

İnan, A. M. (2013). The Effect of Settlement Duration on Integration Levels of Turkish Immigrants in Australia, *Turkish Journal of Sociology*, 2013/2, 3/27, 273-293.

The Effect of Settlement Duration on Integration Levels of Turkish Immigrants in Australia*

Ayşe Mahinur İnan**

Abstract: The main concern of the societies that occur through migrations or take international migrations is to create harmonious societies. The harmonious society can be created as a result of integrating the immigrants within the community. Integration is closely related to the settlement duration besides other factors. This article aims to make the analysis of the integration level among Turkish immigrants in Australia depending upon their settlement durations. This study includes literature research as well as field research. In the part of literature research, the case of Australia's migration and the migration story of Turkish people will be discussed from a historical perspective. In the field research, the results of the survey conducted to 152 Turkish immigrants living in Sydney will be discussed. At the end of the study, it has been shown that the integrations of Turkish immigrants are not completed.

Keywords: Migration, Settlement Duration, Field Research, Turkish Immigrants, Australia

Yerleşim Süresinin Avustralya'daki Türk Göçmenlerin Entegrasyon Seviyesine Etkisi

Özet: Göçler yolu ile meydana gelen veya uluslararası göç alan toplumların temel ilgisi farklı kültürlerin birbirleri ile uyum içerisinde yaşamasını sağlayabilmektir. Birbirleri ile uyumlu-ahenkli bir toplum, göçmenlerin entegrasyonu ile gerçekleştirilebilir. Entegrasyon, göç edilen ülkede yaşama süresi ile yakından ilişkilidir. Bu makalede Türk göçmenlerin Avustralya'da yerleşme süreleri göz önünde bulundurularak entegrasyon seviyelerine ilişkin bir analiz yapılacaktır. Bu çalışmada literatür taraması ve saha araştırmasının sonuçları yer alacaktır. Literatür taraması kısmında Avustralya'nın ve Avustralyalı Türklerin göç hikâyeleri tarihsel olarak incelenecektir. Saha araştırması bölümünde, Sydney'de 152 Türk göçmene uygulanan anket sonuçları değerlendirilecektir. Çalışmanın sonunda, Türk göçmenlerin entegrasyonunun tamamlanmadığı görülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Göç, Yerleşme Süresi, Saha Araştırması, Türk Göçmenler, Avustralya

* The data used in this article was collected in 2011 for my MA research. The same data is analyzed from a different perspective in this study.

** Research Assistant, Istanbul University Faculty of Letters Department of Sociology, aysemahi@gmail.com.

Introduction

Migration has been a very important phenomenon in the history of humanity. People started migrating ages ago, they still go on migrating and most probably they will do so in the future. Migrations affect the structure of the world as a whole because it leads to some changes and even transformations in cultures and societies. The world turning into a 'small village' as a result of globalization makes migration easier and more widespread than before. According to World Migration Report (2010, p.115) "The total number of international migrants worldwide in 2010 is estimated to be 214 million persons". This number is 3.1 percent of the world population. There is a big growth in the number of the immigrants within ten years while demographic growth of world population is constant. It is stated that there were 150 million migrants in 2000 World Migration Report and "the figure could rise to 405 million by 2050" (2010, p. XIX). The growth of immigrants reveals how important to investigate migration phenomenon all over the world. In social sciences, migration has been discussed and studied by several disciplines. According to Haas (2007), the differentiations among these disciplines, paradigms and analysis levels lead to extensive discussions in order to understand the nature, causes and results of migration (p. 9). It is obvious that there is not merely one theory to understand and analyse the migration process. In another words, there is no specific discipline which studies the migration process and phenomenon as a whole.

Every migration case has own causes, structures and types. Theories of migration examine causes, structures of migrations and conditions of the homeland and the host society. According to these properties, theoreticians determine the typology of the migration. Theories on migration vary according to these classifications. Some theoreticians give priority to the causes of migration when they build their theoretical grounds whereas some others give importance to the structures or types of migration. Since the classifications can be done through different perspectives and migration phenomenon goes back a long way, there are so many migration theories. Basically, migrations have economic and social causes. Moreover, the structure of migration is either internal or external. However, it can be said that all these classifications contain each other. To exemplify, the structure of a migration may be internal and it may be due to economic reasons, or likewise it may be international and of economic reasons.

Even if migration, as a move from one place to another, is as old as the history of humanity, the migration is a modern world phenomenon and its theories have considerably increased after Industrial Revolution. At first, migrations were commenced from rural to urban. So, first migration theories

are interested in urban-rural migrations. Afterwards, since rural migrations did not meet labour needs of industries, industrialized countries opened their doors to external immigrants. For that reason, theories of migration have focused on international migrations. There is a differentiation in the 19th century migration theories and 20th century ones. Previous ones focus on only one theoretical perspective related to push and pull factors of migration while modern social scientists have developed several theoretical models using different concepts and hypotheses (Abadan-Unat, 2006, p. 21).

Formerly, migration theories especially focus on migration process including causes, motivation, distance and structure. These theories generally cover before and during migration period. However, migration process is not completed by moving from one place to another because it also consists of post-migration period in which there are lots of things such as integration, culture, and acculturation to analyse. Migration process is generally analysed to comprehend the properties of migration and to get solutions for problems arising from the migration process.

