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The theoretical analyses of social inequality often regard ethnicity as a complicating factor, external to processes of class structuration. This has frequently resulted from the attempt to separately analyse various 'dimensions' of inequality, a tradition deriving largely from Weber's distinction between economic classes and status groups. Since ethnic groups are treated by sociologists working within the Weberian tradition as a kind of status group, they are viewed as a mode of group formation which competes with the formation of classes as coherent social entities.

Ethnicity is viewed as a complicating factor precisely because it is often significant in various structures of inequality. Its importance in processes of labour market segmentation, which produces jobs characterised by widely differing wages, conditions of work and career paths, is supported by evidence of the concentration of certain ethnic groups in specific occupations. The thesis argues that these processes of segmentation affect class composition and the internal structure of classes through the introduction of new productive positions and the alteration of existing ones. Consequently, ethnicity is empirically significant in some processes forming the structure of class.

A suggested solution to this theoretical problem is the integration of subjective and objective aspects of class. The view that objective structures are created and maintained regardless of
the consciousness and activity of participants is rejected. Rather, consciousness is viewed not only as the product of objective social location, but also as creating and changing objective structures. This allows for the incorporation of ethnicity into explanatory accounts, since ethnicity is referred to primarily with respect to cultural attributes. This includes both the attitudes, norms and values of ethnic group members, and assessments of ethnic groups by others.

The thesis investigates the ways in which ethnicity has been operative in historical processes whereby the labour force in Australia has been supplied, especially in the post-war years. In addition, the generation of new positions in the production process, and the way in which workers have been allocated to them, have also been processes in which ethnicity has been operative. These considerations allow the development of a proposed analytical framework which can be used to examine processes of class formation.

The way in which ethnic factors, interacting with various structural mechanisms, are operative in the crucially important stage of initial allocation of workers to positions, is illustrated by an examination of the labour market experience of Vietnamese migrants in Hobart. The study does not test the argument of the thesis, but rather is concerned to illustrate the theoretical position adopted. The limited evidence available in the study adds weight to the concern to include ethnicity in accounts of processes of class formation. Further research is required in order to more fully test, modify and extend this argument, and proposals for this are offered.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Ethnicity and Structures of Inequality

In Australia, four out of ten workers employed in manufacturing are migrants (Australia 1975 (I):2). In some industries, migrants comprise 50% of the workforce. At the same time, the Jackson Committee found that they faced more problems than native-born Australians, and that these migrants on whom some parts of manufacturing depended (mostly southern Europeans), were disadvantaged and often exploited (Australia 1975 (I):87). This situation is paralleled in many Western capitalist societies, where migrants and/or ethnic minorities are often economically, (and at times politically), disadvantaged.

This thesis examines the relationship between ethnicity and structures of inequality, especially the class structure in the industrialised capitalist societies. In spite of the significance of political and economic divisions along ethnic lines in these societies,

...there has been a tendency to analyse class relations within the context of an assumed cultural and ethnic homogeneity. As a result, there has been little if any attempt to incorporate within the framework of analysis those forms of internal cleavage that arise on the basis of religious, linguistic, racial and cultural differentiation.

(Parkin 1979: 31)

Lockwood (1970) claims that historically the concept of race or ethnicity has not played a central role in sociological theory
generally. Not only were the founders of modern sociology not confronted with racial problems as a specific political issue, but they were also committed to precluding biological and other forms of non-social reductionism in their explanations. Consequently, sociological theory focused on universal, constitutive properties of societies in general, such that in stratification studies, ethnic and racial divisions in a population were treated as secondary factors complicating the analysis of social inequality. Not only did ethnicity complicate the analysis of social inequality, but class theories came to regard ethnicity as an 'obstacle' to the actual formation of classes as coherent entities (Giddens 1973: 111). Consequently ethnicity and class were treated as separate phenomena, and ethnicity viewed as an exogenous factor in the processes of social stratification.

Giddens (1973:112) suggests that this separation of class and ethnicity is explicitly built into Weber's separation of economic class and status group, where ethnic groups are treated as a kind of status group. Weber's distinction between class and status has frequently been interpreted as a separation between objective and subjective aspects of stratification. This misinterpretation gained wide acceptance among empirically oriented sociologists who maintained the separation and attempted to analyse the so-called 'dimensions' of stratification (eg. Runciman 1972). Since the root

1This was so even for writers from otherwise divergent positions such as Parsons and Baran and Sweezy in their analysis of the American Negro.
of the separation of class and ethnicity is seen as located in the differentiation between objective and subjective aspects of stratification, it is in the integration of these dimensions that a solution to our problem may be located.

**Weber: Economic Class and Status Group**

Weber (1976:184-185) viewed social inequality as a complex reality and objected to

... that kind of pseudo-scientific operation with the concepts of 'class' and 'class interests' so frequently found these days, ... , that the individual may be in error concerning his interests but that the 'class' is 'infallible' about its interests.

For Weber (1976:181), classes are not communities and the link between class and class consciousness is not direct and immediate. Class is an objective reality that has an influence on the life chances of men, and the factor that creates 'class' is "unambiguously economic interest, and indeed only those interests involved in the existence of the 'market' " (1976:183).  

His discussion of status groups on the other hand, emphasises their communal nature, which although of an amorphous kind, requires that people feel some sense of belonging to each other. Status

---

2Thus Weber (1976:181) speaks of a class when "... (1) a number of people have in common a specific causal component of their life chances, in so far as (2) this component is represented exclusively by economic interests in the possession of goods and opportunities for income, and (3) is represented under the conditions of the commodity or labour markets."
groups are established according to criteria of grouping other than those stemming from the market, criteria which enable status group members to make effective claims for social honour. Thus ethnic groups are regarded by Weber (1976:189) as a kind of status group.

While the distinction between classes and status groups may be portrayed in terms of the differentiation between objective and subjective aspects of inequality, this differentiation cannot be pushed too far. Weber insists that the distinction between a class in itself and a class for itself be maintained. Yet he admits that the concept of 'class interest' is an ambiguous one.

The class situation and other circumstances remaining the same, the direction in which the individual worker, for instance, is likely to pursue his interests may vary widely, according to whether he is constitutionally qualified for the task at hand to a high, to an average, or to a low degree.

(Weber 1976:183)

Furthermore, Weber recognises that a "communal action" by those commonly affected by the class situation can emerge from that situation. The kind of communal action emerging may be amorphous and is dependent on certain conditions such as the general cultural conditions, the extent to which contrasts in life chances have evolved, and especially the "transparency of the connections between the causes and the consequences of the 'class situation' ".

"For however different life chances may be, this fact in itself, according to all experience, by no means gives birth to 'class action' ... The fact of being conditioned and the results of the class situation must be distinctly recognisable. For only then the contrast of life chances can be felt not as an absolutely given fact to be accepted ... It is only then that people may react against the class structure not only through acts of an intermittent and irrational protest, but in the form of rational association." (Weber 1976:184)
However, since in Weber's (1976:183-184) terminology a "communal action" refers to that action which is oriented to the feeling of the actors that they belong together, it becomes obvious that he by no means restricts the notion of subjectivity to the concept of status groups. In addition, Weber (1976:187) is very clearly aware that classes and status groups are closely related, primarily through property.

Class distinctions are linked in the most varied ways with status distinctions. Property as such is not always recognised as a status qualification, but in the long run it is, and with extraordinary regularity.

Consequently, although he wants to avoid mechanistic assertions about the nature of the relationship between class as an objective reality, and class consciousness as a basis for communal action, Weber's own work does not suggest that the objective-subjective split can be rigidly maintained. Yet it is this distinction which has become a major feature in subsequent stratification theory. While constituting a problem for class theory generally, it is also significant in its implications for the way in which ethnicity has been treated in class analysis. The treatment of ethnic groups as status groups, within the context of the separation of status and class as different "dimensions" of stratification, has meant that within class analysis, ethnicity has often been accorded secondary status, and has been regarded as a complicating factor in the process of class formation.
The Objective-Subjective Distinction in Stratification Analysis

It is possible to distinguish four different 'perspectives' in stratification theory. These perspectives are distinguished by reference to the differentiation between objective and subjective aspects, but also vary according to the degree to which they aim to be descriptive or explanatory. These differing perspectives have developed as a result of ideological and theoretical divisions primarily between Marxian and Weberian theorists of stratification.

In the following outline, these perspectives are presented in more exaggerated form than they typically appear in the literature. While there is no suggestion that one or more writers necessarily fits neatly into one perspective, such exaggeration is useful in that it enables us to see more clearly the roots of our problems.

(1) The first 'perspective' aims to identify empirically, strata or classes in various societies, and to provide a 'map' of the structure of inequality. The criteria used are typically objective, such as occupational differentiation, inequalities in income and differential access to formal education. An interest in individual mobility frequently stimulates this theoretical concern (Goldthorpe 1980). The stratification scheme that emerges in such studies resembles a static graduated scale, in which more or less arbitrary grading points represent the boundaries between strata through which individuals move. Typical of these schemes is that of Warner and his colleagues who claim to identify six classes in the United States - Upper Upper, Lower Upper, Upper Middle, Lower Middle, Upper Lower and Lower Lower (Warner et.al. 1963:43).
This perspective locates minority members among the various strata (usually based on occupational categories), and at times recognises that occupational segregation by ethnicity is a characteristic of industrial societies (see Broom & Jones 1976:40). However, in its concern to provide a comprehensive map of social inequality, this perspective separates various 'dimensions' of stratification, and regards them as different 'bases'. Consequently, there can be stratification by economic class, by age, by sex, or by ethnic origin. At the same time, writers recognise that these different bases are frequently connected, since any individual is located in each kind of stratum system. The separation of the dimensions of class and ethnicity, yet the recognition of their relatedness poses problems for this perspective, since each 'base' can prevent the identification of differently based strata. Broom & Jones (1976:116) claim, for example, that

...two cross-cutting factors may mask the existence of strata defined strictly in socio-economic terms: (1) immigration, which alters the meaning and acceptance of educational attainment and other social characteristics, interrupts (sometimes enhances) the flow of an occupational career, and results in a possible drop or increase in earnings compared with men who are similar in other respects; ... Ethnicity,... intersect(s) strictly socio-economic differences and mask(s) the clarity with which social strata can be distinguished.

(emphasis mine)

(2) The second 'perspective' is concerned with the fundamental mechanisms and processes that generate and continue to reshape the objective structure of inequality. While writers inspired by Marx typically have this concern (Carchedi 1975; Poulantzas 1978; Connell 1977), it is also evident among writers in other traditions (Parkin 1979; Giddens 1973; Dahrendorf 1959). Studies of this kind attempt
to explain the structure of inequality by referring to some 'deeper' structural mechanisms rather than simply describe it. The question asked is not so much 'what does the structure of inequality look like?', but rather 'how is this structure generated, why and how does it continue over time, by what processes will the structure be changed?'. The stress is placed not so much on the location of people as on their activity in production and market exchange, and classes are not seen so much as statistical categories, but rather in relational terms.

This perspective recognises that ethnicity has implications for class formation. At times, it is seen to promote class structuration, as when class and ethnic cleavages coincide (Giddens 1973:112), and a specific class such as a sub-proletariat is formed. But more frequently, it is thought that ethnicity cuts across classes, fragmenting them and preventing the formation of classes as coherent unities.

Furthermore, as Parkin notes, these internal class distinctions based on ethnicity are not put on the same theoretical plane as inter-class divisions. For example, inter-class relations are usually conceived of as antagonistic and as an expression of certain generic features of property rights, authority relations or the division of labour. However, intra-class relations inspire a rather more bland concern with "the niceties of social differentiation", eg. variations in life style, and often appear to derive from peculiarly national conditions rather than from universal systemic features of capitalism (1979:29-30).
These first two perspectives view inequality as an objective structure which has an important influence on men's lives in concrete material ways, regardless of men's recognition of this structure (Westergaard & Resler 1975:27). The last two perspectives however, emphasise subjective aspects of stratification.

(3) The subjectivity of individual class members concerns the third 'perspective'. At its most extreme, this subjective dimension is seen as defining class membership in psychological terms. This position is represented by Centers (1949), who distinguishes between a stratum and a class. Strata are objective social and economic categories of people distinguished on the basis of occupation, power, income, standard of living and education. However, class is treated as a phenomenon of a different order altogether. For Centers ...

... classes are psycho-social groups, something that is essentially subjective in character, dependent upon class consciousness (i.e. a feeling of group membership), and class lines of cleavage may or may not conform to what seems to social scientists to be logical lines of cleavage in the objective or stratification sense. (Centers 1949:27)

He defines class as a psychological phenomenon. That is, a man's class is "a feeling on his part of belongingness to something and identification with something larger than himself" (Centers 1949:27). Classes do not have consciousness in all respects. Class only has reality insofar as it is subjectively real to members.

In less extreme forms, some theories are concerned with the content of the common awareness and consciousness developed by
individual class members⁴. These writers are interested in the process of development of class awareness to the point where the class engages in communal action (Mann 1973; Giddens 1973), as well as in actual perceptions of the class structure held by individuals (Parkin 1972; Ossowski 1963).

This perspective recognises that ethnic individuals develop a sense of belonging to their ethnic group, and that their consciousness is also influenced by their ethnicity. However, this can prevent their identification with their class, especially if their ethnic group makes competing claims for loyalty, thereby hindering the possibilities for communal class action. Centers' conception of class parallels the above conception of an ethnic group. Consequently, class and ethnicity retain no distinctiveness, but are collapsed into the same kind of psychological phenomena. An individual's ethnic group, according to Center's definition, can also be his class.

(4) The final 'perspective' considered is the Hegelian-Marxist one, represented especially by Lukács and also by Gramsci. While concerned with subjective aspects of class, interest is in the

⁴However, these later theorists do not separate socio-economic status and awareness/consciousness as being phenomena of a different order from each other, but rather as two aspects of the one phenomenon. Underpinning this approach is the theory of the sociology of knowledge, namely that the sharing of a common social location will give rise to similar perspectives and world view, and that knowledge "is from the very beginning a cooperative process of group life, in which everyone unfolds his knowledge within the framework of a common fate, a common activity, and the overcoming of common difficulties" (Mannheim 1936:26)
consciousness of classes as historical wholes, which is not to be identified with the consciousness of individual members. Classes are conceived as totalities, as actors in the historical process. And class consciousness is viewed as having a holistic nature, with a reality independent of the consciousness of individual members. For Lukács, class consciousness is imputed ideology

... class consciousness consists in fact of the appropriate reactions 'imputed' to a particular typical position in the process of production. This consciousness is therefore, neither the sum nor the average of what is thought or felt by the single individuals who make up the class.

(Lukács 1968:51)

The importance of class consciousness derives from its decisive role in historical change. Lukács argues that the transformation of society requires the dialectical method of conceiving of totality, which is only possible for classes, and more particularly for the proletariat.

... for the proletariat the total knowledge of its class situation was a vital necessity, a matter of life and death; because its class situation becomes comprehensible only if the whole of society can be understood; and because this understanding is the inescapable precondition of its actions. Thus the unity of theory and practice is only the reverse side of the social and historical position of the proletariat. From its own point of view

Likewise, Gramsci (Cavalcanti et al. 1975:21) views consciousness as essential in the process of change, since it allows one to understand one's own historical value and function in life. Consciousness is formed through intelligent reflection, first by a few people, then by a whole class, which reflects on the reasons for certain conditions and on how best to convert them from causes of servitude into symbols of rebellion and social reconstruction.
self knowledge coincides with the knowledge of the whole so that the proletariat is at one and the same time the subject and object of its own knowledge.  
(Lukács 1968:20)

Lukács claims that clarity in conceiving the totality, required for social transformation, is only possible when social groups have a fully economic articulation. This only occurs with the development of capitalism.

... for pre-capitalist epochs and for the behaviour of many strata within capitalism whose economic roots lie in precapitalism, class consciousness is unable to achieve complete clarity and to influence the course of history consciously.

It is true above all because class interests in pre-capitalist society never achieve full (economic) articulation. Hence the structuring of society into castes and estates means that economic interests are inextricably joined to political and religious factors.  
(Lukać 1968:55)

Consequently, status groups (including ethnic groups) cannot have the required view of the 'totalität', and "status consciousness - a real historical factor - masks class consciousness; in fact it prevents it from emerging at all" (1968:58). Consequently, this perspective also views ethnicity as an obstacle to the formation of consciousness required for social transformation.

Although each of these perspectives views ethnicity as a complicating variable in class analysis, empirically, ethnicity and class are linked. In varying degrees in different societies, cleavages between classes coincide with ethnic differentiation. Consequently, the theoretical separation between class and ethnicity
does not allow for a comprehensive understanding of real social processes involved in class formation, just as a too rigid distinction between the objective and subjective aspects of stratification can neglect the empirical reality that social inequality is a 'whole' experience which can defy dissection. Furthermore, the treatment of ethnicity as a secondary, exogenous factor in class formation introduces contortions into attempts to explain conflicts and cleavage in countries such as South Africa.

The complexity of social inequality demands a more integrated theoretical approach in order to adequately explain it. Indeed, many theoretical perspectives already exhibit strains towards the 'inclusion' and integration of ethnic divisions into the framework of stratification theory. For example, some studies which are primarily concerned with class as an objective reality recognise subjective factors in the identification of class. Warner and his associates (1963:xvi,36-38) distinguish between social class and economic class in terms of general behaviour and social attitude. Economic factors, though important, are insufficient to account for all social class behaviour. They therefore define social class in terms of being ranked or evaluated by people (subjective assessment), although evaluation is often based on objective and relational criteria. In a similar way, Broom and Jones (1976:77) distinguish class and strata on the basis of subjective aspects. A class in their terminology, is a special kind of stratum,

6Here the major line of cleavage is apparently racial, yet economic interests are also an integral element of the structure of inequality.
distinguished among other things by an awareness of and competition with other social classes.

On the other hand, those studies whose primary focus is on subjective aspects recognise that subjective awareness or consciousness emerges from objective location. For example, Giddens (1973:111) argues that if classes are to be defined as social realities and not simply in terms of relationships that have no content, then "this must be manifest in the formation of common patterns of behaviour and attitude."

