ETHNOGRAPHIC EXPLORATORY RESEARCH

REPORT # 2

CENSUS-RELATED BEHAVIOR OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEES

IN THE UNITED STATES

Preliminary Report for Joint Statistical Agreement 88- 20

June 1989

Submitted by

Ann M. Rynearson
Principal Investigator

Thomas A. Gosebrink
Co Principal Investigator

International Institute of Metropolitan St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri 63110

Sponsored by:

Center for Survey Methods Research
Bureau of the Census
Washington, D.C. 20233

Dr. Leslie A. Brownrigg, Technical Representative

This research was supported by a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Bureau of the Census. The views, opinions, and findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Bureau of the Census position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

CENSUS-RELATED BEHAVIORS OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEES

A Preliminary Report *1
May 31, 1989
by Ann H. Rynearson, Ph.D. and Thomas A. Gosebrink, Ph.D. with Barrie Gewanter and Manisha Desai

INTRODUCTION

Since 1975, almost 850,000 Southeast Asian refugees have been admitted to the United States. It seems likely that language, cultural differences and the particular circumstances of resettlement of any new Americans will pose barriers to obtain complete and accurate census data. In fact, some evidence indicates that in 1980 there was a 28% undercount of Southeast Asian refugees in the United States. This preliminary report explores behaviors that may act as barriers to census among these populations. The research is part of a larger project to be completed at the end of this year.

The present paper has two components. One is based on ongoing ethnographic fieldwork among Southeast Asian refugees, specifically Lowland Lao in St. Louis. It discusses procedural and substantive issues concerning census-related behaviors. The other is a statistical overview of the distribution and estimated size of Southeast Asian refugee populations in the United States. It is based on a literature review, including data from the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), the Immigration and Naturalization Service(INS) and the U.S. State Department.

Drawing upon statistical data and ethnographic observations, we will pose a series of hypotheses concerning the most effective ways to obtain comprehensive coverage of Southeast Asian refugees in the 1990 Census.

STATISTICAL OVERVIEW

Data

After the Communist takeover of Southeast Asia in 1975, hundreds of thousands of refugees began fleeing Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Many of them eventually found new homes in the United States. Table 1 shows total arrivals from each country between 1975 and 1988. Table 2 gives current Southeast Asian refugee population by country of origin for each state. These figures are adjusted for secondary migration. Despite the fact that official government policy has been to disperse the refugee population, there are marked clustering patterns, with more than 50% of the refugees now living in California, Texas and Washington. (See Table 3 for a percentage distribution of Southeast Asian refugee populations in states with more than 10, 000.)

---

*1 This preliminary report is based on interviews with 21 Lao refugees in St. Louis. Interviews followed a structured protocol of questions rather than an instrument. Some subjects were interviewed twice. Additional interviews are currently being conducted.

Most official government reports are not tabulated by where refugees are located within states. However, some statistics from the INS can be used to infer more detail. Although they do not give figures on total refugee populations of each area, INS provides information on the number and nationality of people adjusting their status from refugee to immigrant within each of the top 50 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) in the country in 1987 and 1988. When they arrive in the United States, refugees have an I-94 visa. After one year they are eligible for immigrant status ("the green card"). Although in the past not all refugees adjusted their status as soon as possible, current law requires that they do so. Thus these figures fairly accurately reflect the number of new arrivals who have lived in each SMSA in those years. Obviously this is only a sample of the total population in each area, most of whom arrived before 1987-88. The "green card" statistics in Tables 4 and 5 show an even more intensive pattern of clustering than is immediately apparent from the distribution displayed on a state-by-state basis.

Recommendation 1
Census results can be improved by creating strategies to target Southeast Asian refugee groups in geographic areas of high concentration. Later in the paper we will be more specific as to possible strategies for reaching out to Southeast Asian refugee groups.