Migration process includes dynamism of its own for both host society and immigrant society. It leads to changes and transformation of both sides. However these changes and transformations bring about the problems of migration process. Contemporary migration studies especially focus on integration and harmony rather than causes and the structure of migration, a topic which has been previously studied. Different policies have been developed to manage the problems which stem from the various cultures being together and the conflict arising from their clash. These include assimilation policies, emigration, genocide, melting pot and multiculturalist policies. These policies are mainly divided into two categories. The first type of policies does not give the chance of life to the members of minorities; they are either killed (genocide) or forced to accept being assimilated within the culture of the dominant society by leaving their own cultural traits. The reason for these practises is to protect monoculture idea of the nation state. Moreover; with the weakening of the nation-state idea, and the influence of rising international migrations, the policies have to be altered and adopted in the age of migrations. Multiculturalist policies started being discussed and applied. The main purpose of the new policies is to provide the integration of immigrants and to create a harmonious society. Countries such as Australia and Canada develop multicultural policies to deal with the problems arising from migration which, in turn, leads to changes in migration policies. They are the most important countries implementing the multiculturalist policies all over the world, since both countries are created with immigrants from different cultures.

Migration is not just about moving from one place to another, it is also about culture, integration and acceptance. Besides, it is not only related to how immigrants experience the migration process and their integration but also related to how the host society perceive the migration and experience the life with the immigrants. In this study, we will concentrate on migration process from the immigrant's perspective, which is the integration level of Turkish immigrants in Australian society. Firstly, the societal structure of Australia has to be historically investigated to have a better understanding of the position of immigrants. Moreover, Turkish people in Australia play an important role in migration studies since they have a different status in a particular context. The importance of this case is related to two basic issues, which are the migration distance and Australia's migration policies. Actually these issues are the same for all Europeans who migrate to Australia, which is also far from their homeland. Moreover, another particular issue regarding Turkish case is that cultural and religious peculiarities of Turkish society are different from host society and other European immigrant societies.

The organization of the article is as follows: The first section reviews some literature background on Australian historical context of migration, which constitutes the major focus of this study. The story of Turkish immigrants is discussed in the second section. In multicultural Australia, Turkish immigrants have a distinguished status because of their different cultural and religious practices from the host society and other European immigrants. Therefore, it is thought to be important to give a brief summary of Turkish people's migration stories. The third section presents the case study carried out in Australian Turkish immigrant community. The effects of settlement duration on integrations of Turkish people living in Australia are analyzed through surveys conducted to 152 Turkish immigrants living in Sydney which has the second largest Turkish population in this country and the results of the surveys are discussed. Finally, the concluding remarks and the points requiring further attention are mentioned in the last section.

This study is a descriptive research adopting the snowball survey technique. Our independent variable is settlement duration. We will analyze the impact of settlement duration on several dependent variables such as language acquisition, neighborhood relationship, close friendship, the perceptions of culture, marriage patterns, social structure and the preference of living place to understand the perceptions of immigrants and their integration levels.

Historical Context of Migration in Australia

Australia was the land of Aboriginal people whose origin goes back to prehistoric times. According to Day (2003, p. 1), they arrived and settled

40.000-50.000 years ago, while to West and Murphy (2010, p.13); the history of Aboriginal people dates back to 60.000 years ago and the first European (Dutch) sighting is in 1606. They named the continent as "*New Holland*" but they did not settle there. After exploration of Australia by Englishman in 1788, the first fleet of settlers from different nationalities such as English, Scottish, Germans, Norwegians sailed from England and landed the continent. The British fleet consisted of 443 sailors, 759 convicts (191 of whom were women), 13 children of convicts, 160 marines, 51 officers, 27 wives, 19 children of free parents, and nine staff members for Governor Phillip (West and Murphy, 2010, p.41, cited in Clarke). Although the passengers had various nationalities, the dominant majority was English (West and Murphy, p.44). The continent became the penalty colony of Britain.

The brief history of Australia enables us to understand the structure of this country. This is the story of Englishman, which has started with establishing a penal colony and governing the island continent. "About 80000 convicts were transported to New South Wales from 1788–1840, a number almost matched by the 61000 free immigrants who arrived, mainly in family groups, in the short period from 1836 to 1842" (Markus, Jupp, McDonald, 2009, p.53). With the British settlers, Australia has its own new settlers. New settlers sent the old ones—the Aborigines to the margins and applied an immigration control policy which is known as "White Australia Policy" started from 1880's. "When the Commonwealth was founded in 1901 this control went to the new government, which immediately passed the Immigration Restriction Act through parliament. This remained in force until replaced by the Migration Act in 1958" (Jupp, 2002, p.8). White Australia Policy is implemented to create a perfect white nation. According to Immigration Restriction Act, people are allowed to migrate provided that they write in an European language and they shouldn't be insane or idiot. Anyone, who is suffering from an infectious or contagious disease of a loathsome or dangerous character, is not allowed to enter the country. Even it is stated that "any prostitute or person living on the prostitution of others" is prohibited. These detailed restrictions are related to create a perfect and European nation. According to Jupp (2007, p. 12), there was a consensus to create a mono-racial society and Tavan (2005, p.12) mentions that Australia was 100 percent white and 98 percent British according to the statistical data of 1943.

