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Abstract

Social capital refers to the actual or potential, tangible or intangible resources embedded in a community. It is the aggregate resources in a community available to an individual (Coleman, 1990) and to the general community as a public good. (Putnam, 2000) The aggregate resources are essentially the opportunities to contribute and mobilise the resources through a membership in a network.

Given with this, this thesis explores the relationship between ethnicity and social capital. More specifically, it examines the role of ethnicity in forming social networks and bringing a community together. This is done by an empirical case study of the Chinese community in Chatswood.

In doing this, the thesis discusses the formation of ethnic community and ethnic social network. The factors for the formations govern the networking opportunities and the extent of connections an individual possesses. This is social network in its quantity manner that is the diversity of opportunities to contribute and mobilise social capital in a community. Also, the thesis discusses the underlying foundations of in-depth social networks. The foundations require the members of a community the willingness to make available resources and the readiness to seek resources. This is social network in its quality manner that is the contribution and mobilisation of social capital, through a membership in a community.
This thesis finds that Chinese persons in Chatswood are willing to form inter-ethnic networks in the ethnic diverse neighbourhood in the multicultural city in the era of globalisation. Nevertheless, the Chinese ethnicity remains a fundamental factor for bringing the community together. Co-ethnic network benefits from the already established ethnic cultural norms, value system and thick trust, and thereby establish confident expectation and obligation. In other words, co-ethnic connections bring about an efficient formation of co-ethnic social capital.

Conversely, inter-ethnic connections necessitate a search for mutual norm and trust that inhibits initial interactions. The search could be overcome by formal avenues that bring about convenience in establishing trust and become the fundamental realm for inter-ethnic face-to-face interaction. There is a barrier in facilitating informal inter-ethnic connections, which is the barrier for the aggregate social capital in the community in Chatswood.

The thesis also examines the implications of social capital. In response, it recommends a way forward with an emphasis on inter-ethnic networks, through planning how, where, for who and on what norms to facilitate networking opportunities.
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Chapter 1
Introduction
Chapter 1  Introduction

Thesis setting

Social capital is a concept and is defined in the following ways:

*Institutions, relationships, and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society’s interaction.* (World Bank, 2004)

*Networks, together with shared norms, values and understandings which facilitate cooperation within or among groups.* (ABS, 2000,5)

*Features of social organisation such as norms, networks and trust that facilitate cooperation and coordination for mutual benefit…that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives.* (Putnam, 2000,56)

Social capital is an important concept, which the Australian Government includes on its agenda. The Australian Bureau of Statistics undertakes study on social capital, and New South Wales local councils prepare community and social plans. Social capital, which has been receiving increasing emphasis is the key focus of this thesis.

This thesis studies social capital in relation to: firstly, the structure of institution and relationship with reference to networking. Secondly, the norm of obligation and expectation in personal interactions with reference to trust. Lastly, the mutual benefits in a community with reference to the resources available in a network. It makes assumptions that persons congregate for the better opportunities to interact and to form networks, to establish an identity with the members and the community, and to participate and to foster a sense of belonging and trust. Also, it assumes that a network is stemmed from a sanctioned norm to coordinate its members and to mobilise the
resources available. Therefore, social capital is the aggregate of the resources, actual or potential, tangible or intangible, within networks. The resources are available to individuals through their membership in a network (Coleman, 1990) and are available to a community in aggregate as a public good. (Putnam, 2000)

There are opportunities and constraints in forming networks and thereby in forming the avenues to contribute and mobilise the resources in the networks. In other words, individuals differ in their potential in contributing and mobilising social capital. (Harper, 2002) In relation to social capital in an ethnic context, Waldinger (1986) asserts that the social capital found in a congregation of co-ethnic individuals in a host country where they have migrated to is a particular factor for the growth and demise of that migrant group in a foreign environment. He refers to ethnic congregation as an enclave that can be rich in ethnic norms alternative to the mainstream’s and binds together co-ethnic individuals in the host country. The ethnic cultural norms also facilitate confident expectation and obligation in the congregation to mobilise resources for co-ethnic individuals.

Australia is ethnic diverse, which is evidenced as the country has the second highest proportion of migrants to locally born persons in the world. (Haskell, 2007) Sydney has received many of the immigrants arriving in Australia. In 2006, 31.7 percent of the population in Sydney was born overseas with their number continuing to increase. (Figure 1) (ABS, 2006) The arriving population is diverse in ethnicity with a total of more than 34 ethnic groups. The countries of birth outside Australia include: England (5.0%), New Zealand (3.5%), China (not including Special Administration Regions of Hong Kong and Macau) (3.1%), Greece (1.9%) and Indonesia (1.7%). (ABS, 2006)
**Figure 1:** Persons born overseas by year of arrival, Sydney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>134,486</td>
<td>167,994</td>
<td>204,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As a multicultural country, the Australian Government is committed to four multicultural principles in accordance to the National Agenda for Multicultural Australia 1989. The first principle is “responsibilities of all”: all Australians have a civic duty to support basic structures and principles of the society to guarantee freedom and equality. The second principle is “respect for each person”: subject to the law, all Australians have the right to express their culture and beliefs, and have a reciprocal obligation to respect the same rights of others. The third principle is “fairness for each person”: all Australians are entitled to equality of treatment and opportunity to contribute to the social, political and economic life of Australia, free from discrimination. The final principle “benefits for all”: all Australians can benefit from productive diversity, which is the cultural, social and economic dividends arising from the diversity. (Department of Immigration and Citizenship, 2006)

Australia celebrates the social reality that the country is ethnic diverse, for example, the Lord Mayor in Melbourne is a Chinese, the Premier of a State is a Lebanese and an AFL player is a Muslim. (Kalina, 2007)

However, multiculturalism has not been always the case in Sydney and Australia. The country experienced laissez faire and was generally accepting immigrants during the colonial era, until the White Australian policy took place between 1901 and 1973 when immigration was restricted. Despite the National Agenda for Multicultural Australia 1989, multiculturalism remains a contentious issue. For example, there have
been criticisms on lowering the status of multicultural affairs by making it the responsibility of a parliamentary secretary instead of a minister’s, and changing the name of the government department from Immigration and Multicultural Affairs to Immigration and Citizenship, and more recently, there has been the emphasis on immigrants’ responsibility to learn English and the introduction of a formal citizenship test. (Haskell, 2007; Currie, 2007)

Thesis question

In Sydney, there is no ethnic segregation, measured by the Index of Segregation. (Burnley, 2001) This contests the mechanisms of ethnic norm and bonding in contributing to the social capital in ethnic communities in earlier theories, especially when the broader community promotes inter-ethnic integration. More specifically, Eisenberg (2007) asserts that multiculturalism fragments a community and diminishes social capital. This leads to the following question:

**How important is ethnicity in bringing a community together?**

More specifically:

I. What are the factors for bringing a community together?

II. What are the factors for forming a social network?

III. How does ethnicity contribute to social capital?

IV. How to mobilise resources in a social network?

V. What contributes to the social capital in an ethnic community?

VI. What is social capital and what is its value?

VII. What is the role of ethnic community in today’s multicultural society?
Thesis methodology

This thesis encompassed a primary and secondary research to explore the relationship between ethnicity and social capital. The primary research consisted of an in-depth individual interview and a focus group held in relation to the case study on Chinese at Chatswood. The secondary research consisted of a literary review as a background to direct the thesis.

Primary research

The primary research consisted of an in-depth individual interview and a focus group. The qualitative research method allowed better opportunities to gauge the sense of respondents, which was the fundamental factor for the formation of co-ethnic network and social capital and was not readily revealed in quantitative research methods. The research attempted to gain an insight into the social life of Chinese in Chatswood that was not readily available in literature. The research received Approval 75081, granted by the Faculty of Built Environment’s Human Research Ethics Advisory Panel on the 5th September 2007.

In-depth individual interview

The prospective interviewee was selected through investigations in the community organisations and services available for the Chinese persons in Chatswood. The aim was to understand the role of the community organisations and services in forming networks between individuals, facilitating opportunities to be involved in the community and contributing to the social wellbeing of Chatswood.
Multicultural One-Stop Assistance Information Centre (MOSAIC) was a prospective organisation. The Centre was a branch of the Willoughby City Council of which Chatswood was a part. It facilitated information sessions and social activities for individuals, mainly of ethnic backgrounds, in the area. Subsequently, Ms. Rita Leung, ethnic coordinator of MOSAIC was approached and an interview was undertaken. The interview schedule was included in Appendix 1.

Focus group
The aim of the focus group was to examine the Chinese respondents’ first hand experiences in profiting and/ or contributing to the social capital in Chatswood.

The prospective focus group respondents were Chinese persons who lived, worked and/or entertained and frequented Chatswood, and were selected with two criteria. First, respondents had migrated to Sydney. This was imperative in understanding the experience in profiting from and/ or contributing to social capital in the migration experience. Second, respondents had resided in Sydney for a minimum of three years. This considered by PePua (et al, 1996) was the minimum to overcome initial settlement challenges and to have the opportunity to be involved in the new environment.

Given with the criteria, Ms Leung had liaised with five respondents and I had liaised with three respondents. The eight respondents belonged to various age groups: three respondents aged in their 20s, two respondents were in the age group of 30 to 50 years, and three respondents were in the age group of 50 plus years. These respondents were chosen to obtain a cross sectional representation of experience at different stages in the life cycle. The interview schedule was included in Appendix 2.
The interview and the focus group were digitally recorded with the consent of the respondents. A performa consent form and project information statement was included in Appendix 3. The audio was transcribed and coded for analysis. Quotes and relevant information had been referenced throughout the thesis in developing concepts.

This empirical research had ethical concerns. Ethnicity remained a sensitive topic. Respondents might have felt obliged to respond to what is considered to be “politically correct”, or they might have been confronted by issues with which they were not comfortable or entirely familiar with. As a Chinese person, I endeavoured to gain from the advantage of a mutual ground of understanding. Also, I endeavoured to overcome predefined conceptualisation which might hinder the interview and interpretation. I overcame the issues by relating to the literature and the information gathered in the interviews.

Secondary research

The secondary research consisted of literary review. It provided a foundation for the formation of ethnic community, social network and social capital. More specifically, it included international and Australian studies on the congregation of Chinese migrants in a host country.
Scope and limitation

Social capital could be attributed to many factors. This thesis recognises the relevance of physical structure and socioeconomic opportunities in social capital. However, it focuses on cultural integration with particular reference to social networking. This effectively forms the scope of this research on social capital.

This thesis defines Chinese persons by their country of birth and language spoken:
I. Country of birth, including: mainland China and Hong Kong Special Administration Region. This essentially refers to the Chinese persons who have migrated to Sydney in the course of their life time.
II. Language spoken at home, including: Mandarin, Cantonese, and other that consists of Hakka, Hokkien, Teochew and Wu. This is a good indicator of the persons who retain the culture.

This effectively forms the scope of Chinese in the study area.

