

THE SOCIOECONOMIC ADAPTATION OF RECENT SOUTHEAST
ASIAN REFUGEES: A STATISTICAL PROFILE

Franklin Goza
and
Marta Tienda

CDE Working Paper 86-1

THE SOCIOECONOMIC ADAPTATION OF RECENT SOUTHEAST
ASIAN REFUGEES: A STATISTICAL PROFILE

Franklin Goza
Marta Tienda
University of Wisconsin-Madison

This research supported by grants from the Social Science Research Council, from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to the Institute for Research on Poverty. Computational support was provided from a grant to the Center for Demography and Ecology from the Center for Population Research of NICHD (HD-05876). I acknowledge institutional support from the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences. Susan Walsh, Diane Duesterhoeft and Gary Heisserer provided invaluable technical assistance.

April, 1986

THE SOCIOECONOMIC ADAPTATION OF RECENT SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEES: A STATISTICAL PROFILE

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to provide background information for analyzing and interpreting the socioeconomic integration experiences of Southeast Asian refugees who entered the United States between 1975 and 1983. Our presentation focuses on three types of adjustment within U.S. society: linguistic change, occupational change, and geographic mobility. We examine these components of refugee integration in the context of several explanatory factors, including ethnic origin, length of U.S. residence and social background characteristics. Ethnic background directly affects the preparedness of new immigrants to adjust to new situations and the differential ability of groups to mobilize resources based on ties of kinship and ethnic affiliation. Year of entry directly affects adaptation outcomes as a measure of exposure to and acquisition of information needed to function in the United States, and through the changing socioeconomic and demographic composition of successive cohorts. We expect to disentangle these effects through multivariate analyses.

The data analyzed here are from the 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees, Wave XII. This data contain household and individual level data on 1,234 households, containing 6,731 individuals who entered the United States between 1975 and 1983. Countries of origin include Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea (Cambodia).

Demographic Characteristics

The data presented in Table 1 indicate that over 62 percent of our sample refugee population is Vietnamese, 21 percent Laotian, and 16 percent

Kampuchean. The modal entry years for our sample Southeast Asian refugees were 1980 and 1981, when approximately 46 percent of the sample arrived on U.S. shores. Although Vietnamese comprised over half of all refugees from Southeast Asia admitted for most years, in 1976 over 70 percent of those admitted were from Laos, and in 1981 slightly over half of those admitted were of Cambodian or Laotian origins. However, the volume of refugees who entered in 1976 was relatively small in comparison to 1981. Sample statistics suggest that the size of the 1981 cohort was 15 times that of the 1976 cohort, but INS statistics show a lower proportion (DHHS, 1983). Men and women were approximately evenly represented (52 percent male) in the total sample, with a slight male advantage in all years except 1976 and 1977.

Southeast Asian refugees are a very young population. The mean age at time of arrival for the entire sample was just under 20 years (see Table 1). The mean age at arrival ranged from 13 years for the 1977 cohort to 25 years for the 1983 cohort, and it increased among successive cohorts. The young age structure of the refugee population reflects the large number of children among those admitted. For all households the mean number of children under 16 was 2.3. By contrast, only 12 percent of all refugee homes contained an individual over 65 years of age in 1983.

The traumas of refugee departure and relocation are such that families are frequently split for various periods of time. Our data indicate that while almost 70 percent of refugee households consisted of two spouse households, a spouse was missing in over 22 percent of all refugee homes. Spouse-absent households were more prevalent among successive cohorts, and since 1980 about 30 percent of all refugee households were headed by single heads. Only 7 percent of all refugees resided in non-family households in 1983, but this average conceals considerable variation among successive cohorts, as Table 1

shows. The living arrangements of these individuals, also reflect some of the difficulties of relocation. Refugee households averaged 5.4 people in 1983, considerably higher than the U.S. average of 2.7 persons for white households.

Ethnicity

Ethnicity should affect refugees' adaptation experiences in the United States because it is correlated with socioeconomic status and because it portrays similarities and differences among people of like national origin. Ethnic differences in socioeconomic success manifest themselves in a variety of ways, as our descriptive results show.

Table 2 demonstrates the ethnic heterogeneity found among the three Asian nationalities. Note the increase in the share of Chinese refugees between 1978 and 1981, when ethnic Chinese comprised almost one-third of adult refugees admitted to the United States. That these individuals experienced ethnic discrimination in their home countries, particularly in Vietnam, partly explains this increase. Whitmore (1985) has documented the Chinese exodus from Southeast Asia and its causes.

Nearly four-fifths of all Southeast Asian refugees admitted between 1975 and 1976 were Vietnamese, but this share dwindled to under one-third after 1978. Thereafter, the Vietnamese proportion of all refugees admitted rose to almost half. In relative and absolute terms, the controversial Hmong never reached 10 percent of the total admitted in any given year, but the presence of Laotians rose after 1976, following the intensification of military activities in that country.

Not only is the Southeast Asian refugee population ethnically diverse, but it is also heterogeneous in its socioeconomic composition. To demonstrate the extent of ethnic socioeconomic differentiation among Southeast Asian refugees, we begin with education. Among the Hmong, a tribal people originally from the

remote hill regions of northern Laos, formal education was not a common experience in peoples' lives. As a result, over 20 percent of this adult male population never attended school (see Table 3). Less than 2 percent of this ethnic group went to school beyond the eleventh grade, and not a single individual completed four years of college. These characteristics render them the most educationally disadvantaged of the Southeast Asian refugees, a circumstance which translates into low rates of labor force participation and extremely high unemployment rates.

Laotians are the second most disadvantaged ethnic group among the refugee population. Over 54 percent of this group completed six or fewer years of formal schooling. At least eight percent, however, had begun their college education. Rates of labor force participation among Laotians approximate those of the Vietnamese, suggesting that their educational handicaps have been less severe than those of the Hmong.

The Khmer of Kampuchea and the ethnic Chinese are groups intermediate to the Hmong and Vietnamese in terms of their educational attainment and rates of labor force participation. Although almost 20 percent of the Khmer began college, over 45 percent had completed but six years of schooling. The Chinese were less represented in the high and low educational categories, as over 51 percent completed between seven and 12 years of formal schooling. Also higher proportions of Chinese men and women held white collar jobs compared to other ethnic groups, including the Vietnamese.

Vietnamese are the most highly educated of the Southeast Asian groups, averaging 10 and 9 years of education, respectively, for men and women. Over 21 percent completed some college training, while only 25 percent finished six or fewer years of schooling; less than 2 percent had not attended school. Because of their high levels of education, Vietnamese have been somewhat more

successful in the U.S. labor market, as indicated by their higher rates of labor force participation relative to the other Asian ethnic groups. Also, many Vietnamese workers formerly held a white collar positions in their country of origin.

For all ethnic groups the educational attainment levels of women were significantly lower than those of men. For instance, among the Hmong not a single woman possessed more than a sixth grade education. Even among the Vietnamese, the best educated ethnic group for either sex, almost 40 percent of all women had less than a sixth grade education. The average number of years of education for all refugee men aged 16 to 64 was 8.6 years, while for women of the same age it was 6.6 years. Vietnamese men had the highest aggregate level of education at 9.8 years, while for Hmong females it was the lowest at .7 years.

English Ability

Another social indicator which significantly influences the extent and pace of refugee adaptation experiences, including labor market integration, is English ability. As we examine the various measures of English competency, including changes in proficiency, we maintain our focus on labor force aged individuals (i.e., those aged 16 to 64). We expect that children under 16 will manifest higher levels of competency and faster rates of proficiency than the work force group, while the elderly would exhibit lower levels of proficiency and slower rates of improvement. Specific questions concerning the young and old groups, however, will not be discussed presently since our main concern is with the process of socioeconomic integration into the labor market.

English speaking and writing abilities were measured on the original instrument with a four level interval scale. Fluency was coded (1) and no

English ability was coded (4). These codes apply both to measures of ability at time of arrival and in 1983, the survey date.

