

Facing Changes and Making Choices: Unintended Turkish Immigrant Settlement in Australia

Ahmet Icduygu*

INTRODUCTION

What happens when a large group of migrants who see themselves as temporary workers, and who plan to return home, enter a country where permanent settlement of immigrants is a determined and well-established official policy? Such was the case of migrants from Turkey to Australia between the late 1960s and mid-1970s. Even though the proportion of Turkish migrants who initially had no intention of settling permanently in Australia declined and there were other changes in the character of the migratory movement, processes of settlement still carry the legacy of earlier temporary migration. This article¹ addresses three questions: why these migrants came to Australia with the intention of staying only temporarily despite the fact that at no time was "guestworker" part of Australia's immigration policy; how they became more or less permanent settlers in Australia; and the extent to which the original intention of temporary migration, and subsequent changes in this intention, affected the incorporation of individual migrants and their families into Australia's social structure.

One of the most important features of mass migration to advanced industrial countries since 1945 has been the significant proportion of temporary labour migrants who have become permanent settlers (Piore, 1979; Castles, 1984, 1989; Rogers, 1985; Hammar, 1985, 1990; Messina, 1989, 1990, 1992). While some aspects of the phenomenon are well known (including the effects of family reunification and the emergence of second and third generations), less apparent are the mechanisms and dynamics of these changes, relationships between the migrants' changing intent and decision to settle permanently, and the way migrants are exposed to the different immigration and integration policies of receiving countries.

* Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

Indeed, in relation to this latter point, change in settlement intention is even paradoxical: the guestworker experience of Turkish migrants in Germany was already shifting to permanent settlement despite discouragement from the German public and the government, whereas in Australia the so-called settler experience of Turkish migrants led to ongoing confusion between being a sojourner and a settler, with a great deal of emphasis on returning to Turkey (Icduygu, 1988, 1991, 1993).

This article considers Turkish migration and settlement in Australia from both the micro and macro levels of analysis. Migration and settlement of Turkish migrants in Melbourne is explored from the immigrants' viewpoint, including how settlement in that city has influenced their lives, both inside and outside their workplaces, over time. The article also addresses Turkish immigration to Australia within the global context of international migration.

The Melbourne Turkish Migration (MTM) study² was conducted by the author between 1987 and 1990. Interviews were conducted in Melbourne in 1987 with 276 first generation adult Turkish settlers aged 18 to 67 years and additional information was collected between 1987 and 1990 on other aspects of their resettlement. The majority of Turkish migrants entered Australia with no intention of settling permanently; others were ambivalent concerning their intentions; and others who had entered with the intention of settling permanently later changed their minds. The movement was therefore characterized by a transition from temporary migration to permanent settlement, termed "unintended settlement". As shown by Kritz and Keeley (1981: xxvii) in another migration context, "very little is known about how important such original intentions are". In order to understand the importance of the context of Turkish migration to Australia for settlement and adaptation experiences, it is necessary to note the history of that flow before addressing related issues concerning temporariness versus permanence in the receiving society.

TURKISH MIGRATION TO AUSTRALIA: AN INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

While emigration from Turkey was uncommon prior to 1960 (Bilmen, 1976: 238), the situation changed dramatically during the ensuing three decades. Thousands of Turks sold their labour in the international market, especially to Western European countries (particularly Germany), Australia, and more recently, Arab countries. Turkey is now a well-known migrant-sending country. By the early 1990s an estimated two million Turkish migrants and their dependents were living in

Europe, 150,000 were in Arab countries, 40,000 Turkish settlers and their children live in Australia, and more than 50,000 are in the United States. The estimated 2.5 million expatriate Turks³ represent 4.4 per cent of the nation's total population.

Although migration to Australia is not numerically important within the context of overall Turkish emigration, its permanent settlement characteristic differs markedly from opportunities offered in European and Arab countries under the so-called guestworker schemes. Yet only a small proportion (estimated one per cent) of emigrants chose Australia in a context (considered by the Australian government, although not by many Turkish migrants) of permanent settlement.

Censuses taken in Australia during the first half of this century show the presence of only a few hundred persons of birthplace Turkey⁴. Most of those in Australia prior to 1967 were probably members of other ethnic groups, such as Armenians, Syrians, Greeks and Jews (Young, 1983: 33; Ethnic Affairs Commission of New South Wales - EAC of NSW, 1985: 7). As the 1966 census shows that the vast majority of Turkish-born persons were non-Muslim, it is highly likely that they were non-Turkish by ethnic origin (Icduygu, 1991: 78). Even if there were some Turkish migrants among these early settlers who gave their birthplace as Turkey, numbers were very small. Indeed, migration was sporadic and restricted to sponsored cases: it was not so much Turkish immigration as the settlement of Turkish-born individuals.

Large-scale emigration from Turkey to Australia began in 1968 following the signing of a bilateral agreement between the Turkish and Australian governments in October 1967 when temporary labour migration from Turkey to Western European countries was already in operation. The agreement between the two countries was signed when urban unemployment in Turkey was of the order of at least 10 per cent, and rural areas had a "reserve of manpower ready to go into the towns or abroad..." (*Le Monde*, 21-22 September 1969, cited in *Migration Today*, 1969: 106-107). In Australia, on the other hand, the central dilemma was how to attract more immigrants. In its editorial of 18 January 1966, *The Australian* newspaper declared,

The Citizenship Convention opens in Canberra today, at a time when the economic advance of Europe makes it harder and harder for us to attract new citizens... the problem is even worse than this: the rate of former new settlers returning home at the end of last year was double that at the end of 1964... Despite this difficulty, Mr. L. H. Waite, President of the Associated Chambers of Manufacturers, advocates that this year's migration target be raised from 145,000 to 165,000... We agree with him... By raising our intake target we stand more chance of

achieving the long-term aim, once widely accepted, of a one per cent annual addition to the population [through migration].

