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ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to ascertain the extent and nature of belonging to the Australian Catholic Church as experienced by immigrants. This experience of belonging was ascertained through the quantitative study of the National Church Life Survey of 2001 and to a lesser extent the Catholic Church Life Survey of 1996. Both surveys were conducted with attenders at a particular Sunday Eucharist and hence measured the experiences only of Catholics who attend Church. This quantitative study was complemented with a qualitative study of a small group of Vietnamese Catholics who were members of a particular parish.

The importance of belonging to a religious tradition is that it provides an aspect of an individual's identity. Identity is many-faceted and formed and reformed in the context of belonging, whether that belonging is to people such as family or to groups of people such as fellow members of a religious tradition. In the process of migration and settlement, the set of primary groups to which an individual belongs is at best disrupted and at worst, lost. Belonging to a religious tradition may provide a constancy of belonging in the immigrant's life when all other aspects of belonging are being renegotiated during settlement in the host country. In the case of the Catholic Church in Australia, there has been some debate about whether or not the Church has been welcoming of immigrants but little testing of immigrants' experience of being welcomed and enabled to belong to the Church. The National Church Life Survey provided a unique opportunity to examine the extent and nature of belonging as experienced by immigrant Catholics.

Since all respondents to the survey were asked their birthplace, comparisons could readily be made between the experiences of Australian-born Catholics and those Catholics who were born elsewhere. Since nearly 3,000 respondents completed surveys in Italian or Vietnamese, comparisons could also be made between these respondents and those who responded to the survey in English. Finally, comparisons were made between the small group of Vietnamese parishioners who engaged in the qualitative research, and other groups of Catholics. The comparisons were made between all the groups on the issue of belonging. In the survey there was a particular question that asked respondents about their experience of belonging, but there were other questions that indicated the nature of belonging of respondents, and these were used in the analysis.

The results of the analyses show that on almost all measures, immigrants belong to the Church to a greater extent than Australian-born Catholics. Immigrants attend Sunday Eucharist in greater proportion than Australian born Catholics. Immigrant Catholics participated
more in devotional activities, they reported a greater degree of satisfaction with their faith life and they hold more orthodox beliefs than Australian-born Catholics. However, they did participate less in parish roles and groups than did the Australian-born Catholics. Whilst it may be concluded that this participation is limited because of the barrier of language, the results of this research indicate that this is not the only barrier to participation. Even those immigrants who responded to the English language survey did not participate in parish roles and groups to the extent that Australian-born Catholics did. Further research may be able to ascertain whether cultural barriers outside the scope of this work determine the level of participation of immigrants.

This research concludes that since the Second World War, Catholic immigrants have 'done the work' of belonging to the Australian Catholic Church. They have done this despite the 'benign neglect' of the Church itself and they represent in fact the Church's 'most Catholic' members.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Launching Anthony Paganoni’s book *Valiant Struggles and Benign Neglect* in October, 2003, the Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne Most Reverend Denis Hart admitted ‘we have not paid enough attention at parish level to the possibilities of enrichment which come from the communities that arrive in our midst’. The title of Paganoni’s book highlights the reality of immigrant Catholics, and indeed, of many immigrants in Australia. They leave behind their families and their culture to make ‘a better life’ for themselves and their children. Upon arrival they have to learn how to survive and then make that better life, adapting to language and customs that are foreign to them. Since immigrants are no less members of the Universal Church than Australian-born Catholics, the Australian Catholic Church should be a familiar place of comfort and security to those who are members of the Catholic faith. Yet, Father Paganoni argues, what they too often faced in the past was what could be termed ‘benign neglect’. Drawing on data compiled for the National Church Life Survey of 2001 and to a lesser extent the Catholic Church Life Survey of 1996, this thesis aims to look beyond the ‘benign neglect’ of the Church to focus on the ‘valiant struggles’ of immigrant women and men who have found a place of belonging in the Catholic Church in Australia.

This introductory chapter outlines the basic argument of the thesis and indicates the issues explored in the following chapters. The thesis examines the nature and extent of belonging to the Australian Catholic Church as experienced by immigrants. By looking at notions of individual belonging in immigrants, the thesis explores the nature and importance of their relationships with the Church community.

In this context, this thesis explores the experiences of immigrants in Australia who have identified themselves as belonging to the Catholic Church. In particular, this study tries to ascertain:

- The extent to which people feel a sense of belonging to the Catholic Church, and
- The different ways that belonging has been experienced by immigrants.
QUESTIONS POSED BY THE STUDY

The research questions this thesis seeks to examine are:

1. What is the extent of the sense of belonging to the Australian Catholic Church experienced by immigrants compared to Australian-born Catholics?

2. In what ways is this belonging experienced by immigrant Catholics when compared to their Australian-born counterparts?

3. How does the experience of belonging vary between immigrants, their children and children of Australian-born Catholics?

4. How does the experience of belonging to the Church vary between different ethnic groups, particularly between Italian and Vietnamese immigrants?

This thesis will show that immigrant Catholics have a greater sense of belonging to their parish communities than Australian-born Catholics, attend more frequently at Sunday Eucharists than Australian-born Catholics, and score more highly on almost all the selected criteria that indicated a sense of belonging to the Church. In short, this thesis suggests those immigrants Catholics are the ‘most Catholic’ of all Catholics in local parishes today. The data also shows, however, that the children of immigrants do not follow the pattern of their parents. The extent and nature of their Church belonging is actually less than that of their parents and less than that of their Australian-born counterparts.

In order to explore the nature and extent of belonging as experienced by immigrants, the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 examines the nature of belonging and its relationship to identity. One’s identity is formed and reformed throughout life in relation to those with whom one identifies. Kin relationships, beginning with the relationship an infant has with its parents, are responsible for one’s foundational identity. Beyond kin there is extended family, then the cultural and social influences that provide the context for family and community. All of this identity formation and moulding takes place in the wider context of the historical background of family, culture and society.

There are three aspects of the immigrant’s identity that are examined in this thesis: ethnic identity, gender identity and religious identity. Ethnic identity is the primary identity disrupted by migration. The migrant moves from being a member of a particular, and often a dominant ethnic group in their home culture, to being an ‘outsider’ in the host culture. Gender identity can also be severely disrupted as traditional gender roles are questioned and sometimes transposed in the host culture. The process of migration and settlement disrupts identity since some or even all of these contexts of ‘who one is’ are left behind. The process of
migration leaves the individual asking, ‘to whom do I belong’? Both home and host cultures are rendered alien and as a result identity has to be renegotiated and reformed.

The literature review in this thesis explores the particular belonging experienced by the immigrants who have left their homeland and need to belong to their host culture as a citizen and as gendered members of their faith tradition. The literature review also highlights the situation of children of immigrants as the effects of migration extend beyond the immigrants themselves.

Finally, the literature review outlines the nature of belonging to the Catholic tradition in Australia and overseas. All members of the Church belong to a community bound together by shared beliefs and values and participation in Church activities. This belonging provides members with a common Catholic identity that is shared regardless of birthplace. Such a shared identity has the potential to ease the immigrants’ transition from their home culture to their host culture, yet previous research has indicated that the Australian Church has not made this transition an easy one. What has been termed the ‘benign neglect’ of the Australian Catholic Church has meant that immigrant Catholics themselves have chosen to remain within the Church and have had to ‘do the work’ themselves to belong.

Chapter 3 provides an historical backdrop for this research and focuses on Australian culture and Catholic Church. Neither the host culture nor the Australian Catholic Church is a static monolithic entity. Both Church and culture have renegotiated and reformed in reaction to post-war immigration. The relationship of the immigrant to the Australian Catholic Church must be seen in the context of changes to the Church itself. Government policies and practices in relation to immigration have undergone profound changes, transforming Australia from a country in which immigrants were expected to assimilate to its cultural norms, to a diverse community that prides itself on its multiculturalism. Changes in government policy and practices have been reflected in the Church. In the first thirty years after the war, the expectation of immigrants by the wider society was that they would assimilate both to the culture of the country and to the Church. In the second thirty years, the reality of multiculturalism in the country and the post-Vatican II changes to the Church meant that immigrants were encouraged to maintain their own culture and language.

Chapter 4 outlines the methodology used in this thesis. Rich sources were available for this research. The National Church Life Survey (NCLS) of 2001 sampled Mass attenders in 255 Catholic parishes throughout Australia and the Catholic Church Life Survey (CCLS) of 1996 sampled Mass attenders in 281 parishes throughout Australia. There were in excess of 100,000 respondents to the survey in 1996 and in 2001 and nearly 24,000 of these Catholics
were born in countries other than Australia. These large numbers of Catholics who were at Sunday Eucharist on the days of the surveys and who provided data formed the basis for the statistical analyses undertaken in this thesis. To date, the data sets represented by these two Church Life Surveys have not been analysed to examine patterns of Church participation and belonging by immigrant and Australian-born Catholics. In this sense the thesis breaks new ground. In addition, 32 interviews were conducted with Vietnamese-born Catholics of one particular parish. These interviews provide a rich source of life experience of this particular group of Catholics. Thus, the methodology used in this thesis combines both the quantitative analysis of the large numbers in the parish surveys and the qualitative analysis of the small particular group.

Immigrant Catholics do not constitute a homogeneous group and in Chapter 5 the particular aspects of some of the variety of Catholic immigrant groups are explored. In the 2001 survey, responses were gathered in Italian and Vietnamese as well as in English and in 1996 survey, responses were also gathered in Italian and Vietnamese as well as in Croatian, Polish and Spanish. The migration of each cultural group is described.

In Chapters 6 and 7 data is presented from the 2001 and 1996 surveys of Mass attenders. This data informs the questions of belonging. Belonging in this study was examined under five categories:

- Belonging through participation in parish life
- Belonging through faith experiences
- Belonging through devotional practice
- Belonging through orthodoxy of belief
- Identity

Statistical analysis of the survey responses from immigrant Catholics compared with Australian-born Catholics is the subject of Chapters 6 and 7. Chapter 6 includes analysis of the survey responses of all Catholics born in other countries compared with those born in Australia, regardless of their English-speaking capabilities whereas Chapter 7 focuses on the responses of those immigrant Catholics who completed responses to the surveys in languages other than English. Chapter 6 also includes the analysis of the responses of immigrants' children.

Chapter 8 includes the results of the qualitative research undertaken with the small group of Vietnamese immigrants from a particular parish. The research shows how they do the ‘work’ of belonging to the Church in a variety of ways and with the encouragement and support of their parish priest. Like all immigrants who come to Australia, the participants in this small study were determined to make a better life for their children. Whatever the circumstances in
which they left Vietnam, they are grateful for the opportunity Australia offers and express a
desire to belong to both the country and the Church. Women, reflecting their majority status
among Church participants but also reflecting the extent of their participation in this particular
parish, made up the group almost entirely. Their reflections on the way in which they have set
about this task illuminate the broader survey data and provide valuable information for those
charged with dealing with immigrant groups in the future.

The thesis will show that, despite the benign neglect of the Church immigrant Catholics
have a greater sense of belonging to their parish communities than their Australian-born
counterparts. More frequent in their attendance at Sunday Eucharists than Australian-born
Catholics, they also scored more highly on almost all the criteria available that indicated a
sense of belonging to the Church. Immigrant Catholics are the ‘most Catholic’ of all Catholics
in local parishes. The other conclusion concerns the children of immigrants who do not follow
the pattern of their parents. The extent and nature of their belonging is actually less than that
of their parents and less than that of their Australian-born counterparts. The implications of this
latter finding are important for the Church.

The uniqueness of this work is that it draws on the perspective of immigrants
themselves to describe their relationship with the Australian Catholic Church. Their experience
can be instructive to the hierarchy of the Church, to pastors and to immigrants’ fellow
parishioners. This thesis focuses on a particular group of immigrants – those who choose to
express their belonging to the Australian Catholic Church by attending Sunday Eucharist on the
day that the relevant Church Life Surveys were conducted. Whilst this research gives a
thorough picture of the degree and nature of belonging of this group of immigrants, there are
limitations to the research. Firstly, through the nature of sampling that yielded the responses to
NCLS 2001 and CCLS 1996, some immigrant Catholic groups were not included. Although
immigrants were over-represented in the surveys when compared with their representation in
the broader population, parishes that were ‘de facto national parishes’ were not included. Although
immigrants were over-represented in the surveys when compared with their representation in
the broader population, parishes that were ‘de facto national parishes’ were not included.
Further research of these particular parishes would enable determination of which parish
characteristics most influence immigrants’ sense of belonging. This research indicates that
language is a barrier to belonging in some but not all cases. That suggests that there are other
cultural barriers experienced by immigrants and comparisons between parishes and their
practices in relation to immigrants would throw light on what would cause such barriers.

Then there are the immigrants who do not attend Sunday Eucharist. Just as this
research provides reasons for belonging, further research with non-attenders would provide
reasons why they do not attend. Their experiences of welcome by the Australian Catholic
Church may be one reason why they do not attend, but there may be other cultural factors at play. Research into these other reasons may assist parishes in providing experiences that enable immigrants to belong to their Church.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The literature reviewed in this chapter begins with an overview of the concept of belonging in its most general sense. Belonging is a process of moving from the outside to the inside and belonging is a movement in relation to the other. Belonging to a community provides identity, as one is in relationship to the ‘other’ or ‘others’ to which one belongs. Identity and belonging are intertwined processes that give an individual a sense of who one is, measured against those to whom one belongs. An individual may have many identities depending on the different groups to which one belongs but primary identity comes from belonging to one’s kin group. This belonging to family and the cultural context that contains it is the belonging that is disrupted in the process of migration and settlement and one’s identity needs to be renegotiated in the host culture. The migrant experience of renegotiating identity involves moving perhaps from being a member of the dominant culture in their home country to being a member of minority culture in the host country and this situation may involve becoming assimilated to the host culture. In Australia’s case, immediately after the World War II, migrants were expected to assimilate to belong to the host culture and although Australia now proclaims itself to be multicultural, acceptance of the migrant is still, in many cases, problematic.

In the context of this thesis both the gender and religious identity of immigrants are considered. Migrant women, no longer merely considered as ‘migrants' wives’, take on the tasks of preserving the home culture and negotiating the host culture on behalf of their families. Included in this negotiation is the preservation and transformation of religious identity. Faith traditions have their own gendered expectations of their members and migrant women fulfil these but both migrant women and men may find a place of comfort and security in belonging to a tradition that is familiar when all else in the host culture may not be.

As it is for any faith tradition, the nature of belonging to the Catholic Church has a variety of aspects. This belonging to a faith community can fulfil social needs and spiritual ones. Common knowledge of the story of the tradition, shared beliefs and values, and participation in the community rituals that bind the members together are all elements of belonging to the Church. Members of a faith community share an identity: ‘Sacralization
protects identity’ (Mol, 1976, p.6). These elements of belonging provide the basis for the research conducted in this thesis.

**BELONGING**

Ilcan (2002) addresses the notion of belonging specifically in the settlement process. She describes settlement as a practice without boundaries, as it is never complete or final. There is always a tension between ‘being’ and ‘being otherwise’. For her, the process of migration and settlement is as much about longing as belonging: ‘a longing that is both the motive and the consequence of belonging and that which resists it’ (2002, p.2). Probyn (1996) wishes to convey a ‘sense that belonging expresses a desire for more than what is’ (1996, p.7) which is similar to Ilcan’s ‘longing’. Probyn also uses body imagery to describe the ‘otherness’, which is the other to which one would belong. She describes it as a ‘yearning to make skin stretch beyond individual needs and wants’ (1996, p.7). Both are concerned with how belonging feels or what the sensations of belonging are. Probyn speaks from her experience as a lesbian outside mainstream heterosexual society and Ilcan tells the stories of those who are settlers, engaging with their subjectivity. These two authors agree that ‘Belonging is fuelled by yearning rather than by the posting of an identifiable goal or stable state’ (1996, p.19). Belonging is a process rather than a state. It is a series of actions undertaken to satisfy yearning or longing. Ilcan’s context is the people who are ‘doing settlement’, whilst Probyn’s context is ‘lesbian desire’ (1996, p.13), which for her embodies ‘outside belonging’. Their descriptions certainly provide a sense of the fluidity of belonging, of moving in and out of groups, of belonging and longing. They describe a process that is fuelled by a yearning that goes beyond individual need and is constantly reshaping individual identity and its relationship with the social and cultural mores with which it identifies and which identify it. Their writing also encompasses ideas about any kind of movement from one place to another. Any such movement involves memories of home in all its varied meanings and these memories are constantly being revised and reconstructed over time.

Belonging provides a context for migration. In the process of moving from one’s home culture to a new host culture, the immigrant’s sense of belonging is at the very least disrupted and he or she is engaged in the longing to belong. Whilst memories of home are reconstructed over time, so is the sense of belonging to the new host culture. Belonging is the essential task of the immigrant if he or she is to become part of the host culture and the work of belonging is a process of relating to the different communities with which the immigrant interacts.
In the process of settlement, the tasks of belonging are undertaken largely in communities. The actual settling in the host culture – finding a place to live, work and learn – takes place in communities. If the kin community is unavailable, the community of the immigrant’s ethnic origin can provide networks that effectively facilitate settlement (Massey et al, 1987). Understanding community is therefore relevant to understanding belonging.

Community has several different sociological meanings (Plant, 1974, Frazer, 1999, Little, 2002). Cohen states: ‘There is no generally acknowledged or accepted theory of community, but there never was’ (2002, p.168). Bauman says that ‘community is often opportunistically stretched to accommodate a wide variety of categories’ (2002, p.13). For Little, this fluidity of definition points to the dynamism of community, of community being a process of relationship development and interaction, rather than a static fixed reality. Historically, the term community referred to the village, kin, religious or ethnic group who shared living and geographical space, as well as some set of values and beliefs by which they lived.

The Industrial Revolution enabled communication and transportation between such communities and the urbanisation of western society, which replaced the village as the geographical space in which community was located. Although communities of kin, religion and ethnicity were maintained, and still are, in urban locations, the increased mobility introduced both a physical and metaphorical dynamism to the term ‘community’. The division between the community and the state, which had its origins in the Aristotelian notion of the polis, or the state, in which the ‘higher values’ reside, grew. Tönnies (2001) contrasted a social relationship of solidarity between individuals based on affection, kinship or membership of a community such as family or group of friends with a social relationship of solidarity based upon the division of labour and contracted relations between isolated individuals consulting only their self-interest. Both terms are mental constructs providing a pair of contrasting hypotheses that can be used in investigating any system of social relationships. Sociologists such as Durkheim (1986) and Tönnies had as their focus the relationship between the economy and the state, and the implications of that relationship for social organisation, or community. For Durkheim, the division between state and communities was a more fluid one than for Aristotle. Not only did the state provide an overarching view of how human groups relate to each other, but the groups also provide a counterpoint to the state, providing checks and balances on the behaviour of the state. Tönnies provided the distinction between communities and societies or
associations. He understood communities in the traditional sense and societies as being more rule-bound, tightly managed purposeful groups. These divisions were a natural outcome of industrial growth and economic change. The traditional understanding of the village community as a primary place of belonging and a source of identity had been irrevocably displaced.

A contemporary revival of the importance of community comes in the form of communitarianism, sometimes seen as a reaction of the individualism of the late twentieth century. Etzioni says ‘Communities are webs of social relations that encompass shared meaning and above all shared values’ (1995, p.24). Communitarians espouse the ‘higher values’ as both means and goals. Giddens names some of the values: ‘equality, protection of the vulnerable, freedom as autonomy’ (1998, p.26). Advocates claim that belonging to community gives a sense of ‘we-ness which promotes psychological health’ (Etzioni, 1993, p.124). Superficially, this promotion of community as a source of identification with the most altruistic human values would seem to be the modern recovery of the best of the primitive geographically based kin communities.

The former leader of the Federal Opposition Mark Latham is one Australian advocate of communitarian politics, claiming that the role of government is to empower communities at the local level. On the subject of citizenship, for example, he argues that the concept must be as inclusive as possible, but states that ‘Whenever governments intervene to nominate a particular identity, then other identities are automatically downgraded’ (2001, p.240). Other critics (Young, 1990, Phillips, 1996, Little, 2002) say that the ideals of communitarianism are a rather naive, romantic reversion to an imagined past. All comment on the dangers of the glorification of the primitive geographically based community. Phillips states it this way: ‘Small communities are not necessarily the most democratic, nor are they the most tolerant of people who want to challenge their current conditions’ (1996, p.120). The virtues which communitarians espouse, such as cooperation, altruism, volunteerism, friendship and mutual respect, are not necessarily present in small communities, and belonging to a dysfunctional small community may well be a source of psychological ill-health rather than wellbeing.

However, the main problem with communitarianism is its political manifestation. The critics argue that political communitarianism is defined too narrowly, leading to several difficulties. One of these is that the community is defined along traditional gender roles in traditional family models, with a Protestant work ethic and the moral norms which would lead to a recovery of a social fabric that has been lost to individualism. They argue that such a recovery must take into account changed social and economic conditions, particularly changed family economies. They further argue that communities of choice are now more prevalent than
the communities of fact that communitarians wish to recover. Communities of choice are those which may share common beliefs, actions and values, but are independent of the social fabric they imagine being reconstructed through traditional family values. The critics further argue that perhaps the most dangerous possible outcome is the moral authoritarianism that may be the outcome of political communitarianism. By reverting to a narrow understanding of community, many are excluded from the political realm, whether it is by their gender, sexuality, social class, ethnicity or religion.

Little (2002) tries to overcome these difficulties by including egalitarianism in the values of the community. His alternative of radical community has its main thrust as constructing ‘political structures in which the voices of excluded communities are heard and dominant powers can be challenged’ (2002, p.98). Cohen (2002) defines community in terms of ‘meaning-making’. These communities of choice are also radical, in that they are more inclusive than those of fact, such as kin-based groups. Such communities share common worlds of meaning. Community members have attachment to a common body of symbols, rituals and values. This understanding of community sustains diversity and expresses commonality which, in turn, enables belonging and nurtures it. Rapport and Overing (2000) also hold that, despite predictions that community belonging would become redundant in the face of nation-state communities and global communities, this type of community continues to satisfy people’s belonging needs. Outside kin-based communities, communities of shared meanings enable people to flourish, and there continues to be a human and social need for them.

There does seem to be agreement on the main constituents of community. The virtues that nourish the human spirit and promote individual and communal life provide a common thread through all types and definitions of community. Whether they are called ‘higher values’ in Aristotelian language, or ‘characteristics’ in communitarianism language, the human virtues such as friendship, volunteerism and care are present in communities. Communities in modern times are communities of shared memory or a ‘quality of sociality’ (Amit and Rapport, 2002, p.3), and therefore are physically a quite different reality from the geographical communities of the pre-Industrial era. The consensus about community amongst these authors is that communities provide a place to belong where common values are shared and lived. Community provides a situation where one can both belong and become.

Advocates of community point to the difficulties of the concept when lived out. Boundaries exist to determine who belongs in the community, and who does not, but their existence potentially sets up prejudice, attitudes of superiority, exclusion and cultural relativism.
Just as ‘People construct community symbolically, making it a resource and repository of meaning, and a referrent of their identity’ (Cohen, 2002, p.118) so also ‘Symbolic boundaries are conceptual distinctions made by social actors to categorize objects, people, practices and even time and space’ (Lamont and Molnar, 2002, p.168). Once categories are determined, judgements can be made about which categories are legitimate, superior and more valued and which are not. As Sibley states: ‘The idea of society assumes some cohesion and conformity which create, and are threatened by, difference, although what constitutes a threatening difference has varied considerably over time and space’ (Sibley, 1995, p.69). This ‘threatening difference’ represents the downside of any community, whether a community of fact or a community of choice.

For many, the advantages of belonging to a community outweigh the potential pitfalls. Members of communities share values and meaning that enable them to be more than individuals. Sharing a common identity as a group builds individual and group resources in order to contribute to society. The literature reviewed here points clearly to the importance of community over time. It would seem that the desire to belong to a community is part of the human condition. Belonging to a community enables identity to be established and to flourish.

In the context of this thesis, the community to which the immigrant can belong is the Catholic Church. For immigrant Catholics the Church is a ready-made community. The Church carries the Catholic values and ideals that the individual believers have as their own. In this way, the Church provides a familiar community to which the immigrant can belong as he or she did in their home country. The Church also provides people with whom the immigrant can readily connect and with whom relationships can be built on the common values and ideals. One’s identity as a Catholic may be able to be carried from home culture to host culture.

**IDENTITY**

In the context of this thesis, identity is viewed as a process of belonging. One’s identity is in dialogue with all the groups and individuals to whom one belongs, both in the present and in the past. The literature describes this process in general and draws attention to the fact that an individual’s identity is a combination of many identities, each one informed by different reference points of belonging and each one interacting with the others. It also points to the disruption to these multiple identities in the process of migration and settlement. It also points to the necessity of placing some boundaries around identity, and the accompanying difficulties of judgement that may be present.
Weeks (1990) says that ‘Identity is about belonging, about what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others’ (1990, p.88). Stokes describes identity in a similar way: ‘At its most rudimentary, to assert an identity is to distinguish oneself or one’s group in a certain way and to differentiate oneself or one’s group from others’ (1997, p.5). Heidegger (2002, p.11) says that ‘Identity is belonging together’. Identity and belonging are continuously interactive elements of the essence of the individual.

Separate elements of an individual’s identity continuously overlap and interact with each other. An individual is not simply a single element of identity, such as ethnicity or gender, but a combination of both. Hence any individual simultaneously holds all the elements of his or her identity, for example as a person of a certain gender and ethnicity. Both these elements of the individual’s identity, and all the other elements, are in dialogue with each other and impact upon each other. Even within the individual, identity is a ‘work-in-progress’ as elements of identity are reshaped and reformed according to the social influences experienced by the individual.

Identity also has an historical context. Another reworking of identity takes place in view of memories as well as present experiences. Identity evolves not just over time but also in relation to particular events in past time. As Ganguly states: ‘recollections of the past serve as an active ideological terrain on which people represent themselves to themselves’ (2001, p.91). For example, one’s identification as a woman may be quite different before and after the event of childbirth. That event redefines a woman’s identity to include motherhood, and that event becomes a reference point for reworking one’s identity. Such reworking then influences other relationships and the nature of belonging to them.

Private subjective memories always have an historical public backdrop. As Ganguly states: ‘the past is made up of a renovated and selectively appropriated set of memories against a backdrop of public events’ (2001, p.92). The backdrop of public events, or public history, refers to the cultural, political and religious history in which the individual is situated. These dominant historical discourses supply the context in which private history is understood and even expressed. Public history is the unconscious non-particular set of memories that inform the private articulated past that belongs to an individual. For the immigrant ‘these memories have taken on a special import because they represent the only set of discursive understandings that can be appropriated and fixed’ (Ganguly, 2001, p.93). In Ganguly’s research on Indian men and women who migrated to the United States, she found that both ‘remake the past’ in order to make sense of their present situation. In her particular research, men denigrated the past to explain their present happiness, and women romanticised the past
in order to explain their present unhappiness. Ganguly's particular case can be extrapolated to
the immigrant case in general. Her point is that the past is the reference point for the present,
and the past contains not only particular subjective memories, but also the broader social
context. In the Indian context the memories included the economic, cultural and political
‘backdrop’ of Indian society, and even the place of men and women within it. The past and the
immigrant’s memories of it are both individual and collective, and these memories of it are in
constant interplay with the present. One’s identity comes out of one’s life journey not as a
simple sum of all the parts, but in active discourse with it.

Identity and belonging are therefore intertwined. One’s identity comes from the
different groups to which one belongs. Each immigrant brings a set of identities with them to
the host culture and these identities come from their individual past experiences of belonging
and the collective past experiences of their culture to which they have belonged.

‘Multiple membership’ as Pakulski and Tranter call it (2000, p.206), or belonging in a
number of ways to a number of social groups implies multiple identities, perhaps organised in
hierarchies, but certainly enacted according to particular social situations. Their discussion
focuses on national identity, but Lindsay is clear about the nature of the primary community:
‘family influences last a lifetime’ (1996, p.58). Lindsay’s focus is the immigration experience
and its effects on identity. Family has the most profound influence on identity. All the other
communities to which one belongs then influence identity. Sets of social relationships provide
a sense of who one is, from the micro-scale of family to the macro-scale of nation. Belonging
in these relationships provides the ‘I’ that can be tested, challenged and also validated against
the ‘We’ to which the ‘I’ belongs. Lindsay points to the loss of these social relationships
through migration as a crisis point for identity.

Lindsay also provides details about other reference points for identity. She includes
geography, language, ritual, religion and education as other contexts in which the ‘I’ belongs in
social relationships that influence identity. All these relationships are renegotiated in the
process of migration and settlement.

Hence, identity is established as a fluid set of identities, being formed and reformed in
relation to others. There is therefore a strong connection between identity of oneself and the
different sets of ‘others’ to whom one belongs. In the case of the immigrant, identity is
disrupted since at the very least the sets of ‘others’ to whom the immigrant belonged in the
home country is changed, and at most these sets of ‘others’ are totally taken away.

Identity then is not a self-contained static position that defines every individual or even
every individual within a group. Although claiming a personal or group identity means
recognising others who share values, experiences and beliefs, not all with whom one identifies will be identical. There are necessarily degrees of this recognition. Stokes, with others (Yuval-Davis, 1989, Camino, 1994, Bottomley, 1997), says that identity formation and maintenance is a ‘dynamic, interactive, social process, and an individual's personal identity is inextricably bound up with its relationship to a collectivity’ (1997, p.5). For the immigrant Catholic, belonging to the group called ‘immigrants’ provides one collective identity and belonging to the group ‘Catholics’ provides another identity. However, each individual immigrant Catholic will belong to those groups in a unique way and while collective conclusions may be drawn about the group ‘immigrant Catholics’, awareness of individual differences must be maintained.

Forming and maintaining individual or group identity necessarily means constructing boundaries around what constitutes identity. Sharing an identity with others means that there must be criteria for not belonging to that identity. With the existence of boundaries, there must be a notion of the ‘other’ or the one who is outside the boundaries or the one who does not belong (Bottomley, 1997, Stokes, 1997, Pickering, 2001). In keeping with identity as dynamic and fluid, the boundaries would also be fluid and in a state of negotiation or dialogue, and the notion of the ‘other’ also open to negotiation. Trinh describes the fluidity of the boundaries around identity as ‘categories that always leak’ (1989, p.161). The setting up of boundaries and the defining of those outsiders who do not belong is open to stereotyping and even oppression of the outsiders. When the categories of insider/outside collapse into what Stokes calls ‘unbridgeable oppositions, so that categories are superior/inferior, friend or foe’ (1997, p.6), such oppression can easily occur. He calls this the problem at the heart of contemporary identity politics, where the dominant group places the minority groups within society in a position of ‘less than’ the dominant group. Others (Lorde, 1984, Lindsay, 1996) say that understanding identity as result of a multitude of interacting experiences means that there can be no basis for differentiation or discrimination, since there is no way to measure the validity of one individual's identity against another. Immigrant Catholics may find two sets of boundaries that leave them feeling excluded. Firstly, as immigrants they may feel excluded from the dominant host culture. Secondly, as Catholics they may feel excluded from the Australian culturally specific Church. While there should not be any differentiation or discrimination, the situation of immigrants in relation to the Church in Australia is that of a minority group and therefore there is the possibility that immigrant Catholics can be placed, or feel that they have been placed, in a position of ‘less than’ the dominant group of Australian-born Catholics.

The potential problems of setting up boundaries can be well illustrated by the example of national identity and ethnic identity. National identity, or belonging to a nation, is historically
understood as belonging to a definite territory. It is also an identity removed from the small community identity, moved to the ‘imagined community’ of the nation. Pickering (2001) describes it as containing those things which unite the people of a nation: ‘their common history and destiny, their common land and language’ (2001, p.89). Calhoun calls it the ‘trump card of identity’ (1994, p.46), subsuming all other identities into this major one. Accordingly, identities provided by such criteria as gender and country of origin are not as valued as national identity. Although people belong to several imagined communities (Anderson, 1991) through which they maintain their multiple identities of gender, religion and country of origin, these communities are constituent of the national community, which is the community of prime importance.

Others challenge the politics of identity, which claims national identity as the most important. Stokes (1997) says that the politics of identity involves contest over the boundaries of the group identity, and also contest over who has the authority to define the national identity. He gives the example of postcolonial liberation movements in western societies to illustrate the limits of national identity as a means of incorporation. These political movements seek to recover the identities of those excluded from the political mainstream – people such as homosexuals, women, indigenous people and immigrants. Pickering says that ‘The inherent danger in any form of nationality lies in the mode of belonging it generates’ (2001, p.107).

Ethnic identity may be defined similarly to national identity. Ethnicity is a shared history, culture and community. It has language, religion and regional belonging in common. Somewhere, far back, the ethnic group has a shared kin group (Wilson and Frederiksen, 1995). For anthropologists such as Geertz (1969), the ethnic group has a primordial character, satisfying the essential need to belong to a group with shared ancestry and culture. The context of ethnic identity for the immigrant changes the sense of identity from one that may have been national in the immigrant’s home country to one that must be renegotiated in the host country. In this sense, ethnicity is a process of construction or invention which incorporates, adapts, and amplifies pre-existing communal solidarities, cultural attributes, and historical memories (Conzen et al, 1992). It is dynamic and fluid, as is any identity, but in the case of the immigrant, it operates relationally in quite a specific manner. Camino (1994) suggests that ‘Many scholars have seen ethnic identity as formed in opposition to host societies, finding that exile forced a group to see itself, sometimes for the first time, as unique’ (1994, p.xi). Being formed in opposition suggests that there is strong boundary definition around the ethnic community, and it also suggests that one of the major tasks of maintaining and developing ethnic identity is centred on the boundaries. The boundaries are between the
national and ethnic identity, and between the ethnic identity in the host country and that of the home country.

This literature does more than suggest that boundaries might be present for immigrants – it confirms that there are boundaries that are strong and that these boundaries influence the identity of the immigrant and its restructure in relation to the host culture. Immigrant Catholics would be no less susceptible to the influence of boundary definition, both as immigrants in the dominant culture and as Catholics in the dominant culture within the Catholic Church in Australia.

In Australia, negotiating the boundaries between national and ethnic identities is the task of the nation through government and the task of the ethnic communities as they settle in the host country. The negotiation is between the dominant Anglo-centric culture and the minority immigrant group and is about the relationships between them. Various authors point to the relative success of this negotiation, giving as evidence the relatively harmonious existence of various ethnic groups to be found in Australia (Bouma, 1997, Castles, 1997, Smolicz, 1997). Castles says that the ethno-cultural pluralism that has been incorporated into multicultural practices has been a model that has largely ensured the civil rights of immigrants in this country. However, he, with others (Martin, 1972, Castles, 1997, Perera, 1999, Castles and Davidson, 2000, Burke, 2002) also points out the shortcomings of the relationship between the dominant culture and the ethnic one, and, therefore, the difficulties faced by the immigrant groups in negotiating their identity in the Australian context. The first difficulty is in the defining of the ‘other’ as inferior to the dominant Anglo-centric culture. Although this superior/inferior dichotomy was officially relegated to history with the abandonment of assimilationist policies in 1973, Burke (2002) and Perera (1999) point out that the differences between the dominant culture and others still are couched in terms of judging one as superior to the other. Castles (1997) says that Australian governments have sought to shape national identity by setting restrictions upon foreign immigration and by setting criteria for citizenship, and shaping domestic policies around principles such as integration or assimilation.

Using the metaphor of the ‘family home’ in Australian media, Burke (2002) notes that in the 1970s it symbolised the welcome and hospitality extended by the generous host to the stranger. The implication behind the metaphor is that the ‘family home’ firstly belongs to ‘us’, those who already belong to the national identity. Out of this ownership and generosity, the immigrant as passive visitor is welcomed. The ‘superior’ position is that of the benevolent and magnanimous ‘homeowner’. The metaphor’s other revelation is the exclusion of the first occupants of the land, or original owners, which further indicates the flawed nature of the
metaphor. Extending the metaphor to the mid-1980s, when economic recession threatened the ability of Australia to be as generous in welcoming the stranger, the image was of the ‘family home’ being under threat by too many, too demanding visitors, and the need to close the door on the intruders. Burke’s point was the image of the ‘family home’ accurately conveyed the difference in popular attitude, as portrayed in the media, to immigrants from the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s. The use of such a metaphor serves also to highlight the underlying racism that defined those of British (and British-like) descent as superior to all others, no matter how magnanimous they were. It was the former who had the choice to open the ‘family home’ or not.

Perera’s (1999) discussion centres on the theme of ‘whiteness’ as a political construct. Its importance is in being associated with a superior social position, rather than colour. She connects the importance of whiteness as an identity, rooted in genetically based beliefs and practices, particularly in relation to aboriginal people. She argues that this racial hierarchy of whiteness was further constructed in immigration policy, with groups identified as better able to blend in placed higher on the scale of potential immigrants than others did. Assimilation was a means of maintaining white supremacy. She believes that this ‘superiority of whiteness’ remains in the Australian psyche still, and even though the language of racism has been replaced, the new language of racism still relies on the old prejudices, which are against all non-whites. That category is especially embodied in the Asian immigrants, ensuring their position on the bottom rung of the immigrant racial ladder. Regardless of wealth, Perera would argue that ‘whiteness’ dictates a superior social position in Australia.

Whilst Castles (1997) acknowledges the inclusionary aspects of multiculturalism which resulted in the shift in the late 1980s towards a citizenship model of national identity, he and Davidson (2000) draw attention back to the dynamism of identity. Participation by all citizens in decision-making at all levels will enable more democracy and less division between different ethnic groups, including the dominant Anglocentric one. This would erode the superior/inferior judgements made by the dominant group and lead to a national identity that is more inclusive of particular ethnic identities.

Hence, there continue to be arguments about how successfully the Australian culture accommodates immigrant ones and how well Australians welcome immigrants and enable them to belong. These arguments extend to the Australian Catholic Church which is itself part of the Australian culture. Questions have been raised about the extent of welcome provided by the Church and its enabling of immigrant Catholics to belong to the Church. These questions
are explored more extensively in a general way in the section in this chapter called ‘Religion in the Immigration and Settlement Process’ and in the specific Australian context in Chapter 3.

This section also underlines the relationship between belonging and identity. As a process, belonging is about becoming and becoming is about one’s evolving identity. Belonging describes identity formation and reformation, especially in the light of experiences as disruptive to identity as migration and re-settlement. In that process, the relationships to land, kin and ethnic groups are disrupted or lost and the identity of the migrant must be renegotiated in relation to the host culture. Boundaries around identity, especially for the immigrant in the host country, must be negotiated with the host culture. The host culture has the ability to welcome the immigrant to the extent that it chooses to do so. The next section considers belonging as a citizen that is the type of belonging that each new immigrant negotiates.

**BELONGING AS A CITIZEN**

This section of the literature review considers the concept of belonging as a citizen in a broad way and then in the particular case of belonging as a citizen in Australia. The initial review includes some understandings of the terms ‘assimilation’ and ‘multiculturalism’. These are the theoretical underpinnings of immigrants’ belonging to their host country. The literature points to changes in understanding of both terms and to the shortcomings of both modes of belonging. Since World War II, Australian government policies and practices have changed from assimilationist to multiculturalist in nature, but in this literature review some authors question whether or not these changes have effectively helped immigrants to belong to this country.

In the literature, some authors argue for the value of assimilation as social policy and others for the value of multiculturalism. Still others argue that multiculturalism is a demographic reality in that Australia is in fact made up of many cultures, and that our unity and acceptance of ‘the other’ is best idealised in the concept of citizenship. Comparison can be made between the experience of immigration in the United States and the experience in Australia, because of the similarities in the patterns of immigration in the two countries. Whilst there are key differences, particularly in the underlying definition of what it means to be a citizen of both countries, there are also some useful parallels in the practice and problems of accommodating the newly arrived immigrant.