It is apparent from the preceding discussion that the problem of incorporating ethnicity into class analysis such that it is seen as an endogenous factor in formation processes, is part of this problem of linking objective and subjective aspects of social class. In view of this, we suggest that not only does subjective awareness emerge from objective social location, but that subjective aspects - values, attitudes, judgements and assessments - contribute to the mechanisms that produce an objective class structure. That is, that the generative mechanisms are not only economic, but also political and cultural. This means that specifically ethnic cultural factors can be regarded not as a complicating feature, but as an essential part of any explanation of the particular formation of the class structure in societies which are ethnically differentiated.

However, before discussing this suggestion further, it is necessary and useful to outline and evaluate the major kinds of responses to the traditional treatment of ethnicity in class analysis, with respect to the contribution they make in resolving the problem.
Responses to the Secondary Status of Ethnicity

There have been three major kinds of response to the treatment of ethnicity as a secondary phenomenon in class analysis or in sociological theory generally. The first response tends toward a 'celebration' of ethnicity thereby denying the continuing social salience of class. Although Van den Berghe (1976:244), (a leading theorist of pluralism), claims that it is a distortion of reality to reduce class to ethnicity or ethnicity to class (1976:244), yet he also suggests that class and ethnicity is an either/or option. He claims that class and ethnic solidarity tend to be antithetical to each other, being logically incompatible principles of organising collectivities for political action (1976:249). Their incompatibility as bases for communal action means therefore that the appeal and salience of one is the inverse of the other. Van den Berghe tends toward giving the 'upper hand' to ethnicity when he claims that even class organisation hinges to some extent on ethnic symbolism.

... it may well be generally the case that class organisation being based on the rather abstract notion of interest, is intrinsically more difficult to achieve than ethnic organisation, based as it is on recognition of readily identifiable cultural symbols. It has not escaped many students of class that in well-defined class systems such as those of eighteenth and nineteenth century Europe, class groups acquired quasi - or sub-ethnic characteristics (of dress, dialect, and so on) and became in Weberian terminology Stande, or status groups.

(Van den Berghe 1976:251-252)

This shift toward giving primacy to ethnicity becomes even more apparent in Glazer and Moynihan (1970,1975) and Bell (1975). They
note what they interpret to be the continuing and growing salience of ethnicity in the United States, and claim that there is a rise in ethnic identification, because working class identities have lost status and respect (Galzer and Moynihan 1970:xxxiv; Bell 1975:157). Consequently, political interest is pursued as effectively now by ethnic groups as it was by classes, and the issues for politics are increasingly ethnic (Glazer & Moynihan 1975:5, 7; Bell 1975:68).

While recognising the interaction between class and ethnicity, these authors nevertheless conclude that the major line of cleavage which is socially salient in American society is ethnic. They claim that changes in the class structure have reduced class sentiment and ties, allowing ethnicity to virtually displace class as the major basis of political identity (Glazer and Moynihan 1970:299; Bell 1975:168).

This position assumes also that a sense of identity with a class or an ethnic group is an either/or event. The roots of this are again to be found in Weber's separation of class and status groups, where different economic and political conditions give rise to class conflict or to status conflict. Furthermore, their claim that ethnicity is the emerging principle of social organisation in plural societies rests on the assumption that changes in the class structure have meant a decline in class organisation, and a reduction in the salience of class. Yet, as the Affluent Worker study by Goldthorpe et.al. (1969) indicates, changes associated with the embourgeoisement thesis such as increased earnings, improved working conditions and enlightened employer policies, do not basically alter the class situation of the industrial worker. "He remains a man who gains his livelihood through placing his labour at the disposal of an employer in return for wages" (1969:157). In
addition changes in worker attitudes or life style did not necessarily indicate the disappearance or decline of the working class, but rather its continuing existence in perhaps a new mode (Lockwood et al. 1969:163 ff). Consequently, careful empirical examination of changes noted in the class structure is required before the decline of class can be assumed.

A second set of responses comes from students of race and ethnic relations, who in order to make ethnicity more central to sociological theory, have attempted to extend the language and notions of stratification (especially conflict theories) into the analysis of ethnic relations (Wilkie 1977; Dunning 1972; Lockwood 1970; Rex 1970; Zubaida 1970; Cohen 1976; Lieberson 1961).

Thus they examine different modes of ethnic contact in terms of different outcomes with respect to the structure of inequality of power and condition. For example, Wilkie (1977:75-87) examines three types of ethnic situations where ethnic groups with differential power meet. In the Colonial situation (exemplified by colonial Latin America or British Africa), rigid stratification may ensue characterised by perfect coincidence between ethnic group and class. The Marginal situation, where the ecological base of an indigenous society is undermined by new settlers, may result in the subsequent exclusion of the indigenous group from the new society. The Immigrant situation found in Australia and Canada for example, eventually results in the assimilation of immigrant groups. Racial or ethnic situations are therefore treated as types and instances of social stratification which emerge out of conflict involving groups possessing unequal power.
However, both Rex (1970) and Lockwood (1970) argue that there are aspects of race or ethnic relations which cannot be fully explained by stratification theory. Rex claims that these aspects are to be found in the existence of deterministic belief systems, whereby the fact that a particular ethnic group suffers discrimination is attributed to an incapacity of the group to perform a role, or a special capacity to behave in particular ways that is determined by genetic inheritance.

We suggest that, although the existence of some kind of stratificational problem is a necessary precondition of the emergence of a race relations problem, it is not by itself a sufficient condition. A further precondition is the existence of certain kinds of belief system. Moreover, it must further be recognised that once a deterministic belief system is used to justify a particular stratification situation, that situation is itself changed thereby and the belief system may set in motion wholly new social processes....

(Rex 1970:51)

However, the claim that this is distinctive to ethnic relations is undermined when Rex himself quoting George Orwell acknowledges that these same kind of belief systems have operated with respect to class;

... the essential thing is that middle class people believe that the working class are dirty ... and what is worse, that they are somehow INHERENTLY dirty.

(Orwell 1937 :114)

Lockwood (1970:64) argues that the distinctiveness of ethnic relations lies in the form of conflict it produces. Ethnic conflict tends to focus on the dominance of one group over another, whereas class conflict concerns the legitimacy of the structure itself, that
is, the system of domination itself. This is because the salient 'cause' of disaffection between ethnic groups inheres in the given and unalterable properties of individual actors, such as colour, and not in the contingent properties of social systems.

It is debateable whether systems of domination established along ethnic lines are not also contingent and perceived as such by participants. It is also arguable whether the salient 'cause' of disaffection inheres in given and unalterable properties as much as in the evaluation and assessment of these properties - a social definition which is not given nor unalterable.

These attempts to analyse ethnic relations as instances of stratification are useful in pointing out the importance of the mode of ethnic contact, the relations of inequality that are present in the encounter, and the consequences this has for the subsequently generated structures of inequality. The mode of ethnic contact can be seen then, as one of the processes and mechanisms generating the structure of inequality in societies which are ethnically differentiated.

At the same time, there is nothing to suggest that contact between two groups of the same ethnic origin (eg. resulting from

7"So that by contrast with class revolution, conflict in plural society, however violent, is not first and foremost directed at an alteration in the structure of power and deference but rather at the usurpation of power and deference by one section of the community to the disadvantage of the other ... Thus revolutionary goals are unlikely to emerge from the antagonism of groups in plural societies unless ethnic and racial divisions happen to coincide with lines of economic and power relationships" (Lockwood 1970:64)
internal migration from rural to urban areas) could not also contribute to these generative mechanisms. In other words, although these writers want to maintain that there is something distinctive about ethnic relations that distinguish them from class relations, they do not make any suggestion that specifically ethnic factors have an impact on the resulting stratification systems. Their analysis rests on explanations in terms of differential political, military or economic power. They have either effectively ignored anything specifically 'ethnic' in these modes of encounter or their accounts are inadequate (see Rex, Lockwood). This leaves the problem of relating class and ethnicity much as it was.

Thirdly, there are those studies which attempt to examine the impact of immigration and the presence of migrants on the class structure of the host society (Moore 1977; Böhning 1972; Castles & Kosack 1973; Collins 1975a, 1975b). These studies generally point out the relatively powerless position of immigrants; politically because they often lack citizenship rights, and economically because they tend to be concentrated in the bottom strata of the occupational structure, doing the dirtiest work for low wages and in poor conditions. Typically, the writers argue that immigrants take on the role of an industrial reserve army, whereby they offer a mobile and disposable labour force which can be used to stabilise the capitalist system through cyclic fluctuations in the economy (Nikolinakos 1975:7; Gorz 1970).

These studies illustrate that members of ethnic minorities are significant in the class structure. Furthermore, the studies suggest that they affect the class structure not simply by providing and allocating personnel to different parts of the occupational...
structure, but also through the creation of a 'lower class', an 'underclass' or a 'sub-proletariat' (Giddens 1973; Castles & Kosack 1973; Nikolinakos 1975). In this, the very structuring of class is influenced.

However, it is not empirically the case that all members of a particular ethnic group can be considered as members of one class (Gabriel & Ben Tovim 1978; Birrell & Birrell 1981). Different ethnic groups are concentrated differently throughout the occupational structure (see Chapter 3). In addition, although there is a suggestion that being a member of an ethnic minority (or at least being an immigrant) has an impact on the process of class formation, yet the concepts of 'underclass' or 'sub-proletariat' are theoretically loose. As Gabriel and Ben Tovim (1978:135) point out, an analysis of exigencies within the economy which produce certain types of labour (such as the need to control cyclic fluctuations), does not of itself specify the mechanisms required to account for the coincidence of 'races' with real economic categories. There is nothing in the economy itself to establish the ethnic basis for differentiation. Capitalism's economic exigencies do not, as such, produce a black 'underclass' or a racially fragmented workforce (1978:138, 146). Consequently, the analysis of the relationship between class and ethnicity requires a consideration of other mechanisms as well as the economic ones which generate a class structure.

**Ethnicity as an Endogenous Factor in Class Formation**

Gabriel and Ben Tovim's comment that analysis solely of economic mechanisms does not provide an explanation of ethnic
segregation in the occupational and class structure, returns us to the earlier mentioned suggestion of including subjective aspects as part of the generative mechanisms of the class structure.

The generation and reproduction of social classes in capitalist society depends on the continued production of (i) positions in the productive process and (ii) agents of production as owners of capital or as labourers (Carchedi 1975). Capitalist production, therefore, under its aspect of a continuous connected process of reproduction produces not only commodities, not only surplus value, but it also produces and reproduces the capitalist relations; on the one side the capitalist, on the other the wage labourer. (Marx 1976: 724)

Economic, political and ideological factors all have a role to play in the generation of positions and of agents. For example, the production of positions may depend on economic factors such as the fragmentation of job tasks, or the introduction of new techniques; yet political and ideological factors may be operative if the internal organisation of the productive process is changed in order to strengthen control over employees (Carchedi 1975: 374).

8 A position in Carchedi's (1975:368) terminology is a functional unit in the production process regarded from the point of view of its technical content, and from the point of view of the social relations it embodies. Agents of production, that is everyone taking part in the capitalist production process, automatically become carriers of the capitalist production relations. The latter are produced through natural reproduction or migration movements (internal or external). Moreover, depending on the mode of migration and the power relations it involves, agents will be produced either as dominant or subordinate in the subsequent stratification system, that is as either an owner of capital or a labourer.
E.P. Thompson is one of the major writers who claims that cultural and political factors are operative in class formation. He sees the historical creation of the English working class as an economic, political and cultural event.

The making of the working class is a fact of political and cultural, as much as economic history. It was not the spontaneous generation of the factory system. Nor should we think of an external force - the 'industrial revolution' - working upon some non-descript undifferentiated raw material of humanity, and turning it out the other end as a 'fresh race of being'. The changing productive relations and working conditions of the Industrial Revolution were imposed ... upon the free born Englishman - and the free-born Englishman as Paine had left him or as the Methodists had moulded him. The factory hand or stockinger was also the inheritor of Bunyan, of remembered village rights, of notions of equality before the law, of craft traditions. He was the object of massive religious indoctrination and the creator of political traditions. The working class made itself as much as it was made.

(cited in Connell & Irving 1980:9)

Thus as Connell & Irving (1980:12) observe, it is necessary to go beyond the economic process in considering the generation of class relations. The reproduction of class relations has a political and cultural dimension of the first importance. Through their value systems, individuals attribute meaning to their class existence which guides their conduct, such that they reproduce its existence or attempt to modify and change it (Parkin 1972). By regarding cultural (subjective) factors as essential parts of the generative mechanisms of objective class structures, it is possible to view ethnicity as endogenous to processes of class formation, and no longer as a complicating factor.

The distinctiveness of an ethnic group is usually referred to in cultural terms. For example, "an ethnic group is distinguished from all others by its unique culture" (Smolicz 1976:6).
Discussion of Thesis

This chapter has attempted to indicate the existing sociological problem of theoretically relating social class and ethnicity - and has proposed that a solution to the problem may be found in integrating subjective and objective aspects of stratification. Since changes in the class structure occur through the generation of new productive positions, including ethnic-specific ones, the succeeding chapter examines segmented labour market theories which offer hypotheses about such processes. Chapter Three describes the labour market situation of ethnic minorities in Australia. From this evidence, a degree of ethnic segmentation can be inferred, and the following chapter explores the implications of such segmentation for class formation processes. In addition Chapter Four investigates the way in which ethnicity may be operative in the production of agents and positions, and in the allocation of agents to positions in the productive process. It also outlines the elements of an analytical framework inclusive of ethnicity, which can be used to examine processes of class formation.

These elements are present in an analysis of the labour market entry of the Vietnamese in Hobart, outlined in Chapter 5. Vietnamese are especially appropriate for the present study because they are a distinct group both racially and culturally from the Anglo-Saxon majority and European minorities. Such socio-cultural distinctiveness should allow more scope for demonstrating the role of ethnicity in class formation processes. Furthermore, cultural
factors, expressed in the form of stereotypes and prejudice against Asian immigrants, have been historically manifest in selection policies and criteria in Australia. It could therefore be expected that they continue to operate to at least a limited extent.

Information and data was gained primarily through focused interviews with the Vietnamese in Hobart and with people working closely with them, particularly sponsors and so-called "befrienders". In addition, Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs officials provided information and contact personnel, while further government literature and information as well as newspaper reports were also used. As well as being limited to Vietnamese settled in Hobart (where most have settled), the study also concerned only those who arrived before July 1981, excluding those who, at the time of interviewing, were still engaged in orientation courses and on-arrival English classes. The final sample included 23 sponsors/befrienders and 17 Vietnamese families containing 54 potential labour force participants. Language difficulties and difficulties in access prevented interviews with 6 Vietnamese families.

The study is limited in that it cannot demonstrate definite labour market segmentation of the Vietnamese, nor consequent changes to the class structure. These limitations result from the very small numbers of Vietnamese in Hobart and from the limited time span of the study. However, the study does yield information on the labour market entry of the group and on some of the conditions surrounding
this process. (The significance of labour market entry is discussed in Chapter Two). There is also some evidence to suggest that cultural factors are operative in these processes. Consequently, the study is not a test of the argument of the thesis, but rather an illustration in a small-scale situation of the role of ethnicity in labour force recruitment and subsequent mobility.

The concluding chapter briefly discusses the relationship between occupations, the focus for the empirical component in this thesis, and the class structure. The chapter reviews the arguments advanced in the thesis, and indicates the implications of these arguments for sociological theory.
CHAPTER 2: SEGMENTED LABOUR MARKET THEORIES

Introduction

Theories in the field of labour market economics offer a possible framework for the analysis of the generative role of ethnicity in the formation of class structures. The theories suggest that historically there has been a growing segmentation of the labour market which has led to marked discontinuities and restricted mobility between sectors. These segmentation processes have been an important factor forming and changing the class structure in modern industrial societies (Wachtel 1973; Edwards 1973; Reich 1973; Gordon 1972, 1973). At the same time, the theories note the seeming congruence of some racial or ethnic groups\(^1\) with particular labour market segments, and they claim that there is in fact a process of segmentation by race (Edwards 1973:xii; Reich, Gordon & Edwards 1973:360). In view of these observations and arguments, the theories offer a potentially fruitful way of solving our problem.

Segmented labour market theories developed out of empirical economic analyses which found that the characteristics usually associated with productivity, eg. years of education and training, had almost no influence on the employment prospects of large numbers

\(^1\)The focus of this thesis is on ethnic groups, but these theories speak interchangeably of racial and ethnic groups. Their usage has been retained in this chapter, as it was in relation to race and ethnic relations theorists in the previous chapter.
of urban employees (Gordon 1972:44; Cain 1973:1218). These observations challenged orthodox human capital theory which focused attention on the supply side of the labour market, i.e. the individual worker and his labour force characteristics such as education, skills and job experience. These characteristics were regarded as the individual's stock of human capital which determined the worker's marginal productivity. In the short run, given assumptions of perfect competition and market equilibrium, this marginal productivity equalled the worker's wages. It was assumed that individual investment decisions were the crucial determinant of productivity and hence of earnings (Birnbaum 1973:151).

However, later studies pointed to the persistence of poverty and income inequality, which seemed to belie the orthodox claim that such inequalities were only temporary imperfections to be overcome in time (Reich, Gordon & Edwards 1973:359). Furthermore, statistically, the distribution of income was more unequal than the distribution of ability and educational attainment. Therefore many authors argued that education reflected only a screening device or a certificate of a set of attitudes and traits attractive to employers, and that these criteria were used by employers for making 'irrational' and 'discriminatory' hiring decisions (see Cain 1973:1217-1219).

In addition, these studies pointed to continuing differentiation in the labour markets, whereby large and persisting differentials in earnings between black and white males and between males and females existed, even when productivity indicators were apparently equal. This was sharpened by several empirical findings concerning labour force participation rates and career patterns of
blacks and whites, which indicated no convergence over the years between World War II and 1970 (Cain 1973:1219).

These observations led to the development of theories which focus on the demand side of the labour market; on job and firm characteristics, and their interaction with the supply side of the labour market (Cain 1973:1222; Gordon 1972:45; Birnbaum 1973:151). On this basis two clearly differentiated labour markets were identified.