This was a time when few persons in prosperous Western European countries were emigrating overseas. Indeed, many Western European governments had begun to admit workers from Southern European countries, one of Australia's sources for permanent immigrants (Immigration Planning Council - IPC, 1968: 67-68; Department of Labour and Immigration - DLI, 1975: 8-9; Birrell and Birrell, 1981: 70; Kunz, 1988: 105). These changes in global international migration markets led Australia to seek new source countries, including Turkey and Mexico (Birrell and Birrell, 1981: 69), although Australia was reluctant to recruit migrants from a range of non-European countries. Within this context, each intake of immigrants from a new source required government explanation and justification "that stressed their assimilability; that is their capacity to fit into the Australian way of life," (Elley, 1985: 57). Concerning immigration from Mexico, Birrell and Birrell (1981: 69) noted that "...it was decided not to pursue this course, because... it was thought Australia could not limit its requirements to those of European descent... without exciting Mexican protest."

The reputation of Turks as guestworkers in Western Europe, as Manderson (1988: 819) shows, "had drawn Australian attention to Turkey as a potential source country for immigrants". With a high level of unemployment, Turkey not only had a labour pool from which a country of immigration could draw, but recent high levels of emigration had, in many respects, institutionalized the emigration phenomenon. Preconditions clearly existed for migration from Turkey to Australia.

There were, however, obstacles to this migratory flow. Many Turkish migrants would not seriously contemplate going to such a distant land because of the high financial cost and socio-psychological burden. Furthermore, Turks were closer to being classified as Asians than Europeans and, as already noted, immigration and ethnic policies in Australia in the 1960s deemed an influx of Asian migrants with "different standards of living, traditions and cultures" as not easily acceptable (Jupp, 1966: 21; Elley, 1985: 57). However, the Australian Government moved quickly to ease the conditions for entry of immigrants from Turkey. Writing in 1985, Elley argued that "pragmatism had reigned" (1985: 50). Through subtle redefinition, Turkey was treated as a European country and in 1967 a bilateral migration agreement extended the assisted passage scheme to Turkish workers and their families. In Turkey, an estimated 900,000 workers were on waiting lists to go abroad, although fewer than one per cent of them were admitted by European countries (Icduygu, 1991: 74). Intra-European labour migra-

tion was experiencing a short-term crisis and the Turkish Government, under pressure of the unemployment problem, sought new markets for labour migration on a continuing basis. Indeed, the timing of successive bilateral labour recruitment agreements—in 1961 with West Germany, in 1964 with Austria, Netherlands and Belgium, in 1965 with France, and in 1967 with Sweden and then with Australia—reflected Turkish emigration strategy of “falling back on another country if one showed signs of saturation and diminished absorption ability” (Bahadir, 1979: 105). The signing of a migration agreement with Australia was therefore a new step in maintaining continuity of emigration.

The 1967 migration agreement not only represented the formal commencement of large-scale emigration from Turkey to Australia, but also set the stage for a composition of succeeding flows as well as settlement and immigration practices. The determinative impact of the 1967 agreement on the migratory and settlement processes over 25 years becomes clearer if a distinction is drawn between impersonally organized migration and chain migration (MacDonald and MacDonald, 1964).

Following the agreement of 1967, substantial immigration from Turkey occurred only between 1968 and 1974, when almost four out of every five Turkish immigrants entered Australia under the assisted passage scheme. This was an impersonally organized movement, in which the selection, transportation, reception, instruction and placement of migrants were made by government organizations and authorities in Turkey and Australia. With the termination of the 1967 agreement in 1974, migration from Turkey not only slowed but took the form of chain and family reunion, with the exception of university graduates who arrived independently during the 1980s. The integration of a substantial number of early assisted migrants greatly affected the characteristics of the relatively small number of later migrants arriving as a result of chain migration and family reunion. Chain migration has been defined as the “movement in which prospective migrants learn of opportunities, are provided with transportation and have initial accommodation and employment arranged by means of primary social relationships with previous migrants” (MacDonald and MacDonald, 1964: 82). The sequence and distinctive features of the two types of migration played a crucial and determining role in shaping the history of Turkish immigration and settlement in Australia.

The MTM Survey data indicate that there were three distinct periods of migration from Turkey to Australia: 1968-74; 1975-80; and 1981 onwards, which reflect changes in the characteristics of the migrants as well as changes in Australia's selective immigration policies as they applied to Turkey. During the first period, migration was mainly

through the large-scale, impersonally-organized migration programme. Migrants were characteristically village-born, young couples (with young children) with limited formal education and little experience of working in an industrialized setting. Most intended staying in Australia only temporarily. The second period (1975-80) was characterized mainly by family reunion and chain migration. Many newcomers had socio-economic backgrounds similar to those of the early migrants who were their relatives or friends, but unlike the early migrants a slightly higher proportion entered Australia for permanent settlement. Family reunion and chain migration continued throughout the third period (1981 onwards) but changes in immigration policy by the Australian government saw a significant number of university graduates arriving in Australia. They were mainly city-born, single and relatively younger than the earlier migrants.

