration. Southern European immigration declined less markedly, but still remained substantial. This decline was accompanied by an increase in immigration from Asia, due in part to a progressive easing of restrictions from 1956 onwards. This period also witnessed an increase in immigration from the Americas and Eastern Europe, notably Yugoslavia (Price, 1975: 307-308). Thus, as the Australian Government worked down its priority list of migrants and, as each migrant pool dried up, it gradually dismantled its restrictive immigration policy in the process. This culminated, at least on the surface, in the final destruction of "White Australia" during the Whitlam Administration of the early to mid-1970's (Price, 1976: Al-A13).

The 1970's also brought a downturn in the economy from the boom years of the earlier two decades (Ward, 1977: 396), and a growing concern over the social and economic side-effects of continued large-scale immigration. From 1970-71 the immigration target was gradually reduced from 170,000 per annum to around 80,000 in 1974. The cuts were largely in the number of unskilled immigrants admitted, except where they were dependents of present or former immigrants. The abolition of restrictions on non-Europeans during this period resulted in a slight increase in the non-European settler intake (Price, 1976: A6-A7, A9, A11-A12).
APPENDIX III

THE STRUCTURE OF THE ARMENIAN DASHNAK PARTY
AND ITS SATELLITE ORGANIZATIONS

The Dashnak Party, as well as its principal satellite organizations, is organized in a way which allows it to adapt easily to new environments, while at the same time maintaining its basic structure. This flexibility is a major contributing factor in the similarity which is found in the social structures of Armenian communities throughout the world. Diagram III.1 shows the general structure of the Dashnak Party. Although there is a hierarchy, the party operates along democratic lines. Each level selects those members who will serve at the next higher level. The number of members located in a specific geographical area largely determines the structure of the party in that area. For example, local groups are formed when approximately thirty members are available. Greater numbers lead to the formation of more local groups as one may have no more than thirty members. When 500 Dashnak members are located in an area, they elect an area central committee. Representatives of these committees then come together annually to elect a regional central committee, which in turn annually appoints a Bureau. The Bureau, as the ultimate authority, sets the policy guidelines for the party and acts as a clearing house for any problems, etc. It does not, however, issue orders. The smallest local group has the same powers, with one exception, as the Bureau. This exception is the expulsion of a member from the party. The local group can recommend such expulsion, but it must ultimately be a decision from the top.

Within each local group, authority also rests on democratic principles. Each group is responsible for electing its own chairman, who exercises authority only with the consent of the group. All items are subject to a majority vote and all members must abide by the majority decision. Thus the structure allows the greatest overall autonomy at the

---

1 The discussion presented here was pieced together from information obtained from a number of Armenian informants.
local level as local groups can act independently within the guidelines set down by the Bureau. At the same time, however, because all requests, reports, etc. must be processed through the chain of command, it is possible to ensure that local actions remain within the basic guidelines.

Dashnak members moving from one area of the world to another are "transferred" from one local group to another via the chain of command. The member's original local group would report to the area central committee that a member was moving to a particular place, the area committee would then report to the regional committee which would notify the Bureau. The Bureau, in turn, would pass the word down the line to the local group in the area to which the man was moving and he would be incorporated in this group. The same process would take place with the international satellite organizations of the Dashnaks.
DIAGRAM III.1

STRUCTURE OF ARMENIAN DASHNAK PARTY
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### Table 5.1
Country of Last Residence by Employment Status Before Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Country of Last Residence</th>
<th>N=1</th>
<th>Employer Earned</th>
<th>Self-Employed</th>
<th>Wage Earner</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Not in Work Force</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Cannot be Determined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>(4) 2 (30) 11</td>
<td>(190) 70</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(22) 8</td>
<td>(18) 7</td>
<td>(6) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(1) 2 (3) 5</td>
<td>(47) 80</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(3) 5</td>
<td>(1) 2</td>
<td>(4) 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>(2) 2 (13) 11</td>
<td>(91) 77</td>
<td>(1) 1</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(5) 4</td>
<td>(3) 3</td>
<td>(3) 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan (+ Israel)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>(1) 1 (9) 10</td>
<td>(70) 81</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(5) 6</td>
<td>(2) 2</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(0) 0 (1) 4</td>
<td>(20) 83</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(1) 4</td>
<td>(1) 4</td>
<td>(1) 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab ME</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(0) 0 (1) 3</td>
<td>(32) 87</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(3) 8</td>
<td>(1) 3</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>(8) 1 (57) 10</td>
<td>(450) 76</td>
<td>(1) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(39) 7</td>
<td>(26) 4</td>
<td>(14) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Arab Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(0) 0 (2) 11</td>
<td>(16) 84</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(1) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>(3) 3 (6) 6</td>
<td>(76) 73</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(4) 4</td>
<td>(10) 10</td>
<td>(5) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Armenia (+ USSR)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(0) 0 (0) 0</td>
<td>(11) 85</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(2) 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>(3) 2 (8) 6</td>
<td>(103) 76</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(4) 3</td>
<td>(10) 7</td>
<td>(8) 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, East and Southeast Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(0) 0 (6) 15</td>
<td>(25) 63</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(5) 13</td>
<td>(2) 5</td>
<td>(2) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(0) 0 (1) 5</td>
<td>(12) 63</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(3) 16</td>
<td>(2) 11</td>
<td>(1) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(0) 0 (3) 19</td>
<td>(10) 63</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(2) 13</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(0) 0 (10) 13</td>
<td>(47) 63</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(10) 13</td>
<td>(4) 5</td>
<td>(4) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and North America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(0) 0 (2) 8</td>
<td>(18) 75</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(3) 13</td>
<td>(1) 4</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>(11) 1 (82) 9</td>
<td>(654) 74</td>
<td>(1) 0</td>
<td>(1) 0</td>
<td>(64) 7</td>
<td>(48) 5</td>
<td>(28) 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes all Survey Respondents.
2 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
### Table 5.2

Means by Which Respondent Found First Job in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Country of Last Residence</th>
<th>N=2</th>
<th>Relative, Friend, Sponsor (N=)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Found By Self (N=)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other (N=)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>(77) 34</td>
<td>(91) 40</td>
<td>(57) 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(44) 83</td>
<td>(6) 11</td>
<td>(3) 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>(59) 57</td>
<td>(36) 35</td>
<td>(9) 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan (+ Israel)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>(31) 40</td>
<td>(27) 35</td>
<td>(20) 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(5) 24</td>
<td>(16) 76</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab ME</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(9) 28</td>
<td>(20) 63</td>
<td>(3) 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>(225) 44</td>
<td>(196) 38</td>
<td>(92) 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Arab Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(16) 89</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td>(1) 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>(41) 48</td>
<td>(36) 42</td>
<td>(8) 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Armenia (+ USSR)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(9) 69</td>
<td>(2) 15</td>
<td>(2) 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>(66) 57</td>
<td>(39) 34</td>
<td>(11) 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, East and Southeast Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(4) 15</td>
<td>(17) 65</td>
<td>(5) 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(1) 8</td>
<td>(11) 85</td>
<td>(1) 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(1) 8</td>
<td>(6) 46</td>
<td>(6) 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(6) 12</td>
<td>(34) 65</td>
<td>(12) 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and North America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>(315) 43</td>
<td>(301) 41</td>
<td>(126) 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. $x^2 = 139.4654$, df = 26, sign. at .0001 level
2. Includes only those male respondents who worked both overseas and in Australia. Excludes those who did not answer.
3. All percentages are rounded to nearest whole percentage point.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal reasons for job change</th>
<th>First job to second job</th>
<th>Second job to third job</th>
<th>Third job to fourth job</th>
<th>Fourth job to fifth job</th>
<th>Fifth job to sixth job</th>
<th>Sixth job to seventh job</th>
<th>Seventh job to eighth job</th>
<th>Eighth job to ninth job</th>
<th>Total job changes</th>
<th>% of total job changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>%1</td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>%1</td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>%1</td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>%1</td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>%1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For more money/better pay</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To obtain better or more attractive position</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to another place for a while</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not like the job</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started own business</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fired from job</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job ended/business closed</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation problems</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
2 Includes all job changes in Australia of the 65 interviewed respondents who have changed jobs at least once.
Table 5.4

Occupational Status Change After Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Status of First Job in Australia</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>Occupational Status of Present or Most Recent Job</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=) %1</td>
<td>(N=) %1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(21) 60</td>
<td>(6) 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
<td>(9) 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(7) 10</td>
<td>(8) 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Manual</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>(8) 3</td>
<td>(33) 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(4) 6</td>
<td>(9) 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service, Unskilled</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>(7) 4</td>
<td>(29) 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>(47) 8</td>
<td>(94) 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
APPENDIX V

OTHER KINDS OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION:
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTICIPATION, CHURCH ATTENDANCE
AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTICIPATION

It has been assumed that spatial dispersion of immigrants indicates successful adjustment or even assimilation to the host society. Such an assumption implies that living mainly among host society members leads to greater social interaction with them which, in turn, eventuates in social assimilation. The basis for this premise can be traced to Tönnies' concept of the "community of place" (locality) as opposed to "community of blood" (kinship and family) or "community of intellect" (friendship, religion, etc.). Although linked to the other two community relations in many ways, Tönnies saw locality as having the distinct roles of providing the foundation for the development of community, and providing a means by which community can reinforce and fulfil itself, that is, through common residence. In Tönnies' view, then, the very fact of living in the same locality implied the presence of significant social relationships. This view gained much support from the early studies of anthropologists, which generally dealt with isolated village communities. The transfer of anthropological field methods to urban environments, which culminated in the development of the "community study method",¹ led to the assumption that the "neighbourhood community" in the city was actually the modern "counterpart of the village". As such, it was conceived of as a cohesive social system within the city and, like the village community to the anthropologist, was often interpreted to be a microcosm of the urban social system. Such an analogy was very misleading since the modern neighbourhood or urban locality was in no way as isolated as the villages studied by anthropologists. Moreover, urban locations have

¹ See Bell and Newby (1971: 40-42, 54-81) and Arensberg (1961) for good discussions of this method. For background on the development of this method see Park and Burgess (1967), Warner (1941) and Weaver and White (1972: 109).
been progressively deprived of their "closed" social system characteristics by the continuous development of modern means of communication and transport which have broadened the psycho-social and territorial range of the members (Mann, 1965: 165), with the result that geographic and social boundaries seldom coincide. Thus, the urban neighbourhood can no longer be considered automatically possessed of "community" relations; in Tönnies' terms, it is no longer a "Gemeinschaft" entity. This has led to the realization "that mere living together in the same locality can result in a conglomeration of very little sociological importance" (Dennis, 1968: 75). At the same time, however, common residence must still be considered of importance since propinquity itself provides a basis for contact and social interaction which can lead to the formation of social relationships. It is this aspect of "neighbourhood" which is examined here with regard to Armenian social participation.