At the time of arrival to the United States the mean English speaking ability and writing scores of all labor force aged individuals were 3.4 (see Table 4), which indicates that their English ability was somewhere between ("a little") and ("none at all"). However, there were distinct differences between the entry cohorts in terms of their respective English ability. This point will be expanded below.

Over time, refugees improved their English skills, as the sample speaking and writing means changed from 3.4 to 2.5 (recall that the inverse coding assigns lower values to better proficiency levels). Thus most refugees in 1983 fell between the categories of speaking English "well" (category 2) and speaking "a little" (category 3), versus "a little" and "none" at the time of entry. The correlation between the latest two measures of English ability was 0.92, but this represents a higher association for the very recent arrivals and a lower one for the earlier cohorts.

To measure in an approximate way the improvement in English speaking and writing ability, we subtracted the "current" score from the score at time of arrival so that differences indicate the amount of improvement. This procedure is problem free until one reaches fluency, at which time further improvements in English ability do not occur. Because only 2 percent of all individuals were fluent at the time of arrival, this should not affect our presentation of language improvement across time.

Speaking ability for all adults aged 16 to 64 improved by almost an entire category (.92), while their writing ability improved slightly less (.82). At time of arrival most groups were more proficient in writing than in speaking English. Furthermore, knowing one's English writing (or reading) ability at

arrival was only an approximate predictor of that person's writing ability at the time of the survey ($r=.43$ and $r=.41$ for writing and reading, respectively). Our preliminary tabulations suggest that experiences in the United States (e.g., sponsor type and initial place of residence) may be as important to English improvement as socioeconomic background. These possibilities we explore below with multivariate analyses.

As expected, there are marked ethnic differences in the amount of English improvement across time. At the time of the survey all groups spoke English better than they wrote it. However, the Chinese, experienced the greatest improvement in their English speaking ability, as their average proficiency score rose from none to well. This dramatic improvement in English proficiency over a relatively short period, while impressive, is somewhat difficult to imagine because of the short time period involved. That these proficiency measures are based on self-reported ability may partly explain the English improvement of Chinese ethnic refugees from Southeast Asia. For the other ethnic groups, the speaking improvement rate was approximately one category, while the Khmer registered a score of zero, indicating no improvement. Partly the low level of Khmer language improvement reflects their comparatively recent arrival to the United States (see Table 2), and the limited time they have had to learn English. Sex differences in English improvement rates were minimal, however they were slightly higher for men.

Formal English training by labor force aged individuals largely accounts for the improvement in English proficiency. Men averaged 10.6 weeks of English language courses for an average of 3.3 hours per week. Because the earlier cohorts possessed enough English to cope with their new environment, their weekly and hourly attendance levels were comparatively lower. Men's weekly and hourly attendance rates increased almost monotonically with each

new cohort. Women attended an average of 10.9 weeks of English courses for approximately 3 hours per week.

Despite the importance of formal language training programs in improving the English skills of the refugee population, participation was not uniform among those eligible to receive English instruction. Only 23.7 percent of all adult men and 25 percent of all adult women ever attended an English class after arriving in the United States. Also almost 40 percent of the men and 35 percent of the women indicated that they attended a language training and cultural orientation program sponsored by the U.S. government before their admission to the United States. Typically this preparation was provided in a temporary relocation center before their U.S. arrival.

Research on earnings inequality has identified language capabilities as a source of market stratification (Grenier, 1984). Because of the relatively limited English ability of most refugees at the time of the survey and the centrality of language skills in determining the pace of integration, we explored further the process of refugee English improvement to establish if socioeconomic background factors were as important as reception conditions in explaining language improvement, and whether the factors governing language improvement differed by gender. Table 5 presents the results of a regression analysis predicting language improvement. The dependent variable, improvement in level of English speaking ability, was constructed as a difference score, as discussed above, thus it is a continuous variable. In these models we depict English improvement as a function of three categories of variables representing socioeconomic background (i.e., age at arrival, English ability at arrival, years of education, household size, and ethnicity); reception factors (i.e., initial region of resettlement, year of arrival, and sponsor type), and opportunities to learn English in this country (i.e., cultural

training, hours of English per week, weeks of English, labor force participation). Separate equations were estimated for men and women.

Model one, containing only the socioeconomic background variables, indicates that for both men and women years of education, age, and English ability at time of arrival significantly influenced the amount of English improvement from the time of arrival until the date of the survey. Each year of education increased English ability by three-tenths of a level whereas each additional year of age at arrival reduced English ability by one-fifth of a level. The coefficient for English ability at time of arrival indicates that the greatest improvements were obtained by those who spoke the least English at time of arrival. Recall that English fluency was coded 1 and no English ability 4 so that those on the upper end of the numeric scale actually spoke less. Thus the lower one's original ability, the higher the expected English improvements. For men, the Khmer and Lao ethnic groups improved significantly less than the Chinese. Khmer women improved significantly less than did Chinese women. Virtually all other ethnic contrasts in English improvement levels were statistically insignificant. However, women with larger families improved their English skills less than otherwise comparable women with smaller families, due to fewer opportunities to receive formal instruction (see Model 3).

Model two contains reception variables in addition to the socioeconomic variables contained in model one. For men the inclusion of these variables amounted to a modest increase in the R^2 statistic (explained variation), but for women the increase was much greater, rising six percentage points. In addition to the socioeconomic background variables that retained their statistical significance in all equations, the variables monitoring year of arrival were generally significant. That is, English ability improved for

five of the eight female cohorts and four of the eight male cohorts when compared to the cohort who had lived in the United States one year. The relationship between English improvement and length of U.S. residence was approximately monotonic for both men and women. These results suggest that year of entry is an important correlate of the exposure to and acquisition of the English language. However, the other reception factors--sponsor types and initial regions of resettlement--were insignificantly related to English improvements.

In addition to the variables presented in model two, model three contains variables monitoring English learning opportunities. For men these additional variables had little explanatory power, as the adjusted R^2 statistic decreased slightly, and none of the variables denoting opportunities to learn English reached statistical significance. For women, however, the addition of these new variables improved the overall fit of the model, increasing the R^2 statistic from 44 to 46 percent. Those women who attended the language and cultural orientation classes provided by the U.S. government (normally while still in a relocation camp) improved almost two ability levels compared to those women who did not participate in the orientation classes. Attendance at English courses in the U.S., however, failed to improve the English ability of either men or women, net of the effects of socioeconomic background and year of arrival.

On balance the process of English improvement appears to differ by gender. For men, background characteristics emerged the most salient explanatory variables. Reception factors and the length of exposure to U.S. society accounted for some improvements, whereas English learning opportunities did not. Socioeconomic background characteristics also significantly influenced English improvement levels of women, but for them

reception factors were also significant in determining changes in their English ability. English learning opportunities also contributed more to explaining the observed improvement levels among women compared to men.

Sponsorship

We now turn our attention to a new social variable--sponsor type--to explore whether the social conditions under which refugees were admitted influenced their labor market integration experiences. Assuming that sponsors were necessary for the rapid adjustment of refugees, during the early phase of the refugee resettlement initiative the U.S. government actively sought out private sponsors for refugees by providing a modest financial incentive to those assuming this role. Table 6 indicates that over 46 percent of adult refugees in our sample were sponsored by U.S. congregations of one denomination or another. The sponsorship role of congregations was strongest during the 1975-1976 period, but subsided thereafter, as the financial incentives provided by the U.S. government also dwindled.

American families, like the congregations, provided a great deal of support during the early years of the refugee influx. However, since 1976 when families sponsored one in four refugees admitted, the share of new arrivals sponsored by American families dropped to only 6 percent during 1982-1983. Relatives were sponsors to almost 30 percent of the refugee population. That many were former refugees themselves in earlier years partly explains their increasing importance of sponsorship by relatives among successive cohorts.