With the decrease of European migration rate, Australia has to open its doors to Asian immigrants. Australia preferred to accept permanent immigrants rather than guest workers as many European countries did because it aimed to create a nation. As Manderson and Inglis (1984, p. 259) state that "the Australian policy envisaged that migrants would come permanently to

Australia, rather than temporarily as guest workers, and conditions of entry and settlement provisions focused on family migration and the assimilation of immigrants. Since the middle of the 1970s "assimilation" has been replaced by the policy goal of "multiculturalism". Australia has opened its doors to the immigrants from various cultural backgrounds to create a nation and to have workforce, so it has to implement the multicultural policies to provide harmony among all cultures in the society. Multiculturalism of Australia is defined firstly in 1977 with the report of Australian Ethnic Affairs Council. To the report (p. 14), "What we believe Australia should be working towards is not a oneness, but a unity, not a similarity, but a composite, not a melting pot but a voluntary bond of dissimilar people sharing a common political and institutional structure".

Current Migration Program of Australia lets people who want to be an immigrant in Australia to apply ignoring their ethnical backgrounds, culture, and religions. Fact Sheet 20-Migration Program Planning Levels from the Department of Immigration and Citizenship states that "Australia's current permanent immigration program consists of two components which are migration and humanitarian. Migration component includes qualified immigrants, family compounds and migrants with a Special Eligibility class visa. Humanitarian component is for refugees and others in humanitarian need". Australia's migration programs changes according to its needs. Previously Australia needed unqualified labor force, while it currently needs qualified labor force.

Australia is an immigrant country with very big cultural diversity. The number of spoken languages and ancestries in the classification of Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) indicates that how Australia has cultural diversities. According to 2011 Census report, there are over 300 ancestries and over 200 spoken languages in Australia. Turkish population, which is the first non-European country signed migration agreement in Australia, is one of these diversities. In the following section, we will touch upon the history of Turkish immigrants within this context.

Turkish People in Australia

After World War II, labor demand of European countries is responded by bilateral workforce agreements. Turkey sent lots of guest workers to European countries temporarily. At that time, Turkey was in depression. The situation of European countries and Turkish people was in complementary distribution because European countries have demands for work force and Turkish people were disposed to work abroad. According to Babacan (2001, p.782), the success of Turkish people as guest workers in Europe attracted great attention

of Australian government. The government saw the Turkish people as potential immigrant source during the times British and European immigration rates decreased. At the same period, the labor demand of European countries from abroad decreased but the desire of Turkish people to go abroad for work was the same as before. With the demand of Australia Government, the bilateral workforce agreement was signed between Turkey and Australia in 1967. This agreement and the demand of Australia for workforce were different from the ones of European countries. Australia has needed not only workforce but also *nation*. As we mentioned before, it opened its doors to permanent immigrants. After the bilateral agreement, Australian government made interviews with immigrant candidates. The discard eligibility was related to desire on immigration duration and working capacity. According to the agreement, Turkish immigrants have to stay for at least 2 years. Otherwise they are obliged to pay back the expenditures of Australian government. The expectation of the first immigrant generation about their migration is working for 2 years in Australia, saving money and going back to Turkey. Only a small proportion of the immigrants did what they want but some of them going back to Turkey re-migrated to Australia within a couple of years.

According to the data obtained from the Internet page of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship, the bilateral “agreement aimed for an intake of 30 per cent skilled and 70 per cent unskilled migrants. Although a greater proportion of the immigrants in the first years of the program were unskilled and found employment as laborers and process workers in the manufacturing sector”. “During the first period, migration was mainly through the large scale, impersonally-organized migration program. Migrants were characteristically village-born, young couples (with young children) with limited formal education and little experience of working in an industrialized setting” (İçduygu, 1994, p. 76).

To 2011 census report, the current population growth of Turkish people is around 67000 but to unofficial records around 150 thousand Turkish people live in Australia. Nearly 92 percent of them have dual citizenship (2006 census report). The profile of new Turkish immigrants has changed since the immigration policy of Australia has changed. Currently Australia needs qualified labor demand so the immigration policy has changed. New Turkish migrations depend on high skilled work force, refuge and family unions.

The Case Study

Language Acquisition

Integration basically requires learning the language of the host society in international migrations. Settlement duration is closely related to second language learning. In our case, we analyzed the effect of settlement duration on English speaking level of Turkish people who lives in Australia. It is known that the more settlement duration is, the higher level of second language learning is. Precondition of the integration into the host society is the high proficiency level of host society's language use. Living in a different culture and society causes some language problems. Next generations of immigrants use the language of host society better than their own cultural language.

To analyze the relationship between settlement duration and English proficiency level of our subjects, the questions are constructed as "*Do you speak English*" and "*How many years do you live in Australia*". The constructed answers of English speaking level question are "*I know very well*", "*I speak well but I have to improve it*", "*I understand but I cannot speak well*", "*I speak English very little*", "*I don't need speaking English*" and "*I do not know speaking English*". According to the analysis results, the subjects with above 25-year settlement have the highest rates in almost all categories. It can be said that this similarity results from the differences in generation; whether they are from the first or the next generation migrating there. The subjects who know speaking English very well are the second generation or child immigrants while the subjects whose proficiency level of English are not very well are first generation coming to Australia as unqualified labor force. The most interesting result is that there are subjects who don't know speak English (25 percent) or who say I don't need speaking English (75 percent) to the ones above 25-year settlement duration. In Australia where the common language is English, the fact that there are people who don't need to speak English shows these people either did not work or worked in places whose owners and customers are Turkish in the ghetto. There is no clear effect of settlement duration on language acquisition. When we look at the overall picture, the subjects who speak English very well constitute nearly 32 percent. The rate of the subjects speaking English well but having to improve it is nearly 34 percent (see Table 1). It can be inferred from these results that the integration of Turkish people has not been completed yet.