Social capital is a concept which cannot be measured. Instead, the level of participation and involvement can be indicated by member size in organisations. The sense of belonging can be indicated by the time spent on volunteering. The notion of trust can be indicated by hypothetical circumstances in mobilising resources. However, these indications cannot be isolated from the influence of other factors, and there could be an under/over estimation of a causal relationship with social capital. Accordingly, this thesis does not measure the strength of factors, but relatively compares the factors in their relationships with social capital.
Social capital is both an outcome and a process. The tighter knitted the community, the social capital richer the community; in turn the social capital richer the community, the tighter knitted is the community. This gives rise to circular reasoning. Accordingly, though this thesis recognises that social capital brings together a community, it examines social capital as an outcome in its factors for formation.

Literature on social capital, especially on ethnic enclaves, is focused in the United States. It has a different context from multicultural Sydney, Australia, and the extent of congregation/segregation in ethnic enclaves. Nevertheless, this thesis has made reference to the literature to gain an understanding in the formation of ethnic communities and social capital to develop general themes. It recognises the limited applicability of literature for the study, and identifies (in)consistencies in literature and the empirical case study in Chatswood, Sydney. More specifically, this thesis disregards literature on ghetto, which is considered to be more pertinent to the context of the United States and not so applicable on multicultural Sydney.

The empirical research of interview and focus group is by no means representative of the Chinese population in Chatswood. The gathered information is the experience and opinion of the respondents in the study area. It is primarily used to convey senses and indicate gaps in research undertaken previously. In addition, many factors for social capital are social culture and psychological phenomenon that can be identified as a collective sense but cannot be explained individually. Ultimately, the notion of social capital differs in different context. This thesis acknowledges the limitation in its study and accordingly restricts its applicability to the context of the study area.
Thesis structure

This thesis explores the role of the Chinese ethnicity in the formation of networks and social capital in the community in Chatswood. Provided below is an outline of the content of each chapter in this thesis.

Chapter 2 (Formation of ethnic community) examines the factors for the formation of ethnic communities. It provides a literary review on the evolving focus on the three factors, including: physical, socioeconomic and social resources. It then relates the factors to the context of multicultural Sydney and the spatial clustering of the Chinese population within the city. This chapter helps explain the factors for ethnic individuals congregating together.

Chapter 3 (Ethnic network) provides a literary review on the four types of networks, including: bonding and bridging network in formal and informal settings. It then relates the types of networks to the Chinese community in Chatswood, it also analyses the factors for their formations. This chapter helps explain the extent of connections and the diversity of opportunities to access social capital in a community.

Chapter 4 (Ethnic social capital) discusses the underlying foundations for social capital, including: identity, participation and involvement, belonging and attachment, trust and trustworthiness, and the notion of reciprocity. It then relates the foundations to the Chinese ethnicity in bringing together a community in Chatswood. This chapter helps explain the depth of connections and the opportunities to contribute and mobilise social capital in a community.
Chapter 5 (Social capital) discusses social networks as a factor for the formation of social capital. It also includes a literary review on the value of social capital in a community.

Chapter 6 (Social capital in Chatswood) concludes the relationship between ethnicity and social capital in the community in Chatswood. It also makes reference to the attributes of social capital in the case study and makes recommendations for the planning for the study area.
Chapter 2
Formation of Ethnic communities
Chapter 2  Formation of Ethnic communities

Introduction

Ethnic communities are the neighbourhoods with higher densities of persons of ethnic backgrounds, and more availability of ethnic goods and services. Despite of the mental maps of some neighbourhoods with predominating ethnic populations, such as Chinese persons in Haymarket, the Chinese persons also highly co-exist with other ethnic persons in Haymarket. Accordingly, ethnic communities in multicultural Sydney are not segregations, measured by the Index of Segregation. (Burnley, 2001, 266)

This chapter discusses the formation of ethnic communities. It refers to the resources available in ethnic communities that bind ethnic persons together in a host country. This is done by reviewing the literature on the resources through history that shaped community formation: from physical, to socioeconomic and to social. Physical resources are infrastructure, transportation nodes and commercial establishments. Socioeconomic resources refer to the opportunities for attaining status and overcoming structural barrier. Lastly, social resources refer to the opportunities for social interaction and cultural integration. The three types of resources entail utility values that advantage persons through their ownership or access to the resources.

The chapter then relates the three types of resources to the formation of ethnic communities in multicultural Sydney and the formation of spatial clustering of the Chinese population within the city. This helps establish the role of the resources as factors for the formation of ethnic communities.
Resources in the formation of ethnic communities

The focus on the formation of ethnic communities have been evolving, each emphasising respective types of resources available in a community. The earlier focus relates to the distribution of physical resources, followed by a shift of focus to socioeconomic resources and the more recent focus has been on social resources.

Physical resources

The earlier focus on the formation of settlement patterns is pertinent to the distribution of physical resources. They are: Burgess’s Concentric Zone Model (1920s), Hoyt’s Sector Model (1939) and Harris and Ullman’s Multiple Nuclei Model (1945). (Figure 2) The models’ concentric rings, wedge shapes, and regional satellites settlement pattern correspond to the distribution of physical resources in a city that include: infrastructure, transportation nodes and commercial establishments. The settlement patterns also correspond with the distributions of households with similar backgrounds. These models generally associate ethnic households with District 3: low class residential in Figure 2. Therefore, many ethnic households in this era congregate around physical resources. This has been evidenced in the Chinatowns in inner cities where employment opportunities for immigrants were once concentrated.
**Figure 2:** Models of settlement pattern.

**Upper Left:** Burgess' Concentric Zone Model (1920s). **Upper Right:** Hoyt's Sector Model (1939). **Bottom Left:** Harris and Ullman’s Multiple Nuclei Model (1945). (Source: Campbell, 2002)

**Socioeconomic resources**

The focus on ethnic congregation was shifted to socioeconomic resources subsequently. Massey (1985) asserts that a removal from inner city enclaves to suburbs which are assumed with better housing quality and neighbourhood amenities is an indication of status attainment. He therefore conceptualises ethnic enclave as a transition zone for new migrants.
Waldinger (1986) asserts that new migrants are constrained in their access to opportunities in a host country. He believes that new migrants congregate to mobilise resources necessary for status attainment and to overcome structural constraints. He gives the example of job search process, in which ethnic network links up potential co-ethnic employer and employee, especially those without work experience in the host country. Iyer & Shapiro (1999) extended the example to ethnic economy, which make available entrepreneurial opportunity in co-ethnic niche markets.

**Social resources**

The Index of Segregation (1960s) has become the most widely used statistic for measuring the extent of spatial clustering of ethnic groups. The index takes into consideration, namely: residential community, social and kinship network, activity space and awareness space. (Allen & Turner, 1996) These considerations are a shift of focus to social resources for the formation of ethnic communities.

Amongst the recent theories, Li (1998) coins the term “ethnoburb” (ethnic suburb) that refers to suburban ethnic cluster of residential and economic activities. Socially, ethnoburb does not necessarily assimilate into the mainstream. Demographically, the cluster is ethnic diverse and there is no one ethnic group dominating a suburb. Economically, the suburb is vibrant, and is supported by a large co-ethnic population and strong transnational linkage with the population’s country of origin. These characteristics are a product of persistence of the original culture and integration into the mainstream culture in a host country.
Skop & Li (2005) attribute the formation of ethnoburbs to the niche immigrants with higher education attainment and professional jobs. This niche population arrive at the host country with socioeconomic status already comparable to the mainstream. They settle in ethnoburbs at the outset of arrival in the country without experiencing transition zones in inner city ethnic enclaves. Therefore, ethnoburbs are more sustainable in nature as suburbanised immigrants are less likely to relocate for further spatial assimilation.

The more recent focus on ethnic communities pertains to social interaction and cultural integration. Ang (2001) compares the traditional ethnic communities against those in the era of globalisation. (Figure 3) Ang summarises that in globalisation, diverse ethnic groups congregate spatially. The ethnic diversity in a neighbourhood brings about integration between the ethnic groups and the mainstream in a community.

**Figure 3**: Traditional ethnic communities and ethnic communities in the era of globalisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional ethnic communities</th>
<th>Ethnic communities in the era of globalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ethnic unity</td>
<td>1. ethnic diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. spatial scattering</td>
<td>2. spatial convergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. transnational nationalism</td>
<td>3. local hybridity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. virtual territorial space</td>
<td>4. actual social and territorial space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sameness in dispersal</td>
<td>5. together in difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ang, 2001, 89.
In short, the shifts of focus in the resources available to ethnic communities that are of utility values to migrants in binding them together in a host country indicate the changing nature of ethnic communities. In earlier days, ethnic households were generally associated with the lower income households that congregated around physical resources in a city. Subsequently, co-ethnic individuals congregate and form a transition zone in the inner city to mobilise socioeconomic resources and to overcome structural constrains. Recently in the era of globalisation, ethnoburbs and ethnic communities bring about social interactions and cultural integration between ethnic groups and the mainstream. These show that the resources are of temporary utility value to migrants in their migration experience and to bring together in a co-ethnic community in a host country.

The particular difference between the three types of resources is their availability. The earlier focus on physical resources is beyond the direct control of residents in a community and is subjected to exogenous influence. Physical resources are the inherited geography, it is the “what” in a community. On the contrary, the recent focus on social resources refers to the interactions amongst the residents and is endogenous to a community. Social resources are fostered by the congregation of individuals, it is the “who” in a community. Meanwhile, socioeconomic resources are a function of both “who” and “what” in a community, where the congregation mobilises the resources and where individuals inherit them.
Resources in the formation of ethnic communities in multicultural Sydney

Physical resources

Higher ethnic population densities are recognised in areas such as Vietnamese persons in Cabramatta and Lebanese persons in Lakemba. These areas are inherited with infrastructure and transportation node not particularly different from other areas in the city. They may include ethnic institutions and services that attract ethnic households. However, ethnic organisation is generally made available following the presence of the higher ethnic population density in a community instead of being a factor for initial clustering in the areas. Therefore, physical resources are not particular focuses in ethnic communities in Sydney.

Socioeconomic resources

There is no conclusive causal relationship between socioeconomic status and ethnic congregations in Sydney. (Burnley, 2001, 267) The most ethnic diverse population by birthplace is found in both lower income statistical local areas (SLAs) and higher income inner Sydney SLAs. On the other hand, lower ethnic diversity is found in all higher income outer Sydney SLAs, and lower and middle income SLAs. This finding: the more ethnic diverse higher income in inner Sydney SLAs and the less ethnic diverse higher income in outer SLAs shows that the distance from the inner city outweigh ethnic diversity as a factor for location decision making.
Burnley’s (2001, 267) finding: ethnic diversity is found in both lower and higher income SLAs contests Massey’s (1985) concept of transition zone, which is lower in status until spatial and socioeconomic assimilation. Instead, the ethnic diverse communities in Sydney are consistent with the characteristics of Li’s (1998) ethnoburb in Ang’s (2001) era of globalisation. Howenstine (1996) reinforces the phenomenon in Sydney that spatial assimilation does not necessarily mean socioeconomic advancement and assimilation with the mainstream.