Primary market jobs are characterised by relatively high wages, security, good working conditions, chances of promotion, and equity in the administration of work rules. Jobs in the secondary market, by contrast, are generally low paying, characterised as well by poor working conditions, little chance of advancement, and highly personalised relations between worker and supervisor. The latter allows harsh and capricious work discipline. Job instability and therefore high labour force turnover are further characteristics of secondary market jobs.

A further distinction within the primary market between an upper and a lower tier is also identified. The upper tier is comprised of professional and managerial jobs, and is distinguished by higher pay and status and greater promotion opportunities. It resembles the secondary sector in having high mobility and turnover patterns, but in the upper tier this mobility is associated with advancement and promotion. Also like the secondary sector, there is a relative absence of an elaborate set of work rules, and a personalised relation between worker and supervisor, but in the upper tier, an internalised code of behaviour is operative. Formal
education constitutes an absolute barrier to job entry, and within the job there is greater room for creativity and initiative, as well as greater economic security (Piore 1973:126-127).

The most important distinguishing characteristic between the three sectors is chances of advancement and upward mobility. While the mobility chains of the primary segment constitute some kind of career ladder (this is true for upper and lower tiers), secondary sector jobs are not connected in such an ordered progression, and different jobs can be held in haphazard order (Piore 1973:128-129). Since each sector is connected with distinctive mobility patterns, the likelihood of intersectoral mobility is low. This discontinuity between sectors is a crucial aspect of segmentation theories, and contrasts with the notions of continuity, fluidity and harmony invoked by orthodox theories (Clairmont & Wein 1974). The consequence of low intersectoral mobility is that career origins are very important, since entry into the labour market (the initial job station) sets the worker on a mobility path which is not easily reversed.

The crucial significance of career origins and labour market entry for subsequent mobility in Australia has been recently demonstrated by Broom and Jones et.al. (1980). They claim that "the overwhelming determinant of later occupational status is earlier occupational status" (1980:98), and while other influences, such as migration, also affect career patterns, these are of lesser importance. Their analyses demonstrated that many Australian men became locked into institutionalised career paths, and in some cases highly segmented labour markets, early in their occupational careers. Professional, skilled and farming jobs are
most fully insulated from other occupational groups, either because of the qualifications barrier to entry or because of inheritance of family farms. About two-thirds of men interviewed who begin as professionals remained as such during the first decade of their working life, and were still so occupied when interviewed. For the skilled manual worker, the comparable figure is just over 50% (1980:98-115). Although immobility is particularly high in these occupational categories, it nevertheless remains a characteristic of all occupations.

In addition, Broom and Jones et. al. demonstrated that different entry points lead to distinctive mobility patterns. For example, none who begin their careers in semi-skilled or unskilled jobs moved subsequently into professional, managerial or clerical work. On the other hand, clerical work is a typical entry job, and career paths lead from it into every other non-farm category (1980:102-108; also Stewart et.al. 1980:197ff). The focus of the empirical study on labour market entry presented in this thesis is based on these arguments concerning the critical importance of career origins2.

The development of multiple labour markets is partly due to growing industrial and market concentration. Large oligopolistic and monopolistic firms have developed capital intensive operations requiring sophisticated co-ordination methods. Their orientation to national and international markets, and the rise in substantial

2 As will be seen, this does not necessitate ignoring the evidence of racial variation in subsequent career patterns put forward by Blau & Duncan (1967:238-9)
product market concentration, gives them the market strength to maintain operations on a regularised basis, making possible the employment of a stable, reliable and committed workforce, and passing onto the consumer any extra costs this requires (Wachtel 1973:99; Birrell & Birrell 1981:35; Sabel 1979:23). This is one source of primary market jobs.

At the same time, such firms also create some secondary market jobs. When large quantities of goods are produced for relatively stable markets, there is also a tendency to cut costs by subdividing tasks and differentiating jobs\(^3\). This can mean that although productivity may increase, the skill level required may decline (Sabel 1979:23; Edwards 1973; Gordon 1972). Secondary market jobs are also constructed by firms without the stability or certainty of product demand, for whom investment in good quality capital equipment is not an economic option. Consequently they set up production in such a way that a minimum capital outlay and a minimum investment in worker training is required (Sabel 1979:23; Piore 1973:141-143). Therefore a consequence of this dualistic industrial structure is the corollary dualism in labour markets.

\(^3\)This is associated by some writers with the fragmentation of the working class (Wachtel 1973:99), a reversal of the forces which in the nineteenth century had produced homogenous work experiences.
Segmentation by Race

The seeming congruence of racial or ethnic minority groups with certain labour market segments, which provided part of the empirical stimulus to the development of these theories, is claimed to occur through a process of "segmentation by race". This proposition contends that the dualistic industrial and labour market structures have interacted with pre-existing divisions by race to produce enduring divisions which are also rooted in objective economic structures (Edwards 1973:xii).

There is plenty of evidence from the United States that migrants are performing many of the secondary labour market jobs, and that native workers are reluctant to accept them even during periods of high unemployment. This has been noted especially for the predominantly black population of American northern inner city areas (Birrell & Birrell 1981:36). However, the theories do not argue that ethnic workers will be dispersed throughout sectors, but argue that frequently they will be confined to ethnic specific jobs. Thus whites in South Africa and Dutch in Australia have often been channelled into primary market jobs. In addition, practices and procedures for the recruitment, hiring, training and promotion of workers may also differ for ethnic minorities (Baran 1973:201).

While minority workers are present in secondary, subordinate primary and independant primary segments they often face distinct segments within those submarkets. Certain jobs are 'race-typed', segregated by prejudice and by labour market institutions. Geographic separation plays an important role in maintaining divisions between race segments.

(Reich, Gordon & Edwards 1973:360)
The processes of ethnic segmentation are also historically rooted. For instance, the labour market position of Blacks in America is partly the outgrowth of the old plantation based caste-like status of the Black worker (Baran 1973; Lieberson & Fuguitt 1967).

After abolition the labour constraints upon the Black agricultural caste were somewhat relaxed, but they continued to set the norms for the employment of Blacks in the cities. The freed men and women were largely confined to jobs that were servile, dirty and low paying. Frequently these positions became known as 'Negro jobs'.

(Baran 1973:200)

In addition, ethnic segmentation is related to processes of industrial concentration. The new concern for large industries was to capture control over production and marketing and this control was threatened by the upsurge of labour conflict.

It has been argued that employers turned to increasing differentiation of job tasks to break down unified worker interests. They also attempted to exploit race and ethnic antagonisms in order to undercut unionism; for example, Blacks or ethnic minority workers were often employed as strike breakers (Edwards 1973:xiv; Reich, Gordon & Edwards 1973:362).

While it is obvious that a considerable overlap between the jobs of ethnic minorities and specific segments has developed historically, as Baran (1973:211) points out, the theory of labour market segmentation does not require any racial assumptions.
One of the great strengths of the current work on labour market segmentation is that the theory is institutionally inclusive. The factors generating the segmentation can be explained in terms of economic dynamics... However, a good thing can be carried too far. Those working on the theory of labour market segmentation would be well warned to pay great attention as to where they draw the limits to the endogenous features of their theories. Because there is a certain degree of congruence between the divisions of the primary and secondary labour markets and those of the racial structure, it cannot be assumed that the one can be collapsed into the other.

He argues for a theory in which the distinctiveness of specific systems and the concreteness of their interaction is maintained. "... history does not unfold according to some laws of mechanics. Within the potentialities inherent in existent circumstances and relations ... 'man makes himself'." (1973:211).

What this suggests is that the position of ethnic minorities in specific jobs in labour market segments, involves the operation of labour market processes interacting with characteristics specific to the ethnic minority, i.e. ethnic cultural factors. Segmented labour market theories provide some insights into this interaction through their emphasis on the importance of workers' attitudes and habits.

Workers' Attitudes

The discussion of worker attitudes constitutes a recognition by these theories that career paths and job structures are not independent of the characteristics of the labour supply, but are both created by the same process. The theories claim that one of the important determining characteristics of the primary and secondary sectors is the behavioural requirements which they impose on the workforce, with respect to punctuality, regularity of attendance,
docility, stability and initiative (Piore 1970:55; 1973:130; Gordon 1972:46). These behavioural patterns, or worker traits, range from these relatively amorphous behaviour traits through to concrete skills, such as specific traits. Specific traits are pieces of behaviour produced as a direct response to the stimulus offered by the environment and are acquired through socialisation processes for new-comers in the work situation (automatic incidental learning). The speed with which an individual adjusts to the new environment depends on his/her traits, and whether or not they are congruent with it (Piore 1973:131-132).

On the other hand are general traits which consist of behaviour derived from a rule, enabling an individual to deduce from the environment and the stimulus what the correct response may be, although that particular combination of circumstances may never have been encountered before. General traits may be deduced from a series of specific traits or learnt through formal education (Piore 1973:131).

Job experience is a crucial factor in the acquisition and reinforcement of these traits and attitudes (Gordon 1972:47). Since Piore contends that lower tier and secondary jobs require specific traits and upper tier occupations demand general traits, the chances of mobility from one sector to another are reduced by the lack of desirable behavioural patterns (Piore 1973:133). Furthermore, behavioural characteristics are reinforced not only through job experience, but also by living among others whose life style is accommodated to that type of employment (Gordon 1972:47). Thus Piore claims that individual Blacks may gain access to the initial job station of a primary market mobility chain. But the life style of
their associates developed through long years of experience of secondary type employment still affects them and influences their attitudes and behaviour patterns. This therefore can mean that the job station eventually becomes detached from that particular mobility chain and becomes institutionalised or segmented as a 'black man's job' (1973:139).

The steady recirculation of personnel through various related sectors of the economy, eg. the secondary labour market and the welfare system, reinforces attitudes and behavioural patterns. For example, Vietorisz and Harrison (1973:366) claim that the secondary labour market keeps wages, productivity and stability to very low levels and brings about technological stagnation. The welfare system is an integral part of this vicious circle by acting as a payroll subsidy to secondary employers, and also maintains living levels low enough to force a steady supply of labour into the secondary labour market. In addition, there can also be conflict between wage earning in the secondary sector and receiving welfare. Welfare often carries other fringe benefits. According to Piore (1970:67-68), this can encourage people to take casual or part time work on the fringes of the economy, where they are paid in cash and income is not reported. Such jobs also tend to possess the characteristics of secondary employment and therefore to foster habits that prevent welfare clients who hold them from getting high wage primary employment at some later date. In a similar way, training programmes such as those that were implemented in the United States in the 1960s were seen as just another form of low wage marginal activity and as a temporary source of income, which could not allow penetration of the primary sector. (Clairmont & Wein 1974:30-31; Harrison 1972).
This attention to attitudes and traits allows for the incorporation of subjective factors in the allocation of agents to positions and in the creation of new positions. Consequently, it is possible to investigate the role of ethnicity in segmentation processes. Since such segmentation processes modify the class structure and are processes of class formation and restructuration, this means that it becomes possible to develop a framework in which ethnicity can be seen as endogenous to class formation. Our next task then is to attempt an assessment of the labour market situation of ethnic minorities in Australia. The following chapter presents what empirical evidence is available for this.
CHAPTER 3: ETHNIC SEGMENTATION IN AUSTRALIA

Introduction

Tracy (1981:15) claims that the empirical evidence for a degree of labour market segmentation between ethnic groups in Australia is enormous:

... the line of segmentation seems to run through the middle of firms, even through the middle of particular factories and workshops, distinguishing as 'migrant jobs' those which have low pay or status or which involve dirt, noise, danger, excessive subdivision, night and shift work and above all, heavy physical effort.

The study of ethnic segmentation in the labour market, however, requires more complex and detailed evidence than Tracy refers to. Labour market segmentation theories do not simply state that jobs differ with respect to income and working conditions. Segmentation involves complex processes whereby jobs are structured over time, in relation to the type of industry and/or firm and its market position (both nationally and internationally). Furthermore, within the same industry, firms structure jobs differently from other firms, depending on factors such as location near raw materials or trading outlets and the kinds of processes carried on in each plant. These processes result in jobs distinguished on the basis of characteristics such as skill, promotion and income. Consequently, in-depth analysis of particular industries, firms and jobs is required to investigate the claims of these theories.
However, such data are not available. Consequently, Census data as well as studies which formed the basis of the Green Paper on Policies for Development of Manufacturing Industry (1975) - (The Jackson Report) - provide the bases for this discussion. Census data allow us to ascertain the degree to which ethnic minority workers are concentrated in (i) employment status categories (i.e. as employer, employee, unemployed); (ii) different industrial sectors and (iii) occupations. The Jackson Report comments on characteristics of jobs in the manufacturing sector, such as wages, conditions and hours of work.

The evidence suggests important variations over time and in different localities (e.g. different States). It also highlights differing patterns of concentration among ethnic groups. Migrants cannot be treated as a single category. Generally speaking, patterns of segmentation, the mode of migration, and qualifications, skills and capital possessed by migrants are different for each group. In broad terms, English-speaking migrants provided professional and skilled labour for the Australian labour market. North-Western Europeans alleviated shortages of skilled tradesmen, while Southern and Eastern Europeans constituted a cheap and unskilled labour force.

(i) Employment Status

Quite dramatic changes in the employment status of some ethnic groups have occurred between 1947 and 1976 as Table 3.1 indicates:
TABLE 3.1: EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF MALES IN AUSTRALIA BY BIRTHPLACE
Census 1947, 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Employer/Self-employed</th>
<th>Employee/Helper</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Total (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia 1947</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,127,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,837,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bt. Isles 1947</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>227,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>393,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany 1947</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland 1947</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece 1947</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


One of the most obvious features of these figures is the relatively high proportion of employers and self-employed workers among the non-English speaking migrants in 1947. This is especially apparent among the Poles, Greeks, and to a lesser extent, Germans. Equally striking is the very marked reversal of this trend during the period between the two censuses, with a strong movement of immigrant workers into the status of employee/helper. This was associated with the start of ambitious immigration programmes in the post-war period.
The earlier high proportions of employers and self-employed workers reflects pre-war migration patterns. For example, many Italians who migrated to Australia were part of the extended 'chain' networks between family and village members already established in Australia, and on arrival were able to go straight to work with their sponsors as partners (Birrell & Birrell 1981:55). Many of them came from the north of Italy, and were attracted by the prospect of economic opportunity as presented by the friend or relative already here. Thus many Italians who went to north Queensland did so with the expectation that eventually they would buy their own farms (Sherington 1980:115-117). Similarly among the Greeks, the occupations of pioneers established a pattern for later settlers through the sponsorship system. For example, in the 1870's, two Greek immigrants from Kythera opened a fish shop in Sydney. By 1911, there were 400 persons of Kytheran birth in N.S.W., almost three-quarters of whom were working in oyster bars, fish shops and restaurants (Sherington 1980:117).

The increasing movement of immigrants into employee status since the War reflects not only changing migration patterns, but also an enormous growth in employment opportunities provided by the expanding manufacturing and tertiary sectors. Generally it is in relation to the employment of ethnic minorities in the manufacturing industry that segmentation arguments are advanced. Yet it should be recognised that although such employment is more likely to have secondary market characteristics, the earlier employer status patterns of some groups such as Italians and Greeks also indicate a degree of 'segmentation'. Although working as employers or self-employed, these groups worked in occupations that were to
some extent isolated from employment with Anglo-Australians, thereby creating some relatively 'ethnic specific' jobs in certain areas.

(ii) Industrial Concentration

Employment by industry also varies between ethnic groups. For example, there was a relatively higher proportion of Australian and British born migrants, as well as Italians, employed in the primary industry sector. With the decline of the primary sector as an employer since the War, these groups have been dispersed throughout other industries in different ways. Australian and British born migrants are relatively more highly represented in the tertiary sector industries of public administration and commerce, while Italians have tended to move into the construction and commercial industries, with a significant proportion still employed in manufacturing.

Despite some decline during the 1970s, it is this last industrial sector which remains a major employer of ethnic minority groups (see Table 3.2). Manufacturing has played a major role in providing jobs for an expanding workforce in the post-war period. About 20% of the total increase in the workforce between 1947 and 1974 was taken up by manufacturing. Immigration was a substantial impetus to growth, and in 1975, 36% of migrants in the workforce were employed in manufacturing (Australia 1975 (I):72).

Although the manufacturing industry is a major employer of migrants in Australia as a whole, the extent of this can vary from one State to another. For instance, in Tasmania, where there is an underdeveloped manufacturing sector, construction work, community
### TABLE 3.2: INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT OF MALES IN AUSTRALIA BY BIRTHPLACE

**Census 1954, 1971a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Building &amp; Construction</th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Public Admin.</th>
<th>Other b</th>
<th>Total (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia 1954</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,643,700c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bt. Isles 1954</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>380,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy 1954</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>127,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany 1954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia '54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** 1954 Census cited in J. Zubryzcki, 1960.

**Notes:**
(a) 1976 Census used different industrial categories and so is not directly comparable with earlier figures.
(b) Other = Mining, Transport, Recreation, Communication, Community Service, Electricity, Gas & Water, Finance, Unemployed.
(c) Rounded Totals.
service work and the electricity industry are also major employers of non-Anglophone ethnic groups (see Table 3.3).

### Table 3.3: Employment of Males in Tasmania in Selected Industries by Birthplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Aust.</th>
<th>U.K.</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Poland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufg.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrn.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total in workforce (100%) 92,444 8093 775 842 656


Table 3.3 also reveals the variation between ethnic groups settled in Tasmania in their pattern of industrial concentration. The Poles' continued concentration in the electricity industry reflects their early contracted employment by the Hydro-Electricity Commission (HEC) in the
post-war years. (Some workers in construction industries would also be employed on HEC projects.) The lesser importance of manufacturing as an employer in Tasmania is evident. Almost as many British-born workers are employed in community service industries as in manufacturing. Italians and Germans, by contrast, have comparable proportions employed in construction. Consequently, regional variations affecting the local structure of industry in turn have an impact on patterns of ethnic concentration.

However, even at the national level, ethnic minorities are not concentrated uniformly throughout the manufacturing sector. As suggested in segmented labour market theories, these workers are employed in distinct segments within this sector:

Migrants, significantly, are concentrated in those sectors of manufacturing with the worst physical working conditions, the worst pay and the jobs which are physically hard and contain the most menial tasks. The capital-intensive sectors we studied, in which conditions were reasonable or good, had a very low migrant population.