At no time was "guestworker" a part of Australia's immigration policy. By encouraging family units, the Government clearly expected Turks to become permanent settlers. Why then did so many Turkish migrants intend to stay only temporarily? In the case of the 1968-74 cohort, it may have been due partly to poor planning of the impersonally-organized migration programme, and partly to established conditions in the international migration market in the late 1960s when Australia drew settlers from the guestworker pool in Turkey. Many persons in this pool had been unable to win recruitment in the European guestworker scheme (Icduygu, 1991: 131). Furthermore, given their rural backgrounds, limited formal education and unfamiliarity with the notion of permanent migration, it is not surprising that the vast majority of early migrants (1968-74 cohort) arrived with limited awareness of what migration to Australia was all about. Indeed, the 1967 agreement did not contain one single explicit or implicit statement on the permanent character of assisted migration⁵. Had this matter been clarified in the agreement, it is likely that the number emigrating to Australia would not have been as high. In this regard, Cevahir⁶, a 53 year-old assisted migrant woman who arrived in Australia in 1973, declared,

When we were recruited to come to Australia, we didn't know that the Australian Government expected us to stay permanently here... Before coming here nobody told us these things.. even if they had told us that this was a permanent migration, we would come here for just three to five years to save money and go back to Turkey, we would not come here for permanent stay. We, Turks, are not like others... We are not accustomed to go abroad for good... You know, in Turkey very few people think about going abroad and staying there permanently, but everyone has a dream to go abroad, work there, save money and come back to Turkey as a rich person... Maybe, a few, university graduate young generation can think about going abroad, USA, Germany or Australia, and to live there permanently. Not many...(R. No. 0202022)⁷.

Cevahir's statement addresses two important issues. First, while Turkish people had no tradition of permanent migration, temporary movement was widespread and acceptable after the early 1960s. Second, the idea of permanent migration had become acceptable only among the new generation, mostly university graduates. These points, which reflect the ongoing dynamics of Turkish labour emigration, were also evident in the emerging differences in the settlement intentions of interviewed Turkish migrants who came to Australia during the successive periods of migration. For instance, among recently arrived university graduates the intention of permanent settlement was much more common.

The MTM Survey shows that less than one fifth of the early Turkish migrants (1968-1974 cohort) intended settling permanently when they arrived in Australia (Table 1, page 86). Although there was a significant decrease in the proportion holding this view between the earlier and later arrivals, 32 per cent of those arriving after 1975 intended staying only temporarily. On the assumption that those who considered their stay in Australia to be permanent would adapt better than those who intended staying temporarily, it could be argued that first intention plays a vital role in the overall adaptation of Turkish migrants in Australia.

Although intention of temporary settlement generally remained in the minds of early (1968-1974) migrants throughout the 1970s, data from the 1987 MTM Survey showed that experiences during the last two decades influenced the decisions to change to permanent settlement by a large number of Turkish immigrants in Australia (Table 2, page 86). Only 14 per cent of Turks in Melbourne said that they planned to return home within a couple of years and more than half those who had arrived between 1968 and 1974 said that they had decided to stay permanently, even though only 18 per cent had expressed that intention on arrival. As the period of settlement lengthened so the number intending to stay permanently increased. However, change in intention had not occurred as a single step. Uncertainty was very common before the final decision; many of the early settlers had still not decided between permanent and temporary settlement. Those who had decided to stay increased from 31 per cent on arrival to 51 per cent at the time of interview; those who had still not decided increased from eight per cent to 36 per cent. Overall, only one third of all respondents in Melbourne were keeping alive their original plans at the time of interview. The remaining proportion kept changing their minds between staying in the receiving country and going back to Turkey, thus reflecting indecision between these two choices.

There is no doubt that for individual migrants and their families the process of changing their original intention of temporary stay to permanent was very complex. Continuing confusion between being a

sojourner and being a settler, coupled with a strong desire to return to Turkey, had influenced almost all aspects of the lives of early migrants during the 1970s. However, by the early 1980s, the decision to settle permanently was made when they realized the advantages of permanent stay or being forced to stay as a result of external circumstances. The decisions of some teenage and adult children not to return to Turkey was important in shaping the settlement decisions of first generation migrants. The adaptation of children became more visible in the 1980s and contributed to their parents' decisions to stay permanently. Then many Turkish migrants with permanent settlement intentions arrived in the 1980s. This period represented a new era in the history of Turkish migration: realization of permanent settlement, not only on an individual level but also at a community level.

TURKISH MIGRANTS IN AUSTRALIA: TEMPORARINESS VERSUS PERMANENCE

Migration to Australia had a profound effect on Turkish immigrants. Their lives changed in uncountable ways. As a major Australian city, Melbourne offered different life chances and life styles and exposed them to Australian values and institutions. At the same time, their experiences in Melbourne were mediated by their own cultural beliefs and social practices. They were not fully ready to be socialized and incorporated into the new society. Many of their beliefs and affiliations to social institutions persisted continuously, although most underwent change in response to the new social environment. For example, influence of pre-migration values, attitudes and customs was obvious in parents' concern for their children. When their children mixed with non-Turkish friends, the first generation migrants, who perceived a lack of morality amongst Australian children, attempted to impose traditional authoritarian protection and guidance. Many migrants who were interviewed in Melbourne indicated that they were reluctant to see their children socializing or having boyfriend/girlfriend relations with, or marrying, non-Turkish persons. It appears that many migrants who had no intention of permanently settling were more restricted than migrants who arrived with the intention of staying permanently (Table 3, pages 87 and 88). However, neither cultural background nor initial settlement intentions directly and absolutely governed their lives; rather they affected the way that they and their families blended into Melbourne society and developed new lifestyles. Through their reluctance to allow their children to mix with non-Turkish persons, first generation migrants indirectly limited their chances of establishing relationships with non-Turkish persons. This is somewhat paradoxical, considering that the majority of Turkish migrants in Melbourne had little contact

with non-Turkish persons in terms of social interaction and friendship even though they wished to have such relationships.