Data
There are many Southeast Asia ethnic groups which may not be identified solely by reference their nation of origin. The various groups differ dramatically in language, culture and history. For instance, from Vietnam there are both ethnic Vietnamese, and Sino-Vietnamese, Cambodians, however, are all the same ethnic Group but are variously referred to as Khmer or Kampucheans. Many different ethnic groups come from Laos, but the largest is the Lowland Lao (ethnic Lao) and the Hmong. There are also other highland groups. Unfortunately, most statistics are calculated in terms of nationality rather than ethnicity. But, generally about 39% of the refugees from Laos are Hmong and most of the rest are Lowland Lao (ORR Report to Congress 1988: 113). Since there are differences among Southeast Asian refugees that cannot solely be identified by nation of origin, nationality alone is not an adequate predictor of appropriate strategy in developing language materials or predicting such things as household composition.

Recommendation 2
Census results can be improved by using strategies tailored to specific ethnic groups, not simply nationalities.

ETHNOGRAPHIC OBSERVATIONS

Unlike many other migrant populations in the US, Southeast Asian refugees did not find stable, long-established communities when they began arriving in large numbers during the 1970's. As Table 6 illustrates, these groups simply did not exist in the United States prior to that time. Because Southeast Asian refugee communities are so new, there is little or no longitudinal research on their behavior, including census-related barriers. The present project, which grows out of Rynearson's eight-year research involvement with Southeast Asian refugees in St. Louis, is a step toward addressing this deficit.

A team led by Drs. Thomas A. Gosebrink and Ann B. Rynearson has been conducting ethnographic fieldwork since Jan. 1, 1989. We have focused primarily on Lowland Lao refugees in St. Louis. Among the ethnic groups in Southeast Asia, the Lowland Lao occupy on intermediate position between the more urbanized Vietnamese and the more rural Cambodians and Hmong. Research within this community suggests hypotheses concerning methods to overcome census barriers among Lowland Lao and other Southeast Asian refugee populations elsewhere.

At the present time the Lowland Lao community in St. Louis is made up of about 600 individuals or 100 households. The first Lao refugees arrived in this area in 1979, with the greatest number arriving in 1982. Since then the population has been remarkably stable, with new arrivals and secondary migrants roughly equal to the number of out-migrants. Residence patterns and levels of acculturation range along a continuum. Many people live in tightly bounded clusters, where everyday interaction with non-Lao is infrequent and unnecessary. Although many go out to work, the important part of their social life takes place within the confines of the Lao community. Most residents of such clusters are little acculturated and have minimal skills in spoken and written English. At the other end of the continuum are those families who have bought homes in suburban areas of the city. Although they maintain ties to the Lao community, they are often more acculturated and fluent in English. In general, they are far more comfortable in dealing with American institutions. Of course other individuals and families range between these two extremes. The range of behaviors displayed in this community parallels the variety of patterns described for Southeast Asian refugee populations in other parts of the United States. (See, for example, the communities described in the volume edited by Morgan and Colson 1987.)

Data for this paper is drawn from a number of ethnographic research activities. Rynearson's participant observation provided a base line of information about the community and its members over the past decade. Additional information was collected as part of a 1988 Alternative Enumeration of the Lao and their neighbors in a racially and ethnically mixed St. Louis neighborhood. More intensive ethnographic fieldwork began in January 1989 as part of the current study. Techniques included participant observation end guided discussions with individual Lao informants concerning their lives both here and in their homeland. We focused particularly on issues and concerns relevant to census barriers--for example, perceived language skills, contacts with neighbors and strangers, etc. These conversations took place in the informants' homes. with the assistance of a skilled Lao interpreter. The finer ethnography will have more comprehensive description and analysis of both methodology and results. In this paper we are highlighting those observations which seem most relevant to understanding and overcoming census barriers among Southeast Asian refugees.

We will begin by addressing various stages of the census process, looking at problems the census may encounter in dealing with refugees at each stage. We will then raise substantive concerns surrounding the use of names and the concept of household. This substantive section is shorter and more tentative then the procedural part because the issues are less straightforward, more complicated and potentially more important. These substantive issues will be more fully addressed in the final report.

PROCEDURAL ISSUES

Three stages of the censusing process can be distinguished for purposes of this paper. These are 1) the precensus, 2) the mail return, and 3) the enumerator return. We will discuss each in turn by making observations concerning census-related behavior of Lao refugees and offering tentative hypotheses for improving census data collection.