(Australia 1975 (IV):20)

Southern European migrants (Italians, Greeks and Yugoslavs) are concentrated in the textile and clothing, metals refining and fabrication, transport equipment and household appliance industries (Birrell & Birrell 1981:110). Many of these industries, unlike those in the United States, are organised on lines much closer to secondary labour markets. Wages and job security are low, and there are few inducements to long service or career advancement. Consequently, there is a high labour turnover (1981:37,111).
However, contrary to the claims of the segmented labour market theories, most of these major migrant employers have been in a strong market position, protected by tariffs and import quotas from severe overseas competition. These high levels of protection enjoyed by Australian manufacturing have prevented the development of a high level of industry marginality in the market such as that experienced in the United States by the textile industry (Birrell & Birrell 1981:38-39).

Consequently, Birrell & Birrell (1981:38) argue that manufacturing industry in Australia in the post-war period did not make demands on immigration policy for cheap, docile migrant labour. Rather, they claim that migrant labour was employed during the manufacturing boom, because they were the only workers available. Employing migrant workers with little or no command of English, required adaptation of the pattern of work processes. One way in which this was effected was through the subdivision of skilled jobs into simple components which could be readily taught to worker who had never engaged in industrial work before (Böhning cited in Birrell & Birrell 1981:38-39). Thus, the Jackson Report states that:

Increasingly, the jobs all these workers are doing have been deskillled. Attempts at efficiency, cost saving, and moves to increase management's control over people and machines, have meant simpler jobs, more machine processes and a proliferation of machine paced tasks. ... In a relentless circle the process is made simpler to fit the abilities of the available workforce (no thought of training) while the process of stripping an industry of skill continues unabated.

(Australia 1975, (IV):10)
Deskilling and the lack of on-the-job training reduces chances of mobility out of this sector. In addition, employers have often not developed internal promotion systems, particularly for wages personnel.

A person, more especially a man, could start work as a junior staff without any qualifications beyond secondary schooling, and have the opportunity of a career which could take him to a senior, well-paid position in the hierarchy of an organisation. On the other hand, a person equally well qualified educationally, who chooses to be a fitter, normally has limited and decreasing promotional opportunities in manufacturing industry while he remains a manual worker.

(Australia 1975(IV):13)

The expectation of employers seems to be that they will continue operating with an unskilled and shifting migrant workforce. Special incentives to facilitate long-term service are lacking (Birrell & Birrell 1981:111). For example, working conditions in plants employing migrants are generally poor:

In the ... shop, filth is the problem as the thick grease covering the ancient weaving machines finds its way onto the hands, faces and clothes of the men operating them. In the ... shop the men find they must wear their clothes with a high proportion of wool or else their clothes will be rotted by the acid in which they become soaked. Even in the present economic downturn it's hard to get people to stay in the ... shop.

(Australia 1975 (IV):11)

In addition, while high wages can be earned in the manufacturing sector, overtime and bonus payments are essential components of the total remuneration (Birrell & Birrell 1981:111). Furthermore, there is a clear indication of differences in the
opportunities for improvement in pay and conditions between wages and staff personnel (Australia 1975 (IV):13). Hours of work tend to be far less flexible in the manufacturing sector than any other, and shift work is more common (1975 (IV):13,17).

The absence of incentives that develop a stable and committed workforce results in high turnover rates, despite increasing unemployment among unskilled workers since 1974. The Ford Broadmeadows plant, for example, reported a turnover rate of 50% in 1978. Patons Brakes assembly plant which employs approximately 1,200 blue collar workers with an 80% migrant component, also experienced a turnover rate of 50%. Although high turnover rates draw complaints from employers they have not yet restructured the workplace in order to retain or attract native-born workers. They are still able to attract migrant labour, although they do not necessarily keep them for long (Birrell & Birrell 1981:111-112).

(iii) Occupational Concentration

Ethnic groups are not only concentrated in specific sectors of manufacturing industry, but they also tend to be more highly concentrated in particular occupations.

In the workforce as a whole, migrants are more concentrated on the manual occupations (of which over 50% are in manufacturing). This applies particularly to Southern Europeans. Of all migrant workers, 44% are tradesmen, production process workers, and labourers; for Australian-born workers, the proportion is 28%.

(Australia 1975 (I):72-73)
Census data (1976) support this contention. A greater proportion of Greeks, Poles and Yugoslavs are concentrated in these jobs than Australian or British born workers. The latter have high proportions employed in professional and technical occupations, as do the Dutch (see Table 3.4 and also Table A.1 in Appendix I).

**TABLE 3.4: EMPLOYMENT OF MALES IN AUSTRALIA IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS BY BIRTHPLACE - Census 1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Aust.</th>
<th>U.K.</th>
<th>N/lands</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Yugo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradesmen/Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process work</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in work</td>
<td>Aust.</td>
<td>2,723,605; U.K.</td>
<td>377,450;</td>
<td>N/lands</td>
<td>41,698;</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


However, these major occupational categories are very broad and highly aggregated and reveal only general trends. In order to examine the degree of segmentation and ethnic group variation, it is necessary to consider occupations at minor group level. Table 3.5 shows those occupations with the greatest concentration of migrant and local workers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Birthplace (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aust.</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>N/lands</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Yugo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers/Managers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietors/Shopkeepers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers/Managers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tradesmen/Production work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool makers/machinists</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters/Painters/Decorators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayers/Plasterers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal workers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total in workforce (100%): Aust. 2,723,605; U.K. 377,450; N/lands 41,698; Poland 24,850; Greece 60,368; Italy 120,327; Yugo. 58,401.

*Source: A.B.S., 1976 Census Population & Dwellings: Cross-Classified Tables (2426.0).*
A significant proportion of Australian, British and Polish-born workers\(^1\) are employers and managers. A similar proportion of Greeks work as shopkeepers and proprietors. Segmentation is also apparent in the occupational group 'tradesmen, production process workers and labourers', with Australian, British and Dutch workers tending to be more highly concentrated in skilled trades occupations. The Dutch in particular, tend to be employed in more skilled jobs in the building trade as electricians, carpenters, bricklayers, painters and decorators. On the other hand, Greeks, Italians, Poles and Yugoslavs are concentrated in jobs as unskilled labourers or in manufacturing related trades, eg. toolmakers. One cannot see specifically ethnic jobs in any of these aggregated categories, except insofar as Greeks are more highly represented as shopkeepers than any other group, and Italians predominate over other groups as bricklayers and plasterers. Italians are also the only other group apart from Australian born to predominate as farmers\(^2\).

\(^1\)Many of the latter group are Polish-born Jews in Melbourne and Sydney.

\(^2\)This predominance of Greeks and Italians in these occupations is made clearer in Table F.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>% of total workforce</th>
<th>% in 'ethnic job'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (a) = Proprietors, shopkeepers (b) = Bricklayers, plasterers.
Regional variation in concentration patterns also pertains with respect to occupations. In some instances, trends apparent at national level are accentuated when investigated at state level. Thus in considering ethnic groups in Tasmania, there are more marked concentrations of most groups in the broad occupation category of tradesmen and production process work. However, there is one noticeable exception to this. Greeks have a far lower proportion of workers in this occupational category than do Greeks at the national level. Greeks in Tasmania are more heavily represented in sales and managerial employment (the latter includes management of business services) (see Table 3.6).

**TABLE 3.6: EMPLOYMENT OF MALES IN TASMANIA IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS BY BIRTHPLACE - Census 1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Aust.</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>N/lands</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Greece</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin./Managerial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Process</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in workforce (100%)</td>
<td>92,444</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consideration of specific occupations allows us to see differences in skill levels between ethnic groups. This is illustrated more clearly in Table 3.7. Jobs in different labour markets are structured differently with respect to the level of skill required for their performance. Many secondary market jobs require low levels of skill and offer no prospect for future skill acquisition.

TABLE 3.7: OCCUPATIONAL SKILL OF MALES IN AUSTRALIA BY BIRTHPLACE - Census 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Prof/Tech.</th>
<th>Clerical/Admin.</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Semi-skilled</th>
<th>U/skill</th>
<th>Total (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,837,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>393,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/W Europe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/Europe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>248,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total w/force</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,875,186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: a N/W Europe = Germany, Netherlands
      b S/Europe = Greece, Italy, Yugoslavia
      c Also includes unemployed and not stated categories.

Most variation between groups is evident with respect to professionally and technically skilled, and unskilled occupations. Australian, British and North-Western European migrants are more
heavily represented among the former occupations and are under-represented in unskilled work. By contrast, Southern Europeans are far more heavily concentrated in unskilled work than any other group. They are also underrepresented in professional work and occupations requiring clerical and administrative skills. This bears out earlier comments about job structuring in certain industries to cope with non-English speaking migrants. If unskilled jobs are held by these groups in firms which make no allowance for skills training, their chances of mobility out of secondary market employment are very low.

Conclusion

This data cannot provide conclusive evidence of ethnic segmentation in Australian labour markets, but it strongly suggests the existence of such segmentation. On the other hand, there are no studies (to our knowledge) which seriously question the existence of this segmentation. Certainly ethnic groups are concentrated in different sectors of the economy, and these patterns of concentration are distinctive for each ethnic group. In addition, variation over time and in different regional localities is evident. Thus it is possible to infer from these data a degree of segmentation in the labour market which is specific to ethnic minorities in Australia and in Tasmania. Such patterns have also been noted in other countries including the United States and Britain (Davidson 1966; Daniel 1968). Thus it may be hypothesised
that ethnicity is significant in labour market processes\textsuperscript{3}.

Labour market segmentation, through its impact on income and related promotion opportunities, necessarily has consequences for various forms of territorial concentration. The common requirement for cheap housing frequently brings together, in the same geographic area, workers in the secondary labour market, as well as welfare recipients. In addition, the location of firms which tend to construct particular types of jobs also attracts workers occupying a similar labour market position. This tendency for geographical concentration among workers in particular labour markets is reinforced frequently when those workers belong to a particular ethnic minority. Here the importance of living in proximity with others of the same family or village of origin, who speak a common language and share a common culture, draws some ethnic minority members into regional proximity to each other. Thus these factors tend to create geographic "communities" of people employed in the same labour submarket.

This form of community or neighbourhood segregation is viewed by Giddens as a distributive grouping (1973:109). Giddens argues that distributive groups, which are "those relationships involving common patterns of the consumption of economic goods, regardless of

\textsuperscript{3}Davidson reports that in Britain, in the lowest occupational categories, there was proportionately more Jamaicans, Carribeans, Pakistanis and Cypriots than in the highest status categories. However, the Indians had a higher proportion in the professional, foremen, skilled manual, own-account and non-manual categories than any other group (including British born) (Davidson 1966:69).
whether the individuals involved make any types of conscious evaluation of their honour or prestige relative to others” (1973:109), are a source of proximate structuration of class. That is, distributive groupings are 'localised' factors which condition or shape class formation (1973:107-108).

Obviously, labour market segmentation has implications for consumption patterns of many goods and services, (not only housing), and is therefore closely related to the formation of these distributive groupings which affect class formation. It is with the question of the relationship of these labour market processes with processes of class structuration that now requires further examination. This issue together with the problem of the way in which ethnicity may be operative in these processes, is taken up in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4: ETHNIC SEGMENTATION AND CLASS FORMATION

Ethnicity: Class Composition and Class Formation

While indications of ethnic segmentation in the labour market are abundant, the significance of this evidence for the problem of class formation is debated. For example, Westergaard and Resler, (1975:356-357) oppose the view that the coloured population in Britain is a new class or a 'sub-proletariat'.

Coloured people are not uniformly concentrated at the bottom of the economic order. They are certainly handicapped in the labour market, as they are in a wide range of other respects; but in no way so as to make them, en bloc, an 'under-class'. ... The plain point is that professional white-collar and skilled manual blacks tend to be left aside in the stereotypes of public debate and research alike.

Furthermore, they claim that even if coloured people were all uniformly concentrated at the bottom end of the economic order, this would not indicate the formation of a new class. It would simply mean that the personnel of the working class would be different. The structure of inequality and the mechanisms generating it would be the same.

... this would still not mean that 'stratification by colour' had replaced 'stratification by class', even just at the lower end of the scale. The poor would be different people. The fact of poverty, the structure of inequality of which poverty is part, the mechanisms of profit and property which produce inequality in a capitalist society, would all be the same.

(Westergaard & Resler 1975:360)
However, other writers have interpreted the evidence of ethnic segmentation as involving the creation of a new class, such as a sub-proletariat, or the internal restructuring of existing classes. The latter is argued by Castles and Kosack (1973:478) who claim that "the restructuring of the working class into an indigenous stratum and an immigrant stratum is immigration's most important impact on society". These two strata within the working class are divided from each other: "the indigenous workers, with generally better conditions and the feeling of no longer being right at the bottom of society" form the higher stratum, and the immigrants "who are the most underprivileged and exploited group of society" form the lower stratum. Frequently, the strata are opposed to each other, and many indigenous workers have prejudiced and hostile attitudes towards immigrants (1973:477).

On the other hand, Giddens (1973:112) claims that where ethnic differences serve as a "disqualifying market capacity" such that ethnic minority members are heavily concentrated among the lowest paid occupations, (or are chronically unemployed or semi-employed), "we may speak of the existence of an 'underclass' ". He points out that the emergence of the so-called affluent worker within the 'mass-consumption' economy has been seen as resulting in significant modifications to the pre-existing class structure. For example, it is assumed by some writers that the "salience of class relationships in influencing conduct and beliefs is radically diminished by the assimilation of the working class into global patterns of consumption common to all members of a society" (1973:221). Giddens (1973:220-221) argues that if such changes, which at times may have affected only the "margins" of a class, are regarded as modifying the class structure, then the changes resulting from the growing
segmentation by ethnicity (which affects substantial proportions of the working class) are at least as significant as other structuring processes. These changes affect not only the income and consumption patterns of the worker, i.e., the proximate sources of class structuration, but his very position in the production process.

These two positions, namely that ethnic differentiation may affect only class personnel, or alternatively, the very structuring of class relationships, is related to various concerns expressed by students of stratification which were reviewed in Chapter One. Those who attempt to identify strata or classes become aware of the ethnic differentiation apparent among the members of these strata. This gives rise to an interest in the conflicting demands made on class members in respect of their ethnic identification (which may cut across class boundaries), and of the class identification, (which cuts across ethnic boundaries). The internal heterogeneity of class personnel, both in objective and subjective senses, is evident as one of the most obvious effects of ethnic differentiation on the class structure.

However, the internal homogeneity of a class is not only reflected in its personnel, but also in its structural unity and cohesion. It is this aspect of class relationships which has attracted the attention of those writers who are concerned with class as a structure. Class as a structure embraces both inter-class
relations and intra-class relations. Within the working class, although all personnel are sellers of labour in the market and do not own the means of production, structured differences in their labour market position, (such as those produced by segmentation processes), may gradually weaken the internal unity and homogeneity of the class, and internal restructuration of the class occurs. Where these structured differences are strongly associated with ethnic differentiation then the latter is argued to have an effect on restructuring class relationships.

The data presented in Chapter Three show that ethnic group members are not uniformly concentrated in the lowest occupational groups, a consideration which reveals the weakness of concepts such as 'ethnic underclass'. Ethnic groups are however, concentrated in specific occupational categories and industries in a pattern which is relatively specific to each group. This supports theories of ethnic labour market segmentation which do not assume or propose that ethnic minorities will all be concentrated in the one sector.

However, this position does not necessarily give rise to the argument that ethnicity is therefore a complicating factor in class formation (see Ch. 1). That argument rests on a 'purist' notion of class that fails to recognise the reality and significance of the effects of ethnicity, and which also clings to an idealised view of the working class. Rather, the view expressed here attempts to account for processes of class formation that historically involve both internal coherence and internal division. Class structuration and restructuration in Western capitalist societies, historically has not been an unswerving movement towards the notion of a revolutionary working class described in so much simplistic Marxist literature. The processes producing internal differentiation within a class is equally important to understand. In addition, these same processes, at another point in time and/or another locality may even produce internal unity.
Rather, it is argued that within each sector, they "often face distinct segments" in certain jobs that become 'race-typed' (Reich, Gordon & Edwards 1973:360). And indeed, Westergaard and Resler (1975:358) themselves recognise that even in more successful segments, members of ethnic minorities may be segregated:

"Coloured workers, for example, are more liable than others to be out of work when jobs are short. But they remain a quite small minority of the unemployed. And coloured professions ... are little exposed to that risk: their experience of job discrimination will turn more on opportunities for promotion and access to the more comfortable and privileged sectors of their fields of work."

(Italics mine)

Therefore, although ethnic segmentation does not form new classes (such as an underclass), it is responsible, in part, for internal differentiation within classes. Since this internal differentiation concerns structured differences in labour market position, position in the production process, as well as related consumption patterns, then ethnic segmentation does not only affect class personnel, but also the very structuring and restructuring of class.

Class structures are generated and modified by the introduction of new productive systems (eg. industrial production), whereby new positions in the productive process are created, and established positions are altered. The emergence of factory production, the expansion in the 'white-collar' tertiary sector, and developments in computer technology are all historical processes which have involved the creation of new productive positions. Where these new productive positions have entailed institutionalised differences in market positions, they modify to a greater or lesser extent, the internal structure of classes.
Labour market segmentation is one such historical process which creates and restructures productive positions according to different levels of skill, conditions of work, pay and promotion. Restricted mobility between the segments creates divisions between workers and reduces homogeneity within a class. Segments are not necessarily equivalent to classes in the Marxist sense, where the boundaries are constituted by the relation to productive means enjoyed by each class. Whether a worker is employed in a secondary sector job with minimal job security and low pay, or whether his position is structured such that he uses more skills, has more security and higher pay, the fact remains that he is still a man who must sell his labour power in the market to earn his livelihood. Furthermore, whatever segment such a worker may belong to, it is employers and managers who retain control of the production process, and who make decisions about differentiation of tasks to meet goals which are not necessarily those of the worker.

However, simplistic, crude Marxist formulations of class mask the fact that the working class is not homogenous either with respect to its personnel or its internal structure; its members are internally differentiated by segmentation processes, and this segmentation is reflected in their life chances, material position, interaction patterns and consciousness.