Sponsorship type differentiated the labor force participation rates of the refugee population such that those sponsored by American families or congregations were more successful in securing jobs. Men participated at much higher rates than did women irrespective of sponsor type, and men's

unemployment rates were uniformly lower than those of women. With one exception, the lowest unemployment rates for both men and women corresponded to refugees privately sponsored, especially for women. The sole exception for men was the unemployment rate for those sponsored by nonrelatives of the same ethnicity, but recall that their labor force participation rate also was lower (see Table 7).

The variation in labor market outcomes indicate the importance of the sponsor's familiarity with the U.S. labor market, and in the case of women, attitudes toward female employment. That is, a long time resident of the United States would likely be much better informed than a recent arrival as to where to look for a job or how to go about preparing for one, as well as the desirability and acceptability of women working outside the home. A long time resident would also be more likely to have personal employment contacts that might be able to find a job for a refugee in need of work opportunities, whereas relatives, especially those who have been in the U.S. for a short while would not.

Residence

Before focusing on the determinants of labor force participation rates and other economic variables in greater detail, we examine refugee residence patterns in the United States because of their profound importance for economic well-being, and employment outcomes in particular. That is, place of residence has been shown to affect greatly individual's quality of life in the broadest sense, involving cultural, economic, psychological and physical opportunities. Accordingly, these aspects must be considered when observing where the refugees live, and why they move or remain in a given locale.

The Southeast Asian refugees are similar to other Asian American groups in that they too are predominantly located in the western states. Fully 38

percent of all refugees resided in the state of California at the time of our survey. Texas, as the state with second largest concentration, contained 8 percent of all Southeast Asian refugees admitted between 1975 and 1983, and New York was third, housing 4 percent of those admitted.

The U.S. government attempted to implement a plan that would prevent the disproportionate concentration of refugees within the United States deliberately to avoid the type of regional concentration exhibited by Cubans. A comparison of state of initial residence with state of current residence suggests that the government has failed in this undertaking. The case of California illustrates why the situation of regional concentration has prevailed.

California was the initial state of residence for 28 percent of all Southeast Asian refugees admitted between 1975 and 1983. However, in less than 8 years, over 650 refugees, or 10 percent of the sample migrated to California. This migration reflects the historical tendency of all Asian Americans to concentrate in western states, particularly along the coastal areas, where earlier Asian immigrants originally disembarked and eventually settled. Accordingly, because of their relatively great numbers and long periods of residence there, certain attitudes and cultural possibilities exist --unique to California and especially its coastal areas--which are conducive to refugee resettlement. Thus, both history and contemporary ethnic residential patterns explain the draw of the west for recent refugees who were resettled elsewhere in the United States.

When dividing the country into the geographic regions used by the U.S. Census Bureau (i.e., northeast, south, northcentral, and west), the pull of the western states becomes even more apparent. In 1983, 49 percent of the refugees lived in the western states, and over 80 percent of these refugees

resided in California and Texas. Although initially 43 percent resided in the western region, they were not concentrated in the two states of California and Texas. Rather, they were much more evenly dispersed throughout the 13 western states as a result of government efforts to distribute refugees more evenly.

Although most geographic movement involved the western region, it occurred throughout the country. To better understand this process we used three measures of residence to construct a five category variable measuring geographic movement. The three measures are current and initial state of residence and state of residence one year ago. By combining these residence categories, we derived the categories of nonmover, return mover, stable mover, multiple mover, and recent mover. As such, our measures monitor interstate mobility rather than intracity or intrastate movement.

The nonmover category was the largest, containing almost 70 percent of the entire refugee population (see Table 8). Stable movers, those who resided at least one year in their state of residence at the time of the survey, were the second largest group, representing 18 percent of the total population. Recent movers, those listing the same initial state as state of residence one year ago but different current residence, made up 11 percent of the sample. The categories return mover and multiple mover each contained less than 1 percent of the sample. This we interpret to mean that movement is either undesirable or well planned, making multiple moves during a short period unlikely.

Focusing on labor force aged men, our tabulations showed that the nonmovers lived predominantly in the west (47 percent), while the northern and southern regions each contained about 20 percent of this group. Stable movers more than likely left their state of original residence and their sponsors to move to a new state with better cultural and/or economic opportunities. Not surprisingly, the western region gained people, while all three other regions

experienced population declines. Contentment with their new residence is indicated by their stability in this locale.

Among recent movers (those moving within the last year), the regional mobility pattern parallels that observed for the stable movers. That is, the share of recent movers residing in the western region increased while that of the three other areas declined. This pattern of inter-cohort geographic concentration can be traced to all three types of movement flowing in the direction of the western states, especially California.

Not all of the movement strategies appear to benefit the individuals involved, as reflected by their unemployment rates for each mover type (see Table 9). That is, only for nonmovers, stable movers and multiple movers was the unemployment rate below 20 percent. With the exception of multiple movers, of which there are relatively few, this evidence suggests that unemployment rates decline as length of residence in a given area increases.

To more clearly understand those factors which influence refugee secondary migration in the United States multivariate analyses were designed to determine those aspects of the refugee resettlement program that promote or retard geographic mobility within the United States. Part of efforts of the Federal Government to disperse geographically refugees bring into focus the policy relevance of our investigation.

Previous theoretical and empirical work indicates that migration occurs selectively. That is, individuals possessing some characteristics have a higher probability of moving relative to those who do not. Age is foremost among those variables known to influence individual migration (Shaw, 1975). Roughly speaking, persons between the ages of 20 and 30 have a higher probability of migrating than older or younger counterparts. Previous research also shows that when controlling for other socioeconomic factors,

migration is highly selective with respect to education (Shryock and Nam, 1965). Thus, better educated individuals are more likely to migrate compared to those who are less well educated (Hamilton and Suval, 1965). Long (1973) included household size in his analysis to control for family status. Long found that larger families migrate less than smaller ones.

There is some support for the importance of occupational differentials in migration selectivity (Deutschman, 1972; Van Valey, 1973). This line of research suggests that workers who are occupationally specialized or who possess advanced skill levels must expand their labor markets beyond the local level to include national and possibly international domains. Unskilled labor is less likely to migrate as the demand for this type of labor can usually be met at the local level.

We also included measures of ethnicity and nationality in order to test the importance of these background characteristics among our refugee sample. Although prior research has indicated that these variables are generally less important than age, education or occupation, they nonetheless have emerged as significant migration determinants in several studies (Stone, 1969; Lansing and Mueller, 1967). Since ethnicity is an important organizing attribute among immigrants (Nelson and Tienda, 1985), we are especially interested in determining their relationship to secondary migration. It is an empirical question, however, whether the effect of ethnicity and/or national origin will persist once the effects on migration of socio-economic background are adjusted.

Our model included additional variables to examine new hypotheses which are tailored to our refugee sample. Sponsor type is one such variable. From 1975 to 1977 most refugees were sponsored by one of various congregations or American families while in later years other refugees (relatives and

non-relatives) predominated. We hypothesized that those residing with relatives and other non-relatives of the same ethnicity would be less likely to undertake a long distance move (within regions), given the importance Southeast Asians normally place on the family, culture, and community. We further hypothesized that, owing to the Asian concentration in the western states and its desirable social and cultural possibilities, those who initially resided in a western state would be the least likely to move. We assess this hypothesis with the variable, "initial region" of residence, which divides the country into the four geographic zones used by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Our model also considers the influence on mobility propensities of "English ability at time of arrival" under the expectation that refugees with higher proficiency levels would be better able to take advantage of opportunities regardless of location. Specifically, we hypothesized that individuals with greater English ability would be more likely to undertake long distance moves, presumably in pursuit of better economic opportunities. Implicitly, this line of reasoning assumes that, when necessary, refugees also will place economic factors over social factors in deciding where to live.