Alba and Nee (1997) attempt to redeem the term ‘assimilation’, whilst admitting that: ‘assimilation has come to be viewed by social scientists as a worn-out theory which imposes ethnocentric and patronising demands on minority peoples struggling to retain their cultural and
ethnic identity (1997, p. 286). The authors attempt to redefine assimilation in order to make it useful. They trace the history of the term through key social scientists, beginning with Park (1939). They argue that Park’s original definition of the term did not imply the negative connotations that later were associated with it, and they quote his definition created for the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, in which assimilation is: ‘the name given to the process or processes by which peoples of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory, achieve a cultural solidarity sufficient at least to sustain a national existence’ (1939, p. 281). The authors argue that this definition implies a give and take attitude on the part of the host and immigrant cultures. Opponents of assimilation argue that the term actually requires the immigrant to erase all but the most innocuous signs (such as exotic food and dress) of his or her alien past in order to embrace the culture of his or her new homeland.

These authors argue that the definition of assimilation outlined by Park does not include immigrants having to erase their past, but that assimilation is a dynamic process of acculturation, allowing for both the host culture and the immigrant culture to interact for the mutual benefit of all. The difficulty is not with the term as much as with policies enacted in its name. Policies and practices, which require immigrants to conform through coercion to the host culture, imply that the immigrant’s culture may well be left behind. The authors’ other main reference point for their discussion is the work of Gordon (1964), who systematically dissected the term assimilation, conceiving it as having seven clear dimensions, once again implying a dynamic, interrelational process rather than a static one-sided adaptation being made by the immigrant. His delineation of both process and outcomes of assimilation were influential – in the United States the terms ‘Anglo-conformity’ and melting pot can be traced back to his work and have been used extensively in assimilation theory.

Alba and Nee describe the work of Gans (1973) as contributing another dynamic dimension of assimilation. He elucidated the notion of generational assimilation. Each new generation represents on average a new stage of assimilation. This implies that generations are the motor for ethnic change, which is certainly visible in language skills acquired by second and third generation of immigrants. The children of immigrants have a different experience of the interaction between the host culture and the immigrant culture than that of their parents.

Alba and Nee go on to argue two major points. One is that the concept of assimilation has great value if understood as it was intended – a dynamic process by which members of different cultures rub shoulders and some of what once belonged uniquely to one culture becomes a part of the other. The other major point is that assimilation is actually desired by the immigrant group. The immigrant family may take some generations to achieve their goals,
but the authors point to the success of the European ethnic groups as proof of their desire to adopt the values of the host country – in this case the United States. Over time they become as educated, as wealthy and as socio-economically advantaged as a group as their Anglo-Saxon counterparts.

Despite the opinions of Alba and Nee regarding assimilation as an appropriate term to describe the process of acculturation, other authors claim that the concept may have supported sufficient practices for European immigration to be successful, but that it no longer can be used. Glazer (1998) points to the importance of assimilation in relation to European immigrants, claiming that the definition of the word was framed with these immigrants specifically in mind. The failure of the concept as it was translated into policy for the United States, as far as he is concerned, lies with its inability to describe U.S. society inclusively. Whilst policies of assimilation enabled immigrants to be equal to older Americans under law, neither these policies, nor any other government policies, addressed issues of social inequality known to African-Americans and native Americans. He concurs with Park (1939) that the key problem for assimilation is not cultural differences, but race. Glazer names this as the single most important factor in the demise of assimilation as a workable policy. He concludes that ‘the word may be dead, the concept may be disreputable; the reality continues to flourish’ (1998, p.33). The example he cites is the high rate of intermarriage among all European ethnic groups, as proof of the thin sense of ethnicity among Americans of European origin. However, this high rate of intermarriage is not present amongst African-Americans, native Americans, Hispanic Americans or Asian-Americans. This apartness of these groups from American society feeds multiculturalism. He finally concludes that multiculturalism is a concept that has the propensity to include all races. Glazer blames assimilation and its exclusiveness for trends such as the ‘resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan and the closing of the gates to the new immigrants’ (Melzer et al, 1998, p.19) in the United States and says that such moves must be resisted.

For example, Fish (1998) dissects the meaning given to multiculturalism, concluding that as a mode of acting it too becomes unworkable. Sooner or later multiculturalists make value judgements about cultural practices, and tolerance for other cultures always has limits. He gives the example of polygamy, which is tolerated in some cultures but inadmissible by law in other cultures. This example illustrates the limits of multiculturalism, which he claims is the equivalent of tolerance of cultures other than one’s own. His argument is that this tolerance has boundaries, both personally and politically. No society can be equally tolerant of all aspects of every culture. He concludes that it is fairly mindless rhetoric to speak of any person being a multiculturalist at all. He states that multiculturalism is a demographic reality – many
cultures coexist within any national boundary. The real issue that creates difficulties in how these cultures peacefully coexist is the racism that exists in people, and his solution to this racism is what he describes as ‘inspired adhoccery’. This attitude moves the reconciliation of difference out of the intellectual, formulaic, policy adherence to particular communities and their reconciliation of their lived differences. In other words, he moves the solution away from the political and to the personal. He advocates a movement away from the universal to the particular, which is where human beings interact with each other face to face, because they are much more able to tolerate a different culture incarnated in a person than a different cultural perspective in the abstract.

His arguments conclude that multiculturalism’s usefulness is in the realm of demographic reality, and that the real problem is that of peaceful coexistence. It is also true that solutions to issues of racism can be found more easily when dealing with a person rather than an idea, but policies that enhance and educate towards solutions are an invaluable context for such ‘inspired adhoccery’ as he advocates.

The discussion about assimilation and multiculturalism serves this research in that it illustrates the difference between the meaning of these terms and the practices associated with them. Assimilation is far removed from its original meaning because of how it was implemented and understood, which is that the immigrant gives away his or her ‘old’ identity and becomes indistinguishable from his or her fellow citizens in the host country. Multiculturalism also has its limitations around practice. Some cultural practices will inevitably be anathema to other cultures and that peaceful coexistence in the face of difference is the challenge of multiculturalism. It would seem that the reality of many different cultural groups sharing the same geography automatically raises that challenge. The real problem lies in the challenge to the dominant cultural group that has the power to embrace or reject minority cultural groups and practices. Whether the dominant cultural group can welcome and enable minority cultural groups to belong is the real individual and collective issue.

In Australia, some of the same arguments about assimilation and multiculturalism have also taken place. Castles (1999) discusses the development of multicultural policies in the Australian context. He describes the development of Australia’s multicultural policies as ‘driven by strategic and economic considerations’ (1999, p. 33). After World War II, the intention of Arthur Calwell (Minister for Immigration 1945-49) was to encourage British migration to fulfil Australia’s need for manual labour. When this immigration fell short in numbers, immigration by people who ‘looked British’ was acceptable, then immigration by other Europeans. All this took place in a time of economic prosperity and under the premise that immigrants would be
assimilated. This policy of assimilation was introduced to turn Dutch, Polish, Italian and Greek immigrants into ‘New Australians’ (Castles, 1999, p.33). This policy only became untenable because of a changed economic relationship with Asia and political pressures applied from within the nation and outside it. Castles asserts that the erosion of the policies of assimilation and the demise of the White Australia policy owe nothing to the political ideals of either major party in Federal Government. He says that both the Liberal/CP and Labor governments of 1960–2000 have had their own agenda in promoting multiculturalism. He names the 1973 oil crisis, precipitating a restructuring of the world economy, a world-wide recession and the advent of globalisation as fundamental influences on the changing attitudes in Australia in terms of immigration. He argues that, despite current political appearances, there can be no return to the homogeneous Eurocentric culture that Australia once had – multiculturalism is a demographic reality. However, he cites examples of situations that have occurred under the present Federal Government to illustrate regression from multicultural policies and practices. One example is the fact that ‘many of the institutions crucial to Australian multiculturalism have been abolished or reduced to insignificance’ (1999, p.32). He argues that multiculturalism is a demographic reality, but that the British-based legal and political systems still exclude many from exercising power over personal and political realities. One such example is that it is illegal for anyone other than a citizen to be elected to parliament. Davidson (1997) agrees, stating ‘Indeed, what is striking is that the commitment to multiculturalism was accompanied by a completely Anglo-Celtic dominance of Cabinets and high-level judicial offices’ (1997, p.85). He argues that, although there are more immigrant members of Cabinets and judicial offices, the fact that the Westminster form of government is still used indicates the Anglo-centric nature of the highest levels of government.

Jayasuriya (1997) describes Australia as an ‘anglo fragment’ (1997, p.2) society and says this understanding of what was the essence of Australian culture informed the ideology of immigration and settlement in the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century. He says the ‘anglo conformity’ demanded of immigrants is still in the Australian psyche today and that explains the ‘new racism’ (p.42). This racism was evidenced by the election of Pauline Hanson in 1996 and the popularity of her One Nation party in the following years (Curthoys and Johnson, 1998, Wu, 1999). The presence of this reaction to immigrants in society indicates a lack of tolerance and a view that ethnic minorities are a threat to the cultural integrity of the community as a whole.

Chan (1999) joins others who assert that the promise of the landmark multiculturalism policy of 1972 has not been fulfilled. She states: ‘Of paramount importance to the policy was
the recognition that the indigenous people were the custodians of Australia for at least 40,000 years’ (1999, p.11). Therefore one of the failures of multiculturalism is the failure of the Reconciliation process. She also refers to stereotyping as a tool of racism and prejudice, citing many past examples of where stereotyping of ethnic groups, beginning with aboriginal people, enabled Australian society to remain divided. She links this stereotyping to the policy of assimilation, which she describes as a ‘tool of racial discrimination’ (1999, p.15). Chan claims that the pretence of creating ‘one nation’ is really a dividing tactic, excluding those who do not belong to the white Australian cultural heritage. She calls for a recapturing of the true spirit of multiculturalism, as intended in the 1972 policy. She describes ‘true multiculturalism’ as a policy that ‘recognises difference and draws strength from difference to build a society with overriding values of equality and justice for all’ (1999, p.18). In other words, despite multiculturalism in the sense of many cultures being a demographic reality, policies and practices make for the exclusion of some cultures to the advantage of others.

Jones used data from the 1995 National Social Science Survey (1997) which contained a module on National Identity to examine what it means to be ‘truly Australian’. His findings support those of Phillips (1996) who found that Australians with a strong attachment to the symbolic boundaries of the national community are less supportive of multiculturalism. Those less inclined to embrace multiculturalism are those Australians who are older and more conservative, likely to be living in the country, who have left school earlier rather than later.

Viviani (1996, p.147) believes that cultural relativism, which necessitates comparisons between cultures, leads to an ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ understanding of immigrants. She argues that this places ‘Us’ in a position of power over ‘Them’, a position that did not change in the political move from assimilation to multiculturalism. With Goot (1993), she doubts that any real retreat from assimilation and White Australia policies really took place in the national psyche, and her solutions for the future bear quite some resemblance to those of Davidson (1997) and McKenzie (1999). Viviani (1999) suggests that Australia needs a strong sense of community, both locally and nationally, as a means of survival as a nation-state in an era of globalisation. This sense of community would break down the barriers between what she describes as the dominant ethnic culture and others, ‘since their very dominance sets up countervailing forces in culture and society’ (1999, p.69). She argues for a new understanding of citizenship to ensure that every citizen has equal rights and duties, and where the principles of equality and justice are enshrined in the political and legal systems of the nation.

Davidson (1997, p.245) argues for a ‘new civics’ and bases his arguments on practicalities as well as ideologies. He states that the laudable multicultural ideal of trying to
understand ‘the other’ is a practical impossibility for at least two reasons. One is that there are over 150 different ethnic groups in Australia, and that numerically that is far too many for anyone to understand. The other reason he offers is that the complexity and uniqueness of any culture precludes the possibility of the full understanding culture of ‘the other’. He suggests that the ‘new civics’ emphasises the ‘scruples’ approach which ‘insists that all individuals be regarded and treated as the same, not as different, since those who continue to be different are necessarily excluded from the community’ (1999, p.249). Further, this approach would allow the host culture to relinquish its passionate clinging to its own heritage, since ‘each individual is seen not as the expression of a culture but taken at face value’ (1999, p.251). In summary, he states ‘the future for living with others will require new virtues: tolerance, trust and compassion’ (1999, p.251). Like Fish (1998), Davidson looks to personal values and their employment rather than to political change.

Others describe Davidson’s ‘new civics’ in a slightly different way. McKenzie (1999) makes particular reference to the example of Vietnamese immigration, as does Viviani (1996), and Castles et al (1988). McKenzie describes cultures, whether they are Australian or Vietnamese, as themselves dynamic and changing through interaction with each other (1999, p.274). Davidson emphasises ‘sameness’ over ‘difference’ and McKenzie emphasises the shifting ground of identity, breaking down barriers between individuals. Identity is not a fixed reference point for any individual, for in communication one enters into the space of the other and the reference point for interaction is the mutually shared space of both. McKenzie describes this interaction: ‘The host and Vietnamese migrant culture continually engage and interlock with each other, interpenetrating, rupturing each other’s difference’ (1999,p. 272–3). Both cultures impact upon each other, which is a more complicated process than assimilation ever implied, and both are influenced by each other, although not to the same extent. McKenzie would say that the process of mutual interaction breaks down barriers between ‘Us’ and ‘Them’, and that the ‘mutual co-implicatedness’ (1999, p.272) or mutually shared space is in fact the reference point for mutual understanding, rather than the reference culture of either party. This provides another way of emphasising ‘sameness’ rather than ‘difference’ and its achievement requires Davidson’s values of the ‘new civics’ – tolerance, trust and compassion.

Authors from both the United States and Australia argue that multiculturalism as a policy has not enjoyed the success anticipated, because there has been a continuance of an ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ attitude through both assimilation and multiculturalism. In both countries there has also been resurgence in popularity of racist attitudes towards immigrants. In Australia this is evidenced by the brief popularity of Pauline Hanson (Curthoys and Johnson, 1998) indicating
further that the ideals of multiculturalism have not been realised. These authors, each in his or her own way, lean towards acknowledging multiculturalism as a demographic reality, rather than an 'issue', and move towards defining citizenship as point of unity for all inhabitants of a particular country. At this point there is some divergence because of the different histories of white settlement in each country. In the United States, the nature of the initial separation from Britain led immediately to that country having its own distinct national understanding of what it meant to be a citizen. The Australian authors argue that, in the Australian national psyche, being part of Britain is still valued. They name this as a factor still in leading towards exclusion of the ‘Other’, particularly of other races.

Therefore, policies regarding immigration and settlement have their inherent faults, particularly the fault of cultural relativism, which at best defines immigrants as other than Australian and at worst less than Australian. Those who promote the values of citizenship accept the demographic reality of multiculturalism and move to address the problem of racism which divides groups of citizens from each other. Castles and Jayasuriya have emphasised a similar understanding of Australian culture being not only British based from the beginning of white colonisation, but of still being so. The British based Australian culture is the demographic reality competing with multiculturalism and these authors argue that this culture is the dominant one.

In the Australian situation, history and political expediency have driven attitudes towards immigrants. The history of British influence that still excludes the original inhabitants of Australia, and the political expediency of wanting labour and later economic relationships with Asian countries were more influential on Australian attitudes towards immigrants than any other ideological position. The divide between aboriginal Australians and others is indicative of the cultural relativism that some argue is still maintained because migration patterns are determined more by the perceived needs of the Australian economy than anything else. The Australian Catholic Church belongs to this culture and will carry some of the attitudes of the general Australian culture. Whether the Church has been more Catholic or more Australian in its attitude to immigrants can only be seen through the experience of Catholic immigrants themselves. The literature reviewed in this section at least raises the suspicion that the welcome given to, and the sense of belonging enabled for, immigrant Catholics may have been influenced by the general Australian cultural attitude towards immigrants.
GENDER AND RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF ETHNIC IDENTITY

In the literature reviewed in this section two aspects of identity are highlighted – gender identity and religious ethnic identity. Women have not been considered as separate entities from their migrant partners until relatively recently as the modern wave of feminism alerted researchers to the absence of women’s experience as immigrants and not merely as immigrants’ wives. Consideration of women’s experiences as immigrants may illuminate their experience as immigrant members of the Australian Catholic Church. The understanding of identity as being multi-faceted leads to religious identity being included as an integral aspect of an individual’s identity. For immigrants, their religious identity may be the only constant in the face of the many challenges that the immigration process brings. The literature reviewed here examines the general nature of religious identity and its importance for immigrants. For women immigrants, combining their gender and religious identities is then considered in the light of changes to women’s roles in the Australian context and in the Church context. Catholic women immigrants must deal with a variety of expectations that are placed upon them. They are expected by the Church to be women who mother, nurture and serve and also to be leaders in their parish communities. In their home culture context, the expectations of motherhood and service may be also present but the expectation of leadership may not. In taking on roles in Australian society, immigrant women may be expected to be equal to immigrant men in work and relationships but these expectations may be quite different in the immigrant household, depending on the influence of the home culture. Some of the complexities of expectations upon immigrant women are outlined in this section of the literature review.

The understanding of migrant women has undergone considerable change in recent times. Simon and Brettell explain that women ‘have been treated more as migrants’ wives than as female migrants, and their role in the migrant process has, therefore, been deemed less important!’ (1986, p.3). Bottomley summarises the cause of ignoring women immigrants in research: ‘In practice, ethnicities, nationalisms and most forms of identity are defined around a masculinist core’ (1997, p.46). The masculinist core is like a primary definition of what it is to be human, and women are defined in comparison to it. Essed (1991) called this gendered racism. Others argue this same point, some extending it. Simon and Brettell claim: ‘Female immigrants experience double or triple discrimination by virtue of their sex, birthplace and or class status’ (1986, p.10).

Previous studies of immigrant women have centred on their class status and their experiences of racism and sexual harassment in the workplace and at home (Martin, 1978,
Bottomley et al, 1984, Storer, 1985, Pettman, 1992). The immigrant woman is expected to maintain her role as wife, mother and nurturer and often to join the paid workforce in jobs that are unskilled and poorly paid. She is often unable to attend language classes because her other responsibilities take precedence (Lange, 2001) and experiences further exclusion from mainstream host society because of the ensuing language barrier.

Others argue that this positioning of the immigrant woman as ‘victim’ is a disempowering portrayal, and not necessarily even a reflection of reality (Evans, 1998). Ganguly argues that feminists in Australia have tended to homogenise immigrant women into either of two categories: ‘the exotic other’ and the ‘oppressed other’ (1995, p. 37) which sets up the mainstream western feminist and the immigrant woman as binary opposites. Ganguly would say that this positioning exists even in Women’s Studies in Australia, and that it is far too monocultural. The fault of western feminism, she also argues, is the same for all of western culture ‘the use of simplistic, binary categories (men versus women, dominant culture versus minority culture’ (1995, p.45). Tsolidis (1993) presents the problem more strongly:

In many ways mainstream feminism and multiculturalism represent opposite ends of a spectrum. Whilst mainstream feminism has attempted to build a political identity on the basis of a unitary understanding of woman and as a result has been vulnerable to accusations of essentialism, racism and imperialism, multiculturalism has attempted to build a political identity on the basis of difference and has been vulnerable to accusations of cultural relativism and pluralism at the expense of equity. (p. 2)

Bottomley also describes the multiculturalism that is ethnic pluralism as unable to address other forms of difference. The aspects of identity (including gender, kinship, culture and religion) are all interrelated and she describes ethnicity as a ‘fairly fluid process’ rather than a fixed set of parameters (1997, p.45). Hence, it is not a matter of understanding an immigrant first as immigrant then as woman, but understanding the interplay of ethnic origin, settlement and gender.

Espin (1999) argues that the success of the settlement on process can actually best be gauged by the integration of immigrant women rather than men, since it is women who ‘do the work’ of accommodating all the transitions required. Women are expected to maintain the traditions of their original culture and ensure they are passed on to their children. They work in their traditional roles within the family as wife and mother, and they work outside the home. They negotiate the space between the old and new world.

The case of Vietnamese women is considered here as one that is typical, in a broad sense, of the experience of settlement in the host country. Vietnamese refugees would have arrived in Australia with their Vietnamese cultural emphasis on respect of parents by children,
respect for the elderly and the spirit of living harmoniously. These three cultural reference points for Vietnamese people meant that ‘the family is the centre of social existence’ (Viviani, 1984, p.174). In the process of resettlement, women's role in the family was a pivotal one in ensuring cultural norms were maintained. Despite the importance of their role ‘the basic subordination of women was firmly embedded across kinship, political, legal and economic institutions’ (Kibria, 1993, p.45). Although Vietnamese women moved into a range of new roles, sometimes even as the main breadwinner in the family, they did not forsake their traditional ones of mother and homemaker, but rather extended their range of roles even within the family. External economic factors impacted on a woman's place in the family and sometimes her relationship with her husband. For example, traditional gender roles can be overturned if a woman who had not worked outside the home in the immigrant's own country suddenly becomes the major breadwinner in the host country (Kibria, 1993, Viviani, 1996). Benson (1994) and Kibria argue that the extension of roles actually helps Vietnamese women economically, linguistically and culturally. Their power base within the family is extended due to the freedoms experienced through their interaction with the host country's culture. Others suggest that this outcome is not likely for most Vietnamese women, as they actually have to maintain their home culture within the family and carry a disproportionate burden in the adaptation process to the host culture. Despite the advantages of freedoms experienced by Vietnamese immigrants, the tasks of women immigrants expand from their home culture to the host culture in ways that are different from men immigrants because it is the women who carry the family burden. They form a bridge for all the family members between the home culture and the new host culture. It would be expected that women immigrants would have religion included in the maintenance of the family's values and ideals and therefore, in relation to the Catholic Church, women immigrants would more likely be responsible for the maintenance of the Church affiliation and Mass attendance.

Religious identity is another focus of this research. Herberg (1960) and Bellah et al (1985) both argued that religion is a central source of group identity, and some (Carey, 1996, Bankston and Zhou, 1996) would say that the role of religion in maintaining racial and ethnic identities has been underemphasised in the study of immigration. Recent scholarship, possibly spurred on by the greater religious pluralism due to post World War II immigration, has marked the importance of religious identity to ethnic identity. Perhaps one of the past difficulties has been in separating religious and ethnic identity. Ebaugh and Chafetz have said that ‘Religious and ethnic identities are so intertwined that it is difficult to separate them’ (2000, p.94). On the other hand, the effort to separate the two denies the importance of one to the other: ‘Religion
should not be seen in isolation, but as a core aspect of culture’ (Bouma, 1997, p.135). Religion is as important to ethnicity as kinship and territory, according to Screiter (1991, p.13). The relationship between religion and ethnicity is that one’s faith tradition is one of the marks of who one is – that is, his or her identity. Just as the kinship group and the geographical origin define the immigrant, so does the faith tradition. There is a sense of belonging to each of these that makes up identity. Although belonging to a faith tradition may seem to be more ethereal than belonging to a specific kin group or geographical location, it is nevertheless an important element of identity. There does not seem to be disagreement about the inclusion of religious identity as intrinsic to ethnic identity, even amongst those who then gloss over it in their research (Carey, 1996).

Making connections between immigrant identities as women and as Catholics becomes complex because of the nature of the Church itself. The role of women in formal and informal religious spheres is complicated, particularly when viewed by feminist theory which argues that women have been treated unjustly, marginalised and even denigrated by the Institutional churches. The relatively recent feminist criticism, begun with the work in the more Christian tradition of people like Daly (1973), Radford Reuther (1975) and Schussler-Fiorenza (1983), argued that organised religion discriminated against women theologically and organisationally, especially in the provision of opportunities for formal leadership. In the Catholic Church, the issue of leadership is for many women still compromised, and, according to some, will continue to be until the ordination of women to priesthood is accepted. However, since the Council of Vatican II and the role of the laity in the Church has been much expanded, many women and men who belong to the Church are more accepting of the Church’s stance that states that women and men are ‘equal but different’ (Pope John Paul II, 1995).

Despite studies of women’s roles in religious groups indicating that considerable gains have been made in expanding formal roles and responsibilities (Wallace, 1992), studies also indicate that women still fulfil traditional caring and nurturing roles in religious communities (Leege and Trozzolo, 1985, Manville, 1997, Cieslak, 2000). Since these researchers also argue that this is due to the extension of the socialised role of women as mothers, carers and nurturers, it would be expected that this pattern would also be present in immigrant communities.

Ebaugh and Chafetz’s (2000) study of immigrants and religion was conducted across 13 immigrant congregations in the United States. They were religious groups of a specific faith tradition, each having a specific dominant ethnic group, except for one Catholic group, which contained seven formally organised nationality groups, and one Protestant group whose
members represented 48 nationalities. They focussed in one part on the roles that women play in these groups, expecting to find that they act to reproduce traditional culture, and simultaneously to develop awareness of gender-based inequalities and sometimes act on the basis of that awareness. They found that women in these congregations do act in traditional women’s cultural roles, specifically in the preparing of food, by being major contributors to the religious education of the second generation, and by providing social service and spiritual expression through formal and informal women’s groups. They maintain and reproduce the culture by acting according to their traditional gendered and religious norms. This finding is supported by other ethnographic studies of immigrant communities (Kim, 1996, Manville, 1997). Manville’s study of an Australian Anglican middle-class parish, with a predominance of British or Australian members, revealed the same roles of women as Ebaugh and Chafetz found. She describes the role of women in this parish: ‘The construction of women as nurturers, carers, and servers encompasses their role as the primary builders and maintainers of the parish community’ (1997, p.26). Comparing these two studies leads to the conclusion that it is gender rather than ethnicity which determines the role women play in their religious group.

Kim’s study of Korean Christian women in the U.S.A. reveals more complexities. It shows that the Church also acts to reinforce the traditional ideal of the Korean woman in the dominant Confucian culture – submissive and selfless. She says: ‘The piously Christian Korean women . . . seem to work hard to make themselves inferior beings in the traditional Korean way, and the religious systems in which they live lend themselves to the perpetuation of these women’s inferiority’ (1996, p.112). However, she also observed that the compulsory submissiveness was also superficial to some extent. Women were able to connect with each other, passively resist male domination, and empower each other. Ebaugh and Chafetz observed the same subtle resistance and empowering of women, as they engaged formally and informally with each other in their roles of service to the community.

For Manville, the gendered structure of the parish is aligned with Acker’s (1992) theory of gendered organisations, of which religious institutions are one. In the immigrant congregations there is a further dynamic of women negotiating the boundary between the home and host culture. For immigrants, the religious congregation may be an essential part of the home culture and a field for its preservation and reproduction, but the culture of the host country is all around them. For women, one of the impacting experiences on their role as women is that of paid work, where two implications may be found. One is that their role in the workforce outside the home may provide them with autonomy and even power, depending on
their job. This contrasts with their traditional role as carer, nurturer and homemaker. The other implication is for their relationship with their husbands, who may have had his status as breadwinner and household head taken from him. The power dynamic between husband and wife may be changed drastically if the role of provider is shifted from the male to the female (Kibria, 1993, Viviani, 1996). Such experiences contrast with traditional gender roles that are reinforced by religion. Ebaugh and Chafetz, and Kim found that the influence of the host culture empowered women who then were empowering other women in their religious communities. Although Ebaugh and Chafetz also noted that women were only taking up positions of power in their congregations that men did not actually want, they observed that this was nevertheless happening. They anticipated that, in the future, ethnic religious congregations would become less a place for cultured gender reproduction, and more a place for women’s equality.

Hence, there are several dynamics occurring for women immigrants in their religious institutions. They certainly fill traditional roles as women and as women of their culture in being community builders through service. They also maintain the reproduction of their culture through religious practice and education of the next generation. There is evidence to suggest that they use the religious setting as one place of negotiating the boundary between their home culture and host culture. In this, the religious context provides a place of belonging where women can associate with others who share values and beliefs, and it also provides a safe place where women can explore their identity as women and can act outside the traditional boundaries provided by their ethnic identity.

In the NCLS of 2001 and the CCLS of 1996 it is possible not only to identify immigrant Catholics, but also to identify the ethnicity of their children. The experiences of the children of immigrants is different to that of their parents since they are more likely to belong to the host culture than the home culture, although the home culture is an influence on them. Research reviewed here indicates that children of immigrants decide which aspects of their parents’ culture they will preserve and which aspects they will discard. In terms of the children of Catholic immigrants, the interest in this research is whether the children of immigrants maintain or discard their faith tradition and its practices.
CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS

Nineteen seventy-three was the landmark year for Australia's attitudes towards immigrants. Before this in Australia, immigrants were expected to assimilate so that, presumably, their children would be simply Australian, distinguishing them from their ‘new Australian’ parents. Research here and overseas (Taylor and McDonald, 1994, Bankston and Zhou, 1994, Birrell and Khoo, 1995, Zhou, 1999, Birrell, Khoo and McDonald, 2002) has shown that immigrant children are economically disadvantaged but that they also tend to be upwardly mobile in terms of education and employment. In Australia, for children aged between 0–14 years of immigrant parents from Lebanon, Turkey and Vietnam ‘a disturbingly high proportion’ were in low-income households where there was no employed parent, or a parent employed in a low skilled occupation (Birrell et al, 2002, p.142). According to these researchers, as the children of immigrants grow up, this disadvantage is overcome as they perform better in educational outcomes than their Australian-born counterparts. This, in turn, leads to better occupational outcomes for children of immigrants. These positive outcomes also depend on the country of origin of the immigrant parents, with children of southern and eastern European parents enjoying higher educational achievement and better occupational outcomes than those from the United Kingdom and Western Europe. Hence, despite the initial economic disadvantage experienced by the children of immigrants, their parents’ determination to make a better life for their children and their consequent emphasis on their children’s education reap long–term benefits for their children (Brown, 1997, Birrell et al, 2002).

However the interest in this thesis is in the maintenance or otherwise of language, cultural traditions and ethnic identity and according to Portes (1994), it is among the second generation, not the first, that such issues are decided. Zhou (1999) describes the acculturation of Vietnamese refugee children as ‘straddling different worlds’ as these children embrace aspects of the host culture such as language and education but maintain aspects of the home culture such as the importance of family and parental control. Whilst Vietnamese male and female children both succeed academically and in the workforce, traditional roles are maintained in their families. According to Kibria (1993) traditional concepts about gender roles become linked to other goals in the host society, such as the ability of women to bring money into the home as well as being a ‘good wife and mother’. This pattern was repeated in the study of South Asian adolescents in Australia (Singh, 2000) which found that girls ‘show more traditional orientation than boys’ (2000, p.309) and the whole group ‘expressed sympathetic attitudes to the retention of core traditional values’ (2000, p.311). Hence acculturation is nor a
linear process but a highly complex one for the children of immigrants. ‘Straddling different worlds’ means that immigrants’ children hold some cultural traditions and discard others whilst simultaneously making their way successfully in the host culture.

They do all this despite the racism many experience. In a South Australian study Singh (2000) described evidence of fear and anxiety amongst his Punjabi participants because of their skin colour and a political context in which the value of Asian migration was being questioned. In the United States Vietnamese respondents a greater percentage of the children reported experiencing discrimination than their parents (Zhou, 1999). ‘Growing American today means being caught in a vastly more complex social world that carries along both the achievements and the failures of the past. Among the latter, none is more important than the consequences of pervasive racial discrimination and the adversarial reactions that it helped create’ (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001, p.268). When such hostility is experienced in the host culture family cohesion is an appropriate defensive response.

‘Straddling different worlds’ (Zhou, 1999, p.1) is an expression that could apply to immigrants’ children and their faith tradition. Some research indicates that religion acts in support of ethnic identity. In the situation of Korean-American Christians in Chicago, Christianity played a powerful role in the ‘construction, support, and reinforcement of Korean ethnic identity/boundary in second-generation members’ (Chong, 1998, p.260). Korean-American Christians are a group twice marginalized in American society: once by their ethnicity in relation to the host culture of the United States and twice by their Christianity in relation to their home culture. Chong acknowledges that belonging to the Christian tradition may reflect a ‘form of defensive ethnicity’ due to this marginalisation. She nevertheless concludes that Christian conservatism enables maintenance of traditional Korean values and has proven quite effective as a ‘form of legitimation for strict, exclusive ethnic group identity in the second generation church members’ (1998, p.275). In the United States the existence of national parishes that accommodate both the cultural and religious traditions of immigrant groups may help immigrants' children walk a path between home and host culture. In Australia parishes provide support for the religious tradition but without the same emphasis on the cultural tradition of immigrants and their children. Hence it will be important to see whether the Australian pastoral practice has enabled the children of immigrants to belong to the Australian Catholic Church.

The next section of the literature review studies the nature of belonging to a faith tradition in general and then the nature of belonging to the Catholic tradition. The outcomes of previous research are considered.
BELONGING TO A FAITH TRADITION

Belonging to a faith tradition involves belonging to a community, sharing common beliefs and values and belonging to a shared story. All this is celebrated through the rituals of the faith tradition. This section explores the different ways that people belong to their faith community. Bellah and colleagues call a faith community a ‘community of memory’, (1985, p.153) one that engages in the retelling of its constitutive narrative in order to convey the particular meaning associated with the religious community. Through belonging to the faith tradition, its members identify with the past and the people of the past who exemplify the narrative and represent the ‘human virtues’ to which all members aspire.

According to Zuckerman (2002) W.E.B. Du Bois’ work on the sociology of religion provides a valuable reference point for examining belonging to a faith tradition. His stress upon understanding religious institutions as social/communal centres antedates Herberg’s (1960) discussion of religious involvement as a source of ethnic attachment by over half a century (Zuckerman, 2002, p.244). His recurring theme throughout his work was that religious institutions do much more than connect people with God – they connect people to one another. Apart from the potential otherworldly benefits of belonging to a faith tradition, Du Bois asserted that many of the benefits of belonging are of this world – belonging to a faith tradition provides a sense of human connection and community. His study was of the African-American church, which not only was a social centre, but a safe haven for African-Americans in a racist segregated world, a theme taken up by other sociologists in terms of ethnicity and religion (Bruce, 1996, Warner, 1998). Du Bois’ contribution was to emphasise the human aspect of belonging to a faith tradition. As a community, the faith group enables people to come together for social as well as spiritual communion.

Belonging to a faith tradition means more than having a connection with one’s fellow believers in a social and human sense. Olson adds to this understanding of belonging: ‘Church friendships involve socializing, but they also involve sharing of personal, spiritual and emotional concerns’ (1989, p.445). In practical terms, this belonging extends from the simple sharing of cups of coffee to the kinds of care that the community provides for its members, whether through formal or informal structures. In modern times the provision of local social services has been largely appropriated to the State, and is no longer the work of the faith community. Hans Mol says that religion ‘stabilises a system of meaning, reinforces a definition of reality, sacralizes identity’ (1976, p.266). In his discussion of Christian identity in the twenty-first century, Wuthnow (1993) makes reference to the Church as a support group more in an
emotional and spiritual sense. He uses the example of 12-step groups – support groups that help people with addictions - as providing the same kind of emotional support that parishes do for re-shaping identity and incorporating spirituality. Sweetser and Forster (1993) observe that the sense of belonging that parishioners derive is through smaller groups who share a common interest or social concern. In the Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life (CPL), Report No. 10 researchers found that 'The extent to which the parish meets parishioners' social needs is a far more important component of sense of community than is the extent to which it meets their spiritual needs' (Leege and Trozzolo, 1987, p.9). Although they also state that it is difficult to know which is ‘cause' and which is ‘effect' in the matter of degree of participation and the sense of belonging, they are clear that these two are strongly linked together. These researchers agree that the small group activities, of which the 12-step programs are only one example, are substitutes for the ‘common life of the earlier, more homogeneous neighbourhood parish' (Leege and Trozzolo, 1987, p.10).

Further to this connection, the Notre Dame Study showed that what they call a ‘sense of attachment' is strongly related to: '(1) the opportunity to participate in community service, (2) the quality of friendliness and concern of people in the parish, (3) the quality of pastoral care and concern, and (4) the opportunity to become a lay leader' (Leege and Trozzolo, 1987, p.15). In the book, Habits of the Heart, Bellah (1985) and his colleagues suggest that the community of memory is also a constituent part of belonging to a faith tradition. The ‘Tradition', with its primary narrative, provides a context for the individual's identity. Every member of the faith community belongs to the ‘Great Story' that is the defining narrative of the faith tradition. Richard, speaking from a Christian theological perspective, writes 'Faith comes to us as the appropriation of the collective remembrance of a “community of memory”' (1984, p.396). He argues that theology cannot be done outside the faith community that holds the tradition, and that Christian identity is only produced within the context of the faith community. He emphasises not only the dependence of individual faith on the tradition, but the dynamic interplay between the individual and the tradition. One can only know oneself in the context of relationship with the world outside oneself, and these two are interdependent. Greeley (1973) inverts the discussion by stating that the quest for community represents the quest for a faith to share (1973, p.101) and from an individual's point of view, the quest for intimacy is a quest for the sacred. Whichever perspective is held, theologically the underlying connection still exists between identity and community. The community holds the defining narrative of the tradition, and the individual holds his or her faith in the context of that tradition. Hence Richard states ‘A faith community . . . is not a place but a project' (1984, p.404). This means that the tradition is
not static and written in stone. It too is being reworked as it is retold in the dynamic context of the community. The individual believer's connection to their faith tradition has many aspects. There is first and foremost a relationship to the ‘Great Story’ of the tradition and in the case of the Catholic tradition the ‘Great Story’ is that of Jesus. There is the accompanying connection to other aspects of the story – how the Catholic tradition continues to mediate the message of the gospels to its members and to the outside world. These other aspects of the community life are the shared values and beliefs that are a corollary to the story of Jesus. The second relationship in the Catholic tradition is the one that members have with each other. Believers share the ritual celebrations of the tradition, the spiritual concerns of the Church and the social connection that parish life can provide. These relationships provide a sense of belonging for all the baptised, whatever their country of birth.

Previous research has provided insight into the specific ways that people of faith stay connected to the core elements of the Catholic tradition. The Notre Dame Study, noted above, is one example of the previous research. In that project, it was found that a stronger sense of attachment or belonging was present in parishes of a post-Vatican II nature because the Council had emphasised the understanding of the Church as the People of God. They also found that attachment was more dependent on people than on the ‘Great Story’. The sense of attachment experienced at parish level was more dependent on people than on the shared values and beliefs of the community. Their conclusion was that the attachment of the community to the shared story is a ‘looser’ one than the attachment to other people.

Recent research (Hornsby-Smith, 1987, Catholic Church Life Survey, 1996, Peyrot and Sweeney, 2000, National Church Life Survey, 2001) has been focussed on the ‘shared meaning’ model of belonging. Researchers look for the common/shared world of meaning, as indicated by responses to questions about beliefs, values and faith practices. Hornsby-Smith describes the nature and extent of belonging for Catholics in England by including five characteristics: self-identification as Catholic, orthodoxy in belief, frequency of mass attendance, institutional involvement and traditional sexual morality (1987, p.51). He also notes that in the post-Vatican II Church Catholics are choosing to belong in ways that were not previously available to them. The way of belonging to the one true Church before the Council is unchanged, but the degree of compulsion is now different.

Hornsby-Smith also argues that in England the possibility of a parish providing all aspects of community life is almost non-existent. In the time since World War II socio-economic changes have meant that the community provisions made in the first Churches are not present in parishes. He states: ‘If essential characteristics of ‘community’ include shared
core values, close face-to-face social interaction, and mutual aid and support, then any empirical study of the typical Catholic parish will indicate unambiguously the absence of community in this sense' (1987, p.200). He argues for the importance of orthodox beliefs and values as the binding features of the Catholic community. Without these orthodox beliefs the social interaction and support do not have meaning in parish life. Parishes as ‘communities of choice’ are inclusive of these beliefs and values more than the social interaction. For Hornsby-Smith, holding such beliefs and values is the way the community is bound together and lives the ‘Great Story’ that is the context of belonging. Although the ideal parish community probably did not really exist believers choose to belong through the characteristics identified in Hornsby-Smith’s study and they belong to the extent they choose. His findings highlight the dynamism of belonging and the complexities of community, concurring with Richard’s description of community as a ‘project’ rather than a place (1984).