Table 1

| | | <i>Do you speak English?</i> | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| | | <i>I know very well</i> | <i>I speak well but I have no improve it</i> | <i>I understand but I cannot speak well</i> | <i>I speak English very little</i> | <i>I don't need it</i> | <i>I don't know</i> | |
| <i>How Many Years do you live in Australia?</i> | Year | | | | | | | Total |
| | 2-5 | 4.3 | 56.5 | 26.1 | 8.7 | 4.3 | | 100.00 |
| | 6-9 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 16.7 | | | | 100.00 |
| | 10-15 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 14.3 | 28.6 | | 9.5 | 100.00 |
| | 16-19 | 53.3 | 40.0 | | | | 6.7 | 100.00 |
| | 20-25 | 25.0 | 45.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 | | | 100.00 |
| | 25+ | 44.3 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 13.1 | 4.9 | 1.6 | 100.00 |
| | Total | 32.2 | 33.6 | 17.1 | 11.8 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 100.00 |

Neighborhood Relationships

Neighborhood types and the relationships in the neighborhood indicate the level of involvement within the society. Integrating in the host society requires having relation and communication with the members of the host society. Neighborhood types of the immigrants show us the level of these relationships; whether Turkish immigrants prefer staying at Turkish ghettos or not. Instead of asking the question “Do you live in the Turkish ghetto or neighborhood?”, we prefer to ask our subjects directly “*Are there any Turkish people in your neighborhood?*” because whether they live in a ghetto or with Turkish neighbor will give us an idea about the rate of the immigrant’s integration within the host society. Living in a ghetto means being far away from the host society and not having to speak English thus it implies a very low rate of integration. Our constructed responses are “*I live in Turkish neighborhood*”, “*Yes, there are few Turkish families*”, “*No, there aren’t*”, “*I don’t know*”. These statements indicate if our subjects consciously prefer staying with Turkish neighbors or not. Moreover, the answer “I don’t know” gives us clues about whether they have any concern about Turkish population or their neighbors. We presume that the longer the settlement duration is, the more our subjects are away of ghettos thus the more they are integrated in the host society. In our case, among our respondents having above 25-year settlement duration, the percentage of population living in a Turkish neighborhood is the lowest (absolutely 25 percent). Most of the respondents (absolutely 64 percent) with the same settlement duration have few Turkish neighbors. While nearly 10 percent of the respondents state that there aren’t any Turkish people in their neighborhood, small percent (nearly 2 percent) of them does

not know whether there are or not (see Table 2). As shown in the table below, the ones with above 25-year settlement constitutes a turning point; that is, when compared to immigrants having above 25-year settlement duration the ones with below 25-year settlement duration have more Turkish neighbors and less integrated in the host society.

Table 2

| | | <i>“Are they any Turkish people in your neighborhood?”</i> | | | | |
|---|--------------|--|--|------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| | | <i>I live in Turkish neighborhood</i> | <i>Yes, there are few Turkish families</i> | <i>No there aren't</i> | <i>I don't know</i> | |
| <i>How Many Years do you live in Australia?</i> | Year | | | | | Total |
| | 2-5 | 39.1 | 39.1 | 13.0 | 8.7 | 100.00 |
| | 6-9 | 25.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 8.3 | 100.00 |
| | 10-15 | 42.9 | 47.6 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 100.00 |
| | 16-19 | 46.7 | 40.0 | 13.3 | | 100.00 |
| | 20-25 | 40.0 | 35.0 | 20.0 | 5.0 | 100.00 |
| | 25+ | 24.6 | 63.9 | 9.8 | 1.6 | 100.00 |
| | Total | 33.6 | 49.3 | 13.2 | 3.9 | 100.00 |

Close Relations

One of the signs of integration is to have relationships with the members of the host society. However, what makes our case different from other cases observed in a society taking migration is that Australia is a country created by migration from nearly all over the world hence we interpret the level of integration of our immigrants in Australian society not only any relation/communication they have with the host society but also with other non-Turkish immigrants. The harmony of the society is also provided by these relations with the members of all different cultures in this society. To measure the level of integration, we prepared the question “*Do you have non-Turkish close friends?*”. Most of our subjects with almost all settlement durations (except for 16-19 years settlement duration) state that they have no close non-Turkish friends (see Table). It is reasonable not to have close friends from different cultures at the initial stage of migration since they have newly started to integrate into the society they migrate to. However; as clear in the table below, our respondents do not have any close relationships with the people from other cultures not only in the first years of migration but also in the forthcoming years. As mentioned before, due to cultural or religious reasons Turkish people do not prefer to have close friends from different cultures. First

generations of immigrants do not let their children have close relations with other cultures and not develop close relations with the members of different cultures. For instance, one of our interviewee says that

I have neighbors from different cultures, I like them, we have good relations, they come to my house to visit us but I don't prefer going their house since their culture is different from ours and I don't feel comfortable in their house.

According to our observations, there are two types of Turkish immigrant groups one of which does not involve in other cultures to protect their culture and to maintain their cultural identity to the next generations, and live in Turkish ghettos. The other type of Turkish immigrant group avoids being together with Turkish society. Especially this situation arises among high-educated immigrants. Moreover, it is seen that Turkish people generally live in ghettos. These ghettos can be shaped physically or mentally. When people are more educated and have better economic conditions, they prefer living outside Turkish ghettos, away from Turkish people, mostly from those having lower status than them. These people create their own mental ghettos because they prefer being alone and they do not have good relationships with their neighbors (Inan, 2012, p.150). Integration does occur not only by learning the language of host society and having good careers but also establishing strong relationships with the members of host society and the members of other immigrant societies.