As argued elsewhere (Icduygu, 1993: 11), while the settlement decision evolved through a transition from temporary migration to unintended settlement, one of the critical turning points related to the question of the second generation. This comprised two contradictory aspects: on the one hand, migrants considered that their children were financially better off in Australia; on the other hand they observed increasing cultural conflict between themselves and their children. Most of the migrants decided to bring up their children, and/or to stay with the adult children, in the receiving country, either believing in the advantages of staying, or being forced by the children who did not want to return to Turkey. In some cases this decision was made following a visit to Turkey, or after an unsuccessful return migration experience. On finding their children speaking English better than Turkish, and behaving like Australians rather than Turks, parents realized that they "didn't have any choice": temporary migration was turning into permanent stay.

Although cultural factors cannot be discounted, the structural and historical background of migration from Turkey and, as Portes and Bach put it (1985: 339), the "social structures into which immigrants became inserted", were more important in deciding the mode of incorporation of Turkish migrants into Australian society. Turkish migrants who saw their stay in Australia as a temporary sojourn did not make any special effort to be socially and economically comfortable in that country. The temporary arrangement was beneficial in enabling them to accomplish their goals to return to Turkey. Migrants interviewed in Melbourne provided examples of these kinds of temporary arrangements, e.g., sharing houses or flats with other Turkish families, or having short-term, temporary job attachments and interests in money-earning rather than occupational, career advancement (Table 3). These aspirations limited their ability to use the country's opportunities to their long-term advantage.

TURKISH CONCENTRATION IN BROADMEADOWS, A MELBOURNE OUTER SUBURB

The 1986 Census showed that a quarter of the Turkish-born population in the Melbourne metropolitan area lived in Broadmeadows, a Melbourne outer suburb, 16 kilometres north of the city. Under the 1967 migration agreement, almost all assisted Turkish migrants who disembarked at Melbourne were accommodated in government-funded migrant hostels. The majority were allocated to the hostel at

Broadmeadows and obtained factory work in Broadmeadows and the neighbouring suburbs of Coburn, Brunswick and Whittlesea. The Ford motor assembly plant at Broadmeadows absorbed hundreds of newly-arrived Turkish migrants, most of whom were unskilled. Indeed, the migration agreement of 1967 "arose from Australia's need to tap a new source of semi-skilled and unskilled labour to meet the demands of Australia's still-growing manufacturing industries" (EAC of NSW, 1985: 8). Proximity to place of employment and other Turkish migrants, and the availability of cheap housing were the main factors affecting the migrants' place of residence. Many therefore remained in the Broadmeadows area after leaving the government hostel, although a minority moved to inexpensive housing areas in the inner city. Due to the gravitational power of place of employment, Turkish neighbourhood and inexpensive housing, many later arrivals and those who settled in other areas of Melbourne also joined friends and relatives as neighbours and workmates. The concentration of Turks in Broadmeadows then became more visible. While other factors influenced the settlement and occupation patterns in Melbourne (Icduygu, 1991: 112-256), structural segmentation of the Australian population provided a particular social class position for Turkish migrants which became more direct and certain when they were concentrated in certain industries and occupations and tended to settle in particular neighbourhoods.

While work and occupational status shaped the migrants' economic and social positions in Australia, "the notion and practice of working abroad" had also determined their mobility in both the pre- and post-migratory periods. They experienced a dramatic change in their working and occupational status over time. Most, including those who were skilled or semi-skilled, initially worked as manual labourers, irrespective of their occupations in Turkey. As duration of residence lengthened, some found jobs in their principal occupations while many spent all their working lives in Australia in manual factory jobs. The working lives of many Turkish immigrants, including early and later arrivals, were characterized by employment instability and, to some extent, downward occupational mobility. Almost two-fifths of the migrants interviewed in Melbourne indicated that their occupational status had declined relative to their last job in Turkey. Only a quarter experienced upward mobility.

While it is difficult to assess the extent to which personal skills or abilities had been the primary determinants of the migrants' occupational position and mobility, it is clear that structural factors channelled Turkish migration as a whole into a wage-labour flow, creating an ethnic community that took on the character of "factory fodder". It could be argued that since the majority of Turkish migrants (particularly in the

early period of settlement) saw their stay in Australia as a temporary sojourn, they did not have a long-term interest in their work and this affected their attitude towards their occupational status and progress. In essence they did not think they would be around long enough to make themselves occupationally and socially comfortable in their work. When their settlement intentions shifted to permanent stay, they had already spent several years in unskilled, dangerous, unhealthy and unsatisfactory jobs, and a large proportion had even quit the paid workforce. After an average of twelve years in Australia, their occupational gains were less than modest. Aspirations to return to Turkey in improved economic circumstances or (later, after accepting the fact that they were unlikely to return to Turkey) to occupy a relatively high economic or social position in Australia had not been fulfilled.