Another element of the shared story is that of ritual. Kertzer (1988) argues that relationships and identities are produced as well as expressed through rituals, saying ‘Solidarity is produced by people acting together, not by people thinking together’ (Kertzer, 1988, p.76). Ritual offers symbolic and embodied knowledge, and so provides a different mode of belonging. Ritual provides a way of telling the story of the tradition that can be inclusive of all members of the faith tradition. Geertz (1969) extends the function of ritual to include any symbol, by which he means ‘any object, act, event, quality or relation that serves as a vehicle for a conception. The conception is the symbol’s meaning’ (1969, p.641). He says that the importance of ritual cannot be underestimated. Merton calls the functions of rituals both ‘manifest’ and ‘latent’ (1968, p.73). The ritual’s manifest functions are the intended ones – for example, every Catholic knows that one intention of Eucharist is to celebrate and remember Christ’s redemptive action. The latent function of the same ritual action is to foster social cohesion, and to strengthen its identity. Part of the dynamic role of the faith community is to ensure that the important ritual actions in which it engages are inclusive of all members of the community. The Notre Dame Study, conducted in the United States, with a largely monocultural, post Vatican II group of parishioners, found that parishioners acknowledge the importance of ritual, but found it to be less important than other factors. ‘The style of worship and the quality of preaching contribute, but more modestly, to continued attachment’ (Leege and Trozzolo, 1987, p.15).

The research summarised here does not clearly establish conclusive criteria for belonging but gives some indication of the specific ways that believers do belong to the Catholic tradition. The Notre Dame study found that belonging to other people with similar
values and world view was more important than any other belonging, whereas Hornsby-Smith found that belonging to people was far less important than self-identification, frequency of mass attendance, institutional involvement and traditional sexual morality. In this list he has specified belonging to the ‘Great Story’, ritual involvement and shared values. Both studies support the general theory that belonging to the Catholic Church is to some extent about all of these things although researchers differ on their relative importance. Both researchers acknowledge the specific context of their findings and those contexts are different from the Australian one.

The element of ritual is theoretically explored as a symbol of belonging and a way of giving meaning to belonging. In the Catholic tradition the Eucharist is described as the ‘source and summit’ of Christian life (Lumen Gentium 11) so it would be expected that Mass attendance would be an expression of belonging to the Catholic Church. In Australia, studies of immigrants and their relationship to the Church have focussed on the celebration of the Eucharist.

Johnstone (1998, p.15) describes the Anglo/Irish style of ritual in the Australian Catholic Church as rigidly formal, accentuating the theological aspects and not the social aspects. Immigrants from countries were expected to adhere to the dominant formula for ritual. Critics of the Australian Catholic Church (O’Leary, 1971, Lewins, 1978, O’Farrell, 1985, Pittarello, 1988) say that no efforts were made by the Australian Catholic Church to include ritual practices and customs of immigrants in liturgical celebrations. The Australian Church lacked the flexibility, the dynamism to respond to these members of the community, and even the understanding of the full importance of ritual in all its aspects.

The understanding of community expressed by Fentress and Wickham (1994) and Cohen (2002) supports the research into the Catholic tradition. Belonging to a faith tradition can provide a ‘community of memory’ and a ‘common world of meaning’. These communities and the dynamic process of belonging to them have a variety of expressions in human social contact, tradition, ritual and orthodox practice and belief. Whatever the context, belonging to a faith community would be as it is described by Ilcan (2002) and Probyn (1996), a yearning for something beyond the individual and a belonging that is a process of becoming. This kind of dynamic process is inclusive of all who wish to belong, and to whatever degree in time or space that they wish to belong. This community can sustain diversity and express commonality, as Cohen’s definition implies. The Church as community in this sense can accommodate and sustain cultural differences whilst promoting and encouraging commonality.
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND IMMIGRANTS

The Catholic Church itself has undergone major changes in its structure and self-understanding. These changes have impacted on the Church’s own appreciation of the migrant condition and it has moved from concern for the spiritual welfare of migrants only, to incorporating the understanding of the migrant journey into its own theology.

Church documents reveal the journey that the Church itself has made. The history of this journey begins for the Catholic Church in Jewish scriptures and in the stories there of leaving one place for another, starting with the story of Adam and Eve leaving the garden. The journey is certainly defined in the paradigmatic pilgrimage of Abraham and Sarai, called from their homeland to Egypt where the covenant between God and God’s people was made. After this initial covenant was made, it was from Egypt under Moses that the exodus pilgrimage ensued. This pilgrimage described by Pontifical Council for the Care of Migrants and Itinerant People as ‘the exemplary model of the history of salvation’ (The Pilgrimage in the Great Jubilee, 1998, p.2). The description of escape and of travel under difficult and uncertain conditions and the eventual arrival in a land of freedom that are in this story all are traits of any physical pilgrimage. In the Jewish and Christian traditions there was always portrayed a sense of guidance and journeying with a power other than oneself. The journeying people understood that Yahweh ‘has watched over your journeying through this vast wilderness’ (Deut. 2: 7).

Since Yahweh as the God of the Chosen People has watched over them the enjoining demand is made of the Chosen People: ‘You must not molest the stranger or oppress him, for you lived as strangers in the land of Egypt’ (Ex. 22: 20).

Jesus is the model of pilgrimage in the Christian scriptures. According to Christian scripture he makes two pilgrimages even before birth – one with his mother to Elizabeth’s house and one with his parents to his birth town. His public ministry is a journeying one. His journey to Jerusalem leads to his final days in Luke, and he calls himself the ‘the way, the truth and the life’ in John 14: 6. Jesus’ pilgrimage is depicted as both a physical journey of seeking out the marginalised, and as a spiritual journey which leads to death, but also beyond to resurrection, and the promise of resurrection for all who believe (Jn. 16: 28; 17: 24). Immediately after the resurrection the first believers are caught up in their own journey. The story of the disciples on the road to Emmaus away from Jerusalem concludes Luke’s gospel (Lk 24: 13-35). In that story they recognised Jesus in the breaking of the bread and the early believers knew that Jesus was travelling with them in a spiritual sense.
The early Church was on a physical and metaphorical journey as it tried to translate what they understood as ‘the good news’ about Jesus into a lived reality. ‘Go, therefore, make disciples of all nations’ (Mt. 28: 19) was the instruction given by Jesus to the disciples and they took up the task in Jerusalem initially and then far beyond. The stories of this journeying formed a large part of the narrative of the book of Acts and Paul’s letters. At the same time, the question of ‘belonging’ also arose (Acts 11), when Peter makes it clear to the Jewish-Christians that circumcision was not a mandatory condition of belonging. Belief in Jesus was the only criterion for baptism, or belonging. From the very beginning of the Church’s history, issues of different cultures were present, and the attitude of the Church was one of inclusion. Belief took precedence over former cultural boundaries. After the initial hesitation, the Christians come to an understanding about the newness of their particular journey ‘anybody of any nationality who fears God and does what is right is acceptable to Him’ (Acts 10: 35).

In 1952, the landmark *Exsul Familia* (Apostolic Constitution of Pope Pius XII on migrants) codified the Catholic Church’s responses to migration. Paganoni (2003) describes it as being of considerable historical importance. This document primarily stressed the Church’s responsibility to provide an accessible sacramental life by whatever means available. It anticipated the setting up of national parishes, and elevated the position of the missionary priest to that of the local parish priest. The express concern of the document was to enable the preservation of the immigrant’s culture and language, whilst providing access to a sacramental life. To achieve this provision, a number of different means were employed. These differed from place to place, depending largely on the decisions made by local bishops. Whatever method was employed, and there continues still to be points of difference concerning the efficacy of them all, the aims were consistent. The danger for the immigrants was that they might lose their faith if they were unable to practise it in a way that was at least recognizable, and the role of the Church was to provide a sacramental life that assisted in the saving of the souls of the migrants. The document *Exsul Familia*, as had pastoral practice up to and beyond this time, stressed the need for care of the immigrant who faced many difficulties in assimilating to their host society, language not being the least of them.

In this way the Church was acting in concert with the prevailing cultural policy, assimilation being the goal of the immigrant. Paganoni (2003) describes the difficulty for the Church as being a theological one. Since the Church must be first and foremost the Church of Christ, other priorities must be relegated. Despite the emphasis of *Exsul Familia* on respecting and preserving the immigrant’s culture, since this was not the main aim of any pastoral care, it was not always taken into account. In the document itself it was even stated that there should
not be any need for special assistance to the third generation of immigrants, since absorption into the mainstream Church and assimilation into the host culture would surely be complete by that time!

The liberating event for the Church of the twentieth century was the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) and it made quite explicit and emphasized the theme of pilgrimage as a holy and necessary metaphor for the Christian journey. Evidence of this is provided in Pope John XXIII’s opening speech (http://www.rc.net/rcchurch/vatican2/), the symbolic journeys made by John XXIII to Loreto in 1962 and Paul VI to the Holy Land in 1964 and the key documents Lumen Gentuim (1964) and Ad Gentes (1965). According to the Pontifical Council for Pastoral Care of Migrants ‘The ‘pilgrim’ Church of God thus became a dominant profile from the very beginning of the conciliar celebration’ (The Pilgrimage in the Great Jubilee, 1998, p.8). The Council had renewed its self-understanding, its understanding of its relationship to the world and its understanding of the situation of immigrants and refugees. The Council moved the emphasis in its self-understanding to being outward-looking and willing to engage with a world it had previously spurned. Its understanding of immigrants included embracing their cultural heritage. Gaudium et spes, (1965) Nos, 12, 24, 29, 44 made particular reference to the pastoral care of immigrants. The Decree Christus Dominus (1965) was also significant, when referring to immigrants, urging the Church to specifically adapt its pastoral practice to the ‘various situations of the time, the place and the people’ (N.18).

In 1969, Paul VI promulgated Pastoralis Migratorum Cura, an instruction to bishops concerning the pastoral care of migrants. It devoted attention to reconciling special care for migrants with normal forms of ministry associated with territorial parishes, indicating an equal value being placed on national parishes and migrant chaplains as that which was placed on ‘normal’ geographical parishes. In 1970, the Pontifical Commission for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People was formed. This Commission was charged with coordinating the care of all people on the move, thus moving emphasis to broadly include all travellers, tourists and nomadic peoples. Following in the footsteps of Vatican II, the Pontifical Commission also emphasized that the Church’s attitude should be couched in a cultural context, mindful of the traveller’s home and host culture and mindful also of the circumstances surrounding their journey. The spirit of the Council was marked by a renewed openness to other Christian traditions and other world religions, which went hand-in-hand with its openness to the diverse richness of other cultures. The inclusion of other cultures is reiterated in the Pope’s annual Messages for the World Day of Migrants and Refugees. In the 2003 statement,
John Paul II encourages Catholics to combat racism and xenophobia and to ‘learn to discern in people of other cultures the handiwork of God’ (N.4).

In the document *Church and People on the Move*, published by the Pontifical Commission in 1978, ‘movement’ was a central theme. It is a lived reality for immigrants, refugees and other travellers. It is an image of the people of God – the pilgrim Church. It is a metaphor for the journey of life, whether described in terms of searching for physical security and positive possibilities for one’s family, or described in terms of searching for ‘the way, the truth and the life’ (Jn. 14: 6). The Pontifical Commission emphasized the goal of the Church’s journey - the loving communion of people with each other and with God (No 10-12). Further, the Church can only operate within the dynamic reality of culture and cultural exchange. Even though there are practical difficulties in incorporating all who believe in Jesus as baptised Catholics, the Church is very clear that these difficulties should and can be overcome. When all can truly belong, the whole people of God can journey together. Hence the Church itself has no doubt about the message of journey as it is lived by immigrants, refugees and other travellers. Their journeys are a metaphor for the journey of all believers towards the eternal reign of God and the people who make the geographical journeys in this earthly life are those who are living the journey to which all believers are called. Whether or not particular immigrants are welcomed and enabled to belong in specific parishes or countries, the Church itself holds immigrants up as a model for the Christian journey.

Having explored connections between the Church and immigrants from the Church’s point of view it is now pertinent to examine the role of religion in the immigration and settlement process from the point of view of immigrants.

**RELIGION IN THE IMMIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT PROCESS**

The role of religion in the immigration and settlement process can be considered as having both a material and spiritual aspect. In the material realm the provision of basic needs such as clothing, bedding and food are included. Religious groups within various traditions see this provision as part of their mission, and the Catholic Church has a long history of such provision. In their work, Ebaugh and Chafetz (2000) found that ‘Catholic churches offer far more social services than any other congregations’ (2000, p.72). Through formal and informal channels social services are extended to migrants, especially in the earliest days of settlement. The value of this hospitality provides an immediate connection between the new immigrant and a
faith tradition. However, the interest in this study is in how the faith of the immigrant, transplanted to a new environment, is of value in retaining and revising the immigrant's identity.

Concerning the situation in the United States, Ebaugh and Chafetz state: ‘Immigrant congregations play a central role in providing a social space where fellow ethnics can meet one another and form networks for mutual support and assistance' (2000, p.74). Here they are referring to faith communities of particular ethnicity and religion in the United States, which were the congregations they studied. Their study included such diverse examples as a Centre for Vietnamese Buddhism and a Chinese Gospel Church. This and other research draws even stronger conclusions: ‘The exclusion and racism experienced by the majority of immigrants often provoke a response in which religion and other cultural forms become the resources for survival and defence' (Castles and Davidson, 2000, p.135). The authors state that the ethnic religious community can be a kind of fortress to which the migrant can retreat and re-arm in order to go back to ‘battle the forces' of the host country. Others express the idea of the ethnic religious community more as a place of safety and comfort: ‘Where identity is threatened in the course of major cultural transitions, religion may provide resources for negotiating such transitions' (Bruce, 1996, p.108). Herberg (1960) had put it in more familial terms: ‘The church and religion were for the parents the one element of continuity between the old life and the new' (1983, p.73). Bankston and Zhou (1999) say that church membership is a prime source of identity and motivation because it is a focus for organising the social relations of a group.

All agree that the importance of belonging to a religious group provides social support for immigrants. For some the need might be to find some familiar context in a foreign place, such as attending a familiar ritual with all its familiar symbols, actions and actors. For some, the religious group provides a source of safety and security when all other things around them seem to be almost frighteningly unfamiliar. For others, belonging to a religious group may provide the only security in identity when all other aspects of identity are in the process of transition and re-negotiation. And for others, the religious group may take the place of kin relationships that are not available in the host country. In the United States, where the immigrant congregation is both the religious and ethnic community, the affiliation for the new immigrant may be stronger and more important in the provision of social space where networks for support and assistance can be provided. The association of ethnicity and religion is quite explicit in an immigrant congregation and the existence of these congregations has a strong history. These congregations were established with the express purpose of providing continuity between the home country and host country for the immigrant of a particular faith.
Australia provides a different context from the United States for the congregational affiliation of migrants. Whilst some religions have provided ethnic churches for their members, the Catholic Church in Australia generally has not (Lewins, 1978). The Catholic Bishops in Australia chose deliberately to opt for the provision of migrant chaplains for different groups of immigrants, and these chaplains largely were visitors to existing geographical parishes. In Australia there have been very few ethnic congregations, the alternative being the development of immigrant ‘parishes within parishes’. Even when the parish priest has been of a particularly ethnicity himself the expectation has been that he will minister to all within the geographic boundaries of the parish. Despite the different context Bouma (1997) draws the same conclusions as his counterparts in the United States: ‘Religious groups have provided meaning, comfort and a ready access to social life including contact with people who share some basic values, beliefs and life experiences’ (p.60). Campion (1987) shares the view, saying that at the very least, what happened in the local Catholic parish was familiar enough for immigrants to find a ‘home’ there. There is some agreement between the U.S. and Australian research about the role of the religious community in the host country. It can provide a familiar place to belong and be a source of comfort and security.

The structural differences between the ethnic congregations of the U.S. and the geographical parishes of Australia do give rise to some criticism of the Australian form of ‘hospitality’ extended to the stranger. Some claim that the dominance of the Irish Australian Church was such that other groups of immigrants felt far from welcome. O’Leary (1971), Lewins (1978), Pittarello (1987) and Turner (1992) are all critical, although in different ways, of what they view as a lack of acceptance of immigrants by the Church. These criticisms are further explored in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

Some further observations apply more generally to both United States and Australian immigrant religious groups. Since the religious community can be a place of secure belonging, sometimes immigrants can become more religious, and more conservatively religious than they were at home (Warner, 1998). Ebaugh and Yang (2001) also observe that immigrant groups, who have not necessarily had a congregational model in their religious tradition in their home country, adopt such a model in the United States. An example is that of Eastern religious groups, such as Buddhists, forming themselves around the predominant American Protestant model of the church community, instead of their traditional, more individualistic one. They suggest that this is part of the transition from the home religious culture to the host one, since the congregational model is the dominant Protestant one in the United States. They also suggest that it reflects the desire for a local community to which the immigrant can belong and
identify with more easily. They contrast this belonging with belonging to an Institution, indicating that belonging to a community may be the preferred ‘mode of belonging’ for immigrants.

Ebaugh and Chafetz (2000) also found that coming from a minority faith tradition in their home country to a majority faith tradition in their host country makes a difference to their level of association. When an immigrant has belonged to a minority faith in their home culture, the level of cohesion amongst members is high, usually due to perceived or real threats to the religious group. The level of threat is greatly diminished when the minority faith is a majority one in the host culture and therefore the level of cohesion to the faith tradition may be diminished. For example, this may be the experience of Asian Christians in the United States or Australia. On the other hand, the members of a majority faith in their home culture may feel under threat in the host country where they find themselves members of a minority faith. Ebaugh and Chafetz indicate that this leads to a greater proselytization by such groups in the host country. Whilst little research has been done on the majority/minority aspect of belonging to a faith tradition, it is another factor which appears to affect the degree and type of belonging of immigrants.

Accepting religious identity as an important aspect of the immigrant identity means that immigrants will find ways to belong to their religious tradition in their host countries. The spiritual home can be both a support and survival mechanism for immigrants. In the U.S., where congregations have been formed along ethnic lines, the immigrant has the advantage of finding a spiritual and ethnic place of belonging. In Australia, where immigrants were expected to belong to their local geographical parish, the immigrants could certainly find a spiritual place of belonging but may have had their ethnicity ignored.

The changing nature of the tradition also affects the belonging of immigrants in relation to ethnicity and religion, and two examples illustrate how this internal dynamic of a religious tradition may impact on immigrants and their religious identity. Part of the work of liberation theology is to separate the gospel message from its western cultural baggage (Phan, 1991) and the Church itself has recognised that its missionary activity was layered with such baggage. The Church itself changed its attitude towards Asian and other cultures and its missionary activity engages with other cultures rather than rejecting them. This illustrates that the Church itself is not a monolithic entity that does not change, especially in relation to culture. The religion is itself open to change and renegotiation and it is not a neat parcel that the immigrant carries from the home country to the host country.
The second example of the changing Church is more immediately pertinent to immigrants who have experienced the Catholic Church in the years before the Second Vatican Council and then after the Council. The Council had a major impact on the Church’s understanding of itself and on the members’ understanding of their relationship to the Institution and their role within it. Immigrants who arrived in Australia before the Council came from and to a different Church than those who arrived after the Council. The Church then has its own changing identity that affects all of its members, including immigrants. The Catholic Church has itself changed in the years following the Second World War. It changed from being a Church preoccupied with the sacramental life of immigrants in their host country to one that acknowledged the cultural practices that the immigrant brings to that country. Rather than adopting an attitude that reflected an expectation that immigrants should ‘fit in’ with the Church, the Church now holds dearly of itself being like an immigrant on a pilgrimage towards God. In practical terms, the Catholic Church has always provided materially for immigrants, and spiritually the Church has provided a safe haven of familiarity in the host country. All of this is as true in the Australian situation as in any other. The particular historical circumstances of migration to Australia since the Second World War, and the attitude of the Australian Catholic Church to immigrants is further examined in Chapter 3. The historical period covered by the work of this thesis includes the time of the Second Vatican Council and the time of the development in the Church of Liberation Theology and these contexts influence the relationship between the Australian Catholic Church and immigrants, because after the Council immigrants came to a very different Church to the one immigrants encountered beforehand.

THE NATURE OF BELONGING TO THE CATHOLIC TRADITION: OVERSEAS RESEARCH
This last section of the literature review examines quite specific aspects of belonging to the Catholic tradition previously briefly described. The importance of this section is its pertinence to the National Church Life Survey and the Catholic Church Life Survey’s nature and questions. There are themes and questions in these surveys that have been used in other country surveys and the outcomes of previous research provide a point of reference for this thesis.

In the United States context, the Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life (CPL) used some of the same material and techniques as used in the surveys of the Australian Catholic Church. The CPL material serves as a point of reference and comparison for the research that is the focus of this thesis. The CPL Study uses data from 36 parishes drawn from a larger sample of 1,100 parishes in the CPL. These 36 were chosen for intensive study because they
were 'representative of the principal dimensions along which Catholic parishes differ' (1985, Report No.3, p.4). The researchers chose to treat ethnic parishes separately and they focussed on the people they called 'core Catholics' who have parish connections, which the authors estimate to be only one quarter to one third of all Catholics in the U.S. Report No. 10, entitled *The Parish as Community* (1987) concentrates on the nature of belonging. The connection between community and belonging is made in the Introduction: 'Thus, for our purposes, we shall say that community (1) develops a sense of belonging or loyalty, (2) empowers common actions, and (3) nurtures standards, from outside the individual, which direct just and honourable civic participation' (1987, p.2).

Analysis was made of the question 'How much of a sense of community is there in your parish?' (1987, p.7). The results indicated that the sense of community felt was independent of parish size, and also indicated a relationship between ethnic homogeneity and sense of community. They also indicated that the sense of community was independent of a parish's social characteristics, and is most strongly related to '(1) the sense of attachment its parishioners feel toward it and (2) how upsetting its parishioners would find a move to another parish' (1987, p.10). Furthermore, the extent to which a parish meets parishioners' social needs is a far more important component of sense of community than is the extent to which it meets their spiritual needs.

The author of this report then addresses the issue of belonging, which is called 'attachment' (1987, p.11). The author seeks out the factors that contribute to attachment, and is able to determine which characteristics contribute most to parishioners' sense of attachment. Personal characteristics, such as gender, stage in the family life cycle and marital status are on their own not particularly useful indicators of a sense of attachment. Of those, only age is relevant – older people tend to be more attached. Those who participate in numerous activities have a strong sense of attachment and vice versa – those with a strong sense of attachment tend to participate a lot. The other highest correlations with a sense of attachment are with a sense of spiritual needs being met, a sense of social needs being met and the quality of conversations with the parish priest.

Investigations into participation among American Catholic parishioners also point to strong connections between belonging and explicit types and extent of participation. Michael Welch's (1993) analysis (based also on CPL data) focuses on four kinds of religious participation that Catholic parishioners display, and on three different types of influences on participation. His research leads him to conclude that there are definite initiatives that can be undertaken in parishes to promote participation. He tested hypotheses in order to examine the
predictive ability of different types of variables related to religious involvement. He makes some recommendations that share some commonality with the aspects of belonging described above. To promote increased involvement of parishioners, he recommends the presence of specialised ministries and programs within a parish, and the level of adult faith-sharing that is enabled to occur. He promoted ‘communities of choice’ that are the small groups within the larger parish community, in which members can share common personal, emotional and spiritual concerns. He also recommends that parishes should focus on ‘maximising the overall social integration of parishioners’ (1993, p.326). He says that the building of community provides ‘an authentic sense of belonging and a connection to fellow parishioners’ (1993, p.326).

Peyrot and Sweeney (2000) make another contribution to the research on belonging. They examined determinants of satisfaction with the parish amongst practising Catholics in Baltimore City. They focussed on four key areas of parish experience that may contribute to parishioner satisfaction and concluded that these four areas were all significant determinants of satisfaction. They found that ‘the ultimate criterion of satisfaction was how well parishioners’ spiritual and moral needs were met’ (2000, p.7). The other criteria were positive feelings towards the parish priest, the sense of community and the parish’s commitment to outreach. The importance of the parish priest’s leadership and relationship with the parishioners and the importance of the sense of community experienced had both been previously tested and found to positively correlate with parishioner satisfaction. The other two criteria were tested for the first time in that research and have a higher (in the case of the spiritual benefits) or nearly as high (in the case of Outreach) correlation with satisfaction. They caution that their study may not have application outside Baltimore, where it was conducted, and that it is limited to those who worship more often. Their research does indicate the importance of spiritual and moral needs in the nature of belonging.

In the research conducted by Davidson et al (1997) the researchers were trying to ascertain the aspects of Catholic life that unite and divide American Catholics. They conducted a national telephone poll of 1,058 persons over the age of eighteen who called themselves Catholic. They compared six components of faith across a number of factors. Four of their six components related to beliefs and practice, both pre-Vatican II and post-Vatican II. They also considered beliefs and practices that remained relatively intact from before the Council until after it. They categorised these in what they called ‘pan-Vatican II’ beliefs and practices. In relation to pan-Vatican beliefs the researchers found that ‘they are a very salient dimension of faith for parishioners’ (1997, 43). Traditional beliefs such as the belief in the virginity of Mary
and in the transformation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus were ones that strongly united Catholics. They also found that pre-Vatican II beliefs persist among a sizeable proportion of Catholics. Beliefs such as obedience to the Church were widely held amongst the ageing Catholic population. The greatest source of common ground uniting Catholics was in the area of pan-Vatican II beliefs. They describe them as 'the glue that holds Catholics together' (1997, p.55). Their study suggested that 'people with lower levels of education, lower status jobs, and lower incomes have more traditional religious orientations than people with higher levels of education, higher status jobs and higher incomes' (1997, p.78). Of the three, income was the largest determinant of traditional religious orientation. It also suggested that homemakers were more traditional in their beliefs than students and people in the labour force. The study concluded that age made a difference to beliefs and practices, with a 'linear trend away from conventional religious sensibilities, with the youngest Catholics being the least inclined to maintain traditional faith and morals' (1997, p.137). In terms of gender, women and men were more alike than different in their faith practices and beliefs. Finally they found that of the ethnic groups that they compared, Asian-Americans are the most traditional in their beliefs and practices.

The Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life Report No. 3, entitled Participation in Catholic Parish Life: Religious Rites and Parish Activities in the 1980's (1985) describes participation in specific parish activities and contributes insights into the different ways that men and women participate in parish life. The report acknowledges 'the many responsibilities shouldered by women' (p.15). Women fulfil traditional roles of service such as laundring the Church linen and decorating the Church, and they fulfil traditional nurturing roles of teaching and ministry to those in need. They also fill roles of leadership, dominating membership of parish councils and fulfilling more liturgical roles of leadership than men, with the one exception being that of the ordained minister. Women do not only outnumber men in the membership of parishes, but they are outnumber them in leadership in the parish. The authors of this report suggest that the influence of Vatican II, which invited greater participation of the laity, marked the beginning of the increased diversity of roles undertaken by women. They conclude that it had more effect on women's participation than on that of men.

Also in the United States, Cieslak (2000) also identifies elements of parish life that are important to women. He tested 31 variables that represented responses to questions answered in a survey conducted in the Rockford Catholic diocese in Illinois. Fifty-five thousand people from 105 parishes participated and he found that females rated community and liturgy as more important for their participation than for men.
In considering the English situation, Hornsby-Smith (1987) identifies ten ‘types’ of Catholics, and then analyses the types of communal involvement, arriving at four ‘degrees of belonging’. He uses the orthodoxy of belief, mass attendance, institutional involvement and sexual morality categories as descriptive of those who belong. He then categorises Catholics into his ten ‘types’, according to their degree of belonging to each of the above categories. The characteristics used to identify the ten types of Catholics share common elements with the research conducted with Catholics in the United States.

He states that ‘at least three criteria must be met for a sense of community belonging to be sociologically meaningful: shared beliefs and values, frequent interaction, and reciprocal social support and mutual aid’ (p.127). He also acknowledges that Catholics belong to the Church in ways and to the extent that they choose. And in the future: ‘Increasingly it seems likely that Catholics will select a more individually-chosen form of religious identity’ (p.130). There is no exact and particular way that all Catholics belong to the Church.

In these investigations cited there are differences in their conclusions, according to the cohort studied, the exact questions asked, and the method of research applied. But what is confirmed is that the nature of belonging to the Church encompasses human connectedness to other people, belonging to ‘communities of choice’ which share common personal, spiritual and emotional concerns and belonging to the ‘community of memory’ that holds the defining narrative of the tradition. These are expressed, nurtured and affirmed through the ritual dimension of the tradition. All of these research projects have named and investigated the extent and nature of belonging to the Church and elements of these research projects have been incorporated in the surveys used in the National Church Life Survey and the Catholic Church Life Survey.

SUMMARY

Belonging provides the context for this thesis. The essential task of the immigrant in moving from his or her home culture to the new host culture is to find ways to belong. The importance of belonging is that it is in this process that the individual’s identity is situated. In migrating one’s identity is at least disrupted because those with whom one identifies are no longer there, except in memories. Those with whom one identifies begins with one’s family and family history but extends to the cultural milieu with which one identifies and the cultural history with which one identifies. The task of the immigrant is to adapt his or her identity to the new environment of the host culture.
For the Catholic immigrant the Catholic identity is one to which he or she belongs in the home and host culture. This identity is readily transportable and may provide a ready-made community and belief system to which the Catholic immigrant can belong. Whether this happens or not depends on the host culture and the host Catholic culture and the degree of welcome issued to the immigrant.

There is no doubt that immigrants face boundaries around the host culture in the process of settlement because the host culture is the dominant one. This could lead to immigrants’ culture being placed in the position of being ‘less than’ the dominant one and therefore immigrants may feel excluded from the host culture and the host Catholic culture.

Understandings of how immigrants find their new cross-cultural identity have varied over time. Assimilation came to mean that immigrants discarded their old identity for their new Australian one. Multiculturalism, if taken to mean the acceptance of all cultures, can prove to be an impossible task. If multiculturalism is understood as a demographic reality then the real challenge is for the dominant cultural group and whether or not it can embrace difference.

Historically in Australia this has not been the case. Acknowledgement of the original inhabitants of the land is still to fully take place. English based political systems are still maintained. Some would say that Australia still has to find its own identity as a nation. Migration policies came out of Australia’s labour and economic needs. This history has provided a platform for cultural relativism that ensures that there is still demonstrated a ‘Them and Us’ cultural attitude in Australia. The Australian Catholic Church, being part of the Australian culture, may also reflect this aspect of the culture.

Immigrants bring many aspects to their identity with them. As well as their religious identities they bring their gender identities. In the past women immigrants have largely been considered as ‘immigrants’ wives’ rather than having their own separate identity. Women immigrants deal with a multitude of expectations. They have cultural expectations from their home culture and added ones from the host culture. In terms of their religious identities they may have the same expectations as they had in their home culture and more from the host culture. Research indicates that the burden on immigrant women to mother, nurture and serve their families only increases in the process of migration and settlement. The emphasis on women rather than men comes from this research and its relationship to the expectations placed on women by the Catholic Church.

The experience of the children of immigrants is quite different from that of their parents. They belong more to the host culture than the home culture and are able to choose which aspects of their parents’ culture they will preserve and which aspects they will discard.
Whether they maintain their parents’ faith culture and whether they feel they belong to the Australian Catholic Church is a question for this research.

The literature thus far provides a background for considering immigrants’ belonging to a faith tradition and in particular belonging to the Catholic tradition. Belonging to the Catholic tradition means a number of things:

- Human connectedness to other believers,
- A shared history that comes from the narrative or ‘Great Story’ of the tradition – the story of Jesus,
- Shared personal, spiritual and emotional concerns,
- A common way of ritualising and celebrating belonging to the Church.

These are the essential elements of being a Catholic, identifying with and belonging to the Catholic faith. These are the elements that will be examined for and analysed in this research. This research will compare these elements of belonging between Catholics born in Australia and Catholics born elsewhere.
CHAPTER 3
CATHOLIC IMMIGRANTS IN AUSTRALIA 1945 – 2001

INTRODUCTION
The role of the Catholic Church in the settlement process and enabling the immigrant to ‘belong’ has varied over time. This chapter discusses the role of the Church in the settlement process of Catholic immigrants who have arrived in Australia since the end of the Second World War. The way in which this role was defined and understood has developed in response to changes within both the Church and Australia as a whole. In examining such changes the year 1973 stands as a watershed. Prior to this time the ‘type’, if not the number of immigrants allowed into Australia was determined by the Immigration Restriction Act. The Australian Citizenship Act in 1973 marked the official dismantling of the White Australia Policy, and its replacement by a selection policy in which race was no longer a key determinant of eligibility. Within the Church the implementation of reforms as a result of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) provided a space in which immigrants could retain their ethnic identity. Together these changes were to have a significant impact on the number, expectations and reception of migrants within the Australian Catholic Church.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND - 1945 – 1972
In the wake of the Second World War the fears of Asian invasion led Australia to embark on a new wave of immigration. Facing a projected decline in the birth rate (Wilton and Bosworth, 1984) and a shortage of labour (Jupp, 1996) the government looked to immigration to build Australia’s population to a level sufficient to defend the country against any future threat from the North (Jupp, 2001). Australia’s attachment to Britain and its distrust of all who were not of British origin (Wilton and Bosworth, 1984, Lack and Templeton, 1995) ensured that migration from that source was greatly encouraged. Between 1947 and 1954, over 300,000 people arrived from the United Kingdom, but despite special inducements being offered, British immigration never reached the level to which the government aspired.

Northern Europeans were deemed the next most suitable group of immigrants to be acceptable because, as Kate Walsh argues,

\[
\text{the Department of Immigration believed that they would blend into Australian society and not form conspicuous minority groups (2000, p.151)}
\]

The Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell, embarked on a recruiting tour to Europe. Persuaded to visit a displaced persons’ camp he was impressed by the physical similarities
between the refugees of the Baltic States and the British. On being assured of IRO (International Refugee Organisation) funding and ships, Calwell announced that Australia was prepared to accept its responsibility as a member of the IRO, and open its doors to refugees (Wilton and Bosworth, 1984, Jupp, 2001). Between 1947 and 1953, 170,000 such refugees were brought to Australia, along with a further 11,512 privately sponsored refugees, most of whom were Jewish. A continuing labour shortage fuelled a further widening of the recruitment net during the 1950s and 1960s. Treaties were negotiated with a number of mainly southern European countries allowing Australia to choose the immigrants it required to meet its employment needs. By 1961 non-British immigrants made up 8 per cent of the Australian population of 10,634,267, with Italians (228,000), Germans (109,000), Greeks (77,000) and Poles (60,000) constituting the largest groups. By 1966, one seventh of the Australian population had been born overseas, a greater proportion than any other country apart from Israel. During the 1960s immigration accounted for about 41 per cent of population growth. A sustained period of economic growth, low inflation, low unemployment and high overseas investment underwrote an immigration program which saw nearly 2,000,000 arrive in a mere 24 years (2001,DIMIA).

Since 1901 the Immigration Restriction Act had provided the means of excluding immigrants considered being undesirable. Initially this had meant all non-white immigrants but the policy was changing with selection increasingly based on the assumed assimilability of the applicant. ‘New Australian’, the label collectively applied to the Dutch, Polish, Italian and Greek immigrants who arrived in the post-war years, signified that they had passed this test. Despite their difference, it was assumed, and expected that they would embrace assimilation (Castles, 1999, p.33). The definition of assimilation is contested (Park, 1939, Gordon, 1964, Alba and Nee, 1997)) but there is agreement that it was the immigrant who was expected to do the work of ‘fitting in’ to the dominant culture in the host society. Conformity was central to the assimilation process. Jayasuriya argues that Australia’s self-understanding as an ‘Anglo fragment’ (1991, p.2) society informed its immigration and settlement policies. Assimilation meant conformity to British culture, and discarding the ‘language, customs and national sentiments’ of the ‘old’ countries from which immigrants had come (Lewins, 1978). The way of belonging in the new country was to become ‘like us’.

This understanding of Australian culture was problematic for the Catholic Church. Its origins lay in the Irish Catholic culture, rendering the Church ‘Anglo-Celtic’ rather than ‘Anglo’. There had been antipathy in the past between Church and the wider society due to the history of British oppression in Ireland. In welcoming immigrant Catholics would the Church act as an
institutional arm of Australian society and expect immigrants to conform to the dominant 'Anglo fragment' culture or to the 'Irish fragment' that it represented?

The Catholic Church's primary concern for immigrants was the fear that their faith may be lost in the process of immigration and settlement (O'Leary, 1955, Lewins, 1978). Lewins considers that the Church subsumed all cultural questions within the Catholic realm. The spiritual life of the immigrant was of greater importance than the cultural one. He states that the Church actually separated the spiritual life from the material one, although both he and O'Leary acknowledge that religion and culture cannot be totally divorced. O'Leary's description of the 'dangers' faced by immigrants regarding their faith included 'religious' ones, such as the moral danger faced by the lonely separated husband from his family, but also recognised 'cultural' difficulties by publishing mass sheets in other languages. Nevertheless, they agreed that the primary concern of the Church is the provision of the sacramental life to immigrants.

The Catholic Church's responses to migration was codified in 1952, with the landmark Apostolic Constitution, *Exsul Familia*, which emphasised the Church's responsibility to provide an accessible sacramental life by whatever means available. *Exsul Familia* stressed the need for care of the immigrant who faced many difficulties during the resettlement process, language not being the least of them. For example, in the United States national parishes were established. These were parishes specifically established to accommodate immigrant Catholics and each one catered for a specific cultural group. The advantages of such a system were that immigrant groups could worship in their own cultural way and socialise with their fellow immigrants. The major disadvantages were the isolation of these communities from the broader Catholic culture of the host society and the difficulties that they created for second and third generation immigrant Catholics. The Church in Australia provided language assistance through written material and migrant chaplains to enable access to the sacramental life, but it decided not to establish national parishes. Immigrants were expected to belong to their local geographical parish.

This path was chosen ostensibly to help the immigrant fit into the Australian Church but Lewins (1978) points to the fears of the Australian hierarchy regarding immigrants. One fear that the bishops believed the parish priests held was that of the potential divisiveness of establishing especially the 'missions with the care of souls' (p.37), which would at the very least, dilute their authority over all those in their geographical location. The attitude of the Australian hierarchy was to prioritise the geographical parish and the integration of migrants into it, and an even more fundamental fear of the provision of any separate services was the financial cost to parishes deprived of the contribution immigrant members may have made to
the extensive building programs undertaken in new parishes where these immigrants were most likely to reside (O’Leary, 1957, 28-9, Lewins, 1978, p.54). Martin (1972) suggests that the experience of national parishes in the United States inspired this fear to some extent, and was parallel with the second fear, which was financial. If some parishioners who were immigrants joined parishes with which they identified more readily, then they would take with them the financial resources normally available to the geographical parishes. Bishops and priests did not want to lose these resources. In any case, it was presumed that the need for assistance to immigrants would dissipate in time and certainly by the third generation immigrants’ families would be assimilated to the Australian Church. The Church at that time celebrated its rituals in Latin and prided itself on the fact that the Eucharistic celebration was the same wherever one went. It therefore regarded it as unnecessary to accommodate any cultural differences that may have been present through immigration.

Assimilation was itself a foreign concept to the Church, since all of its members belonged to an unchanging body, identical throughout the world - the ‘one, true Church’. In a sense though, the Church was acting in concert with the prevailing cultural policy, assimilation being the expectation of the immigrant. The Catholic Church viewed the problems faced by immigrants purely as religious ones, its concern being with ‘saving their souls’. The assimilation that the Church assumed would happen was also a religious one, one that coincided with the cultural assimilation of the immigrant. By ignoring the immigrant's Catholic culture, the Church was in fact advocating that the immigrant 'fit in' to the host country's Catholic culture. The way the Catholic immigrant would belong to the Catholic Church in the host country was to adopt that country's cultural Catholicism. Even though the Australian Church deliberately decided not to establish 'ethnic parishes', for whatever reasons, it did little else to welcome immigrants. Certainly, Eucharistic celebrations used the language of the Church and were therefore comprehensible to immigrants whose first language was not English. However, the parish priest had the choice of implementing any other strategies that would include immigrants. This meant that there were a variety of initiatives taken, from nothing, to the parish priest learning another language, to incorporating a range of cultural parish activities that included immigrants. This ad hoc approach to immigrant Catholics did not necessarily welcome or include them in Australian Catholic parish life.