Precensus Observations

Many approaches are being developed for increasing awareness and understanding of the 1990 Census in the general population. Our research indicates that certain special strategies may be necessary for reaching out to Southeast Asian refugees. During the Test Census conducted in St. Louis in 1988, one major channel for census outreach was through advertising in print and electronic media. Our discussions with the Lao raised serious questions about the effectiveness of this approach for creating awareness among Southeast Asian refugees, while also suggesting alternative, more effective strategies. People we spoke to did not subscribe to magazines or newspapers, but 75% of them read the Lao language newsletter from the Lao Mutual Aid Association of St. Louis. Some of the Lao do occasionally read the neighborhood newspapers distributed free to all households in the area. They use them to look for jobs, housing and sometimes sales on desired merchandise. In other words they only pay attention to newspaper ads if they need something specific; they do not browse the Sunday paper as some Americans might.

TV ads are pretty much ignored, even though 67% reported being interested in news on TV. Although eight out of eleven sometimes listened to the radio, most did not understand what was being said. They were primarily interested in music. Three quarters of the households we visited have VCRs and most of the time in front of the TV is spent watching rented movies from Thailand, China and India. Such movie videos are usually available at ethnic markets.

As part of the 1988 Test Census in St. Louis there was an intensive “media blitz.” A study conducted by the Gallop Organization found that 55% of the Black and 67% of the general non-Black population of the city was aware of the Test Census (DeLuca 1988). Of all the Lao whom we spoke with only two remembered anything about the blitz, including the very large and obvious billboards. Even the Lao college students we contacted were unaware of the campaign. Thus, the usual commercial advertising seems to have little impact on the Lao and is not a suitable channel for outreach to them.

Recommendation 3
During the Precensus stage, the Census can increase refugee awareness:

1) Print fliers in native languages. These can be distributed with imported rental movies or included with other purchases from ethnic markets.

2) Insert "trailers" about the Census at the beginning or end of rental movies.

3) Provide Census information and graphics to ethnic associations, so that they can be Included in "ethnic" newsletters or mailings such as those done by mutual aid associations.

4) Use ethnic associations and other trusted support organizations and institutions for direct outreach. See below under "Mail Returns."

MAIL RETURNS

Observations
Several of our findings have implications for obtaining complete and accurate mail returns from Southeast Asian refugees. The Lao population exhibited a wide range of language skills. Thirty-six per cent of the individuals we spoke with read little or no Lao. Sixty per cent of the women were illiterate in Lao. All people reported some difficulty understanding written English, although the more acculturated experienced fewer problems. Even those with a relatively good command of English tend to seek assistance when confronted with problematic documents. In part this seems to be a culturally patterned reliance on patron-client ties. In part this is a learned response to possible pitfalls in dealing with mail in America.

Initially sorting the mail is a problem, for junk mail often looks like official government documents and vice versa. In the past, some Lao have made plans to use the "$50,000 Grand Prize" money they believed they had received. Others discarded or set aside months of important messages from insurance companies, lending agencies and landlords. The Lao use a variety of strategies for sorting the mail. About a third of the informants reported that the mail is initially divided into that addressed to named household members and that addressed to "Occupant." Frequently mail addressed to "Occupant" is discarded without opening. Mail with the names of household members is assumed to be more important. They also look for familiar return addresses, such as banks end utilities.

Mail identified as important is handled in a variety of ways. In 60% of the households we visited the husband dealt with the mail, and in another 20% both husband and wife share the responsibility. If they do not understand something, the more acculturated use dictionaries. The others look for help both inside and outside the household.

Although school age children any not be consulted on routine matters (such as bills), they are often the first to be asked to explain mail which is difficult to understand.

Parents are not always satisfied with their children' s explanations, however, and not all households contain teenagers. Some informants reported that they often check the same materials with at least two different helpers. Frequently they seek aid from known and trusted culture brokers. Anthropologists use the term "culture brokers" to refer to those individuals who are able to bridge the gap between cultures. In this case they may be either Lao who speak and write English better or Americans who are accustomed to dealing with Lao refugees. Data from our 1988 study revealed that most people who needed assistance with mail returns sought help from an refugee mutual aid association, a local church or the International Institute. Census returns completed with this type of assistance were highly accurate.