**Social resources**

There is no ethnic segregation, measured by Index of Segregation, and there is no one ethnic group dominating a SLA in Sydney. (Burnley, 2001, 266, 267) The most ethnic diverse SLAs are Fairfield and Marrickville, home to Portuguese, Lebanese, Vietnamese, Chinese, Greek and other ethnic groups. This distribution pattern reinforces the fact that the city is ethnic diverse and ethnic groups cannot be identified in isolation in a neighbourhood. The ethnic diverse congregations facilitate social interactions and cultural integrations between ethnic groups and the mainstream that is consistent with Ang’s (2001) characteristics of ethnic communities in the era of globalisation.

The utility values of resources that bring together a co-ethnic community in a host country is temporary in nature. An example of this is Leichhardt Local Government Area, which has lost its appeal for the Italian born population. Leichhardt is home to many persons whose parent(s) were born in Italy, but persons who were born in Italy in the area are now marginally dominated by New Zealander born. Meanwhile, persons born in Italy are now by far the second largest proportion of the population in the adjacent suburb of Haberfield, second to Australia born. (ABS, 2006) This
relocation of the Italian population in Sydney could be a natural migration process with increasing participation in the mainstream and reducing participation in the ethnic congregation. Also, it could be attributed to the limited capability of ethnic congregations to accommodate different stages in the migration flow of that group. The temporary nature of ethnic communities is consistent with Massey’s (1985) transition zone but contradicts Li’s (1998) ethnoburb’s sustainable nature.

In sum, physical and socioeconomic resources, the “what” in a community, limitedly contribute to the formation of ethnic congregations in Sydney. The diverse ethnic populations which have been distributed across the city reflect that the physical and socioeconomic resources represent similar utility values for all ethnic groups in pulling and binding them in a community. In other words, physical and socioeconomic resources are not ethno-specific factors for persons congregating in Sydney.

Resources in the formation of Chinese communities in Sydney

Physical resources
Chinatown in Sydney has always been located in the inner city around the predominating economic activities of the era. First, it was located where The Rocks is now located, next to the wharves and peripheral to the city shopping centre. It then relocated to Wexford Street and subsequently Haymarket, close to the centre for market gardeners. It then again relocated to its current address on Dixon Street. The
enclave was home to more than half of the Chinese population in Sydney prior to suburbanisation and World War II. (Connell & Ip, 1981) This pattern is consistent with the focus on employment opportunities and physical structure in ethnic communities in earlier days.

Suburbanisation exemplified post World War II. In 1966, the top ten congregations of Chinese SLAs were: Randwick, Canterbury, Marrickville, Ashfield, Rockdale, Waverley, Willoughby, Ku-ring-gai, Burwood and Ryde. (Choi, 1975) Given that this distribution pattern of the Chinese population was similar to that of the mainstream in Sydney, (Burnley, 2001, 276) suburbanisation pattern is not ethno specific in the formation of ethnic congregation in Sydney.

**Socioeconomic resources**

Burnley (2001, 276) finds a causal relationship between distribution patterns, and an individual’s dialect spoken and socioeconomic status. The Cantonese speaking migrants from Hong Kong, Malaysia and Singapore tend to be made up of younger professional families. Many of them have settled in the higher income SLAs in Hornsby and Ku-ring-gai, and recently in the middle income Baulkham Hills SLA. Meanwhile, many Cantonese speaking migrants from mainland China who are relatives of skilled migrants and students given amnesty in 1989\(^{(1)}\) have settled in the Hurstville and Strathfield SLAs.

\(^{(1)}\) *Tiananmen Square massacre in Beijing (1989) prompted the federal government to give 20,000 mainland Chinese students who were studying in Australia a four year amnesty stay. (Burnley, 2001, 279)*
On the other hand, Burnley (2001, 276) finds many Mandarin speaking migrants have settled in Marrickville, Canterbury and Ashfield SLAs. More specifically, Mandarin speaking students who were from northern and central China, Shanghai regions and those who were given amnesty in 1989 have settled in the Burwood, Canterbury and Concord SLAs. Also, lower income migrants from South China have settled in the Fairfield SLA. This distribution pattern of the Chinese population in the city shows that the common dialect spoken is a factor for ethnic congregation. Also, the socioeconomic status is another factor for ethnic congregation, however that cannot be examined in isolation from the influence of housing affordability, which is not an ethno specific factor when considering congregations.

**Social resources**

The distribution pattern of the Chinese population in Sydney corresponds to the individual’s migration experience. Many pre-war arrivals have moved from the inner city and the surrounding suburbs to the southern middle distance suburbs, whilst those who arrived subsequent to the establishment of the People’s Republic of China (1947) have moved from Canterbury in the south to Ku-ring-gai in the north. (Connell & Ip, 1981) Therefore, the common migration experience has been a factor for Chinese persons congregating in the respective parts of Sydney.

Burnley (2001, 276) finds many Chinese persons who had qualified in Sydney first settled in Randwick SLA, then relocated to the upper north shore, Hurstville and Kogarah after ten years of residence. In other words, the common experience of qualifying in Sydney, namely at the University of New South Wales in Randwick
SLA, reinforces that common experience has been a factor for the formation of congregation. However, this common experience diminishes its significance over time that residents then relocate to alternative established Chinese congregations in the city.

In 2006, the top ten congregations of Chinese SLAs in Sydney are shown in Figure 4. The table makes reference to ancestry and birthplace, it essentially identifies individuals whose parents and/or themselves have migrated to Sydney. Figure 4a refers to the absolute population size and is ranked by the size of congregation, whilst Figure 4b refers to the percentage representation of population and is ranked by the density of Chinese. The two tables, when compared with Choi’s (1975) top ten Chinese congregations, show that Ashfield, Burwood, Ryde and Willoughby have remained attractive to Chinese persons over time, whilst Waverley has by far faded out as a Chinese enclave. This reinforces the concept that ethnic congregations are temporary in nature in accommodating different stages in the migration flow of that group.
**Figure 4a:** Top ten congregations of Chinese SLAs in Sydney, by population size, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical local area</th>
<th>Persons of Chinese ancestry</th>
<th>% of total population in SLA</th>
<th>Total persons born in China and HKSAR</th>
<th>% of total population in SLA</th>
<th>Total % of population of Chinese ancestry, and born in China &amp; HKSAR in SLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurstville</td>
<td>15,014</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>10,236</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryde</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9302</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>38.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield East</td>
<td>16,518</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>3375</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>12,466</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>6729</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby South</td>
<td>11,207</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>6718</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randwick</td>
<td>12,427</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>5468</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby</td>
<td>10,042</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5684</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kogarah</td>
<td>9153</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>6445</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwood</td>
<td>6495</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4314</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield</td>
<td>6428</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>4366</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS, 2006
**Figure 4b:** Top ten congregations of Chinese SLAs in Sydney, by percentage representation, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical local area</th>
<th>Persons of Chinese ancestry</th>
<th>% of total population in SLA</th>
<th>Total persons born in China and HKSAR</th>
<th>% of total population in SLA</th>
<th>Total % of population of Chinese ancestry, and born in China &amp; HKSAR in SLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>12,466</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>6729</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hurstville</td>
<td>15,014</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>10,236</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Burwood</td>
<td>6495</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>4314</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kogarah</td>
<td>9153</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>6445</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strathfield</td>
<td>5473</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>3205</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ryde</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9302</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ashfield</td>
<td>6428</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>4366</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Willoughby</td>
<td>10,042</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5684</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hornsby South</td>
<td>11,207</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>6718</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fairfield East</td>
<td>16,518</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>3375</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABS, 2006
In short, the distribution pattern of the Chinese population in Sydney is similar to that of the mainstream and other ethnic groups in the city. However, amongst the Chinese population, Chinese persons congregate themselves in the respective parts of Sydney in accordance to their dialect spoken and migration experience. This shows that the “who” in a community is a factor for Chinese congregations in Sydney.

Conclusion

Ethnic communities in multicultural Sydney in the era of globalisation are ethnic diverse. The communities facilitate social interaction and cultural integration between the ethnic groups and the mainstream in a community. The congregation of diverse ethnic population shows that they perceive similar utility values in the resources available which pull and bind them together in the community. Nevertheless, Chinese persons have congregated in respective parts of Sydney according to their commonality in migration experience and dialect spoken. This indicates that the “who” in a community is of ethno-specific values to Chinese persons in congregations.

Physical resources, the “what” in a community, limitedly contribute to the factors for ethnic congregations in Sydney. Infrastructure, transportation nodes and commercial establishments are generally distributed across the city today and are not particular pulling factors for congregations. Meanwhile, ethnic organisations and services continue their pulling and binding forces to bring together ethnic individuals.
Socioeconomic resources minimally contribute to the factors for ethnic congregation in Sydney. They were once perceived as a transition zone necessary for overcoming structural constrains and attaining status in a host country. However, Sydney exhibits an ethnic diversity in both of its higher and lower income areas. This is especially the case when migrants arrive at the city with socioeconomic status already compatible with the mainstream's.
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Introduction

Social resources are one of the three identified factors for the formation of ethnic congregations. Social resources, the “who”, are the people and their networks that make up a community. They are fundamental for the formation of ethnic communities in today’s multicultural society.

Coleman (1990) and Putnam (2000) assert that social network is one of the most important attribute for social capital. This chapter first includes a literary review on the types of social networks, including bonding and bridging network in formal and informal setting. It then relates to the social network in the Chinese community in Chatswood.

This chapter also analyses the factors for the formation of bonding and bridging network in the Chinese community in Chatswood. The factors are the individual’s characteristics shared in common in the members of the network that effectively govern the size of networks an individual possesses. This is the extent of networks in a quantitative manner. However, it is recognised that there are many social culture and psychological phenomenon that come into force in the formation of social networking. These are beyond the scope of this thesis.
Social network

Social networks stems from families, workplaces, neighbourhoods, local associations, and a range of informal and formal meeting places (ABS, 2004, 5). There are four types of networks: informal bonding network, formal bonding network, informal bridging network and formal bridging network. (Figure 5)

Figure 5: The four types of social networks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bonding</th>
<th>Bridging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal</strong></td>
<td>Formal bonding</td>
<td>Formal bridging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal</strong></td>
<td>Informal bonding</td>
<td>Informal bridging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bonding networks**

Bonding networks are embedded in persons who share commonality in areas such as: ancestry and origin, language, socioeconomic status and residence location. Tocqueville and Almond of the American School make particular reference to family and friendship in which the connections unite members. (Arneil, 2006) Tonnies’s concept of gemeinschaft makes reference to kinship and biological ties, sharing of territory and common values expressed through religion that bind individuals together. (Ringer & Lawless, 1989)
Bridging networks

Bridging networks are embodied in persons who are deemed different and who are bound together by business associates, acquaintances and mutual friends. Tonnies’s concept of gesellshaft makes reference to the special purpose association formed by the deliberation, calculation, and ambition. (Ringer & Lawless, 1989)

Formal and informal networks

Formal networks involve engagement in organisations. They can be reflected in the size of memberships in community organisations, the time and monetary expenditure on civic engagement, and the number of cultural, leisure and social group an individual belongs to. However, engagement in organisations does not completely reveal the extent of networking. An example of the shortfall is the mailing list of membership whose members do not necessarily interact in person.