A set of dummy variables monitoring year of arrival ("years in the United States") monitors the effect of exposure to the U.S. on the individual refugee's secondary movement experience. Because of the requirement that refugees' initially must reside in the same state as their sponsor, coupled with their initially unfamiliarity with this country, we expected the likelihood of moving would increase with longer U.S. residence.

Table 10 summarizes the results of the models estimated. These results show that the coefficients for the variables measuring age, education, former Asian occupation, and household size were not decisive (statistically

significant) determinants of whether refugees changed their place of residence. A brief discussion of these nonsignificant effects is warranted because of their established importance in other studies. Age was employed in our models in several different fashions. That is, we first introduced it as a continuous variable, and later as a three and four category dummy variable. Even in a model where age was the only independent variable, we rejected the hypothesis that age significantly influenced the probability of migration.

In a similar and equally comprehensive fashion we tested the effect of education. That is, first we examined several different categorical versions of this variable and later treated it as a continuous variable. In no instance did a significant association between secondary migration status and education emerge. Likewise, Asian occupation was recoded into 6 dummy variables representing occupational categories. Regardless of the stage at which this variable entered the equation, it never attained statistical significance.

Table 11 presents the model and coefficients which best fit the data. (This model corresponds to number 6 of Table 10.) As expected, the mean probability of undertaking an interregional move increased in a monotonic fashion with length of U.S. residence. When compared with refugees in the comparison category (those who arrived 1 to 2 years before the survey) each of the seven previous entry cohorts were more likely to have moved, although only, five of these contrasts were significantly different. Using Petersen's method (1985) to compute the mean probability of moving, we determined that those in this country eight years were nearly 30 percent more likely to move than those in the comparison group.

Although the propensity to move did not differ significantly by nationality or ethnicity, the Vietnamese were more likely to experience long

distance moves compared to Laotians and Kampuchians. Similarly, ethnic differentiation in migration probabilities was minimal, but it appears that Chinese ethnics were slightly more apt to have moved compared to the Vietnamese.

As hypothesized earlier, those refugees initially relocated to the western states were significantly less likely to have moved compared to those living in the Northeast. Refugees originally resettled in the South had a mean probability of moving 10 percent greater compared to their counterparts residing in the Northeast.

Our hypothesis concerning the effect of sponsor type on the likelihood of moving received some support. That is, when compared to refugees with congregational sponsors, those who were sponsored by an American family were 7 percent more likely to have moved, while those sponsored by relatives or non-relatives of the same ethnicity were significantly less likely to have moved. Yet, it was refugees with sponsors of like ethnicity and not those residing with family members who were least likely to have undertaken a secondary move between regions. This finding diverged from our expectation, although in general the influence of the sponsorship variable conformed with our expectations.

Overall, this analysis generated several unique results. First, age was not an important predictor of the secondary movement of refugees. Recall, however, that we examined only interregional movement, not intracity or intrastate movement. This finding differs from results obtained when examining the native born Asian population of this country. Although we lack a pat explanation for this outcome, we believe that this highlights yet another aspect of the uniqueness of the refugee population vis-a-vis the native born, or labor migrants who entered the United States voluntarily.

Other socioeconomic traits also were unrelated to the probability of undertaking interregional moves. We speculate that the reason age, education, former Asian occupation, and English ability at arrival were not significant explanatory variables of refugee movement is that upon arrival to this country most individuals were forced to begin anew, regardless of socioeconomic characteristics. Unlike labor migrants, refugees generally are not prepared to continue where they left off. Rather, they must first familiarize themselves with their new situation before deciding upon yet a different place to live. Support for this view emerges in the strong association between length of U.S. residence and the probability of a secondary move.

This reasoning partly explains why refugees with American family sponsors were more likely to move. That is, because U.S. sponsors are most familiar with the language, culture, and opportunities available in this country--especially in comparison to other immigrants or refugees--they were better equipped to guide their "clients" in securing and/or the resources needed to undertake a secondary move.. Also native born American citizens frequently have connections elsewhere that may have been able to provide needed employment assistance. Table 6 reinforces the plausibility of these arguments, as it indicates that those men with American family sponsors had the highest labor force participation rates.

We offer two suggestions for why English ability was unrelated to interregional movement. First, those individuals speaking English well may have been able to explore local options until employment was located making,thereby movement unnecessary. Second, those who spoke English poorly may have untaken a major move in order to reside in an area where it was possible to work without speaking English, such as enclave employment on the West Coast. However, these interpretations are largely speculative on our

part and require further verification with data better suited to establish reasons for, and consequences of, secondary migration.

Lastly, we noted that when compared to ethnic Vietnamese, the ethnic Chinese were less likely to move. Our interpretation of this result is based on past studies which indicate the ethnic Chinese may have been able to take advantage of opportunities uniquely available to them (Mydans, 1984; Peters, et al., 1983). That is, because of earlier waves of Chinese immigrants and their subsequent dispersal throughout this country, various Chinese networks now exist in almost every state, functioning in cities of all sizes. These networks offer new Chinese, regardless of national origin, all sorts of social and economic possibilities without requiring geographical proximity and thus, a major interregional move. Again, this interpretation which is grounded in secondary data and studies, must remain speculative until further verified.

In sum, while socioeconomic variables explained little about the likelihood of moving, exposure to the United States through longer periods of residence does seem to promote geographic movement. This could occur with longer residence in this country, or through the important information that an American family could transmit as they helped maintain a single refugee household. Lastly, refugees appear to migrate to those areas where there are possibilities to maintain their ethnic sense of community and cultural identity, predominantly toward the West Coast. We believe that regardless of government action taken refugee clustering will continue to occur and is largely inevitable.

Economic Indicators

We now turn our attention to those variables documenting labor market outcomes, and serving as measures of economic integration. For this we maintain our focus on those individuals of labor force age. When comparing

the labor force participation rates of all men to all women, we showed that more men participate than women, i.e., 60 percent versus 42 percent (see Table 9). However Table 12 shows that labor force participation rates rise with longer periods of U.S. residence. For the most part, unemployment rates of both sexes move in the opposite direction--that is, they rise as length of U.S. residence declines. Gender differences in labor supply are also clearly evident. Our measure of hours worked each week by those currently with jobs indicates that on average women worked slightly over 36 hours per week, while men worked just under 38 hours per week. For all male cohorts the work week averaged 38 to 39 hours per week, except for those entering in 1982 or 1983, for whom the average hours worked per week was only 34 hours. Irrespective of their year of entry, the average weekly hours worked for women ranged between 35 and 37 hours.

Among those refugees with a job underemployment does exist, although it appears not to be a major problem. Below we examine which individuals may experience underemployment and to what degree. In future analyses we also will consider household sources of income and current training, as we examine the activities of adults who were not in the labor force, and how they are able to survive economically.

Table 13 presents the recoded Asian occupations of refugee men and women, and also compares Asian occupations with current U.S. labor force status. These data indicate that approximately 36 to 41 percent of all adult refugees were students at the time of departure, while 8 percent were soldiers in Asia prior to their U.S. arrival. Approximately one-fourth of the women in our sample were homemakers in their countries of origin prior to departing.

Among men former Asian managers, clerks, professionals, soldiers, craftsmen, technicians, and service workers were those most likely to be in

the U.S. workforce in 1983. Only former farmers (likely one of the groups least prepared to adapt to the United States), students and male homemakers exhibited labor force participation rates below 50 percent.

Among refugee women, the highest labor force participation rates corresponded to those formerly employed in Asia as professionals, clerks, service workers, and laborers. As a group, however, approximately 60 percent of all refugee women did not participate in the U.S. labor force in 1983. The most prevalent occupations among those participating were service workers, operators, and crafts, in that respective order.