The Australian Government saw the churches as partners in the post-war migration program. It provided free passages for chaplains on ships departing Britain carrying more than 1,000 immigrants. For ships with less than 500 immigrants chaplains were provided from Fremantle, the first port of call for new arrivals. Co-operating churches were provided with lists
of arriving immigrants so that they could enlist volunteers to greet the newly arrived at their point of disembarkation. This cooperation was maintained until the 1970s. Despite its sometimes-oppositional relationship with Government in the past, the Catholic Church was an enthusiastic participant in the migration program. Looking back, in 1972, Archbishop O'Donnell, the President of the Federal Catholic Immigration Committee, stated

*The Church . . . was completely in accord with the Government in its planned programme of immigration, adjusted as always to Australia's economic and social needs.* (Mechem, 1991, p.99)

The success of this cooperation owed much to the relationship between the Minister for Immigration and the Catholic Church's representative for immigration, Archbishop Justin Simonds. Calwell was a former member of St. Mary's West Melbourne, where Archbishop Simonds was parish priest from 1942 (Vodola, 1997). Both were in Europe in 1947 and Simonds, like Calwell, had the opportunity to observe firsthand the plight of European war victims. Following his report to his fellow bishops on his return the Federal Catholic Migration Committee (FCMC) was formed. Answerable to the Bishops' Conference, this committee was charged with the duty of welcoming Catholics on arrival.

To the Government's expectations that the new arrivals learn English, get a job and assimilate, the Church added a fourth element, integration into the life of the local parish. The Australian bishops deliberately chose this over the other available models, reproducing in the Church the assimilation model of the wider society. As the government provided English language classes for the newly arrived, so the Church provided chaplains to enable communication. The major objective of the Church was the salvation of souls; hence the need for priests who could hear confessions and provide translations of prayer sheets for the immigrants. Initially such priests, including married priests from Eastern Rites, were found amongst the ranks of the Displaced Persons, but later, overseas priests were recruited to fill this role.

The FCMC, later the Federal Catholic Immigration Committee (FCIC) undertook a number of tasks that fell under the general heading of 'care of immigrants'. The securing of services of chaplains, placing religious Sisters as teachers in immigrant camps, the securing of interest-free loans from the International Catholic Migration Loan Fund and the instigation in parishes of Immigration Sunday Collections were all tasks of the FCIC. The FCIC was also heavily involved in the sponsorship and settlement of immigrants. Young men and women from refugee camps, single young women from Italy, Malta and Spain were sponsored and
settled through the agency of the FCIC. Cyril Hally describes the FCIC as functioning ‘predominantly at an administrative level’ (1980, p.23).

Diocesan Immigration Offices were also set up to help immigrants and refugees. The directors of these offices are accountable only to their local ordinary, and largely worked independently of each other. Broadly speaking, Sydney and Adelaide concentrated on welfare provision, counselling services and liaison with Migrant chaplains, whilst Melbourne, Brisbane and Perth concentrated on sponsorship and provision of loans (Lewins, 1978, Hally, 1980). Merchant (1995) concluded that the work of the Office had been of great service to immigrants and the Australian Church since 1949.

Collaborating with the Australian bishops with the aid of the FCIC were the many religious congregations of men and women who came to Australia with the express purpose of providing services to immigrants. Paganoni (2003) lists some fourteen congregations which either arrived in Australia soon after World War II, or who took up specific work with immigrants at around this time. It would seem from Paganoni’s work that this occurred not in any planned way, but because of initiatives undertaken by individuals either in Australia or overseas. For example, the Scalabrinians initiated their own presence in Australia from Rome, first arriving in 1952. On the other hand, the Salesians, Oblates, Passionists and Franciscans undertook their ministry to immigrants through their pastoral contacts in parishes and schools already established here. Those who came from overseas were not necessarily made particularly welcome, having to rely on the hospitality of local authorities to help them settle in appropriate accommodation and to be provided for in a material sense.

Sharing the hardship of their fellow immigrants in being in a strange land and having to assimilate to a new culture, many were also faced with indifference and even hostility from members of the Australian clergy (Mechem, 1990) and even their own ethnic community (Cappello, 1999). There were practical issues of housing and finance, due in some part to the differences in diocesan practices regarding the Migrant Chaplains. The difficulties faced by Migrant Chaplains, particularly in relation to status because they were not parish priests, meant that doubts about the value of Migrant chaplains were already apparent in the 1950’s (Smolicz, 1994). The fact that Migrant Chaplains faced such difficulties was a sign of the resistance of the Australian Church to immigrants in general because of the decision not to have ethnic parishes and not to separate out immigrants from existing geographical parishes.

Some have doubted that the practices of the Church in Australia adhered to the Constitution *Exsul Familia* (Lewins, 1978, Hally, 1981). The Constitution urged bishops to establish national parishes, which were legally constituted parishes with their own national
priest, or Missions with the Care of Souls. These were quasi-parishes where the national priest works in a designated area, in conjunction with local parish priests, with equal status and co-responsibility. Neither of these was established in Australia, where territorial parishes still remained as the prime structure for the care of all the believers. Mechem (1990) offered an explanation that was shared to some extent by Paganoni (2003) and O’Leary (1971). He says that the system of providing Migrant Chaplains, of which there were about 50 at the time of publication of the Constitution, was working well and did not need to change. The three agree that the Constitution was based almost entirely on documents preserved in Roman archives, and therefore was centralist and European in its context and content. This made it not so applicable to the Australian Church scene. The only facet of the Constitution that was taken up was the institution of Immigration Sunday, with a collection for pastoral work and an accompanying Bishops’ Statement on matters relevant to immigration. Mechem concludes ‘The acceptance of Exsul Familia by the Australian Church was thus done responsibly and with full awareness of the needs of our situation here’ (1990, p.88). He also noted the influence of the Second Vatican Council on the Apostolic Letter Pastoralis Migratorum in 1969 and claimed that it confirmed the actions of the Australian bishops. The Australian Church continued to provide migrant chaplains working within the existing parish structures. Mechem concluded that the new document represented affirmation of a system of pastoral care that was achieved locally where possible and in a spirit of collegiality and subsidiarity. This assessment was made in the light of his admiration for the Federal Catholic Immigration Committee and its work.

Hence the work of the Australian Catholic in welcoming immigrants and their chaplains was piecemeal and reactive rather than pro-active. Hence the term ‘benign neglect’ used by Paganoni (2003). The priority for the Church was the maintenance of existing parish structures, the use of migrant chaplains and including immigrants in them. The problem with this way of welcoming immigrants was that it was essentially left in the hands of individual parish priests who may or may not be inclined to welcome immigrants and thus give them a sense of belonging to the Australian Church.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND - 1973-2001

In 1973, the Australian Citizenship Act replaced the Immigration Restriction Act and effectively removed all discrimination between British and other immigrants. It marked the official end of the ‘White Australia Policy’, a policy that had been undergoing a slow decline since the end of the Second World War. The new Act affected immigration in a number of ways. Although the total numbers of immigrants decreased throughout the 1970s the new Act ensured that potential immigrants were treated equally, creating greater diversity in Australia’s immigration intake. Prior to 1975 refugees were admitted from Chile (1973), Cyprus (1974) and East Timor (1975), and refugees were then able to sponsor their relatives to come to Australia under the Family Reunion program. Birrell (1999) states that the Government ‘significantly liberalised the family entry rules’ during the late 1970s and 1980s. Since 1975 the majority of refugees have come from Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, and between 1977 and 1982 family reunions and refugees have accounted for 40 per cent of all settler arrivals. In more recent years the refugee program has embraced people from places as diverse as Lebanon, Cuba, Yugoslavia, the Middle East and North Africa but there has been a change to the ‘mix’ of immigrants arriving in Australia. The economically driven Government policy has ensured that the shift towards skilled migrants has continued, with at least 54 per cent of new migrants selected from the Skill Stream. Of the 70,000 or so immigrants that arrive as part of the Migration Program each year, a larger percentage of them arrive under the Skill Stream. The proportion of immigrants in this category has risen from 33% in 1998–99 to 41% in 2002–3 (Australian Bureau of Statistics).

The Australian Citizenship Act embodied a change in settlement as well as intake policy with multiculturalism replacing assimilation. To Castles (2001) multiculturalism ‘represents the antithesis of “assimilation”’ (p.87). A conceptual model that set out principles for public policy in countries with a multi-ethnic population, multiculturalism has been interpreted in Australia to mean the acceptance of different cultural groups with their own equal rights in all spheres of society. To enable equal participation in society, a range of government initiatives were undertaken in the 1970s and 1980s. Davidson (1997) and Castles (1999) see the change of policy as a pragmatic response to a changing economic relationship with Asia and political pressures both within the nation and beyond it. Castles argues that both Liberal/CP and Labor have had their own agenda in promoting multiculturalism with economic considerations as fundamental.

However changes in official policy have not been reflected in community attitudes. Goot (1993), Viviani (1996), Chan (1999), and Castles (2001) have all argued that the change
from assimilation to multiculturalism did not dislodge the assumed superiority of the dominant culture. The rise of the One Nation party and public acceptance of the current federal government’s treatment of asylum seekers are evidence of the survival of real divisions between ethnic groups. This is caused by racism, which extends the Us/Them dichotomy to “Us=Superior/Them=Inferior” (Davidson, 1999, Jones, 1999, Viviani, 1999, Castles, 2000, 2001). Those who promote the values of citizenship accept the demographic reality of multiculturalism and move to address the problem of racism, which divides groups of citizens from each other. This is a problem in religious groups as it is in society as a whole. However, religious organisations should be able to address the problem of racism as they already uphold values that the advocates of citizenship espouse.

The change in policy within Australia had been preceded by a refinement of attitude within the Church. The Australian Church to which immigrants came between 1945 and 1965 was Anglo-Celtic in its cultural nature and pre-Vatican II in its religious culture. The events of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) were to impact greatly on the nature of the Church, and after the Council immigrants arrived to a very different kind of Catholicism to that of the earlier post-War years. Although missionaries largely from Ireland founded the Church in Australia it had begun to claim an identity that was separate from its origins. Catholics had moved from being being ‘blue-collar’ working class to being more like the dominant Protestant middle-class, Catholics having more in common with this group than they had before. Once education became part-government funded a further barrier between Catholics and the rest of society was removed. ‘By the 1950’s the old Irish Australia, that of heritage and sentiment, had been almost totally absorbed in its Australian concerns, with merely an occasional nod to its origins’ (O’Farrell, 1985, p.307). The process of becoming a truly Australian Church was not completed. The influx of immigrants, for which the Church was unprepared, also disturbed the homogeneity of the Church, and changed its identity. Collins (1991) and Woodward (1997) would say that the Catholic Church in Australia is still in search of its identity.

The effects of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) also impacted on the identity of the Church in Australia. Campion says that ‘Vatican II was welcomed by Australian Catholics’ (1988, p.203). O’Farrell also says that ‘The effects of all this within Catholicism was at first liberating and exhilarating, a time of hope’ (1985, p.406), but they agree that what ensued in Australia was first of all confusion, then sharp decline into factional in-fighting between Church progressives and conservatives. The Church withdrew from political involvement, and also abandoned the old Catholic world to rely on its own internal life (O’Farrell, 1985). He blames the failure on the Church leadership, which abdicated its responsibility in the public sphere, and suffered a credibility loss in
the internal sphere that began with authority problems in relation to the encyclical *Humanae Vitae* in the 1960s. This encyclical reinforced traditional Church teaching on birth control and it caused division in the Church. Many believed that this teaching was going to be revised and they were disappointed in what they perceived was a regressive step after the Council. Collins says that the Church has become a sub-culture of Australian society and has retired into its own borders, its failure being in the ‘task of translating the message of Christ and the Catholic tradition into this culture’ (1991, p.12). Paganoni says that these factors have led to the drastic falls in attendance numbers, the decline in the number of priests and religious and the restructuring of clerical and lay leadership at the parish level. Catholics who wanted to return to what they would call the ‘glory days’ before the Council blame it for all the losses since incurred, especially in membership, but this decline is the reality in all Christian churches in the latter part of the twentieth century.

The face of the Church that greets the new immigrant is the Church at the local level. It was here that the ramifications of the Council were most obvious and impacted on Australian born and immigrant Catholics alike. Changes to the liturgy meant that the Eucharistic celebration was in fact more foreign to immigrants than it had been before the Council. It was now celebrated in English and was more informal in nature with altar rails removed and the priest facing the people. In many parishes familiar icons and practices disappeared. Some Australian born and immigrant Catholics were disenfranchised by the almost overnight disappearance of significant statues, such as that of the Sacred Heart, and popular devotional practices such as Benediction and the Rosary. One of the main freedoms after the Council was in the variety of ways of practising one’s Catholic faith. The ‘one true Church’ could look very different from parish to parish and Sunday to Sunday. Members of the tradition began to make choices about how, when and to what extent they ‘practised’ their faith.

The leadership structure of parishes became a much flatter one, with clergy and lay people sharing leadership roles in liturgy and the day-to-day running of the parish. The acknowledgment of the Church as the ‘People of God’ (*Lumen Gentium No. 11*) was taken as an invitation to all the baptised to participate in the life of the Church in a myriad of ways. In Australia men and women took up roles in the liturgy itself and on such boards as Parish Councils, which acted as advisory groups to the parish priest. Some even took up paid employment in the Church as pastoral associates, filling roles of pastoral ministry in the parish.

The result of Vatican II was a much wider range of choices about how and to what extent people could belong to the Church and these choices were also open to the newcomers to Australia. The broadening of understanding of who ‘qualifies’ to be Catholic leads people to make choices about the nature and extent of their belonging. An example of choices Catholics make is that instead of necessarily attending their local parish they now exercise the choice to attend church
services where one feels ‘at home’. Belonging as a Catholic has changed since the Council of Vatican II.

Women members of the Church too have seen their place in the Church change since the Council. The inheritance of Catholic women in the Australian Church seems to have been much like that of women of the Church everywhere. As O’Farrell (1985) described it, the Australian Church was strongly influenced by the image of femininity that took two opposed extreme forms. One was the ideal of the Virgin Mary, and at the other extreme, the dangerous Eve. Either perspective of femininity led to the conclusion that women would be best occupied in domestic affairs. For the daughters of Eve, their path to salvation was to marry Catholic men and be good wives and mothers, therefore too preoccupied with these tasks to fall into the ways of sin. An example of such sinfulness was the tendency of Catholic women to enter into ‘mixed marriages’ more than men, when the role of women was to nurture and maintain the ‘one, true faith’. The ideal of Mary was linked to the domestic virtues particularly and she was the role model for women who could be ‘queen of the home’, just as Mary was ‘queen of heaven’. In Australia, this emphasis on women being in the home was overlaid with the antipathy between the Protestant secular state and the Catholic world. This antipathy required men to resist the State and women to be protected from it. Hence some Catholic spokesmen resisted the secular women’s movement to gain the right to vote (first granted to women in South Australia in 1894 – followed by other states with Victoria being the last in 1904), seeing it as a source of potential contamination of their Catholic womanhood.

O’Farrell described Australian family culture of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as marked by a ‘sharp differentiation of function’ (1985, p.258). Public life, politics and even Church politics were the domain of men, and home life was the domain of women. One of the duties of Catholic mothers was to educate their children in the ways of the faith. The image of the home as a safe haven for the Catholic mother to protect her children from the ways of the secular world in which the father ventured to provide the material goods necessary for survival was the summary one which described the Catholic family in the early twentieth century.

The only women who were acceptable outside the family were members of religious congregations, who had undertaken a ‘higher vocation’. Their roles as teachers, missionaries and nurses were an extension of the role of ‘mother’, and included the training of future mothers. Even as educators of girls, they provided distinctions between male and female. Whilst both boys and girls were taught cultural and literary subjects, boys were taught book keeping and geometry when girls were taught needlework and darning. The image of the ideal Catholic woman as mother survived intact until the combined influences of the women’s movement of the 1970’s and the
Council of Vatican II. These coincided closely enough for women in the Australian Church to question their traditional roles within the family and the Church.

The comprehensive report on the participation of women in the Catholic Church in Australia, *Woman and Man One in Christ Jesus* (Macdonald et al, 1999) indicates the diversity of roles and opinions held by women in the Church today. The authors comment on this diversity, even hesitantly summarising the two ‘types’ of women who make up the membership of the Church. The group that show satisfaction with the current role of women in the Church are committed to a more traditional and conservative understanding of the Church and of women. The group less satisfied with the role of women in the Church are more liberal in their outlook and regard the Church as ‘lagging behind’ the wider Australian society in its treatment and appreciation of women’s roles and potential roles. The findings of the Project show that women participate in leadership in liturgy and other parish activities, in welfare, education and undertake theological studies. The Report finds that women now undertake almost every task within the Church. However, the pain and alienation of being denied participation in some tasks and of being excluded by the language of the Church was shared by most respondents, and remains ‘the dominant feeling of participants’ (1999, p.375).

The report used a variety of methods to gather information. Two thousand four hundred and ninety-five written submissions were received and analysed. Information gleaned from the Catholic Church Life Survey of 1996 was included. Public hearings at which presenters could speak to the key inquiry questions were held at 23 centres throughout Australia. Nearly 500 presentations were made at these gatherings. Some 50 targeted group discussions were held with sectors of the Church that the Research Management Group felt were not represented through the other avenues. These groups included women from lower socio-economic backgrounds, women from Non-English speaking backgrounds and refugee women. The groups ranged in size from 6-10 and in the latter two categories, there were 6 groups formed for discussion. Among the immigrant group there was, however, no Asian representation. But among the refugee group there was a group of staff members of a Catholic Secondary College that has a very high percentage of students from an immigrant or refugee background and these women were Vietnamese. There was a third group of thirty-six female students, all of whom were from immigrant backgrounds. The authors acknowledged that there was great difficulty in getting such groups together and immigrant and refugee women were not highly represented in the project. Lastly, members of Catholic Church organizations and theological institutions were surveyed to ascertain women’s involvement and level of involvement in such organizations.

Of relevance to this research are the responses from CCLS data, especially on the matter of belonging and the responses from immigrant and refugee women. While these groups share most
responses to the key questions, posed by the study, with all women in the Church, there are some particular differences in their situation. Language remains as a major barrier to participation in the Church for first-generation immigrant and refugee women, as does the cumulative pressures and demands of settlement, care of the family and work outside of the home. These women engage mostly in the ‘invisible’ work of the Church as an extension of their roles as mothers. They ensure that they teach their children values and beliefs that are based on those of the Church. If they are involved in the parish, they are most likely to be found doing domestic work, such as cleaning the Church, arranging flowers or preparing food for parish functions.

The shared concerns of participants through all avenues, apart from CCLS respondents, are summarised in the Report. ‘Pain, alienation and often anger resulted from a strong sense of women's marginalisation, struggle, disenfranchisement, powerlessness, irrelevance and lack of acknowledgement within the Church’ (Macdonald et al, 1999, p.375). Although women participate in a great variety of ways to the life of the Church, and participate more than men, they reported real barriers to their inclusion in the full life of the Church. The continuing patriarchal and hierarchical nature of the Church was seen as the fundamental barrier. It was seen most clearly in the exclusion of women from leadership and decision-making roles, the exclusion of women from priestly ordination and the failure of the Church to grant equal roles and status to women.

Respondents to the CCLS represent a distinct group in the Catholic population. They are older, they attend mass more often than most (90% attend weekly or more) and young people and separated and divorced people are under-represented. Although CCLS respondents and other contributors to this report do not make up two mutually exclusive groups, the CCLS group arrives at quite different conclusions to all other participants to the Report. CCLS respondents feel a generally strong sense of belonging to their parish, in contrast to the others who feel a sense of alienation. CCLS respondents are satisfied with assistance and encouragement received from the parish or wider Church when they had accepted some responsibility for doing something in the parish or wider Church. Other participants said they felt little or no assistance for women to participate in the Church. CCLS results indicated that they felt there were generally no barriers to their participation in the Church.

The contrast between the responses to the CCLS and all other responses begs an explanation, but such an explanation is difficult to provide. The distinctiveness of CCLS respondents has been described and that group is not typical of the general population of those who named themselves Catholics on the 1996 census. CCLS responses are statistically representative of all Catholic Church attendees. Of the other participants in the Report, many do represent specific interest groups, which could, and most likely would, fall outside the descriptions of Catholics gleaned
from the CCLS group. The only real conclusions about why such great differences exist between the CCLS responses and all others are articulated in the report. The wide spectrum of views and emotions expressed about women’s participation in the Church is reflective of the diversity of women who belong to the Church. Diversity in age, education, social and economic situation, ethnic background and understanding of the nature of the Church all affect responses. In addition, there was a polarisation of views in many aspects of the Report. There were those wishing to maintain the current situation of participation or even return to the situation of the pre-Vatican II church and there were those seeking an even more expanded role for women, even questioning the Church’s stance on ordination.

The value of the Report is that it indicates what people are thinking about the relationship of women to the Church in Australia. The authors were surprised at the extent of responses, saying that it illustrated that ‘the issue of the participation of women in the Catholic Church in Australia is crucial and controversial’ (p.373). Despite the efforts of the Research Management Group to actively seek out groups such as immigrant women and refugee women they were poorly represented in the total number of participants.

The spirit of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) was also marked by a renewed openness to other Christian traditions and other world religions, which went hand-in-hand with its openness to the diverse richness of other cultures. In 1969, Paul VI promulgated Pastoralis Migratorum Cura, devoting attention to reconciling special care for migrants with normal forms of ministry associated with territorial parishes. In 1970, the Pontifical Commission for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People was formed. This Commission was charged with coordinating the care of all people on the move, thus moving beyond immigrants to include all travellers, tourists and nomadic peoples. Following in the footsteps of Vatican II, the Pontifical Commission also emphasised that the Church’s attitude should be couched in a cultural context, mindful of the traveller’s home and host culture and mindful also of the circumstances surrounding their journey. Whilst not moving away from the inclusiveness of the ‘one true Church’, the Church acknowledged that the faith of the immigrant has a cultural context.

In the document Church and People on the Move, published by the Commission in 1978, ‘movement’ was a central theme. Movement is a lived reality for migrants, refugees and other travellers. It is an image of the people of God – the pilgrim Church and a metaphor for the journey of life, whether for physical security and positive possibilities for one’s family, or described in terms of searching for ‘the way, the truth and the life’ (Jn. 14,6). The Pontifical Commission emphasised the goal of the Church’s journey - the loving communion of people.
with each other and with God (No 10-12). The Church, it asserted, can only operate within the
dynamic reality of culture and cultural exchange.

But the work of Catholic agencies in Australia continued in much the same way as it
had developed since the Second World War. Sponsorship extended to refugees from Asia in
the 1970’s and 1980’s. In 1995 the Australian Catholic Migrant and Refugee Office was
established by the Australian Catholic Bishops’ Conference. It took the place of the Federal
Catholic Immigration Committee and the Australian Refugee Office and assumed many of their
functions. The work of this Office is a mixture of advocacy, policy planning and pastoral care of
immigrants, working co-operatively with other Catholic agencies and government bodies.

In the early 1980’s the role of the Catholic Immigration Office (CIO) in Melbourne
expanded from the areas of sponsorship and welfare to assuming the role of co-ordinating the
different bodies within the Church involved in immigration (Merchant, 1986, p.38). Two such
bodies are the Catholic Co-ordinating Committee for Refugees, which was established in 1979,
and the Archdiocesan Commission on Migration, established in 1982. The CIO also presents
submissions to the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs
(formerly the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs) and to other relevant government
agencies. According to Merchant, the role of the CIO is changing, especially with restrictions
and demands made of the CIO’s sponsorship role. The CIO imagines that the promotion of
multiculturalism in the Church may become a more major role. Merchant concludes that the
work of the Office has been of great service to immigrants and the Australian Church since
1949. Similarly, religious congregations have continued their work in chaplaincy and pastoral
care. Paganoni (2003) cites the example of the recent arrival of the Claretian Sisters to care
for members of the ageing Italian Catholic cohort.

Despite the provision of these services to immigrants and refugees, O’Leary (1971),
Lewins (1978), Hally (1980), Pittarello (1987), Turner (1992) and Smolicz (1994) are all critical
of the Church’s attitude towards immigrants. They claim that the Church’s expectation was still
that the immigrant assimilates. Writing in 1971 O’Leary summarized post World War II
criticisms of the Australian Catholic Church’s attitude to migrants:

_When immigration began after the Second World War, there was a fear in Australia as to the possible disruptive effects of introducing many diverse varieties of catholic life and practice. There seems to have been a policy decision in catholic circles to play down these diversities and to accelerate as much as possible the complete Australianisation of the immigrants or at least of their children. Twenty years of experience should have allayed these fears_ (O’Leary, 1971, p.150).
Although agreeing that the bishops were right in not following the norms of *Exsul Familia*, he criticised them for only taking on a minimalist interpretation of *Pastoralis Migratorum*. As far as he was concerned, the ethnic catholic communities and their chaplains remained on the periphery of the Australian Catholic Church.

Others maintain that little changed after 1971 despite the significant policy shifts at both the national and Vatican levels. To Lewins (1978) the Catholic Church in Australia only served as a place where immigrants felt once again excluded from the predominant culture. Instead of faith being a source of unity, it was a source of division. Hally (1980) makes a valuable contribution in terms of suggesting a way forward for the Church to respond to the 'changing ethnic composition of the Church's membership' (1980, p.34). He advocated the establishment of a research and policy development unit that would enable the Church to better manage the needs of the ethnic membership, and the demands of multiculturalism. Its main purpose would be to 'create a climate of awareness amongst all Catholics of the pastoral implications of the multiculturalism in our midst' (1980, p.36). By failing to move beyond its Irish-Australian base the Church was excluding Catholics from other cultural traditions, an experience, Turner (1982) argues, was still common at the time of her writing. Collins points out that, by 1986, 'around 45 per cent of all Catholics in this country are either born overseas themselves or are children with at least one parent born overseas' (1986, p.213). Pittarello (1988) criticized the Australian Church for ignoring the demographic reality that it was increasingly composed of immigrants and their children. The Church is an immigrant one, and 'the foundation and tradition of the Catholic Church in Australia is increasingly becoming unsuitable to the majority of Catholics living in this country' (1988, p.147). The notion of the Anglo-Celtic Australian Catholic Church had become redundant, given the reality of the demographic make-up of the membership. Pittarello saw the immediate task of the Church as being that of revising its own social and cultural identity. Smolicz (1994) claims that the overall cultural image of the Australian Catholic Church is largely unchanged despite the influx of immigrants. Other authors argue that Australia has always had immigrants and pastoral care from countries other than Ireland (Paganoni, 2003, Cahill et al, 2004) and that the 'temptation to identify Irishness and Catholicism is somewhat misplaced' (Grech and Cahill, 2005, p.2). They argue that since the 1960's the friction between parish priests and migrant chaplains has dissipated and that the demographic reality of a multicultural Catholic church is largely accepted and encouraged in Australia today.

Despite the changes to the Church through the Second Vatican Council that were meant to be more inclusive of the laity, women and especially immigrant women still have trouble finding a place to belong in the Australian Church. Women feel alienated from a hierarchical and patriarchal institution and immigrants still are not included in the Church. The only immigrant women expressing
satisfaction with the Church are older mass attenders. The Church still provides an ad hoc and therefore inconsistent approach to ‘welcoming the stranger’. Although peak bodies established by the Church work in advocacy on behalf of immigrants and especially refugees, the degree and type of welcome issued at the parish level is still entirely at the discretion of the parish priest. The particular case of immigrants still receives scant attention in seminaries and priests may or may not choose to learn a language other than English. It is little wonder that immigrant groups sponsor ‘de facto national parishes’ themselves, such is the little welcome they may receive in their geographical parish.

The data available through the NCLS provides an opportunity to test the validity of such critique. Taking into consideration the variations that occur from parish to parish, immigrant group to immigrant group and migrant chaplain to migrant chaplain, do immigrants feel excluded or do they feel a sense of belonging to the Catholic Church? Does this sense of belonging vary with age, gender and length of time in Australia?
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY

AIMS AND PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

This study looks specifically at the experiences of immigrants in Australia who have identified themselves as belonging to the Catholic Church. The study is both quantitative and qualitative in nature. In particular, the study tries to ascertain:

- The extent to which people feel a sense of belonging to the Catholic Church
- The different ways immigrants have experienced that belonging.

The study combines both a quantitative component that uses the National Church Life Survey of 2001 (Appendix I) and the Catholic Church Life Survey of 1996 and a qualitative component that was conducted with a small group of Vietnamese immigrant Catholics from one particular parish. The purpose of using both types of data analysis was to obtain both the ‘big picture’ of the experience of immigrant Catholics and the in-depth view of the experience of one small group. The two perspectives together provide a more complete understanding of the immigrant experience of belonging to the Australian Catholic Church.

The significance of the quantitative study is that it accesses the lived experiences of immigrants in the Church, rather than the Church's own assessment of its provision of care. The evidence provided is on a large scale, rather than anecdotal, and provides an overall picture of the relationship between the Church and immigrants. Using the data, this study will shed light on the effectiveness of the practices and policies of the Australian Catholic Church's pastoral care of immigrants in the past, and perhaps inform those policies and practices in the future. Since language serves as a barrier to Australian culture and to the Australian church culture, responses from English speaking respondents will at times be considered separately from those in other languages, but at times responses from the two groups will also be compared. The responses of the children of immigrants will also be considered, as the experiences of the second generation may reasonably be expected to differ from those of the first generation (Chong, 1998). The significance of the smaller qualitative study is that it will provide information about the nature and extent of the experienced belonging of this particular group in this particular parish with all the individual characteristics of these immigrants and this small ‘slice’ of the Church. A more detailed picture is thus obtained about this one group of immigrants and their relationship to the Church.
The combination of the large quantitative study and the smaller qualitative study provides the possibility of the ‘best of both worlds’. Although in this research the quantitative study forms the larger part of the work, the qualitative study provides further interpretation and clarification of quantitative results in the case of Vietnamese Catholics. Variable categories in this particular case may be ‘fleshed out’, and an in-depth study of a small yet interesting subgroup is obtained.

Through analysis of NCLS 2001 and to lesser extent CCLS 1996, the data will provide knowledge of the extent of the sense of belonging to the Australian Catholic Church, as recorded by immigrants in comparison to their Australian-born counterparts. The wide range of variables available through this survey material will enable this sense of belonging to be related to such aspects of immigrants’ faith life as their level and type of involvement in the parish. In this way, the nature of belonging as experienced by immigrants, and in comparison with their Australian-born counterparts, can be quantitatively assessed. The qualitative analysis provides further insights into the nature and extent of belonging, as experienced by a small group of Vietnamese immigrants who belong to one particular parish. The consistency of their life experiences and their faith experiences gives a shared subjective reality out of which a closer examination of the factors, which influence their belonging, can be scrutinised.

Although some immigrants who are part of this study may have arrived prior to World War II, the context of the study is the society and Catholic culture they have experienced since World War II. This study of the immigrant experience of belonging to the Church will be compared with the extent and nature of belonging experienced by Australian-born Catholics.

**QUESTIONS POSED BY THE STUDY**

The research questions then are:

1. What is the extent of the sense of belonging to the Australian Catholic Church experienced by immigrants compared to Australian born respondents?

2. In what ways is this belonging experienced by immigrant Catholics compared to their Australian born counterparts? Specifically, belonging is compared through examining four aspects of the nature of belonging:
   - Participation in parish life
   - Evaluation of faith life
   - Frequency of engagement in faith activities
   - Beliefs
3. How does the experience of belonging vary between the children of immigrants and the children of Australian born parents?
4. How does the experience of belonging vary between different ethnic groups?

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

LEARNINGS FROM THE LITERATURE
One’s identity is disrupted in the process of migration and settlement. Since ‘Identity is about belonging, about what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others’ (Weeks, 1990, p.88) and identity is disrupted in the process of migration, belonging becomes a major task for the immigrant. Belonging to the Church is one source of identity that the Catholic immigrant brings with him or herself when he or she migrates to Australia – hence it is to be expected that immigrants would seek and find comfort in belonging to the Church.

However, belonging to the Church in Australia is not a simple and straightforward process. The Church is part of Australian culture and thus influenced by it. Australia’s attitude to migrants has evolved since major waves of migration after World War II. Australia wanted to boost its population but expected immigrants to assimilate to the Australian way of life, as demonstrated by seeking out first of all British migrants then those who looked British. The Australian Church also wanted immigrants to ‘fit in’ to the Australian Church, as demonstrated by its deliberate policy of not founding any ethnic parishes (parishes that would accommodate the immigrants’ culture as well as their religion). In the early to mid-1970’s both the Australian cultural attitude to immigrants and the Church’s relationship with them changed. In the wider Australian society there was broader acceptance of immigrants maintaining their culture and this was enshrined in the multicultural policies of government. The Church underwent the changes of the Second Vatican Council and grew to understand itself to be on a spiritual journey analogous to the physical one of the immigrant. Whether or not these changes affected the extent and nature of belonging of immigrants is a consideration of this research.

Gender also effects belonging to the Church. Women may be expected to carry on traditional roles of maintaining family and ensuring that their cultural heritage is passed onto their children. They may also find themselves working outside the home and being impacted upon by the cultural mores of the host country. Women who are Catholic immigrants are also impacted upon by the culture of their church, which traditionally has supported women’s roles as wives and mothers. Studies of women’s roles in different churches have revealed that women predominantly play a traditional role in their community but immigrant women may also be empowered through connections with other women in their religious community. If women
immigrant Catholics are expected to assume the traditional roles supported by their home culture and by the Church, there may be differences between men and women in the extent and nature of belonging.

The experience of the children of immigrants is quite different to that of their parents. These children 'straddle different worlds' (Zhou, 1999, p.1) as they walk in and between the culture of their home and their host country. While these children may fulfil the dreams of their parents by achieving educational and vocational goals, traditional roles may be expected in the home. One of these traditional roles is to be a member of the faith tradition of the family and whether or not this is achieved will be tested in this thesis.

Finally, the nature of belonging to the Church is a topic for this research. The literature indicates that this belonging is multi-faceted. Belonging to the Church means belonging to a community with shared values and beliefs. It means belonging to the shared story and history of the Church. It means belonging through involvement, such as mass attendance and other institutional involvement. This research will examine the different ways in which immigrants belong and compare them with the ways that Australian-born Catholics belong.

METHODS

QUANTITATIVE METHODS
Quantitative analysis essentially relies on counting. The aim of quantitative research is best understood as to arrive at a shared knowledge of a group. Its aim is to minimise subjectivity, and to arrive at conclusions that are reliable and valid because they come from counting responses of large numbers of people to questions of interest. The outcome in quantitative research is to arrive at conclusions that are both coherent to those outside the research and are independent of the researcher (Babbie, 1998). Quantitative analysis rests on the assumptions that there is orderliness and regularity to all phenomena that can be discerned (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1987, p.30) and that there is a shared reality among the relevant individuals that can be discerned and described (Reynolds, 1971, Nachmias & Nachmias, 1987).

Quantitative analysis enables variables to be isolated and defined, and provides ready answers to questions of size and degree of variance among responses. Degrees of impartiality and objectivity are assumed because records of observation are distanced from the survey design and the research. In the surveys available for this research this has been the case since the formulation of the surveys, their execution and the subsequent entering of data were all completed independently of this study. Therefore the quantitative analysis of the National
Church Life Survey 2001 and the Catholic Church Life Survey 1996 provides the possibility of reliable outcomes. The volume of responses and the method of collecting and entering data ensure that the shared subjective reality of the whole group (attender Catholics) and the shared subjective reality of the sub-group (immigrant attender Catholics) may be comprehensively known. Quantitative data analysis yields results that are countable. Both NCLS 2001 and CCLS 1996 were designed to be analysed quantitatively. Since the volume of the available data is so large, it naturally lends itself to this type of analysis. Therefore, quantitative analysis of the large amount of data available through NCLS 2001 and CCLS 1996 is the main tool of data analysis being used for this study.

The quantitative study includes many more representative home cultures than can be investigated thoroughly here. In response to the birthplace question on NCLS 2001 and CCLS 1996, some 28 options were available for respondents to name their birthplace. There are too many home cultures named in the survey to be able to study each of them in detail in this thesis and some home cultures have too few representatives in the survey to be able to draw valid conclusions about them. Further research could consider the individual characteristics of different immigrant Catholic groups more thoroughly than is possible in this study. At times in this study it will be necessary to group immigrants across several countries of origin.

National Church Life Survey Research is a joint project of the Uniting Church NSW Board of Mission, ANGLICARE Diocese of Sydney and the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference. The 2001 survey was conducted in May of that year and it surveyed 435,000 attenders in over 7,000 churches incorporating 19 denominations. The survey covered 80 per cent of all churchgoers, and was constructed so as to include a statistically representative sample of rural and urban parishes. The survey was not distributed in a way that reflected the distribution of immigrant Catholics through the population (see Chapter 5, Introduction). The core survey was completed by 85 per cent of churchgoers and there were 23 other surveys evenly distributed through the other 15 per cent of churchgoers. Catholics completed the A-C survey, A-C standing for “Attender Catholics”. In 2001, 255 Catholic parishes took part in the A-C survey, representing more than 80,000 Catholic respondents. In 2001 equivalent surveys in Italian and Vietnamese were also completed. Some 2,197 surveys were completed in Italian and 1,496 surveys were completed in Vietnamese. Of the other types of surveys distributed, a survey asking specific questions about attitudes towards migration and immigrants was used.

The Catholic Church Life Survey 1996 was commissioned by the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference and was conducted in association with the National Church Life Survey of that year, commissioned by the Uniting Church and Anglican Church. It was conducted in
November 1996 and it surveyed 101,000 attenders in 286 parishes. The survey covered 80 per cent of all churchgoers, and was constructed so as to include a statistically representative sample of rural and urban parishes throughout Australia. The core survey was completed by 67 per cent of churchgoers and there were 33 per cent of Catholics who completed other surveys randomly distributed. In 1996, equivalent surveys in Italian, Vietnamese, Croatian, Polish and Spanish were also completed. Some 2,019 surveys were completed in Italian, 974 surveys in Vietnamese, 134 in Croatian, 473 in Polish and 100 in Spanish. Of the other types of surveys distributed, a survey asking specific questions about attitudes towards migration and immigrants.

The nature of the questions in both surveys was similar and the questions were grouped by NCLS in four dimensions of Church life: ‘Faith and Worship’, ‘Our Life Together’, ‘Community Connections’ and ‘Vision and Purpose’. These dimensions were further classified into 12 core qualities that tend to be present in congregations and parishes that are effective and healthy. One of the three core qualities that came under ‘Our Life Together’ was ‘Growth in belonging and involvement’ and it is these questions that form the basis for this research. The questions predominantly that were used in this research were those that were indicators of the extent and nature of belonging according to the literature. Hence the specific question: ‘Do you have a strong sense of belonging in this parish?’ was necessarily included as respondents’ report of their sense of belonging. Chi-squared tests were performed to determine whether gender or birthplace were variables that influenced respondents’ sense of belonging. Other questions were grouped into four categories for analysis: participation in parish activities, perceptions of faith life, religious engagement and orthodoxy of beliefs. These groups of questions incorporated the nature of belonging to the Church as described in the literature. These four categories were compared between groups of Catholics born in Australia or elsewhere. A new variable was also created using the responses to these questions by these groups and it was called ‘Identity’ since belonging and identity are intertwined. A three-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed using Gender, Age and Birthplace as the independent variables and Identity as the dependent variable to see if any of the independent variables had a ‘main effect’ and to explore the possibility of an ‘interaction effect’, that is to see whether any of the independent variables act together to effect Identity.
QUALITATIVE METHODS
The purpose of qualitative research is to produce descriptive data in the participant's own words, actions and/or observable behaviour. Qualitative research therefore seeks to describe the human experience in terms of the subject's own frame of reference (Holosko, 2001). Qualitative research can be described as 'systematic investigations that include inductive, in-depth, non-quantitative studies of individuals, groups, organizations, or communities' (Barker, 1999, p.393). Qualitative research is defined by contrast to quantitative research: 'Qualitative research is any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at primarily by means of statistical procedures and other methods of quantification' (National Health and Medical Research Council, 2004, p.12). Qualitative research aims to select 'information-rich cases relevant to the research question' (NH&MRC, 2004, p.14). It can be described as the 'fleshing out of variable categories' through a 'more detailed exploration of a small, but interesting sub-group' (Bryman, 1988, p.26). Much of this type of research is conducted through interviews of various kinds. Interviews may be structured, semi-structured, unstructured, key informant interviews, and oral history, which is based on both structured and semi-structured interviews, and each reflects a different degree of participation of the interviewee. The type of interview conducted for this research was structured, with consideration given to unanticipated directions of the interviews. The interviews with the small group of Vietnamese immigrants were conducted to provide further interpretation and clarification of the findings from the quantitative data. This qualitative research will thus 'flesh out' some aspects of the quantitative work. It will also indicate some of the breadth of experience of individual immigrant communities, and individuals within communities, pointing to possible future directions for research in this field.