On the other hand, informal networks do not involve organisations, but are embedded in day-to-day life. However, it could be difficult to discern formal and informal networks. An example is religious community, in which the organised worshiping activity brings together persons in what constitutes a formal setting. Meanwhile, interactions in places of worship often extend beyond worship to social activities in an informal setting. According to Putnam, (2000, 67) social ties in religious communities are as important as religious ties.
Formal and informal networks complement each other. As in a religious community, relationships found in formal avenues extend beyond and help establish informal relationships. Similarly, existing informal ties recommends participation and involvement in organisations and thereby establish formal relationships. Therefore, strengthening both formal and informal network is important to the social network in aggregate, which is the fundamental foundation for social capital.

In sum, the four types of social networks are the connection between individuals and the community. (Figure 6) The various social structure, demographic pattern and social representation in a community imply the various attitude, value, expectation, identity and motivation in individuals. These variations necessitate a commonality, a common purpose and a sanctioned norm in a community to coordinate its members. Therefore, bonding network is more readily formed given the already established and understood cultural norms in a community, whilst bridging network requires a search for the sanctioned norm in a community.
**Figure 6:** Social network, being the connection between individuals and the community. (Deaux, 2006, 5)

This chapter and the following chapter study social resources with the case study of the Chinese community in Chatswood. Chatswood, New South Wales, Australia is a suburb defined by the Australia Bureau of Statistics on the north shore of Sydney as shown in **Figure 7.** **Figure 8** refers to the Chinese in Chatswood. There are 50 proprietors from Hong Kong leasing premises in the shopping area of Chatswood, and more Chinese proprietors are also leasing premises in the office towers in the area. (Burnley, 2001, 279)
**Figure 7:** The study area: Chatswood


**Figure 8:** Chinese in Chatswood.

**a. Country of birth of person, by year of arrival in Australia.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Special Administration Region (HKSAR)</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. Ancestry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancestry: country of birth of parent</th>
<th>No. of persons</th>
<th>% of Chatswood population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c. Origin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin: country of birth of person</th>
<th>No. of persons</th>
<th>% of Chatswood population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKSAR</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2497</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language spoken at home</th>
<th>No. of persons</th>
<th>% of Chatswood population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (hakka, Hokkien, Teochew, Wu)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3749</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Speak English only (%)</th>
<th>Speak other language and speak English very well and well (%)</th>
<th>Speak other language and speak English not well or not at all (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>31 (2.2)</td>
<td>941 (65.3)</td>
<td>470 (32.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKSAR</td>
<td>30 (3.0)</td>
<td>882 (85.5)</td>
<td>120 (11.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61 (2.5)</td>
<td>1823 (73.7)</td>
<td>590 (23.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Chinese social network in Chatswood

Chinese social networks in Chatswood include bonding and bridging relationships, through Multicultural One-Stop Assistance Information Centre (MOSAIC) and church, and through friend’s friends. In the context of this thesis on ethnicity, the term bonding network is essentially referring to co-ethnic ties amongst Chinese persons. Bonding network takes place locally in Chatswood and Sydney, and transnationally with Chinese persons in their country of origin. Meanwhile, the term bridging network refers to the connections between Chinese and non Chinese persons that are found through the commonality of individual’s characteristics, other than ethnicity.
**Informal Chinese bonding network**

Informal Chinese bonding network in Chatswood mainly takes place at the shopping village on Victoria Avenue, which has been established as a centre for Chinese goods and services through the years. It draws co-ethnic members from the surrounding areas for shopping, business and entertainment. In this sense, Chinese-ness in Chatswood is an informal binding factor for Chinese persons in the neighbourhood, as a focus group respondent said:

*Everyday in Chatswood, I see people [I know].*

The high density of Chinese persons and businesses in the neighbourhood represent better opportunities for co-ethnic interaction. This is evidenced by Abrahamson’s (2006) findings that there are persisting closely knitted relationships between Chinese customers and store owners in Chinatowns. Similarly, Ms Leung indicated:

*If there are more people from their own background, then they may be able to form an informal network .....to speak the same language and always wanting to go the same places.*

**Formal Chinese bonding network**

There are 40 Chinese associations, (Pe Pua, 1994) and many Chinese churches in the city. These are avenues for Chinese persons to participate in an organisation and to interact with other members. MOSAIC is an example of an organisation in Chatswood, though not being Chinese specific, arranges information sessions for new migrants and weekly social activities:
Because it is not only information that the new migrants were after, and they need a social network...people would want to meet people from their own country. (Ms Leung)

Formal and informal networks complement each other. For example, existing informal ties encourage participation and involvement in MOSAIC, as 80 percent of its existing members come to know about the Centre through friends. (MOSAIC, 2007) Meanwhile, MOSAIC’s weekly social activities help establish informal relationships.

*We [MOSAIC] are one of the bodies that help people form network......we provide an opportunity for people to form a network.* (Ms Leung)

**Transnational Chinese bonding network**

Transnational bonding network takes place between the Chinese persons in Sydney and their family and friends at their country of origin. This network has been contested in Park’s Race Relations Cycle, which asserts that assimilation is imperative through the migration experience. However, today’s studies generally recognise the persisting transnational linkages with persons from the country of origin in the migration experience. (Fong & Ooka, 2006)

In particular, Pe Pua (et al, 1996) coins the term “astronaut”, which refers to the bread winners of migrant families who return to the country of origin to make a living. They fly frequently between the old and the new homes. “Astronaut” is a common phenomenon in Sydney that fosters persisting linkages with the country of origin. In addition, this fosters Ang’s (2001) hybrid identity in migrants, who are subjected to the influence of the old and new homes, in the era of globalisation.
Some respondents maintained transnational relationships. They did so for the similar reasons in bonding network. In addition, they did not consider the distance an issue for the formation of this network:

*I always keep in touch with friends and family, I enjoy and I want to.*

*It is now easier to get the news back in Hong Kong or China, there is Chinese newspaper and Chinese cable TV and internet and friends.*

**Informal and formal bridging network**

Social networks are often found in common race, similar to that found in co-ethnicity, as a focus group respondent said:

*All my friends are Chinese and Asian.*

For example, some Chinese churches include a parent congregation which is Chinese speaking and a subsidiary congregation which is English speaking that attract Chinese and Asian members in general. In addition, Chinese communities are often perceived as Asian communities, where Chinese restaurants are interspersed with Asian restaurants such as Korean, Japanese, Thai and Vietnamese. (Yeung, 2006) Therefore, race is similar to ethnicity as a determining factor for social networking for Chinese residents in Chatswood.

Respondents indicated that many of their bridging networks are formed in formal settings, at church, university and work. MOSAIC arranges mixed group leisure activities for its members of different ethnic backgrounds. Examples of these activities are Italian cooking class for all members and Taichi class for the interested Korean and Italian members.
Because we [MOSAIC] feel that it is important for people from different cultures to interact with one another, so to help them to relate to one another and to enjoy activities in a mixed group. (Ms Leung)

The fact that many bridging networks are facilitated in organisations implies the restricted opportunities for the formation of this network. This is evidenced by the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affair’s (1986, 2) findings that Chinese are eager to make friends with Australians.

Factors for Chinese networking in Chatswood

The Chinese networks at Chatswood are stemmed from commonalities. These commonalities include ethnicity, which is unique from birth that refers to the Chinese-ness and the Chinese dialects spoken. Other commonalities include: distance from networking opportunities, demographic characteristics, migration experience and religion.

Chinese-ness

Chinese culture preserves traditions and customs. (Yuan, 1963) Therefore, consuming Chinese-ness is one of the reasons Chinese persons frequent Chatswood. Examples of Chinese-ness are Chinese newspaper, animal’s parts that are not readily available in the mainstream markets such as chicken feet and duck tongue. Focus group respondents brought up discussions on Chinese cuisine on several occasions. Some respondents would travel from the north shore of Sydney to the inner city and line up at the only yumcha restaurant in Sydney in earlier days. Similarly, Chinese ingredients were not readily available in suburbs in earlier days, thereby cooking became an
activity that brought respondents together to share recipes. Yumcha is part of the Chinese culture and Chinese food in Sydney allows Chinese persons to create a comfort zone and to reminisce about their countries of origin. (Tam, 2002) Therefore, the Chinese-ness at Chatswood provides Chinese persons with the opportunities for cultural sustenance and home-making.

The extents of cultural sustenance and home making sought by the respondents varied according to their age. Older respondents tended to frequent Chatswood more often than the younger respondents. Though, this might be partly attributed to their restricted mobility to access the other parts of Sydney. Meanwhile, younger respondents showed inconclusive outcomes, as they frequented all parts of the city.

In addition, Chinese-ness attracts non Chinese persons for cultural experience and facilitates opportunities for bridging networks. For example, MOSAIC arranges cultural talks which often attract non Chinese attendances.

**Language**

Language is an inconclusive factor for social networking. English is important for new migrants to interact with the mainstream and to integrate into a host country. However, it is not so important when interpreter service and translated materials are available. According to Ms. Leung, the large Chinese population in Sydney has prompted the availability of translated Chinese materials and Chinese/ English bilingual workers in many disciplines. This availability of Chinese language in day to day lives reduces spoken and written Chinese as a factor for co-ethnic networking.
Nevertheless, the importance of English remains, as MOSAIC’s English class continues to be the most popular class of all classes the Centre offers. (MOSAIC, 2007) Meanwhile, non English speaking elderly migrants are particularly constrained in learning a new language:

*Some older people……find the lessons [Adult Migrant English Service] very hard. They keep saying the classes are tiring and they don’t know what the teacher is talking about, so they gradually lose interest and they may not go to those classes.* (Ms Leung)

Meanwhile, language and communication does not merely refer to the face value of verbal messages. The focus group was conducted in English, implying that verbal messages is not an issue in communication. Instead, respondents indicated that it was the “mind” and the “culture” that matters in communication. Cultural Exchange (2007) reinforces the similar that a barrier for migrants in seeking employment is the Australian culture rather than language. A respondent summarised:

*People find it easier to relate to people who are similar to them and so make friends easier with them……it is more efficient to grow relationships with them…..In-jokes or easier everyday small talk allows sharing.*

This shows that communication is stemmed from value system, understanding and unspoken rules in a culture. Chinese newspaper in Sydney includes: news, business and finance in Sydney and at home; entertainment and literature; migration, social and community news, welfare and social security. (Pe Pua, 1994) However, Chinese persons in Sydney read Chinese newspaper not necessarily because of the language, instead as a respondent explained, it was the “interesting news” in the country of origin that prompted her reading Chinese newspaper.
**Demography and time**

Demography, here, refers to age, gender and lifestyle that influence an individual’s propensity of time to engage in day-to-day networking.

Age influences the mobility to access networks. The focus group respondents in the older age group more frequently mentioned the convenience of Chatswood. Also, they considered distance as a factor, when asked if they would offer assistance to friends. This implies their concern on the physical distance from networking opportunities. In particular, a respondent in this age group had been discouraged from volunteering at locations far away from her suburb of residence. Therefore, mobility to access builds upon distance from networking opportunities as a factor for social network.