EARLY AND LATER TURKISH IMMIGRANTS

Arrivals after the late 1970s included a significant proportion of city-born, skilled and professional men and women. Since the number of these latecomers was small in the whole Turkish community, and they had been in Australia for short periods, it is difficult to compare their settlement experiences with those of the early migrants. Even so, Table 4 (pages 89 and 90) indicates that their characteristics and experiences were distinctive. For example, later migrants were likely to spend a longer time than early migrants finding their first employment and also to have fewer job changes. Downward occupational mobility was more characteristic of later migrants than early migrants. They also changed their places of residence less often than the early migrants and bought their first homes in Australia in less than five years, compared with eight years for the early migrants. Although acquisition of property depended on one's financial situation, many latecomers had arrived with the intention of permanent settlement.

Later migrants had more permissive attitudes concerning control and discipline of their children than did the early migrants. They were less likely than early migrants to be opposed to their children marrying non-Turks which suggests that they were more ready to be socialized and integrated into their new social environment. Their proficiency in English certainly helped them form friendships with non-Turkish persons. Fewer latecomers than early migrants felt they experienced discrimination. They were also more satisfied than early migrants with their lives in Australia, and more optimistic about their future prospects (Table 4).

While later migrants seemed to be more successfully integrated in Australian society, they experienced difficulties in finding suitable

employment. Their adaptation was shaped by the complex interaction between individual characteristics, abilities and motivations and the social context. The major difficulties faced by latecomer university graduates and other skilled migrants in the labour market resulted from their being more selective about their employment, structural employment problems during the 1980s, their limited knowledge of English and holding overseas qualifications that were sometimes unrecognized.

CONCLUDING COMMENT

This article has addressed changing patterns of migration and settlement of Turkish immigrants in Melbourne, Australia, through a transition from temporary sojourn to unintended settlement. Aside from the changing structural context of settlement, we have identified distinctive features of early and later migrants which indicate considerable heterogeneity between the two arrival cohorts. An analysis of the origin of large-scale migration from Turkey drew attention to the structural factors which operated to bring thousands of Turkish migrants to Australia and to channel them into certain jobs and particular neighbourhoods and social networks. While individual characteristics, perceptions, interpretations and actions help explain why some migrants were more successful than others, adaptation had clearly been influenced by initial intentions to stay only temporarily. The preceding analysis and discussion on the migration and settlement experiences of the sample of Turkish immigrants highlights the fact that, for many, moving to Australia meant choosing by default. Many were not aware of all the alternatives when they pursued a course of action because it seemed the most practical thing to do. Structural dynamics and factors in the international migration market largely accounted for this happening. In Australia, they spontaneously encountered innumerable social, economic, demographic and cultural changes. Their decisions to stay permanently were generally made on the basis of perceived consequences of each alternative rather than just gravitating toward the one that initially seemed most practical.

NOTES

1. Part of this article is based on my doctoral dissertation, "Migrant as a Transitional Category: Turkish Migrants in Melbourne, Australia" which was submitted to the Department of Demography, Australian National University, in 1991. The Research School of Social Sciences of the Australian National University generously provided funding for the research, which was supervised by Drs. Christabal Young, Lincoln Day and Charles Price. I would like to thank them for the many suggestions and ideas they provided in discussions, which helped in writing this essay. This essay has also benefited from the assistance of Laraine Stanley.
2. For a more detailed description of the Melbourne Turkish Migration (MTM) Study, see Icduygu (1991).
3. Estimated by the author. The sources for these estimations are SOPEMI Reports by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Secretariat.
4. While a great deal of research has been done on Turkish workers and their families in Western Europe, and on various non-Turkish immigrant groups in Australia, very little consistent research has been done on the Turkish migrants in Australia. For detailed information on studies of Turkish migrants in Australia see Icduygu (1991). For a voluminous annotated bibliography of the studies on Turkish migrants in Europe see Abadan-Unat and Kemiksiz (1986). For detailed information on studies on the experience of various immigrant groups in Australia, see the four issues in the bibliographic series, *Australian Immigration, A Bibliography and Digest*, edited by Price (1966, 1971, 1976, 1979). For the same purpose, see also the bibliography in the encyclopaedic work, *The Australian People*, edited by Jupp (1988).
5. The careful wording of the 1967 agreement which tried to avoid any implication of permanent settlement in Australia was probably a result of the insistence of the Turkish authorities. The Turkish government clearly intended Turkish emigration to be temporary migration. Historically, from the standpoint of the official policies and ideologies in Turkey, any kind of mass permanent migration was, and is, out of the question.
6. The names of respondents used in this study are not their own.
7. This quotation was drawn from the transcript of interviews with Turkish migrants in Melbourne in the Melbourne Turkish Migration Survey (MTM). A seven digit identification number was given to each interviewed respondent. Preceding this number, the abbreviation of "R. No." refers to "respondent number".