Occupational adjustment in the United States has proven to be a particularly difficult task for the Southeast Asian refugees. Downward mobility is easily discerned when comparing columns one (Asian occupation) and three (U.S. occupation) of Table 13 for men, or columns four and six for women. Relatively fewer men worked as professionals, managers, salesmen, farmers and farm laborers in the United States. There were, however, more technicians, clerks, service workers, craftsmen, operators, and laborers in the U.S. labor force. In other words, it appears that many men from the highest white-collar positions have assumed lower level white-collar, and oftentimes blue-collar positions. The share of farmers declined because of the heavy capital outlay and different skill levels required here except for farm laborer jobs. This apparent tendency toward downward mobility will be examined further with multivariate analysis which aims to discern whether the moves were transitory, and whether there are any discernible flows among occupations.

Table 14 regroups all refugees currently in the U.S. labor force into three year cohorts based upon year of arrival to the United States, and presents their most recent occupational distribution. In this manner it

becomes easier to identify patterns of occupational clustering by years of arrival and gender. Among the earliest group of male refugees, over 25 percent listed their U.S. occupation as either professional, managerial, or technical jobs, but among the later male cohorts this figure declined to approximately 5 percent. Sales and clerical positions accounted for over 15 percent of the first male cohort, but only 5 to 7 percent of the later cohorts. While farmers and laborers amounted to less than 5 percent of the occupational distribution for all male groups, the categories of service, craft and operator positions contained 55, 81, and 86 percent, respectively, of all males in these entry cohorts.

The occupational distribution of refugee women closely parallels that described above for males. The high proportion of women in the categories of professional, managerial, and technical positions corresponds to the earliest cohort (19 percent), while less than 4 percent of the women in the later cohorts held these occupations in 1983. Almost 20 percent of the employed women in the earliest cohort worked as clerks or in service occupations, compared to 11 and 5 percent, respectively, for the later cohorts. Lastly, as observed for men, most employed refugee women were concentrated in the service, crafts, or operator occupations.

These results suggest that some workers experience limited upward occupational mobility after an initial period of downward mobility. However, as a result of the experience of downward mobility, many workers of both sexes were concentrated in the service, crafts, and operator positions, at least on a temporary basis. In later multivariate analyses we shall attempt to determine which individuals were most likely to experience occupational change, and to describe the inter-cohort occupational exchanges by sex.

To understand how refugees adjust their main activity to relocation in the United States we explored the topic of refugee occupational mobility. In the analyses to be discussed we examined what adult refugees not participating in the Asian civilian labor force are now doing in the United States. The ASR occupational codes made it possible to identify non-participants within the Asian civilian labor force and to determine the current U.S. employment and occupational status of these individuals. Almost 100 percent of the non-participants were either former students, soldiers or homemakers. Below we examine the occupational adjustment of these three groups beginning with the experiences of those who were students at the time of departure.

In our sample 1,415 Southeast Asian refugees aged 16 to 64 were identified as students at the time of arrival to the United States (i.e., 791 men and 624 women). Among this Asian student population fully 59 percent were not in the U.S. labor force and also did not indicate a U.S. occupation. This occurred primarily because most of these individuals continued their studies upon arrival to the United States. As a result, over 93 percent of the men ex-students not currently in the labor force indicated they had never worked in this country. Schooling was one of the principal reasons indicated for not seeking work, as 81 percent of these men indicated they were attending college, while an additional 9.2 percent was receiving other instruction in specialized English or technical programs. Thus over 90 percent of this population retained their student status. Other reasons for not seeking work among former students in Asia were: limited English ability (2.9 percent), health problems (2.2 percent), and child care responsibilities (1.1 percent). The remaining 3 percent of the men ex-students who were not working and not attending school at the time of the survey listed a combination of the above mentioned reasons for not seeking employment.

Another segment of the population of students in Asia actually held jobs in the United States. That is, among ex-student men, 42 percent were in the U.S. labor force in 1983 and reported an occupation, but 15 percent were unemployed. The occupations of professionals, managers, and technicians accounted for almost 10 percent of the employed men ex-students. Service jobs comprised the modal occupational category for former men students (37.3 percent), while crafts and operators together accounted for an additional 35.5 percent of this group. Although the unemployment rate among former men students was relatively low, so too were the average number of hours worked by individuals in certain occupational categories. Clerical workers averaged only 22 hours of work per week, service workers 31 and technicians 34 hours per week. Former men students in all other occupational groups averaged between 35 and 41 hours of work per week, with the exception of sales workers, who averaged nearly 48 hours per week.

Among women ex-students, only the 38 percent in the U.S. labor force reported a U.S. occupation. The unemployment rate for this group was 13 percent. Of the women not listing a U.S. occupation, over 93 percent indicated they never worked in this country. The vast majority of those not working in the United States (82 percent) were attending classes. More specifically, over 70 percent of ex-student women who were not in the labor force at the time of the survey were attending college, while an additional 8 percent attended other types of classes. Other reasons women gave for not seeking paid employment were: child care responsibilities (5.2 percent), limited English (4.1 percent), health problems (1.8 percent), and no work believed available (0.8 percent). Various combinations of the above reasons for not seeking work accounted for the remainder of those former Asian student women who were not in the U.S. labor force in 1983.

Underemployment among this relatively well educated group of refugee women was evident for most occupational groups. Sales, clerical, and service workers all averaged between 27 and 31 hours of work per week, while professional and technical workers averaged between 33 and 38 hours of work per week. Only ex-student women working in craft or operator positions averaged 40 hour work weeks.

Over 8 percent (N = 156) of the adult male refugee population were soldiers in Asia at the time of departure. Our survey indicates that 79 percent of the ex-soldiers were in the U.S. labor force in 1983, but 17 percent were unemployed. Among the ex-soldiers who were employed in 1983 the modal occupational category was crafts (28.2 percent) followed by operators (23.3 percent), service occupations (17.5 percent), and technical positions (6.8 percent). Although the unemployment rate for ex-soldiers was high, underemployment was not a problem. Ex-soldiers in every occupational category averaged at least 40 hours of work per week.

We believe that the reason the ex-soldiers worked more than ex-students is that they were older on average (37 vs. 23 years), and more likely to be heads of households (91 percent vs. 25 percent). Although they may not have held the most prestigious jobs, nor possessed the highest levels of education, their higher labor supply partly compensated for their placement in lower status (and presumably lower-paying) jobs.

Among the relatively small percentage of ex-soldiers not in the labor force in 1983, 79 percent indicated they never were employed in the United States, primarily because of school attendance (42 percent). Other reasons for nonparticipation were: limited English (24.2 percent), health problems (12.1 percent), and child care responsibilities (3.0 percent). The remainder of this group indicated a combination of the above reasons for

non-participation. While only 42 percent indicated that their primary reason for not being in the labor force was school attendance, 70 percent were attending English classes and had done so for an average of at least 17 hours per week for 46 weeks (this variable is truncated at the upper end so the mean is actually higher). Over 20 percent indicated they were also attending other classes, mainly college programs.

Over 400 women indicated that they were homemakers at the time of departure. Of this group nearly 40 percent of those aged 16 to 64 were in the U.S. labor force in 1983, but 26.4 percent of these women were unemployed. Joblessness was the most prevalent among those who previously worked in crafts, service, and operator positions in the United States. As these are occupations that have been declining due to the restructuring of the U.S. economy, the unemployment rates of Asian women who held these positions reflects their high risk to lay-off.

Among the former homemakers currently employed, once again the occupations of operators (32.3 percent), service (29.8 percent), crafts (20.2 percent), and sales (4.8 percent) were predominant. This pattern of occupational preeminence reflects that observed among ex-students. There was less evidence of underemployment by hours of work among these former homemakers. That is, whereas technical workers averaged 28 hours of work per week, service workers 35, and operators 36.5, all other occupational categories averaged at least 40 hours of work per week.

For the most part, the former Asian homemakers not in the U.S. labor force appear to be be homemakers in this country as well. Less than 3 percent of Asian homemakers ever held a job in the United States. Over 30 percent indicated they were not seeking work because of child care responsibilities, while nearly 20 percent indicated that non-participation was due to a

combination of child care and schooling attendance. The other reasons for not seeking employment were: attending school (12.6 percent), limited English (12.2 percent), and health problems (8.9 percent).