Also, age is pertinent to lifestyle. Younger respondents benefited from more avenues to form connections at university and at work. This was in addition to leisure activities and religious congregations, which were avenues also for respondents in the older age group. Meanwhile, younger respondents showed dividing participation levels in organisations: two were churchgoers who regularly attend services at church and fellowships at university, one volunteered at a community organisation in which his mother was also involved, and one was not engaged in any organisation. On the contrary, respondents in the older age group showed better propensity of time in participating in organisation, given their retired lifestyles. This is evidenced by members of MOSAIC, about 70 percent of who are older than 50. (MOSAIC, 2007)

*They enjoy the classes and the social bit of the classes......they have settled in already, otherwise they wouldn’t have the time to come to those activities. (Ms Leung)*
The focus group was conducted on a weekday and included 7 females and 1 male, as males invited had declined participation in the group. Also, 96 percent of MOSAIC members are females. (MOSAIC, 2007) This implies better propensity of time amongst females than males participating in organisation, given the presumably difference in occupation pattern. Therefore, the employment commitment influences individual’s time propensity for networking. In particular, a respondent indicated that her work shift at night prevented her from making day-to-day connections. In addition, time propensity influences the collective networking opportunities amongst members of a community to meet at a mutual time. (Putnam, 2000)

**Distance from networking opportunities**

Ethnic diversity is distributed in multicultural Sydney, there is no ethnic enclave by Index of Segregation. (Burnley, 2001, 266) According to Putnam (2000), this ethnic heterogeneity in a neighbourhood fosters civic engagement and bridging networking. This is a truism, as focus group respondents had many of their bridging networks formed at work, university, church and MOSAIC.

Social network is stemmed from face-to-face interaction. Therefore, distance from networking opportunities is a determining factor for social networks. This is reinforced by the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs’ (1986, 2) findings that Asians in Sydney consider the distance between relatives and/ or friends a disadvantage in locational decision making. At a neighbourhood scale, focus group respondents formed relationship with their neighbours. At a regional scale, respondents who were members of MOSAIC frequently interacted with MOSAIC members. More specifically, 68 percent of MOSAIC members reside in Chatswood.
and an additional 15 percent reside in the Willoughby Local Government Area. (MOSAIC, 2007) Putnam (2000) explains that distance consumes time that more time spent on travelling means less time for real interaction. Moreover, respondents who did not maintain transnational ties attributed to the distance that has weakened the relationships:

*They \{persons at the country of origin\} are far away and you are distanced.*  
*It \{news at the country of origin\} doesn’t immediately concern me.*  
(Focus group respondent)

Respondents’ indicated that they interacted with their, Chinese and non Chinese, neighbours and MOSAIC members more often than with their Chinese friends living in other parts of Sydney. Therefore, distance from networking opportunities is a better determining factor than co-ethnicity for the formation of social networks.

*Migration experience*

Ms Leung believed that unequal access to opportunities is inherited in many new migrants in the new environment because of the lack of understanding in the local legislation and cultural system. However, focus group respondents did not mention structural constraints that hindered them from forming social relationships in their experience, nor economic background as being a factor for participation in social network. This is inconsistent with Massey’s (1985) concept that new migrants form networks to gain socioeconomic status. Instead, this is similar to Li’s (1998) ethnoburb when migrants arrive Chatswood with income already compatible with the mainstream. In addition, prior to the establishment of ethnic resources at Chatswood, it was believed that these resources were unnecessary in the area given the relatively
greater affluence compared with areas such as Paramatta and Blacktown. (Ms. Leung, focus group respondents) Nevertheless, ethnic needs in information resources had been identified and prompted the establishment of the Centre in the area. This further contests Massey’s (1985) correlation between the demand for ethnic resources and migrants with lower income status.

**Religions**

A churchgoing respondents showed parallel bonding and bridging connections in her religious networking in the Chinese and non Chinese congregations. She attended a Chinese church on the north shore and formed religious connections with co-ethnic individuals, whilst she also took part in non ethno-specific fellowship outside the Chinese church at university where there is a mix of ethnicity.

In short, Chinese-ness and Chinese language are the ethno specific factor for the formation of network. They are facilitated through ethnic physical resources, such as ethnic goods, services and organisation. Meanwhile, non ethno specific factors include: individual characteristics of age, gender and religious faith, distance from networking opportunities and migration experience. Commonalities in these factors bring together the population group sharing these characteristics. Also, they further stratify population group sharing these characteristics in an ethnic group.

Social network are stemmed from the norms in a community. Ethnic bonding network is more readily formed, given the already established and understood ethnic cultural norms amongst individuals. On the contrary, bridging network necessitates a search for the sanctioned norm that is often found in commonalities through life experience and value system in subcultures.
Conclusion

There are four types of networks: bonding and bridging network in formal and informal settings. The factors for their formation in the Chinese community in Chatswood are the characteristics the members of the community share in common. They refer to the “who” in a community. They essentially govern the extent of connection an individual possess that is the quantitative sense of social network.

Co-ethnic connection is more readily formed given the already established ethnic commonality in individuals. Chinese specific factors for bringing the Chinese community together in Chatswood include: Chinese-ness in provision goods and services in the neighbourhood, common dialect spoken, and same mind and same culture amongst the persons living in the area. Ethnic commonality fosters opportunities for efficient communication, home making and cultural sustenance. This ethno-specific factor remains a preference in the formation of networks.

Meanwhile, bridging network necessitates a search for commonality in individuals. Non ethno-specific factors that bring the Chinese community with the rest of the community together in Chatswood include: gender and age, distance from networking opportunities, migration experience and religions.
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Introduction

The four types of network in Chatswood vary in their quantity and quality. Chapter 3 has discussed the factors for formation of networks that effectively governs the size of networks an individual possesses. This is the extent of networks in their quantitative manner.

This chapter discusses the elements in networks, including identity and participation, belonging and trust, and reciprocity. These elements govern the depth of networks in their qualitative manner. A person’s self identification and participation in a community facilitate a sense of belonging; the participation and belonging in turn facilitate trust. Ultimately, these elements mobilise the resources available in a network to individuals, through their membership in the community.

This chapter examines the elements with a review of literature and relates to the Chinese in Chatswood with interviews. It is recognised that these elements are both an outcome and a process. Participation nurtures a sense of belonging and trust in the community, meanwhile the sense belonging and trust also encourage participation.
Identity

Migrants living in a host country away from home experience identity politics. Literature on identity, particularly ethnic identity, is divided in relation to its persistence or fluidity. Some literature believes that identity, being in the blood, is static and is stereotyped by skin colour and features; whilst other believes that it is socially derived in the environment a person lives in.

Focus group respondents, all of whom migrated to Sydney in the course of their lifetime, regardless their residence length in Sydney or their migration experience in the stage in their life cycle, self identified themselves as “Chinese”. Though, some respondents added that they are Australian nationality-wise, and some identified themselves more as Australian than Chinese. Meanwhile, some had “no doubt” that they are Chinese. Therefore, Chinese-ness persisted.

Respondents’ self identifications are consistent with Deaux’s (2006) four models of identity experiences. First, identity is fundamentally determined by traits and collective memory:

*Where the root is. Where the heart is.* (Focus group respondent)

Similarly, an identity is attested by ethnic activities:

*I eat rice everyday.* (Focus group respondent)
Alternatively, an identity is supported by social relationships and networks, and becomes embedded in an individual:

*All my friends are Chinese.* (Focus group respondent)

Lastly, identity is a resolution in the original and new identities. This is Ang’s (2001) hybrid identity. This is evidenced in the respondents who maintained original identities through transnational networks with friends and family in the country of origin in addition to the new identity through social networks in the new culture. An Australian-born-Chinese (ABC) respondent who has spent time in both Hong Kong and Australia summarised:

*I think that we are a breed of our own, like we're not pure ABC yet we are not pure FOB [foreign overseas born].*

According to Norton, (2000) self identification is complemented by collective identity in the community. Focus group respondents would identify themselves not only as Chinese but also as Chinese who live in Chatswood. (Abrahamson, 2006) In other words, participation and involvement in the ethnic group in the neighbourhood facilitates an identity in the Chinese in Chatswood.

Literature translates identity: individual to “I’, community to “we”, and outsiders to “them”. According to Cornell & Hartmann, (1998) self identification and collective identities help individuals find more commonalities with some people and less with others. Meanwhile, it is a psychological phenomenon that individuals frequent more often with “we” than “them”.
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So we relate both to people who are FOB and pure ABC and our own kind more, on the spectrum of things, than pure Anglos and pure only Chinese speaking people. (Focus group respondent)

This is a truism: in ethnicity and race, most focus group respondents had more Chinese and Asian friends than non Chinese and non Asian friends; in organisations, many MOSAIC members were friends with other members of MOSAIC. Therefore, identification with a community is a core factor in networks.

**Participation and belonging**

Identity remains a symbol until there is participation and involvement in a community. (Cornell & Hartmann, 1998) More specifically, face-to-face interaction is a core factor for social capital. (Putnam, 2000) However, focus group respondents expressed dividing opinions in the importance of face-to-face interaction. Respondents who maintained frequent transnational linkages asserted that, despite the rare real interaction, transnational networks were just like other form of networks. On the other hand, respondents who maintained minimal transnational linkages lacked commonality of “we-ness” with their counter persons in transnational network:

*It’s hard when you don’t have common topics to talk about. People change and so things that people have in common also are lost and communication thins.* (Focus group respondent)
Nevertheless, focus group respondents all indicated a sense of attachment to the
country of origin, though to various extent, given the presence of transnational friends
and family. Meanwhile, they also indicated a sense of belonging to Sydney, given the
presence of a family and the investment in properties. Respondents, regardless of their
length of residence in Sydney or their migration experience in the stages of their life
cycle, showed dividing sense of belonging and attachment to Sydney and their
country of origin. Nevertheless, the identity to Sydney represents mere potential for a
thin highly bridging network, given the abstract common purpose of the society.
Therefore, identity, participation and involvement, and a sense of belonging is best
facilitated at a neighbourhood level to achieve thick social network.

According to Olson (1965) individual’s participation and involvement in a community
is bound together by a conscious pursuit of a common purpose. More specifically, a
organisation is bound together by a common purpose of its members and its objective
with which it is formed. Common purpose is not limited to material interest or status
attainment, but also includes mutual support and a search for meanings. (Cornell &
Hartman, 1998) This is could a sustenance of individual’s characteristics, such as
ethnicity, age, gender, nationality, religion, residence suburb. The pursuit of the
common purpose nurtures a sense of pride and thereby a sense of belonging in a
community.
The Chinese community at Chatswood, as shown in Chapter 3 has been formed to take advantage of the efficient communication, home making and cultural sustenance. Similarly, members who regularly participate in MOSAIC’s leisure class have a purpose:

*Exercising [MOSAIC leisure class] is good.* (Focus group respondent)

*They enjoy the classes and the social bit of the classes.* (Ms Leung)

In turn, members’ contributions to the common purpose of a community nurture a sense of belonging and attachment in the community. This is especially the case when the common purpose is achieved and there is a sense of pride in the community.