REFERENCES

- Abadan-Unat, N., and N. Kemiksiz
 1986 *Türk Dis Gocu: 1960-1984* (Turkish External Migration: 1960-1984), Siyasal Bilimler Fakultesi, Ankara.
- Bahadir, S. A.
 1979 "Turkey and the Turks in Germany", *Aussenpolitik*, 1: 104-115.
- Bilmen, M. S.
 1976 "Educational Problems Encountered by the Children of Turkish Migrant Workers", in N. Abadan-Unat (Ed.), *Turkish Workers in Europe 1960-1975*, E. J. Brill, Leiden: 235-252.
- Birrell, R., and T. Birrell
 1981 *An Issue of People*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne.
- Castles, S.
 1984 *Here for Good*, Pluto Press, London.
 1989 *Migrant Workers and the Transformation of Western Societies*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.
- Department of Labour and Immigration (DLI)
 1975 *1788-1975 Australia and Immigration*, Australian Government Publishing Office, Canberra.
- Elley, J.
 1985 *Guestworkers or Settlers? Turkish Migrants in Melbourne*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Monash University, Melbourne.
- Ethnic Affairs Commission of New South Wales (EAC of NSW)
 1985 *Eighteen Years After*, An Interim Report by the EAC of NSW, Sydney.
- Hammar, T.
 1985 "Sweden", in T. Hammar (Ed.), *European Immigration Policy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
 1990 "Comparing European and North American International Migration", *International Migration Review*, 23(3): 631-637.
- Icduygu, A.
 1988 *Non-intended Settlement and Ethnic Adaptation: The Case of Turkish Migrants*. Paper presented at the Australian Population Association 4th National Conference, August 1988, Brisbane.
 1991 *Migrant as a Transitional Category: Turkish Migrants in Melbourne, Australia*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Demography Department, Australian National University, Canberra.
 1993 *Temporariness versus Permanence: Changing Nature of the Turkish Immigrant Settlements in Australia and Sweden*. Paper prepared for the XXIIInd General Conference of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, 24 August-1 September, Montreal.
- Immigration Planning Council (IPC)
 1968 *Australia's Immigration Programme for the Period 1968-1973*, tabled in the House of Representatives, Canberra.
- Jupp, J.
 1966 *Arrival and Departures*, Cheshire-Landsdowne, Melbourne.

- Jupp, J. (Ed.)
 1988 *The Australian People. An Encyclopaedia of the Nation, its People and their Origin*, Angus and Robertson, Sydney.
- Kritz, M. M., and C. B. Keeley
 1981 "Introduction", in M. M. Kritz et al. (Eds), *Global Trends in Migration: Theory and Research on International Movements*, Center for Migration Studies, New York.
- Kunz, E. F.
 1988 "Post-war Non-British Immigration", in J. Jupp (Ed.), *The Australian People. An Encyclopaedia of the Nation, its People and their Origin*, Angus and Robertson, Sydney: 100-106.
- MacDonald, J. S., and L. D. MacDonald
 1964 "Chain Migration, Ethnic Neighbourhood Formation and Social Networks", *Millbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 42(1): 82-97.
- Manderson, L.
 1988 "Turks", in J. Jupp (Ed.), *The Australian People. An Encyclopaedia of the Nation, its People and their Origin*, Angus and Robertson, Sydney: 818-825.
- Messina, A. M.
 1989 "Anti-Immigration Illiberalism and the 'New' Ethnic and Racial Minorities in Western Europe", *Patterns of Prejudice*, 23, autumn: 17-31.
 1990 "Political Impediments to the Resumption of Labour Migration to Western Europe", *West European Politics*, 13(1): 31-46.
 1992 "The Two Tiers of Ethnic Conflict in Western Europe", *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, 16(2): 51-64.
- Piore, M. J.
 1979 *Birds of Passage*, Cambridge University Press, London.
- Portes, A., and R. L. Bach
 1985 *Latin Journey*, University of California Press, London.
- Price, E. A. (Ed.)
 1966 *Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest, No. 1*, Australian National University Press, Canberra.
 1971 *Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest, No. 2*, Australian National University Press, Canberra.
 1976 *Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest, No. 3*, Australian National University Press, Canberra.
 1979 *Australian Immigration: A Bibliography and Digest, No. 4*, Australian National University Press, Canberra.
- Rogers, R. M. (Ed.)
 1985 *Guest Come to Stay*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.
- Young, C. M.
 1983 "Education, Employment and the Turkish Community in Australia", *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, 2(2): 35-57.

TABLE 1
SETTLEMENT INTENTIONS AT THE TIME OF ARRIVAL
BY PERIOD OF ARRIVAL (% DISTRIBUTION), 1987 MTM SURVEY

Settlement intentions	Period of arrival		
	1968-74	1975-87	1968-87
Temporary settlement	77	32	60
Not decided	4	14	8
Permanent settlement	19	54	32
Total	100	100	100
(N) ¹	171	105	276

TABLE 2
SETTLEMENT INTENTIONS AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW
BY PERIOD OF ARRIVAL (% DISTRIBUTION), 1987 MTM SURVEY

Settlement intentions	Period of arrival		
	1968-74	1975-87	1968-87
Temporary settlement	12	19	14
Not decided	35	36	36
Permanent settlement	53	45	50
Total	100	100	100
(N) ¹	171	105	276

1. "N" in all tables means the number of persons interviewed.