Discussion

The above discussion presented promising results. While refugee women's labor force participation rates were below the U.S. average, we expect that their labor force participation rates will continue to increase as the refugees acquire English and other human capital skills needed to secure employment in this country. Forty percent of the homemakers who were not working in their country of origin had entered the U.S. labor force, probably due to economic need as well as an environment more conducive to the entry of women into the labor market. Many more were attempting to improve their English skills or increase their education in other areas, circumstances which in themselves facilitate the economic activity of women.

The brightest spot on the future horizon, however, is reserved for the young adults currently in college. These people were probably among their countries' most intelligent to have been studying at the few highly selective centers of advanced learning at the time of their departure. They were also young enough to master the English language within a relatively short period of time. These assets, combined with their formal training at institutions of higher learning in the United States, will make them very competitive in whatever field they choose once they enter the U.S. work force. We believe that once these individuals begin their careers the level of economic self-sufficiency among the Southeast Asian refugee population will greatly increase as will their overall social and economic contributions to this country.

Bibliography

- Department of Health and Human Services. 1983. Report To Congress: Refugee Resettlement Program, Annual Report FY 1982. Washington, D.C.: Social Security Administration Office of Refugee Resettlement.
- Deutschman, H.D. 1972. "The Residential Location Decision: A Study of Residential Mobility." *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 6:349-364.
- Grenier, G. 1984. An Analysis of the Effect of Language Characteristics on the Wages of the Hispanic-American Males. *Journal of Human Resources*, 19:35-52.
- Hamilton, H.C. and E. Suval. 1965. "Educational Selectivity of Migrants from Farm to Urban and to Other Non-Farm Communities," in M.B. Kantor (ed.), Mobility and Mental Health. Springfield, IL: Thomas, p. 166-195.
- Lansing, J.B. and E. Mueller. 1967. The Geographical Mobility of Labor. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.
- Long, L.H. 1973. "New Estimates of Migration Expectancy in the United States." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 68:37-43.
- Mydans, S. 1984. "Chinese Refugees from Vietnam Thrive in Chinatown." *New York Times*, 11 February, 29, 32.
- Nelson, Candace and Marta Tienda. 1985. "The Structuring of Hispanic Ethnicity: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives." Ethnic and Racial Studies 8 (1): 49-74. Reprinted in Ethnicity and Race in the U.S.A. Boston: Rutledge and Kegan Paul, PLC.
- Peters, H., B. Schieffelin, L. Sexton, and D.A. Feingold. 1983. Who Are the Sino-Vietnamese? Culture, Ethnicity, and Social Categories. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Petersen, T. 1985. "A Comment on Presenting Results from Logit and Probit Models." *American Sociological Review*, 50:130-131.
- Shaw, R.P. 1975. Migration Theory and Fact. Philadelphia, PA: Regional Science Research Institute.
- Shryock, Jr., H.S. and C.B. Nam. 1965. "Educational Selectivity of Interregional Migration." *Demography*, 2: 579-592.
- Stone, L.O. 1969. Migration in Canada. One of a Series of 1961 Census Monographs, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Canada.
- Van Valey, T.L. 1973. "Elite Migrations," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Whitmore, John K. 1985. "Chinese from Southeast Asia." Pp. 59-76 in Refugees in the United States, ed. David W. Haines. Greenwood Press: Westport, Conn.

Table 1

SELECTED SOCIOECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SOUTHEAST
 ASIAN REFUGEE POPULATION BY YEAR OF ARRIVAL: ALL INDIVIDUALS, 1983

Percent by Characteristics	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
<u>Country of Origin</u>									
Cambodia	3.5	2.2	13.8	2.5	9.4	8.4	33.4	31.3	27.1
Laotian	1.1	71.7	20.2	30.5	25.3	36.0	20.3	12.5	11.8
Vietnamese	<u>95.4</u>	<u>26.1</u>	<u>66.0</u>	<u>66.9</u>	<u>65.4</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>46.3</u>	<u>56.3</u>	<u>61.2</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1
<u>Gender</u>									
Male	52.7	45.7	47.2	60.4	51.0	52.0	53.0	55.1	52.4
Female	<u>47.3</u>	<u>54.3</u>	<u>52.8</u>	<u>39.6</u>	<u>49.0</u>	<u>48.0</u>	<u>47.0</u>	<u>44.9</u>	<u>47.6</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>Mean Age at Arrival</u>	19.4	17.3	12.8	19.7	19.7	20.3	19.9	20.8	24.7
(N of Individuals)	(1113)	(92)	(579)	(239)	(866)	(1482)	(1403)	(787)	(170)
<u>Type of Family Headship^a</u>									
Husband and Wife	84.3	95.0	81.0	71.7	70.6	67.9	62.9	62.9	48.0
One Spouse Missing	8.3	--	9.5	15.2	23.9	26.8	30.2	27.3	32.0
Non-Family	<u>7.4</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>13.0</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>9.8</u>	<u>20.0</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean Household Size	5.4	5.8	5.5	5.6	5.7	5.3	5.3	5.5	4.9
Mean Number of Children	2.0	2.8	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.0
(N of Households)	(242)	(20)	(21)	(46)	(163)	(299)	(275)	(143)	(25)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees
^aFor household heads only.

Table 2

ETHNICITY OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEES BY PERIODS
OF ARRIVAL: ALL INDIVIDUALS, AGES 16-64, 1983.

Ethnic Origin	1975-76	1977-78	1979	1980	1981	1982-83	Total
Chinese	7.6	23.7	44.2	32.1	23.6	15.5	23.8
Hmong	1.7	8.3	2.6	6.7	.5	2.1	3.1
Khmer	3.1	3.0	6.7	7.5	28.9	25.1	13.3
Lao	3.6	16.6	19.7	23.4	18.7	9.4	15.2
Vietnamese	82.6	32.5	24.1	28.2	27.5	47.4	42.4
Other Southeast Asian	.9	14.8	2.8	2.2	.8	.6	2.0
Missing	.5	1.2	.0	.0	.0	.0	0.0
Total	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.1	99.8
(N)	(804)	(169)	(507)	(869)	(781)	(530)	(3660)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

Table 3

SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEES BY ETHNICITY AND GENDER: ALL INDIVIDUALS AGED 16-64, 1983

	Chinese		Hmong		Lao		Khmer		Vietnamese		Other Southeast Asian	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Mean Education at Arrival	8.0	6.7	4.2	.7	7.0	4.7	7.8	4.1	9.8	8.6	9.4	8.1
Education Distribution at Arrival												
None	3.5	11.6	20.7	78.6	5.9	23.9	6.6	29.5	1.2	3.1	17.5	36.1
1-5	20.7	26.3	36.2	16.1	28.4	33.3	32.6	39.8	15.5	23.7	20.0	11.1
6	15.2	16.7	31.0	5.4	20.6	19.7	6.2	5.7	9.2	10.0	7.5	8.3
7-11	40.3	30.6	10.3	.0	33.0	16.7	27.3	17.4	33.0	31.9	15.0	8.3
12	11.5	7.5	.0	.0	3.9	1.9	8.4	3.4	19.7	17.0	5.0	.0
13+	8.8	7.3	1.7	.0	8.2	4.5	18.9	4.2	21.4	14.3	35.0	36.1
Total	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9
Labor Force Participation Rate	58.3	41.1	48.3	21.4	65.6	50.8	47.6	24.2	62.2	47.8	66.7	44.4
Percent Unemployed	20.6	21.1	39.3	41.6	17.0	23.1	13.8	15.6	17.1	18.7	.0	.0
Percent Holding White Collar Occupations in Country of Origin	28.3	24.0	5.2	1.8	15.4	11.7	23.8	10.2	21.7	27.2	10.0	11.1
(N)	(434)	(438)	(58)	(56)	(306)	(264)	(227)	(264)	(866)	(687)	(40)	(36)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