The limitations of the qualitative study concern the scale of it. It would not be reasonable to extend the findings of such a small and particular piece of research to being applicable to any of the larger groups to which this particular group belongs. Drawing conclusions about 'all refugees', 'all Vietnamese immigrants', 'all immigrants', 'all women immigrants' or even 'the Church' would be beyond the scope of this part of the study. Such small-scale studies would have to be repeated with other groups of immigrants in other parish situations to obtain validity. Nevertheless, some insights that can be further pursued in future research may be gathered in this study.

A series of structured interviews were conducted with 32 Vietnamese immigrants who belong to one particular parish. The study of this particular group had the same purpose as the larger quantitative study, which is to ascertain the nature and extent of belonging as experienced by church attenders in relation to their particular parish. The group of 32 was
identified by the parish priest as representative of Vietnamese parishioners who were active in the parish, either in the community or the parish school, or both. Their names and addresses were obtained through the parish records and initial contact was made to seek their assistance. University Ethics Committee approval was obtained (Appendix III), and the Vietnamese immigrants were interviewed using a fairly structured interview method. Vietnamese is their first language and nearly all those interviewed were women. The interview schedule was translated initially into Vietnamese, and checked for equivalence both before and after the interviews were conducted. A female translator was employed to work with the researcher. Both were present for all interviews, some of which were conducted entirely in Vietnamese, some entirely in English and most in a mixture of both languages. Responses were recorded on the interview schedule. Participants were given a letter explaining the purposes of the interviews (Appendix V) and they signed a consent form (Appendix VI). After being introduced at Sunday Vietnamese Eucharist, and having made initial contact with potential participants by phone, the researcher and translator were welcomed into the homes of participants where the interviews took place. The interviews each took about 45 minutes and some participants offered stories that were outside the actual interview schedule. For example, many chose to tell their story of how they came to be in Australia. After the interviews were completed, responses were collated. To assure the anonymity of respondents, neither the parish to which they belong or the interviewees are named in this thesis. The full Interview schedule is included in Appendix IV, and responses and the collated material are stored securely at the University as required by the Ethics Committee.

Overall, the group consisted of younger female immigrants who had arrived in Australia after 1980 as refugees. They therefore make up quite a specific sub-group of the immigrant Catholic population. Interviewees were asked introductory questions about their birth date and place, educational qualifications and income. These questions were the same as those asked through NCLS 2001 and they were asked to determine the socio-economic and family circumstances of this small group, with the intention of being able to compare it with NCLS 2001 respondents. Other questions were asked specifically about the interviewees' views on their life in Australia. These questions asked for comparisons to be made between their life here and their life in Vietnam. The last set of questions asked respondents to comment on their spiritual life in their parish. These questions were asked in order to ascertain the nature of belonging experienced by these respondents.
THE COMBINED APPROACH

Some analysts (Cain and Finch, 1981, Purvis and Taylorson, 1983, Bryman, 1988, Brannen, 1992) suggest that the quantitative and qualitative modes of research go hand-in-hand to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the research question(s). Quantitative research surveys the field and qualitative research mines the field (Brannen, 1992). Combining both methods enables the researcher to study the subject from a macro-level (quantitative) and a micro-level (qualitative) (Cain and Finch, 1981). Both types of inquiry inform each other, whether by questioning or confirming outcomes. De Vaus (1985) describes the relationship between the two methods by saying that quantitative research has the capacity to count enough observations to enable the researcher to arrive at a theory. The theory can then be further tested through further qualitative observations. He, like others (Brannen, 1992, Glasner and Moreno, 1989) advocate for including both methods of research whenever possible, as they can inform and enlighten each other.

There is a particular advantage in using both quantitative and qualitative methods in this research. In the case of the quantitative research, surveys in other languages were used, enabling statistical analysis of people born in countries other than Australia and the smaller sub-group of people whose first language is not English. Statistical comparisons can thus readily be made between different groups of Catholics. Use of surveys in other languages in NCLS 2001 and CCLS 1996 was a deliberate strategy to include the immigrant population within parishes and this strategy could be made good use of in this research.

The qualitative research was undertaken with one of the groups of immigrants whose first language is not English – the Vietnamese Catholics. Surveys in Vietnamese were used in both 2001 and 1996 surveys and the possibility of the small group of Vietnamese Catholics in one particular parish being able to enliven and enrich the quantitative research was too opportune to be ignored. Hence the combination of methods was deliberately chosen and employed. The outcomes of the research would begin with the measurable analysis of the large numbers of immigrant Catholics and finish with the insights available from one particular group of such immigrant Catholics.
CHAPTER 5
IMMIGRANTS WHO BELONG TO THE AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

INTRODUCTION

This section describes the immigrant Catholics who contributed to the National Church Life Survey of 2001 and the Catholic Church Life Survey of 1996. In 2001, the data were collected through a national sample of 255 parishes and in 1996 the data were collected in a similar national sample of 281 parishes. The nature of sampling did not include any particular attempt to target particular parishes where immigrants may have attended Sunday Eucharist in their own language. Immigrant Catholics responded through surveys in English and in some cases other languages.

Surveys in languages other than English were distributed across the Catholic population as requested by individual parishes. This distribution method of surveys in languages other than English was haphazard and reliant on parish requests, meaning that in some parishes that offer mass in other languages surveys in those languages were not distributed. Presumably such parishes attract immigrants who prefer to attend mass in their own language, and therefore the distribution method prevented an even greater representation of immigrants. Analysis of four major dioceses – Adelaide, Brisbane, Melbourne and Sydney – showed that parishes with regular masses in languages other than English were most commonly not included in NCLS 2001 or CCLS 1996. In 2001, when surveys were available in Italian and Vietnamese, of twenty-nine parishes in the four dioceses that offered mass in Vietnamese regularly, only six of these parishes were represented in NCLS 2001. Of ninety-six parishes in the four dioceses that offered mass regularly in Italian, only fourteen such parishes were represented in NCLS 2001. There was a similar representation of parishes that offered mass in a language other than English in CCLS 1996. Of the twenty-nine parishes in the four dioceses that offered mass in Vietnamese, three only were represented in CCLS 1996. Of the ninety-six parishes that offered mass in Italian regularly, only twelve were included in CCLS 1996. Of the thirty-three parishes that offered mass regularly in Polish in the four dioceses, only three were included in CCLS 1996. Of the twelve parishes that offered mass regularly in Croatian, only one was represented in CCLS 1996. Of the twelve parishes that offered mass regularly in Spanish in the four dioceses, none were represented in NCLS 1996.
This analysis indicates that a much greater representation of immigrants who could have responded in their own language could have been obtained by purposely selecting more parishes in both 2001 and 1996 where there was a regular mass in a language other than English. Credit must be given to those parishes who distributed surveys in other languages. It was clear from the data that several multicultural parishes distributed surveys in more than one language, and this would have required a dedication to inclusiveness on the part of the parish leadership team. It is due to such effort that many surveys in languages other than English were able to be completed.

The first question for this research was therefore whether the nature of sampling provided a fair representation of immigrant Catholics compared with the Catholic population that is represented in Australia generally. Australian Census figures were therefore compared with NCLS 2001 and CCLS 1996. The following table gives the percentages of Catholics by birthplace for both NCLS 2001 and CCLS 1996:

### Table 5.1: Birthplaces of Catholics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>2001 Census % of All Catholics</th>
<th>2001 NCLS % of All Catholics</th>
<th>1996 Census % of All Catholics</th>
<th>1996 CCLS % of All Catholics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia (including Croatia)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia, Eastern Europe, Baltic States</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europe</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table gives some comparisons between those who report themselves as Catholic through the Census, and those who completed Surveys in 1996 and 2001. Compiling the table required some grouping together of countries of birth. In particular, the category ‘Other Asia’ includes people born in Hong Kong, China, India, Sri Lanka, Northern Asia, South East Asia and Southern Asia because Asian countries were categorised in two different ways on the Census and on the NCLS and CCLS surveys. The only consistently named Asian countries on both were Vietnam and the Philippines. Some discrepancies may have occurred because of slight variations in the naming of other countries. ‘United Kingdom’ on the Census was ‘Britain’ on NCLS and CCLS. ‘Russia, other Eastern European and the Baltic States’ on the Census was ‘USSR’ on NCLS and CCLS. ‘Former Yugoslavia (including Croatia)’ on the Census became simply ‘Croatia’ on NCLS and CCLS. ‘Mauritius’ was included in the Census, but was not included in NCLS and CCLS, and therefore is included in the table under ‘Other’. Lastly, all the Australian-born categories on NCLS and CCLS were collapsed, where those surveys had distinguished between Australian-born of Australian parents, or one or other or both parents being born overseas. NCLS and CCLS also distinguished between Australian-born of Aboriginal or Torres Island heritage, but the Census asked this question separately. Therefore the category Australian-born includes people of Aboriginal or Torres Island heritage. The percentages in each column also do not add up to 100 per cent because of missing values on the Census, and on NCLS and CCLS.

CCLS and NCLS measure church attendance in 1996 and 2001 respectively. The differences in percentage representation from different countries in attendance are indicative of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asia</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East/North Africa</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central/Sth. America</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total born elsewhere</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the ‘hit and miss’ nature of including immigrants in CCLS and NCLS, caused by reliance on individual pastors seeking surveys in languages other than English. There are variations from the Census percentages for some countries of origin that can only be attributed to this way of nature of sampling. An example of such a variation occurs for people born in North America. In the 2001 Census there were .3 per cent of Catholics who were born there, yet of all Catholic respondents to NCLS, there were 2.6 per cent who were born in North America. On the other hand, despite the nature of sampling, percentages of Catholics from some countries were almost the same for the Census, NCLS and CCLS. Italy, Germany and Lebanon are three examples of such countries. The overall percentages for people born somewhere other than Australia indicated that they are actually over-represented in NCLS and CCLS. These people comprise 22.1 per cent of the Australian Catholic population according to the 2001 Census, yet they comprise 29.5 per cent of respondents to NCLS 2001. Since the nature of sampling for NCLS did not especially seek out parishes or even particular masses where immigrants were likely to be present, this may indicate that a greater percentage of overseas-born Catholics actually attend Sunday Eucharist than the percentage of Australian-born Catholics that do so. While the nature of sampling makes analysis of some individual countries of origin, especially those with small numbers represented in NCLS difficult, comparisons can easily be made between Australian-born respondents and all those born overseas. As Italian-born Catholics, under-represented in NCLS, and Vietnamese-born Catholics, over-represented in NCLS, had the opportunity to complete surveys in their own language, a separate analysis of their responses is possible.

OTHER LANGUAGE SURVEYS

The second question was whether the immigrants who responded to NCLS 2001 and CCLS 1996 were truly representative of the general cohort of immigrants from their country, or did the nature of the data collection mean that only specific groups of immigrants from each country were included. In order to answer this question the profile of the members of each immigrant group who responded to the surveys needs to be compared to that of the group as a whole. A comparison of such profiles also serves to highlight the differences between immigrant groups, underlining the difficulty of trying to describe ‘the immigrant condition’ in general.

The other language surveys that were used in 1996 were Polish, Croatian, Spanish, Italian and Vietnamese. The two largest groups of immigrants that responded using surveys other than English were the Italian language respondents and the Vietnamese language
respondents. These two language surveys were also used in both 2001 and 1996 and hence provided a large amount of data to be analysed. The Polish, Croatian and Spanish surveys used in 1996 yielded a small number of responses and analysis of these three groups individually was not possible. A description of these three different language groups begins this section. With each language group is presented a brief history of their immigration to Australia and their representation in CCLS 1996. A description of the Italian and Vietnamese language respondents completes this section.

POLISH LANGUAGE RESPONDENTS

Polish migration has a long history, having begun when the country was divided between Russia and Austria in 1795 denying Poles civil liberties and forcing many to flee. A group of fifty arrived in Australia after the defeat of the Hungarian uprising of 1848-49, many of whom joined the Catholic Polish centre established at Sevenhill in South Australia by an Austrian Jesuit Fr. Aloysius Kranewitter. Polish priest Fr. Leo Rogalski came to serve the community which had its own church and school but there was little continuing migration as Australia was so far away and its immigration policy favoured British migration (Kaluski, 1985).

Australia and Poland were allies in World War II during which took the lives of two million non-Jewish Polish civilians and about three million Polish Jews. Three million ethnic Poles, sent to forced labour camps during the war, were freed by Allied Forces and a further 250,000 escaped to Germany in 1945 before the Red Army ‘liberated’ the eastern provinces. Many of these people, who could not and did not want to return a homeland under Communist control, were attracted by the prospect of resettling in Australia. Polish ex-servicemen, the veterans of the Tobruk siege and Polish pilots who had survived the Battle of Britain, began to arrive in 1947, followed by refugees from camps in India and British East Africa as well as some Poles from Great Britain (Jamrozik, 2001). The third and the largest group, 60,000 Displaced Persons from the refugee camps in British, American and French occupation zones of Germany and Russia came to Australia in the years 1949-51. Ten thousand of these were not of Polish ethnic origin - mostly Ukrainians and Byelorussians, but including 1,500 Polish-born Germans and several thousand Polish Jews. The second wave of Polish migration to Australia occurred between 1957 and 1966, after the relaxation of harsh Polish emigration policies. This wave saw 14,000 Poles arrive to marry or join other family members. Political unrest associated with the ‘Solidarity’ movement brought a further 12,000 immigrants between
However the predominance of post-war migrants in the Polish community has rendered it relatively homogeneous in terms of age and experience.

While 95 percent of Poles are Catholics, only two-thirds of the people of Polish origin claim affiliation with the Catholic Church. In CCLS 1996 473 people responded to the Polish language survey, 145 of whom were men and 292 of whom were women. As Figure 5.1 shows, the Polish-speaking respondents had an average age of 56.3 years with the largest concentrated in the 70-79 age group. Most had arrived in Australia before 1960, with further analysis showing that more Polish-speaking immigrants had arrived between 1941 and 1950 than in any other decade.

From this analysis it is clear that the nature of sampling conducted in 1996 yielded a Polish-speaking sample that was typical of Polish immigrants to Australia.

CROATIAN LANGUAGE RESPONDENTS

Chain migration was the major form of Croatian immigration to Australia, with most motivated to leave their homes because of dissatisfaction with Austro-Hungarian rule. The first Croatians arrived in Australia between 1850 and 1860, some to search for gold and others to become fruit growers. They settled around Parkes, Dubbo and Broken Hill in New South Wales and around Shepparton, Ballarat and Mildura in Victoria. The period after the Second World War saw the
largest immigration of Croatians. The first phase, which lasted until the 1960s, brought Displaced Persons who had been members of the defeated military forces. The second wave began during the 1960s when Tito opened the borders, allowing temporary workers to leave, mostly to Germany (Paris, 2001). Many of these temporary workers became permanent migrants, increasing the Croatian population in Australia from some 50,000 to nearly 144,000 in between 1961 and 1970. This wave of immigration, which peaked in 1970-71 when more than 53,000 migrants from former Yugoslavia arrived in Australia, was the largest from that country. The major push factor was the influence of communism, and in particular the problems non-party members experienced in gaining employment. This particularly impacted on Croatians, more than ninety percent of whom were members of the Catholic Church, which was opposed in principle to communism. According to Peisker (1999) the other major push factor for rural Croatians was an economic one. An unsuccessful attempt at market reform in 1965 created unemployment and redirected some of the rural population abroad. The Croatians who arrived at this time were part of the European migration welcomed by Australia at a time of economic boom. Most arrived at Bonegilla, in Victoria and then found work as manual labourers.

In his analysis, Peisker combines members of the first and second wave migrant group as ‘typical working class’ (1999, p.354), the only difference being whether they were city or country dwellers originally. The Croatians who came from villages and small towns were somewhat isolated from communism, not only geographically, but by their lack of education. In these circumstances, Catholicism had developed in Croatia as a central element of ‘Croatianness’, in opposition to neighbouring orthodox Serbs. Religion represents a major point of difference between these two groups and therefore took on a place of primary importance for Croatian rural immigrants of the 1960s and 1970s. Peisker argues that for these rural immigrants, Catholicism was a more essential ingredient of their ethnic identity than for city immigrants, and remains so. Peisker states that for both groups their Catholicism is more important to them than for other groups of Croatian immigrants since their faith tradition formed such a large part of their home identity.

The third phase of Croatian immigration occurred during the 1980s, and consisted mostly of family reunion migration. Serbia’s wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina from 1991 onwards brought about a fourth phase (Drapac, 2001).

The people who came in these last two waves represent immigrants of a quite different nature. Whether they came for employment or as refugees they were more likely to be urban dwellers, with a reasonable command of English, and little attachment to the Catholic Church. The changing politics of their homeland and the inconsistent categorisation of Croatians on the
Australian census, where they are contained within the general category of Yugoslavian or even Southern Europeans, have both made it difficult to say who exactly is ‘Croatian’. Although exact numbers are uncertain the Croatian first and second-generation population in Australia is estimated to be around 200,000. Victoria provides a home for thirty-seven percent of all Croatian immigrants, concentrated largely in the western suburbs of Melbourne with the Catholic Croatian centre being located in Clifton Hill, an inner northern suburb of Melbourne. As Figure 5.2 respondents to the 1996 CCLS were primarily drawn from the first and second waves of Croatian migration. Croatian language surveys were completed by 134 people, 47 men and 87 women, with an average age of 51.5 years.

Even though the sample of Croatian-speaking respondents was quite small it was typical of the first two waves of Croatian immigrants, who were workers often from rural areas.
SPANISH LANGUAGE RESPONDENTS

One hundred people responded to the 1996 Spanish language survey, 53 men and 47 women. Their age groups and time of arrival are illustrated in Figure 5.3:

The graph shows that Spanish-speaking respondents were younger than Polish or Croatian-speaking respondents. Their average age was 42.7 years. More of these immigrants arrived in Australia between 1981 and 1990. Further analysis of country of birth provided some insight into the nature of Spanish-speaking respondents. Nineteen were born in Chile and forty-four were born in El Salvador, making up more than half of the respondents. El Salvador was ravaged by civil war between 1980-91, and between 1978-85 more than 42,000 people were killed, most of them being civilians killed by State forces. More than 100,000 Salvadorans fled the country as refugees. For some who escaped to neighbouring Honduras, their escape provided no respite, as they were met with hostility there, and even those who escaped to the United States were initially deported back to their own country. The first major influx arrived in Australia in 1983 when a group of 75 Salvadorans arrived under the Special Humanitarian Program. In the 1980’s Australia accepted 10,000 Salvadorans under this program and under the refugee program. Salvadorans are Spanish speaking and predominantly Catholic.

Chilean migration to Australia really began after the democratically elected government of Salvador Allende was overthrown in a military coup in 1973. During the next three years in Chile individuals friendly to the Allende government or active in Popular Unity
organisations were arrested, tortured and sometimes murdered. In 1975 there were some 6,000 political prisoners in Chile and in 1976 most of them were released to enter exile. After 1973 Australia accepted political refugees from Chile until there were almost 15,000 Chileans living in Australia, compared with 90 in 1901. Today there are more than 40,000 Chileans and their children living here (Schneider, 2001).

ITALIAN LANGUAGE RESPONDENTS

Although Italian interest in Australia can be traced back to a map drawn in 1676 by Manila-based Dominican missionary, Fr. Vittorio Riccio, it was in the nineteenth century that the country became a destination for Italian emigrants. By the second half of the nineteenth century, Gianfranco Cresciani argues, emigration was endemic (2001, p.500). From the time of the early European settlement in Australia there is an Italian presence with immigrants joined by missionaries coming to minister both to aboriginal communities and to the Italians living in Australia. Between 1830 and 1850 several thousand Italian-speaking Swiss arrived in Australia and gold, adventure and escape from poverty saw more immigrants arrive particularly in Victoria in the 1850s and Western Australia in the 1890s. To meet their spiritual needs, Bishop John Bede Polding brought out four Passionist priests to Sydney in 1843. In this group that worked with aboriginal people there were three Italian priests and one French priest. In Western Australia Angelo Confalonieri, arrived in Perth also to work with aboriginal people in 1845 and at least two – Angelo Confalonieri and Nicola Caporelli – of the twenty-seven priests at the New Norcia Mission were also Italian. An Italian missionary, Elzeario Torregiani, rose to be bishop of Armidale between 1879 and 1904. It is estimated that by the beginning of the twentieth century there were already some 8,000 Italians living in Australia. They were located mainly in the countryside and employed in a range of mostly unskilled or semi-skilled occupations.

With poverty still plaguing their country Italians began to come to Australia in their thousands rather than in their hundreds. The immigrants were basically of two kinds: there was a small, mostly invisible nucleus of educated middle-class people and a much larger group of destitute illiterate or semi-literate peasants. Chain migration meant that whole families and sometimes whole villages of people migrated to particular areas of Australia. ‘They brought with them their apathy towards authority, their suspicion for the educated, their hatred of poverty’ (Cresciani, 1985, p.45). After the First World War economic hardship and political differences in Italy further increased the numbers arriving in Australia. With immigration to the United States severely restricted in 1921 and 1924, Australia became a more popular destination, attracting 23,000 Italians between 1921 and 1930. However the general disdain of
the non-British embodied in the Immigration Restriction Act tempered the welcome they received. Isolated from their homeland, and often unable to communicate because of illiteracy, they were expected to cast away memories, experiences and cultural background in order to conform to the ‘Australian way of life’. Italy between 1922 and 1940 was torn politically with fascism competing with democracy and Catholicism for the allegiance of the people, and some of these struggles were reproduced in Australia. Within the Church itself there was some support for facism, with Archbishop Daniel Mannix supporting the expansionism of Mussolini (Cresciani, 1985). Australian suspicion led to the internment of over 4,000 Italians during the Second World War, the Australian government believing that Italian support for facism made them ‘enemies’. Not all those interned were enemies of the State, since the 4,000 internees included some anti-fascist Italians and Jewish-Italians. Due to the realisation that internment had been carried out in haste and without proper screening procedures, internees were able to appeal to the Aliens Tribunal for their release as early as November 1940 and by 1944 only 177 Italians were held in internment camps.

Italy was ‘left prostrate’ in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War (Bosworth, 2001, p.505). Emigration was adopted as a national solution with nearly 55,000 Italians leaving for Australia between 1946 and 1950. Initially, the Australian government did not share their enthusiasm but in 1950 the two nations negotiated an assisted passage agreement which allowed for 20,000 Italian immigrants per year for five years. Most were initially housed at the ‘Reception and Training Centres’, former army camps refitted to accommodate Displaced Persons, the most well known of which was at Bonegilla, near Albury in New South Wales. Like the Displaced Persons, all non-British immigrants had to sign a two-year directed labour contract with the Australian government. Although the work to which they were directed was usually poorly paid and involved heavy labour, this arrangement had enabled the government to overcome shortages and provided employment on arrival. However by the time the non-British immigrants started arriving, while conditions had in the holding camps had improved, there was often up to six months wait for employment. Disillusioned Italians were in the forefront of the 1952 Bonegilla riot (Sluga, 1988), as a result of which the immigration accord was suspended for two years. Bosworth (2001) argues that the relationship between Italy and Australia was strained between 1945 and 1954 (2001, p.507) because of the way in which Italian immigrants were received. Expected to assimilate into Australian culture, they were treated with suspicion and some bigotry. Although Italian emigration to Australia resumed in 1954 it never again reached the heights of 1951-1952, falling away to a mere trickle in the 1970s, as Italy became more prosperous than Australia.
For Italians, women generally came after their husbands or as fiancés. Some came as proxy brides, but until 1960 very few Italian women came alone. On arrival, women arriving alone were often then left in ‘rural or suburban isolation’ (O’Brien, 1989, p.77) because they had left behind their major source of emotional and practical support, which was their family. Their position as mothers and child-bearers dictated the value of women in Mussolini’s Italy. To Mussolini the ideal family consisted of mother, father and twelve children. Women’s claim to citizenship lay in their status as actual or potential mothers, but men made the decisions with women not being enfranchised in Italy until 1946. O’Brien argues ‘all Italian women who came to Australia as post-war immigrants were influenced in some way’ by such views (1989, p.180).

The prevalence of proxy marriages reflects this notion of women’s roles. Proxy marriages between Italian nationals (usually women) and Italian immigrants took place in Australia in the 1950s and 1960s. They were performed when the physical absence of either the bride or groom made it necessary for a stand in or “proxy” to register consent to the marriage on behalf of the missing party. This form of marriage, which had been a part of canonical tradition and was accepted as legal by Australian authorities, was used by various immigrant groups but was most common amongst Italian-Australians. Extrapolating from the figure of eight percent proxy marriage amongst Italians settled in Western Australia, Iuliano (1999) estimates that as many as 24,000 Italian-Australians were married by proxy. Proxy marriage was more common in Australia than in either the United States or Canada. In many parts of the United States, such marriages were not legal and the Canadian government viewed the practice with suspicion, imposed some roadblocks (such as testing couple’s familiarity with each other), to deter people from using the practice to evade legitimate immigration.

There were no such impediments in Australia. The gender imbalance in the Italian-Australian community was the most obvious motivation. In 1947, almost seventy percent of the Italian-born population in Australia was male, an imbalance that had decreased only slightly by the early 1960s. Price and Zubrzycki (1962) argued that Italian men (along with Greeks) preferred to marry Italian women, but not all could afford the time or the money to return home to select a bride. For Italian women, proxy marriage offered the opportunity to escape the poverty of the home country via emigration. Both the Catholic Church and the Australian government supported the practice. To the Church the issue was both moral and religious. As early as 1939 Santamaria, himself the son of Italian immigrants and a prominent Catholic lay leader, argued that ‘The absence of women folk often leads an Italian, who would otherwise be regular in his religious practices, to abandon his faith’ (1939, p.294). Marriage too would, it was hoped, prevent illicit sexual activities. The Australian government shared the latter view.
Concerned about the ‘rampant sexual proclivities’ of Southern Italian men’ (Iuliano, 1999, p.330) the Department of Immigration commissioned anthropologist J.S. McDonald to investigate. His 1953 report, which recommended the promotion of family and female immigration from Italy, resulted in prioritising wives, fiancées and dependent children in the personal nomination scheme.

Female migration was also encouraged as part of the Australian government’s desire to build up the Australian population. Italian single men, provided with wives, would reproduce, and provide the government with the maximum value for its initial investment in the immigrant. To both Church and Government women were valued as wives and mothers, reproducers rather than producers although on arrival many would be expected to enter the workforce (Iuliano, 1999, p.332). However by encouraging proxy marriage these supporters of assimilation were, perhaps unwittingly, strengthening ethnic identity. The women often came from the same villages as their husbands, and, in Australia socialised within Italian communities, preserving a fragment of the culture they were supposed to have left behind. Within these communities women were retained in the subordinate position they had occupied in the Mussolini era. Women’s usefulness was defined in terms of her childbearing and her stabilising moral influence on men. Her position in society, whether Italian or Australian, and in the Church, was defined in relation to and by men.

Like the Australian Government, the Catholic Church’s policy towards Italian Catholics was one of assimilation. Santamaria articulated this attitude in 1939, when he said: ‘If the Italian problem is to be solved so far as the Catholic Church is concerned, our deliberate aim must be to abolish, in so far as it is possible, every distinction between the normal young Australian and the normal young Italian immigrant’ (p. 303). The best place for this process to occur, the Apostolic delegate Romolo Carboni argued in 1958, was in the Church. There were, however, some concessions in the early years. Welfare agencies like the International Catholic Migration Commission and the Catholic Migrant Loan Fund offered financial assistance. Two Italian religious orders were also prominent. The Capuchins, with a ‘version of saints and showmanship usually associated with peasant Italy’ (Bosworth, 2001) had been in Australia since 1835. In 1952, the Scalabrinians, representing a more modern and educated voice of the Italian Church, opened their first missions. However migrants were often distrustful of Italian priests who did not come from their village or region.

There were cultural differences between Australian-born and Italian-born Catholics that led to suspicion and doubt. Expectations as to attendance and financial contribution were central. Australian-born Catholics were used to regular weekly family attendance at mass and
making regular financial contributions to the Church through their geographical parish. Italian-born Catholics celebrated special occasions much more and men were irregular attenders at the Sunday Eucharist. They preferred to make their irregular, but no less generous financial contributions, often through large Church organisations rather than donating regularly to the local parish. The style of Mass in Australia was much more rigid and formal than it was in Italy, with little of the emotion that marked the celebration of significant saints’ days at home. Over time these suspicions and doubts have dissolved both because there was some degree of assimilation but also because of the Church’s embrace of multiculturalism in the wake of Vatican II. The style of worship and practice in local parishes has changed in response to the various cultures represented in the pews. However, critics (Lewins, 1978, Hally, 1980, Pittarello, 1987, Turner, 1992) have argued that words and actions are still not aligned in terms of accommodating immigrants in the Church. They would agree with Girola’s (2003) claim that the rhetoric of multiculturalism still does not match the reality found in Sunday Eucharistic celebrations, with a persistence of the divide between ‘true Australians’ on one side and ‘ethnics’ on the other.

Italian language surveys were used in both 1996 and 2001 in the Church Life Surveys. In 2001, 2,197 people responded using the Italian language survey, 546 men and 1,651 women. Figure 5.4 shows the ages of the respondents and their time of arrival in Australia.

Figure 5.4 Italian Language Respondents 2001

![Figure 5.4 Italian Language Respondents 2001](image-url)
Concentrated in the 60-69 age group, with an average age was 64.0 years, the bulk of the Italian-speaking respondents immigrants arrived here between 1951 and 1960. The Italian language survey was also used in 1996, when 2,029 people responded to the Italian language survey - there were 519 men and 1,510 women. The 1996 data, shown in Figure 5.6 confirms this conclusion with more Italian speaking respondents in the 60-69 age group than any other but with a slightly lower average age than that of the 2001 respondents of 62.7 years.
VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE RESPONDENTS
Although a few Vietnamese migrants had stayed on after coming to Australia as students under the Colombo plan, large-scale migration did not begin until 1975. Viviani (1996, p.2-3) has identified four separate waves of migration corresponding not only to events in Vietnam but to international and national factors influencing resettlement. The first wave, which came out of South Vietnam shortly after the fall of Saigon, consisted mostly of ‘ethnic Vietnamese (both Southerners and former Northerners), Catholics who expected religious repression, and some ethnic Chinese who feared the takeover of their businesses’ (Viviani, 1996, p.103). The second wave between 1976 and 1978, was more of a trickle, due to ‘the restrictive nature of Australia’s entry policies’ (1996, p.103). It consisted predominantly of ethnic Vietnamese, some from refugee camps and others fleeing the beginnings of political and economic constriction in Vietnam. The third wave, consisting almost entirely of ethnic Chinese, came after the closure of private business in Vietnam in 1978 and after the aftermath of a renewed outbreak of war in the region. The fourth wave came after 1989 and consisted of ethnic Vietnamese and Chinese who had been in refugee camps for long periods. These people were a mixture of rural and urban, workers and unemployed, small and large traders. Although mostly classified as economic refugees, some would also have met the criteria for being political refugees.

Viviani’s neat description of the waves of migration between 1975 and 1995 illuminates the differences between those who have settled here. Clearly, ‘Vietnamese refugees’ does not describe a homogeneous group. They have come from all parts of the country – north and south, city and country. They range across the spectrum of wealth and educational qualifications from the unemployed non-English speaking to the wealthy professional elite. Ethnic Vietnamese and ethnic Chinese are two distinct groupings, the latter largely engaged in business before and after leaving Vietnam. And finally, as Viviani states, there are different refugee ‘types’ represented in the total cohort. There are the ‘revolutionary activists’, the ‘passive hurt’ and the ‘eager assimilationists’ and each of these groups ‘leans into’ their new world with a different past and a different outlook. The settlement process varied between families of ‘the first wave’ for whom both the Australian government and welfare agencies were ill-equipped even language-wise to cope and ‘the fourth wave’, many of whom came via the Family Reunion program and therefore arrived to find an already established primary cultural support group.
Despite such differences, Viviani states ‘It is apparent that Vietnamese regard their family situation and their relationships with other Vietnamese as the crucial factors in their settlement’ (1984, p.258). The problems of re-settlement were many. Studies in the United States, which also accepted refugees from Vietnam, indicate that Vietnamese identified the four major issues on arrival as: not enough money, separation from family, war memories and mastery of the English language (Strand, 1989, p.115). Dunning ranked the problems in this order: maintaining ethnic identity, English language, employment and sociocultural adjustment (Haines, 1989, p.73). Lewins and Ly (1985), describing the experiences of those of the ‘first wave’, identify ‘type of job’ as ‘the most important facet of settlement because it has a profound influence on a whole range of other areas’ (Lewins and Ly, 1985, p.66). Any opportunity to attain desired employment or any employment at all, is however largely dependent on the refugee’s command of the English language: ‘the biggest single influence in determining their current jobs is being an English speaker’ (Lewins and Ly, 1985, p.69). Employment at a satisfactory level, Lewins and Ly argue, allowed the Vietnamese to realise other goals such as owning a home, giving their children a full education and, possibly, being able to effect family reunion. Viviani’s research produced similar results. ‘Command of the host society’s language and employment are the most important manifestations of settlement’ (1984, p.196). In Australia, the Social Security system provided a financial springboard which alleviated the immediate financial anxiety, and, despite an initial shortage of interpreters (Lewins and Ly, 1985, p.30), some minimal proficiency in English became achievable through government-provided classes. Proficiency in English remains problematic for many Vietnamese refugees, but access to employment, and housing has facilitated the settlement process.

Between 1975 and 2000 some 224,000 Vietnamese refugees settled in Australia. They were the beneficiaries of both a relaxation in Australia’s entry policies, and a perceived obligation to the victims of a war in which Australians had participated. The Vietnamese-Australian community, the fifth largest immigrant group in Australia, is youthful, with more than half the Vietnamese population in Australia under the age of forty. Despite its internal differences, members of the community, according to Tran My-Van (1991), share four goals: to survive in an alien land, to invest in their children’s education, to help family and friends in Vietnam and to repay Australia and Australians for their kindness.

In Vietnam the enduring effects of Confucianism ‘confined every individual to a social position within a structured hierarchy’ (Thomas, 1999, p.161). Both within the family and in society as a whole, the patriarchal model prevailed and women were subservient to men. Confucian values were codified in the four ‘virtues’ of women: working skills, demeanour,
speaking skills and behaviour, while their lives were to be governed by the three ‘submissions’: obedience to a woman’s father, then her husband and after his death, her son. Although the strength of this cultural consciousness may have varied with an individual’s particular circumstance, the three submissions and four virtues indicate very clear expectations of a woman’s place and role. However, alongside this discourse runs another one - matriarchal in nature and described in stories rather than edicts – which also is embedded in the consciousness of Vietnamese women. One such story concerns the three Trung sisters who were warriors in 40 C.E., leading the resistance against the Chinese (Taylor, 1983, p.38-39), indicating not only a woman’s ability to resist invaders, but also their importance particularly in wartime. The mythical stories in the cultural consciousness of Vietnamese women emphasise their strength in protecting those in danger – their children, their men and their country.

The existence of these two parallel histories in the collective consciousness of Vietnamese women is an indication of their complexity. Despite the gender roles assigned by Confucianism and embedded in Vietnamese women’s culture, Vietnamese women also carry within them the strength that comes from the ‘warrior’ tradition.

‘For Vietnamese the family is the centre of social existence’ (Viviani, 1984, p.174). The central importance of the family enabled Vietnamese refugees to leap some of the key hurdles in re-settlement. Despite the many ruptures that had occurred to traditionally structured families – usually three generations living in the one house – through war and fleeing their homeland in haste and danger, the family values entrenched in Vietnamese culture came with the refugees. Respect of parents by children, respect for the elderly and the spirit of living harmoniously (Nguyen Xuan Thu, 1994, p.75) are described as ‘ethical norms’ and are rooted in Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism. The strength of these cultural norms firstly enabled the establishment of new kinship ties, including members of the extended family, which provided a basis for what Kibria calls ‘household economic cooperation’ (Kibria, 1993, p.99) which she argues was only possible because of the ‘ideology of family collectivism’ (Kibria, 1993, p.99). Central to this ideology is the notion that the family is more important than the individual and the corollary is that the individual will be cared for, by, and in the family. This ideology when lived has some serious economic consequences. However, the pooling and sharing of all available resources is clearly efficient in terms of satisfying material needs, and enabled Vietnamese families to work together to overcome the most basic of human needs to be housed, clothed and fed.

Women’s role in the family was pivotal throughout the process of re-settlement, and it is in the matter of gender relationships that perhaps the most upheaval took place. ‘Within
refugee families', Rumbaut (1989) has argued, ‘the role of women emerges as a central underlying variable’ (1989, p.171). Vietnamese women moved into a range of new roles, without forsaking their traditional roles as mothers and homemakers. The need for women to have paid employment outside the home was undeniable for many refugees, and Vietnamese women proved willing to take on the most menial of jobs. Vietnamese men were often facing a quite different employment scenario in their host country. Skilled workers may have had to take a ‘lesser’ job than they had held in Vietnam, due to a lack of English skills, a lack of recognition of their qualifications or a lack of job availability. The extreme example of a man going from the only breadwinner in Vietnam to being financially dependent on women’s earnings in Australia was not an isolated one. As Kibria (1993) found in the U.S., ‘The decline of men’s earning power and, more generally, in their social status, was central to the shift in the gender balance of power that had been generated by migration’ (Kibria, 1993, p.112).

The changed economic balance of power was not the only factor in the change in women’s status. Attendance to other practical matters broadened women’s roles and led to a greater freedom for them. As a natural extension of the homemaker/mother role, Vietnamese women took on the tasks of liaising with instrumentalities directly linked to their families’ welfare. Through their dealings with such agencies as public utilities, health care providers and schools, they learnt first how to negotiate the host society’s culture. Broadening their network more quickly than men, with the added bonus of being able to connect with a range of women engaged in similar tasks. In addition the gender imbalance in the refugee community rendered women more valued in the host country than they had been in Vietnam, simply because they had become a relatively scarce commodity. According to Kibria this inequality in numbers ‘accentuated the greater fragility of male dominance and, more generally, the traditional family order’ (Kibria, 1993, p.121). In both the United States and Australia, the culture mitigated against the subordination of women. Although full gender equality has yet to be achieved, the freedoms enjoyed by women in these countries stands in stark contrast to that of women ruled by the four virtues and the three submissions noted above. The Vietnamese were unaccustomed to seeing educated women active in politics and business, or prominent in print and visual media. Even the number of women who ostensibly play the homemaker/mother role seemed brash, outspoken and confident. Coupled with the laws which make monogamy the only acceptable marriage contract, and seek to protect women from male violence even in the home, the message about gender relationships in the host country were quite clear. As women and men from Vietnam moved in the host country’s culture, some of this message was inevitably and irrevocably heard.
More than forty percent of Vietnamese in Australia are Buddhists, and twenty-two percent are Catholics. Unlike European immigrants who came from Christian countries and had seldom been subject to religious persecution, the Vietnamese came to Australia because of a real or anticipated religious oppression in their own country, in which they had been members of a minority faith tradition. In migrating to Australia Vietnamese Catholics moved out of this minority position. They arrived in Australia after changes in government and Church policy which should have meant that their Vietnamese culture and their Vietnamese Catholicity was easier to retain and be celebrated. The ramifications were visible in both the Church and in society as a whole. The presence of priests and seminarians amongst the refugees further eased the tradition and together the community established Vietnamese Catholic centres in most capital cities, providing a space in which Vietnamese Catholics can continue to practise their faith in familiar ways.