TABLE 3
INITIAL SETTLEMENT INTENTIONS OF TURKISH MIGRANTS
AND THEIR INTEGRATION INTO THE LIFE IN AUSTRALIA,
1987 MTM SURVEY

	Settlement intentions at time of arrival		
	Temporary settlement (N=166)	Not decided (N=22)	Permanent settlement (N=88)
English-speaking ability at the time of interview:			
Not at all/not well	40	22	10
Well	46	46	34
Quite well/very well	14	32	56
Having non-Turkish intimate friends			
Yes	3	41	19
No	97	59	81
Experience of discrimination			
Yes	25	50	44
No	75	50	56
Satisfaction with life in Australia			
Yes	58	50	85
No	42	50	15
Migrants' views on the future prospects for their lives in Australia			
Pessimistic	15	27	6
Neither pessimistic nor optimistic	49	32	19
Optimistic	36	41	75
Attitudes to becoming an Australian citizen			
Already became	58	23	89
Intended to apply	11	14	2
Have applied for	16	36	6
No intention	15	27	3

TABLE 3 (cont'd)
INITIAL SETTLEMENT INTENTIONS OF TURKISH MIGRANTS
AND THEIR INTEGRATION INTO THE LIFE IN AUSTRALIA,
1987 MTM SURVEY

	Settlement intentions at time of arrival		
	Temporary settlement (N=166)	Not decided (N=22)	Permanent settlement (N=88)
Migrants who are opposed to their children marrying non-Turkish			
Son			
Yes	55	64	42
No	45	36	58
Daughter			
Yes	77	55	55
No	33	45	45
Sharing house/flat with others within the first five years			
Yes	62	55	29
No	38	45	71
Average number of residential moves within the first five years	3.3	2.2	1.9
Average number of jobs held within the first five years	3.2	2.3	2.0
First visit to Turkey* (median duration)	4.7 years	--	6.7 years
Purchasing home in Turkey* (median duration)	4.1 years	--	6.5 years
Purchasing home in Australia* (median duration)	9.3 years	--	5.8 years

*Survival Analysis. The median duration indicates "x" years after arrival.

TABLE 4

A COMPARISON OF THE EARLY AND LATER IMMIGRANTS
BY SOME ASPECTS OF THEIR INTEGRATION INTO THE LIFE
IN AUSTRALIA, 1987 MTM SURVEY

	Early immigrants ¹ (N=171)	Later immigrants ² (N=105)
English-speaking ability at time of interview		
Not at all/not well	41	11
Well	31	61
Quite well/very well	28	28
Having non-Turkish intimate friends		
Yes	7	23
No	93	77
Experience of discrimination		
Yes	27	43
No	73	57
Satisfaction with life in Australia		
Yes	56	80
No	44	20
Migrants' views on the future prospects for their lives in Australia		
Pessimistic	15	10
Neither pessimistic nor optimistic	52	15
Optimistic	33	75
Attitudes to becoming an Australian citizen		
Already became	55	81
Intended to apply	13	9
Have applied for	15	5
No intention	17	5

1. Early immigrants (N=171): Migrants who arrived in Australia in the years between 1968 and 1974.
2. Later immigrants (N=105): Migrants who arrived in Australia in the years between 1975 and 1986.

TABLE 4 (cont'd)

A COMPARISON OF THE EARLY AND LATER IMMIGRANTS
BY SOME ASPECTS OF THEIR INTEGRATION INTO THE LIFE
IN AUSTRALIA, 1987 MTM SURVEY

	Early immigrants ¹ (N=171)	Later immigrants ² (N=105)
Migrants who are opposed to their children marrying non-Turkish		
Son		
Yes	59	40
No	41	60
Daughter		
Yes	71	47
No	29	53
Sharing house/flat with others within the first five years		
Yes	59	33
No	41	67
Average number of residential moves within the first five years	2.9	1.7
Average number of jobs held within the first five years	2.9	1.9
First visit to Turkey* (median duration)	4.2 years	6.1 years
Purchasing home in Turkey* (median duration)	3.9 years	5.5 years
Purchasing home in Australia* (median duration)	7.8 years	4.6 years

1. Early immigrants (N=171): Migrants who arrived in Australia in the years between 1968 and 1974.
2. Later immigrants (N=105): Migrants who arrived in Australia in the years between 1975 and 1986.

*Survival Analysis. The median duration indicates "x" years after arrival.

LA FIXATION NON INTENTIONNELLE D'IMMIGRANTS TURCS EN AUSTRALIE - S'ADAPTER AU CHANGEMENT ET OPERER DES CHOIX

Depuis le début des années 60, des milliers de Turcs ont quitté leur pays, notamment pour l'Allemagne de l'Ouest, en vue de se placer sur le marché du travail, essentiellement dans le cadre du régime dit des "travailleurs immigrés". Seul un petit pourcentage d'entre eux (estimé à 1 pour cent) ont émigré vers l'Australie, avec la motivation—selon le Gouvernement australien—de s'y installer définitivement, même si beaucoup d'entre eux ne voyaient pas les choses de cette façon. Cet article s'intéresse à l'expérience unique de la migration turque en Australie et pose trois questions principales : Premièrement, pourquoi ces immigrants se sont-ils rendus en Australie avec l'intention de n'y effectuer qu'un séjour temporaire en dépit du fait qu'à aucun moment, le régime des "travailleurs immigrés" n'a fait partie de la politique d'immigration de ce pays? Deuxièmement, comment en sont-ils arrivés à se fixer de façon plus ou moins permanente en Australie? Et troisièmement, dans quelle mesure les intentions initiales de ces immigrants "temporaires" et l'évolution de ces intentions ont-elles influé sur l'insertion des immigrants et des membres de leur famille dans le tissu social australien?