Table 4

ENGLISH ABILITY OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEES AT ARRIVAL, BY LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY,
ETHNICITY AND GENDER: ALL INDIVIDUALS AGES 16-64, 1983

Ethnicity and Gender	Speaking				Total	Writing				Total	(N)
	Fluent	Well	Little	None		Fluent	Well	Little	None		
Chinese											
Men	1.2	5.6	26.9	66.4	100.1	1.4	7.0	23.0	68.7	100.1	(431)
Women	.0	3.0	25.5	71.5	100.0	.2	3.9	21.8	74.0	99.9	(435)
Hmong											
Men	.0	1.7	29.3	69.0	100.0	.0	5.2	34.5	60.3	100.0	(58)
Women	.0	.0	5.4	94.6	100.0	.0	.0	12.5	87.5	100.0	(56)
Khmer											
Men	1.3	7.9	42.3	48.5	100.0	1.3	9.7	37.4	51.5	99.9	(227)
Women	.0	2.3	28.5	69.2	100.0	.0	.8	28.1	71.1	100.0	(263)
Lao											
Men	.7	3.6	47.4	48.4	100.1	2.3	15.1	44.7	37.8	99.9	(304)
Women	.0	.8	29.3	70.0	100.1	1.1	8.7	29.3	60.8	99.9	(263)
Vietnamese											
Men	3.5	20.3	38.3	37.8	99.9	5.2	25.5	32.1	37.3	100.1	(851)
Women	3.1	14.1	34.1	48.7	100.0	3.4	17.9	30.4	48.2	99.9	(680)
Other Southeast Asian											
Men	3.7	7.4	25.9	63.0	100.0	11.1	14.8	22.2	51.9	100.0	(27)
Women	.0	4.3	8.7	87.0	100.0	4.3	13.0	13.0	69.6	99.9	(23)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

Table 5

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF IMPROVEMENTS IN ENGLISH SPEAKING
ABILITY AMONG SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEES AGED 16 to 64
(Standard Error in Parentheses)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
<u>Socioeconomic Background Variables</u>						
Age at Arrival	-0.022** (.002)	-0.023** (.003)	-0.021** (.002)	-0.022** (.003)	-0.022** (.002)	-0.020** (.003)
English Ability at Arrival	.728** (.049)	.759** (.059)	.718** (.048)	.741** (.059)	.719** (.050)	.752** (.059)
Years of Education	.029** (.007)	.029** (.009)	.028** (.007)	.029** (.009)	.027** (.008)	.025** (.009)
Household Size	.005 (.011)	.025* (.012)	.001 (.011)	.011 (.012)	.000 (.011)	.015 (.012)
Ethnicity						
Hmong	.167 (.131)	-0.201 (.144)	.062 (.141)	-0.315* (.148)	.069 (.141)	-0.324* (.148)
Khmer	-0.186* (.081)	-0.307** (.086)	-0.132 (.083)	-0.194* (.089)	-0.131 (.084)	-0.222* (.089)
Lao	-0.182* (.084)	-0.110 (.091)	-0.207* (.089)	-0.157 (.095)	-0.208* (.089)	-0.178 (.093)
Vietnamese	-0.048 (.078)	.125 (.085)	.034 (.080)	.104 (.086)	.020 (.083)	.126 (.086)
Other Southeast Asian	-0.089 (.276)	-0.265 (.212)	-0.020 (.274)	-0.330 (.210)	-0.012 (.277)	-0.278 (.208)
<u>Reception Variables</u>						
<u>Sponsor Type</u>						
American Family			-0.003 (.113)	-0.056 (.118)	.002 (.114)	-0.063 (.117)
Relative			-0.010 (.066)	.020 (.068)	-0.012 (.066)	-0.002 (.068)
Ethnic Non-Relative			-0.035 (.142)	-0.074 (.156)	-0.034 (.143)	-0.086 (.155)
Other			.075 (.097)	.112 (.100)	.082 (.097)	.078 (.100)
<u>Initial Region</u>						
Northeast			.108 (.086)	.014 (.094)	.112 (.086)	.061 (.093)
North Central			-.004 (.075)	.100 (.079)	.005 (.077)	.130 (.078)
South			-0.099 (.080)	.045 (.084)	-0.094 (.081)	.040 (.083)
<u>Year of Arrival</u>						
1982			.183 (.139)	.088 (.125)	.170 (.141)	.091 (.127)
1981			.225 (.136)	.162 (.115)	.201 (.140)	.170 (.120)
1980			.315* (.140)	.340** (.121)	.296* (.148)	.346** (.130)
1979			.525** (.152)	.517** (.137)	.510** (.158)	.570** (.145)
1978			.707** (.181)	.679** (.236)	.713** (.184)	.672** (.238)
1977			.071 (.540)	.530 (.548)	-0.001 (.547)	.263 (.549)
1976			1.352* (.560)	.830** (.306)	1.284* (.567)	.669* (.308)
1975			.100 (.251)	.757** (.163)	.073 (.257)	.731** (.173)
<u>English Learning Opportunities</u>						
<u>Language and Cultural Training</u>						
Weeks of English					.043 (.062)	.193** (.061)
Hours per Week					.00 (.003)	.001 (.004)
Labor Force Participation					-0.005 (.063)	.006 (.066)
Constant	-1.324	-1.675	-1.582	-1.859	-1.531	-2.214
R ²	.431	.380	.463	.436	.462	.459
(N)	(387)	(377)	(387)	(377)	(387)	(377)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

*Significant at $\alpha < .05$.**Significant at $\alpha < .01$.

Table 6

TYPE OF SPONSORSHIP BY YEAR OF ARRIVAL: ALL INDIVIDUALS AGED 16 TO 64, 1983

Sponsor Type	1975-1976							1977-1978							1979							1980							1981							1982-1983							Total						
	Percentage							Percentage							Percentage							Percentage							Percentage							Percentage							Percentage						
Congregation	60.1							42.0							47.7							40.2							40.7							42.3							46.1						
American Family	25.1							2.4							6.1							6.7							6.7							5.8							10.3						
Relative	8.7							21.9							29.8							38.0							34.4							38.9							29.0						
Nonrelative of Same Ethnicity	1.2							2.4							3.6							3.1							5.8							3.8							3.4						
Other	4.4							11.2							12.2							11.7							12.0							8.9							9.8						
Unknown	$\frac{.5}{100.0}$							$\frac{20.1}{100.0}$							$\frac{.6}{100.0}$							$\frac{.3}{100.0}$							$\frac{.4}{100.0}$							$\frac{.4}{100.0}$							$\frac{1.3}{100.0}$						
Total	100.0							100.0							100.0							100.0							100.0							100.0							100.0						
(N)	(804)							(169)							(507)							(869)							(781)							(530)							(3660)						

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

Table 7

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES BY
 TYPE OF SPONSOR: ALL INDIVIDUALS AGED 16 TO 64, 1983
 (Percent in Labor Force or Unemployed)

Sponsor Type	Men		Women	
	Labor Force Participation	Unemployed	Labor Force Participation	Unemployed
Congregation	61.3	19.2	43.2	21.0
American Family	70.7	14.3	58.3	50.6
Relative	53.3	18.8	35.4	72.1
Nonrelative of Same Ethnicity	52.4	6.1	43.3	66.6
Other	62.6	21.4	42.1	67.2
Unknown	63.6	.0 ^a	40.0	60.0
(N)	(1143)	(207)	(732)	(148)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

^aSample size is small. All 14 respondents in the labor force were employed at the time of survey.