In 2001, 1,496 people responded to the Vietnamese language survey, of whom 680 were men and 816 were women. Figure 5.6 shows their age groups and time of arrival in Australia:

![Figure 5.6 Vietnamese Language. Respondents 2001](chart)

Vietnamese immigrants are both the youngest and most recently arrived of the groups studied in this thesis. Most Vietnamese language respondents arrived between 1981 and 1990 and their average age was 40.2 years. As Figure 5.8 shows this pattern is consistent with the 1996
Church Life Survey, with the average age of the 974 respondents, 455 men and 519 women, was 38.4 years:

![Figure. 5.7 Vietnamese Language Respondents 1996](image)

These descriptions show that in CCLS 1996, immigrants are represented according to the immigration pattern of their country of origin. The small numbers of other language surveys, Croatian, Polish and Spanish, particularly the Croatian and Spanish language surveys used, means that further analysis of the data from these groups of immigrants is not possible. This small sample of the data about Catholic immigrants also illustrates the difficulty of trying to portray ‘the immigrant condition’ in relation to the Australian Catholic Church. The relationship between each immigrant group and the Church, never mind each individual immigrant, cannot be fully explained when immigrant groups are merged together.

However, the number of respondents to the Italian language and Vietnamese language surveys has provided a body of data for further analysis. The analysis in this Chapter has shown the following characteristics of each group:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY TYPE AND YEAR</th>
<th>NO. RESPONDENTS (MEN)</th>
<th>NO. RESPONDENTS (WOMEN)</th>
<th>AVERAGE AGE (YEARS)</th>
<th>DECADE OF ARRIVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITALIAN LANGUAGE 2001</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>1951-1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALIAN LANGUAGE 1996</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>1951-1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE 2001</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>1981-1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE 1996</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>1981-1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROATIAN LANGUAGE 1996</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>1961-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISH LANGUAGE 1996</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>1941-1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPANISH LANGUAGE 1996</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>1981-1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6
IMMIGRANTS AND BELONGING TO THE
AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

INTRODUCTION
This chapter analyses immigrant Catholics' responses taken from NCLS 2001 using the version of the survey that was the one completed by most attender Catholics (the A-C survey, meaning attender Catholics). In the following chapter analysis has also been conducted on the surveys that were completed by Mass attenders in languages other than English in 2001. The analysis begins with some comparative descriptions of Australian-born Catholics and those born overseas, then compares the declared sense of Church belonging of both groups of Catholics. Comparison is then made between these groups using the variables measured in the NCLS that relate to the nature of belonging, using the headings participation, faith life, frequency of engagement and beliefs. Finally, the variables that individually describe the nature of belonging are statistically combined to form a single ‘belonging variable’, named as ‘Identity’. This new variable is then compared across birthplaces, age groups and gender in the NCLS sample.

More than 80,000 respondents completed the main Catholic attender survey, of whom more than fifty thousand, or nearly sixty-one percent were female. Nearly seventy percent of respondents were born in Australia and slightly more than thirty percent were born elsewhere. The analysis that follows compares the responses of those attenders born in Australia with those born elsewhere.
ANALYSIS

Figure 6.1 shows the gender, age and birthplace distribution of all respondents to the 2001 attender Catholic survey.

![Fig 6.1 Attenders 2001](image)

Figure 6.1 shows that more women than men responded to the survey. For Australian-born respondents, 56.0 percent are female compared to 60.1 percent for those born elsewhere. The percentage of women born elsewhere who responded to the survey was the highest of all four groups. This indicates that a higher percentage of women born elsewhere than anyone else attend Sunday Eucharist. This confirms the generally held perception that a greater percentage of immigrants than of Australian-born Catholics attend Sunday Eucharist. The figures suggest that on this measure immigrants ‘belong’ to the Australian Catholic Church to a greater extent than Australian-born Catholics. However, this is also the only time that there were discernable differences in the responses of women and men born elsewhere. Responses by immigrant men and women to all other survey questions were indistinguishable according to gender. It would seem that if immigrant men do belong to the Church, they belong in the same way that immigrant women do.

The majority of Australian-born men and women are over sixty, a little older than for respondents born elsewhere, the majority of whom were aged between forty and fifty-nine. This may suggest that the Australian-born membership of the Church is an aging one when compared with the immigrant Catholic population.
Set out below are family descriptions included to compare some of the demographic descriptions of Australian-born Catholics and those born elsewhere.

**FAMILY DESCRIPTIONS**

Table 6.1 shows differences in average age, the percentage of each group in their first marriage and the average number of children:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN IN AUST. (% n=60,268)</th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (% n=26,100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE AGE</strong></td>
<td>53.9 years</td>
<td>51.0 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% FIRST MARRIAGE</strong></td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO. CHILDREN</strong></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NOTE: The number of responses to individual questions varies because not all respondents answered all questions)

The table shows that attender Catholics born elsewhere are on average slightly younger than attender Catholics born in Australia. A slightly higher percentage of them are in their first marriage and they have on average slightly fewer children than attender Catholics born here.

**EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS**

Table 6.2 shows the highest educational qualifications achieved by attender Catholics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN IN AUST. (% n=60,268)</th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (% n=26,100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME SEC. SCHOOL</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED SECONDARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST SEC. SCHOOL</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that more attender Catholics born elsewhere have achieved higher qualifications than attender Catholics born in Australia, although they are also slightly over-represented in the group that had completed or partially completed primary school education. Attender Catholics born in Australia, by contrast, cluster in the groups who have completed or partially completed secondary education. The percentages in each category for Catholics born elsewhere indicate the range of educational levels that immigrants bring to this country or acquire here. The Vietnamese respondents in the interviews (see Chapter 8) were clear that they had come here to ‘make a better life’ and Table 6.2 would indicate that Catholic
immigrants who are of an eligible age have higher academic qualifications than Australian-born Catholics.

**SENSE OF BELONGING**

On the survey, there was a particular question that asked ‘Do you have a strong sense of belonging to this parish?’ Responses to this question were collated and are presented in Table 6.3. The percentages of respondents reporting a strong sense of belonging are almost identical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG SENSE OF BELONGING</th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN IN AUST. (%) n=57,382</th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=24,737</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2 shows a further breakdown by sex and by birthplace of the extent of belonging as experienced by respondents to the survey.

![Fig 6.2 Sense of Belonging Percent of each group](image)

The following hypothesis was tested: a **significant association will be found between gender and a sense of belonging**. The relevant Chi-square statistic was calculated using cross-tabulation analysis. The variables ‘gender’ and ‘sense of belonging’ (with four categories: no; yes, not as strong; yes, same and yes, strong and growing) were used (Table 6.4)
Table 6.4 Cross-Tabulation Gender and Sense of Belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSE OF BELONGING</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES, NOT AS STRONG</th>
<th>YES, SAME</th>
<th>YES, STRONG AND GROWING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=75,946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8978</td>
<td>4244</td>
<td>13012</td>
<td>19987</td>
<td>46221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>9325</td>
<td>4328.4</td>
<td>13968.1</td>
<td>18599.5</td>
<td>46221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6344</td>
<td>2868</td>
<td>9939</td>
<td>10574</td>
<td>29725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>5997</td>
<td>2783.6</td>
<td>8982.9</td>
<td>11961.5</td>
<td>29725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis is supported by the analysis, which produced a significant association between gender and sense of belonging ($X^2 [3, n=75,946] = 468.831, p<.001$). The results indicate that a higher percentage of women than men have a strong and growing sense of belonging.

The same analysis was used to test the hypothesis that there is a significant association between birthplace and belonging. The variables ‘birthplace’ (with two categories: born in Australia, born Elsewhere) and ‘sense of belonging’ (with four categories: no; yes, not as strong; yes, same and yes, strong and growing) were used. The results are shown in Table 6.5:

Table 6.5 Cross-Tabulation Birthplace and Sense of Belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSE OF BELONGING</th>
<th>OF</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES, NOT AS STRONG</th>
<th>YES, SAME</th>
<th>YES, STRONG AND GROWING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=77,889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10780</td>
<td>5465</td>
<td>17669</td>
<td>20349</td>
<td>54263</td>
<td>54263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>10931.5</td>
<td>5078</td>
<td>16354.3</td>
<td>21899.2</td>
<td>54263</td>
<td>54263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born Elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4911</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>5806</td>
<td>11085</td>
<td>23626</td>
<td>23626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>4759.5</td>
<td>2211</td>
<td>7120.7</td>
<td>9534.8</td>
<td>23626</td>
<td>23626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis is supported by the analysis, which produced a significant association between birthplace and a sense of belonging ($X^2 [3, n=77,889] = 814.280, p<.001$). The percentage of attender Catholics who were born elsewhere and had a strong and growing sense of belonging was greater than the percentage of Australian-born Catholics with this sense of belonging.
The same analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis that there is a significant association between gender, birthplace and sense of belonging. The variables ‘birthplace’ (with the categories *born in Australia, born elsewhere*) and ‘sense of belonging’ were used for two tables, one for women and one for men. The results are shown in Tables 6.6 and 6.7:

### Table 6.6 Cross-Tabulation Women and Sense of Belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSE OF BELONGING</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES, NOT AS STRONG</th>
<th>YES, SAME</th>
<th>YES, STRONG AND GROWING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women born in Australia Count</td>
<td>6203</td>
<td>3233</td>
<td>9904</td>
<td>13118</td>
<td>32458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>6304.7</td>
<td>2980.3</td>
<td>9137.5</td>
<td>14035.6</td>
<td>32458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women born elsewhere Count</td>
<td>2775</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>3108</td>
<td>6869</td>
<td>13763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>2673.3</td>
<td>1263.7</td>
<td>3874.5</td>
<td>5951.4</td>
<td>13763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant association between birthplace and sense of belonging for women ($X^2 [3, n=46,221] = 494.872, p<.001$). There were a higher percentage of women born elsewhere than women born in Australia who had a strong and growing sense of belonging.

### Table 6.7 Cross-Tabulation Men and Sense of Belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSE OF BELONGING</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES, NOT AS STRONG</th>
<th>YES, SAME</th>
<th>YES, STRONG AND GROWING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men born in Australia Count</td>
<td>4295</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>7361</td>
<td>6621</td>
<td>20386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>4347</td>
<td>1965.2</td>
<td>6810.3</td>
<td>7245.5</td>
<td>20386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men born elsewhere Count</td>
<td>2049</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>9939</td>
<td>3953</td>
<td>9357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>902.8</td>
<td>3328.5</td>
<td>3328.5</td>
<td>9357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was also a significant association between birthplace and sense of belonging for men ($X^2 [3, n=29,725] = 339.973, p<.001$). There were a higher percentage of men born elsewhere than men born in Australia who had a strong and growing sense of belonging.
Immigrant women and men, more than their Australian counterparts, belong to the Church strongly and experience this as a growing phenomenon. But it is immigrant women who experience this most of all. The majority of attenders had a strong sense of belonging, with a clear majority reporting that their sense of belonging was either the same as, or more than, it had been in the previous year. However the group with the 'strongest' sense of belonging was that made up of women born in places other than Australia. This would seem to confirm that women immigrants are using their religious tradition as the constant place where they can belong in all the transitional work of settlement. They seem also to be ‘doing the work' (Espin, 1999) of maintaining the family connection to the Catholic Church.

The analysis of the ways immigrant Catholics belong to the Church compared to their Australian-born counterparts is contained in the next sections.

**BELONGING THROUGH PARTICIPATION IN PARISH LIFE**

The literature reviewed indicated that participation and a sense of belonging or attachment to a parish are closely related. NCLS data provided items that described participation in parish life and in terms of this participation Table 6.8 shows the differences between the two groups of respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in Parish Life</th>
<th>Attender Catholics Born in Australia (%) n=60,268</th>
<th>Attender Catholics Born Elsewhere (%) n=26,100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Wider Community</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles in Parish</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Parish Groups</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Outreach Activities</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Altruistic Acts</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows some differences in the levels of participation of Attender Catholics born in Australia and those born elsewhere. Attender Catholics born in Australia are more likely to participate in the wider community and to have some role or roles in their parish than Catholics born elsewhere. They are also slightly more likely to participate in parish groups and outreach activities than those Catholics born elsewhere, but similar percentages of both groups participate in altruistic acts.
Since the belonging-participation category produced different results for Catholics born elsewhere compared to Catholics born in Australia some further analysis was conducted on this category alone. Correlation analysis was conducted using the sum of the four parish types of participation, the stated sense of belonging and the created category of ‘Catholic Identity’ (the statistical properties of this category is explained in detail on p.113). Catholic Identity is the statistical sum of the aspects of participation. The correlations are presented in Tables 6.9 and 6.10.

**Table 6.9 Correlations for Australian born Catholics between Participation and Belonging**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>STATED SENSE OF BELONGING</th>
<th>CATHOLIC IDENTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.288**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATED SENSE OF BELONGING</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHOLIC IDENTITY</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td>.434**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.10 Correlations for Catholics born elsewhere between Participation and Belonging**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>STATED SENSE OF BELONGING</th>
<th>CATHOLIC IDENTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.233*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATED SENSE OF BELONGING</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHOLIC IDENTITY</td>
<td>.491**</td>
<td>.404**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tables show the relationships between participation, the stated sense of belonging and Catholic identity. For Australian born Catholics and for Catholics born elsewhere there was a small positive correlation between participation and the stated sense of belonging (r=.288** and r=.233*). For both groups of Catholics there was a high positive correlation between participation and Catholic identity (r=.549** and r=.491**). Also for both groups there was a medium positive correlation between the stated sense of belonging and Catholic identity (r=.434** and r=.404**). This correlation indicates that belonging correlates with participation for all Catholics, but it does not indicate whether belonging is derived from participation or vice versa. This analysis confirms the quite strong connection between belonging, Catholic identity and participation. The little difference between the correlation for Australian-born Catholics and those born elsewhere may be a product of the ability of Catholics born elsewhere to participate.
in the activities described in Table 6.4. Participation in these activities depends on language and on cultural factors that invite or inhibit participation. Given that the analysis in this chapter is solely of English language surveys and the criticisms outlined in Chapter 2 of the Australian Catholic Church’s monoculture it can be surmised that it is factors other than language that inhibit the participation of Catholics born elsewhere to participate in parish activities. The lesser percentage that engages in activities in the wider community would indicate that the general cultural differences between the Australian-born and those born elsewhere inhibit that participation as well.

**BELONGING THROUGH FAITH EXPERIENCES**

Respondents were asked to evaluate their faith life through four main survey questions. Table 6.11 shows the extent to which both groups of Attender Catholics reported these experiences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.11 Perceptions of Faith Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AT LEAST SOME GROWTH IN FAITH IN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAST YEAR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTENDER CATHOLICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORN IN AUST. (%) n=60,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTENDER CATHOLICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=26,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGREE THAT SPIRITUAL NEEDS ARE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MET IN THIS PARISH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGREE THAT PREACHING HELPS IN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAILY LIFE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGREE THAT MASS USUALLY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRENGTHENS FAITH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that slightly more attender Catholics born elsewhere reported some growth in faith in the last year than those born in Australia, reporting positively on the degree to which their spiritual needs are met through the preaching they hear at mass. The difference in percentage for each of these survey questions is less than ten percent. However, in each case a greater percentage of attender Catholics born elsewhere reported positively about these faith experiences. The data in this table confirms that Catholics born elsewhere belong to their faith through faith experiences more than Australian-born Catholics in terms of their faith life.
BELONGING THROUGH DEVOTIONAL PRACTICE

Table 6.12 shows the differences in frequency of engagement in faith experiences between the two groups:

Table 6.12 Frequency of Religious Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN IN AUST. (%) n=54,908</th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=23,230</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at least twice per month</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in private devotional acts more than once a week</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently talk to own household about faith</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily talk to others about faith</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that Attender Catholics born elsewhere engage in these identified faith experiences more frequently than those born in Australia. The difference in relation to attendance at mass and ease at talking about the faith with family and others is minor compared to more than ten percent more Attender Catholics born elsewhere reported engaging in private devotional practices more than once a week. This difference may be explained by the nature of Catholicism that immigrants bring from their home country but further testing would be required to be certain. For Vietnamese immigrants, for example, a cultural religious tradition may have created a climate that encourages private devotional acts.

BELONGING THROUGH ORTHODOXY OF BELIEF

Table 6.13 shows the differences in responses to three questions that examined three ‘belief’ aspects of the respondents’ faith, and indicates the orthodoxy of that belief. They differ from the other variables in that they are not about participation.

Table 6.13 Orthodoxy of Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN IN AUST. (%) n=54,869</th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=24,042</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God is at least more important than most other things in life</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Church authority (with no difficulty)</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bible is the word of God, to be taken literally</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that a greater percentage of Attender Catholics born elsewhere holds that God is more important than most things in life or the most important reality in their lives. This result correlates well with the findings as to their greater frequency of participation in and positive evaluation of their faith experiences. If God were at least more important than most things in life to someone, it would make sense that he or she would participate frequently in faith activities and would be strengthened in his or her faith by that participation.

The other responses measure orthodoxy of belief. In both cases, a higher percentage of Attender Catholics born elsewhere hold to the most orthodox position asked by the NCLS survey. Although these two questions test orthodoxy only in relation to two specific issues, the differences that emerge may be an indication that Attender Catholics born elsewhere hold more orthodox views on a broad range of belief questions than those born in Australia.

Limited testing of the orthodoxy of beliefs was available through the Catholic Church Life Survey of 1996. There were five questions on that survey that were about belief. The difference in responses between Australian born Catholics and those born elsewhere is shown in Table 6.14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN BORN RESPONDENTS (%) n=62,731</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=18,675</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THERE IS ONE GOD, MADE UP OF FATHER, SON AND HOLY SPIRIT</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESUS WAS BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNION IS LITERALLY THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABORTION IS ALWAYS WRONG</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-MARITAL SEX IS ALWAYS WRONG</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that slightly more respondents born elsewhere hold orthodox beliefs on these matters also, indicating that their beliefs are likely to be generally more orthodox than those of Australian born respondents.

These results indicate that on three of the four measurements of belonging – participation, perceptions of faith life, frequency of religious engagement and orthodoxy of beliefs - Attender Catholics born elsewhere ‘belong more’ than do Australian-born Catholics. Only in the belonging-participation category do Australian-born Catholics ‘belong more’ than Catholics born elsewhere. Although a very similar percentage of Attender Catholics born in
Australia and those born elsewhere reported a strong sense of belonging to the Church, they experience that belonging in different ways.

IDENTITY

To construct a single scale of belonging that included responses to these different aspects, responses to the following fifteen variables from the 2001 survey were chosen:

1. Participation in the wider community
2. Roles in the parish
3. Participation in parish groups
4. Participation in outreach activities
5. Participation in altruistic acts
6. Degree of growth in faith in the last year
7. Degree to which spiritual needs are met in the parish
8. Degree to which preaching helps in everyday life
9. Degree to which mass strengthens faith
10. Frequency of attendance at mass
11. Frequency of engagement in devotional activities
12. Frequency of discussion of faith with household
13. Frequency of discussion of faith with others
14. Importance of God in one's life
15. Acceptance of church authority on beliefs

A scale using responses to these fifteen variables was then constructed. This scale was called 'Identity' since the items constitute not simply belonging but Catholic identity. For the scale Identity the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .72, which indicated that the scale has good internal consistency.

The relationship between the respondents' stated Sense of Belonging and Identity was investigated using Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient. There was a medium, positive correlation between the two variables \[ r=0.44, N=75232, p<0.0005 \], with medium levels of a Sense of Belonging associated with medium levels of Identity.

Analysis of Variance was used to compare the effects of three independent variables and the effect of the interactions between the three variables on Identity. A three-way ANOVA was conducted with Gender, Age group and Birthplace as the independent variables and Identity as the dependent variable. These analyses were conducted with age groups 15-39, 40-59 and 60+. Birthplaces were grouped into two categories: born in Australia and born
elsewhere. There was a statistically significant main effect for gender \( [F(1,75960) = 954.66, p<.05] \), however the effect size was small (eta squared = .012). Identity also differed significantly with age \( [F(2,75960) = 1156.62, p<.05, \text{ eta squared}=.030] \). Similarly, identity differed significantly with birthplace \( [F(1,75960) = 1010.28, p<.05, \text{ eta squared}=.013] \). The interaction between gender and age is significant \( [F(2,75960) = 4.53, \ p<.05, \ \text{ eta squared} = .000] \), as is the interaction between gender and birthplace \( [F(1,75960) = 8.73, p<.05, \ \text{ eta squared} = .000] \). The interaction between age and birthplace is also significant \( [F(2,75960) = 131.17, p<.05, \ \text{ eta squared} = .000] \), but the interaction between gender, age and birthplace is not significant \( [F(2,75960) = 1.97, p>.05, \ \text{ eta squared}=.0] \). Therefore, although there were both main effects and interaction effects the Eta squared value for each was very small.

The table shows the results of the three-way ANOVA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>163.710</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>163.710</td>
<td>954.66</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>396.688</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>198.34</td>
<td>1156.62</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>173.248</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173.248</td>
<td>1010.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Age</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>4.526</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Birthplace</td>
<td>1.497</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.497</td>
<td>8.731</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age*Birthplace</td>
<td>44.987</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.493</td>
<td>131.168</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Age</em>Birthplace</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>1.970</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the age group 15-39 \( (M = 2.862, \text{ S.D.} = .459) \) was significantly different from the mean score for the age group 40-59 \( (M = 2.992, \text{ S.D.} = .411) \) and from the age group 60+ \( (M = 3.112, \text{ S.D.} = .406) \). Also the mean score for the age group 40-59 was significantly different to the mean score for the age group 60+. These results indicate that Catholic identity varied with age, the group who identified most with being Catholic was the oldest. Those who identified most were over 60, followed by those in the 40-59 age group, with the 15-39 age group identifying least as Catholic. These results indicate that in terms of Catholic identity and the whole package of Church belonging, age alone is the most significant factor in determining how much one belongs, or how strongly one identifies oneself as Catholic.

In summary:

- There is a medium positive correlation between Sense of Belonging and Identity.
There were statistically main effects for gender, age and birthplace.

There were statistically main effects for the interactions between gender and age, gender and birthplace and age and birthplace.

Age alone is the most significant factor in determining how much one belongs to the Church, or how strongly one identifies oneself as being Catholic.

The analysis confirms that the Sense of Belonging correlates to participation in parish life, evaluation of faith life, frequency of engagement in faith activities and beliefs. Gender, age and birthplace also determine the extent of one’s sense of belonging with age being the greatest determinant.

**IMMIGRANTS’ CHILDREN**

Of the more than sixty thousand Australian-born respondents to the National Church Life Survey of 2001, more than 80 percent were children of parents born in Australia. Of the twenty percent of children born of immigrants, slightly more than 24 percent were born of parents who both were from an English-speaking country and 37 percent were born of parents, one of whom came from an English-speaking country. Nearly 34 percent were born of parents who both came from countries that were not English speaking. Figure 6.3 shows the birthplace of the parents of all Australian-born respondents to NCLS 2001.

![Figure 6.3 Australian-born Children of Immigrants](image)

The following section compares the experience of belonging of immigrants’ children with that of their parents, then compares the various groups of immigrants’ children by language.
FAMILY DESCRIPTIONS

Table 6.16 shows differences in average age, the percentage of each group in their first marriage and the average number of children.

Table 6.16 Age and Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=26,100</th>
<th>CHILDREN OF ATTENER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=11,983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE AGE</td>
<td>51.0 years</td>
<td>45.4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FIRST MARRIAGE</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. CHILDREN</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, the average age of the children of immigrants is less than that of immigrants themselves, but the average age of the children indicates that many of them are adults.

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Table 6.17 shows the highest educational qualifications achieved by immigrants and their children.

Table 6.17 Highest Educational Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=26,100</th>
<th>CHILDREN OF ATTENER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=11,983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME SEC. SCHOOL</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED SEC. SCHOOL</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST SEC. SCHOOL</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that a greater percentage of immigrants’ children have been educated beyond primary school yet fewer of them have post-secondary school qualifications compared with their parents.

SENSE OF BELONGING

On the 2001 survey, there was a particular question that asked ‘Do you have a strong sense of belonging to this parish?’ Responses to this question are presented in Table 6.18:

Table 6.18 Sense of Belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A-C CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=26,100</th>
<th>CHILDREN OF A-C CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=11,983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONG SENSE OF BELONGING</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows little variation between immigrants and their children in their reported sense of belonging.

**BELONGING THROUGH PARTICIPATION IN PARISH LIFE**

Table 6.19 shows the differences in participation between the two groups:

**Table 6.19 Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Area</th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=26,100</th>
<th>CHILDREN OF ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=11,983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN WIDER COMMUNITY ROLES IN PARISH</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN PARISH GROUPS</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN OUTREACH ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN ALTRUISTIC ACTS</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that children of immigrants participate slightly more than their parents in roles in their parish and parish groups, but the difference in levels of participation is still quite small when compared with the level of participation of Australian-born Catholics (Table 6.8)

**BELONGING THROUGH FAITH EXPERIENCES**

Table 6.20 shows the extent to which both groups of Attender Catholics reported on their faith experiences:

**Table 6.20 Perceptions of Faith Life**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Area</th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=26,100</th>
<th>CHILDREN OF ATTENDER CATHOLICS BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=11,983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT LEAST SOME GROWTH IN FAITH IN LAST YEAR</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT SPIRITUAL NEEDS ARE MET IN THIS PARISH</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT PREACHING HELPS IN DAILY LIFE</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT MASS USUALLY STRENGTHENS FAITH</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that children of immigrants reported less satisfaction with their faith life than their parents.
BELONGING THROUGH DEVOTIONAL PRACTICE

Table 6.21 shows the differences in frequency of engagement in faith experiences between the two groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.21 Frequency of Religious Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTENDANCE AT LEAST TWICE PER MONTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.2 (catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.2 (children of catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGE IN PRIVATE DEVOTIONAL ACTS MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.5 (catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.4 (children of catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENTLY TALK TO HOUSEHOLD ABOUT FAITH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0 (catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4 (children of catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASILY TALK TO OTHERS ABOUT FAITH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.8 (catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.2 (children of catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that children of immigrants engage less frequently in devotional practices than their parents, especially in attendance at church, a difference of 10 percent.

BELONGING THROUGH ORTHODOXY OF BELIEF

Table 6.22 shows the differences in responses to the three questions that examined belief.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.22 Orthodoxy of Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOD IS AT LEAST MORE IMPORTANT THAN MOST OTHER THINGS IN LIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.9 (catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.5 (children of catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIEF IN CHURCH AUTHORITY (WITH NO DIFFICULTY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.8 (catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.6 (children of catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE BIBLE IS THE WORD OF GOD, TO BE TAKEN LITERALLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.3 (catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2 (children of catholics born elsewhere)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the children of immigrants have substantially less orthodox beliefs than their parents, with differences of between 10 and 14 percent on the selected items. Since language and culture are both potential barriers to participation, it was then decided to group those immigrants’ children who had at least one parent who spoke English together, and compare them with children whose parents came from non-English speaking countries. These two groups of immigrants’ children were then compared with Australian born children of Australian-born parents. Table 6.23 shows some differences between the groups:
Overall the children of non-English speaking immigrants differ more in some respects than others from Australian born children of Australian-born parents and from the children of English speaking immigrants. The differences in age is the most marked with the average age of children of non-English speaking immigrants fourteen years less than that of the other two groups. The percentage of children of non-English speaking immigrants who were in their first marriage is also lower than that of the other two groups as was the average number of children. For each of the three variables, the children of English speaking immigrants are more like the children of Australian-born parents than they are like the children of non-English speaking immigrants. Table 6.24 shows the highest educational qualifications of each of the three groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.23 Age and Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF AUSTRALIAN-BORN PARENTS (%) n=48,675</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FIRST MARRIAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. CHILDREN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.24 Highest Educational Qualification

| **AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF AUSTRALIAN-BORN PARENTS (%) n=48,675** | **AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF ENG. SP. IMMIGRANTS (%) n=7,317** | **AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF NON-ENG. SP. IMMIGRANTS (%) n=4,098** |
|----------------------------|
| PRIMARY SCHOOL | 6.9 | 6.8 | 4.2 |
| SOME SEC. SCHOOL | 25.8 | 25.8 | 20.1 |
| COMPLETED SECONDARY SCHOOL | 26.5 | 27.0 | 28.3 |
| POST SEC. SCHOOL | 19.6 | 19.8 | 22.8 |
| DEGREE | 20.2 | 20.5 | 24.6 |

The pattern of Table 6.23 is repeated here. The children of English speaking immigrants are more like the children of Australian-born parents than they are like the children of non-English speaking immigrants. The children of non-English speaking immigrants have achieved a slightly higher level of education than the children in the other two groups with nearly half
having some form of post-secondary school qualification, whereas the percentage for the other
two groups is closer to forty.
In terms of belonging to the Church, there is also some variation between the three groups, as
shown in Table 6.25:

### Table 6.25 Sense of Belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF AUSTRALIAN-BORN PARENTS (%) n=48,675</th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF ENG. SP. IMMIGRANTS (%) n=7,317</th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF NON-ENG. SP. IMMIGRANTS (%) n=4,098</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONG SENSE OF BELONGING</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the children of non-English speaking immigrants are more like the children of English-
speaking immigrants, and both groups are different to the children of Australian-born parents.
Unlike their parents, however, a higher percentage of the children of Australian-born parents
have a strong sense of belonging than either of the other two groups.
Just as in other analyses of belonging, the relevant variables from 2001 were then examined.
Participation in various activities was compared, and that comparison is shown in Table 6.26:

### Table 6.26 Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF AUSTRALIAN-BORN PARENTS (%) n=48,675</th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF ENG. SP. IMMIGRANTS (%) n=7,317</th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF NON-ENG. SP. IMMIGRANTS (%) n=4,098</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN WIDER COMMUNITY</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLES IN PARISH</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN PARISH GROUPS</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN OUTREACH ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN ALTRUISTIC ACTS</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of participation the children of English-speaking immigrants are like the children of
Australian-born parents and both of these groups differed from the children of non-English
speaking immigrants. The percentage of children in the first two groups that participated in the
wider community and in outreach activities is almost double the percentage of children of non-
English speaking immigrants who participated in this way. The percentage of children in the
first two groups who had some role in their parish is about ten percent more than the percentage of children of non-English speaking immigrants who participated in this way. The only category of participation for which all three groups had almost identical percentages of participation was in participating in altruistic acts. In summary, children of non-English speaking immigrants actually participated in parish and community life to a lesser extent than both children of Australian-born parents and children of English-speaking immigrants. Although their command of English may be assumed to be greater than that of their parents, their level of participation was actually more like that of their non-English speaking parents than that of other English-speaking respondents to the A-C survey. This may suggest that factors other than English influence the participation level of these second-generation immigrants but the data available from the survey do not allow such factors to be identified.

In terms of their spiritual growth and life, the three groups are compared in Table 6.27:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF AUSTRALIAN PARENTS (%)</th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF ENG. SP. IMMIGRANTS (%)</th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF NON-ENG. SP. IMMIGRANTS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT LEAST SOME GROWTH IN FAITH IN LAST YEAR</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT SPIRITUAL NEEDS ARE MET IN THIS PARISH</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT PREACHING HELPS IN DAILY LIFE</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT MASS USUALLY STRENGTHENS FAITH</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows very little difference between the three groups across all four factors. As could reasonably be expected from all those who are attenders, all three groups had more than seventy percent of each cohort who reported growth in faith in the last year and that their spiritual needs are met in their parish. The slightly lower percentage of children of non-English speaking immigrants who reported that their spiritual needs were met is difficult to explain without further information. More than seventy percent of each group reported that the preaching they heard helped in their daily life, and that mass usually strengthened their faith. Again, such results could have been reasonably expected from those who attend Church.
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Frequency of engagement in devotional activities and in talking about matters of faith were compared and the results of this comparison are shown in Table 6.28:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF AUSTRALIAN PARENTS (%)</th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF ENG. SP. IMMIGRANTS (%)</th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF NON-ENG. SP. IMMIGRANTS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTENDANCE AT LEAST TWICE PER MONTH</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENTLY ENGAGE IN PRIVATE DEVOTIONAL ACTS</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENTLY TALK TO HOUSEHOLD ABOUT FAITH</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASILY TALK TO OTHERS ABOUT FAITH</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that there was little difference between the three groups in their frequency of engagement at all levels. A slightly lower percentage of the children of non-English speaking immigrants attended mass at least twice per month and a slightly lower percentage of that group frequently engaged in private devotional acts. In this matter, children of immigrants are similar to children of Australian born respondents and dissimilar to their parents. There was a similar percentage of all three groups that frequently talked to their household about faith, and a similar percentage of all three groups that easily talked to others about faith.

The last three variables to be examined in this section are considered here because they refer to three ‘belief’ aspects of respondents’ faith, and indicate the orthodoxy of belief that they had. The responses are shown in Table 6.29:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.29 Orthodoxy of Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRALIAN-BORN CHILDREN OF AUSTRALIAN PARENTS (%)</strong> (n=48,675)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOD IS AT LEAST MORE IMPORTANT THAN MOST OTHER THINGS IN LIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIEF IN CHURCH AUTHORITY (WITH NO DIFFICULTY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE BIBLE IS THE WORD OF GOD, TO BE TAKEN LITERALLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, there is little difference between the three groups. In the matter of orthodoxy of belief, children of non-English speaking immigrants are very like the children of Australian-born parents and the children of English-speaking immigrants. A slightly lower percentage of them declared that God is at least more important than most other things in life and a slightly higher percentage declared no difficulty with their belief in the authority of the Church in matters of doctrine and morals. A slightly higher percentage of this group also declared that the bible is the word of God, to be taken literally. Overall, the percentage of each group holding the three orthodox beliefs was similar.

In summary, the children of non-English speaking immigrants were similar in many respects to both the children of Australian-born parents and the children of English-speaking immigrants. On average, they were slightly younger than the other two groups and had slightly fewer children. A greater percentage of them were better educated than those of the other two groups. A slightly lower percentage of them than the children of Australian-born parents had a strong sense of belonging. The percentage of children of non-English speaking immigrants who had a strong sense of belonging was almost identical to the percentage of English-speaking immigrants who also had a strong sense of belonging.

The major differences between the children of non-English speaking immigrants and the other two groups was in participation. These children participated in their communities, in parish roles and in parish outreach activities to a far lesser degree than children of Australian-born parents and children of English-speaking immigrants. In all other aspects of belonging, considered as separate variables, children of non-English speaking immigrants are similar to the other two groups.
SUMMARY

The research questions stated in chapter one were:

1. What is the extent of the sense of belonging to the Australian Catholic Church experienced by immigrants compared to Australian-born Catholics?
2. In what ways is this belonging experienced by immigrant Catholics when compared to their Australian-born counterparts?
3. How does the experience of belonging vary between immigrants, their children and children of Australian-born Catholics?
4. How does the experience of belonging to the Church vary between different ethnic groups, particularly between Italian and Vietnamese immigrants?

The analysis in Chapter 6 has provided answers to the first three research questions. Considering only the numbers of Catholic respondents to NCLS 2001, the percentage of women born elsewhere was higher than the percentage of men born elsewhere and women and men born in Australia. This alone indicates that women born elsewhere are the group most engaged in doing the work of belonging to the Church in Australia. Further examination of the four groups – men born in Australia, women born in Australia, men born elsewhere and women born elsewhere – shows that immigrant men and women, more than their Australian-born counterparts, belong to the Church strongly and experience this as a growing phenomenon. But it is immigrant women who experience this most of all.

Immigrant Catholics have a similar sense of belonging to Australian-born Catholics, but that sense of belonging is experienced in different ways. Immigrant Catholics participate in parish life to a lesser extent than Australian-born Catholics and this participation correlates with a sense of belonging and with Catholic identity. On all other criteria of belonging tested in the analysis, immigrant Catholics ‘belong more’ than their Australian-born counterparts. A greater percentage of immigrant Catholics reported positively about their faith experiences, a greater percentage engaged more frequently in devotional practices and a greater percentage held more orthodox beliefs than their Australian-born counterparts. When the scale ‘Identity’ was created from the belonging variables, and then tested for the effects of gender, birthplace and age it was found that age alone was the most significant factor in determining how much one belongs to the Church.

In terms of the extent and nature of belonging immigrants’ children differ from their parents. They have a similarly strong sense of belonging and children born of English-speaking immigrants participate in parish life to a similar extent as Australian born respondents. Children of non-English speaking respondents participate at a similar level as their parents,
which is less than for Australian born respondents. In terms of their faith life, children of non-English speaking immigrants reported less satisfaction than any other group and their frequency of engagement in devotional acts and their orthodoxy of belief was also much less than for their parents. Despite the strong sense of belonging reported by the children of immigrants, the measures of belonging indicate this group experiences the most tenuous attachment to the Catholic Church.

In conclusion, immigrant Catholic attenders ‘belong more’ to the Australian Catholic Church than Australian-born Catholics. However, their children do not have a great experience of belonging to the Church, although their reported sense of belonging is only slightly less than that of Australian-born children of Australian-born parents. The analysis in Chapter 7 will focus on surveys in other languages in order to answer the fourth research question.
CHAPTER 7
RESPONDENTS IN LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH

INTRODUCTION
NCLS 2001 provided surveys in only two languages other than English – Italian and Vietnamese. This chapter largely draws on data available from the Italian and Vietnamese language surveys from NCLS 2001, with occasional reference to CCLS 1996 surveys in cases where the responses have provided additional information pertinent to the thesis' central issue of belonging.

The analysis in this chapter extends the descriptions of Italian and Vietnamese migration offered in Chapter 5. In 2001 there were 2,029 respondents to the Italian version of the main survey, 519 were men and 1,510 were women. In the same year there were 1,496 Vietnamese-language respondents, 680 were men and 816 were women. There were nearly three times as many women respondents who used the Italian language survey but the proportion of men and women who used the Vietnamese language survey was much closer, with women outnumbering men by only 10 per cent. This shows that on the day of the survey there were more women than men at Church, supporting the past finding (Ebaugh and Chafetz, 2002, Kim, 1996, Manville, 1997) that it is women more than men who maintain the religious culture in the process of migration and settlement. The percentages of women compared to men in the Italian and Vietnamese language surveys vary greatly between the two languages. Seventy-five per cent of Italian language respondents were women whereas 55 per cent of Vietnamese language respondents were women.

As in Chapter 6, the analyses provided here show differences and similarities not only between Australian-born Catholics and those born elsewhere, but also between different groups of Catholics born elsewhere.
ANALYSIS

Figure 7.1 shows the contrast between Italian and Vietnamese respondents in terms of age and time of arrival:

Almost all of the Italian language respondents arrived in Australia before 1970, whereas almost all the Vietnamese language respondents arrived after 1970. The Italian language respondents are also older, with the majority of them being older than 60 years of age, and the Vietnamese language respondents are almost all younger than 60 years of age. The stark contrast between the two groups of immigrant respondents raises questions about whether there are equally stark differences in their experiences of belonging to the Church. This question is answered through the analysis.

FAMILY DESCRIPTIONS

The data allow the extent and nature of belonging as experienced by these immigrant Catholics to be compared to that of Australian-born Catholics. This analysis begins with some comparative descriptions of Australian-born Catholics and those who responded in Italian and Vietnamese, then compares the declared sense of belonging of the three groups of Catholics. The pattern of this analysis is similar to that provided in Chapter 6.
Table 7.1 provides some initial background information concerning these three groups of respondents:

Table 7.1 Age and Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS (%) n=83,737</th>
<th>ITALIAN LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=2,207</th>
<th>VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=1,496</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE AGE</td>
<td>53.1 years</td>
<td>65.5 years</td>
<td>40.2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FIRST MARRIAGE</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. CHILDREN</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the differences in age with Vietnamese language respondents the youngest group and Italian language respondents as the oldest group. Both other language groups have a higher percentage in their first marriage than Attender Catholics. The fact that both other language groups have a greater tendency to be in their first marriage may be explained by cultural factors. Perhaps immigrant Catholics place a higher value on family and staying together or they may have stronger marriage bonds through the immigration experience. From the data, it is impossible to say why there is such a marked difference between Attender Catholics and the two immigrant groups on this variable, merely to observe that such a difference exists and that it presents a fruitful field for further research.