Armenian Neighbourhood Participation in Sydney

In Chapter Four it was shown that, in Sydney, there were no Armenian "neighbourhoods" as such, where the great majority of the local population was Armenian. There are, however, areas with relatively large concentrations of Armenians, although even in these areas Armenian households are quite widely dispersed. Only seven of the interviewed respondents stated that most of their neighbours were Armenian and even for these it can be assumed that most were referring only to those neighbours they knew personally. Eighty per cent of those interviewed, on the other hand, stated that the great majority of their neighbours were Australians, while another 10 per cent lived in localities containing a complete mixture of immigrants and Australians.

Almost three-quarters of the interviewed respondents knew of at least one Armenian family who lived in the same neighbourhood, while half knew of six families or more. In only five cases did the local neighbourhood Armenians constitute the majority of the Sydney Armenian families known to these respondents. In almost every other case the majority of those personally known resided in the same Major Area of Sydney as the respondent.
Sixty of the respondents had a "close" friend, or friends, living in the same neighbourhood, although only nine stated that they had any intimate friends living this near. For 33, these close neighbourhood friends were all Armenian, while six respondents stated their only close neighbourhood friends were Australians. The respondents' durations of residence in Sydney have had no appreciable effect on this pattern of neighbourhood friends. What these findings indicate is that for the Armenian immigrants most neighbourhood social relationships are formed with other Armenians or other immigrants and not with Australians, even though a progressively larger proportion of them reside in all-Australian neighbourhoods. Thus, neither greater residential proximity, nor greater duration of this residential proximity, appears to lead to increased social interaction and friendship formation with Australians.

An examination of the characteristics of Armenian neighbourhood friends shows that most came from the same countries as the respondents. For example, just over half the Armenian neighbourhood friends of those from South, East and Southeast Asia came from the same country as the respondents, while 86 per cent of the neighbourhood friends of those from the non-Arab Middle East did so. Thus, the majority of the close neighbourhood friendships are not only restricted to other Armenians but also to Armenians from the same country as the respondent.

The frequency of contact with neighbourhood friends, both Armenian and non-Armenian, was quite high, with one-quarter of the respondents seeing them daily and 79 per cent seeing or visiting with them at least once a week. Only 12 per cent saw them only every month or so. Unlike that with intimate friends, the frequency of contact with neighbourhood friends was much greater for those whose friends were mostly Australians. This indicates that these respondents have forged closer relationships and have greater interaction with their Australian neighbours than have those with only Armenian friends in the neighbourhood.

1 Eighty per cent of the interviewed respondents' intimate friends resided in other suburbs.
The reason for this is clear. Those Armenians who confine their neighbourhood participation to other Armenians are more interested in social participation within the Armenian "community" and, since the community is widely dispersed, greater social participation is directed outside the local neighbourhood. Those whose close neighbourhood friends are all, or mostly, Australians, are less interested in relationships with Armenians and tend to make more of an effort within the local neighbourhood.

This finding is supported by an examination of the nature of the contact respondents have with neighbours in general. Only those whose neighbourhood friends are all or mostly Australian have what could be described as "close" contact; they help each other with shopping, lend or borrow things or help with children. Over half of the others only said "Hello" when passing, while some had no contact with neighbours at all. Thus, with the exception of the former, the kinds of contact the Armenians have with their neighbours is very superficial and cannot be considered of much significance with respect to social interaction with Australians.

CHURCH ATTENDANCE

Approximately nine-tenths of the Armenians consider themselves members of one of the three Armenian churches - the Apostolic Church, the Armenian Catholic Church or the Armenian Evangelical Church. The remainder are all members of other Christian churches, with the exception of a few who have no religion.

The central importance of religion for the Armenians cannot be underrated. For one thing, it has been the repository of the national identity for centuries. This is especially true for the predominant Apostolic Church and much less so for the other two. In Sydney, the Apostolic Church was the very first Armenian institution to be founded (1953) and for this reason must be considered an important factor in the development of the Sydney community.

Attending church, however, is not considered very important by most
Armenians, beyond attendance at the important times of the year or for special occasions. Only two-fifths of the respondents attend church as frequently as once per month, while less than half of these attend every week. During the month before they were interviewed, however, 48 per cent of the respondents stated they had attended church at least once, while one-fifth had attended more than once.

This low attendance is attributable to a number of factors, especially the ideological split in the congregation of the Apostolic Church and the development of a number of anti-church factions. The strife generated by this split caused many members to stop attending church, although it apparently did not result in any of them abandoning their religion. It has, however, contributed to the development of the Apostolic Church as a social meeting place. On any Sunday there will generally be a larger gathering of Armenians who socialize outside the church than actually attend the service inside. Many of these have no intention of entering the church or participating in the service and a good number no longer consider themselves members of the church. After the service, those who are members adjourn to the church hall, where they drink tea and coffee. In this way the Apostolic Church serves as a social meeting place for those who oppose the present church hierarchy, as well as for church members and supporters.

In summary, church attendance by the Armenians is generally low, although the contact which does take place in churches is largely with fellow Armenians. In this way, such attendance as there is must be considered to strengthen community ties, at least within the different factions of the community. Those who are members of non-Armenian churches are assumed to be the more assimilated members of the community, making their contact with Australians in this context of little importance with respect to their social adjustment.

VOTING PATTERNS: POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Voting in Australian elections is compulsory, which in itself causes

There is no evidence of any such conflict within the other Armenian churches. Low attendance in these churches must be attributable to other factors.
those who become naturalized Australians to participate at least to a minimal degree. Identifying with one of the Australian political parties, however, like joining formal organizations, is a form of commitment on the part of the individual. Of the interviewed respondents who have become naturalized (80 of 97), just over half (41) consider themselves members of an Australian political party. The majority claimed membership of the Liberal Party, while the rest stated they were Labor Party supporters.

When asked why they claimed membership of one party or the other, the most common response for the Liberals was that their party was more capitalist and less socialist, while the Labor supporters felt their party cared more for the common people. Wilson (1973: 94) has noted that immigrant participation in voluntary associations is usually associated with increased political participation, even if the associations are themselves non-political. This is not true for the Armenian immigrants. The percentage who consider themselves members of Australian political parties is neither correlated with the number of organizations they join nor with their overall participation in Australian organizations.

Another factor which affects membership in Australian political parties is the period lived in Australia (Table V.1). Although the short-term residents had the largest percentage who were not eligible to vote or to join political parties, they also had the largest proportion who considered themselves members of political parties. This was in contrast to the longer term residents, especially those who have lived in Australia for 10 or more years, who, although having the greatest proportion eligible to vote, also had the smallest percentage who considered themselves party members. In other words, the more recent arrivals appear to be more interested in political participation in Australian society.

With respect to the Armenian political parties, especially the Dashnaks, it was almost impossible to obtain any information on personal involvement from respondents. Having migrated from countries where these parties were either discouraged or in some cases, suppressed, most respondents were reluctant to discuss their relationship to them or their participation
Table V.1
Influence of Duration of Residence in Australia on Political Party Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of Residence</th>
<th>Consider Oneself a Member of Australian Political Party (N=) %</th>
<th>Do Not Consider Oneself a Member of Australian Political Party (N=) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>28 (20) 71</td>
<td>(8) 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td>51 (21) 41</td>
<td>(30) 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79 (41) 52</td>
<td>(38) 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 $x^2 = 6.6268$, df = 1, sign. at .025 level.
2 Includes only those who are naturalized Australians.
3 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

in them. However, a question concerning which party they tended to identify with was asked in order to provide an additional insight into the internal political nature of the Sydney Armenian community. Fifty-four per cent of the interviewed respondents stated they did not identify with any Armenian political ideology. Of the remaining 45 respondents, 35 stated they identified with the Dashnaks, six with the Ramgavars and four with the Hunchaks: thus, over three-quarters of those who admitted identifying with an Armenian political ideology did so with the Dashnaks. Identifying or sympathizing with one of these parties or ideologies does not necessarily imply membership or active participation. In fact even the Dashnak Party in Sydney can be assumed to have only a small number of actual members. As shown in the previous chapter, however, the influence of these ideologies in shaping the present social structure of the Sydney Armenian Community is profound.
APPENDIX VI

THE ACCULTURATION CONCEPT IN
PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT STUDIES

Acculturation, in broad terms, refers to the acquisition or borrowing of certain culture traits from one society by people in, or from another society (Shannon and Shannon, 1967:52). Interest in this phenomenon initially developed in the field of Anthropology as a direct result of the cultural changes brought about by colonial encounters. In this context the cultures of the "host" societies were threatened by numerically inferior, but politically dominant groups which attempted to impose all or part of their own cultures on the larger subordinate populations. Because of these circumstances, the host societies underwent the greatest changes and tended to "acculturate" to the colonialists.

In their studies, anthropologists were primarily concerned with the material, linguistic and social changes which occurred. Little or no attention was given to psychological changes.¹ Because most acculturation studies conducted prior to the 1960's were done by anthropologists and a few sociologists, this lack of attention to the psychological sphere continued until quite recently² (Singer, 1961: 41).

During the late 1950's and the 1960's there developed an increasing interest in the psychological assimilation of immigrant groups, especially

¹ This was largely due to the anthropological methods of data collection, i.e., personal observation and participation, and the fact that until relatively recently "Psychological Anthropology" was not a serious area of study.

² There was interest in a psychological approach to the study of acculturation in the 1940's. For example, Child (1943: 4) drew attention to the fact that "Psychological analysis needs to be made of individual behaviour and attitudes in relation to the acculturation situation". His belief that a psychological approach would be of great assistance in the general understanding of acculturation was heeded by only a few researchers in the following decade and a half. For examples, see Hallowell (1955), Spindler (1955) and Taft (1957).
in Australia. One of the principal aspects of the assimilation process was taken to be the "acculturation" of immigrants to their host society. Unfortunately, the broad nature of the acculturation concept, which was borrowed from Anthropology, made for considerable confusion in these studies, where acculturation was taken at times to be the overall assimilation process, while at other times it was considered only one of the sub-processes. This confusion is illustrated in the following statement:

"The term of 'acculturation' is not used with any consistency. Some writers use the terms 'assimilation', 'accommodation', 'absorption', 'cultural integration', 'social acceptance', 'convergence of norms', 'self-identification', etc., to denote the concept here called 'acculturation'." (Weinstock, 1964: 322).

Even the attempts to formulate a more precise and useful "acculturation" concept, such as that of Peterson and Scheff (1965), did not greatly help the situation. The very fact that they equated "acculturation" with "assimilation", and the colonial encounter situation with that of immigrant assimilation, meant that their view of the concept was too broad to permit a more precise definition (Peterson and Scheff, 1965: 155).