Table 3

| | | <i>Do you have non-Turkish close friends?</i> | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | | <i>No</i> | <i>Yes, 1-2</i> | <i>Yes, 3-5</i> | <i>Yes, 6-10</i> | <i>Yes, 10+</i> | |
| <i>How Many Years do you live in Australia?</i> | Year | | | | | | Total |
| | 2-5 | 34.8 | 26.1 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 4.3 | 100.00 |
| | 6-9 | 33.3 | 8.3 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 33.3 | 100.00 |
| | 10-15 | 38.1 | 23.8 | 14.3 | 9.5 | 14.3 | 100.00 |
| | 16-19 | 20.0 | 26.7 | | | 53.3 | 100.00 |
| | 20-25 | 25.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 | 25.0 | 100.00 |
| | 25+ | 32.8 | 24.6 | 13.1 | 4.9 | 24.6 | 100.00 |
| Total | 31.6 | 23.0 | 13.8 | 7.9 | 23.7 | 100.00 | |

The Perceptions of Culture

The concept of culture is widely discussed in every period of social sciences. However there hasn't been a consensus in the meaning of this concept. In general, it is used for religion, history, ethnicity and language of a society. Everybody needs a distinctive element to identify him/herself. To

understand the distinctive element of their culture, we directed a constructed question “*What is the most influential factor that determines your culture?*”. Five constructed answers to this question are “*religion, history, ethnicity, native country, language*”. In our study, the effect of settlement duration on the factors determining culture will be analyzed. Most of the subjects (nearly 30 percent) with 2-5 years settlement duration consider native country (homeland) as the most influential factor determining their culture but the lowest rate (nearly 9 percent) with the same settlement duration see the ethnicity as the most influential cultural factor. While half of the subjects with 6-9 years settlement duration states that the language is the most influential one, the other half with the same settlement duration regards other factors except ethnicity as equally influential; in other words, within this group none of the subjects see the ethnicity as the most influential cultural factor. On the other hand, in all other settlement durations (the ones above 10 years), the immigrants take religion as the most significant factor determining the culture (see Table 4). The study shows that religion, language and native country are the most influential factors while ethnicity is the least influential factor determining culture among Turkish people live in Australia. Religion is the most rated one among the influential factors. This can be stemmed from the fact that they live in a country whose population has different religion from theirs thus the distinctive element they get to identify themselves is religion. Up to ten years, people see language and native country as the most influential factor. This is also reasonable because at the initial stage of migration it is difficult for them to integrate into a new country as they will miss their homeland and what they have there, thus they use the native country as the distinctive feature in their identity construction. Furthermore, living in a different culture with a different language makes it difficult to communicate with others hence causes these people to feel as foreigners. Therefore, they identify themselves with their own languages. Actually, these results show that religion depending on the settlement duration is the most distinctive element in determining the cultural perception in Turkish immigrants’ identity construction.

Table 4

| | | <i>What is the most influential factor that determines your culture?</i> | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | | <i>Religion</i> | <i>History</i> | <i>Ethnicity</i> | <i>Native Country</i> | <i>Language</i> | |
| <i>How Many Years do you live in Australia?</i> | Year | | | | | | Total |
| | 2-5 | 26.1 | 17.4 | 8.7 | 30.4 | 17.4 | 100.00 |
| | 6-9 | 16.7 | 16.7 | | 16.7 | 50.0 | 100.00 |
| | 10-15 | 61.9 | 14.3 | 4.8 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 100.00 |
| | 16-19 | 46.7 | 13.3 | | 20.0 | 20.0 | 100.00 |
| | 20-25 | 55.0 | 15.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 | 10.0 | 100.00 |
| | 25+ | 37.7 | 8.2 | 9.8 | 21.3 | 23.0 | 100.00 |
| | Total | 40.8 | 12.5 | 6.6 | 19.7 | 20.4 | 100.00 |

After analyzing the effect of settlement duration on the most influential factors determining culture, the meaning of culture for our respondents is important for us to complete our analysis. We tested the effect of settlement duration on the meaning of culture. The constructed question “*What does concept of culture mean for you?*” is asked to the respondents. The definition of culture according to Eliot (1948, p.27) is that culture is simply everything that makes life worth living. Based on this definition, we constructed answers as “*customs and traditions*”, “*moral values and rules*”, “*religious values and rules*”, “*life style*”, “*societal symbols*” and “*language*”. For most of the respondents from almost all settlement durations, culture means customs and traditions. For most of the respondents with 10-15 years settlement duration, culture equally means “*customs and traditions*” and “*moral values and rules*” whereas for most of the respondents with 16-19 years settlement duration, the meaning of culture is equally distributed to “*customs and traditions*”, “*moral values and rules*” and “*life style*” categories (see Table 5). The study shows that while people consider the most influential factor determining their culture is religion, they mostly state that for them culture means “*customs and traditions*” rather than “*religious values and rules*”. It can be asserted that since customs and traditions involve religious values and rules, people prefer more inclusive category to define the concept of culture. Moreover, the previous question is constructed to analyze the most influential factor of culture and the latter one is related to the general meaning of culture. So, it can be said that if religion is the most influential part of the culture, customs and traditions are highly related to religious values. Therefore, Australian Turkish people identify themselves with their customs and traditions.