*They [volunteers] don’t necessarily live in the area but ......because they are involved, they devote their time and their skills here......If you don’t feel you are part of the community, you don’t bother.* (Ms Leung)

In addition, participation and involvement in a community bring about interaction between members that also facilitate a sense of belonging between members. Focus group respondents indicated various extent of interactions in networks, from thinner involvement in a network “hi, good morning, hello” to “good friends”. The more frequently the individuals interact, the more belonged and attached they are to connections. Therefore, participation and involvement nurtures cohesiveness in both the members and the community, and forms a tightly knitted network.
Trust and trustworthiness

Trust in social capital, according to the Macquarie Dictionary (1999) definition, means a sense of confidence to rely on the network and to believe in the network. For example, an individual’s trust in a community means the individual is comfortable to seek assistance from the community and believes that the community would make available assistance when called upon.

Alternatively, trustworthiness in social capital, according to the Macquarie Dictionary (1999) definition, means confident expectation and obligation of a person’s ability or intention to pay at some future time. Trustworthiness comes into force when a person decides to interact with another person at initial contact, or to take initiative to offer assistance.

Trust is pertinent to risk. Sztompka (1999) describes that risk is a consequence of decisions, which is oriented to the unknown future, and implies the uncertainty about the occurrence of an event. Meanwhile, Arneil (2006) asserts that interaction fosters trust in a community and encourages members to act trustworthily. Therefore, trust and trustworthiness stems from a counterperson who could make available resources when called upon. Trust and trustworthiness is not found in every person who is connected, and when measuring connection by its extent or size, trust is not readily taken into consideration.
Fukuyama (1995) finds that Chinese persons have an inclination to trust the persons related to them, and distrust persons outside their family and kin. Similarly, Pe Pua’s (et al, 1996) find that Chinese migrants are reluctant to discuss difficulties with outsiders that a time period is necessary to develop in-depth connection with persons in the new environment, to trust and to confide their difficulties. Many research respondents indicated that family and friends would be the first point of contact in case of difficulties. They would only seek help from outsiders depending on the “nature and extent of the issue”. This shows that, without trust, resources available in networks are of little value to its members.

There are two types of trust. Thick and thin trust (Arneil, 2006), or personalised trust and generalised trust (Stone, 2001). Thick trust/ personalised trust exist in established social relationships, whilst thin trust/ generalised trust exists in strangers. The two types of trusts essentially refer to the trust in bonding and bridging networks respectively. They are similar to the two types of networks and are stemmed from a sanctioned norm in a community. They are functions of face-to-face interactions and socioeconomic background of individuals.

**Norms in a community**

Participation and involvement in a community, for a common purpose, necessitate a sanctioned norm to coordinate the members in a community. Sanctioned norms are operating rules, value systems and understandings embedded in cultures. Examples of norms include legislations of a city, regulations of an organisation and morals in a friendship. Black and white legislations are necessary to bring together bridging networks in a society, whilst morals and unspoken rules facilitate interpersonal relationships. The sanctioned norms facilitate expectations and obligations in
members and organisations, they are a basis for trust. However, they vary in their effects: legislations are good for coordinating members who have an abstract common purpose and generalised trust in a highly bridging network. On the contrary, morals are good for mobilising mutual support, where the sanctioned value system and understanding facilitate personalised trust and a sense of cohesiveness. (Schuller, 2007)

Focus group respondents conveyed their initiatives to interact with strangers, regardless of their ethnicities. Respondents’ initiatives was contingent on the deemed trustworthiness of the counter person judged by his/ her attitudes and behaviour: “the person”, “outspoken”, “personality”, “active, open character”, “politeness”. A respondent said:

*I always take the initiative...but some of them, you look at him/ her, [shake head] keep the mouth shut. But [if] they are friendly, and normally we would chat.*

This is also reflected in the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affair’s (1986, 2) findings: Chinese believed that anyone could be a good neighbour, and were pleased to have an Australian family as neighbour. In other words, not withstanding Fukuyama’s (1995) findings, respondents are trusting, and they also see trustworthiness in counterpersons in forming bridging network. Though, resources remained very much mobilised in closer networks. This shows that there is generalised thin trust in Chinese community in Chatswood, however thick personalised trust which is necessarily for mobilising resources remains oriented within the co-ethnic networks.
**Fact-to-face interactions**

Face-to-face interaction is a core factor to nurture trust. Sztompka (1999) describes a circle of trust: the narrowest radius covers family members, then friends, neighbours, colleagues whom we know personally and interact face-to-face with; the widest circle covers the population whom we have commonality in such as ethnicity, religion, gender, age and professions. Meanwhile, Ringer & Lawless (1989) asserts that individuals who are more engaged with their communities are generally more tolerant and trusting. In other words, the closer the circle, the more the interaction, and the more the trust.

**Socioeconomic background of individuals**

There is a causal relationship between trust and income levels. Leigh (2006) attributes the causal relationship to better trust and more spending on local public goods in richer communities. In addition, he attributes to the inequality of income levels, which might be associated with a sense of injustice and detracts from trust. Focus group respondents did not raise economic consideration in relation to trust. However, respondents implied better trust amongst residents of the north shore suburbs than amongst residents of the western suburbs. Whilst the north shore suburbs are home to higher incomes earners than those of the western suburbs, the physical distance also implies the lesser face-to-face interactions between respondents and person in western suburbs. In other words, income levels in a neighbourhood cannot be isolated from distance and opportunities for face-to-face interactions when considering trust levels.
Leigh (2006) finds that racial and ethnic diversity are associated with lower levels of trust. He attributes this to the diverse culture and thereby the difficulty to establish a mutual norm in connections. More specifically, he finds that language is a more important factor than ethnicity for trust. This is evidenced in two older Cantonese respondents who perceived a declining level of trust in Chatswood and attributed this to the increasing Mandarin speaking population in the neighbourhood in the recent years. This shows the importance of functional communication, together with the same mind and culture, as a factor for trust.

Eisenberg (2007) finds that ethnic diversity and multiculturalism weakens the trust and norm which are fundamental to bonding networks. Respondents indicated a declining level of trust in the Chinese community in Chatswood.

*Back then, in supermarket, we talked to each other, we became good friends. Not like now.....

*In the olden days, Chinese people were very warm, but nowadays I don’t feel that warmth. The trust is gone.* (Focus group respondent)

Similarly, younger respondents believed that the decline was a general social phenomenon. The declining level of trust exhibits characteristics consistent with Putnam’s (2000) findings in the declining social capital in the United States. However, the declining level of trust in the multicultural city also contradicts to the city’s commitment to multiculturalism in accordance to National Agenda for Multicultural Australia 1989. Nevertheless,
**Civic trust**

Civic trust refers to the confidence in an organisation and the information provided. The norm of an organisation that is the objective with which the organisation is formed implies expectations and obligations in its members through regulations and organisational cultures. The formalised organisational norm helps eliminate risk and foster a sense of trustworthiness in an organisation and its members. (Nooteboom, 2007) It helps overcome the thin trust in initial bridging and bonding networks.

In particular, the formalised organisational norm helps instill value system and unspoken rules in its members. The formal avenue initiates thin trust and, together with the opportunities for face-to-face interaction and the sanctioned norm, facilitates think trust in connections. This trust is complemented by informal networks. For example, 80 percent of the existing members of MOSAIC come to know about the Centre through word of mouth. (MOSAIC, 2007)

Ms Leung reinforces the importance of trust in an organisation in mobilising resources:

> If they trust me, and I may say that with this specific problem, may be police officers can help. Because they trust me and they can rely on the police officer. But perhaps if that may not be their first option or they didn’t know that police officer before, but through someone that they trust, they will seek help.
In sum, trust is stemmed from a sanctioned norm of value system in the operating rules of a culture. Persons who share a commonality in individuals’ characteristics benefit from the already established norm in the culture and the thick trusts, they more efficiently form initial contacts and in-depth connections. Meanwhile, trust in bridging network can be fostered, through face-to-face interactions, which the communication facilitate same mind and same culture. In addition, trust can be fostered through formal avenues, which the established organisational norm brings about convenience in overcoming the fear of risk in initial contacts and trustworthiness in the members and the organisation.

**Reciprocity**

A restricted sense of reciprocity refers to the contribution in a tightly knitted network. Members of a tightly knitted network are likely to encounter each other in the future, and would have their goodwill at stake through the counterperson’s membership in the network. (Kay & Johnson, 2007) Therefore, an individual is likely to contribute in accordance to morals in interpersonal relationships, in addition to the black and white legislation of the community. Meanwhile, a broader sense of reciprocity is Putnam’s (2000) generalised reciprocity. He asserts that individuals would contribute for philanthropy, without anticipating a return from the counterperson, and be confident that the favour would be returned by the general community when need arises. Generalised reciprocity contributes to public good.
In ethnic communities, Massey’s (1985) concept of status attainment in the earlier days conveys a notion of reciprocity amongst new migrants to mobilise opportunities that is contingent to their socioeconomic status in a host country. This notion of reciprocity is pertinent to general resources today. The Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs’ survey (1986, 2) found that 38 percent of Asian migrant household indicated contact with at least one Asian migrant family in their neighbourhood and 40 percent regarded at least one such Asian migrant neighbour as a close friend. This is a form of restricted reciprocity, being limited to persons of the same race from the same neighbourhood.

MOSAIC essentially operates on the notion of reciprocity. The centre is equipped with only one full time staff, whose responsibility is to manage 40 volunteers, who form the rest of the operation of the Centre.

*People can volunteer and contribute back to the community.* (Ms Leung)

MOSAIC facilitates opportunities of reciprocity, by providing a formal avenue for volunteers to devote their time and skills. The Centre mobilise potential resources in its members and contribute to the social capital in the community.

In sum, each element is as fundamental to social capital. They are better facilitated in smaller communities in contributing to social capital. In particular, the elements are interrelated, they contribute to social capital and thereby strengthen other elements. In other words, social capital self perpetuates.
Conclusion

The elements for quality social network, include identity and participation, belonging and trust, and reciprocity. These elements are embedded in the “who” in a community. They essentially govern the depth of connection an individual possess and the resources available in a network. This is the qualitative sense of social network.

As discussed in Chapter 3, commonality, common purpose and sanctioned norm in a community are the core factors for bringing together networks. This chapter discusses the identity of “we”, which the commonality in its members, the common purpose in an organisation and a norm of expectation and obligation in a community. The mutual identity, together with face-to-face interaction which foster a sense of belonging, are the core elements of mobilising resources in networks. Co-ethnic individuals benefit from the already established ethnic identity and ethnic cultural norms, which nurtures trust and reciprocity, and are more readily form tightly knitted communities. On the contrary, bridging network necessitates a search for the mutual identity and the cultural norm. The searching process is embedded with thin trust and a fear of risk in initial contacts. Bridging network also necessitates face-to-face interactions to help communicate an understanding in the unspoken value system and operating rules for thick trust and in-depth relationships. Meanwhile, formal avenues in organisation instil readily available norm and trustworthiness to nurture bridging connections.