Labour market segmentation along ethnic lines involves the creation of ethnic-specific positions and the restructuring of established positions. Such restructuring affects mobility opportunities to the extent that the position becomes institutionalised as a 'migrant's job' with its own migrant career
pattern. Where there is congruence between these processes and the ethnic characteristics of a group, then it can be hypothesised that ethnicity operates as a generative mechanism in segmentation processes, and consequently in processes forming and modifying the class structure. (The class structure involves not only groupings around the means of production, but also the internal structure and dynamics of those groupings).

This returns us to our earlier arguments, namely that economic factors are not the only mechanisms generating a class structure - political and cultural factors also have a role to play in the production of positions and workers with specific characteristics. These factors are not all of equal importance, but they are essential in order to give a complete account of class formation processes, (including the articulation of boundaries, internal differentiation, consumption patterns and cultural patterns/consciousness).

The opposition of Westergaard and Resler (1975:17) to this view may be located precisely in this consideration. They argue that the mechanisms generating structures of inequality are purely economic, related to property and market.

Property, profit and market - the key institutions of a capitalist society - retain their central place in social arrangements and remain the prime determinants of inequality. The vast expansion of state activity; the consolidation and institutionalisation of labour's counter-pressure against capital, ...; the deliberate direction of education to widening individual talent ... Their impact has been within boundaries largely fixed by the maintenance of private property, profit and market as the key institutions controlling the conduct of society's affairs.
Economic mechanisms are said to fix the parameters within which all other processes and changes occur, thereby minimising their impact. Furthermore, these processes have no serious effect on the economic mechanisms. Consequently, the presence of ethnically diverse agents of production in specific jobs or labour markets segments has significant impact neither on the processes generating the structure of inequality, nor on the essential nature of that structure.

However, as has been pointed out by many students of the Soviet and East European societies, patterned social inequalities and, indeed, class formation is not necessarily the outcome of private property and market relationships (see Lane 1971; Djilas 1976; Inkeles 1964; Konrad and Szelenyi 1979). This, plus the evidence of the segmentation of the labour market along ethnic lines, and the ethnic group variation apparent in the data presented in Chapter Three, urges us to include ethnicity as an important endogenous factor in class structuration.

One can see that ethnic groups exhibit different patterns or profiles of concentration among economic sectors, industries and specific jobs. Furthermore, variation between ethnic groups can occur at all stages of the labour market process - both at entry to the labour market, and at subsequent points along mobility chains. For example, Blau and Duncan show that large racial differences exist in the translation of educational attainment to first job; within the first job large racial differences in wage and status have also been substantiated, (controlling for age and education). There is also evidence of substantial differences between racial groups in access to promotion within sets of occupations. Thus even after initial occupation has been determined, patterns of
advancement from first job vary widely between the races (cited in Gordon 1972:114-115). Variation between ethnic groups is also evidenced in differing patterns of consumption, life styles, social norms, and consequently of consciousness and social cohesion - all of which are important aspects of class position. This variation is due both to ethnic/racial differences and factors relating to ethnic segmentation.

Variation between ethnic groups cannot be accounted for by explanations which consider only economic factors. However, evidence of variation suggests that neither is it sufficient to treat ethnic segmentation simply in terms of generic groups such as 'migrants' as Giddens and Castles & Kosack do. Rather it is the fact that workers are 'Greeks' or 'Dutch' - members of specific ethnic groups - which is significant. This brings us to the conclusion that factors particular to each group must form part of the explanatory account of class formation.

Additionally, the variations evident between different regions for the same group (eg. the Greeks) point to the rather obvious

2Negroes for example, have less advantageous social origins than whites; their education is poorer than that of whites; disproportionate numbers of them are from the South where opportunities are inferior, and they start their careers on lower levels. Yet even when these differences are statistically standardised and it is examined how negroes would fare if they did not differ from whites in these respects, their occupational chances are still inferior to those of whites. And moreover, better educated Negroes fare even worse relative to Whites than uneducated Negroes (Blau & Duncan 1967:238-9).
fact that factors specific to localities must also be considered. Ethnic groups do not live and work in a vacuum, but rather they act within specific sets of circumstances. They also create new circumstances, such as the chain network of migration established by Greeks and Italians. While economic factors are important in the generation of regional variation in circumstances, they do not operate in isolation from political and ethnic cultural ones. Consequently, explanations which can account both for ethnic group variation and regional variation requires the incorporation of ethnicity.

Ethnicity

At this point it is necessary to clarify what is meant by 'ethnicity'. Frequently, in discussions of this concept, attention centres on the notion of identity and awareness. For instance, Van den Berghe defines an ethnic group as "one that shares a cultural tradition and has some degree of consciousness of being different from other such groups" (1976:242; see also McKay & Lewins 1978; Bullivant 1981; de Vos 1975). In this definition and others like it, ethnicity is the awareness of an individual that he shares some distinctive traits with others. These traits are frequently objective and observable criteria such as language, traditions and customs. The recognition that a person belongs to a group may have little or no importance for him (or be highly significant). However, the awareness and identification constitute an essential part of ethnicity. This form of self-ascribed ethnicity we will refer to as 'ethnic awareness'.
However, the existence of objective observable traits such as those mentioned above means that ethnic identity may be ascribed to an individual by others in the society (Bullivant 1981:43). This socially ascribed ethnicity can have implications for those members of an ethnic group who do not themselves identify with their group, and who perhaps do not wish to be identified even as an 'immigrant'. Whether or not a person wishes to identify, instances occur where he is forced to do so and ethnic labels or stereotypes are attached. Such labels and stereotypes can have an impact on the economic, political and social position of the ethnic group; for example, through effects on government immigration policy, union policy and action, and employers' attitudes.

In addition, there is a third aspect of ethnicity, namely the notion of a shared cultural consciousness. This consciousness bears similarities to 'class awareness' as outlined by Giddens (1973:111). Class awareness consists of those attitudes, beliefs, common patterns of behaviour and style of life that exist among a group of people sharing a common social location. This form of subjective reality exists regardless of whether or not the individual affiliates himself with a class, and regardless even of his recognition that other classes exist.

In a similar way, members of an ethnic group who share a common descent develop attitudes, beliefs, common patterns of behaviour and lifestyle which are distinctive to them. This shared cultural

3The propensity of native-born Australians to attach such perjorative, stereotyped labels to 'foreigners' has been shown by Yarwood (1964:43).
consciousness will exist to some degree, regardless of whether or not the individual affiliates himself with his ethnic group. It is important not to confound ethnicity and these aspects of culture, such that they are indistinguishable from each other - a tendency which has been present in some ethnic relations literature (see Cohen 1976:24; Smolicz 1979:6). While ethnic groups may be distinguished on the basis of culture, culture is by no means the property only of groups designated as 'ethnic'. Nevertheless, shared descent which is basic to the concept of 'ethnic group' (Vallee 1975; Keyes 1976; Wallerstein 1979), is frequently validated by pointing to the existence of common cultural attitudes. In addition, as Giddens (1973:111) argues, if these common patterns of behaviour and attitudes do not exist, then classes (and ethnic groups) are not social realities.

Culture

Culture is invoked in this thesis both as a defining characteristic of ethnic groups, and as a generative mechanism of the class structure. One of the clearest expositions of the concept of culture is to be found in Parsons (1951). Parsons centres his discussion around three points: first, that culture is transmitted and constitutes a social heritage; secondly, that it is learned; and third, that culture is shared (1951:15).

4For example, Cohen claims that "what makes ... group solidarity and inter-group rivalry ethnic rather than anything else, is the fact that each group possesses a distinct culture ..." (1976:24). Smolicz also asserts that "an ethnic group is distinguished from all others by its unique culture. It's prime function is to develop that culture and articulate it further to meet the current needs of its members" (1979:6).
The aspect of transmissability distinguishes culture from social structure, because culture can be diffused from one social structure to another. While there is a crucial interdependence between cultural patterns and the other elements of the social system, yet "these other elements are not completely 'pattern-integrated' with culture or with each other" (1951:15).

Transmissability depends however, on the individual actor and his capacity to learn the cultural tradition. In learning, cultural pattern elements are incorporated into the action systems of individual actors. By learning to conform with a norm of behaviour, one is learning cultural patterns which function as determinants of human action. The capacity to learn depends in part on the personality system, and the degree to which an element of culture is compatible with those already learned. The physical organism and environment may also set limits on learning. More importantly, since cultural tradition is shared, the individual actor is subject to the exigencies of interaction in a social system. These factors can all affect the transmissability of culture as a static unchanging entity which is no more than a social heritage. Culture is the product of human interaction, as well as its determinant, and consequently changes and evolves over time (Parsons 1951:15-16).

Culture then, may be conceived of as the shared pattern of values, norms, beliefs and attitudes which is the product of human action and interaction over time, yet which also moulds that activity and the specific forms it assumes. Thus, an ethnic group develops cultural patterns unique to it, which shape and produce behaviour patterns and customs specific to the group. These cultural
patterns may perhaps be more accurately termed socio-cultural patterns.

When different ethnic groups come into contact with each other, the uniqueness of cultural systems becomes apparent, and in some cases is perceived as a problem. For instance, Castles & Kosack (1973:121) point out that cultural differences between immigrants and native groups in the workplace may produce conflict and misunderstanding. Where immigrants come from pre-industrial societies, they are not accustomed to the exercise of authority through formal technically-rational rules and structures, since authority in their home country is usually linked to specific persons. Nor are they accustomed to the practices developed by workers for regulating output and work rhythm, nor to trade union organisation. Immigrant workers may therefore often seem willing to accept a paternalistic relationship with the employer, and their behaviour may cause other workers to fear the weakening of organisation and the undermining of conditions.

Ethnicity as a Class Generating Mechanism

It is with this understanding of ethnicity that the question of the manner in which it operates in the production and restructuring of class must now be explored. The continuing production of a class structure depends on the generation of agents and of positions in the productive process to which agents are allocated. The shared cultural outlook and attitudes which inform the behaviour of the ethnic group, and the attitudes of relevant members of the host society, which ascribe specific characteristics to an ethnic group, (i.e. socially ascribed ethnicity), have an impact on these processes.
The attitudes, values and norms of the ethnic group and its individual members constitute characteristics of the labour supply which can influence their labour market decisions and occupational behaviour. The demand side of the labour market, (important in view of segmented labour market theories), also requires a consideration of attitudes - ie, attitudes of host society members. When jobs are constructed in a particular way, a demand for specific characteristics in the labour force is established. The assessment of the qualities of different ethnic groups, which some employers form, may lead them to think these jobs requirements can be met by those ethnic workers.

The Supply of Labour

Natural reproduction and population movements are the two major processes which supply a labour force, but it is the latter which is significant in the production of ethnically differentiated workers. Migration supplies labour when new productive systems are being instituted, thus facilitating their development, as well as continuing to supply established systems.

The former is perhaps most evident in the case of intrusive migration where the migratory population introduces and imposes economic changes (eg. colonial situations), but it is also present in other types of migration. Historically, forced migrants such as

5These two sides of the labour market interact in other ways as well. One of these, suggested in Chapter 3 occurs when jobs are restructured to cope with the characteristics of the labour supply. Over time, such jobs then demand labour supply with those characteristics.
African slaves provided the labour for plantation economies, thereby facilitating the development of large-scale commercial agriculture, while voluntary migrants and refugees who came to Australia after 1945 were crucial in allowing the development of a manufacturing sector in the economy. These latter cases amount to different forms of international labour recruitment.

Political forces, such as oppression, and economic factors such as high unemployment and poverty, are frequently among the various 'push' factors which produce different types of migration (Smith 1976:20-21; Borrie 1975:590; APIC 1977:39). However, ethnic characteristics may be used to define a group to be excluded or persecuted. Such a group may subsequently become refugees (e.g., Jews in Nazi Germany). In other instances, ethnic attributes have been used as criteria in the selection policies of various host societies, which determine whether or not a person will be permitted to become a voluntary migrant.

The latter has been evident in the history of immigration to Australia, where attitudes and stereotypes of host society members and groups attempted to define which ethnic groups were suitable as migrants. In the early phase of post-World War II immigration (1947-52), British migrants were definitely preferred, while non-British of European ethnic origin were second preference. "'It is my hope', stated Arthur Calwell in November 1946, 'that for every foreign migrant there will be ten people from the United Kingdom'." (cited in Sherington 1980:128).

Calwell's pledge was dictated in part by the philosophy and mood of the labour movement which had developed a policy as to which
ethnic minorities were desirable as migrants. This attitude had its origins in the nineteenth century struggles which opposed the importation of Indian Coolie, Pacific Island and Chinese labour, and was frequently based on stereotyped images (Markey 1978). Early racial stereotypes were eventually incorporated into the policies of various anti-Chinese and anti-immigration groups, and finally into policies and attitudes of trade unions. The impact of these attitudes on Australian immigration policy up to the Second World War was such that the ethnic composition of the Australian population was overwhelmingly Anglo-Saxon (see Table 4.1).

**TABLE 4.1: BIRTHPLACE OF AUSTRALIAN POPULATION**

*Census 1901-1976*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK/Eire</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (includes Asia &amp; Africa)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (100%)</td>
<td>3774</td>
<td>4455</td>
<td>5436</td>
<td>6630</td>
<td>7579</td>
<td>8987</td>
<td>10508</td>
<td>12756</td>
<td>13548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=(1000)

Although these firm attitudes were expressed after World War II, they were not able to maintain their effectiveness. Britain's own manpower shortage plus the shortage of shipping to transport migrants, meant that British migration after the war was slow, and the search for migrants was directed to non-British European countries. In later years, supplementation was sought in the Middle East, United States and Latin America (Borrie 1975(I):99-101).

This willingness to direct the search for migrants to non-British sources was prompted by economic and political factors. One major factor in the new immigration programme was fear of foreign invasion, triggered by the experiences of World War II. In addition, the war had furthered the industrialisation of the economy, while at the same time placing it under severe strain. Australia had a serious housing shortage; transport services were rundown; power shortages and black-outs were common; coal and steel production had declined. The country had plentiful natural resources, but was limited by a shortage of man-power, due to the ravages of the war and the lower birth rate of the depression years. This severe labour shortage coupled with the perceived need to develop resources and industry added impetus to the decision for a large planned programme of immigration (DIEA 1978:12; Borrie 1975,1:100). However for many years, Asians and Africans were not considered suitable migrants.

It is in this historical context that immigrants in post-war Australia have provided a reserve of labour, searched for and recruited to meet the demands of the economy. Although not totally effective, the formation of ethnic stereotypes nevertheless had an impact on this process, through selection policies and criteria,
thus affecting the characteristics of the incoming migrant labour supply. These characteristics, such as skills, have a bearing on the subsequent allocation of the worker to a position in the productive process.

**Allocation of Workers to Positions**

The allocation of migrant workers to positions in the productive process is dependent in part on the type of migration involved\(^6\). For example, intrusive migration producing colonial situations results in the intruders generally being owners and controllers in the new imposed productive system. For the voluntary migrant or refugee, a crucial element is the host society's power to control migrant characteristics through selection criteria. Further control of allocation processes is exercised by the host society through recognition or otherwise of overseas skills and qualifications. However, ethnicity is also involved in these processes.

Direction into labour market segments is partly dependent on the congruence of cultural traits of the worker with behavioural characteristics demanded by different jobs and workplaces (see Piore 1970:55; 1973:57). For example, some jobs, especially in the secondary sector, can tolerate relatively high levels of absenteeism, depending on factors such as the amount of skill

---

\(^6\) This point is stressed by those writers mentioned in Chapter 1 (Wilkie, Rex, Lockwood) who consider race/ethnic relations as instances of stratification and who attempt to explain different modes of ethnic contact and outcomes of contact with respect to the resultant structures of inequality.
required, and different concepts of pain and illness among ethnic groups can affect such absenteeism (see Castles & Kosack 1973:334).  

Furthermore, the acquisition of traits required in jobs is more difficult for workers whose cultural outlook and behavioural characteristics differ widely from them, while socialisation in the workplace is hampered when there is a language barrier (Piore 1973:131-132). In particular, traits required by upper tier jobs which frequently involve the exercise of some initiatives (1973:133) demand an awareness of and familiarity with the cultural environment which is probably greater than that possessed by many ethnic minorities.

The cultural outlook of an ethnic minority may also affect the way in which they attempt to find work. This influences allocation since methods of finding employment may have relatively more links with a particular labour market sector than another. For example, CES offices in Australia tend to advertise more low or unskilled jobs and casual/temporary work than professional jobs. If a person relies on this method of finding employment, he may well be directed into secondary market jobs. If contacts or family networks are used to find work, the sector into which one is channelled would depend in some degree on the social location of the contacts.

7 For example, Castles and Kosack reported that Spaniards and Italians stayed home more frequently than Black and North Africans for minor illnesses like 'flu, whereas when the latter did take time off from work, they stayed away longer periods as their illnesses tended to be more severe (1973:334)
In looking for work, one important factor affecting allocation to positions are the plans and motivations of the migrant. It has been argued for instance, that many migrants from relatively underdeveloped countries or from rural backgrounds are frequently interested primarily in either buying their own farm or business, or returning with savings to their country of origin (Sabel 1979:25-26). These migrants tend to be 'target' workers interested only in industrial work to the extent that it enables them to raise the money to effect their goals (Birrell & Birrell 1981:36).

This concern for income has a number of consequences. First, immigrants frequently prefer highly paid low skilled jobs, to relatively low-paying jobs offering the chance of advancement. They are more likely to be tolerant of job insecurity, their attitude being rooted in a secondary labour market identity (Sabel 1979:24-26). In addition, especially new migrants may not be attuned to the status system of the host society, and therefore are not concerned at the low status attributed to their occupation by the native population (Birrell & Birrell 1981:36). Thus their preoccupation with income and relative disinterest in other characteristics of industrial work can be a factor channelling some ethnic groups into secondary market jobs (1981:109). This also affects the jobs of many migrant women. Since many ethnic groups do not perceive the role of women as involving a work career, many migrant women only work to increase the income of the family.

