CHAPTER TWO

THE STUDY AND CONCEPTUALISATION
OF THE SOJOURNER

This chapter is divided into three sections: In the first section, some arguments about the concept of the sojourner are given to identify an appropriate sociological meaning for the term. In the second section, basic categories used in this research project are described. Then, in order to introduce the sojourner- and settler-types of foreigners, four basic types of foreigners’ settlement will be illustrated by reviewing relevant migration studies.

2.1 SOCIOLOGICAL DISCUSSION ON THE SOJOURNER

2.1.1 Lack of the Consideration of Sojourners

Migrant ethnic groups are generally recognised as sub-cultural groups within the host community and it is in these terms that they become a focus for migration studies. However, not all sub-cultural groups can be ethnic groups and not all sub-cultural ethnic groups consist of migrants who have become permanent settlers. There are long-term temporary residents who sometimes make up significant sub-cultural groups in the host community. Although when we study assimilation and integration, we generally include only settlers, sojourners can also be included as they have continuous first-hand experience of cross-cultural contact with the host community for an extended period. Especially in the era of global migration, the growing significance of sojourning foreigners should not be ignored. As I have mentioned in the Chapter I, there are significant numbers of long-term residents who actually live in societies, and should not be classified as settlers in the analysis of global migratory movements.

In sociological studies of migrant adjustment to the host community, the outstanding conceptual framework until the late 1950s/early 1960s was that of ‘assimilation’. Later it has been somewhat replaced by ‘integration.’ It is interesting to note that despite changes in Australia’s multicultural policies, in which the term ‘assimilation’
was replaced by ‘integration’ and therefore applied to migrant settlement issues (Mizukami, 2000a: 110–113), there was little recognition of the distinctive characteristics of ‘sojourners’. The idea of ‘integration’ was well embedded in academic debate as it was in official parlance, before multiculturalism was established as a national policy in the 1970s. ‘Integration’ was officially adopted in 1964 when the Department of Immigration changed the name of its division from the Assimilation Division to the Integration Division (Baldock and Lally, 1974: 58). In the mid-1960s, when the ‘White Australia’ policy was officially abandoned, assimilation was also relinquished at least in name (Castles et al., 1988: 51). Prior to such official statements, the concept of ‘integration’ had been used in social scientific debate since the mid-1950s. According to Lewins (1988: 858), in the late 1950s Australian academics questioned the explanatory form of assimilation applied to migrant settlement and so pluralist approaches began to emerge. But despite such changes in nomenclature, insight into the distinctive characteristics of ‘sojourners’ is not an embedded part of migration policy. Various scholars (e.g. Wilton and Bosworth, 1984; Galvin and West, 1988; Lewins, 1988; and Castles, et al. 1988) discuss the changes from assimilation to integration. However, these studies do not refer to sojourning foreigners as they centre upon migrants as permanent settlers, and the ideological shift from assimilation to pluralism.

In the 1960s, many social-welfare workers and schoolteachers pointed out the lack of sufficient social services for immigrants from non-English-speaking backgrounds.1 A better understanding of these problems has led to changes in, and the expansion of, such services for migrants.2 However, the problems which Japanese residents, and

---

1 The first serious public debate over institutional responses to the presence of migrants emerged in relation to the problems teachers and school officials were finding due to lack of educational resources for migrant children (Martin, 1978: 34). Furthermore, Ronald Henderson’s research, published in 1969, disclosed that certain non-Anglo-Saxon ethnic groups had extremely high rates of poverty. Accordingly, there had been an implicit understanding of the existence of socially disadvantaged groups before the official promotion of multiculturalism addressed cultural diversity in relation to poverty in the 1960s. Castles et al. point out that “through growing awareness of multi-ethnic migration, community activists, social workers, bureaucrats, and politicians started to take consideration of migrants’ experiences” (1988: 44).

2 See Jupp (1991), and Jordens (1997).