With the introduction of psychological variables into the study of

---

1 Sociologists have intensively studied ethnic groups since the 1920's and the 1930's, but for the most part have concentrated their interest on "minority groups" and "race relations". They mainly dealt with studies of prejudice, discrimination and other aspects of "inter-group relations". Even as late as the mid-1950's anthropologists had tended to neglect such studies, even though they claimed great interest in "culture change" (see Spiro, 1955). Probably some of the greatest interest in this area was exhibited by demographic sociologists and psychologists in Australia who were concerned with the study of Australia's great post-War immigration programme.

2 Part of this confusion can be traced to the anthropological concept of culture. It is taken to signify the complex, interlocking whole of material elements (artifacts), social elements (usages, customs and institutions) and spiritual/intellectual elements (art, value systems, beliefs) through which an individual as such, or as a member of a group, meets the requirements of life in all its aspects. Thus, the fact that "culture" includes social and psychological, as well as material, aspects, means that the merging of two or more cultures - acculturation - can be seen to take place in one or all three spheres.
acculturation, the situation appears to have become even more confused. In some cases, material or social changes have been considered to indicate psychological changes, while in other cases changes in psychological and non-psychological spheres have been equated rather than considered separately. The assumption underlying these approaches was that acculturation involved changes in all aspects of "culture", the objective as well as the subjective. Although undoubtedly true, there is a fallacy in equating psychological changes with changes in the more objective aspects of culture, even though the cause of the changes may be the same. It is precisely this failure to draw a qualitative distinction between the objective and subjective aspects which has resulted in much of the confusion noted in the literature concerning the "acculturation" of immigrants, or, the actual role of acculturation in the psychological assimilation process.

There have been various attempts to separate the psychological from the more objective aspects of the acculturation process, although the distinguishing criteria have often been mixed and have contributed to the confusion. Table VI.1 presents five such attempts by researchers who have dealt with the assimilation of immigrant groups in Australia and Canada. Although the factors they have chosen as indicators of the psychological and non-psychological aspects of the process vary somewhat, all imply that the principal distinguishing criterion of the former is the internalization of the host society's values, norms and attitudes, while the latter are changes in objective, observable, cultural aspects which do not necessarily involve psychological change. The distinguishing criterion which is felt to be missing from them all is whether or not changes in the two types of indicators are consciously made. Richardson appears to recognize this distinction in his discussion of "optional" acculturation when he notes that "Expressive patterns of behaviour can only develop convincingly when they develop naturally ...". He further points out that any attempt on the part of immigrants to consciously adopt these expressive qualities may actually be detrimental to their acculturation as such attempts may arouse suspicions.

1 Smith (1939: 122) noted that, "In the main, the process of assimilation is an unconscious one and the person is incorporated into the life of the new group without being aware of it". This internal nature of the assimilation process has also been referred to by other researchers, such as Neiva and Diegues (1959: 197) in their acculturation study of immigrants in Brazil.
Table VI.1
Attempts to Separate Psychological and Non-Psychological Aspects of the Acculturation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Psychological Aspects</th>
<th>Non-Psychological Aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Johnston (1963)</td>
<td>Subjective Assimilation Related to satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual seeks to identify with Australia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators: food habits, leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cronin (1967)</td>
<td>Assimilative Change (Private Sector)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators: value, ideals, friends, associations, primary relation, inter-marriage, identification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Mapstone (1966)</td>
<td>Internal Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal, emotional and effective aspects of change; customs, traditions and mores.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators: local dialect, religion, family structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Richmond (1967a)</td>
<td>Primary Assimilation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction and identification with host society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators: feeling at home in the new country, desiring to remain rest of life in new country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Richardson (1974)</td>
<td>Optional Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour present in majority of native-born but not required of a new-comer. Indicators: knowledge of Australian culture, beliefs, &quot;optional&quot; behaviour (use of slang terms in speech). Associated with prior identification with host society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturative Change (Public Sector)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public satisfaction - job, house, Australia as place to live. Indicators: food habits, naturalization, occupation, language capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visible, observable aspects. Indicators: acquisition of English, name changes, mode of dress, food habits, housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective aspects. Indicators: knowing and using vernacular language, adoption of prevailing values, social mixing with host population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obligatory and Advantageous Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced changes in behaviour or changes which are seen to be of benefit to individual migrant. No specific indicators mentioned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A number of the researchers have dealt with what they see as the "assimilation" process rather than the "acculturation" process. For the purposes here, however, the headings of assimilation can be roughly equated with the present approach to acculturation.
or opposition from the host society members (Richardson, 1974: 47). In other words, the immigrant is not "optionally" acculturated and thus psychologically assimilated until he "unconsciously" behaves and thinks like the host society members.
APPENDIX VII

SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE OBJECTIVE
OR EXTERNAL ACCULTURATION OF THE SYDNEY ARMENIANS

EXTERNAL ACCULTURATION: GENERAL

External acculturation encompasses those facets of cultural change about which a conscious decision has been made. Included are "obligatory" changes which, although not purposive, are made with the full knowledge of the immigrant. Those cultural patterns of the Armenians which are deemed to fall into this category of acculturation and which are considered here are: acquisition of English and improvement in English proficiency; name changes; food habit changes; changes in leisure time activities. Having been urban dwellers, accustomed to city living and Western dress modes, the aspects of housing and dress are not considered.

ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

The importance of acquiring at least a workable knowledge of the dominant language of the host country has been shown in a great number of studies of immigrant groups. In most cases it is considered the most important aspect of the new culture which an immigrant must learn in order to adjust. As stated by Smith (1939: 147), "Without a common means of communications, full and free interchange of ideas is impossible, and he [the immigrant] is left outside the range of influence that would aid his acculturation". Although he can consciously copy certain externalities of life in the host society and thereby reach a certain level of accommodation, unless he learns the host society language, he will continue to remain both separate from, and alien to it.

The importance of being proficient in English has already been shown for various facets of Armenian life in Australia. For example, being
very proficient was found to be necessary for the development of intimate friendship relations with Australians, while English fluency was noted to be one of the most important factors associated with post-migration occupational mobility. In other cases, however, such as membership of, or participation in Australian organizations, it was not the linguistic ability developed since migration that was important, but the level of proficiency at the time of arrival.

Apart from the fact that a majority (4/5) of the respondents possessed some knowledge of English prior to migration, as an immigrant group they can also be considered to have been positively inclined to learn English or to improve their English language skills after arrival. Having existed as a minority group for centuries, and in situations where they were invariably required to learn and use the larger society's dominant language or languages, learning new languages in response to new situations has been very much an accepted part of Armenian life. Settlement in Australia, therefore, brought with it a positive acceptance on the part of most that it was not only necessary, but also extremely important, to learn or improve their English language skills. Many began to study English in anticipation of their migration to Australia, while others actively sought to learn or improve their language skills immediately upon arrival.¹ There were no cases encountered in the Survey where Armenian immigrants either did not want to learn English or did not want to improve their use of the language. Its crucial importance for a satisfactory life in Australia was universally understood.

Before examining their acquisition of and improvement in English proficiency after arrival, it is first necessary to discuss the means by

¹ Unlike the members of many immigrant groups whose principal language was not English, the Armenians were in no way intimidated by their lack of proficiency in English. Rather than "shying away" from personal contact with Australians, or situations where they were required to learn and speak English, most actively sought such contact and situations since they recognized how valuable they were to obtaining a good command of the language. A good example is provided by the fact that most sought work with Australians rather than other Armenians.
which these two variables are measured. In most studies of immigrant language acquisition and improvement, the level of proficiency attained by individuals has been measured in one of two ways, self-assessment or interviewer assessment. The first is usually elicited by means of a questionnaire and the second determined during a personal interview. Although both methods have obvious drawbacks, in most cases the latter is probably the more reliable (Johnston, 1965a: 93).

In the present study, aspects of both methods have been combined. Self-assessment of English proficiency at both arrival in Australia and at the time of the Survey were obtained by means of the postal questionnaire. This was followed by interviewer assessment of the current language use of those members of the postal questionnaire population who were selected for intensive interviews. Since the interview situation lasted for a period of from two to five hours, it was possible to arrive at a very good assessment of the interviewees' language proficiency. Having been obtained independently, it was then possible to compare the two assessments for the same individuals. The results of this exercise showed that, in fact, they were the same in most cases. In those instances where they were found to differ, the self-assessment generally reflected one level of proficiency lower than was determined from the interview. This very close correspondence between the two indicates that their own assessment of their language proficiency can be considered to be a good measure.

Unlike many non-European immigrant groups in Australia, a significant number of the Armenians (1/3) were fluent in English before migration, while only 17 per cent had no knowledge of English at all. The earlier arrivals, who came mainly from South, East and Southeast Asian countries, were, on the whole, more proficient than those who came later from the Middle East. The least proficient were the more recent arrivals who came largely from the non-Arab Middle East (Table VII.1).

English proficiency on arrival was not only related to where they had lived before migration, it was also highly correlated with many personal characteristics. Those who were very proficient were predominantly those
Table VII.1  
Factors Related to Level of English Proficiency at Time of Arrival and at Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N=1</th>
<th>Level of Proficiency in English at Time of Arrival</th>
<th>Level of Proficiency in English at Time of Armenian Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High 2%</td>
<td>Medium 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Arrival 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1963</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-1967</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1972</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1976</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Last Residence 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Middle East</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Arab Middle East</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South, Southeast and East Asia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and North America</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Arrival 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Learned English 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At School</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
Table VII.1 (contd.)

1 Number of respondents and percentages differ slightly between tables due to fact that those who did not answer were not included in each table.
2 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
3 Proficiency on arrival: $x^2 = 30.5401$, df = 9. sign. at .001 level.
   Proficiency at time of Survey: $x^2 = 72.8899$, df = 9. sign. at .0001 level.
4 Proficiency on arrival: $x^2 = 111.457$, df = 12, sign. at .0001 level.
   Proficiency at time of Survey: $x^2 = 61.688$, df = 12, sign. at .0001 level.
5 Proficiency on arrival: $x^2 = 184.594$, df = 6, sign. at .0001 level.
   Proficiency at time of Survey: $x^2 = 205.133$, df = 6, sign. at .0001 level.
6 Proficiency on arrival: $x^2 = 42.448$, df = 15, sign. at .0002 level.
   Proficiency at time of Survey: $x^2 = 156.553$, df = 15, sign. at .0001 level.
7 Proficiency on arrival: $x^2 = 256.941$, df = 3, sign. at .0001 level.
   Proficiency at time of Survey: $x^2 = 139.684$, df = 3, sign. at .0001 level.
who had secondary or tertiary education, who were in the young to middle age groups (20-59) and who had received formal training in English at school (Table VII.1).

These same characteristics were also found to be highly correlated with their level of proficiency at the time of the Survey, even though three-quarters of those who were less than fluent when they arrived had improved their English language skills by this time. This indicates that these characteristics continued to exert a significant influence upon the "degree" of improvement in English proficiency after arrival.