8 For example, between 1907 and 1911, according to Italian statistics, the average annual number of immigrants returning to Italy from the United States was 150,000, or 73% of the total numbers who left for America in those years (Sabel 1979:25-26)
Stereotypification also has an impact on the allocation of ethnics to positions. It can affect, for instance, the kinds of jobs which employers make available to ethnic workers. Ethnic workers may find themselves excluded from certain jobs because employers only believe them to be suited for certain work. Or they may be welcomed to do some unpleasant jobs because employers have formed images of foreign workers as docile, hard-working, willing to accept lower pay and poorer conditions than native born workers.

Stereotypes held both by employers and the labour movement are often reinforced through the experience of working with individuals whose cultural outlook is dissimilar and who experience difficulty in adjustment to the work environment and the behavioural characteristics it requires. Migrants are often not regarded as 'typical' workers:

They do not conform to the standard image of a worker and do not react as managers have come to expect workers to react. Their motivation is not the same as traditional Australian workers, and they do not view the strike weapon in the same way as their bosses or their union officials. Consequently, management policy has been directed towards converting them to a more predictable group ....
(Australia 1975 IV:20)

Migrants come with differing degrees and kinds of industrial experience. Those from rural backgrounds lacking factory or prior union experience often prove difficult for unions to organise, thus encouraging some unions to enter into closed shop or check-off
agreements with employers. Other ethnic minority workers do have prior industrial experience, but find it difficult to ignore their own heritage of industrial struggle and to adapt to Australian modes of conflict resolution (Quinlan 1979:274).

Consequently, migrants are regarded as 'problems' and are attributed with unpredictable behaviour. Unions have adopted two different kinds of response to this situation. One response has involved their attempt to see the interests of the Australian-born and foreign-born workers as essentially identical, a viewpoint which ignores the linguistic and cultural handicaps of migrants (Quinlan 1979:274). It is these handicaps which frequently hamper socialisation in the workplace, including further training on the job. The Jackson Report in this respect claims that:

Despite a migrant workforce in the factory for 25 years, the union has until now never produced information literature in any language other than English ... The union has failed to communicate with the migrants. It's not just a case of not serving the migrants - the migrants often don't even know what the union is all about ...
(Australia 1975:25)

This neglect by unions (and by management) has, in effect, been one mechanism locking ethnic minority workers into secondary positions.

Such action was taken by the Australian Railways Union in response to the problem of tracing "foreign" names - an action which contains hostility towards the "stranger-ness" of the ethnic worker.
A different union attitude has been prompted by the spontaneous disputes - even riots - which were the result of migrant worker dissatisfaction with poor pay and conditions and with union inactivity (eg. the strike at Ford Broadmeadows plant, 1973). These infrequent outbursts have been regarded as evidence of peculiarly ethnic behaviour patterns; and the media and some union officials have sought to trace this phenomenon to the temperament of Southern Europeans (Quinlan 1979:275). However, neither does this attitude provoke any consistent and systematic attempt to deal with the problems peculiar to ethnic minority workers. Treating such actions as due to the 'inherent' temperament of workers means that the problem is regarded as insoluble. The result for the ethnic worker with respect to job chances and promotion remains the same.

In addition, ethnic stereotyping has had an impact on the recognition of overseas qualifications. Kunz (1975) claims that the campaign to keep foreign doctors unregistered in the 1950's was built on arguments such as the contention that all European doctors were specialists who specialised from the earliest part of their study, and who therefore were unable even to attend a confinement. It was claimed that the ethics of European doctors were 'different', 'doubtful', 'not proper'; while the European doctor was also criticised for his imperfect knowledge of English which made him dangerous to the patient (1975:60-61). Non-recognition of

10 These statements did not only emanate from professional associations. A district Controller at the migrant camp, Bonegilla, told new arrivals "that all newcomers are labourers and all European professional degrees are in Australia of no value as such documents can be bought on the black market in Europe. Therefore there are no doctors among the newcomers." (Kunz 1975:270).
qualifications channels workers away from the upper tier primary market occupations for which qualifications are essential, and in which they have been previously employed.

Generation of Positions

The above discussion has assumed the existence of a given structure of positions. However, ethnic groups are not only allocated to already available positions, but they also create new ones, and at times render a position a specifically 'ethnic' one.

For example, the growth of the manufacturing industry in Australia in the post-war period was dependent on the influx of migrant workers, many of whom fulfilled two year labour contracts working in those industries which experienced labour shortages (Martin 1965:12; Salter 1978:42). While at first, migrants filled these positions because Australian born workers were not available, "by the late 1960's, the economy had become geared to a continuing migration program supplying labour for the metals, clothing, footwear, textiles and building industries ..." (APIC 1977:68). Some sectors of the economy had therefore come to depend on the labour of certain ethnic groups, even though Australia no longer experienced a labour shortage. Over time, this sector had institutionalised these jobs as 'migrant' jobs. This process of institutionalisation entailed an ethnic division of labour, whereby Australian and British-born supplied labour to commerce, community and business services, transport, finance and public administration (1977:8), while Southern and Eastern Europeans supplied sections of manufacturing.
Ethnic stereotypification can have an impact on this process of institutionalisation. For example, if ethnics of a certain origin come to be concentrated in specific occupations or industries, then negative stereotypification of them may prejudice Australian born workers (or workers of different ethnic groups) against working with them. This results in the increasing identification of that job or sector with that group.

One indication that this occurs is that, despite the current high level of unemployment among young unskilled Australians and the relatively good pay offered by these jobs, young Australians are unwilling to take many routine factory jobs. Birrell & Birrell (1981:114) argue that this reluctance could be related partly to their perception of these jobs as 'migrant work'. The work is stigmatised as low status, and so also is the workplace setting: "the Australian worker is likely to find himself with a migrant foreman". Employers also seem to believe that the jobs in question are suited only to migrants. One employer is quoted as saying:

> We've got no choice. It's a matter of supply. Migrant women are the only ones wanting work. When an Australian comes in I am suspicious. It usually means they can't get a job anywhere else because they're no good. And I end up having to get rid of them.

(cited in Birrell & Birrell 1981:115)

While the reluctance of native-born workers extends to other reasons as well, the consequence nevertheless, is that these firms come to rely heavily on migrants.
This utilisation of and growing dependence on migrant labour leads to the subdivision and deskilling of jobs in these firms in order to cope with language barriers, unfamiliarity with industrial work, and at times, low skills. Some migrants enter these secondary market jobs with the primary motivation of earning good money so they can pursue other goals, and one consequence of this instrumental attitude is that he has little or no pride of craftsmanship. Even in routine work procedures, such an attitude can at times have detrimental effects on product quality which in turn affects the market position of the firm (Sabel 1979:26-27). This relative lack of initiative and disinterest in product quality can lead to further deskilling of tasks, accentuating the secondary characteristics of the job, as the job is restructured to cope with these worker attitudes. Although the instrumental attitude of the worker also generates a high labour turnover, the jobs now only attract a certain kind of worker, including migrants with similar attitudes. Thus the process of institutionalisation of jobs as 'migrants' jobs' is furthered.

Not only are some jobs rendered 'ethnic specific' ones, but ethnics also develop new positions (eg. niche occupations). In some cases the development of these positions may be due to the operation of the ethnic group's values and norms, as well as by their desire to pursue self-employed occupations. For example, the tendency of Greeks to have very close family ties and strong paternal authority, means that they tend to utilise family networks more frequently. By employing family members, they have developed a relatively high degree of concentration as proprietors and shopkeepers, such that Greeks are becoming increasingly identified with that occupation.
In other instances, ethnic members bring skills with them which are specific to their ethnic group, and establish occupations which utilise these (eg. in ethnic restaurants). At times, prejudice and negative stereotypes have forced some groups, of whom the Chinese are the most notable example in Australia (Rivett 1975:188), into these niche occupations, where they are not in competition with Australian workers.

Proposed Analytical Framework

In the light of these arguments, it is necessary to analyse class formation processes in a way which allows the operation of ethnicity as an endogenous factor. Such an analysis must attempt to account for ethnic segmentation in the labour market (the process by which the class structure is modified), as well as for variation in segmentation patterns over time, among different ethnic groups, in different localities, while allowing for the operation of cultural mechanisms and enabling an investigation of their interaction with economic and political ones (see Figure 4.1).

The first element of the framework is the forces which produce various types of migrations, whereby ethnically diverse workers are supplied. These migrations not only accompany and facilitate the development of new productive systems and positions, but also have an important bearing on the characteristics of the workers, thus influencing their allocation to positions in the new structure. The most significant characteristics in this respect are the age/sex composition, skills as well as motives and attitudes of the ethnic members. These characteristics may be further affected by the mode of migration (eg. refugee movements).
FIGURE 4.1: PROPOSED ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK
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CLASS FORMATION AND RESTRUCTURATION
It is from this pool of potential immigrants that host societies select their intakes. Selection policies control not only the number of migrants accepted, but also their characteristics, including their ethnic origin, education, qualifications etc. In addition, host societies can at times control the allocation of migrants to different regions in the country or even to specific jobs. Various social structures in the region to which the migrant is allocated, which consist both of barriers and opportunities for the particular ethnic group, vary over time and from one region to another.

The structure consists of (a) the structure of industries and firms and the level of development of the host society, and the impact this has on (b) the structure of jobs and employment opportunities. These two factors include the degree of labour market segmentation already existing in the host society and the recognition of skills and professional qualifications. Related to these factors are the degree and kind of organisation of labour; the existence of professional associations; the wage and salary structure in different industries and occupations; the existence of regularised channels of job seeking. In this labour market context, the attitudes of various groups within the host society, the stereotypes and images formed by them of different ethnic groups, as well as discrimination which may result from such attitudes are significant. It is these attitudes, which have a bearing on the

11 This can include arrangements such as contracted labour similar to that concluded between the Australian government and assisted migrants in the immediate post war years.
degree to which a particular ethnic group is in demand in specific labour markets.

Other related factors include the social welfare system, initial allocation to accommodation and its location, education systems and English classes as well as access to credit. Additional factors easing labour market entry include whether or not the immigrant has kin, friends or a sponsor in the host society, or some other form of (perhaps official) contact network.

The characteristics of the immigrants, including their cultural outlook, influence the way in which they use the opportunity structure. It is partly in this respect that variation among ethnic groups in their occupational concentration is located. Furthermore, ethnic groups do not only use an existing opportunity structure, but they also partly shape it (eg. through establishment of ethnic organisations).

The opportunity structure into which the migrant enters, the use he makes of it and his modification of it, determine the outcome of this process, namely the allocation of the migrant to a position in the productive process, either to an established position or to one created by the migrant group. The initial point of entry into the labour market, the mobility opportunities existing in the job, the behavioural requirements it imposes on the worker and their congruence and interaction with his cultural attitudes and life style, all have a significant impact on his subsequent career pattern. Over time, any significant segmentation in the labour market resulting from these processes has an impact on the class structure and modifies it. Furthermore, this modification of the
class structure further alters the opportunity structure existent for future immigrants and subsequent generations of ethnic members.\textsuperscript{12}

This framework includes ethnicity, and allows for the way in which cultural traits operate and interact with structural factors to affect the formation of the class structure. Its applicability in accounting for the initial occupational allocation of Vietnamese refugees in Hobart is illustrated in the following chapter.

\textsuperscript{12}For example, the introduction of migrant labour and the two year employment contract were significant factors in the development of manufacturing in Australia. This has consequently modified the opportunity structure for succeeding migrants who have been increasingly channelled into this sector of the labour market.
CHAPTER 5: THE VIETNAMESE IN HOBART

The Vietnamese Refugee Movement

The movement of refugees from Vietnam is an example of an acute refugee movement arising from political change and the movement of military forces (see Kunz 1973:132). The first Vietnamese refugees left in mass in 1975 when Northern forces took Saigon. These Vietnamese had been closely associated with the American presence and had been employed in occupations created by the War in the armed forces, public administration and the "American Sector" (Kirkwood, Kaplan, Russin & Vecchi 1970:41-42). Succeeding groups of Vietnamese refugees were affected by the attempts of the new government to re-educate anti-communist elements and to create a socialist state in the south (see Kunz 1973:137). These attempts included collectivisation of agriculture and nationalisation of business (Grant 1979:24-28; Spraegens & Ngo Vinh Long 1980:2), and affected mainly the Chinese minority (who formed the bulk of the renewed exodus in 1978-79), as well as farmers and some professionals (Becker 1979:5). Further refugees left Vietnam because of economic difficulties experienced in the wake of the war, and exacerbated by natural disasters and the lack of international aid (Morrow 1979:1-2).

Kunz (1973:143) suggests that this form of displacement creates a group with specific characteristics - namely, the predominance of young men with relatively higher education. The external barriers encountered by any group of migrants or refugees on entry to a host society vary in their impact according to such characteristics. The labour market is the location for some external barriers which
operate to prevent entry into specific occupations. These barriers are related to the qualifications or skills required for entry into occupations, linguistic ability necessary for effective performance on the job, and the amount of capital required to enter certain self-employed occupations. These barriers close off a number of occupations for those groups/individuals not possessing the requisite supply characteristics, and especially affect jobs in professional and technical fields, as well as clerical, administrative, service and sales jobs. These barriers therefore determine to a large extent the jobs which are available to a particular ethnic group.

At the same time as these barriers are operative, there also exist factors which direct ethnic groups or individuals into specific labour markets and occupations. Among these factors are types of job-seeking practices utilised by ethnic groups, the degree to which financial need constrains workers to accept unsuitable jobs, knowledge of the labour market possessed by the workers, and the existing structure of the local labour market. Another such factor is the emergence of group solidarity which tends to reinforce segmentation processes.

Labour Market Position of Vietnamese in Hobart

72% (ie. 51 persons) of the Vietnamese population in Hobart, aged 15 years and over are labour force participants. However, most are unemployed (see Table 5.1), Tasmanian Vietnamese experiencing a higher unemployment rate than Vietnamese in some other States such as Western Australia (see Courtney 1981:2). At this early stage of
settlement, the Vietnamese are not yet distributed throughout the employing industries or occupational structure. 18 of the 20 employed Vietnamese are engaged in horticulture, manufacturing, community service and sales. No Vietnamese has been employed by the traditional major employers of migrants in Tasmania - the Hydro-Electric Commission, the building, construction and mining industries. Although the sample only includes Vietnamese living in Hobart where fewer are likely to be employed by these industries, this also appears to hold true for Vietnamese living elsewhere in the State.

Table 5.1: OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF VIETNAMESE IN HOBART 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers etc. (Horticulture)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Process</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Recreation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total employed 20 40
Unemployed 31 60

Total labour force 51 100

Source: Interviews, Hobart, 1981
Segmentation patterns cannot genuinely be determined at this early stage, but there is evidence to suggest that such a Vietnamese segment may be forming in plant nursery occupations. 6 Vietnamese are employed in these jobs by 2 nurseries. These and other jobs held by Vietnamese in the manufacturing sector are unskilled and low paying with little or no prospects of advancement. None of them entail much on-the-job training. Furthermore, five are employed in part-time or temporary work. All of these jobs are vulnerable to unemployment. The pattern emerging for the Vietnamese labour force is therefore typically one characterised by secondary market employment or unemployment (see Table 5.1 and Appendix 2 for details).

There has already been some job changing among the earlier arrivals (see Table 5.2). The given reasons for this include employer exploitation, low pay, lack of custom in the employing establishment, language difficulties, or the offer of other jobs. Only in one case has any upward mobility occurred, and this is tenuous, since the position, (a teacher's aide), is temporary. In 2 other cases, terms of employment have improved, but otherwise these job changes are typical of the secondary market and are not related to career advancement. This is particularly the case for those who have left or lost jobs and are now unemployed (5 persons).

In addition to manifesting a mobility pattern characteristic of the secondary labour market, job changes have also accentuated patterns of occupational concentration in plant nursery work and community service occupations with workers tending to move into those sectors.
TABLE 5.2: JOB HISTORY OF VIETNAMESE IN HOBART WHO HAVE HELD MORE THAN ONE JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job1</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Job2</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Present Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>2 mth.</td>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>2 mth</td>
<td>Job 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td>nursery (different)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acupuncture</td>
<td>4 mth</td>
<td>Masseur</td>
<td>2 mth</td>
<td>Job 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>3 mth</td>
<td>Teacher's aide</td>
<td>4 mth</td>
<td>Job 2 (temp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiter</td>
<td>1 1/2 mth</td>
<td>Trainee</td>
<td>1 mth</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td></td>
<td>marine mechanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen hand</td>
<td>2 mth</td>
<td>Groundsman</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Job2 (temp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interviews, Hobart, 1981

External Barriers: (i) Qualifications and Skills

Primary market occupations are largely closed off to Vietnamese due to the non-transferability of qualifications and skills and to language difficulties. Although language problems hampered attempts to ascertain these characteristics and the previous occupations of the Hobart Vietnamese, nevertheless it is apparent that the group is relatively highly qualified and skilled compared with Vietnamese settled in Queensland and in Australia as a whole (see Tables 5.3, 5.4 and Appendix 3 for details).
The profile of the Hobart Vietnamese bears similarities to that of Dutch and Polish intakes into Australia, while the latter groups are more comparable to the Yugoslavian intakes. However, this disparity between Vietnamese groups is partly explained by the marked fluctuation in the skill structure of arriving groups of Vietnamese refugees from one year to another (see Appendix 6). This suggests that such variations in the skill structure of different Vietnamese groups may be due to the political situation in Vietnam which affected specific occupational groups at different times.

TABLE 5.3: PREVIOUS MAIN OCCUPATION OF VIETNAMESE IN HOBART 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vietnam Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical Workers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Workers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers, Fishermen</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport workers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradesmen/Production process</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interviews, Hobart, 1981
Notes: 7 had also been in the armed forces, and 12 had been engaged in rural activities for some time.
TABLE 5.4: SKILL LEVEL OF IMMIGRANTS ON ARRIVAL IN AUSTRALIA  
BY BIRTHPLACE 1976-81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aust.</td>
<td>Qld.</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof/Admin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9033</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Europeans in Australia cited in Price 1981

Notes: 1 = includes both males and females 
2 = males only 
3 = Vietnamese only started arriving in Hobart in any number in 1980. In order to compare the Hobart group with others in Australia, occupational categories used in Table 5.3 are converted into skill levels using Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs classification criteria (see Appendices 4 and 5). Both this classification and that presented in Table 5.3 are problematic. Some occupations have no direct Australian equivalent; career disruption due to the War and succeeding events in Vietnam often made it difficult to determine the main occupation of the individual. In addition, Gatbonton (1980:9) points out that some Vietnamese may have inflated their skill levels in order to improve their position. The large variation in numbers also renders any comparison extremely tentative.
times, as well as to fluctuations in Australian selection policies and criteria over the years.