Table 5

| | | <i>What does concept of culture mean for you</i> | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| | | <i>Customs and traditions</i> | <i>Moral values and rules</i> | <i>Religious values and rules</i> | <i>Life Style</i> | <i>Societal Symbols</i> | <i>Language</i> | <i>Other</i> | <i>All</i> | |
| <i>How Many Years do you live in Australia?</i> | Year | | | | | | | | Total | |
| | 2-5 | 56.5 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | | 4.3 | 100.00 |
| | 6-9 | 33.3 | 16.7 | | 25.0 | 8.3 | 8.3 | | 8.3 | 100.00 |
| | 10-15 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 9.5 | 14.3 | | | 4.8 | 4.8 | 100.00 |
| | 16-19 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 20.0 | 26.7 | | | | 4.8 | 100.00 |
| | 20-25 | 55.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 | 15.0 | | | | | 100.00 |
| | 25+ | 42.6 | 18.0 | 16.4 | 11.5 | 3.3 | 4.9 | | 33.3 | 100.00 |
| | Total | 42.8 | 20.0 | 13.2 | 13.8 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 33.0 | 100.00 |

Marriage Patterns

Marriages are related to cultural rites of passage besides love. When we think of it as cultural passage, the question will arise about selecting wives and husbands; *How do people living in a society composed of various cultures select their wives and husbands?* or *Do families accept the marriages from different cultures?* We think that the answer to these questions is crucial in showing the integration level of immigrants into the society. If there is intermarriage between the members of different cultural, racial or religious backgrounds, it indicates that they share a common cultural, social or educational background in the society. Most importantly, it shows that there is a relationship among different cultures. Establishing relationships with different cultures is the basic element of integration. According to Australian demographer Charles Price, 'intermarriage is still the best measure of ethnic intermixture because it breaks down ethnic exclusiveness and mixes the various ethnic populations more effectively than any other social process' (cited in Khoo, 2011, p. 101).

Our hypothesis is that the more settlement duration, the higher approval level of close family member's marriages from different cultures. We think that gender affects the level of approval. People tend to approve the culturally different marriages of female relatives lesser than the marriages of male relatives. To analyze our hypothesis, we constructed two questions considering two sexes. The questions are "Do you approve the marriage decision of your brothers or sons from different cultures" and "Do you approve the marriage decision of your sisters or daughters". The answers are constructed in the way "Absolutely don't approve", "if s/he is Muslim, I do", "I approve", "His/her selection, I don't intervene in", "Other". Brothers, sisters and children are the closest relatives

to test Turkish immigrants' considerations about intermarriage and the level of integration.

The study results show that our hypothesis is invalid. When we look at the crosstabs, the more settlement duration is the less approval of intermarriage for both sexes (see Table 6 and Table 7). It is likely to think that when the settlement duration is longer, the integration level will be higher. Intermarriages are very important indicators of integration. However; as we mentioned before, Turkish people in Australia have different characteristics such as religion. The most influential factor of culture is religion for our respondents as summarized before. It is important for immigrants to protect their own culture as well as integrating into the host society. In a society with various cultures, it becomes considerably important to protect one's own culture and to transfer his/her own culture to the next generations if it is very different from other cultures. In such circumstances, preserving their own culture takes precedence of integrating into the host society. Our study results indicate that the settlement duration has a reverse effect on their considerations about intermarriages. Interestingly enough, the subjects in the early period of their settlement durations approve intermarriages (see Table 6 and Table 7). It is stemmed from the fact that the ones newly migrated to Australia (2-5 years) are not aware of how important to preserve the culture since they don't know how much it is necessary to transfer their own culture to the next generations but rather they are attracted by the cultural varieties and richness. On the other hand, the ones having above 10 years settlement duration generally do not approve marriages from different cultures and they prefer selecting their partners from their homeland (Turkey). In fact, the fact that recent migrations depend on family union (as mentioned in the previous section) confirms this hypothesis.

Table 6

| | | <i>Do you approve the marriage decision of your brothers or sons from different cultures?</i> | | | | | |
|---|--------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--------------|---------------|
| | | <i>Absolutely don't approve</i> | <i>If she is Muslim, I do</i> | <i>I approve</i> | <i>His selection. I don't intervene in</i> | <i>Other</i> | |
| <i>How Many Years do you live in Australia?</i> | Year | | | | | | Total |
| | 2-5 | 8.7 | 17.4 | 26.1 | 39.1 | 8.7 | 100.00 |
| | 6-9 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 8.3 | 33.3 | 8.3 | 100.00 |
| | 10-15 | 19.0 | 23.8 | 9.5 | 38.1 | 9.5 | 100.00 |
| | 16-19 | 13.3 | 26.7 | | 46.7 | 13.3 | 100.00 |
| | 20-25 | 15.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | | 100.00 |
| | 25+ | 41.0 | 24.6 | 4.9 | 29.5 | | 100.00 |
| | Total | 25.7 | 25.7 | 10.5 | 33.6 | 4.6 | 100.00 |

Table 7

| | | <i>Dou you approve the marriage decision of your sisters or daughters?</i> | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|-------------------------------|------------------|--|---------------|--------------|
| | | <i>Absolute-ly don't approve</i> | <i>If she is Muslim, I do</i> | <i>I approve</i> | <i>Her selection. I don't intervene in</i> | <i>Other</i> | |
| <i>How Many Years do you live in Australia?</i> | Year | | | | | | Total |
| | 2-5 | 8.7 | 26.1 | 17.4 | 39.1 | 8.7 | 100.00 |
| | 6-9 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 8.3 | 33.3 | 8.3 | 100.00 |
| | 10-15 | 19.0 | 38.1 | 9.5 | 23.8 | 9.5 | 100.00 |
| | 16-19 | 13.3 | 26.7 | | 46.7 | 13.3 | 100.00 |
| | 20-25 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | | 100.00 |
| | 25+ | 45.9 | 21.3 | 1.6 | 31.1 | | 100.00 |
| Total | 29.6 | 26.3 | 7.9 | 31.6 | 4.6 | 100.00 | |