Four categories of English language improvement are identified here, based upon the difference between the individual's level of proficiency at arrival and at the time of the Survey. The four categories are: (1) no improvement, indicating that the immigrant has not attained a higher level of proficiency since arrival; (2) minor improvement, indicating that level of proficiency at the time of the Survey was only one level above that at arrival; (3) moderate improvement, signifying proficiency has improved two levels since arrival; (4) major improvement, indicating maximum improvement - an immigrant who knew no English on arrival attaining fluency by the time of the Survey. It should be noted here that only those who had room for improvement, those less than fluent upon arrival, are considered in order to avoid distorting the figures for those who have not improved their proficiency.¹

Table VII.2 illustrates the changes in English proficiency between time of arrival and the Survey. It is obvious that the actual level of proficiency at arrival is very important in relation to the achievement of some improvement by the time of the Survey, even if most showed only minimal improvement. This finding is not surprising, since obtaining some knowledge of English could be considered almost a necessity of life in Australia. For this reason, it can be assumed that the pressure to learn or improve English

¹ Since those fluent on arrival were already in the highest proficiency category, they would have to be placed in the "no improvement" category if included.
Table VII.2
Changes in English Proficiency between Arrival and Time of Armenian Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of English Proficiency at Time of Arrival</th>
<th>N=1</th>
<th>Level of English Proficiency at Time of Armenian Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=)</td>
<td>High (N=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>(283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>(101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>(64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>(471)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Excludes those who did not answer.
2 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

Language skills was greatest for those who knew little or no English, with the consequent result that a greater proportion of these immigrants improved their English proficiency.

With respect to the degree of improvement in proficiency attained since arrival, the factors which appear most significant are age at arrival, period of residence, the presence of Australian-born children in the household and the language usually spoken in the home. Although the other factors discussed earlier, such as education and region of last residence, are also statistically significant, they do not appear to be as important as the above in determining the extent of an individual's improvement.¹

Those immigrants who have tended to show a greater improvement in English proficiency are those who were relatively young on arrival, who have resided longer in Australia, who have Australian-born children and who usually speak English in the home (Table VII.3). Thus, it has been shown that those who have achieved the greatest improvement are those who were more able to learn a new language and who have had the greatest exposure to the language. They

¹ Neither of these two factors is statistically significant with respect to whether or not improvement in English proficiency has taken place in general.
### Table VII.3
Factors Affecting the Degree of Improvement in English Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>N=1</th>
<th>No Improvement (N=)</th>
<th>Minimal Improvement (N=)</th>
<th>Moderate Improvement (N=)</th>
<th>Major Improvement (N=)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at Arrival in Australia</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(4) 8</td>
<td>(10) 20</td>
<td>(22) 45</td>
<td>(13) 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>(25) 13</td>
<td>(104) 55</td>
<td>(50) 27</td>
<td>(10) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>(42) 31</td>
<td>(65) 47</td>
<td>(30) 22</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>(39) 33</td>
<td>(59) 50</td>
<td>(20) 17</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>(21) 33</td>
<td>(38) 59</td>
<td>(5) 8</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(12) 39</td>
<td>(17) 55</td>
<td>(2) 7</td>
<td>(0) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>(143) 24</td>
<td>(293) 50</td>
<td>(129) 22</td>
<td>(23) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Residence in Australia (years)</strong>&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(28) 28</td>
<td>(56) 56</td>
<td>(14) 14</td>
<td>(2) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>(51) 26</td>
<td>(95) 48</td>
<td>(49) 25</td>
<td>(4) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>(52) 21</td>
<td>(127) 52</td>
<td>(53) 22</td>
<td>(11) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(12) 26</td>
<td>(15) 33</td>
<td>(13) 28</td>
<td>(6) 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>(143) 24</td>
<td>(293) 50</td>
<td>(129) 22</td>
<td>(23) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian-Born Children</strong>&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>(109) 29</td>
<td>(186) 49</td>
<td>(75) 20</td>
<td>(13) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>(34) 17</td>
<td>(107) 52</td>
<td>(54) 26</td>
<td>(10) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>(143) 24</td>
<td>(293) 50</td>
<td>(129) 22</td>
<td>(23) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Normally Spoken in the Home</strong>&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(1) 3</td>
<td>(14) 36</td>
<td>(14) 36</td>
<td>(10) 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>(141) 26</td>
<td>(278) 51</td>
<td>(113) 21</td>
<td>(12) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5837</td>
<td>(142) 24</td>
<td>(292) 50</td>
<td>(127) 22</td>
<td>(22) 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes only those who have had the opportunity to improve their English proficiency since arrival.
2. All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
3. $x^2 = 139.120$, df = 15, sign. at 0.0001 level.
4. $x^2 = 22.755$, df = 9, sign. at 0.0068 level.
5. $x^2 = 11.627$, df = 3, sign. at 0.0088 level.
6. $x^2 = 66.615$, df = 3, sign. at 0.0001 level.
7. Number of respondents differs from other tables because of exclusion of those who did not answer.
are also the more educated, although those who learned English outside school showed a slightly greater tendency to improve their skills. This latter finding is almost certainly related to the fact that very little of the improvement in language proficiency in Australia was due to formal teaching, but was the result of informal learning at work, in the home or in casual associations with English speakers.

In conclusion, it can be said that, with regard to language acquisition and improvement, the Armenians have purposely acculturated very rapidly and very well. Today, over half are considered very fluent in English, while only a very few have no real facility with English at all. These latter individuals are either Armenians who were relatively old when they arrived in Australia, or else they are the very recent arrivals. Although the level of English proficiency differed widely due to diverse background and personal characteristics, most have managed to achieve at least a minimal degree of improvement since arrival, with the greatest improvement taking place as a result of long and continuous exposure to the language.

NAME CHANGES

Mapstone (1966: 236), in his study of the Greek Macedonians of Shepparton, noted that name changes indicated an "awareness on the part of an immigrant of a divergence in this aspect of the two cultures and an attempt to adjust to the new one". Thus, in changing his name to one which is common, or at least familiar to host society members, the immigrant is consciously striving to accommodate to his new environment (Smith, 1939: 132). There are basically two major reasons for wanting to make such changes. First, they may realize that their names are difficult to pronounce or to spell in the host society, in which case there may be a tendency to adopt a completely new name or, more commonly, to modify the original name to make it both more pronounceable and easier to spell. Secondly, they may want to disassociate themselves totally from their immigrant backgrounds and origins so as not to be automatically labelled as migrants or minority group members. In such cases they would almost certainly adopt completely new

1 This tendency has been found in many different groups. See Smith (1939: 130), Gordon (1949: 62) and Mapstone (1966: 237).
names which were relatively common in the host society. With regard to name changes, however, a distinction must be made between changes in given names and changes in surnames. In general, most people are more emotionally attached to their surnames than to their given names, a view which is supported by the fact that immigrants rarely change the former (Child, 1943: 22; Mapstone, 1966: 237). For this reason, it can be assumed that changes of surnames can be taken to indicate a much greater effort being made to acculturate to the host society. This is especially true when the surnames are quite distinctive or different from those common in the host society.

For the Armenians, a variety of surname changes were found, although the overall occurrence was relatively low (10/97). The most common changes were those entailing a modification of the original names to make them both easier to pronounce and to spell. Invariably, the portion of the surname which was retained included the distinctive ending which Armenians see as indicative of their Armenian origin. For example, the surname Izmiritlian might be shortened to Ritlian. By doing so, it is shorter, easier to pronounce and spell in English while, at the same time, it retains the distinctive Armenian suffix. Such a case is considered a definite attempt by an individual to accommodate without disassociating himself from his Armenian origins. Similar findings have been made for other immigrant groups such as the Greek Macedonians (Mapstone, 1966: 237).

In a few cases the -ian or -yan suffix has been dropped. Since this ending has emotional connotations for many Armenians, such an occurrence may often indicate an attempt to remove all traces of Armenian ancestry in order to be more readily accepted by Australians. ¹

Changes in given names show a different pattern. Being Christians, many Armenians have names which are taken from the Bible and therefore have close English equivalents. Some examples of Armenian names and their

¹ For other ethnic groups, where a surname suffix is not necessarily indicative of ethnic ancestry, dropping the suffix to shorten the name may not have such connotations. For example, Gordon (1949: 61) found that the majority of the Minneapolis Jews tended to drop the Slavonic suffixes of their original names. For this group, however, the endings were not intimately involved with their Jewishness.
English equivalents are: Krikor (Gregory), Hagop (Jack), Kevork (George), Ohannes (John). Very few of the Armenian immigrants were found to have legally changed their given names, but have simply assumed or adopted the English translation. In some cases, they have adopted an English-sounding version, or a shortening of their Armenian name. For example, Viken might become Vic. Use of the English version is generally confined to work-place and to associations with Australians or other non-Armenians, while most continue to use their Armenian names at home and in Armenian social circles.

Table VII.4 presents the reasons given by the interviewed respondents for adopting English first names. It is clear that the principal impetus for such change was a desire to overcome the problems they encountered, or the embarrassment they felt when Australians had difficulty pronouncing their names. It is interesting, however, that over a fifth stated they had been given or assigned Australian or English names by their employers or workmates who could not, or did not want to make the effort to pronounce their Armenian names. The following remarks are illustrative of this:

"At my first job the foreman couldn't pronounce Razmick so he said he would call me Ross." (56-year old Egyptian Armenian who came in 1963).

"At work my boss asked me my name. I answered Garabed. He said I had to change my name. He couldn't pronounce it. He said better I put Gary." (39-year old Lebanese Armenian who arrived in 1967).

"It was suggested at work 'What shall we call you?' My workmates wanted to give me an Australian name so I took it." (41-year old Jordanian Armenian who came in 1963).

---

1 Of the 52 interviewed respondents who have adopted English first names since arrival, 40 use these names only with Australians or other non-Armenians.

2 This is apparently quite common with immigrants. Child (1943: 22) found that it was common among the New Haven Italians to use their Italian names when speaking Italian and to use their English names when speaking English.

3 Smith (1939: 130) found such occurrences to be relatively common with respect to Armenian immigrant groups.
Table VII.4
Reasons Given for Adopting English First Names in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>No. of Replies</th>
<th>% of Replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Make it Easier:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to Spell and Pronounce:</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name was Given by Australians:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Become Part of Australian Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Order Not to be Recognised as a Migrant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Total number of replies given by 52 interviewed respondents who have adopted English first names since arrival in Australia.

2 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

Only one respondent stated that he changed his given name to avoid being recognized or labelled as a migrant. None had apparently done so to try and hide their Armenian ancestry.

It has been assumed that names given to children born in a new country may also indicate the cultural orientation of the immigrants (Cronin, 1972: 192; Mapstone, 1966: 238). In fact, such changes may be a more reliable index of cultural change than name changes among the first generation immigrants themselves (Smith, 1939: 132). This would be especially true for those immigrant groups which strongly adhered to traditional naming practices in their countries of origin, since these practices would present an additional obstacle to such name changes.