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Table 7.2 shows the highest educational qualifications achieved by each of the three groups of Catholics:

Table 7.2 Highest Educational Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS (%) n=83,554</th>
<th>ITALIAN LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=2,207</th>
<th>VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=1,496</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME SEC. SCHOOL</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED SECONDARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST SEC. SCHOOL</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most striking feature of this data is the preponderance of Italian-language respondents with a primary school education as their highest qualification. At the other end of the educational
scale, less than two percent of Italian Catholics had a degree as their highest qualification, compared with more than 11 percent of Vietnamese Catholics and nearly 20 percent of Attender Catholics. These data reflects the socio-economic status of Italians who migrated to Australia. They left Italy post World War II because of poverty and came to Australia where their lack of education restricted them to working as unskilled or semi-skilled labourers. What the data do not show is the degree to which this group continues to be impoverished as they enter old age. The qualitative research with the Vietnamese immigrants provided further insights into their reported standard of living, but no such data are available regarding the Italian language respondents.

**SENSE OF BELONGING**

The question that provides an initial context for the description of Italian Catholics and their relationship to the Australian Catholic Church is the one of belonging. In response to the question: ‘Do you have a strong sense of belonging to your parish?’ the resultant data provided the results shown in Table 7.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG SENSE OF BELONGING</th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS (%) n=77,889</th>
<th>ITALIAN LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=2,207</th>
<th>VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=1496</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONG SENSE OF BELONGING</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that Italian speaking Catholics had a very strong sense of belonging to the Church, exceeding that of Attender Catholics, which in turn was greater than that of Vietnamese language Catholics. Given the longer period of time they have been in the country, Italian-speaking Catholics could be expected to belong more strongly to the Church than Vietnamese-speaking Catholics, although in many cases they have been here since post 1975. This does not explain the lower percentage of feeling a sense of belonging of Attender Catholics, the majority of whom have been members of the Australian Church all their lives.
BELONGING THROUGH PARTICIPATION IN PARISH LIFE

Table 7.4 shows responses to questions about participation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Attender Catholics (%)</th>
<th>Italian Language Catholics (%) n=2,207</th>
<th>Vietnamese Language Catholics (%) n=1,496</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Wider Community</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles in Parish</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Parish Groups</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Outreach Activities</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Altruistic Acts</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that Italian language respondents participate in the wider community and in altruistic acts less than Attender Catholics, but participate more in their parish community. On the other hand Vietnamese language respondents participate considerably less than the other two groups in the wider community and in roles in the parish. It could be surmised that language provides something of a barrier to this type of participation, yet the same argument should apply to Italian language respondents. This suggests that there are other barriers to these types of participation for Vietnamese language respondents. Another possible reason for the greater participation of Italian language respondents is that they have assimilated more to the Australian Church since they have been in Australia for a longer period of time.
BELONGING THROUGH FAITH EXPERIENCES

Table 7.5 shows responses to the four main survey questions which asked respondents to describe their experiences of their faith life:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS (%) n=86,368</th>
<th>ITALIAN LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=2,207</th>
<th>VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=1,496</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT LEAST SOME GROWTH IN FAITH IN LAST YEAR</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT SPIRITUAL NEEDS ARE MET IN THIS PARISH</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT PREACHING HELPS IN DAILY LIFE</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT MASS USUALLY STRENGTHENS FAITH</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that for three of the four questions, Italian language respondents are much more like Vietnamese language respondents than Attender Catholics. The major difference in response was to the self-assessment of growth in faith in the last year. Only slightly more than 61 percent of Italian language respondents reported some growth in faith in the last year, compared with nearly 89 percent of Attender Catholics and more than 90 percent of Vietnamese language respondents. Perhaps this lower figure for the Italian language respondents is a reflection of age. It may be that older Catholics in general reach some kind of ‘plateau’ of faith, and there is a stage where growth in faith is no longer felt to be a necessary goal. Yet the responses to the other three questions suggest otherwise, since both Vietnamese and Italian language respondents answered similarly and, as has been shown, their average ages are quite different.

Nearly 90 percent of Italian language respondents agreed that their spiritual needs are met in their parish, which is similar to the nearly 92 percent of Vietnamese language respondents who reported the same. For Attender Catholics, nearly 82 percent of them reported that their spiritual needs were met in their parish.

Similarly, the percentage of Italian language respondents who reported that the preaching in their parish helps in everyday life is similar to the percentage of Vietnamese language respondents who reported the same. For Attender Catholics, the percentage that reported this was more than ten percent less than for both other language groups.
The same pattern of difference between responses for the three groups was repeated for the last faith experience question. Both other language groups had a higher percentage than Attender Catholics in their response to whether or not mass usually strengthens their faith. From the table overall, it can be concluded that the faith experiences of all Attender Catholics are extremely important to them. The percentage in each group that agreed that their spiritual needs were being met, that agreed that the preaching they hear helps in daily life and that agree that Mass strengthens their faith are very high for each group, as would be hoped for those who attend. Yet, in each case, the percentages are higher for the other language respondents than for Attender Catholics.

This suggests that Italian and Vietnamese language respondents are more satisfied with their faith life than Attender respondents all together. This was also the case for respondents born elsewhere when compared with their Australian–born counterparts (Chapter 6, Table 6.11), suggesting that irrespective of language, respondents born elsewhere are generally more satisfied with their faith life.

**BELONGING THROUGH DEVOTIONAL PRACTICE**

Respondents were asked to describe their devotional practices quantitatively through the four questions that registered the frequency of their engagement in devotional activities and also the frequency and ease with which they talked to other people about their faith. Responses to these questions are given in Table 7.6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.6 Frequency of Religious Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTENDANCE AT LEAST TWICE PER MONTH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-C CATHOLICS (%) n=86,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALIAN LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=2,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=1,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGAGE IN PRIVATE DEVOTIONAL ACTS MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FREQUENTLY TALK TO HOUSEHOLD ABOUT FAITH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EASILY TALK TO OTHERS ABOUT FAITH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that more Vietnamese language respondents attend mass at least twice per month than Attender and Italian language Catholics. The percentage of each group that participated in private devotional acts was similar, but a much higher percentage of Vietnamese
language talk to their household about their faith. It could be presumed that this is because they are younger and, therefore, more likely to have young children with whom they engage in the process of educating them in their faith. However, a much lower percentage of them talk to others easily about their faith, but since many more Italian language respondents talk about their faith to others, it can be presumed again that factors other than language prevent this from happening.

**BELONGING THROUGH ORTHODOXY OF BELIEF**

The three questions discussed in this section refer to three ‘belief’ aspects of respondents’ faith, and indicate the orthodoxy of belief that they had. They are different from the other variables already considered here in that they are not about participation, although they are still about the subjective opinions of respondents to the survey. The responses are shown in Table 7.7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief in God</th>
<th>Attender Catholics (%)</th>
<th>Italian Language Catholics (%)</th>
<th>Vietnamese Language Catholics (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God is at least more important than most other things in life</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Church authority (with no difficulty)</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bible is the Word of God, to be taken literally</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A higher percentage of both Italian and Vietnamese language than Attender respondents indicated that God is at least more important than most other things in life. A higher percentage of both groups also had no difficulty in believing in Church authority. A higher percentage of the Italian language respondents believed the Bible is literally the word of God, but the percentage of Vietnamese language respondents who believed that was similar to that of Attender Catholics. This indicates that both groups are generally more orthodox in their beliefs than Attender Catholics. These differences invited additional analysis.
In the Catholic Church Life Survey of 1996 there were five questions that gave some indication of orthodoxy of belief and the responses to these are shown in Table 7.8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Attender Catholics 1996 (%)</th>
<th>Italian Language Catholics (%)</th>
<th>Vietnamese Language Catholics (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THERE IS ONE GOD, MADE UP OF FATHER, SON, AND HOLY SPIRIT</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESUS WAS BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNION IS LITERALLY THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABORTION IS ALWAYS WRONG</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-MARITAL SEX IS ALWAYS WRONG</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that Italian and Vietnamese language respondents are both more orthodox than Attender Catholics in nearly all their beliefs. A far greater percentage of Vietnamese language respondents than Italian language respondents and Attender Catholics believe that there is one God, made up of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. A lower percentage of Attender Catholics than other language respondents believe that Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary and that abortion is always wrong. A much higher percentage of Vietnamese language respondents believe that pre-marital sex is always wrong. This confirms the differences found between Attender respondents born in Australia and those born elsewhere. Catholics who were born elsewhere generally hold more orthodox beliefs than Catholics born here.

Considering the nature of belonging for Italian and Vietnamese language respondents when compared with Attender Catholics in the four categories of participation in parish life, evaluation of faith life, frequency of engagement and beliefs produces some interesting observations.

Overall, participation in all the named aspects is less for Vietnamese language respondents than Italian language respondents and for Attender Catholics. The overall participation for Italian language respondents is also less than that of Attender Catholics. This matches the result for participation when Attender Catholics born in Australia were compared with Attender Catholics born elsewhere. Without this matching, it may be thought that
participation is hindered by language, but the fact that English-speaking respondents born elsewhere also participate less than Italian and Vietnamese language respondents would suggest that other barriers may prevent immigrants participating in aspects of parish life, although the other language respondents have strong levels of participation. Some of these barriers may be accounted for by the cultural differences between the ‘Irish-Australian’ Church and the culture of the Churches from where immigrants have come as indicated by critics of the Church in Chapter 2. Surveys in other languages provided some questions that also may provide some knowledge about other barriers immigrants experience to their participation. Analysis of these questions is included in the latter sections of this chapter.

The nature of belonging in terms of respondents’ faith life indicated that Italian and Vietnamese language respondents had higher percentages that agreed that their spiritual needs were being met, that agreed that the preaching they hear helps in daily life and that agree that mass strengthens their faith than for Attender Catholics. Overall Italian and Vietnamese language respondents ‘scored higher’ than Attender Catholics in the faith life aspect of belonging.

Similar results occurred for belonging through frequency of engagement in faith activities. Italian and Vietnamese language respondents ‘scored higher’ than Attender Catholics in this aspect of belonging.

It was in the orthodoxy of beliefs aspect of the nature of belonging that the starkest contrast between Italian and Vietnamese language respondents and Attender Catholics was found. Overall, the other language respondents have much more orthodox beliefs than Attender Catholics and therefore ‘score higher’ on this nature of belonging.

By the addition of responses to the questions about the nature of belonging, it would seem that Italian and Vietnamese language respondents ‘belong more’ than Attender Catholics. Further analysis is possible through statistically combining the individual elements of the nature of belonging and compared with the respondents’ stated Sense of Belonging, then analyse these data according to birthplace, gender, age and time of arrival.
IDENTITY

To construct a single scale of belonging that included responses to these different aspects, responses to the following fifteen variables from the 2001 and 1996 surveys in languages other than English were chosen:

16. Participation in the wider community
17. Roles in the parish
18. Participation in parish groups
19. Participation in outreach activities
20. Participation in altruistic acts
21. Degree of growth in faith in the last year
22. Degree to which spiritual needs are met in the parish
23. Degree to which preaching helps in everyday life
24. Degree to which mass strengthens faith
25. Frequency of attendance at mass
26. Frequency of engagement in devotional activities
27. Frequency of discussion of faith with household
28. Frequency of discussion of faith with others
29. Importance of God in one’s life
30. Acceptance of church authority on beliefs

A scale using responses to these fifteen variables was then constructed. This scale was called ‘Identity’ since the items constitute not simply belonging but Catholic identity. The relationship between the respondents’ stated Sense of Belonging and Identity was investigated using Spearman’s rank order correlation coefficient. There was a small, positive correlation between the two variables \( r = .26, N=7945, p<.0005 \), with low levels of a Sense of Belonging associated with low levels of Identity.

For those people who responded using a survey in a language other than English, there was a question that to provide information about the date of their arrival in Australia. A four-way ANOVA was conducted using Gender, Age group, Birthplace and Time of arrival as the independent variables and their score on the Identity scale as the dependent variable. Time of arrival was divided into six categories: prior to 1951, 1951-1960, 1961-1970, 1971-1980, 1981-1990 and 1991-2000. There was no significant effect for gender \( F(1,9139) = .391, p>.05 \), but there was for birthplace \( F(2,9139) = 6.792, p< .05 \), and the effect size was small (eta squared = .001). There was a significant effect for age \( F(2,9139) = 10.093, p<.05 \), and
again the effect size was small (eta squared = .002). There was no significant effect for time of
arrival \[F(5,9139) = 1.917, p>.05\]. There was no significant effect for the interaction between
gender and birthplace \[F(2,9139) = 2.840, p>.05\], nor for the interaction between gender and
age group \[F(2,9139) = .511, p>.05\]. Similarly for the interaction between gender and time of
arrival \[F(5,1.411) = .217, p>.05\], the interaction between birthplace and age group \[F(4,9139)
= 1.525, p>.05\], the interaction between birthplace and time of arrival \[F(10,9139) = 1.109,
p>.05\] and the interaction between age and time of arrival \[F(10,9139) = 1.436, p>.05\]. This
result was repeated for the interactions between gender, birthplace and age \[F(4,9139) = 1.279,
p>.05\], gender, birthplace and time of arrival \[F(8,9139) = 1.721, p>.05\], gender, age
and time of arrival \[F(10,9139) = 1.259, p>.05\] and birthplace, age and time of arrival
\[F(15,9139) = 1.274, p>.05\]. Finally, there was no significant effect determined for the
interaction of gender, birthplace, age and time of arrival \[F(12,9139) = 1.359, p>.05\].
Table 7.9 shows the results of the ANOVA.

Table 7.9 Identity: All Other Language Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>5.568</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.784</td>
<td>6.792</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>8.273</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.136</td>
<td>10.093</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of arrival</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>1.917</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Birthplace</td>
<td>2.328</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Age group</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Time of arrival</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace*Age group</td>
<td>2.501</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace*Time of arrival</td>
<td>4.544</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group*Time of arrival</td>
<td>5.885</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Birthplace</em>Age group</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Birthplace</em>Time of arrival</td>
<td>5.641</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Age group</em>Time of arrival</td>
<td>5.159</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace<em>Age group</em>Time of arrival</td>
<td>7.835</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>1.274</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score on birthplace for those born in Italy ($M = 3.308$, $S.D. = .668$) was significantly different from those born in Vietnam ($M = 3.186$, $S.D. = .571$) and from those born elsewhere ($M = 3.496$, $S.D. = .691$). The mean score for those born in Vietnam also was significantly different from those born elsewhere. The same test indicated that the mean score for those in the 15-39 age group ($M = 3.135$, $S.D. = .562$) differed significantly from those in the 40-59 age group ($M = 3.328$, $S.D. = .614$) and from those in the 60+ age group ($M = 3.333$, $S.D. = .694$). The 40-59 age group did not differ significantly from the 60+ age group.


In summary:

- There was a small, positive correlation between respondents’ stated Sense of Belonging and Identity.
- There was a significant small effect for birthplace and age but no significant effect for gender or time of arrival.
- There were no other significant effects for interactions between birthplace, age, gender and time of arrival.

Again, the analysis suggests that the longer an immigrant has been in Australia and the older he or she is are the major determinants of the sense of Catholic Identity.
ANALYSIS BY DIFFERENT LANGUAGES USED AT MASS

Analysis particularly of the Vietnamese language surveys suggested that language may make a difference to the degree and type of belonging that Catholics who completed surveys in languages other than English may have experienced. Analysis by the language used at mass was then conducted of both the Vietnamese and Italian language surveys of NCLS 2001 in order to determine whether attendance at mass in their own language made a difference to belonging. The survey questions on belonging that provided differences of more than ten percent are listed below in Table 7.10:

Table 7.10 Participation Variables by language used at Mass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles in Parish</th>
<th>Usual Mass in Vietnamese (%) n=647</th>
<th>Usual Mass in English n=314</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usual Mass in Vietnamese</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual Mass in English</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Parish Groups</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Parish Groups</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Outreach Activities</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Pastoral Activities</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that for participation variables, there is considerable difference between Vietnamese Catholics who usually attend Mass in Vietnamese, and those who usually attend Mass in English. It would seem that Vietnamese Catholics who attended Mass in Vietnamese are much more able to participate in other aspects of their faith life than those whose usual Mass is in English. The provision of Mass in their own language enables Vietnamese Catholics to participate more fully in all aspects of their faith life.

Whether other parish activities in which these respondents participated are also conducted in Vietnamese cannot be ascertained. Nor can it be ascertained whether Vietnamese language respondents come from parishes that are ‘de facto national parishes’ – that is parishes where the population is largely Vietnamese and/or the priest(s) are Vietnamese. Since such parishes were not particularly targeted in the NCLS it is not possible to say whether there are other cultural factors enabling Vietnamese Catholics to belong to the Church.
Table 7.11 shows a similar result was obtained for Italian language respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Variables by language used at Mass</th>
<th>USUAL MASS IN ITALIAN (%)</th>
<th>USUAL MASS IN ENGLISH (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROLES IN PARISH</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN PARISH GROUPS</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN OUTREACH ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN PASTORAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Italian language respondents usually attend mass in Italian, they are much more able to participate in all aspects of parish life than if the mass they usually attend is in English. The experience of Italian language respondents is the same as for Vietnamese language respondents and the explanation for this similarity is also likely to be similar. These results would suggest that the decision taken by the Australian Catholic bishops not to create national parishes was to the detriment of immigrants.

**DEGREE OF WELCOME EXPERIENCED BY IMMIGRANTS**

This section deals with responses to quite specific questions asked on NCLS 2001 and CCLS 1996, about immigrants and the attitudes of Attender Catholics towards them. In 2001, survey ‘P’ was responded to by 1,021 people, representing approximately 0.8% of the Catholic respondents and their responses to questions about immigrants are given below: Survey ‘P’ was in English, and these questions were not asked on Italian or Vietnamese surveys.
Table 7.12 Association with Catholics Born Elsewhere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2001</th>
<th>PEOPLE BORN IN AUSTRALIA (%) n=628</th>
<th>PEOPLE BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=233</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APART FROM FAMILY MEMBERS, AT LEAST WEEKLY CONTACT WITH PEOPLE FROM OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT LEAST A FEW FRIENDS FROM ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS DIFFERENT TO ONE’S OWN</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT LEAST MONTHLY ASSISTING PEOPLE FROM OTHER ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS, EXCLUDING MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.12 shows that people born in countries other than Australia have more contact with people from other ethnic groups and more of them have at least a few friends from different ethnic backgrounds.

Table 7.13 Service Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF LARGER NUMBERS OF NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING PEOPLE BEGAN ATTENDING CHURCH HERE, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WOULD YOU PREFER?</th>
<th>PEOPLE BORN IN AUSTRALIA (%) n=622</th>
<th>PEOPLE BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=224</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOIN SERVICES IN ENGLISH</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOIN ENGLISH SERVICES, BUT HAVE SOME SEPARATE LANGUAGE FACILITIES</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPARATE LANGUAGE SERVICES</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALLY SEPARATE CONGREGATIONS</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.13 shows some differences in preferences between Australian-born respondents and people born in other countries. About the same percentage of both groups have the strongest preference for non-English speaking people joining services that are in English. The second highest percentage of both groups preferred non-English speaking people joining services in English, but having some separate language small groups or other activities. This means that over 70 percent of Australian-born and overseas-born Attender Catholics preferred services to be celebrated in English. Table 7.14 lists some other attitudinal responses:
Table 7.14 Cultural Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>PEOPLE BORN IN AUSTRALIA (%) n=604</th>
<th>PEOPLE BORN ELSEWHERE (%) n=606</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY COMFORTABLE OR COMFORTABLE WITH CONGREGATION OF OTHER ETHNIC BACKGROUND USING BUILDING</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT OR IMPORTANT FOR PARISH TO MINISTER ACROSS CULTURES</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFER TO BE IN CHURCH WITH PEOPLE FROM A RANGE OF ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFER TO BE IN CHURCH WITH PEOPLE FROM SIMILAR ETHNIC BACKGROUND</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that wherever Attender Catholics have been born, more than 70 percent of them are comfortable or very comfortable with congregations of other ethnic backgrounds using the building they worship in for their own services. Also, approximately 90 percent of all Attender Catholics regard it as important or very important for the parish to minister across cultures. However, just over half of Australian-born attenders prefer to be in church with people from a range of ethnic backgrounds compared with more than three-quarters of people born elsewhere. This suggests an agreement more in principle than practice with ministry across cultures and different ethnic groups using the worship space.
Table 7.15 Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrants Should Adapt to Fit in with Current Mainstream Australian Culture</th>
<th>People Born in Australia (%) n=698</th>
<th>People Born Elsewhere (%) n=269</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia Should Evolve to Accommodate Migrants so That Everyone Will Develop a Common Culture</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants Should Keep Their Own Culture so Australia is Culturally Diverse</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Are Better Off for the Diversity That Comes with Our Migrant Intake</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Must Be Careful Not to Let Too Many Migrants Into This Country</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.15 shows that there is a large percentage of all Attenders that agree that migrants should adapt to fit in with current mainstream Australian culture and that Australia should evolve to accommodate migrants so that everyone will develop a common culture. A much larger percentage of overseas-born than Australian-born attenders believed that we are better off for the diversity that comes with our migrant intake. A small percentage thought that we must be careful not to let too many migrants into this country. Together this suggests that large numbers of Attenders agree with the present multiculturalism of Australia, or with the continued evolution of an Australian culture that can accommodate people of other cultures. This affirmation of multiculturalism is reinforced by the large percentages of Australian-born and overseas-born respondents who agree that we are better off for the diversity that comes with our migrant intake, although the percentage of people born elsewhere who agree that we are better off for the diversity is more than ten percent higher than the percentage of people born in Australia.

CCLS 1996 also contained some similar questions about migrants, and also asked some of these questions in the surveys in other languages. All attenders were asked to respond to the statement: ‘Migrants from overseas receive less respect at this parish than other attenders’. Responses were made to this question by a total of 1,258 Catholics on the ‘E’ version of CCLS (the version that contained questions about migrants and refugees), and these responses were in English. The same question was also asked on all five other language
surveys. There were 2,185 responses from respondents in Croatian, Italian, Polish, Spanish and Vietnamese. The table below shows the varying responses to the question:

Table 7.16 Degree of Respect for Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY TYPE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (%)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (%)</th>
<th>NEUTRAL/UNSURE (%)</th>
<th>AGREE (%)</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'E' n=1,776</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL OTHER LANGUAGE SURVEYS n=1,639</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.16 shows considerable disparity between the two groups. Those Catholics who responded in English are certain that migrants are not less respected in their parish than other parishioners, but 42.7 percent of respondents in other languages agreed that migrants are less respected. The perception of the respondents to Survey Type ‘E’, who represent the Catholic population at large, does not match the perception of their experience of immigrants in their parish life. Further analysis of the other language surveys disaggregates their experience by cultural group. This is shown in Table 7.17:

Table 7.17 Respect of Migrants by Language Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY TYPE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (%)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (%)</th>
<th>NEUTRAL/UNSURE (%)</th>
<th>AGREE (%)</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'E' n=1,751</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALIAN n=1,007</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISH n=324</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIETNAMESE n=707</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Croatian (73) and Spanish (74) language responses are excluded because of small numbers)

The high percentage of Vietnamese speaking respondents who indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that migrants are less respected (72.4%) indicates their experiences in parish life are not of being respected. Their experience contrasts sharply with the perception of ‘E’ survey and Italian and Polish language respondents. This outcome from the survey may indicate that the actual initial experience of immigrants in the last twenty or so years has remained as alienating and as unwelcome, or even more so, as that experienced by their predecessors. More disappointingly, this outcome may indicate that the Australian
Catholic Church may have successfully become more inclusive of European cultures but not of Asian ones. This is despite changes in the rhetoric of the Church in general towards immigrants, despite the more inclusive nature of the Australian Catholic Church since the Second Vatican Council and despite Australian society becoming theoretically more multicultural in general.

Other language respondents were also asked whether their parish provided opportunities to practice their customs. Their responses are shown in Table 7.18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL OTHER LANGUAGE SURVEYS n=2,185</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE (%)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (%)</th>
<th>NEUTRAL/UNSURE (%)</th>
<th>AGREE (%)</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that 78.9 percent of other language respondents stated that their parish provides opportunities to practice customs that come from their home Church experience. This seems to affirm that parish life does offer more than assimilation to the Anglo-Irish model of the Catholic Church that critics assert was offered to immigrants immediately after the Second World War. As with the previous question, the small numbers representing some language groups means that the information gleaned from this question is quite limited. There is no way of knowing how many opportunities, and of what types, are offered. Also, a parish-by-parish analysis would reveal whether these immigrants happen to be in places where such opportunities are more likely to occur because of the cultural backgrounds of parishioners and/or of the parish priest. Nevertheless, it can be said that more immigrants than not certainly feel that they do have opportunities to practice their own customs in their parish. In this aspect of parish life, they may well feel that they are respected.
CHAPTER 8
VIETNAMESE CATHOLICS

INTRODUCTION

The qualitative research that is the subject of this chapter is presented within the context of the quantitative analysis presented in Chapters 5-8. That analysis shows that immigrants are over-represented in the NCLS compared with the 2001 census, despite the nature of sampling that excluded parishes where various ethnic groups tend to congregate. The percentage of immigrant Catholics attending Church who are women is higher than the percentage of immigrant men who attend Church and higher than the percentage of Australian-born men and women Catholics, but in the analyses there is little difference between the responses of men and women church goers. Although a similar percentage of Australian born and immigrant Catholics have a strong sense of belonging to the Church the nature of that belonging is different for the two groups. On three of the four categories of belonging immigrant Catholics ‘belong more’ to the Church than their Australian born counterparts. Only in the belonging-participation category do Australian-born Catholics belong more than those born elsewhere. When all aspects of belonging are considered together as ‘Catholic Identity’, age is the major determinant of who has the strongest identity. This is irrespective of birthplace and gender.

In contrast, the children of immigrants do not share their parents’ experience. They do not belong to the Church to the same extent as their parents or in the same way. In fact they are more like the children of Australian-born Catholics in most respects, and in fact are being ‘lost’ to the Church because they have relatively little sense of belonging.

Immigrants who responded to NCLS in their own language form a distinct group of Catholics. Quantitative analysis of their responses reinforced the results for all Catholics born elsewhere except in the matter of Identity. Immigrants who are older and have been here the longest have the strongest Catholic Identity.

Responses to specific questions about immigration from Australian-born and immigrants themselves indicated some reasons for the most recently arrived immigrants not having as strong a sense of belonging as the group who have been here the longest. Immigrants tend to participate in parish life more when they attend Mass in their own language – hence provision of Masses in other languages enables their participation. Australian-born Catholics stated that migrants are respected in their parish but the experience of immigrants is
quite different. Nearly half of them stated that migrants are not respected in their parish. Their experience of welcome contrasts with the intention of welcome of Australian born Catholics.

The present chapter provides a ‘picture’ of the small group that participated in the qualitative research. The group of 32 Vietnamese Catholics that all belong to the one parish were interviewed and they provided insights into their experience of belonging to the Church. Questions were designed to glean information that built on that provided by NCLS. These questions were translated into Vietnamese and checked by two Vietnamese people, not involved in the interviews, for cultural sensitivity. A Vietnamese interpreter from the parish was employed to be present at the interviews that were conducted in interviewees’ homes. Potential participants were contacted by phone and appointments made for interviews. Most interviews lasted for about one hour and provided clear pictures of the experience of belonging to the Church for these parishioners. Although their experience cannot be extrapolated to be descriptive of the whole immigrant experience of belonging, their responses to survey questions give a picture of the nature of their belonging and insights into what particularly enables them to belong. All these participants have chosen to participate in parish life and that differentiates them from the total cohort of immigrant Catholics. They have articulated reasons for their strong sense of belonging to their parish and attribute their participation to their parish priest, but this reason belies their own commitment to their faith. As refugee immigrants they have survived the difficult journey to come to Australia and they exhibit the same determination to foster their own faith and that of the whole parish community. This chapter highlights their commitment and that of other Vietnamese participants in the study.

VIETNAMESE PARTICIPANTS IN THE RESEARCH

Although the group who participated in the qualitative research was predominantly female, in all other respects it was similar in constitution to the Vietnamese respondents in the surveys. Thirty-two Vietnamese Catholics participated in the qualitative research; twenty-three of whom were women and nine were men. At 36.6 years their average age in 2001 was slightly less than the average for all Vietnamese respondents, with one participant being under the age of twenty-one, ten were between twenty-one and thirty, fourteen between thirty-one and forty and seven over the age of forty. Their pattern of migration was reflective of the group as a whole with twenty arriving between 1981 and 1990, and twelve arrived between 1991 and 2000. Most, although not all, were in the ‘first wave’ of emigration from Vietnam. Of the twenty-three who told their story of leaving Vietnam fifteen of them had escaped by boat and passed through
refugee camps in Malaysia, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Indonesia and Singapore, before arriving in Australia by 1985. Of the others, seven others were sponsored – three by their husbands, and four by other relatives and the last was born in Australia to parents who had escaped Vietnam in 1981.

All of the participants feel privileged to be in this country. They are enormously grateful for the opportunities provided to them and their families, and have great reservations about being in any way critical of any aspect of their lives here. Twenty-nine declared themselves very satisfied with their life here. The two that did not – they only felt fairly satisfied – had a member of their family die in the boat trip out of Vietnam which has led them to feel less than totally happy about their decision to escape. Freedom was the word most often used during these interviews. All participants agreed that there is more freedom available in Australia than in Vietnam, freedom to do what you want, freedom to say what you want, freedom to have what you need, freedom from government oppression. These freedoms contrast with their experiences in Vietnam where one woman recalled armed soldiers used to stand at the back of Church and watch the people and the proceedings – ‘spying on us even in Church’. Another man told of his family’s business and house being confiscated, with soldiers then harassing his family in their home, insisting that they had hidden jewellery and money. He also was due to be conscripted into the Army to fight in the war in Cambodia, but escaped before that could happen.

IMPORTANCE OF FAMILY
Coupled with the opportunities of freedom and relative financial security goes the promise of happiness. The only respondent who said he was less happy here was sad because of the recent death of his wife after a long illness. Of the other respondents twenty-two stated that they had more chance to be happy in Australia than in Vietnam while five said that they had the same chance to be happy here as in Vietnam. They all defined happiness in terms of family. Two of their comments were: ‘If the family is together, it doesn’t matter where you live’, and ‘Since most of my family are around me here, and the same was true in Vietnam, I have the same chance of happiness wherever I am’. Seventeen people said that ‘a good life for the family’ makes them happy. Included under this general description were things like ‘the family has all it needs’, ‘the family is together’ and ‘family life is good’. A further three people said that ‘happy’ was about opportunity, especially for the children, which is very like ‘a good life for the family’.
For one newly married couple it was hard to say whether they had more chance of happiness here or in Vietnam. They said they would have to wait and see how the future unfolds – their clear focus was on the very recent birth of their first child. When asked what they meant by happy, family emerged as the overwhelming centrepoint for the feeling of happiness. The only other source of happiness mentioned was ‘freedom’, used by eight people. This further emphasises the importance of freedom to this group of Vietnamese refugees.

Illustrating the importance of family, the focus of all 26 participants with children, were the future opportunities that Australia offered them. These participants were confident that their children would have a ‘good’ education and be able to find employment that would make them happy. Coupled with the response to happiness being about family goes the comment that ‘So long as they (the children) find a job where they are happy, that is good’.

The response to the question about people’s family relationships was more varied. Fourteen people said that their family relationships were easier in Australia than in Vietnam, four said that they were the same, and ten said that they were actually harder here than over there. Those who found family relationships much the same argued that it doesn’t matter where you live, family relationships are what they are, but for the rest the variation was associated with the presence, or lack of it, of family members here. Those who had all or most of their immediate family here, and who, as a result, were doing better in a material sense also described their family life as easier. Those who said harder were more likely to be isolated. Some had most of their family still in Vietnam, another was a recent widower, and another geographically isolated with no access to a car. One bemoaned the loss of the family closeness and loyalty inherent in Vietnamese culture. The other talked about the compromises that must be made between generations carrying old Vietnamese culture only and generations carrying a mixture of Vietnamese and Australian cultures.

Cultural differences and potential difficulties were illuminated more by responses to questions about values. Parents were worried that Vietnamese children born here showed less respect for their parents than they would have in Vietnam. Whilst they appreciated all that Australia had to offer their children, they were worried that this value would be lost to them. The question of relationships between husband and wife elicited the most animated responses from the participants. Only six of twenty households represented in this study had both husband and wife working outside the home, but even the women who stayed in the home felt empowered within the relationship. Twenty-two of the respondents said that decision-making between husband and wife was equally shared, but they did qualify this statement, saying that
this equality applied to ‘important things’. One woman was extremely pleased to report that without access to the men’s only clubs that were available in Vietnam, her husband was now prepared to change nappies and wash and dress their child. Two respondents had left abusive male partners, something that would not have been possible in Vietnam. While Vietnamese men had been slow to learn that this behaviour was unacceptable, Australian laws against husbands abusing wives, and government financial support enable women in this situation to leave.

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES
FAMILY DESCRIPTIONS
The participants in the qualitative research are a unique group, although their profile matches closely with all the Vietnamese members of their parish, as indicated in Table 8.1. Their average age is less than that of any other groups of immigrants or Australian-born Catholics in this research and a high percentage of them are in their first marriage. The difference between NCLS Vietnamese Catholics and this small group may be explained by the difference in average age. Being on average four years younger than the whole Vietnamese cohort and nearly twenty years younger than the Attender Catholics would indicate that the average length of time that they have been married is less than the average for the total group. This may explain why more of these Vietnamese people are still in their first marriage.

The average number of children was not an accurate indication of the makeup of the homes of the group members. Apart from the quite young children living in many of the homes much more complex household arrangements were apparent. Although fourteen participants were members of nuclear households, where there were two parents and an average of 2.4 children, another ten participants were members of extended family households. The remaining eight were in single or conjugal households. The extended family households had largely come about through sponsorship of siblings and parents to Australia, and resulted in some quite crowded and busy homes. One young woman had eight young children, her husband and her mother living in their three-bedroom home, with one of those allocated to her mother, and children sleeping in bunks in one room, on the lounge room floor and in the parents’ bedroom. This was not the only home where lounge rooms doubled as bedrooms. The figures giving the average number of children per family do not adequately convey the story of these multi-generational homes.
Table 8.1, which compares average age, the percentage of respondents in their first marriage and the average number of children, confirms that the members of the qualitative research group are similar to their fellow parishioners, who in turn are similar to the respondents to the NCLS who used the Vietnamese language survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS (%)</th>
<th>ALL VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%)</th>
<th>ST. ANONYMOUS’ VIETNAMESE C. (%)</th>
<th>QUALITATIVE RESEARCH GROUP (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE AGE</strong></td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% FIRST MARRIAGE</strong></td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO. CHILDREN</strong></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Socio-economic situation**

Although NCLS provided some information about the socio-economic situation of respondents, the 1996 version provided more detailed information about this aspect of respondents’ lives. Vietnamese Catholics who responded in that survey research described themselves generally as having a lower standard of living than 1996 CCLS Catholics. The percentage of all Vietnamese Catholics who described themselves as having a standard of living of much or quite below average was more than twenty percent whereas only six percent of 1996 CCLS Catholics described themselves as being in this category. The same pattern emerged in the percentages of Catholics describing their standard of living as slightly below average, with nearly sixteen percent of all Vietnamese Catholics reporting this as their standard of living compared with just over nine percent of 1996 CCLS Catholics. At the other end of the scale only two percent of all Vietnamese Catholics reported their standard of living as much or quite above average compared with twelve percent for 1996 CCLS Catholics. The conclusion from this data is to be expected. Vietnamese Catholics, being refugees and the families of refugees who have been here less than thirty years, have a standard of living that they consider less than average. Household incomes confirmed self-descriptions of standard of living. Over 70 percent of all Vietnamese Catholics and those in St. Anonymous’ parish reported their income as less than $30,000 whereas just over forty-four percent of all Catholics stated that their household income was less than $30,000. At the other end of this scale, only three percent of Vietnamese Catholics reported their income as greater than $60,000 whilst 24 percent of 1996 CCLS Catholics reported the same.
Participants in the small group research regarded their standard of living differently to other Vietnamese Catholics, with only nine percent describing their standard of living as much or quite below average and 75 percent describing their standard of living as average.

Responses to the question about educational qualifications showed that Vietnamese Catholics are overall less well educated than 1996 CCLS Catholics. Whilst nearly nineteen percent of Vietnamese Catholics had primary school as their highest qualification the figure for 1996 CCLS Catholics was only nine percent, whilst these figures are reversed in the highest category of educational qualification.

The Vietnamese translator and some Vietnamese parishioners advised that the specific question about income was ‘too invasive’ to be asked face-to-face. There was other evidence gleaned from visiting the homes of those people involved in the qualitative research. Apart from homes being crowded by accommodating members of extended families as well as children, many were also sparsely and inexpensively furnished. Some were government rental properties and in a bad state of disrepair. Household incomes were dependent on government allowances to some extent in nearly half of the households visited. Extended families particularly depended on pensions, Newstart allowances and Austudy that family members contributed. Most women in the families that were part of the qualitative study were not in paid employment outside the home, but did work at other than their home duties from home. This work was mainly looking after other people's small children or sewing. Only three respondents were engaged in employment that they called well paid. Two of these worked in information technology with multi-national companies and one was running her own business. All remaining members of the small qualitative group were employed in positions in factories or small business. All these indicators supported the self-description of these people's standard of living as average or below average.

The figure of 75 percent reporting their standard of living as average contradicts the physical evidence. There could be two reasons for this contradiction. One is the connection to the omitted ‘household income’ question. Perhaps the question about standard of living is also too invasive in the sense that it pried too much into people's private affairs and therefore they answered with the ‘safe’ mid-range response. The other possible reason is the relativity of the concept of 'standard of living'. Perhaps compared with conditions left behind in Vietnam, these people do experience a much better standard of living in Australia, even though in Australian terms that may not be the case. The very term 'standard of living' after all does not necessarily exclusively refer to financial ease of living, and for the Vietnamese refugees it probably has a much broader meaning than that.
1996 CCLS provided some specific information that enables a comparison between the socio-economic situation of all Catholics and Vietnamese Catholics. Respondents were asked to describe their standard of living on a five-point scale ranging from ‘quite a bit below average’ to ‘quite a bit above average’. They were also asked to estimate their household income in categories ranging from $0->$120,000. Table 8.2 shows the comparison for these indicators.

Table 8.2 Standard of Living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD OF LIVING</th>
<th>CCLS 1996 CATHOLICS (%) n=62,731</th>
<th>ALL VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=974</th>
<th>ST. ANONYMOUS’ VIETNAMESE CATHOLICS (%) n=178</th>
<th>QUALITATIVE RESEARCH GROUP (%) n=32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUCH/QUITE BELOW AVERAGE</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIGHTLY BELOW AVERAGE</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIGHTLY ABOVE AVERAGE</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUCH/QUITE ABOVE AVERAGE</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the experience of the Vietnamese Catholics in St. Anonymous’ parish confirms that of all Vietnamese Catholics. Their standard of living and household income and are likely to be less than for all other Catholics. Despite this reality the Vietnamese Catholics in this parish indicated by their responses that this experience was not seen the way it might be by someone looking in from the outside. By describing their standard of living as average they indicated their satisfaction with life in Australia, as they had already stated by describing their gratitude for being able to come here.

**BEING A VIETNAMESE CATHOLIC**

The members of the qualitative research group were people known to the parish priest as active members of the parish. They were parishioners who were involved in a range of parish activities – some were involved through the parish school, some through the Vietnamese liturgies and choir and some through ‘merely’ supporting their fellow parishioners through visiting those in need. They were actively encouraged by the parish priest to be involved. He himself had learnt Vietnamese and visited the country in order to know these parishioners...
better and to cater for their needs. It would be reasonable to expect that the sense of belonging that these Vietnamese Catholics had was quite strong.