Cette étude montre que l'accord de migration de 1967 entre les Gouvernements australien et turc a marqué une étape centrale dans l'histoire de l'immigration turque, rendant possible l'arrivée d'immigrants turcs en Australie et influant également les stades successifs de la migration et de l'installation. Il n'y a pas eu d'immigration turque importante en dehors de la période 1968-1974, période durant laquelle l'immigration s'est effectuée essentiellement sur la base du programme de migration assistée fondé sur l'accord de 1967. A l'expiration de l'accord en 1974, l'immigration en provenance de Turquie a non seulement diminué, mais elle a surtout concerné des arrivées "en chaîne" et des regroupements familiaux, à l'exception des diplômés universitaires des années 80. Etant donné que l'Australie n'avait guère attiré que les immigrants turcs de la réserve de travailleurs immigrés constituée dans les années 60 et 70, la majorité des premiers immigrants, contrairement à ceux qui les ont suivis, n'avaient pas l'intention de s'installer à titre définitif et se considéraient comme une main-d'oeuvre temporaire appelée à retourner au pays le moment venu. Beaucoup d'entre eux, cependant, ont changé d'avis ou échoué dans leurs plans : certains ne sont jamais retournés en Turquie et d'autres ont refait plusieurs fois le voyage pour l'Australie. Par conséquent, l'installation d'immigrants turcs en Australie a été caractérisée par une période transitoire entre la migration temporaire et l'installation non intentionnelle.

En dépit du fait que les intentions initiales des immigrants temporaires ont eu une incidence importante et continue sur la manière dont ils se sont progressivement insérés dans le tissu social australien, la structure historique de l'immigration turque en Australie, indépendante de la volonté d'installation des immigrants, a eu une dimension et un rôle bien spécifiques. Les immigrants ont ainsi été confrontés à des rapports économiques et sociaux inhabituels dans la société hétérogène, stratifiée et pluraliste du pays d'accueil. Si l'Australie est devenue une "nouvelle patrie" pour de nombreux Turcs, leur nouveau cadre social s'est révélé être dans une grande mesure le résultat dialectique des caractéristiques particulières de ces immigrants eux-mêmes, de la société qui les avait accueillis, de celle qu'ils avaient quittée, et du contexte plus général de la migration internationale dont ils étaient l'un des maillons.

ENFRENTANDOSE A LOS CAMBIOS Y TOMANDO DECISIONES: ASENTAMIENTO IMPREVISTO DE INMIGRANTES TURCOS EN AUSTRALIA

Desde principios de los años sesenta, miles de turcos han salido al extranjero, particularmente a Alemania Occidental para vender su mano de obra principalmente en el marco del sistema denominado trabajadores migrantes. Sólo una pequeña proporción (aproximadamente el 1 por ciento) ha migrado a Australia en un contexto considerado por el Gobierno australiano (aunque no por muchos migrantes turcos) como un asentamiento permanente. Este artículo examina la experiencia única de inmigración turca a Australia y trata de tres cuestiones principales: primero, porqué estos migrantes fueron a Australia con la intención de radicar únicamente por una temporada pese al hecho de que la política de inmigración de Australia nunca ha comprendido el aspecto "trabajador migrante"; segundo, cómo pasaron a asentarse de manera más o menos permanente en Australia; y, tercero, en qué medida la intención original de migración temporal, y los subsiguientes cambios en su intención, incidieron en la incorporación de migrantes individuales y de sus familias en la estructura social de Australia.

Este estudio pone de relieve que el acuerdo suscrito entre los Gobiernos de Australia y Turquía en 1967 constituye un aspecto central de la historia de la inmigración turca, haciendo posible que exista una corriente de migrantes turcos a Australia y afectando estructuralmente las distintas etapas de migración y reasentamiento. Durante 1968 y 1974 se produjo una considerable migración turca, principalmente a través de un programa de migración asistida, basado en el acuerdo de 1967. Este acuerdo llegó a su término en 1974, lo cual, en los años ochenta, no solamente dio lugar a una disminución de la migración desde Turquía, sino que comprendió muchas llegadas a través de la migración en cadena

y de la reunificación familiar, con excepción de graduados universitarios. Habida cuenta de que Australia atraía a los migrantes turcos provenientes de un grupo constituido en los años sesenta y setenta cuyo objetivo era el del trabajador migrante, la mayoría de los primeros migrantes, a diferencia de aquéllos que llegaron más tarde, inicialmente no tenían la intención de asentarse de manera permanente, pero se consideraban como trabajadores temporales quienes, llegado el momento, retornarían a su país de origen. No obstante, muchos cambiaron de idea o no lograron realizar estos planes y terminaron no volviendo nunca a Turquía o retornando reiteradamente a Australia. En consecuencia, el asentamiento turco en Australia se caracteriza por una etapa de transición entre la migración temporal y el asentamiento imprevisto.

Si bien su intención inicial de ser migrantes temporales tenía una importante y continua repercusión en las maneras en que se incorporaban en los distintos contextos sociales en Australia, la estructura, determinada históricamente, de la inmigración turca y del asentamiento en Australia, independientemente de la intención de asentamiento de los migrantes, tenía una capacidad y función propias. Los inmigrantes se encontraban en el centro de relaciones sociales y económicas inusuales en un país de acogida heterogéneo, estratificado y pluralístico. Si bien Australia se ha convertido en un "nuevo hogar" para muchos turcos, su contexto social ha sido principalmente el resultado dialéctico de una característica peculiar de los propios migrantes, la sociedad en la que se incorporaron, la sociedad que abandonaron, y el contexto más amplio de migración internacional del que formaron parte.