Unlike the Jews (Gordon, 1949: 123), the Sicilians (Cronin, 1972:
192-193), the Greek Macedonians (Mapstone, 1966: 238-240), and undoubtedly many other groups, the great majority of the Armenians who migrated to Australia did not practice and, in most cases, did not even know of any traditional Armenian naming customs. Nevertheless, there was a strong preference for Armenian names, even for those born in Australia. Most (47/81) of those with Australian-born children have given them Armenian names, or at least, a combination of an Armenian and an English name. Like the respondents themselves, the majority of the children with only Armenian names follow the pattern of using an English equivalent or nickname with Australian or non-Armenian associates or in situations outside the home and Armenian circles.

This tendency to give children an Armenian name appears likely to continue for some time as the majority (31/56) of the young couples stated they would give such names to any future children they may have.

The principal reasons that the respondents have given their children English names are similar to those which they gave for adopting English names themselves (Table VII.5). Most parents were aware that their children would encounter an easier time at school, at work, and so on, if they possessed familiar names which were both easy to pronounce and to spell. In a few cases they attempted to arrive at a satisfactory compromise by giving them Armenian names which are easily pronounced and spelled in English. In other cases they gave the English translation of traditional Armenian names, in the same manner as shown earlier for the respondents themselves. In all cases, except possibly one, giving children English names cannot be considered an attempt to hide or disguise their Armenian or immigrant origins, but simply an effort to ensure that they do not suffer unnecessary difficulties because of their names.

---

1 Two interviewed respondents mentioned the traditional custom of naming children after grandparents. One adhered to this practice while the other did not think that Armenians really followed it any more.

2 Five of the 34 respondents who had given their children English names had also given them an Armenian name "so they would have the choice".
Table VII.5
Reasons for Giving Australian-Born Children English Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>No. of Replies</th>
<th>% of Replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Make it Easier on Them:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Help Them to Fit Better into Australian Society:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Normal for Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-Speaking Country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to be an Outcast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easier to Spell and Pronounce:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Reasons:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Assigned Name at School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Interested in Armenians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Total number of replies given by 34 interviewed respondents who gave their children English names.
2 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

Not all name changes have been made in order to accommodate or acculturate to Australian society. A few respondents have legally retaken their original family names which had been changed in the past for one reason or another. During their resettlement after the massacres and dispersions, many Armenians were given different or altered surnames by immigration or local officials who misunderstood the pronunciation of their names. This was particularly true in the Arab countries where they settled.1 Thus, the names with which they were registered in their new countries became their legal names. Another situation was that of the Indian Armenians.

1 According to one informant, there is no set way of pronouncing or spelling Armenian names in Arabic. Consequently, whatever way they pronounced the Armenian name was the way they spelled it.
Having been afforded the status and privileges of the colonial ruling class, the British, there was considerable pressure placed on them to alter their names to English or English-sounding names. Because it was socially, as well as commercially advantageous, many families did so.

There were also a number of individual situations where it had been useful, at the time, to change the surname. One such case is given by a 65 year old Indonesian Armenian, who migrated to Australia in 1951:

"When my father arrived in Indonesia, he was told that an Armenian with a similar name had a bad reputation there. He was told that he would be confused with this man and should therefore change his name. After he did so he couldn't change it back in Indonesia but he still used his traditional Armenian name in Armenian affairs."

Settling in Australia gave these individuals both the freedom and the opportunity to legally assume their original family names. Although the actual number who did so was quite small, the very fact that a few did is indicative that, for these individuals at least, their Armenian heritage and identity were considerably more important to them than acculturating to Australian society.¹

What these name changes show is that most of the respondents have only "accommodated" themselves to their new circumstances because it has been advantageous for them to do so, or because they have had very little choice in the matter. In only the rare case does it appear that the name has been changed to try and hide their immigrant or Armenian background. Thus, it can be concluded that most of the changes which have occurred are those which could be expected in the adjustment of first generation immigrants and cannot be considered important cultural changes.² Nevertheless, they

¹ Although the numbers are too small to draw any valid generalizations it does appear significant that most of those who retook their original family names were well-educated white collar workers. This would indicate that they were probably adjusted enough in other areas of life in Australia not to view their Armenian names as a hindrance to their overall adjustment.

² The changes noted here appear to be quite common. For example, Gordon (1949: 62) came to a similar conclusion for the Minneapolis Jews, as did Mapstone (1966: 238) for the Greek Macedonians of Shepparton.
do show an awareness on the part of the Armenians of cultural differences between themselves and Australian society and the fact that most are willing to make at least minor adjustments which make life easier in their new circumstances.

**FOOD HABITS**

Food habits have been found in many studies of immigrants and ethnic groups to be among the most resistant to change (Spiro, 1955: 1249; Weinstock, 1964: 335). This is especially true with respect to first generation immigrants (Johnston, 1969: 27). For example, Kosa (1957: 70) found that Hungarian immigrants in Canada still preferred their national dishes after residing there for an average of 24 years. A similar finding was made by Reynolds (1935: 233) for British immigrants in Canada.

In discussing the food patterns of any immigrant group it should be remembered that such patterns may change in two ways. Firstly, the kinds of foods eaten may change; immigrants may change from eating lamb to eating beef because the former is unavailable. Secondly, the actual style of cooking may change; the same foods are eaten but they are prepared in new and different ways. The first category of change is usually obligatory and cannot be considered culturally significant, while the latter changes represent the true acculturation of food habits. In reality, what is generally found for most immigrant groups is change along a continuum from only obligatory changes to a complete acceptance of the food habits commonly found in the host country.

The varied backgrounds of the Armenian immigrants preclude an examination of changes from "traditional" Armenian food patterns to "typical" Australian food patterns. Also, the fact that almost all were urban

---

1 There are many studies in the ethnic literature which show that it is far from uncommon for food patterns to persist for generations after the initial arrival of immigrants. Studies in Australia which support this finding are: Craig (1954), Cronin (1967), Johnston (1965a) and Mapstone (1966).

2 Although there are many "traditional" Armenian dishes, the cuisine of most of the Armenians in Australia could be broadly described as "Middle Eastern", as the food habits reflect those found throughout the Middle East. The Armenians, unlike the Jews, do not have any known dietary laws.
dwellers provides a further complication, as it can be assumed that most were exposed to a wide variety of cuisines prior to migration to Australia. Nevertheless, it is possible to examine the general persistence of, or changes in, former food habits since migration, regardless of whether or not such patterns can be considered typically Armenian.

Over three-quarters (77 per cent) of those interviewed stated they had not changed their food habits since arrival in Australia. Of the others, half indicated that they ate only "Australian" foods, while the other half ate a mixture of new foods and those usually eaten before migration. There was no apparent difference noted for those considered to have had the potential to be more rapidly acculturated in Australia, nor did longer periods of residence in Australia have any noticeable effect on change in food habits.

In general, most of the foods they had been accustomed to eating overseas were found to be readily available in Australia. Even special spices could be obtained relatively easily from established delicatessens or other food shops which carried Middle Eastern foods. This is probably the main reason why only one or two food stores, which are run by Armenians for Armenians, have been established in Sydney.

Probably the most important aspect of changing Armenian food habits in Australia concerns not so much the actual food itself but the associated social patterns. Traditionally, the kitchen has been the preserve of the Armenian wife and food preparation has always been considered "women's work". This arrangement is still viewed as the "natural way of things" in the Middle Eastern countries where women generally do not work outside the home. Consequently, prior to migration to Australia, it can

---

1 The variable examined here was educational level, as Cronin (1972: 168) found that individuals with high education revealed high change in food habits, while those with low education levels revealed low change.

2 Another reason for the relatively few Armenian food shops is the fact that the population is so scattered in Sydney. Those shops which have been established are located in the area of greatest population concentration.
be assumed that most Armenian women adhered to this pattern.\textsuperscript{1} This meant that they probably had no problem in maintaining their traditional eating habits overseas, since, as housewives, they had available the time needed to prepare the traditional foods. This time factor cannot be over-stressed, since many of the more commonly eaten dishes, if prepared properly, can take many hours of work each day.

Settlement in Australia has drastically changed this situation for many women, since they have had to obtain employment outside the home. Consequently, they no longer have the time which they previously had for food preparation. Because of this it could be assumed that there would be a growing tendency to relinquish the traditional food patterns for those which are less time-consuming and which suit their new circumstances better. Although a few cases were noted of this happening, they in no way represent an increasing trend.\textsuperscript{2} In the great majority of homes, the women continued to undertake their "duty" in the kitchen. A good example is provided by the situation of one of the interviewed couples who had migrated from Egypt. Although both the husband and wife worked full-time, they continued to eat only "Armenian" cuisine at each evening meal since the husband refused to eat anything else. Consequently, every night after dinner the wife spent approximately three hours (usually from about eight o'clock until eleven, she said) preparing food for the next evening's dinner. This was considered necessary because the long preparation time which was required for most of the dishes was not available after arriving home from work.

Although such situations obviously do not prevail in all Armenian homes, similar occurrences were quite common. There was no case noted where the husband played an active part in food preparation, except in the more masculine preserve of Australian-style barbeques or picnics.

In conclusion, the food patterns of the Armenians appear to have

\textsuperscript{1} The fact that so few married women had worked overseas supports this assumption (see Chapter Five).

\textsuperscript{2} Even in many of these cases Armenian food was still eaten on special occasions or when sufficient time was available for its preparation.
changed little since migration to Australia, with respect to both the kinds of food eaten and the methods of preparation. In most cases there has been little need to change, as traditional ingredients have been available and Armenian women have continued to accept their traditional role in the kitchen. Consequently, as far as food patterns are concerned, there seems to have been little acculturation to date, at least of those who arrived as adults. That which has occurred appears to be mainly confined to the addition of Australian food practices and foods, rather than to significant acculturation of former food habits.

From the above assessment, it is possible to predict that significant acculturation of food habits in the future, at least for most of these first generation Armenian immigrants, will almost certainly depend upon changes in other aspects of Armenian family life. The most important aspects are the authority structure of the family and the role of the Armenian wife in this structure. Should these change to the point that Armenian wives no longer perceive the preparation of traditional foods to be an obligation, or no longer feel they should be required to carry the full burden of food preparation, then a consequent shift in food habits is likely to occur. Present evidence, however, indicates that such changes are unlikely to take place on a large scale, at least in the foreseeable future.

CHANGES IN LEISURE ACTIVITIES

Johnston (1965a: 15, 19) noted that the leisure activities of immigrants provided an important variable for the examination of acculturation if they were found to be vastly different from those of host society members. Although valid, this assumption needs a further qualification; not only are the kinds of activities important, but the patterns of activities must also be considered. In fact, the leisure activities of the immigrant group may be the same as those of host society members but the emphasis on activities may differ. Consequently, not only must changes in the kinds of activities be examined, but changes in the patterns of these activities.