Recommendation 4

The Census can increase the number and quality of refugee mail returns by:

1. Establishing centers where refugees can take their mail returns for help in completing them. By locating these centers in institutions which the refugees know and trust, the Bureau can thus take advantage of the existing network of culture brokers. The centers should receive supplies of appropriate native-language census forms and instructions on how to use then as part of precensus preparations.

2. Using the language skills of the refugees' teen age children in completing the mail returns. This would require two sub-components:

a. Curriculum materials tailored for English as a Second Language (ESOL) students should be prepared and disseminated to school districts with a high proportion of Southeast Asian refugees. See Tables 4 and 5 for a list of the States with large numbers of refugees from particular groups. Table 7 shows the states with the largest concentrations of refugee school children. Donnelly (1989) found that public school systems are a good source of detailed information about specific areas or schools where refugees and immigrants are concentrated. This particular strategy may be useful for outreach to other immigrant groups besides Southeast Asian refugees.

b. Precensus awareness activities should alert parents to the arrival of the mail return and inform them that the children can play an active role in completing them. Parents should be prepared to recognize the Census logo/return address, since this is an important cue used to distinguish between junk and important mail.

ENUMERATOR RETURNS

Observations

Our research indicates that enumerators should expect problems first with gaining admittance to the home and then with communicating with Lao and other groups. Barriers stemming from Southeast Asian refugees' relations with American society can have particularly negative consequences for obtaining accurate enumerator returns. Both participant observation and guided discussion with the Lao reveal that there is very little interaction with outsiders, i.e., non-Lao, in the neighborhood setting. Even relatively fluent English speakers do not, on the whole, advance conversations with their neighbors beyond the level of “Hi.” This is true regardless of the ethnic or racial identity of the neighbors. They seem to lack confidence that they can understand and communicate with Americans. In a study of Lao living in Alabama and middle Tennessee, researchers found 80% of the refugees experience stress through problems understanding the behavior of Americans and 82% reported difficulties because America did not understand Lao cultural ways (Nicassio et al 1986:25). Among the Lao in St. Louis even the most acculturated spend their free time associating with other Lao.

Barriers to interacting with neighbors are reinforced because Lao and other refugees are initially settled in the City's most dangerous neighborhoods primarily because housing is cheapest there. Experiences in these neighborhoods produce an aversion to strangers, especially low income African Americans. As one informant succinctly put it, '”they shoot my window, they shit my house.” Gangs of local teenagers go from apartment to apartment knocking on the doors at all hours of the day and night. The Lao suspect that this is a prelude to burglary when there is no response to the knock. Virtually every discussion sooner or later comes around to tales of vandalism, burglary, mugging or arson experienced in such neighborhoods. Thus, reality-based fear adds to the feelings of social distance towards outsiders. (Seventy per cent of the people who move out of these areas give “bad neighbors” as the basis for their decision.)

Most people we spoke with reported that they would not readily answer a knock on the door unless they knew the person. About half stated they would look out the window and ask what was wanted; if they didn't understand, they would not open the door. We asked whether official identification papers or badges would help and over half said that they would. More men were likely to attempt communication then women. Eighty per cent of the respondents stated that they would be more willing to talk to such a person if he/she were accompanied by a Lao. In general Lao seen to prefer that contact with outsiders be structured through interpreters, appointments and references. They prefer to deal with strangers only after they have been introduced, usually through the good offices of a friend, a culture broker or a fellow Lao.

Where Lao are clustered, an informal leader is usually present and can validate the right of a stranger to ask questions and receive answers. This parallels the situation in Laos. Our analysis of the 1988 Alternate Enumeration found that where enumerators had the assistance of culture brokers to guide and introduce them to particular households, the enumerator returns are highly accurate. Where this was not the case, the returns were badly garbled, including missed individuals and gross spelling inaccuracies. One household contained a husband, wife and three children. An enumerator apparently visited during the day, when the unemployed wife was at home with her infant son. The return for the household lists only the wife and son, and their names and biodata were badly scrambled. Gaining admittance, especially gaining a certain level of trust, is therefore made easier by working through established centers, culture brokers and cluster leaders.