In St. Anonymous’ parish there are also many opportunities for Vietnamese Catholics to take on roles in the parish, especially in the case of liturgy support. Since there are two Sunday Masses each month celebrated in Vietnamese, and they are celebrated in the spirit of the post-Vatican Australian Catholic church, there is much lay participation. In the qualitative research, respondents were high in their praise of the parish priest who has learnt Vietnamese and is the presider at these Sunday Eucharists. They themselves make a major contribution to these Masses. Vietnamese Catholics read, give out communion, make up the choir and generally organise the Eucharistic celebrations for the good of the Vietnamese Catholic community. At the time of the research, one of these monthly celebrations was taking place in a school hall, and required the attending physical labour of moving furniture in order to change the hall into a church and back again. It was observed that a large number of Vietnamese Catholics contributed to making this a relatively easy and smooth process. Also in this parish, there was a building program in progress. The new residence for the priest had been built and the new parish community centre was about to be begun. These were both being built in the part of the parish where most Vietnamese parishioners lived, and through their responses to questions, it became clear that many of these people had assisted in the planning and building projects. Hence, in this particular parish situation there were many opportunities for participation in parish roles. The parish priest encouraged their engagement and Vietnamese parishioners responded.

When comparing responses to the question: ‘Do you have a strong sense of belonging to your parish?’ analysis demonstrated that the percentage of Vietnamese respondents from St. Anonymous’ parish who had a strong sense of belonging was greater than that of all Vietnamese language respondents and more like the percentage of all Attender Catholics. This is shown in Table 8.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS (%)</th>
<th>ALL VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%)</th>
<th>ST. ANONYMOUS’ V. CATHOLICS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONG SENSE OF BELONGING</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table affirms the experience of the members of the small research group. There are many opportunities and much encouragement for these members of the parish to belong. Although it
is not possible to say whether the sense of belonging is derived from participation, or the other way around, Table 8.4 confirms the connection between sense of belonging and participation in roles in the parish. There are a much higher percentage of Vietnamese language respondents that participate in roles in the parish than that of all Vietnamese language Catholics. The percentage of Vietnamese language respondents from St. Anonymous’ parish who participate in roles in the parish is more like that of all Attender Catholics than Vietnamese language respondents, although it is still 10 percent less than for all Attender Catholics.

Table 8.4 Participation in Roles in the Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLES IN PARISH</th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS (%) n=86,368</th>
<th>ALL VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%) n=848</th>
<th>ST. ANONYMOUS’ V. CATHOLICS (%) n=57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BELONGING THROUGH FAITH EXPERIENCES**

The responses in the qualitative research gave a clear idea of how these Vietnamese Catholics ‘managed’ their faith experiences to their own satisfaction. Whilst these respondents were impressed with the parish priest’s qualities of openness, friendliness and inclusiveness, most of this group had also visited the Vietnamese Catholic Cultural Centre that is fairly accessible to them if they have access to a vehicle. Some said that they had gone there only for special occasions, naming relatives’ sacramental celebrations as an example. Others attended for special feast days that were significant for Vietnamese Catholicism. Still others said that they actually preferred the Vietnamese Centre and felt more at home there, enjoyed the quality of the Vietnamese choir there, and they alternated between their geographical and cultural parishes. Some certainly knew of some Vietnamese Catholics who chose always to go to the Vietnamese Centre for Mass in their own language, but also for the cultural context in which this was held. Some described Mass at the Vietnamese Centre as more rigid and formal than mass in their geographical parish, suggesting that older Vietnamese Catholics would prefer that style of liturgy. The four participants who described their situation as ‘having the best of both worlds’ probably summarised the situation of all in this survey. Whilst they appreciate the welcome they receive in St. Anonymous’ parish, and they participate in that parish life, the Vietnamese Centre provides cultural aspects that are not otherwise available. Therefore these Vietnamese Catholics, acknowledging that reality, make choices about their faith life practices to ensure that their spiritual needs are met. Therefore they did say that their spiritual needs are met because they can access other Vietnamese Catholic facilities as required. They
recognised the limitations of their geographical parish, despite the best of intentions, and used their own initiative to fulfil their spiritual needs.

The members of the qualitative research group were further asked to rate a number of activities on a scale that asked whether these activities helped their faith grow. Nearly ninety-seven percent of this group agreed that Sunday Mass helped their faith grow very much. In helping their faith grow, this group also named only three other factors that influenced this growth. Sixty-nine percent of the group named the leadership qualities of the parish priest as influential in their growth in faith, 66 percent named their sense of belonging, and 47 percent named their participation in parish community activities as contributing to their growth in faith. Nothing rates as highly for this group as attendance at Mass in fostering their growth in faith. It also suggests that the influence of the parish leader cannot be underestimated in his influence on the faith life of this group, and that a sense of belonging is linked to growth in faith.

In St. Anonymous’ parish the people participating in the small group research offered some explanation for their frequency of attendance at Sunday Eucharist. Mass in their own language was available in their parish twice per month and greatly appreciated by the research participants. When the frequency of attendance if further examined, a greater percentage of Vietnamese Catholics in St. Anonymous’ parish attend Sunday Eucharist 2-3 times per month, more than other Vietnamese Catholics which may indicate that some of the Vietnamese parishioners of St. Anonymous’ parish may only attend the Vietnamese masses that are available in the parish twice per month. This could be because the parish is geographically isolated and ill-served by public transport, meaning that some of those who wish to attend only in their own language have limited choices.

In the qualitative study conducted in that parish, those Vietnamese Catholics reported a decline in their religious practice since coming to Australia, except for attendance at Sunday Eucharist. The only reason offered for this decline was that the sense of belonging to a family in a village in Vietnam where such practices were engaged in by all led to a sense of compulsion about religious practice. Such compulsion was not experienced in Australia, and hence practice declined. In contrast, observations made at the time of the research support the high level of private devotional activity. In every home visited during the time of the qualitative work, there was a shrine to the elderly relatives of the family, suggesting that some devotional rituals took place in these homes as a matter of course. These rituals could have been more cultural than Catholic, but they were devotional practices in the home. These Vietnamese Catholics had this devotional practice as a given in their family routine. Also these Catholics were young themselves and most had young children in their households. Part of parenting
young children in these families was engaging them in Catholic faith practices, and examples of this were observed, even while the children were doing homework tasks set at their Catholic primary school. In other words, despite some reports by Vietnamese Catholics that their religious practice declines after coming to Australia, the evidence here indicates that they participate at a higher rate than Australian-born attenders.

Comparisons between Attender Catholics, Vietnamese language respondents and Vietnamese language respondents in St. Anonymous’ parish confirms the experience of the qualitative group, as shown in Table 8.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATTENDER CATHOLICS (%)</th>
<th>ALL VIETNAMESE LANGUAGE CATHOLICS (%)</th>
<th>ST. ANONYMOUS’ V. CATHOLICS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTENDANCE AT LEAST TWICE PER MONTH</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT PREACHING HELPS IN DAILY LIFE</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE THAT MASS USUALLY STRENGTHENS FAITH</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGE IN PRIVATE DEVOTIONAL ACTS MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table illustrates those Vietnamese respondents to the quantitative survey share the experience of the members of the small group. The importance of Sunday Eucharist and its contribution to the healthy faith life of Vietnamese language Catholics of St. Anonymous’ parish is clearly illustrated by the table. This is due to the work of the parish priest, and also to the resourcefulness of the parishioners themselves who access their Church in the geographical parish and the cultural centre. They also contribute to promoting a healthy faith life for others through their participation in roles in the parish.

**CONCLUSION**

The Vietnamese Catholics of St. Anonymous’ parish, like all Vietnamese Catholics, are socio-economically disadvantaged when compared with other respondents to NCLS 2001. They have come to Australia predominantly in the last twenty years, fleeing their country as refugees. They have endured not only war in their own country but in many cases years of hardship in refugee camps before they arrived. They also come as members of a minority religion in their own country. Despite these hardships, or perhaps because of them, they are ‘more Catholic’ than their Australian born counterparts. They are satisfied with their faith life, they engage in devotional activities and they hold orthodox beliefs about their faith more than
Australian born Catholics. In their parish, they acknowledge the efforts of their parish priest in making all these things possible for them and he has certainly done more than simply provide Mass in Vietnamese twice a month. However, their own efforts must also be acknowledged. Not only have they had to deal with the trauma of their migration, but also they have ‘done the work’ of migration and settlement. Their faith has remained important to them in this process and they have also ‘done the work’ of not only maintaining their Catholic Identity, but belonging to their community and passing on the faith to their children.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This thesis examined the nature and extent of belonging to the Australian Catholic Church as experienced by immigrants. The study focussed on those immigrant Catholics who have been members of the Church in Australia since the Second World War. The study was both quantitative and qualitative in nature. In particular, the study sought to ascertain:

- The extent to which people feel a sense of belonging to the Catholic Church
- The different ways immigrants have experienced that belonging.

The study combines both a quantitative component that uses the National Church Life Survey of 2001 (Appendix I) and the Catholic Church Life Survey of 1996 and a qualitative component using interviews that were conducted with a small group of Vietnamese immigrant Catholics from one particular parish. The purpose of using both types of research was to obtain both the ‘big picture’ of the experience of immigrant Catholics and the in-depth view of the experience of one small group. The two perspectives on the one experience provide a more complete understanding of the immigrant experience of belonging to the Australian Catholic Church.

The major research finding is that immigrant Catholics ‘belong more’, as indicated by the measures used in the study, and in different ways, to the Church than their Australian-born counterparts. They are more frequent in their participation in devotional activities, they expressed greater satisfaction with their faith life and they hold more orthodox Catholic beliefs than do Australian-born Catholics.

An analysis of the response of the Church in the immediate post-war period suggested that it, like the national Government, was reluctant to make other than immediate short-term provision for immigrants, assuming that the migrant would assimilate to the Irish Catholic church as they were expected to assimilate to the Anglo-Australian nation. Only in the last quarter of the twentieth century did the Church, like the nation, abandon this expectation and embrace a multiculturalism that was evident in practice long before it became policy, practice developed and sustained by the efforts of migrants themselves.

This research has somewhat contradicted the picture that emerged from the historical analysis, in that migrants are more Catholic than Australian-born Catholics and those immigrants who arrived first are the most Catholic of all.

Explaining why this is the case is not easy. The literature indicates that belonging to the Church may assist identity maintenance for the immigrant and it also indicates that women ‘do the work’ of belonging on behalf of their immigrant families. Immigrants are drawn to
belong to the Church to a greater extent than Australian born Catholics and a greater percentage of women than men immigrants do the work of belonging to the Church. The percentage of immigrant women belonging to the Church is even greater than the percentage of Australian-born women, confirming their key role in the migration and settlement process. This research confirms that belonging to the Church is different to belonging to a society that has barriers between the dominant culture and the many cultures that immigrants bring with them. The shared values, beliefs and community of memory provided by initiation into the Church transcend the sometimes harsh experiences of immigrants in the broader mainstream Australian society. The experience of immigrants in this study confirms the research findings summarised in the literature review – that belonging to the Church provides a familiar place of safety in a new and sometimes hostile dominant host culture.

The Church’s own efforts may also have played a part in enabling immigrants to belong. Before the Second Vatican Council immigrants were expected to assimilate to the Australian Church, but this Church in many ways resembled Catholicism as it was expressed throughout much of the world. Although the rituals of the Australian Church were rigidly formal they were also easily recognisable, as they were uniform throughout the world, using the Catholic Church’s universal language of Latin. After the Council the Church’s own understanding of itself and its relationship to immigrants meant that it adopted the image of pilgrim for itself and was more welcoming of the diverse cultures that made up its membership.

However it also seems that the pervasive suspicion of immigrants in Australian society extends to members of the Church who believe that welcome is extended to immigrant members much more than immigrant members experience it. The Vietnamese parishioners who cited examples of a lack of welcome as they had experienced it confirmed this in the qualitative research.

Participation in parish roles and groups proved to be the distinguishing factor for the nature of belonging between immigrant and Australian-born Catholics. Determinants of participation are indicated by the experience of Vietnamese parishioners in St. Anonymous’ parish and from responses to other language surveys. Being able to participate in Eucharistic celebrations in their own language enhances participation but language is not the only determinant. Culturally inclusive parish activities enhance participation and whilst this is the result of deliberate efforts in this one parish it is not the norm, since these Vietnamese parishioners participate in their parish life to a greater extent than do other immigrant groups in their parishes. This raises the question of whether the Australian Catholic bishops made the right decision when they chose not to establish national parishes. Such parishes would have
enabled cultural expressions of faith for immigrant groups. The defacto national parishes that have come about due to the initiatives of immigrant groups and chaplains themselves provide the cultural context that they seek, and even when the Vietnamese Catholics of St. Anonymous’ parish only availed themselves of that opportunity occasionally, they appreciated the availability of their cultural centre.

The extent and nature of belonging of immigrants’ children provides a source of concern. They ‘belong less’ than their parents and the nature of their belonging is more like that of Australian-born Catholics except in the matter of participation in which they are like their parents. It is as if they have lost the orthodox Catholicism that their parents bought with them and yet have inherited the alienation experienced by them. This means that they may potentially be lost to the Australian Catholic Church. It is also with immigrants’ children that the decision of the Australian Catholic bishops not to create ethnic parishes may have been detrimental. In the United States such parishes act as an ethnic bulwark against the forces of the dominant culture and enable the second generation to manage the tasks of sorting and maintaining aspects of the immigrant culture. Such would seem to be the case in the study of Korean-American Christians (Chong, 1998). The decision of the Australian bishops to maintain geographical parishes as the norm and to expect immigrants to belong there would appear to contribute to the lack of Church belonging of their children.

Further surveying of immigrant Catholic experience in the context of the particular parish situation would enable clearer pictures to be formed particularly about the opportunities provided by parishes and taken by immigrants to participate in parish roles and groups. This would provide answers for parish leadership about why immigrants do not participate in this way and how they might be able to do so. The parish context of St. Anonymous’ is quite unique in that it is neither a mainstream Anglo-Australian parish, that may provide masses in other languages, nor a parish predominantly of another culture, even staffed perhaps by a priest of another culture. It is quite possible that the context of each individual parish influences immigrants’ ability to participate. Research that examined the cultural context of parishes and it relationship to immigrants’ participation would extend the work of this thesis.

The initiatives taken by the parish priest at St. Anonymous’ have been successful. It would seem that parish priests are not compelled to take such inclusive initiatives and this means that individual parishes may vary greatly in the degree of welcome they extend to their immigrant members. This raises the question beyond the research here of the nature of the various arms of the Australian Catholic Church that are meant to assist immigrants. The nature of their work and its relationship to immigrants in their geographical parishes is unclear. The
relationship of Migrant Chaplaincy, the Australian Catholic Migrant and Refugee Office, and even seminary training to the situation of immigrants is unclear and possibly un-co-ordinated. The actions of this particular parish priest should not be unique and entirely initiated by him. Such actions should be the responsibility of all who lead the Church.

Further research into the situation of the children of immigrants is also necessary. As research has shown their educational and occupational outcomes varied by age and country of origin of their parents, so might their affiliation to the Church. Their parish context may also influence the extent and nature of their belonging. This research may lead to outcomes that improve Church policy and practice to enhance their belonging.

Finally the broader context of the situation of the Church needs consideration. This thesis shows that older immigrants who have been here the longest belong the most to the Church. Hence immigrants who belong are, like their Australian born counterparts, an ageing membership. The efforts of these immigrant Catholics will not serve to halt the decline in overall Church membership, especially since their children do not belong to the extent of their parents. This raises questions about the long-term expectations of Vietnamese Catholics. Whilst they are the youngest immigrant Catholics and the Church to which they belong is much more overtly multicultural than that of their predecessors, it remains to be seen whether or not their children experience belonging to a greater extent than their parents. Given that their parents do not feel as welcomed in their parishes as their parishes intend them to be, and given the anecdotal evidence drawn from St. Anonymous’ parish about incidents that can only be called racist, it would seem that multicultural policies have not translated into inclusive actions in the Church. Literature on multiculturalism in Australian society in general means that this is no surprise. In Australian society, as in the Church, the words of inclusiveness that have defined multiculturalism in the last 30 years do not match the actions. Once again, the Church mirrors society, just as it did by pursuing policies of assimilation in the early post-World War II years. All this points to the likelihood of Vietnamese children of immigrants feeling alienated from the Australian Catholic Church.

This research ends as it began. Archbishop Hart, the Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, at the launch of Fr. Anthony Paganoni’s book, stated that the Church has not paid enough attention to the possibilities of enrichment that immigrants can provide. It would seem that this is still the case in the Australian Catholic Church and that Anthony Paganoni’s historical perspective still applies today. Despite the benign neglect of the Church, immigrants struggle valiantly to belong to the Church and to enrich the Australian Catholic story.


Lindsay, E. (1996). *Questions of Identity: An Italian Sonata*. Murdoch University, Collie, W.A.
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Appendix I: National Church Life Survey 2001
1. You and Your Parish

1. How often do you go to Mass? Please answer for how often you go to Mass, AND for how often you go to Mass in this parish. Fill IN ONE circle IN EACH COLUMN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How often go to Mass?</th>
<th>In this parish?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is my first time</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever/special occasions only</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three times a month</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually every week</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a week</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How long have you been going to church at this parish?
□ Less than 1 year □ 6-10 years
□ 1-2 years □ 11-20 years
□ 3-5 years □ More than 20 years
□ I am visiting. I usually go to church somewhere else
□ I am visiting and do not regularly go anywhere else
□

3. Do you have a strong sense of belonging to this parish?
□ Yes, a strong sense of belonging, which is growing
□ Yes, a strong sense - about the same as last year
□ Yes, although perhaps not as strongly as in the past
□ No, but I am new here
□ No, and I wish I did by now
□ No, but I am happy as I am
□ Don’t know / not applicable
□

4. Do you agree or disagree: “My spiritual needs are being met in this parish”?
□ Strongly agree □ Disagree
□ Agree □ Strongly disagree
□ Neutral or unsure
□

5. Are you regularly involved in any group activities here? (Mark ALL that apply.)
□ Yes, in small prayer, discussion or Bible study groups
□ Yes, in clubs, social groups, or other types of groups
□ No, we have no such groups
□ No, I am not regularly involved
□

6. Do you regularly take part in any parish activities reaching out to the wider community (eg, community service, social justice, welfare, outreach, evangelisation)? Mark all that apply.
□ Yes, in outreach or evangelisation activities
□ Yes, in community service, social justice or welfare activities of this parish
□ No, we don’t have such activities
□ No, I am not regularly involved
□

7. Do you currently perform any of these leadership or ministry roles here? (Mark ALL that apply.)
□ Reader (deacon) or special minister of the Eucharist
□ Music ministry (eg, choir, organist, musician)
□ Member of a liturgy planning group
□ Member of a children’s liturgy group
□ Teacher in the parish school
□ Religious Education teacher in a Government school
□ Member of the baptism team
□ Member of children’s sacrament preparation team
□ RCIA team member or sponsor
□ Preparing couples for marriage
□ Member of the parish council or similar leadership group
□ Member of a committee
□ Leader of a prayer, discussion or Bible study group
□ Leader of an adult social group
□ Leader in youth ministry or youth group
□ Visitor to the sick or elderly or others in need
□ Another role not mentioned above
□ I do not have any leadership or ministry role at present
□

8. Before you started coming here, were you going to church anywhere else?
□ No, I’ve come here for most/all of my life
□ No, before coming here I had not been going to church for several years
□ No, before coming here I had never regularly attended a church
□ Yes, immediately before coming here, I was going to church somewhere else
□

9. Before you started coming here, what type of church did you go to? (Mark ONE only.)
□ Another Catholic parish
□ Anglican
□ Presbyterian
□ Baptist
□ Salvation Army
□ Churches of Christ
□ Seventh-day Adventist
□ Lutheran
□ Uniting
□ Methodist
□ Other Pentecostal
□ Orthodox
□ Other
□ I did not go to church anywhere else before coming here
□

2. Your Faith

10. Over the last year, do you believe you have grown in your Christian faith?
□ No real growth
□ Some growth
□ Much growth, mainly through this parish
□ Much growth, mainly through other groups or churches
□ Much growth, mainly through my own private activity
□

11. Some people feel they came to faith gradually. For others, it began at a definite moment of commitment. Have you ever experienced such a moment of decisive faith commitment or Christian conversion?
□ No, I’ve had faith for as long as I can remember
□ No, I came to faith through a gradual process
□ Yes, at one specific moment in the last 5 years
□ Yes, at one specific moment more than 5 years ago
□ Yes, a number of specific moments of commitment or recommitment
□ Don’t know / not applicable
12. How often do you spend time in private devotional activities (e.g. prayer, meditation, reading the Bible alone)?
- Every day / most days
- Occasionally
- A few times a week
- Hardly ever
- Once a week
- Never

13. Which statement comes closest to your view of the Bible? (Mark ONE only)
- The Bible is the word of God, to be taken literally word for word
- The Bible is the word of God, to be interpreted in the light of its historical and cultural context
- The Bible is the word of God, to be interpreted in the light of its historical context and the Church's teaching
- The Bible is not the word of God, but contains God's word to us
- The Bible is not the word of God, but is a valuable book
- The Bible is an ancient book with little value today
- Don't know

14. In what year were you born? Please complete the year.

15. Are you:
- Female
- Male

16. What is the highest educational qualification you have completed?
- Primary school
- Some secondary school
- Completed secondary school
- Trade certificate
- Diploma or associate diploma
- Bachelor degree from a university or equivalent institution
- Post graduate degree or diploma

17. Which term best describes your present marital status?
- Never married
- In first marriage
- Remarried after divorce
- Remarried after death of spouse
- In a de facto relationship
- Separated but not divorced
- Divorced and not remarried
- Widowed

18. Do you have a spouse or partner who is also completing a survey form here?
- Yes
- No

19. What is your employment status? (Mark all that apply.)
- Employed full-time (30 hours or more)
- Employed part-time
- Self-employed
- Unemployed
- Retired
- Full-time home duties / family responsibilities
- Student
- Other

20. What is the postcode of the place where you usually live?

21. Where were you born?
If born in Australia, please mark one circle in Section A.
If born overseas, please mark one circle in Section B.

SECTION A. I was born in Australia and:
- Both my parents were born in Australia
- Both parents were born in another English-speaking country
- One parent was born in an English-speaking country
- Neither parent was born in an English-speaking country

SECTION B. I was born overseas in:
- New Zealand
- Pacific Islands
- Great Britain
- Ireland (incl. N. Ireland)
- Italy
- Malta
- Other Southern Europe
- Other Western Europe
- Eastern Europe / Former USSR
- India / Sri Lanka
- Middle East / North Africa
- Other Asia

4. You and Your Community

22. Are you involved in any community service, social action or welfare groups not connected to this parish? (Mark all that apply.)
- Yes, community service, care or welfare groups
- Yes, social action, justice or lobby groups (eg. environmental, human rights or local issues)
- No, I'm not involved with such groups

23. In the past 12 months, have you done any of the following? (Mark all that apply.)
- Lent money to someone outside your family
- Cared for someone who was very sick
- Helped someone through a personal crisis (not sickness)
- Visited someone in hospital
- Given some of your possessions to someone in need
- Tried to stop someone abusing alcohol or drugs
- Donated money to a charitable organisation
- Contacted a parliamentarian or councillor on a public issue

24. Which of the following best describes your readiness to talk to others about your faith?
- I do not like to talk about my faith; my life and actions are sufficient
- I find it hard to talk about my faith in ordinary language
- I mostly feel at ease talking about my faith and do so if it comes up
- I feel at ease talking about my faith and look for opportunities to do so
- I do not have faith, so the question is not applicable

25. Would you be prepared to invite to Mass or another church service here any of your friends and relatives who do not currently go to church?
- Yes, and I have done so in the past 12 months
- Yes, but I have not done so in the past 12 months
- Don't know
- No, probably not
- No, definitely not
5. About Your Involvement Here

26. Do you live in this parish?
☑ Yes ☐ No

27. What is the STARTING TIME of the Mass that you usually attend in this parish? (Mark more than one time if you often attend different Masses.)
☐ Saturday Evening
☐ Before 9:00 am ☐ Afternoon (12:00 – 3:59 pm)
☐ 9:00 – 9:59 am ☐ Evening (from 6:00 pm)
☐ 10:00 – 10:59 am ☐ I don’t usually go here
☐ 11:00 – 11:59 am

28. Compared to 2 years ago, do you think you participate in activities of the parish more, less, or about the same amount as you did then?
☐ Participate more
☐ About the same participation
☐ Participate less
☐ Not applicable (been coming less than 2 years)

29. Which of the following aspects of this parish do you personally most value? (Mark up to THREE options)
☐ Wider community care or social justice emphasis
☐ Traditional style of worship or music
☐ Outreach to those who do not attend church
☐ Teaching those who do not attend church
☐ Contemporary style of worship or music
☐ Social activities or meeting new people
☐ Celebrating the Eucharist / receiving Holy Communion
☐ Small prayer discussion or Bible study groups
☐ Ministry to children or youth
☐ Praying for one another
☐ Openness to social diversity
☐ The parish school

30. How many children of any age do you have, whether they live at home or elsewhere? (If none, write ‘0’.)

Please write number: __________________________

If you have no children, fill this circle O and go to Q. 33

31. Please answer the following questions for each of your children, starting with the eldest. If you have more than five children, just answer for the first five.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Child</th>
<th>Does he/she live at home?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eldest child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child No 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child No 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child No 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child No 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Do your children regularly attend church? (Mark all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Child</th>
<th>Regularly attends church in another parish?</th>
<th>Yes, at a church other than a Catholic one?</th>
<th>Yes, at a Catholic church which is not one you go to?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eldest child</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child No 2</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child No 3</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child No 4</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child No 5</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. How satisfied are you with what is offered here for children and young adults? (Mark a circle in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Child</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For children aged under 12 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For youth aged 12-18 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For young adults aged 19-25 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Leadership and Direction

34. Of the following, which one best describes your opinion of the future direction of this parish?
☐ We need to go back to the way we did things in the past
☐ We are faithfully maintaining past directions
☐ We are currently deciding on new directions
☐ We are currently moving in new directions
☐ We need to rethink where we are heading
☐ Our future is very unclear or doubtful
☐ Don’t know

35. Does this parish have a clear vision, goals or direction for its ministry and mission?
☐ Yes, and I am strongly committed to them
☐ Yes, and I am partly committed to them
☐ Yes, but I am not committed to them
☐ I am not aware of such a vision, goals or direction
☐ There are ideas but no clear vision, goals or direction

36. Have this parish’s leaders encouraged you to find and use your gifts and skills here?
☐ Yes, to a great extent
☐ Yes, to some extent
☐ Don’t know
☐ Not at all

37. To what extent does the parish priest or appointed pastoral leader take into account the ideas of the people here?
☐ A great extent
☐ Some extent
☐ Don’t know
☐ Not at all

38. Which of the following is the best description of the style of leadership of your parish priest or pastoral leader?
☐ Leadership that inspires people to take action
☐ Leadership that is active in persuading others
☐ Leadership that sets high standards for others
☐ Leadership where the people start most things
☐ Leadership that is active in persuading others
☐ Leadership that sets high standards for others
☐ Leadership where the people start most things
☐ Leadership that inspires people to take action
☐ Leadership where the people start most things
☐ Leadership that sets high standards for others
☐ Leadership that inspires people to take action
7. A Few More Questions About You

39. Are you a Catholic?
☐ Yes ☐ No

40. Is your spouse or partner a Catholic?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

41. Do you have any of the following roles in the Church?
☐ Lay person employed as a teacher in a Catholic school
☐ Religious sister or brother
☐ Priest or deacon
☐ None of the above

42. How important is God in your life?
☐ God does not matter to me at all
☐ Fairly important, but many other things are more important
☐ God is more important to me than almost anything else
☐ God is the most important reality in my life

43. Do you accept the authority of the Church to teach that certain doctrines of faith and morals are true, are essential to the Catholic faith, and are to be believed by all Catholics?
☐ Yes, with no difficulty
☐ Yes, with some difficulty
☐ Yes, with great difficulty
☐ No

44. Do you talk about matters of faith with the other members of your household?
☐ No, I live alone
☐ No, we do not talk about matters of faith
☐ Yes, occasionally
☐ Yes, frequently in informal ways
☐ Yes, frequently in informal ways as well as part of family or household prayer

45. How many of your close friends attend a church on a regular basis?
☐ All ☐ None
☐ Most ☐ Don’t know
☐ Some

46. While you may value many different styles of music, which of the following do you feel would be MOST helpful to you in parish worship? (Mark up to TWO.)
☐ Traditional hymns
☐ Classical music or chorales
☐ Sung responsorial psalms and other parts of the Mass (e.g. Holy, Holy, Lamb of God, etc.)
☐ Contemporary hymns
☐ Other contemporary music or songs
☐ Music or songs from a variety of cultures
☐ Contemplative chants (e.g. Taizé, Iona)
☐ African-American gospel music
☐ No music or songs
☐ Don’t know

47. Do you agree or disagree: "The preaching I hear in this parish is very helpful to me in everyday life."
☐ Strongly agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neutral or unsure

If you are a visitor today, please stop here

48. Do you feel that attending Mass in this parish strengthens you spiritually?
☐ Always
☐ Usually
☐ Sometimes
☐ Never

49. How often do you experience the following during church services at this parish? (Mark a circle in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A sense of God’s presence</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being inspired to take action</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awe or mystery</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in understanding</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of God</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of fulfilling my obligation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. How important is this parish community in your life?
☐ Not at all important
☐ A little important
☐ Quite Important
☐ Very important
☐ Extremely important

51. Do you agree or disagree: "In the past year we have grown in unity and strength as a parish community."
☐ Strongly agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neutral or unsure

52. Do you agree or disagree: "This parish is strongly focused on serving the wider community?"
☐ Strongly agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neutral or unsure

53. Do you agree or disagree: "This parish is always ready to try something new?"
☐ Strongly agree ☐ Disagree
☐ Agree ☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Neutral or unsure

54. Which best describes your involvement in the making of important decisions in this parish?
☐ I have been given the opportunity and often participate in decision-making
☐ I have been given the opportunity, and occasionally get involved in decision-making
☐ I have been given the opportunity but don’t usually get involved in decision-making
☐ I have not been given an opportunity to be involved and I feel fine with this
☐ I have not been given an opportunity to be involved and I am not happy about this

Thank you for your help today
APPENDIX II: OTHER LANGUAGE SURVEYS 2001
### Italian - English Questionnaire Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Italian Version</th>
<th>English Version</th>
<th>Question Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-i</td>
<td>A-C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### You and Your Parish

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Mass attendance frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Parish attendance frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>How long attending this parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Involvement in group activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spiritual needs met?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Activities reaching out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Church anywhere else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Type of church previously attended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### About Your Faith

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Growth in faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Come to faith gradually?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>View of Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Devotional activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### About You

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Year born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spouse/Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Birthplace: see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year of arrival in Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### You and Your Community

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>In past 12 mths have you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Readiness to talk about faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Prepared to invite to Mass…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Your Involvement Here

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mass in English or Italian/Vietnamese (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Live in this Parish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30a</td>
<td>Number of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30a</td>
<td>31a</td>
<td>Age of child (room for 5 children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30b</td>
<td>31b</td>
<td>Live at home? (room for 5 children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Attend regularly? (room for 5 children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Change in participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Find gifts and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Future directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Leadership style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Questions about you &amp; your faith</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some final Questions about your Involvement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qn 21: Birthplace**
1. Italy
2. Other European country
3. Australia
4. Other country

**Qn 27: Language of celebration of the Mass you usually attend**
1. Italian
2. English

**Qn 46: Importance of this parish community in your life**
1. Not at all important
2. A little important
3. Very important
4. Extremely important

Note that there is no equivalent of option 3 in the English version ("Quite important")
### Vietnamese - English Questionnaire Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vietnamese Version</th>
<th>English Version</th>
<th>Question Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>You and Your Parish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-v 1a</td>
<td>A-C 1a</td>
<td>Mass attendance frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Parish attendance frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>How long attending this parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spiritual needs met?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Involvement in group activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Activities reaching out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Church anywhere else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Type of church previously attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About Your Faith</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Growth in faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Come to faith gradually?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Devotional activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>View of Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About You</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Year born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spouse/Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Birthplace (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Year of arrival in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You and Your Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>In past 12 mths have you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Readiness to talk about faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Prepared to invite to Mass…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your Involvement Here</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Live in this Parish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Mass in English or Italian/Vietnamese (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Starting time of Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Change in participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Most valued about parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>30a</td>
<td>Number of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33a</td>
<td>31a</td>
<td>Age of child (room for 5 children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33b</td>
<td>31b</td>
<td>Live at home? (room for 5 children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qn 21: Birthplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Laos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qn 28: Language of celebration of the Mass you usually attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vietnamese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX IV: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR QUALITATIVE RESEARCH
INTRODUCTION
Can you tell us a bit about yourself? What is the story of your journey to this place? How did you decide to come here.

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

1. In what year were you born? Please complete the year

   1 9

2. What is your gender?

   (i) Female       (ii) Male

3. What is your present marital status?

   (i) Never married
   (ii) In first marriage
   (iii) Separated but not divorced
   (iv) Divorced and not remarried
   (v) Divorced and remarried
   (vi) Widowed and not remarried
   (vii) Widowed and remarried

4. In what country were you born?

   (i) Australia
   (ii) South Vietnam
   (iii) North Vietnam

5. In what year did you arrive in Australia?

   1 9

6. What is the highest educational qualification you have completed?

   (i) Primary school
   (ii) Some of secondary school
   (iii) Finished secondary school
   (iv) Trade certificate
   (v) Diploma or associate diploma
   (vi) Batchelor degree from a university or equivalent
   (vii) Post graduate degree or diploma
7. Which statement best describes your household?
(i) I live alone
(ii) A couple with no children living at home
(iii) Two parents with child(ren) living at home
(iv) One parent with child(ren) living at home
(v) Some adults living in the same household

8. Taking into consideration the house you live in, your income, the property or investments you own, the car you drive and so on, would you say that your standard of living is above or below average?
(i) Much below average
(ii) Quite a bit below average
(iii) Slightly below average
(iv) Average
(v) Slightly above average
(vi) Quite a bit above average
(vii) Much above average

9. Please indicate the kind of employment all the members of your household are engaged in:
Yourself ____________________________________
Other adult 1 ________________________________
Other adult 2 ________________________________

10. What is your religious denomination? And that of your spouse or partner?
(Please circle ONE number in each column, if applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yours</th>
<th>Your spouse/partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Christian Church</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A non-Christian religion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How satisfied are you with your life in Australia?
(i) Very satisfied
(ii) Fairly satisfied
(iii) Not very satisfied
12. In Australia, compared to Vietnam, would you say that you have

(i) More freedom
(ii) Same freedom
(iii) Less freedom

13. In Australia, compared to Vietnam, would you say that you have

(i) More wealth
(ii) Same wealth
(iii) Less wealth

14. In Australia, compared to Vietnam, would you say that you have

(i) More chance of being happy
(ii) Same chance of being happy
(iii) Less chance of being happy

What do you mean by “happy”?

15. In Australia, compared to Vietnam, would you say that your children

(i) Have more opportunities to be successful
(ii) Have the same opportunities to be successful
(iii) Have fewer opportunities to be successful

What do you mean by “successful”?

16. In Australia, compared to Vietnam, would you say that your relationships within your family are

(i) Easier than they would have been
(ii) The same as they would have been
(iii) More difficult than they would have been

17. In Australia, for Vietnamese people, what has happened to these values?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>Less important in Australia</th>
<th>The same importance in Australia</th>
<th>More important in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect of parents by children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect of men by women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect of women by men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect of authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect of tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for those who have died</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. In your situation, you would describe the relationship between husband and wife as:

(i) Equal in all things
(ii) Men in charge of all things
(iii) Women in charge of all things
(iv) Men in charge of major decisions, women in charge of minor ones
(v) Women in charge of major decisions, men in charge of minor ones
(vi) Men in charge of money, women in charge of the home
(vii) Women in charge of money, men in charge of the home

19. In Australia, compared to Vietnam, how would rate your religious practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More Often in Australia</th>
<th>Same as in Vietnam</th>
<th>Less Often than in Vietnam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prayer or Meditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Religious Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at Sunday Liturgies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Parish Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. For Australians, compared to Vietnamese, what would you say about these Church values?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Australians hold this value more highly than Vietnamese</th>
<th>Australians hold this value the same as Vietnamese</th>
<th>Australians hold this value less highly than Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for parents by children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for those who have died</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Over the last year, do you believe you have grown in your Catholic faith?

(i) No real growth
(ii) Some growth
(iii) Much growth, mainly through this parish
(iv) Much growth, mainly through other groups or churches
(v) Much growth, mainly through my own private activity
22. In your spiritual life, please indicate which of these features help your spiritual growth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Helps very much</th>
<th>Helps to some extent</th>
<th>Helps very little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at Sunday mass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in parish community activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting in leadership in liturgical activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting in leadership in social/community activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in family prayers and rituals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in prayer and liturgies in the Vietnamese community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in friendship groups in my parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The qualities of leadership of the parish priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My sense of belonging to this parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. In your parish, please indicate which of the following you observe, and how often:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Done very often</th>
<th>Done sometimes</th>
<th>Done very rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for people from other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of liturgies and other events for people of other cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the Catholic culture of other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for the Catholic culture of other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome for new parishioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome for those from other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V: LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS
INFORMATION LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

ROLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE SETTLEMENT OF MEMBERS OF A VIETNAMESE CATHOLIC COMMUNITY

Research Supervisor: Rev. Dr. Michael Mason

Student Researcher: Mary Noseda.

This research project is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D. at Australian Catholic University, Patrick Campus, Melbourne. The purpose of this research is to find out in what ways the Catholic Church in Holy Child Parish, Dallas has helped the community of Vietnamese parishioners to grow in their faith and settle into the community.

You are asked to give approximately an hour of their time to the student researcher – to respond to the interview questions. The researcher and interpreter (should one be required) will be the only people who know the participants’ identities, and these will not be permanently recorded or made available to anyone else at any stage.

It is hoped that this project will benefit the community of St. Anonymous’ Parish by knowing more about itself in order to provide ways and means for effective growth in faith to occur in the community. It is hoped that individual participants will have an appreciation for their own value as people of faith through reflecting on their life experiences in the process of participation. It is further hoped that the Catholic church in Australia will further understand the needs of immigrant groups and be able to respond to them.

Since you are voluntarily giving generously of yourself and your time, it is understood by myself that you are free to withdraw from participation at any time and without giving any reason.

Any questions regarding this project can be directed to the student researcher and/or the Supervisor at the following address and phone number:
Rev. Dr. Michael Mason,
ACU,
St. Patrick’s Campus,
Locked Bag 4115,
Fitzroy MDC 3065.
Phone 9953 3161

This study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University.
In the event that you have any complaint about the way you have been treated during the study, or a query that the Researcher or the Supervisor has not been able to satisfy, you may write care of the nearest branch of the Office of Research:
Chair, Human Research Ethics Committee
C/o Office of Research
Australian Catholic University
115 Victoria Parade
Fitzroy VIC 3065
Tel: 9953 3157
Fax: 9953 3315

Any complaint made will be treated in confidence, investigated fully and the participant informed of the outcome.

If you agree to participate in this project, you should sign both copies of the Informed Consent form, retain one copy for your records and return the other copy to the Researcher.

Yours Sincerely,

Mary Noseda
Appendix VI: Consent Form

(COPY TO BE RETAINED BY PARTICIPANT)

ROLE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE SETTLEMENT OF MEMBERS OF A VIETNAMESE CATHOLIC COMMUNITY

Research Supervisor: Rev. Dr. Michael Mason

Student Researcher: Mary Noseda

I have read/had translated and understood the information provided in the Letter to the Participants and any question I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity, realising that I can withdraw at any time.

I agree that research data collected for the study may be published or provided to other researchers in a form that does not identify me in any way.

NAME OF PARTICIPANT

SIGNATURE DATE

NAME OF STUDENT RESEARCHER

SIGNATURE DATE

Two copies of the consent form are required: one copy for the participant to sign and keep for their records and one copy to sign to be returned to the researcher.