The principal leisure activities of the Armenians today are, in
order of importance: visiting friends and relatives (18 per cent of those interviewed); watching television (45 per cent); reading (32 per cent). For two-fifths of those interviewed, the kinds of leisure activities pursued have not significantly changed since migration to Australia. One fifth perceived that their leisure activities were now basically those of Australians. The remainder largely continued their former activities, but at the same time expanded them to include some which were seen as primarily Australian. Thus, the majority of the Armenians themselves perceived that changes in their leisure activities have occurred since arrival in Australia.

It was assumed that most changes in leisure activities in the direction of the patterns of Australian society would be largely influenced by two factors - their age on arrival and their period of residence in Australia. An examination of these factors, however, showed that the first was not statistically significant, while the latter indicated just the opposite trend (Table VII.6). The longer-term residents generally consider their activities more Armenian, or at least similar to those they had overseas, while the more recent arrivals feel their activities are more Australian or at least half and half. The main implications of this are that those who have become reestablished in Australia have tended to revert to their former ways.

Even for those who stated that they had not significantly altered their leisure activities in Australia, there were still alterations to the patterns of such activities because of their changed circumstances. Most had come from overseas communities where they had enjoyed an active social life. These communities were not only socially close-knit but usually geographically close as well. Leisure activities were characterized by a continuous round of visiting, club meetings, social gatherings and sporting events within the Armenian community. A typical evening would see a variety of friends and relatives dropping in for a chat. Settlement in Sydney has led to completely different circumstances. No Armenian neighbourhoods have developed, which would facilitate the continuance of the former activities, and even in areas where they are concentrated they have tended to settle widely. Thus, the distances between Armenian households in Sydney must be considered to present some hindrance to easy social intercourse.
Table VII.6
Perception of Changes in Leisure-Time Activities in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of Residence¹</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>No Change (N=)</th>
<th>Activities Are Now Half Australian²</th>
<th>Activities Are Now Mostly Australian³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=) %³</td>
<td>(N=) %³</td>
<td>(N=) %³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(4) 33</td>
<td>(5) 42</td>
<td>(3) 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(9) 28</td>
<td>(16) 50</td>
<td>(7) 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(22) 50</td>
<td>(15) 34</td>
<td>(7) 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(5) 56</td>
<td>(3) 33</td>
<td>(1) 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>(40) 41</td>
<td>(39) 40</td>
<td>(18) 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Combining rows 1 and 2 and rows 3 and 4, $x^2 = 8.6022$, df = 2, sign, at .05 level.
² "Australian" also refers to activities of non-Armenian ethnic groups which are quite common in Australia.
³ All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

The structure of the Sydney Armenian community has also affected the continuation of former leisure activities. Although there are a number of clubs and sporting organizations, they are only able to arrange occasional social events. Most do not have club houses or meeting places where continuous or regular social interaction is possible. Moreover, the factional nature of the community means that many Armenians do not take advantage of many of the social events which do occur. It is partly for these reasons that many have taken advantage of the facilities offered by non-Armenian clubs and sporting organizations.

Probably the most significant change is that which is brought about by the need to become reestablished in Australia. This often requires both husband and wife to work in order to pay for a home, to become financially secure, and so on. Consequently, there is little time available to enjoy the kind of socializing which they were accustomed to overseas. Thus, even though the kinds of leisure activities may not change, under these circumstances the patterns of activities undoubtedly do, at least during the reestablishment period.
Changing patterns of leisure activities do not show true acculturation unless they change away from the Armenian or overseas patterns and in the direction of those of Australian society. Whether or not this occurs is greatly influenced by how immigrants view host society leisure activities. Generally, most of the interviewed Armenians regarded the Australian "stereotyped" activities with disdain. They felt Australians wasted their time and money drinking in the pubs and clubs and failed to spend time with their families or in visiting friends or relatives. There was very little desire on the part of many to participate in these "Australian" activities, except occasionally with workmates when it would have been considered rude to refuse. Thus, the "Australian" activities which were adopted were those of attending Australian clubs, such as leagues clubs, but usually only with the family or close Armenian friends.

In conclusion, although a substantial number of Armenians perceive their leisure activities as changing, for most these activities do not appear to be changing in the direction of greater Australian society. Most changes noted can be classed as "obligatory" acculturation, since the changed circumstances since arrival have made them almost inevitable. So far, then, such acculturation has resulted primarily in temporary alterations to the former leisure patterns with only minor additions of new "Australian" patterns.

---

1 Some changes will undoubtedly occur simply because of the differences in the Australian environment from that of the immigrant's country of origin. Also, it is not necessary for immigrants to adopt only "Australian" leisure patterns to become acculturated. The fact that one-fifth of the Sydney population consists of foreign-born persons and their children means that Armenians may also acculturate to one of these groups, or to any combination of groups and the "Australians" at the same time. The principal criterion for the acculturation of their leisure activities, therefore, is that the changes which occur are not those brought about by the environment, but changes due to contacts with non-Armenians in Australia.

2 Those activities which are felt to be the more common social activities of the Australian male, i.e., drinking with the "mates" in a pub, going to the races, and so on.
APPENDIX VIII

INDICES OF SATISFACTION, IDENTIFICATION AND ACCULTURATION FOR THE SYDNEY ARMENIANS

A. INDEX OF SATISFACTION WITH LIFE IN AUSTRALIA

A number of researchers have used questionnaire responses to measure migrant satisfaction, notably Richardson, Taft and, more recently, Anderson. The principal concern of most has been to divide migrants into satisfied and dissatisfied, and then to show what has led to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Although valuable, most of these studies have been unconcerned with determining the relative level of an individual's satisfaction.

Richardson (1967: 18) introduced a set of six measures of migrant satisfaction which have formed the basis for many of the later studies of migrant satisfaction. These measures were based on whether or not the migrant: was fairly satisfied with life in Australia; was satisfied or dissatisfied with his present accommodation; desired to spend the rest of his life in Australia; was satisfied, or not, with living in his present neighbourhood; had been generally satisfied with life in Australia from time of arrival until present; was satisfied with life in Australia at the present time.

Taft (1961: 269-270) used these measures in a study of Dutch immigrants, although he had included others not used by Richardson. These additional measures were found to be strongly correlated with Richardson's six measures, leading to the conclusion that "it would be possible to extend the satisfaction scale to include further items representing satisfaction in a diversity of life spheres" (Taft, 1961: 272).
Anderson (1979: 215-218), in his recent study of the satisfaction of Latin American migrants in Australia, criticized the "Richardson Scale". He considered the six measures to be repetitious while not being comprehensive. Anderson (1979: 219) selected five questions which he felt suited the Latin American situation better and which allowed for the ordering of responses instead of the yes/no dichotomy generally used in earlier studies. While noting that his questions, like those of the previous studies, could be taken as individual measures of satisfaction, Anderson stressed that combining the results increased the reliability of the overall measures of satisfaction; if a migrant indicates he is satisfied on four of the five measures he can be more reliably classified as satisfied than if only one, two or three indicators show satisfaction.

It is also possible to determine the relative level of a migrant's satisfaction by considering the indicators in combination. Anderson (1979: Appendix IV) did this in his study by identifying three major levels of migration satisfaction, each with three sub-levels. His three major levels are termed "Satisfied", "Neutral" and "Dissatisfied"; while his nine sub-levels ranged from strongly satisfied to strongly dissatisfied (Anderson, 1979: 230). A similar attempt has been made here for the Sydney Armenians, although some of the satisfaction indicators are different.¹

Five questions were intuitively selected to measure the general satisfaction level of the respondents:

1. Would you encourage or discourage your friends or relatives to come here?

2. Have you sponsored any friends or relatives to come to Australia?

¹ Anderson has mixed questions which elicit both responses concerning general satisfaction as well as satisfaction in specific life spheres. In the present study, level of general satisfaction is determined only by measures of overall satisfaction, while specific areas of satisfaction - such as job satisfaction - are examined with respect to the various levels.
3. If you could make the choice again, would you still migrate to Australia, or would you choose to go to another country, or would you not migrate at all?

4. Did you plan to settle here permanently when you first arrived?

5. Do you consider your life is generally satisfactory now?

All questions are positively associated in that a positive answer indicates satisfaction with Australia, while a negative answer indicates dissatisfaction. A neutral answer is taken to indicate that the migrant is neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Questions one through three indirectly ask the migrant to assess Australia as a satisfactory country in which to live and whether or not he is happy with having settled here. Question four is taken to indicate his desire at time of arrival to remain in Australia and his propensity to become satisfied. Question five is the migrant's own evaluation of his life in Australia at the time of the Survey.

An unweighted, standardized score was assigned to each answer, depending upon whether it indicated satisfaction with Australia (score = 2), dissatisfaction (score = 0) or neither (score = 1). For example, in answer to the first question, those who would encourage friends or relatives to migrate to Australia were given a score of two, those who would discourage them from coming, a score of zero, and those who would neither encourage or discourage them were given a score of one. Thus it was possible for unweighted tallies of individual migrant scores of general satisfaction to range from zero to 10, with 10 indicating that the migrant is probably the most generally satisfied with life in Australia and zero indicating that he

---

1 The migrants' current desire to permanently remain in Australia was not asked, since the fact that they still resided here at the time of the Survey is taken to be indicative of this.
is probably the least. A score of five therefore indicated an individual who is neither very satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Table VIII.1 gives a breakdown of the satisfaction scores of the 97 interviewed respondents.

### Table VIII.1
Satisfaction Scores of Sydney Armenians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Most satisfied</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Least satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

It is clear that the large majority of the interviewed respondents lie at the "Most Satisfied" end of the scale, with the average satisfaction score being 7.6 for all 97 interviewees. Based on this average score and a standard deviation of 2.1, three "levels" of satisfaction are identified here: those with a score of 10 are considered the highly satisfied; those with six, seven, eight or nine are considered those who exhibit medium satisfaction; those with a score of five or below are in the low satisfaction category.

1 Dissatisfaction is treated here as a low level of satisfaction. Although on this 10 point scale four and below is very likely a strong indicator of dissatisfaction, for the purposes here it is considered a low level of satisfaction.
B. INDEX OF IDENTIFICATION WITH AUSTRALIA

The following questions were intuitively selected as the best measures of the current level of Armenian identification with Australia:

(1) If you were on a trip overseas and someone asked you your nationality, would you tell him you were "An Armenian" , "An Australian" , "An Armenian living in Australia" , or "Other"?

(2) Do you feel that an Australian can be as close a friend to you as another Armenian?

(3) Do you feel Australians discriminate against immigrants in general?

(4) Do you feel that, because you are living in Australia, you should live like an Australian?