Almost every household seems to have regular channels to the outside. These individuals are members, either adults or children, with the best command of English. Anyone seeking to communicate with the household should plan contacts when this person is most likely to be home. In St. Louis those Lao who remain at home during the day rather than go to work tend to have poor English skills and to be less acculturated. They will often not deal with strangers at all. In some arena the only people home during the day are older women babysitting others' children. They are usually totally illiterate, completely unacculturated and routinely do not answer the door. The English-speaking adults and children are likely to be at work or school until late afternoon or early evening, the best time to visit and communicate with a Lao household. Informants report that daytime visitors sometimes leave a note asking the English-speaking member of the household to call back in the evening.

Recommendation 5
Census enumerators will more quickly, easily and accurately obtain census data on Southeast Asian refugees by:

1. Redistributing census awareness materials just before the enumerators begin work. The Census will not be a topic of major importance in Southeast Asian refugees' lives, and they are likely to have largely forgotten about it between the two phases.

2. Making appointments. This can be done through the centers where possible. In some cases the center might introduce enumerators to informal cluster leaders and thus gain access to most households in a cluster.

3. Taking along a member of the ethnic Group as interpreter and bridge.

4. Scheduling at least two contacts per household, first to introduce oneself and the next to interview a fluent English speaker or other household representative. The first contact might be making a phone call or simply leaving a note for an English speaker to call.

5. Visiting in late afternoons, early evenings or weekends in order to encounter most fluent English speakers.

SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

There are two substantive issues that are not addressed in the procedural section that have important implications for the Census: names and definitions of household members.

Names
Within Lao residential clusters, there is a high level of personal knowledge--about who

is living where, with whom, etc. - but no one knows official names. Everyone has a nickname, either a descriptive label (like “Shorty”), an animal mascot (“Tiger”) or a relational term (“Father of _ “) In an effort to be obliging, neighbors or members of the household may provide an enumerator with speculative versions of names. For example, one man is known as “Chanh.” Everyone knows his real name is longer, and in referring to him to outsiders they will call him “Khanchanh” or “Somchanh” or “Sengchang” (all common combinations). The less well educated of the women often do not know the long official names of their children, all of whom are called by nicknames. Even the date of birth is sometimes confusing. Some people memorized their ages while in the refugee camps and have never changed it since. Thus, quite aside from language barriers, people just do not know these administrative labels for the people they know so well.

Spelling will also be a major problem if the enumerator asks household members to spell their names. Even the best English speakers have difficulty pronouncing certain letters. It is particularly hard to distinguish the sounds written with the letters “H,” “X,” and “S” and between “R” and “L.” Mail boxes, drivers' licenses, social security and green cards often do not agree.

In the process of being resettled in the U.S., however, Lao refugees have become quite accustomed to producing paper containing basic information about their identity. The head of household and/or his wife (more often the wife) must frequently gather all their documents to obtain social services — welfare, food stamps, energy assistance, school, etc. These documents include I-94s during the first year after arrival and “green cards” after that.

Recommendation 6
Census enumerators can speed the process and improve the accuracy of the results if they:

1. Ask to see the I-94s or green cards for all household residents. This might require two trips or arrangements through a third party such as a neighbor.

2. Learn naming conventions for the various Southeast Asian groups. The Bureau should produce and distribute these materials as part of the training for enumerators.

Household Membership

Observations

At the present time, most Lao households in St. Louis consist of the nuclear family only. In the early days after resettlement this was less often the case, but the nuclear family household does seen to be a preferred residence pattern. In fact during guided discussions, most Lao claimed that no one outside the nuclear family had ever lived with them although we knew from past observations that this statement has untrue.

Married couples often take in one or more single young (and more rarely women), who share expenses and eat with the family. Partly this reflects a wish to save money on housing, especially before family members are working. In some cases these people are relatives of nuclear family members, if only classificatory ones. Others are family friends: in one recent case a Nigerian youth, abandoned by his own people, lived in a Lao household for several months. In Laos and Northern Thailand, it is not uncommon for young men to stay with married couples while they seek their fortunes away from home. Among the Lao living in the two census blocks surveyed this summer, over 33% of the households contained such *lan* ("nephews"): the kinship term *lan* in Lao refers to nephews, nieces, grandchildren and cousins, i.e., any junior relative outside the nuclear family. During times of economic hardship the number of such shared residences is much higher.