However, as the preceding discussion indicates, Vietnamese have not been able to move into similar status occupations in Hobart (see also Appendix 7). Some qualifications are not recognised by professional associations, eg. in the medical and legal fields. Others do not correspond to Australian requirements. For example, according to one Vietnamese source, only six months training after secondary school is required in order to be employed as a teacher in a private school. Three years training is necessary in order to teach in public schools. In Australia, only the latter period of training would be acceptable. Formal certificates of training are occasionally lost during escape, so claims cannot be verified. Some trades are learned from family or friends or are self-taught, while secondary education had been a usual qualification for government jobs. Consequently, although the occupation may be classified as skilled, the amount of training involved may be negligible or different from that required in Australia (see Appendix 3).

(ii) Language

The Decade Report (1973:19) claimed that fluency in English was an important determinant of employment and jobs for migrants, particularly affecting the degree of mobility out of occupations as 'tradesmen, production process workers and labourers'. As Table 5.5 illustrates, the minimal English language ability of most Hobart Vietnamese on arrival has thwarted their entry into a range of jobs, and has acted as a barrier to retraining or further study, thus
### TABLE 5.5: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ABILITY ON ARRIVAL AND OCCUPATIONS OF VIETNAMESE LABOUR FORCE IN HOBART - 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Ability</th>
<th>No. People</th>
<th>Hobart Occupation</th>
<th>No. People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Good</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers aide</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Minimal</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acupuncturist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storeman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plant nursery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. None</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen hand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Groundsman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plant nursery</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Car wrecker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Masseur</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To mainland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not seeking work</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Not known</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To mainland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Interviews, Hobart, 1981

**Note:** Assessment of English language ability of Vietnamese on arrival was based on (i) assessments by Adult Migrant Education teachers, and (ii) information from interviews with Vietnamese, sponsors and befrienders.
hampering mobility into the primary labour market. In addition, this factor has also acted as a barrier to employment per se. 31 Vietnamese in the sample are unemployed. Of these, 28 had no English on arrival. However, while lack of fluency in English may prevent access to jobs, possession of fluency does not guarantee it, nor does it necessarily open the door to primary market jobs.

Likewise, although qualifications and training have not allowed entry into appropriate occupations in Hobart, nor guaranteed employment, yet those with higher qualifications have been relatively more successful in finding work of some kind. It could be hypothesised that those with qualifications have greater self confidence in their ability to obtain and hold a job; employers may also be impressed by their alleged background and are perhaps more willing to give them job opportunities (see Table 5.6 and Appendix 7).

The possession of qualifications, skills and linguistic competence as entry tickets into employment is reflected in the characteristics of the unemployed Vietnamese (see Table 5.7). A higher proportion of younger Vietnamese (15-29 years) than older, and of females than males are unemployed. Younger age groups lack job experience, training and qualifications. Many were students in Vietnam, either in secondary school or some form of tertiary education, but not all had completed their courses. Lack of English language ability prevents some from continuing study, forcing them to look for work.
### TABLE 5.6: OCCUPATIONS IN VIETNAM AND EMPLOYMENT IN HOBART OF VIETNAMESE IN HOBART - 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vietnam Occupation</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof/Technical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inad. descr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Dept of Immigration & Ethnic Affairs, Hobart; Interviews, Hobart, 1981

**Note:** * Not all who were employed in Vietnam are seeking jobs in Australia.
Lack of success in gaining employment by females is also partly dependent on channelling factors such as attitudes to family life and sex roles.
Channelling Factors: (i) Attitudes towards the family

Differential employment rates according to sex and marital status are partly due to certain attitudes the family which can be seen to operate as channelling factors. For the Vietnamese, "the family is everything". The family is normally the extended family structure which provides the welfare system for each member. Traditionally, the family gave support, carried out business dealings and at times, had influence in the bureaucracy on behalf of its members. Each member was dependent on others, and the misfortune that befell one could be traced to the misdemeanour of another. In order for the family to perform these functions and because of its extended structure, clear and strict codes of behaviour were demanded of its members according to their sex, age and family position.

Thus, the husband was to be the dominant partner in the marriage relationship. The woman was subordinate to and protected by him, and was required to defer to him. The importance of producing children, especially males, traditionally meant that the primary role of the woman was linked to child bearing and home responsibilities. Although recent years have seen the changing of some of these attitudes and practices, it nevertheless remains true that Vietnamese women generally continue to defer to their husbands. Even when both partners are wanting to work, the role of the male as primary breadwinner means that there is no instance of a wife being in paid employment while her husband is not. In addition to these attitudes, the loss of extended family members, especially of grandmothers, means that care of young children devolves increasingly onto the mother, while financial constraints prevent the use of child care centres.
Channelling factors such as these attitudes and practices are an essential component in the account of labour market entry by the Vietnamese. External barriers make available a limited number and kind of jobs; however, the particular occupational concentration of Vietnamese is also influenced by these other structures, processes and attitudes.

(ii) Labour Market Structure

The structure of jobs available in the labour market varies over time, according to economic boom/slump cycles, as well as between regions. (Consequently, the degree and kind of ethnic segmentation in the labour market also varies). New entrants to the production process are therefore already faced with a structured set of positions into which they can be directed.

Tasmania is a peripheral economy (see Wilde 1980) whose growth is based on its ability to extract natural resources. 11% of the State's workforce is engaged in the rural or mining sector, compared with 8% nationally (Wilde 1980:8). However, specialisation and consequent vulnerability to market changes characterise the sector and it is not a route to a diversified economy. This vulnerability is shared by much manufacturing industry in Tasmania which is closely tied to natural resources. Apart from these export industries, Tasmania has attracted industry which decentralised to the State in search of cheap and competition free labour (Wilde 1980:9; Barton 1981:28). Such industry decentralises when production is routine and requires fewer skills, consequently offering fewer primary market jobs. At the same time, industries containing many sophisticated, skill intensive and labour intensive activities are
markedly underrepresented in the State (Wilde 1980:9).

Consequently, the structure of industry in Tasmania is such that relatively fewer primary market jobs may be available than at some other mainland locations. One indication of this is that many Tasmanian employers have head offices, and therefore some more highly paid staff in primary sector jobs located in mainland capital cities (Callaghan 1977:21). Therefore, even for those Vietnamese with fluent English and recognised skills, the opportunities for entry into primary market jobs are restricted. In addition, the slow rate of growth in the economy has meant that the level of unemployment in Tasmania has been consistently above the national average (Wilde 1980:30,36; Callaghan 1977:62).

Typically, the existence of various ethnic segments in the local labour market has acted as a powerful influence in the initial labour market entry of migrants, especially when jobs in this sector are relatively unskilled, and have been structured to cope with the particular problems of migrants, eg. lack of English language. Certain industries in Tasmania, most notably the Hydro-Electric Commission, relied heavily on migrant labour during the post-War years (Scott 1957:21). The employment of migrants in mining, building, construction and electricity industries was unique to the State (see Zubrzycki 1960:96-97), and quite different from the employment of immigrants in manufacturing and amusement industries in mainland states. The evidence suggests that a migrant sector did develop in the labour market during those years, consisting of mainly unskilled or semi-skilled jobs in industries which found it difficult to attract native labour.
Although employment opportunities in these industries have recently declined, these employers would superficially appear more likely to engage the newly arrived Vietnamese workers. In addition, financial necessity would have directed Vietnamese into more readily available jobs such as these, since like many migrant groups, they arrived with little or no capital or possessions.

However, the existence of such a 'migrant sector' has not exerted this influence in the case of the Vietnamese, and apart from the small number of Vietnamese employed in manufacturing, no other Vietnamese has entered a traditional migrant sector. One explanation for the absence of Vietnamese in traditional areas is to be located in the cessation of the contract system of migrant labour. Another is to be found in their method of job seeking.

(ii) Job Seeking: Particularism and Group Solidarity

Vietnamese job-seeking practices are characterised by two related features - a high degree of particularism and a slowly developing group solidarity. In Vietnam, friends, relatives and other contacts were mobilised to obtain employment. There was no effective national employment service, and therefore no familiarity with such a bureaucratically organised service as the C.E.S. (Kirkwood Kaplan et.al. 1970:42-47). Therefore, although they utilise the CES offices in Hobart, a typical Vietnamese approach to the CES would be less concerned with a range of job vacancies than with the existence of "a job for me". Their approach to CES officers indicates an expectation that contact networks underlie the apparently bureaucratic system. Consequently, the CES has been ineffective in job placement of the Vietnamese in Hobart.
This personalised approach is reinforced by an Australian contact system developed specifically to meet the needs of Vietnamese refugees. This consists of sponsors under the Community Refugee Support Scheme (CRSS), and befrienders to Vietnamese who moved into the migrant hostel (Friendship and Settlement Scheme - FSS). Vietnamese are unaccustomed to being unemployed, and their helplessness in the face of this, in addition to their tradition of personalised contacts, causes the Vietnamese to rely heavily on sponsors and befrienders.

As a result, 26 of the 30 jobs found for Vietnamese were obtained through contacts, 18 of them through 'official' befrienders and sponsors (see Table 5.8). On the one hand it could be argued that unemployment rates among the Vietnamese are lower than might otherwise have been the case. However, the encouragement given to personalised dealings by this "quasi-kin" contact system has meant that the ability of the Vietnamese to develop the skills needed to utilise CES and other regularised job seeking channels, has not developed.

Related to such particularistic practices is the gradual development of group solidarity. This is evident to some degree also among Vietnamese in Melbourne, where contacts within the Vietnamese community have been responsible for much of their employment in the manufacturing industry (see Jolley, Connell & Grunberg 1980:5,12). Vietnamese in Tasmania are also developing such links. The nucleus of these links consists of a group of 7 family units (including a large extended family) which escaped from Vietnam on the same boat. All arrived in Hobart in late 1980, and all went initially to the
### TABLE 5.8: METHOD OF JOB ATTAINMENT BY VIETNAMESE IN HOBART 1980-81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Attainment</th>
<th>No. jobs</th>
<th>No. people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. CRSS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job offers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CRSS</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. FSS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job offers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own befrienders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Befrienders to other FSS Vietnamese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRSS sponsor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers of other Vietnamese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Australians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. persons who had more than 1 job</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FSS</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total under both schemes</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Interviews, Hobart, 1981

hostel. Their shared experience of escape through to resettlement formed ties of loyalty among a group with otherwise varied backgrounds. On leaving the hostel, residential proximity, the bonds of the extended family and the activity of Australian contacts
enables the circulation of news and information. As other Vietnamese arrive they too are drawn into this loose structure.

However, at this early stage of settlement, the lack of effective and organised, as well as recognised, leadership, relative newness and small numbers, means that solidarity has not developed to any great extent, nor is it effective in overcoming some of the externally encountered barriers outlined earlier. Vietnamese in Hobart must still turn to Australian contacts, who become drawn into the Vietnamese community as "quasi-kin", typically in a parenting role.

Both the 'parenting role' adopted by the Australian contacts and their own social location have acted as factors channelling Vietnamese into specific labour markets. As 'parents' or advisors, befrienders and sponsors have inhibited access to employment in the traditional migrant area of HEC construction work. They argue that while other migrant groups went to these isolated towns, the Vietnamese are too small in number and would be adversely affected. In addition, the parenting role of befrienders has been exercised through their occasional criticism of employers whom they claimed were exploiting Vietnamese workers. In some cases, this has led to the worker's dismissal or leaving the job. Attributing knowledge and authority to their sponsors, Vietnamese are quick to seek their approval and frequently follow their advice in these respects.

While inhibiting Vietnamese from undertaking certain types of work, the social location of sponsors also acts as a factor directing Vietnamese into secondary employment. Many are middle class church members, and the FSS in particular is dominated by
women. A number are teachers, public servants or housewives without the personal contacts in the business world which give access to primary market jobs. Those who have found jobs for Vietnamese were themselves employed in staff or supervisory capacities in manufacturing industries, or were community workers.

Frequently, the jobs searched for by befrienders have been secondary market jobs. At times, this has been affected by stereotypification. For example, the opinion that all Vietnamese were 'mechanically minded' led some to search for mechanic's jobs. On other occasions, the sponsor's consciousness of the barriers imposed by language and qualifications leads them to search for jobs where these will not be an impediment. Typically, these tend to be secondary market occupations such as storemen, janitor, supermarket nightfiller, petrol pump attendant and cleaner.

Vietnamese in the Class Structure

Vietnamese in Hobart form the lower stratum of the working class. Most are unemployed, while those with jobs are vulnerable to retrenchment. They constitute part of the working class which circulates through the secondary labour market, the training economy (via NEAT schemes) and the unemployment sector. They experience the conflicts between these sectors, since taking a job may entail financial setback through the loss of fringe benefits. Those employed work in low or unskilled jobs with minimal chances of advancement.

The presence of Vietnamese in the labour market has certainly affected the composition of the working class. However, their
presence has also reinforced ethnic divisions within the working class. This has occurred through the operation of factors which act as external barriers to their entry into a primary market, as well as factors which positively direct the Vietnamese into the lower stratum. Among the latter must be included the cultural outlook of the Vietnamese themselves with respect to sex roles and family life, as well as job seeking methods. In addition, the attitudes and assessments of Vietnamese settlers formed by contacts and sponsors have been crucial factors in initial job placement.

Subsequent mobility for Vietnamese out of this segment of the working class seems unlikely given the strength of external barriers. The ability to accumulate sufficient capital to enter the private business sector is crucially dependent on the ability of the Vietnamese to gain employment, or on the support given by new and more wealthy sponsors. The degree to which such a venture may benefit the group as a whole is furthermore dependent on the development of stronger group solidarity. The determination of some individuals, together with the generally high educational and occupational aspirations expressed by Vietnamese, may allow some to move into primary market jobs. However, for the group as a whole, barriers of language, qualifications and lack of capital will probably not be overcome in the 1st generation.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

Occupations and the Class Structure

The existence of an ethnically differentiated working class is a long term feature of Western European and Australian society. The present study has attempted to address some of the problems that have emerged in sociological theory in its accounts of the relationship between such ethnic differentiation and the class structure. An illustration of the argument of this thesis consisted of a short study of the occupational allocation of a single ethnic group in Hobart, thus raising the issue of the relationship between occupations and the class structure.

In the light of theories of labour market segmentation, the concept of 'occupation' used in this thesis emphasises the notion of 'structured career paths' (see Stewart, Prandy and Blackburn 1980:73). This recognises that most individuals experience a variety of job tasks throughout their working life. Such career paths may be 'dead-end' job changing, or progress through stages requiring greater skill, initiative and responsibility. Thus, as Stewart et.al. observe (1980:73), it is not sufficient simply to refer to occupational titles as a basis of assignment to a class position. Managers, for example, rarely begin their careers as managers, but more often as clerical workers, tradesmen or perhaps professionals. The career path followed by a worker has an important bearing on his consciousness, life style and relationships. Furthermore, as is
apparent from segmented labour market theories, the type of industry or firm in which a person is employed affects the degree of job security, income and associated life chances and life style available to him.

Occupation, understood in this dynamic sense, is therefore linked to the class structure through its effect on life-chances and life style, ie. on the person's position in the consumer market and its implications with respect to social relationships and consciousness. Simultaneously, the person’s occupation at any time is his position in the production process, and his career path through various productive positions is determined to a large extent by his initial occupation.

Consequently, it is possible to view occupations as the critical link between the production sphere, usually given primacy by Marxist writers in the determination of the class structure, and the market sphere (including labour and consumption markets) typically emphasised by Weberians. Following Blackburn and Mann (1979:1-3, 295-6), this thesis argues that this rigid distinction should be abandoned.

Allocation to positions in the productive process, ie. to occupations, occurs through the operation of the labour market, and the worker's location in production corresponds to that in the labour market. Capitalism presupposes this market where labour as a commodity is bought and sold, a necessary exchange for the subsequent extraction of surplus value in production. The actual selling of labour power and the terms under which the worker has to sell it are fundamental to the class structure in the advanced
capitalist societies (see Blackburn & Mann 1979:1).

Consequently, this critical role of 'occupations' renders them as the single most important factor affecting the specific shape of the class structure at any time. Occupations embody production relations, and are crucial in determining the life chances of an individual or group.

**Ethnicity in Class Formation**

Differing emphases of the Marxian and Weberian traditions were also observed in Chapter One, where it was argued that there has been a tendency for class theory either to neglect ethnic divisions or to treat ethnicity as a complicating factor which prevents class formation. Weberian accounts, which emphasise the division between subjective and objective dimensions of stratification radically separate ethnic groups (as status groups) from economic classes. This results in the relegation of ethnicity to the status of an exogenous factor in the analysis of class.

The separation of these dimensions is frequently apparent in the Marxist literature also, where economic factors are regarded as the fundamental mechanism producing the objective structure of class. The Marxian tradition also emphasises the distinction between explanatory and descriptive accounts of stratification, and gives primacy to the former. Marxist writers are therefore concerned with fundamental structural mechanisms, and ethnic divisions are dismissed as 'surface' phenomena, distorting the 'pure' class consciousness of the proletariat and preventing the formation of a revolutionary working class.
Thus, the distinction between the two traditions tends to fade in their common relegation of ethnicity to peripheral status. However, the empirical significance of ethnicity in the class structure casts doubt on this theoretical position, and on such a 'purist' notion of class, and begs a solution located in the integration of subjective and objective dimensions of stratification. Although both traditions divorce the formation of classes as objective entities from subjective processes, yet as Parkin (1979:2) complains, such a view regards even the objective existence of a class as somehow separate from the decisions and activities of its members, as though the structure can somehow continue to produce itself regardless of their consciousness or activity. Actors are reduced to being mere incumbents of social roles. The presence of ethnically diverse workers in the labour market therefore is viewed as irrelevant in the structure of inequality. Such a view is rejected in this study. As Giddens argues:

The concept of structuration involves that of the duality of structure, which relates to the fundamentally recursive character of social life, and expresses the mutual dependence of structure and agency. By the duality of structure I mean that the structural properties of social systems are both the medium and the outcome of the practices that constitute those systems. ... structure is both enabling and constraining. ... Structure thus is not to be conceptualised as a barrier to action, but as essentially involved in its production. (1979:69-70)

Thus institutions and structures do not operate in ways totally unknown and uncomprehended by actors who produce and reproduce them. The knowledge (albeit partial) which every actor in society has of
these institutions and processes and his attitudes toward them is not incidental to the operation of society, but is necessarily involved in it. To acknowledge the interdependence of structure and action is not to ignore that some conditions of action are unknown, and that action has unintended consequences (Giddens 1979:71-73). Nevertheless, when it is recognised that actors with knowledge and with cultural outlooks do produce and reproduce structures, then the characteristics of actors, including ethnic characteristics, do have an effect.