In addition, it is recognised that social capital is a product as well as a process. Identity and participation nurture norms and help mobilise resources in a community, whilst the norm of reciprocity also strengthen identity and participation. Ultimately, a
tightly knitted community is good for mobilising the resources in the network, through the membership in the community, which the resources are social capital. Therefore, the more intensive the elements are, the richer social capital is a community.
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Introduction

This chapter discusses the formation of social capital with reference to social networks, more specifically co-ethnic and inter-ethnic networks. It relates to the discussions in Chapter 3 and 4 in the quantity and the quality of networks, yet recognising that physical structure and socioeconomic opportunities are also factors for social capital. The chapter also includes a literary review on the value of social capital in a community.

Social capital

Social capital refers to the actual and potential, tangible and intangible resources embedded in a community. It is the aggregate resources in a community available to an individual (Coleman, 1990) and to the general community as a public good. (Putnam, 2000) The aggregate resources are governed by the opportunities to contribute and mobilise the resources through a membership in a network.

The different inherited opportunities and constraints in the formation of networks, which govern their potential extents and depths in quantity and quality, result in the different social capital in communities. A community with thick bonding and bridging networks would be socially cohesive and in turn would nurture “confident and creative” members in the community. (Schuller, 2007, 16) (Figure 9)
Social capital is built upon the underlying foundations that include: the notion of reciprocity, trust and sanctioned cultural norms. It requires the members of a community the willingness to make available resources and the readiness to seek resources i.e. the notion of reciprocity. This notion is stemmed from the trust in a community and the trustworthiness in the members. In turn, this trust is stemmed from the sanctioned cultural norm which is essential for confident expectation and obligation. However, co-ethnic and inter-ethnic networks differ in the availability of the underlying foundations and therefore differ in their readiness in formations of social capital.

Co-ethnic network benefits from the already established ethnic cultural norms and value system, where co-ethnic individuals are more ready to establish thick trust and consequently confident expectation and obligation in the co-ethnic community. According to Schuller (2007, 16) members of a network that is found with a mutual identity and sanctioned cultural norms bring about “comfortable” relationship and
interaction. Therefore, co-ethnic persons are more efficient in initiating contacts and more readily to congregate in a foreign environment. The similar is also readily found in co-racial individuals. Therefore, common ethnicity/race bring about efficiency in developing networks.

On the contrary, bridging networks between persons who are deemed different necessitates a search of a mutual norm to overcome the thin trust in initial contacts. This is a search in mutual identities and commonalities to help establish a sense of “we-ness”. According to Schuller (2007, 16) members of an inter-ethnic network are “suspicious”. Nevertheless, bridging networks can be facilitated through formal avenues, where the formal sanctioned norm in the objective with which an organisation is formed help foster a sense of trustworthiness in the members and the organisation. In other words, formal avenues make available established sanctioned norms to bring about the convenience in overcoming initial thin trust. However, bridging connections remain less readily formed and a lesser part of the networks an individual possesses.

Meanwhile, face-to-face interaction intensifies trust in members, as interactions helps establish mutual identity, a sense of belonging and attachment to the members and the organisation. More specifically, face-to-face interaction helps communicating a sanctioned cultural norm, as which does not merely refer to the face value of verbal messages in such as black and white legislation. A norm refers to the morality in interpersonal relationship that is not readily negotiated but through life experience and value system in a culture. Therefore, face-to-face interaction nurtures thick trust and a sanctioned norm for the development of in-depth networks to mobilise and contribute to social capital.
The members and organisations are the “who” of a network, in addition is the “what” in communities as factors for social capital. The “what” refers to the physical structures which provide opportunities for initial contact, face-to-face interaction, participation and involvement in a community, such as community organisation and places of worship. The “what” also partly refers to the income levels of a community. The higher income level provides better spending for physical structures and facilitates better trust in a neighbourhood that are factors for social capital.

**Implications of social capital**

There is a limitation to measure the implications of social capital. This is because social capital cannot be isolated from other factors influencing a social phenomenon, as a result, there may be an over/ under emphasis on its advantage and disadvantage.

**Economically**

According to the notion of reciprocity, members contribute to their community. Putnam’s (2000) generalised reciprocity reduces transaction cost in day-to-day business. He gives the examples that in social capital rich community, there would be no need to double check the change at cashier or the car door at garage. In the United States, one-standard deviation increase in trust corresponds to more than one-half of a standard deviation increase in economic growth. (Glaeser, n.d., 1)
A restricted sense of reciprocity is shown in Ionescu’s (2002) reduced transaction costs in business context, where trust-based relationships reduce bureaucratic procedures and information costs. Another restricted sense of reciprocity is shown in Massey’s (1985) concept of status attainment in ethnic communities, which helps migrants overcome structural constrains in settlement experience.

**Human capital**

Neighbourhoods make available physical infrastructure to assist the persons in need. For example, volunteers at MOSAIC arrange English and other interest classes to help improve the skills and knowledge of its members.

The tangible and intangible resources in social capital help reduce psychological and physical stress, and lead to better general health, longer life expectancy and happiness in a community. (Jordan & Munasib, 2006) This is evidenced in the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs’ (1986, 2) findings that almost half of the Chinese persons in Sydney related their contentment to the friendliness and helpfulness of their neighbours.
Socially

The notion of sanctioned cultural norm and trust implies confident expectation and obligation in members and organisations. This discourages the phenomenon of prisoner dilemma and free rider, where persons pursue self interests and lead to negative outcomes in the community. This also nurtures, for example, safe neighbourhoods, as evidenced in a sense of security in the focus group respondents in Chatswood. In addition, the objective with which an organisation is formed mobilises a climate for change for the long term benefits of members and the organisation. (Ritzen, n.d.)

Governance

The discouraged “wrong” behaviour in members and organisations brings about transparency, accountability and efficient operation. In the United States, one-standard deviation increase in trust increases judicial efficiency by 0.7 of a standard deviation and reduces government corruption by 0.3 of a standard deviation. (Glaeser, n.d., 1)

Jordan & Munasib (2006) have raised the issue that thick co-ethnic bonding connections could result in over-isolation between “we” and “them”. Identity to a community becomes exclusive, participation becomes oriented to the closed community and impedes extra-community involvement, and distrust inhibits accessing extra community resources. However, these disadvantages are unlikely in the case study in Chatswood, given the inter-ethnic social interaction and cultural integration in the ethnic diverse neighbourhood in multicultural Sydney in the era of globalisation.
Conclusion

The factors for bringing a community together is very much oriented to a common ethnicity/race, given the already established commonalities that help facilitate initial interaction, and the thick cultural norms and trust that are fundamental for social capital. Nevertheless, commonalities, norms and trusts are not only found in ethnicities, in so far that a mutual identity is found. In particular, formal avenues help instil trust and overcome the barrier in initial contacts in networks. In addition, face-to-face interaction is a fundamental factor in networks to mobilise resource and contribute to social capital in a community.

Moreover, social capital evolves from the relationship between the members and the networks. Without networks, the resources in individuals cannot be accessed by other members in the community. Similarly, individuals without a membership, a sense of belonging nor trust, a network cannot facilitate the resources in individuals for the wider community. Ultimately, social capital is embodied in the social relationships in a community, where resource could be contributed to and drawn from.
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Introduction

This chapter concludes on the role of ethnicity in bringing together the Chinese community in Chatswood. It also makes recommendations to help foster social capital in the study area of Chatswood.

Social capital in the Chinese community in Chatswood

Chatswood is a regional centre of Sydney and is inherited from higher order facilities that attract individuals into the neighbourhood. It is frequented by a large population of various ethnic backgrounds visiting for various reasons. Chatswood consists of a high representation of Chinese, which the Chinese-ness caters for home making and cultural sustenance and fosters co-ethnic connections. The concentrated Chinese-ness also attracts non Chinese persons for cultural experience and facilitates bridging interactions. This is consistent with the characteristics of Li’s (1998) ethnoburbs and Ang’s (2001) ethnic communities in the era of globalisation, where the ethnic diversity in Chatswood has the opportunities for inter-ethnic social interaction and cultural integration.

However, social connections remains very much oriented to co-ethnic persons. Figure 10 is a general comparison of the bonding and bridging networks the focus group respondents possess in the community in Chatswood. It shows that the Chinese co-ethnic network benefits from the Chinese ethnicity as an additional factor for forming co-ethnic connection and bringing a co-ethnic community together. It shows
the more avenues amongst Chinese persons to come into contacts and expand their network size. The larger co-ethnic network size implies more potential in meeting the right counter persons in a network to develop in-depth connections.

**Figure 10** A comparison of the bonding and bridging networks of the focus group respondents in the community in Chatswood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Bonding networks</th>
<th>Bridging networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal formation</strong></td>
<td>To consume Chinese-ness</td>
<td>Cultural experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends who were already known before arrival, plus that of bridging networks</td>
<td>Mutual friends, neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal formation</strong></td>
<td>Place of worship, other community organisation, plus that of bridging networks</td>
<td>MOSAIC, university and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commonality/identity</strong></td>
<td>Ethnicity, race, language, religion, plus that of bridging networks</td>
<td>Age, gender, suburb of residence, migration experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural norms</strong></td>
<td>Ethnic, Organisational</td>
<td>Organisational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td>Willing to trust, Declining trust</td>
<td>Willing to trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier</strong></td>
<td>Dialect spoken</td>
<td>Cultural norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocity</strong></td>
<td>Tangible assistance, referral, volunteering</td>
<td>Cultural experience, volunteering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the initial connections are established, focus group respondents indicated the same sense of belonging to bonding and bridging networks. However, inter-ethnic face-to-face interactions remain limited in the formal realm of organisations. The limiting face-to-face interactions restrict the formation of thick trust in bridging connections and thereby the formation of bridging capital. Meanwhile, Cantonese speaking respondents indicated declining trust within the Chinese community, together with the reason of the increasing Mandarin speaking population in the area. This shows that language remains a fundamental factor for bringing a community together.

This thesis finds that the Chinese persons in Chatswood are willing to form bridging networks in the ethnic diverse neighbourhood in the multicultural city in the era of globalisation. Nevertheless, the Chinese ethnicity remains a fundamental factor for bringing a community together. In particular, language remains a binding force in the ethnic group or conversely a barrier in bridging inter-ethnic connections. Meanwhile, inter-ethnic interactions remain limited in the formal realm of organisations that restricts face-to-face interaction. Therefore, the different language and the restricted face-to-face interaction prevents a deep understanding in the counter culture and value system which is the core factors for forming thick trust and in-depth bridging network.

In conclusion, there is a generalised thin trust in the Chinese community in Chatswood in forming bonding and bridging network. The Chinese ethnicity remains an advantage in efficiently forming initial bonding contacts and in-depth bonding connections, thereby facilitating bonding capital. Chinese bridging network with other
ethnicities remain thin. Formal avenues and face-to-face interactions help develop initial contacts and trust, whilst there is a lack of informal bridging connections. Bridging capital remains weak in the Chinese community in Chatswood, which is the barrier for the aggregate social capital in the community in Chatswood.