Table 8
 MOVER TYPE BY SEX AND REGION OF CURRENT RESIDENCE:
 ALL INDIVIDUALS, 1983

Percent by Mover Type	West		South		Northeast		Northcentral		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Nonmover	46.2	50.6	20.5	19.0	14.5	13.6	18.8	16.9	100.0	100.0
Stable Mover	50.8	53.4	29.0	27.8	8.1	6.3	12.1	12.5	100.0	100.0
Recent Mover	53.6	53.1	18.4	20.4	10.3	10.3	17.7	16.1	100.0	99.9
Return Mover	40.0	48.0	16.7	16.0	13.3	8.0	30.0	28.0	100.0	100.0
Multiple Mover	31.8	20.0	40.9	50.0	13.6	25.0	13.6	5.0	99.9	100.0
(N)	(1682)	(1638)	(772)	(667)	(447)	(382)	(613)	(513)	(3514)	(3200)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees.

Table 9

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES BY TYPE OF
MOVEMENT AND GENDER: ALL INDIVIDUALS AGED 16 TO 24, 1983

<u>Mover Type</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Nonmovers</u>			
Labor Force Participation	58.2	41.5	50.2
Unemployed	17.3	19.8	18.3
<u>Return Movers</u>			
Labor Force Participation	71.4	76.5	73.6
Unemployed	26.7	30.1	28.6
<u>Multiple Movers</u>			
Labor Force Participation	50.0	47.4	48.6
Unemployed	25.0	.0 ^a	11.8
<u>Stable Mover</u>			
Labor Force Participation	67.6	48.9	59.3
Unemployed	17.7	20.5	18.7
<u>Recent Mover</u>			
Labor Force Participation	50.0	23.5	36.8
Unemployed	29.4	29.2	29.3
(N)	(1909)	(1733)	(3642)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

^aSample Size is small.

Table 10

LOGIT MODELS OF INTER-REGIONAL MOVEMENT AMONG SOUTHEAST ASIAN
REFUGEE MALES AGED 16-64^a

Models	Scaled Deviance	Degrees of Freedom
1. Baseline*	1784	1775
2. minus Age	1785	1778
3. minus Asian Occupation	1791	1783
4. minus Household Size	1791	1784
5. minus Education	1792	1785
6. minus Years in the United States	1886	1792
7. minus Ethnicity	1925	1796
8. minus Sponsor	1969	1800
9. minus Initial Region	2041	1803
10. minus Nationality	2083	1805

Models Compared	Ratios of Change	df Change	x ² Change	P
1 vs. 2	.33	3	1	NS
2 vs. 3	.88	5	6	NS
3 vs. 4	0	1	0	NS
4 vs. 5	1	1	1	NS
5 vs. 6	13.43	7	94	<.001
6 vs. 7	9.75	4	39	<.001
7 vs. 8	11.00	4	44	<.001
8 vs. 9	24.00	3	72	<.001
9 vs. 10	21.00	2	42	<.001

^aSource: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees.

*Baseline includes the grand mean, household size, years of education, Asian occupation, age and dummy variable representing years in the United States, ethnicity, sponsor type, initial region of resettlement, and nationality.

Table 11

EFFECTS OF SELECTED BACKGROUND AND RECEPTION CHARACTERISTICS ON GEOGRAPHIC
MOVEMENT AMONG SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEE MEN, AGE 16 TO 64

Location	Logit Coefficient	First ^a Derivative
Nationality		
Laotian	-0.74	-0.119
Kampuchean	-0.02	-0.004
Initial Region of Resettlement		
Northcentral	.16	.032
South	.43*	.092
West	-0.50*	-0.086
Sponsor Type		
American Family	.34	.070
Relative	-0.20	-0.038
Ethnic Non-Relative	-0.70	-0.112
Other	-0.04	-0.009
Ethnicity		
Hmong	-0.54*	-0.092
Khmer	-0.01	-0.001
Lao	.15	.031
Vietnamese	-0.54	-0.090
Year of U.S. Arrival		
1981	.49*	.106
1980	.80*	.181
1979	.01	.002
1978	1.16*	.271
1977	1.10	.256
1976	1.22*	.285
1975	1.69*	.396
Constant	-1.52	
Degrees of Freedom	1785	
-2(log likelihood χ^2)		

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees.

*Significant at $\leq .05$.

^aFigures computed using $P(D=1/L_1) - P(D=1/L_0)$, where L_1 is the respective logit coefficient and $P=.26$.

Table 12

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES BY YEAR OF ENTRY AND BY GENDER:
ALL INDIVIDUALS AGES 16 TO 64, 1983

	Year of Arrival					
	1975-1976	1977-1978	1979	1980	1981	1982-1983
<u>Men</u>						
Labor Force	73.2	77.6	66.8	57.9	52.9	40.6
Unemployed	11.0	11.8	18.7	23.8	14.6	34.2
(N)	(422)	(98)	(256)	(449)	(403)	(281)
<u>Women</u>						
Labor Force	60.8	49.2	49.8	43.5	28.0	23.7
Unemployed	14.8	21.9	23.4	18.7	20.8	37.9
(N)	(378)	(65)	(249)	(418)	(378)	(245)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

Table 13

DISTRIBUTION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEE MEN AND WOMEN ACCORDING TO
OCCUPATION IN COUNTRY OF ORIGIN AND CURRENT U.S. OCCUPATION:
ALL INDIVIDUALS AGED 16 TO 64, 1983

Occupation	Men			Women		
	Asian Occupation	Percent ^a in U.S. Labor Force	U.S. Occupation	Asian Occupation	Percent ^a in U.S. Labor Force	U.S. Occupation
Professional	5.6	80.4	2.5	3.7	71.9	1.1
Managerial	1.7	97.0	.5	.2	50.0	.2
Technical	2.0	76.3	3.4	1.1	57.9	1.9
Sales	8.5	68.7	2.3	13.3	43.0	3.2
Clerical	3.9	83.8	2.8	2.1	72.2	1.9
Service	6.9	75.8	17.6	4.4	68.4	13.0
Crafts	6.2	78.0	13.1	2.1	58.3	6.6
Operators	4.0	67.5	9.4	1.7	40.0	8.6
Farmers	5.0	46.9	.9	3.9	19.4	.1
Laborers	.4	75.0	1.3	.3	80.0	.9
Farm Laborers	2.0	53.8	.3	2.8	35.4	.2
Students	41.0	42.3	NA	35.9	38.0	NA
Homemakers	.5	20.0	NA	23.6	40.0	NA
Soldiers	8.2	78.8	NA	.1	0.0	NA
Unknown/No Occupation ^b	<u>3.9</u>	66.7	<u>45.9</u>	<u>4.9</u>	35.3	<u>62.3</u>
Total	99.8		100.1	100.1		100.0
(N)	(1909)	(1909)	(1922)	(1735)	(1735)	(1738)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

^aPercentages are computed based on former Asian occupation.

^bIncludes students and homemakers as well as those who are not in the labor force for whatever reason.

Table 14

U.S. OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEES IN LABOR FORCE
BY YEAR OF ENTRY AND GENDER: ALL INDIVIDUALS AGES 16 TO 64, 1983

Occupation	1975-1977		Year of Entry 1978-1980		1981-1983	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Professional	9.2	6.4	2.2	1.1	3.1	.8
Managerial	2.3	.9	.5	.7	.0	.0
Technical	15.7	11.4	3.6	1.9	.4	.8
Sales	7.5	12.3	4.3	7.1	1.2	4.2
Clerical	7.9	7.3	3.6	4.1	4.2	.8
Service	13.1	28.3	36.4	36.0	45.6	42.5
Crafts	26.9	18.3	24.4	19.9	22.8	12.5
Operators	14.8	12.8	20.1	25.1	17.4	34.2
Farmers	1.6	.0	1.7	.7	1.9	.0
Laborers	1.0	1.4	2.9	3.4	2.3	2.5
Farm Laborers	.0	.9	.5	.0	1.2	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.2	100.0	100.1	100.0
(N)	(305)	(219)	(418)	(267)	(982)	(120)

Source: 1983 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees

Mailing Address:

Center for Demography and Ecology
University of Wisconsin
1180 Observatory Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53706-1393
U.S.A.