One context in which they are significant is the labour market, where the characteristics of labour supply vary according to the skills and qualifications held to enhance its value to the employer. Chapter Two examined labour market theories which proposed that the demand for labour by owners and controllers of capital was also structured in varying ways. This structuring produced new productive positions designed to meet the exigencies of product marketing and competition. In addition, structuring occurs to cope with the local environment and the characteristics of available labour supply, including the characteristics of ethnic minority workers.

Segmentation processes, by generating new productive positions and restructuring others, further affect the degree of homogeneity among workers. Although workers remain sellers of labour and do not control the structure of jobs available to them, nevertheless they enter jobs characterised by markedly different wages, conditions and career paths, and thereby become divided from each other. Consequently, the structuration of class, especially the internal structure of the working class, is affected by such labour market processes.
In this labour market, certain ethnic groups are highly concentrated in specific industries and occupations which offer low pay, poor working conditions and low job security, while others tend to monopolise primary market jobs. This is illustrated in Chapter Three, and allows us the inference that a degree of ethnic segmentation exists in the labour market. However, unlike Castles and Kosack (1973:463) who claim that the social position of immigrant workers is basically the same in each Western European country they examined, irrespective of regional variation, the national origin or ethnic characteristics of the immigrant worker the Australian data reveals variation between ethnic groups in these patterns of concentration.

This variation is partly due to national origins, since countries of emigration differ with respect to levels of economic development and educational opportunities. However, these characteristics of workers' origins do not constitute a complete explanation of their subsequent occupational outcome. For example, variation is also noted between Italians and Greeks, groups usually classified together as Southern Europeans on the basis of similar levels of development in the countries of origin. Consequently, it is argued that ethnic characteristics have an impact on labour market processes, and therefore on class structuration. Ethnicity therefore, represents a factor of 'mediate structuration' (see Giddens 1973:107). By this term, Giddens means "the factors which intervene between the existence of certain given market capacities eg. skills and qualifications and the formation of classes as identifiable market groupings".
The concept of ethnicity is discussed in Chapter Four. Three aspects are considered: first, the self-identification of ethnics with their group; second, the ethnic identity ascribed to individuals or groups by others on the basis of often objective ethnic attributes; and finally, the shared cultural consciousness of ethnic members, possessed to some degree by all, regardless of whether or not they themselves identify with their group. The way in which ethnicity operates in the processes of labour market segmentation and class structuration is therefore primarily through the attitudes and norms of both ethnics and relevant others. This also includes stereotypification. Thus 'ethnicity' in this discussion is referred to primarily in relation to its subjective aspects.

Consequently, if ethnic characteristics are important in structuration processes, and if it is important whether labour market participants and class members are Dutch, Greek or Vietnamese, then ethnicity must be viewed as an integral component in the activity producing and reproducing the objective structure of class. This requires that subjective mechanisms be seen as contributing to the mechanisms generating objective structures.

The structuration of class requires the continuing production of workers and owners of capital and of productive positions. Chapter Four indicates ways in which ethnicity has historically operated in these processes and in the processes of allocating productive agents to positions. A framework developed out of these theoretical arguments and historical processes is outlined in this chapter, and an empirical illustration of the operation of ethnicity
in labour force recruitment is presented in Chapter Five, utilising elements of this framework.

This empirical study is limited in its scope and methodology. An adequate investigation of the ways in which ethnicity is significant in structuration processes would require either a longitudinal study, or the historical construction of these processes in the experience of various ethnic groups. Furthermore, to more fully assess the impact of ethnicity, a comparative framework is essential. Ideally it would involve a study of various ethnic groups in different regional settings over time. Additionally, the study has made no attempt to quantify the impact of various structural and cultural factors. It is more concerned with the illustration of the theoretical issues concerning the processes generating class as a structure, utilising a perspective developed by segmented labour market theorists.

Studies of this kind may contribute to the resolution of the long-standing and futile 'structure-action' debate in sociology, as well as enabling more coherent accounts of many situations of inequality and oppression in ethnically divided societies. In relation to the former, interpretive understanding which attempts to identify and consider attitudes, intentions and beliefs of actors, needs to be combined with an analysis of how this consciousness is related to action; "... and of how systems of belief are causally related to the structural relations and mechanisms present in specific social formations" (Keat & Urry 1975:227).
In relation to the latter, the integration of the concepts of class and ethnicity should allow not only less distorted accounts of the structures of inequality under investigation, but also allow the development of more sound policy options aimed at addressing such issues by governments, unions and other organisations.
TABLE A.1: EMPLOYMENT OF MALES IN AUSTRALIA IN OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS BY BIRTHPLACE
Census 1971, 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7/8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aust. 1971</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aust. 1976</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K. 1971</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany 1971</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany 1976</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether. 1971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland 1971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupational groups: 0 - Professional/Technical; 1 - Management & Administrative; 2 - Clerical; 3 - Sales; 4 - Farmers and Fishermen; 5 - Miners & Quarrymen; 6 - Transport & Communication; 7/8 - Tradesmen & Production Process Workers; 9 - Service, Sport & Recreation; 10 - Armed Services; 11 - Unemployed

(cont. over page)
### TABLE A.1: EMPLOYMENT OF MALES IN AUSTRALIA IN OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS BY BIRTHPLACE

**Census 1971, 1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Occupational group %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreign born</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occupational groups:** 0 - Professional/Technical; 1 - Management & Administrative; 2 - Clerical; 3 - Sales; 4 - Farmers and Fishermen; 5 - Miners & Quarrymen; 6 - Transport & Communication; 7/8 - Tradesmen & Production Process Workers; 9 - Service, Sport & Recreation; 10 - Armed Services; 11 - Unemployed

**Source:** Australian Bureau of Statistics. 1971 & 1976 Census: Population & Dwellings: Cross-Classified Tables (2426.0)
TABLE A.2: OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION AND STATUS OF VIETNAMESE IN HOBART - 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant nursery workers</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundsman</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 7/8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile factory workers</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car wrecker</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickworks labourer</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass factory</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Prod. factory worker</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storeman</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen hand</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acupuncture/masseurs</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's aide</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interviews, Hobart, 1981

Notes: FP = Fulltime permanent; FT = Fulltime temporary; PP = Part time permanent.
TABLE A.3: PREVIOUS MAIN OCCUPATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF VIETNAMESE IN HOBART - 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation in Vietnam</th>
<th>No. employed</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OD-021 Medical practitioner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Tertiary degree (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Degree + specialisation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE-026 Nurse, no certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 18 mth hospital tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF-037 Medical worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 2 yr. acupuncture tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG-039 University lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Tertiary degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG-052 Secondary teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 6 mths. tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG-055 Primary teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG-056 Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 6 mths. tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI-061 Lawyer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 4 yr. degree, 7 yr. pr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK-075 Med. Sci. Technician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Tertiary degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL-079 Accountant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 4 yr. degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL-087 Computer programmer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- 2 yr. Uni. Tr. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not known (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A-150 Book keepers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Secondary educ. (1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B-151 Typist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C-154 Clerical worker-govt.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Secondary educ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C-155 Bank clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Secondary educ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont. over page)

Notes: tr = training; pr = practice
### TABLE A.3: PREVIOUS MAIN OCCUPATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF VIETNAMESE IN HOBART - 1981 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation in Vietnam</th>
<th>No. employed</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3B-206 Street vendors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Not known (1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C-203 Proprietors, shopkeepers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Primary educ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C-205 Shop assistants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Primary educ. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not known (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A-302/307 Rice, fruit farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Secondary educ. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B-330 Farm workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Not known (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E Fishermen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- Not known (1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- No quals. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A-500 Deck Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- 2yr. Tech Coll. as boat mechanic; master's licence; boat drivers licence (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B-502 Engine room hand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Not known (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 1 yr. tr. in Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues on next page)

**Notes:**  
a = 1 person combined 2 jobs  
tr = training; pr = practice
### APPENDIX 3 (Cont.)

**TABLE A.3: PREVIOUS MAIN OCCUPATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF VIETNAMESE IN HOBART - 1981 (Cont.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation in Vietnam</th>
<th>No. employed</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/8B-613 Sewing, embroidery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- No quals. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8C-616 Boot making not factory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 3 yr. tr. in family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8E-631 Jeweller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Self-taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8F-632 Lathe operator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Apprentice (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not known (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8F-643 Welder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8F-636 Car mechanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 2 yr. tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8F-637 Aircraft mechanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8F-647 Boat mechanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 2 yr. tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8T Waterside worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- No. quals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A-801 Special police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C Hairdresser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Formal quals + 14 yrs. pr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A-828 Naval officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Interviews, Hobart, 1981

**Notes:**
- a,b = 1 person combined 2 jobs.
- tr. = training; pr. = practice
- Of the 46 people, at least 7 had also been in the armed forces and 12 had been engaged in rural activities for some time.
APPENDIX 4

CLASSIFICATION OF OCCUPATIONS INTO SKILL LEVELS BY DEPT. OF IMMIGRATION AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS

Skill levels and examples of appropriate occupations are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Level</th>
<th>Examples of Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Technical</td>
<td>Medical Practitioners, Laboratory Technologists, Nurses, Chemists, Engineers, Solicitors, Teachers, Electronics Technicians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Commercial and Administrative</td>
<td>Non-professional Proprietors and Contractors, Clerks, Typists, Managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>Tradesmen, Butchers, Pottery Makers, Dressmakers, Tailors, Bakers, Printers, Dry Cleaners, Small Goods Makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>Receptionists, Bus Conductors, Drivers, Sales Personnel, Builders' Labourers, Laundry Workers, Packers and Storemen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>Rural and Fisheries Workers, Factory Workers, Labourers, Private Domestics, Hotel and Catering Occupations, and other service occupations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Workforce</td>
<td>Home Duties, Non-working children, Retired Persons, Invalids.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gatbonton 1980:9d
## CLASSIFICATION OF VIETNAM OCCUPATIONS INTO SKILL LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vietnam Occupation</th>
<th>Skill level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Practitioners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University lecturer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary teacher</td>
<td>Professional and Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Science technician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer programmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book keepers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. clerical worker</td>
<td>Clerical, Commercial, Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank clerk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Proprietor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat mechanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embroidery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootmaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathe operator</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car mechanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft mechanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop assistants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing factory workers</td>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeweller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterside worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Level</th>
<th>Australia %</th>
<th>Queensland %</th>
<th>Hobart %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof/Clerical/Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gatbonton, 1980
Dept. Immigration & Ethnic Affairs, Hobart.
Interviews, Hobart, 1981
APPENDIX 7

TABLE A.5: OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION IN VIETNAM AND HOBART - 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian occupation</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7/8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>A/H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Prof.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Clerical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Transport</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8 Prod. process</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Armed service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Unemp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inad. des</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dept. of Immigration & Ethnic Affairs, Hobart; Interviews, Hobart, 1981.

Note: Numbers underlined indicate mobility into same occupational category in Hobart.
A/H = At home
APPENDIX 8

FIELDWORK METHODOLOGY

Information and data required for the study was collected principally through focussed interviews with Vietnamese settlers in Hobart and with their sponsors and befrienders under the Community Refugee Settlement Scheme (CRSS) and the Friendship and Settlement Scheme (FSS).

Sample and Interviews
The first Vietnamese refugees arrived in Tasmania in October 1980. By September 1981, when interviewing was being conducted, 18 families comprising 92 persons had been settled under the CRSS in Tasmania, while 27 families comprising 132 persons arrived under the hostel scheme.

Because of resource constraints only those families who remained in Hobart were interviewed. However, this included the majority of Vietnamese in Tasmania. Since the main focus of the study was on those refugee settlers who were actively seeking work, the sample was further restricted to those who had arrived in Tasmania prior to July 1981 (1). The final sample of Vietnamese settlers consisted of 22 Vietnamese families comprising 69 potential labour force participants (7 families under the CRSS and 15 families under the FSS).
5 families with 15 potential labour force participants were not interviewed. The reasons for non-interview included language difficulties - 2 families; shift work and other difficulties in contacting them - 3 families. Consequently, interviews were conducted with 17 Vietnamese families (54 potential labour force participants) and 23 sponsors/befrienders. Some of these sponsors represented sponsoring groups. All who were contacted agreed to an interview.

Interviewing was conducted in August-September 1981 by the writer. Initial contact with the Vietnamese was generally made through their sponsors. In addition, the Dept. of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs provided lists of names and known addresses. Names of sponsors were also provided by this Department and by one of the co-ordinators of the F.S.S. Interviews were generally conducted in English and lasted 30-50 minutes. The greatest problem encountered was language difficulties. This problem had been foreseen and questions had been constructed using simple language. In most cases, this together with rephrasing of questions where necessary and slowness and clarity of speech enabled the interviewer to gain the required information. In one instance a Vietnamese interpreter assisted in the conduct of an interview, while in some other cases, sponsors who had developed a reasonable degree of communication with their sponsee, acted as an "interpreter".
Questionnaire

A schedule of topics to be covered was constructed, consisting of questions and probes. Actual wording of questions tended to vary in each situation according to the language ability of the respondent.

In addition to certain demographic data, the following information was sought:

1. **Job History** - the number of jobs held, periods of unemployment, reasons for losing or leaving jobs, the number of jobs the individual has attempted to obtain, the kind of jobs he/she has attempted to enter.

2. **Job entry** - ie. how jobs were obtained.

3. **Kind of jobs obtained** - level of skill required, tasks performed in the job, amount of on-the-job training, prospects for advancement, conditions of employment.

4. **Correspondence between jobs** held in Tasmania and jobs held in Vietnam.

5. **Instances of job discrimination**.

The interviews also attempted to explore various cultural features which could have an impact on labour market entry and subsequent career patterns.

1. **Attitudes towards the family and marriage** - exploiting family networks, effects on ability to accumulate capital or undertake further education.
(2) Attitudes towards authority - eg. employers, trade unions or some other workers.

(3) Attitudes toward work.

(4) Career aspirations including attitudes towards education.

(5) Attitudes towards social welfare.

(The basic questionnaire used is found in Appendix 9)

Factual information was fairly easily obtained. However, limited English language ability prevented many from expressing opinions and attitudes in any detail. In addition, the writer felt that frequently the opinions expressed were those the respondent thought would be most acceptable to the interviewer or which would perhaps enlist the help of the interviewer in solving their unemployment problem.

Although opinions and attitudes were expressed, this kind of information was more valuably gained from casual comments made during the interview. The perceptions of the sponsors were also used to gain some understanding of this area of concern.

The sponsors were questioned on the way in which they became involved in the settlement programme and the kind of assistance they had rendered to the Vietnamese families. In addition, they were asked about the Vietnamese family members: their immigration to Australia, job history, family composition and what sponsors 'knew' of their aspirations and attitudes.
TOPICS AND QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS

(Front page Summary Information)

NAMES & AGES:

PREVIOUS EMPLOYMENT:

PRESENT EMPLOYMENT:

QUALIFICATIONS:

DATE & TIME OF INTERVIEW:

INTERVIEW NUMBER:

PLACE INTERVIEW CONDUCTED:
A. JOB HISTORY

1. What work did you do in Vietnam?
   Probe: job description
   training
   periods of employment
   number of jobs

2. How big was the workplace in Vietnam?
   Probe: number of workers
   scale of work
   family business

3. Do you have work here in Tasmania?
   Probe: who is looking for work

FOR THOSE UNEMPLOYED

4. What kind of work are you trying to find?

5. Have you applied for any jobs?
   Probe: number
   kind of job
   when applied

5a. Have you ever had a job here in Tasmania?

6. Why do you think it is so hard for you to find a job?

FOR ALL

7. How did you find your job in Vietnam?
   Probe: contacts
   employment agency
FOR THOSE EMPLOYED/EVER EMPLOYED

8. How did you find your job here in Tasmania?
   Probe : contacts, befrienders
          newspaper
          CES
          approach employer

9. What work do/did you do here in Tasmania?
   Probe : where
          job description
          any training

10. When did you start this job?

11. How many jobs have you had here in Tasmania?
    Probe : when
            where
            why left the job

12. Do you/did you like your job here in Tasmania?

13. How do/did other workers/boss treat you?

14. Do you/did you have a union at the place where you work(ed)?

15. What do you think is the proper way to behave at work?
    Probe : working hard
            absenteeism
            reliability
            punctuality

16. What do you think is the proper way for a worker to behave towards his boss?

B. EDUCATION

1. Do you think education is important?
   Probe : for self/children
           advancement

2. Do you do any study now?
   Probe : kind of study
           amount of study
           future intentions
C. BEFRIENDERS

1. What were your biggest problems when you came to Tasmania?
2. What are your biggest problems now?
3. How do you try to solve your problems?
4. Do you have Australian friends?
5. Do they help you?
   
   **Probe:** how, who

D. FAMILY

1. Are all your family with you in Tasmania?
   
   **Probe:** where rest of family is

2. Do you send money or parcels to your family in Vietnam?
   
   **Probe:** what is sent, how frequently

3. In Vietnam did you live with your parents?
   
   **Probe:** extended family, importance of family

4. In Vietnam do women work outside the home?
   
   **Probe:** for sex roles

E. WELFARE

1. Do you receive payments from the Australian government?
   
   **Probe:** kind, how long have been receiving

2. What do you think of these payments?

3. Is there anything like this in Vietnam?
F. WAY OUT TO TASMANIA

1. How did you leave Vietnam?

   Probe: for migration history
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