**THE WAY FORWARD**

The aggregate value of social capital includes the size of connections in quantity and the depth of connection in quality. Planning for the size of connections is planning for land use and physical structure that bring persons together. This is the “what” in a community that helps bring together bonding and bridging connections in formal and informal settings. Meanwhile, planning for in-depth connections is planning the right physical resources for the right population group. More specifically, it is planning how, where, for who and on what norms to make available the physical resources that provide networking opportunities.

Planning for social capital is to be at a neighbourhood level. This is in accordance to Wiggins’s (1975) findings that residents in Sydney prefer to have a higher proportion of persons in the same social network in the same neighbourhood, followed by more frequent interactions with neighbours who do not belong to the same social network.

In the context of this thesis on ethnicity, planning for social capital is planning for both co-ethnic and inter-ethnic connections. Planning for inter-ethnic connections has the objective to achieve harmony and cohesion in a community that is consistent with the Australian Government’s commitment to multiculturalism in accordance to the National Agenda for Multicultural Australia 1989.
Planning for how– informal and formal setting for networking opportunities

Planning physical structure for Chinese persons is not constructing Chinese-ness, as in the Chinatown in the inner city. Anderson (2000, 2001) criticises that Chinatown has been constructed as a token of commitment to multiculturalism. Figure 11 are examples of physical structures showing Chinese-ness, however which do not necessarily facilitate social capital in the neighbourhood. Similarly, there is a difference between an Asian grocery and the Asian aisle in a Coles Supermarket in achieving an oriental sense in the environment. Accordingly, planning focus is not on the “what” in the built environment, but the “who” in the community.

Figure 11 Chinese-ness in physical structure.
The “who” in a community is the population’s participation that brings about a sense of Chinese-ness through place making. For example, in Chatswood, Chinese migrants take part in the configuration of a Hong Kong/China in the ethnic diverse neighbourhood. (Abrahamson, 2006) The mental map of Chinese-ness at the shopping strip on Victoria Avenue is created by the skin colour, atmosphere, and goods and services available.

In the thinnest sense of networking, planning is to expose persons to the opportunities to interact at events such as Harmony Day and cultural presentation. One off events attract new members to a community, provide networking opportunities and expand the size of a network. Here, planning is to make available venues by land use distribution and to simplify the bureaucracy process to encourage events.

In addition to one off events, planning is to provide regular networking opportunities. Planning is to distribute land use, such as community centres and places of worship, which implies the involvement of formal organisations. Formal organisations, together with the objective with which they are formed, reduce a fear in risk and nurtures a sense of trustworthiness amongst the members in initial contacts. On the contrary, informal settings such as Chinese garden remains good for co-ethnic relationships and already established inter-ethnic relationships that however are weak in facilitating bridging connections.
The more in-depth the interactions, the more harmonious and cohesive a community. In particular, planning could capitalise on the ethnic diversity and facilitate face-to-face interaction. Examples are language and cooking lessons in mixed ethnic settings that facilitate inter-ethnic interactions and communicate cultural norms, which helps establishing cohesiveness between members.

**Planning for where- accessibility of networking opportunities**

Planning for face-to-face interactions is planning for the accessibility of networking opportunities. Accessibility, here, refers to the physical distance between the location of networking opportunities and member populations. It is a particular concern for persons restricted in mobility, namely the elderly and the youth. It also implies travel time and discourages persons who are restricted by time to network. Therefore, planning is to distribute land use in proximity to the target populations and especially to the members restricted in mobility.

Planning for social capital is to take place at the neighbourhood level, which is more accessible to the general public. Accessibility, here, refers to the opportunities to be involved in a community organisation. The smaller level is the organisation, the better is the opportunity to involve the general public in day-to-day business. According to Portes (2000) member’s contributions through volunteering, regular attendances and engagement in the day-to-day operation of a community organisation contribute to quality social capital. Moreover, organisations are to make themselves accessible and impose minimal barrier for memberships. Also, they are to make themselves known to its target population through marketing. The opportunities for participation and involvement nurture the notion of reciprocity and contribute to social capital.
Planning for whom- mutual identity in members

Planning is to focus on inter-ethnic connections. Chinese persons entail a readily available thick cultural norm and trust that brings about the readily formation of bonding capital. On the contrary, the formation of inter-ethnic connections and bridging capital remain dependent on formal avenues. Therefore, planning is to facilitate formal avenues to bring together persons who share mutual identity in “we”. Potential inter-ethnic “we-ness” could be found in age, gender, residence suburb, migration experience, religion and interest.

In addition to the readily established identity in individual’s characteristics, planning could help derive an identity in between “we” and “them”. This is Ang’s (2001) hybrid identity as a result of identity politics in migration experience, in which the arrival at Sydney has instilled the Australian mainstream culture whilst the departure from home has diminished the original culture. This “in between” identity is found in persons who have migrated to Sydney in the course of their life time. It also extends to the second generation population group who were locally born and maintain ethnic culture at home. This identity refers to life experience in general that is not ethno-specific, and implies a large potential in this network. This highly bridging network in the society is weak in mobilising resources. Nevertheless, planning is to make available meeting places with the opportunities for face-to-face interaction and participation to help form a cohesive community.
Planning for what- the operating rules in organisations

Planning is to help establish a mutual operating rule in bridging networks. According to Portes (2000), members are to understand the operating rules of the community to establish in-depth relationships and contribute to the notion of reciprocity. Mutual operating rules are readily established through the objective with which an organisation is formed that help instill a mutual identity and trust in initial contacts. Therefore, organisations bring about the convenience in the formation of network.

Alternative to the established operating rules in an organisation, planning could educate operating rules in persons. The initial contact between persons is contingent on the trust, expectation and obligation in the counter person. Therefore, like educating the legislation of a city and regulations of a community, planning could educate the ethnic diversity and multiculturalism. This is essentially expanding individual’s circle of trust.

Planning is to facilitate cultural integration in bridging connection. The cultural norms of an organisation are negotiated through communications, which are not merely referring to the face value in an operating rule, but also the underlying morality. Therefore, the resources on translation and interpretation services are to be expanded to transmitting the culture through bridging face-to-face interaction and in-depth inter-cultural lessons such as etiquette and colloquial language.
Conclusion

Planning for social capital in the general community in Chatswood is planning for the co-ethnic bonding capital and inter-ethnic bridging capital in aggregate. It is recommended to undertake similar study on each ethnic group in their bonding network and bonding capital in the neighbourhood. It is also fundamental to study their willingness and barrier in forming bridging network. The studies help identify the opportunities and constraints in contributing to the aggregate social capital in the general community in Chatswood.
SOCIAL CAPITAL
IN THE CHINESE COMMUNITY IN CHATSWOOD

APPENDICES
Interview Schedule - Ms. Rita Leung

Topic 1  Ethnic community - MOSAIC
1. What is the role of MOSAIC in the community?
2. Who does MOSAIC serve?
3. What are some of the factors that you think are bringing the people to MOSAIC?
4. What do you think is the role of MOSAIC in facilitating social networks for its members?

Topic 2  Social network
1. What are some of the factors that you think are crucial to form social networks?
2. What are some of the opportunities and constrains in forming co-ethnic and inter-ethnic connections?
3. How do people come to know about MOSAIC?
4. What is the turn over in the members of MOSAIC?

Topic 3  Social capital
1. Who are the active members in MOSAIC?
2. What are some of MOSAIC’s strategies to actively involve its members?
3. What are some of the most popular events organised by MOSAIC?
4. What are some of MOSAIC’s strategies in facilitating a sense of belonging in its members?
5. What do you think is the role of MOSAIC in bringing together a community?
6. How willing are the members to seek/accept assistance from MOSAIC?
7. What are some of the opportunities to contribute to MOSAIC?
Interview schedule: Focus group

Topic 1  Ethnic community
1. What were some of the factors which you considered when choosing to make Chatswood your home?
2. How often do you shop at a Chinese shop or go to a Chinese restaurant, in Chatswood or other parts of Sydney?
3. Do you have any family or friends living in Chatswood?

Topic 2  Social network- quantity
1. How many of your friends are Chinese/ Asian/ non Asian?
2. How many of these are your close friends?
3. Where did you make your Chinese/ Asian/ non Asian friends?
4. How often do you keep in touch with friends and family at your home country?

Topic 3  Social network- quality
1. What do you do in your leisure time?
2. What would you take into consideration when making new friends?
3. Conversely, what do you think the new friends are thinking of when they first interact with you?
4. What are some of the factors that you would consider to make a friend a close friend?

Topic 4  Social capital
1. Do you identify yourself an Australian/ Asian/ Chinese?
2. How do you feel belonged or attached to the Chinese community in Chatswood/ home country?
3. Who would you seek help from if you were in need?
4. What are some of the potential benefits that you see in your existing social network?
5. Are you involved in any community organisation?
6. Are you engaged in any volunteer work?
Participant selection and purpose of study
You are invited to participate in a study of the social networks and resources in the Chinese community in Chatswood. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because of your first hand experience, living, working and frequenting in the Chinese community in Chatswood.

Description of study
If you decide to participate, we will proceed to a one to one in-depth interview pertinent to your perspectives concerning the Chinese community at Chatswood, and issues Chinese new migrants experience when integrate into the mainstream. The interview will be about 60 minutes long and will be recorded. The collected information will be analysed and used to help understanding the study topic better. From now to the publication of work will be about a month. We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this study.

Confidentiality and disclosure of information
Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission, or except as required by law. If you give us your permission, we plan to discuss the results, interpret ideas from the information, and quote from the interview. The materials will be presented to faculties in a thesis.

Recompense to participants
Nil

Your consent
Your decision whether or not to participate will not prejudice your future relations with The University of New South Wales or other participating organisations.

If you have any questions, please feel free to ask Cynthia Chan (cynthia.chan@student.unsw.edu.au). If you have any additional questions later, Ms Susan Thompson (9385 5295; s.thompson@unsw.edu.au) will be happy to answer them.

Cynthia Chan

REVOCATION OF CONSENT. Project Title: Chinese in Sydney: Chinese new migrants in Chatswood
(Please send this entire form to the above address.)
I hereby wish to withdraw my consent to participate in this research project. I understand that such withdrawal will not jeopardise my relationship with The University of New South Wales, other participating organisations or other professionals.

…………………………… ……………………………………………..….… …………………..…………
Signature Please PRINT name Date
You are making a decision whether or not to participate in a research project.

This PROJECT CONSENT FORM enables you to indicate your preparedness to participate in the project. By signing this form, your signature indicates that you have decided to participate.

You will be given a PROJECT INFORMATION STATEMENT that explains the project in detail, and that statement includes a revocation clause for you to use if you decide to withdraw your consent at some later stage. The PROJECT INFORMATION STATEMENT is your record of participation in the project.

This PROJECT CONSENT FORM will be retained by the researcher as evidence of your agreement to participate in this project.

Please complete the information in this box.

Please indicate which of the following options you agree to by ticking one of the following options:

☐ I consent to being quoted and identified

☐ I do not want to be quoted or identified but am prepared to participate anonymously

.........................................................
Signature of Research Participant

.........................................................
Please PRINT name

.........................................................
Date

Name of researcher: Cynthia Chan
Social capital in the Chinese Community in Chatswood
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