Social Structure

As we mentioned before, The Turkish population in Australia has a very different case because of their cultural, social and religious properties. Maintaining and protecting their culture is very important for them. Even if Australia as a multicultural country gives a very big importance to the maintenance of all cultures and supports all societies from different countries to sustain their own culture, its main purpose is to create a harmonic society where all cultures from different backgrounds can live together. In our case, since protecting and maintaining their culture becomes their main goal, the level of having close relationships with people from different cultures is very low for Turkish immigrants. This situation leads to a closed society of Turkish people in Australia. To measure the influence of settlement duration on the considerations of the subjects, we constructed the statement "*Turkish people living in Australia generally live in a closed society*". Considerations of the subjects were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from *1=strongly agree* to *5=strongly disagree*. According to the results, none of the respondents give the answer "disagree". Very high percentage of our respondents from all settlement durations gives the answers "strongly agree" and "agree" (see Table 8). Overall picture indicates that most of the respondents think that Turkish people living in Australia generally live in a closed society irrespective of subjects' settlement duration in Australia.

Table 8

| | | <i>Turkish people living in Australia generally live in a closed society</i> | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|--------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| | | <i>Strongly Agree</i> | <i>Agree</i> | <i>No idea</i> | <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | |
| <i>How Many Years do you live in Australia?</i> | Year | | | | | Total |
| | 2-5 | 47.8 | 34.8 | 13.0 | 4.3 | 100.00 |
| | 6-9 | 33.3 | 58.3 | | 8.3 | 100.00 |
| | 10-15 | 19.0 | 47.6 | 9.5 | 23.8 | 100.00 |
| | 16-19 | 40.0 | 33.3 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 100.00 |
| | 20-25 | 25.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 15.0 | 100.00 |
| | 25+ | 39.3 | 41.0 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 100.00 |
| Total | 35.5 | 41.4 | 10.5 | 12.5 | 100.00 | |

The Country They Want to Live

Up to now, it is seen that the integration level of Turkish people living in Australia is slightly related to their settlement duration. Our last question “*where do you want to spend the rest of your life?*” will give the general frame. The respondents from almost all settlement durations state that they want to live in Turkey. There is a very big increase in their desire to live in Australia among the respondents with above 16 years settlement durations but the desire for living in Turkey is still higher except for the respondents with above 25-year settlement duration (see Table 9). According to the study results, it can be inferred that Turkish people living in Australia give importance to the integration into the host society. Furthermore, they mainly focus on the protection and transferring their own culture. The settlement duration has an effect on the desire for living in Australia which either shows a positive correlation between the settlement duration and the level of integration or the desire for living in Australia due to some social and economic opportunities of this country which is in fact the reason for their migration. It has to be highlighted that living in a space for a long time establishes an attachment to that space and makes them to get used to live there.

Table 9

| | | <i>Where do you want to spend the rest of your life?</i> | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| | | <i>Turkey</i> | <i>Australia</i> | <i>Other</i> | <i>Both Turkey and Australia</i> | <i>Don't know</i> | <i>Not decided</i> | <i>Where my children are</i> | |
| <i>How Many Years do you live in Australia?</i> | Year | | | | | | | | Total |
| | 2-5 | 65.2 | 8.7 | 17.4 | | 4.3 | | 4.3 | 100.00 |
| | 6-9 | 66.7 | 8.3 | 8.3 | | | 16.7 | | 100.00 |
| | 10-15 | 80.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 10. | | | | 100.00 |
| | 16-19 | 46.7 | 40.0 | | | 6.7 | | 6.7 | 100.00 |
| | 20-25 | 60.0 | 30.0 | 5.0 | | 5.0 | | | 100.00 |
| | 25+ | 44.3 | 45.9 | 4.9 | | | 1.6 | 3.3 | 100.00 |
| Total | 56.3 | 29.1 | 6.6 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 100.00 | |

Conclusion

This article provides various analyses to understand the integration level of Turkish immigrants living in Australia. It is thought that the integration level is highly related to the settlement duration, which is also our independent variable. Integration level can be analyzed through several variables. A migrant's integration into the host society starts by learning the language of the host society and taking part in the every societal level. Our first dependent variable is language acquisition. The influence of settlement duration on the language acquisition of the subjects has been analyzed. The results show that even if there is an effect of settlement duration on the language acquisition, there are some first generation-immigrants who don't know speaking English. As the second dependent variable, we have looked at whether neighborhood relations affect the level of integration or not. What we have found is that living in a Turkish neighborhood leads to low level of integration because the immigrants prefer developing relations within their own cultures rather than having contact/relations with other cultures. In our case, the ones with above 25-year settlement duration comprise a turning point, which indicates the least rate of settlement preference within the Turkish community. Our third dependent variable is about getting close relationship/friends. It is also aims to test the previous variable. If subjects prefer living outside Turkish neighborhoods, they are expected to have close relations with the ones from different cultures. However, even if there are subjects having close friends from different cultures, most of the respondents do not have close friends irrespective of their settlement duration. Our next two dependent variables are related to culture and perception of culture. The distinctive element of the culture plays a very important role in identity construction. The results show that our respondents with above 10 years settlement duration consider religion as the most influential component of culture. Culture mostly means *customs and traditions* for the subjects from all settlement durations. Therefore, if religion is the most influential part of the culture, customs and traditions are highly related to religious values. Another dependent variable is relevant to intermarriages. In a multicultural society, intermarriages indicate high level of integration into the host society. We have tested to what extent our subjects are integrated into Australian society through the approval level they have for marriages of brothers/sons or sisters/daughters from different cultures depending on settlement durations. We have hypothesized that the more settlement duration, the higher the approval level for marriages from different cultures will be. However, the results implied almost the opposite because the subjects with above 10 years settlement duration don't approve the marriages from different cultures to preserve and maintain their own cultures.