These four questions are taken as measures of the individual Armenian's perception of his own identity (question one), his perception of his similarity to Australians (questions two and three) and his attitude towards the adoption of Australian identity (question four).

In addition, three indirect measures of identification with Australia were derived from the interview information: the level of social participation in formal Australian organizations; the frequency of home visits with Australians and the speed with which the interviewees have become naturalized Australians. By assigning standardized scores to these measures, based on the degree of identification with Australia indicated by each, the relative level of a respondent's identification can be determined.

Table VIII.2 presents the seven indicators used in determining the respondent's Identification with Australia Index. Scores are standardized and range from zero to one, with zero indicating that the individual does not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Respondent identified himself as:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian of Armenian extraction</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian or other living in Australia</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian or other</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Respondent feels an Australian:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be as close a friend as another Armenian</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot be as close a friend as another Armenian</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Respondent feels:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians don't discriminate against migrants in general</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians do discriminate against migrants in general</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Respondent feels:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He should live like an Australian</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He should live neither like an Australian nor Armenian</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He should live as he did before migration</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Respondent's level of participation in Australian organizations is:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High¹</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Respondent visits or is visited by Australians in the home:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often²</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Respondent became naturalized:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the minimum period of time³</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the minimum period of time + 1 year</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the minimum period of time + 5 years</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not eligible</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is eligible, but not yet naturalized</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ These three levels of social participation are based on the average participation score and the range of scores of those who participate. 71 interviewed respondents participated in Australian organizations for a mean score of 3.32. The range of the score was 1-9, consequently, low participation was taken to be scores of 1 or 2, medium 3 or 4, high 5+.  

² These categories are equated as follows:  

- **Often** = At least weekly  
- **Sometimes** = At least monthly  
- **Seldom** = Only a few times a year  
- **Never** = Has never visited or been visited.  

³ The minimum period of time for eligibility for naturalization has changed twice since World War II with respect to non-Europeans. In 1957 non-Europeans, not married to Australians, could qualify for citizenship on completing 15 years of residence. In 1966 this was changed to 5 years and (contd.)
again in 1973 was changed to 3 years. The situation for the Armenians is further complicated by the fact that they have come from European and non-European countries and held both European and non-European citizenships. For example, an Armenian who came from England on a British passport in 1970 could become naturalized within a year of arrival while one who came on an Iranian passport in the same year would have had to reside for at least 5 years. The situation becomes even more complex when marriage to an Australian citizen is included. Such persons become exempt from the normal residential requirements. With regard to the interviewed respondents all of these factors have been taken into account in assigning them to one of these categories.
identify with Australia and one indicating positive identification. The composite scores for the respondents therefore range from zero to seven, again denoting a continuum of identification with Australia from a low level to a high level. It should be emphasized that low scores on this index do not necessarily mean that the respondent is highly identified as an Armenian but simply that he fails to identify himself strongly as an Australian.

Based on the mean composite score of 3.46 for the 97 interviewed respondents and a standard deviation of 1.25, high, medium and low levels of identification with Australia were derived. Table VIII.3 gives a breakdown of the distribution of the respondents across the three levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification Level</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (4.72-7)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (2.21-4.71)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (0-2.2)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

1 A score of zero could therefore be taken to be equivalent to no identification with Australia.
Since the primary concern here is an examination of the psychological adjustment of the Armenians in Australia, the Index of Acculturation is derived solely from variables which relate to internal acculturation. The following are the five variables which were selected to measure the acculturation level of the 97 interviewed respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Authority Structure of Family:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Dominance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Individual</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Characteristics of Ideal Daughter-in-Law:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional response</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When Children Can Make Their Own Decisions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional responses</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(never, both son and daughter married, son a certain age, daughter when married)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(when they want to, when they start work, finish school, etc.; same for sons and daughters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When Children Should be Allowed to Leave Home:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional responses</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(when both are married, boys certain age or self-supporting and girls married)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(certain age, start work, same for sons and daughters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Who Looks After Parents When They Retire:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional response</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the scores shown above, any case where there was no response or incomplete information on a variable the score of 0.5 is assigned, indicating a neutral response.

The information supplied on the above five variables by those interviewed was scored and the scores added to obtain each respondent's Index
of Acculturation, which is taken as his overall degree of acculturation. The scores for individual respondents ranged from zero to five, with zero indicating little or no internal acculturation and five signifying maximum internal acculturation. Table VIII.4 shows the distribution of the scores for the 97 interviewees.

Table VIII.4

Distribution of Index of Acculturation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>%(^1) of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 Least Acculturated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 97 100

\(^1\) All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

Using the mean score of 2.4 for all 97 interviewed respondents and the standard deviation of 1.28, three levels of internal acculturation are identified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level of Acculturation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3.5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1.5</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The traditional Armenian family was patriarchal, with the eldest male as head of the entire family. Usually he was the grandfather and his wife served as the recognized head of all the females in the household. It was not uncommon for the rural household to contain as many as 50 to 60 persons since the members consisted of the patriarch, his wife, their sons, the wives of married sons and all unmarried daughters. In some cases the brothers of the patriarch and their families were included (Matossian, 1962: 3). These large households brought the families both power and prestige and for this reason there was much social pressure for extended families to remain together (Matossian, 1962: 6).

All members of the household were subject to the decisions of the patriarch, who had to be obeyed at all times. There was seldom any disobedience, however, as obedience to the father's, and especially the grandfather's word was instilled from birth (Nelson, 1954b: 13).

All family income was at the disposal of the patriarch, who directed the family's work routine and oversaw all economic transactions. Although in the more important affairs he would consult with the adult members of the family, the final decision was his (Matossian, 1962: 3). Within the traditional family the dominance and superiority of the elders and of the males was well established. Sons were generally allowed greater freedom than daughters and their wishes were more often heeded. The girls were kept at home to learn and perform the domestic duties of wife and mother while the boys were allowed to run errands and work in the fields. Sisters looked to their brothers for protection and advice and were required to be obedient to them. When a bride took up residence in her husband's home she not only became a member of her husband's family, but was also required to remain silent and to speak to no males except her children.
Both the parents might administer punishment to their children. The usual form was a reprimand although physical punishment might be resorted to if necessary. In most cases, children were lectured about the values and traditions of Armenian family life. They were also taught to fear and respect their fathers and to love their mothers and were often told that their parents made every sacrifice for their welfare (Nelson, 1954b: 14).

When girls reached puberty they were no longer allowed to play with boys. Around this time a girl's parents arranged for her betrothal and marriage, usually to a boy of 18-20 years. Although romances were not uncommon, the parents' approval was still required before marriage. The prime consideration for most marriages was the extent of the mutual benefits which the match might bring to the respective families (Matossian, 1962: 5).

Between betrothal and marriage, the young couple were allowed to meet, but never alone. Loss of virginity before marriage was the greatest disgrace for a girl, as well as her family, and if it occurred her future chances of marriage were very slim. Greater tolerance was shown to unmarried boys, although premarital intercourse was still rare. Extramarital relations were virtually unknown (Atamian, 1949).

It was common for elderly parents to live with their sons who were expected to support them. Older persons were always treated with respect, but if the patriarch became too old to continue his duties, his authority usually passed to his eldest son or brother (Matossian, 1962: 5).

Within the household, the productive activity was strictly divided between men and women. All domestic duties were performed by the women who prepared the meals, made the clothes, and so on. The men were responsible for all work in the fields, house construction, and skilled trades. There was usually no sharing of work by men and women (Matossian, 1962: 6).

In summary, the traditional Armenian family was patriarchal, extended or joint, patrilineal and patrilocal. All authority was vested in the senior male of the household and men were considered dominant and
superior to women. Parents were responsible for making most of the decisions concerning their children's lives, including choice of marriage partners. The relations between unmarried children were very restricted after puberty, with much of the honour of the family vested in the daughters retaining their virginity until marriage. Both before and after marriage men and women performed separate roles in the household and did not participate in each others' work activities. Sons lived with and supported their elderly parents once they could no longer work.

Much pressure was placed on the traditional structure of the Armenian family, beginning in the latter part of the last century. The first influence came from the introduction of Western education and ideas by Protestant missionaries. This led to attempts to emulate the Western style of life which was antithetical to the patriarchal family structure. As noted by Matossian (1962: 212) "It was among the Armenians most influenced by Western education that traditional values had lost the most ground".

The greatest changes resulted from the massacres and dispersions of the World War I period. Families were often shattered with some members killed and others dispersed widely in different countries. Even where families were able to remain intact, the fact that most settled in cities and other urban areas necessitated alterations to the traditional family structure. No longer was it possible for extended families to reside in the same household and to be semiautonomous. This meant the demise of the traditional patriarchal structure of the Armenian family, with the authority previously held by the grandfather passing to the father.¹

However, many of the families retained the extended family bonds and it was common for large numbers of related families to reside in the same areas. This was especially true in the Arab countries where the Armenian refugees and their families lived in ethnic enclaves and reestablished large thriving communities. The arrangement of a number of nuclear families

¹ Nelson (1954b: 59) noted that one of the chief factors in the decay of grandparental control of Armenian families who migrated to the United States after World War I was the acceptance by married children of the common non-Armenian practice of leaving the parental home after marriage.
tied together by these extended family bonds proved a good compromise in their new circumstances, as it permitted mutual support while allowing maximum autonomy. This type of family has been found elsewhere and is termed by Litwak (1960b: 10) a "modified" extended family, as opposed to what is generally thought of as the "classical" extended family. The modified extended family is described as consisting of a series of nuclear families bound together on an egalitarian basis, with a strong emphasis on extended family bonds as an end value. It differs from the latter in that it does not demand close geographical propinquity, occupational involvement or nepotism, nor does it have a hierarchal authority structure. On the other hand it differs from the nuclear family structure in that it provides significant and continuing aid to the nuclear family.

This change from the more classical extended family to that of a modified extended family is a very important one. As noted by Litwak (1960a: 385-386), it is consistent with democratic industrial society, that is, with modern economic systems, as well as being an important aid to the geographical mobility of its members. The fact that most Armenian migration to Australia was family migration and most immigrants were sponsored by relatives in Australia is indicative of the latter aspect; while the very rapid occupational adjustment of the Armenians after arrival is indicative of the former. It must also be considered important with respect to the preservation of traditional Armenian family values. Besides providing mutual support to the nuclear families, the presence of extended family bonds must also be considered to provide the atmosphere and social pressure needed for the continuation of traditional family values.