Laotians count the community size in terns of number of households, not individuals. They tend to equate household with family. Since the young singles are not family members, they are not seen as household members either. These young are socially almost invisible. In most cases the boarding youths are not a secret (e.g., affecting welfare); they are just not seen as fully functioning community members and are socially irrelevant. It seems likely that these boarders would be even more likely to be dropped in places where there is a high welfare dependency.

One or more married couples may also share an household. These are often close kin, e.g., parents and children or married sisters and their families. This fits the traditional family residence pattern, wherein a newly married couple live for years with the wife's parents. At least three Lao households in St. Louis each contain three nuclear families living together, arising partly from a desire to save both money. These multifamily households are by no means exceptional in this community. This type of household may cause confusion for the census enumerator, depending upon who is interviewed it might be easy to miss the other nuclear family(s), or difficult to get the information with just a few of these adult married people to count.

Household membership is flexible with the Lao as it is with other groups. In a longitudinal survey of Southeast Asians in the United States, the Office of Refugee Resettlement recently found that "nearly one-third of the individuals covered were not in the same households one year earlier" (ORR. 1988: 143n). In St. Louis it is the young singles and components of the multifamily households who tend to move around the most.

Recommendation 7
The census will obtain a more accurate count of household members outside the nuclear family by :

1. Targeting those issues in precensus awareness materials. Besides general census familiarity, the materials should also address the need to count household members outside the nuclear family. Giving examples might make it more understandable.

2. Enlisting the cooperation of the Lao cluster leader as noted above. Such informal headmen are used to acting as the interface with the larger society. They are usually

good at English and sophisticated enough to understand the importance and privacy of census data. The leader could probably give general information on which households the young single men are living in. In most cases they can help arrange to have the men present or at least to leave their I-94s for the enumerator's visit to each household.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has been prepared to assist the 1990 Census achieve a more accurate count of Southeast Asian refugees in the U.S. Many of the observations made here say have applicability for other immigrant groups. How broadly applicable is a subject for future research. As a preliminary report, this paper highlights those behaviors and cultural patterns which may act as barriers to census enumeration. Consequently it is not a full ethnographic picture of the Lao and other refugee groups. This discussion of census related behavior would not be complete without a brief mention of structural features common to all refugees.

For purposes of the Census, in what respects are Southeast Asian refugees different from other newcomers? At the simplest level, they are very far from their homelands. As refugees they are, by definition, unable to return home unless the political situation changes dramatically. In the context of the present paper, the most important point of contrast with other immigrants, both legal and illegal, can be found in the circumstances of their arrival in the United States.

Refugees are subjects of an enormous, complex bureaucratic mechanism, the resettlement process. Once chosen to come to the U.S., they acquire a special legal status which entitle them to a range of benefits and services. Hence, it is to their material benefit to be identified as refugees. This is a dramatic contrast to other kinds of immigrants, especially those who are illegal or semi-legal.

An elaborate network of social service institutions has been created to handle the resettlement process. Among other programs, the U.S. government has promoted the formation of mutual aid associations as one form of assistance. Since both MAAs and mainstream social service institutions have well-established channels for working with local refugee populations, they can be a source for identifying community members for census outreach. Clearly it is in the interest of both types of agencies to document the size of refugee population in their local areas. It is for these reasons that we have placed heavy emphasis on the use of MAAs and social service institutions as a starting point for many of the strategies we recommend for reaching out to Southeast Asian refugees.

The large scale movement of refugees has become a major phenomenon on the international scene of the late twentieth century. In the Refugee Resettlement Act of 1980, the United States recognized this reality by promising to help address the problems so caused. In the future, the numbers and countries of origin of refugees admitted to the U.S. will change with shifts in foreign policy. It is likely, however, that refugees will continue to be an important part of the immigrant stream to this country.

Techniques now being developed to assure an accurate count of refugees for the 1990 Census will therefore continue to be valuable well into the twenty-first century.