The next variable is actually related to our all variables and we have tried to investigate it by the statement “Turkish people lives in a closed society”. Most of the respondents think that Turkish people generally live in a closed society irrespective of subjects’ settlement duration in Australia. Our last variable is which country the subjects want to live. The results indicate that no matter how long or short their settlement duration is, most of the subjects state their wish to live in Turkey. Moreover, there is an increase in the desire to live in Australia among the subjects with above 16 years settlement duration. If we look at the results from a general frame it is seen that settlement duration has an effect on some variables. Therefore, we can conclude that integration of Turkish immigrants in Australia is not completed yet.

Integration is a process comprising the experience of both the immigrants and the host society. In this study, we focus on Turkish immigrants’ perspective of how they consider their integration level into the host society (Australia), how they evaluate their own culture-traditions with respect to the host society’s culture-traditions and how much they desire to go on their life in Australia. However, we have not studied how Australian society considers Turkish immigrants as a migrated group in their country; what they think about their integration level as well as adaptation experiences to Australian culture and traditions. This is a topic that we leave for further studies. We strongly believe that the perspective of Australian society about Turkish immigrants constitutes the other side of the coin thus a study investigating this issue will fill this gap in the literature of migration studies.

References | Kaynakça

Abadan-Unat, N. (2006). *Bitmeyen göç: Konuk işçilikten ulus-ötesi yurttaşlığa*, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Adıgüzel, Y. (2010). Diasporadaki kimlik algılamalarına göç tipinin etkisi: Almanya ve İngiltere Türk toplumlarının karşılaştırılması, *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 20, 97-119.

Australian Ethnic Affairs Council (1977). *Australia as a multicultural society - Submission to the Australian Population and Immigration Council on the Green paper, Immigration policies and Australia's population*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Australian Multicultural Advisory Council (2010). *The People of Australia: The Australian Multicultural Advisory Council's Statement on cultural diversity and recommendations to government*, n.p.

Babacan, H. (2001). Turks. J. Jupp (Ed.), *The Australian people, an encyclopedia of the nation: Its people and their origins* (pp. 781-782). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Day, A. (2003). *Historical dictionary of the discovery and exploration of Australia*. Lanham, Maryland and Oxford: Scarecrow.

Eliot, T. S., (1948). *Notes towards the definition of culture*. London: Faber&Faber Ltd.

de Haas, H. (2007). Migration and development: A theoretical perspective. Paper presented at the conference of "Transnationalisation and Development(s): Towards a North-South Perspective", Center for Interdisciplinary Research, Bielefeld, Germany, May 31 - June 01, 2007, (Working Papers – Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development; 29) Bielefeld: COMCAD.

Icduygu, A. (1994). Facing changes and making choices: Unintended Turkish immigrant settlement in Australia. *International Migration*, 32, 71-93. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2435.1994.tb00516.x

İnan, A. M., (2012). Çok-kültürlülük tartışmaları bağlamında Avustralya'da yaşayan Türklerin kimlik algısı. Unpublished MA Thesis, İstanbul University.

International Organization for Migration, (2010). *World Migration Report 2010 The Future Of Migration: Building Capacities For Change*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.

Jupp, J. (2002). *From White Australia to Woomera The Story of Australian Immigration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jupp, J., (2007). The Quest for Harmony. J. Jupp, J. Nieuwenhuysen, and E. Dawson (Ed.), *Social Cohesion in Australia* (pp. 9-20). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Khoo, S., (2011). Intermarriage, integration and multiculturalism: A demographic perspective. J. Jupp and M. Clyne (Ed.), in *Multiculturalism and integration: A Harmonious Relationship*, (pp. 101-119). Canberra: ANU E Press.

Manderson, L. and Inglis, C. (1984). Turkish migration and workforce participation in Sydney, Australia, *International Migration Review*, 18 (2), 258-275.

Markus, A., Jupp, J. and McDonald, P. (2009). Australia's immigration revolution. Crows Nest: Allen&Unwin.

Ravenstein, E. G. (1889). The laws of migration, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 52 (2), 242-305.

Stouffer, S. (1940). Intervening opportunities: A theory relating mobility and distance, *American Sociological Review*, 5 (6), 845-867.

Tavan, G., (2005). *The long, slow death of White Australia*. Carlton North: Scribe.

Tekeli, İ. (1975). Göç teorileri ve politikaları arasındaki ilişkiler, *ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1 (1), 153-176.

West, B. and Murphy, F. (2010). *A Brief History of Australia*. New York: Facts on File Inc.

Web Pages | İnternet Sayfaları

<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2071.0main+features902012-2013>

<http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/20planning.htm#b>

<http://www.migrationheritage.nsw.gov.au/belongings-home/about-belongings/australias-migration-history>

http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/statistics/comm-summ/_pdf/turkey.pdf