Thus, although the traditional Armenian family structure was largely replaced by a "modified" form by the time Armenians began to arrive in Australia in numbers, many of the family values which had originated in the earlier structure continued to be preserved. Settlement in Australia can be assumed to have set in motion at least some changes in these values and their associated behaviour.
THIS BIBLIOGRAPHY IS PRESENTED
IN THE STANDARD
AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL FORMAT
**Abdel-Malik, A.**  

**Ablon, J.**  

**Abrahamian, R.A.**  
1968  Eighteenth Century Armenian Sources on India. Epebah.  
(In Russian. Summary in English).

**Abu-Lughod, J.**  
1961-62  Migrant Adjustment to City Life: The Egyptian Case.  

**Adams, J.S.**  

**Allen, S.**  
1971  New Minorities: Old Conflicts: Asian and West Indian Immigrants in Britain.  

**Anderson, P.**  
1979  Latin Americans in Australia: A Study of Migrant Satisfaction.  

**Appleyard, R.T.**  
1963  The Economics of Recent Emigration to Australia from Germany and the Netherlands.  

**Arberry, A.J. (ed.)**  
1969  Religion in the Middle East.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Arensberg, C.M.**  
1961  The Community as Object and Sample.  

**Arlan, M.J.**  
1975  Passage to Ararat.  
New York: Ballantine.

**Armenian Youth Federation of America**  
1947  The Armenians in Diaspora. Blue Book No. III.  
Boston: Hairenik Press.

**Arpee, L.**  
1909  The Armenian Awakening.  
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.


Australian Department of Immigration 1974 Australia and Immigration. A Review of Migration to Australia, Especially Since World War II. Canberra: Australian Department of Immigration.


Barakat, H.I.  

Barbour, K.M.  
1961  The Republic of the Sudan.  
London: University of London Press.

Barron, M.L.  

Basil, A.  
1969  Armenian Settlements in India.  
Calcutta: The Armenian College.

Beijer, G.  

Bell, C. and H. Newby  

Bernard, W.  

Bogue, D.J.  

Borhek, J.T.  

Borrie, W.D.  
1954  Italians and Germans in Australia.  
Melbourne: Cheshire.

1959  The Cultural Integration of Immigrants. Paris: UNESCO.

Bott, E.  

Bottomley, G.  

Bowen, M. (ed.)  

Breton, R.  
Bromley, J.E.

Broom, L. and F.L. Jones

Broom, L., F.L. Jones and J. Zubrzycki
1965 An Occupational Classification of the Australian Workforce. Supplement to Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 1(2).

Brown, L.A. and E.J. Moore

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.

Bullard, Sir R.

Burgess, E.W.

Burney, C. and D.M. Lang

Burnley, I.H.


Burnley, I.H.

Burtt, J.


Butler, E.W.

Butterworth, E. and D. Weir

Buxton, N. and Rev. H. Buxton

Campisi, P.J.

Caplow, T.

Chakmakjian, H.

Charanis, P.
Charsley, S.R.

Chevan, A.

Child, I.L.

Chimbos, P.D.

Choi, C.Y.

Choldin, H.M.

Chopourian, G.H.

Chorley, R. and P. Haggett (eds.)

Choucri, N.

Christopher, A.M.

Churchill, C.W.

Chyz, J. and R. Lewis

Clark, W.A.V.
Clarke, J.I. and W.B. Fisher

Clyne, M.G.

Cohen, A.

Cohen, E.

Colless, B.

Congalton, A.A.

Conybeare, F.C.

Corbyn, F.C.

Craig, J. (J. Martin)

Cronin, C.

Curzon, R. 1854 Armenia: A Year at Ezeroon and on the Frontiers of Russia, Turkey and Persia. London: Murray.


Driedger, L.

Duncan, O.D. and B. Duncan

Duncan, O.D. and S. Lieberson

Eisenstadt, S.N.

Elkin, A.P.

Encel, S.

Encel, L., B. Buckley and J.F. Schreiber

Encyclopedia Britannica (14th ed.)
1938 Armenia. 2: 377-381.

Fedden, R.

Ferrier, R.W.

Fisher, W.A.

Fishman, J. (ed.)
Fishman, J.


Fishman, J. and V.C. Nahirny


Fitzpatrick, J.P.

Ford, T.R. and G. DeJong (eds.)

Galvin, J.P.


Gans, H.J.

Gavoor, A.

Germani, G.

Gibbons, H.A.

Glazer, D.
Glazer, N.  

Glazer, N. and D.P. Moynihan  


Goldscheider, C.  

Goldstein, S.  

Gordon, A.I.  

Gordon, M.  

Gracey, G.Y.  

Great Soviet Encyclopedia (3rd. ed.)  

Grigorian, S.  

Gulick, J.  


Hallowell, I.A.  

Hamalian, A.  

Harik, I.  
Harvey, S.  

Hayden, R.G.  

Heiss, J.  

Hepworth, Rev. G.H.  

Herbst, P.G.  

Hewson, R.H.  

Hitti, P.K.  

Hodge, R.W. and P. Hodge  

Hoffman, N.N.H.  

Horobin, J.W.  

Horowitz, D.L.  

Hoult, T.F.  

Hourani, A.H.  
1970 Race, Religion and Nation-State in the Near East.  

Housepian, M.  

Hovanessian, R.  
Hovannisian, R.G.

Huber, R.

Ianni, F.A.J.

Ibrahim, S.E.

Issaacs, H.R.

Issawi, C.P.

Jackson, J.A. (ed.)

Jahn, J., C.F. Schmid and C. Schrag

Jaunzems, I. and L.B. Brown

Johnston, R.
Johnston, R.J.
1971b Urban Residential Patterns. London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd.

Jonassen, C.T.

Jones, F.L.

Jordan, R.P.

Kaloustian, S.

Katz, F.E.

Kernaklian, P.

Klarberg, M.

Kosa, J.

Kulhanjian, G.A.
Kunz, E.F.  

Kurkjian, V.M.  

Lang, D.M.  

Lansing, J.B. and N. Barth  

La Piere, T.R.  

Lee, E.S.  
1970 The Role of the Ethnic Community as a Reception Area for Italian Immigrants in Melbourne, Australia. International Migration 8(1/2): 50-63.  

Lewis, B.  

Lieberson, S.  

Lieberson, S. and T.F. Curry  

Liffman, M.  

Lippmann, W.  
Litwak, E.

Lockhart, L.

Longrigg, S.H.

Lutfiyya, A.M. and C.W. Churchill (eds.)

Lynch, H.F.B.

Lynch, K.
1960 The Image of the City. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

MacDonald, J.S.

MacDonald, J.S. and L.D. MacDonald.

MacIver, R.M.

MacIver, F.

McEwan, P.J.M.

McIntire, D.

McLoughlin, P.M.

Mahakian, C.

Malcom, M.V.

Mangalam, J.J.
Mangalam, J. J. and H. K. Schwarzweller

Mann, P. H.

Mapstone, J. R.

Marcson, S. A.

Mardian, C. F.

Mardikian, G. M.

Martin, J. I.

Matossian, M.

Mead, M.

Medding, P.

Megrian, L. D.
Melikian, L.H. and A.D. Karapetian

Melkonian, V.

Minasian, A.D.

Minasian, E.


Mirak, R.

Mirzaian, A.


Missakian, J.

Mitchell, J.C. (ed.)

Moldofsky, N.


Moore, E.G.

Morgan, J.

Morgenthau, H.
Morris, H.S.  

Murphy, H.B.M.  

Murphy, R.T.  

Nahirny, V.C. and J. Fishman  


Nalbandian, L.  

Nansen, F.  

National Population Inquiry  

Neiva, A.H. and M. Diegues, Jr.  

Nelson, H.  


Nercessian, V.  

New Encyclopedia Britannica (15th. ed.)  
1974 Armenian Catholic Church. 1: 524.


O'Brien, P.  

Opperman, H.  


1971a Australian Immigration, A Bibliography and Digest (No. 2). Canberra: Australian National University Press.
1974 The Great White Walls are Built: Restrictive Immigration to North America and Australasia, 1836-1888. Canberra: Australian Institute of International Affairs with the Australian National University Press.
Price, C.A. and J. Martin (eds.)  
1976 Australian Immigration, Part 1, No. 3.  
Canberra: Australian National University Press.  

Price, C.A. and A. Mirzaian  

Price, C.A. and P. Pyne  
1970 Migration from the United Arab Republic to Australia.  
Migration Today 14: 33-40.  

Price, C.A. and J. Zubrzycki  

Prothro, E.T.  

Raffi, A.  

Redfield, R., R. Linton and M. Herskovits  

Reynolds, L.G.  

Richardson, A.  
Richardson, A.

Richmond, A.
1967  Post-War Immigrants in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Richardson, A. and R.P. Verma

Rogers, T.W.

Rogg, E.

Rondot, P.

Rossi, P.H.

Royal Central Asian Society

Ruesch, J., M.B. Loeb and A. Jacobson

Sanjian, A.K.

Sarkisian, E.K. and R.G. Sahakian

Sarkissian, A.O.

Sarkissian, K.
Sarkissian, K.

Scheff, T.J.

Schorger, W.D.

Scott, P.

Sengstock, M.C.

Shannon, L.W. and M. Shannon

Shaw, S.

Shevky, E. and W. Bell

Silver, B.D.

Simmons, J.W.

Simpson, J.H.

Singer, M.

Smith, T.L.
Smith, W.C.  
1939  

Smolicz, J.J. and R. McL. Harris  
1977  

Spindler, G.  
1955  

Spiro, M.E.  
1955  

Stilwell, F.J.B. and J. Hardwick  
1973  

Stimson, R.J.  
1970  

Stirling, P.  
1970  

Stoller, A.  
1966  

Stookey, R.W.  
1976  

Sweet, L.E. (ed.)  
1970  

Taft, R.  
1953  

1957  

1960  

1961  

1962  

1963  
Taft, R.
1965  From Stranger to Citizen.  Perth:  University of Western Australia Press.
Taft, R. and A.G. Doczy
Tashjian, J.H.
Taylor, L.
Teo, S.E.
Thomas, B.
Throssell, H. (ed.)
Tilley, C.
Tilley, C. and C.H. Brown
Timms, D.
Toriguian, S.  

Torrey, G.H.  

Tritton, A.S.  

Trlin, A.D.  


Vernant, J.  

Verwey-Jonker, H. and P. Brackel  

Vincent, Joan  

Wallis, Wilson  

Ward, R.  

Warner, W.L.  

Warner, W.L. and L. Srole  

Watson, J.L. (ed.)  


Watson, P. (ed.)  

Weaver, T. and D. White  
Weiermair, K.

Weinberg, A.A.

Weinstock, S.A.
1964 Some Factors that Retard or Accelerate the Rate of Acculturation, with Special Reference to Hungarian Immigrants. Human Relations 17: 321-340.

Wilson, P.R.

Wolpert, J.

Yale, W.

Yarwood, A.T.
1968 Attitudes to Non-European Immigration. Melbourne: Cassell Australia.

Yeretzian, A.

Zeidner, R.F.

Zelinsky, W.

Ziegler, S.

Zimmer, B.G.

Zubrzycki, J.
Zubrzycki, J.