APPENDIX

TABLES OF STATISTICAL DATA

SOUTHEAST ASIAN REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

Table 1: Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals in the United States by Nationality, FY 1975-1988

Table 2: Southeast Asian Refugees: Estimated Cumulative State Populations Including Entries from 1975 through 4/30/88

Table 3: States with Southeast Asian Refugee Populations of At Least 10,000 Persons

Table 4: Refugees and Asylees Granted Lawful Permanent Resident Status By Selected Country of Birth and Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area of Residence FY 1987

Table 5: Refugees and Asylees Granted Lawful Permanent Resident Status By Selected Country of Birth and Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area of Residence FY 1988.

Table 6: Southeast Asian Population in the United States: 1980 and 1970

Table 7: States With Largest School Enrollments of Refugee Children: April 1987

TABLE 1

Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals in the United States
By Nationality, 1975-1988

	Cambodia	Laos	Vietnam	Total
1988	3,276	14,563	17,499	35,338
1987	1,539	15,564	23,012	40,115
1986	10,054	12,894	22,443	45,391
1985	19,131	5,181	25,209	49,521
1984	19,849	7,224	24,927	52,000
1983	13,114	2,835	23,459	39,408
1982	20,234	9,437	43,656	73,327
1981	27,100	19,300	86,100	132,500
1980	16,000	55,500	95,200	166,700
1979	6,000	30,200	44,500	80,700
1978	1,300	8,000	11,100	20,400
1977	300	400	1,900	2,600
1976	1,100	10,200	3,200	14,500
1975	4,600	800	125,000	130,400
Total	143,597	192,098	547,205	882,900

Source: Refugee Reports, December 16, 1988, p. 10.

TABLE 2

Southeast Asian Refugees: Estimated Cumulative State Populations a/ Including Entries From 1975 through 4/30/1988

State of Residence	Estimated Total	State of Residence	Estimated Total
Alabama	3,300	Montana	1,000
Alaska	100	Nebraska	2,300
Arizona	6,800	Nevada	2,400
Arkansas	3,100	New Hampshire	900
California	338,000	New Jersey	7,500
Colorado	11,800	New Mexico	2,200
Connecticut	7,600	New York	31,500
Delaware	300	North Carolina	6,300
Dist. of Columbia	1,500	North Dakota	900
Florida	14,600	Ohio	12,000
Georgia	11,100	Oklahoma	8,800
Hawaii	7,700	Oregon	19,600
Idaho	1,700	Pennsylvania	28,000
Illinois	28,000	Rhode Island	7,200
Indiana	4,300	South Carolina	2,500
Iowa	9,200	South Dakota	1,000
Kansas	10,300	Tennessee	5,900
Kentucky	2,900	Texas	64,900
Louisiana	14,800	Utah	8,900
Maine	1,700	Vermont	600
Maryland	10,100	Virginia	22,700
Massachusetts	27,200	Washington	40,600
Michigan	11,700	West Virginia	400
Minnesota	30,200	Wisconsin	12,700
Mississippi	1,700	Wyoming	200
Missouri	7,800	Guam	300

Total 858,800

a/ Adjusted for secondary migration through 9/30/87 rounded the nearest hundred. Not adjusted for births and deaths in the U.S.

Source: Monthly Report of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, April 1988, p. 2.

TABLE 3

States with Southeast Asian Refugee Population
of At Least 10,000 Persons

State	Number	Percent
California	332,600	39.3%
Texas	64,300	7.6%
Washington	40,000	4 7%
New York	31,100	3.7%
Minnesota	29,300	3.5%
Illinois	27,800	3.3%
Pennsylvania	27,700	3.3%
Massachusetts	26,700	3.2%
Virginia	22,500	2.7%
Oregon	19,400	2.3%
Louisiana	14,800	1.7%
Florida	14,400	1.7%
Wisconsin	12,100	1.4%
Ohio	11,900	1.4%
Colorado	11,700	1.4%
Michigan	11,600	1.4%
Georgia	10,900	1.3%
Kansas	10,200	1.2%
Maryland	10,000	1.2%
Subtotal	728,900	86.1%
Other	117,500	13.9%
Total	846,400	100.0%

Source: Report to Congress, Refugee Resettlement Program, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1988, p. 117.

TABLE 4

Refugees And Asylees Granted Lawful Permanent Resident Status
By Selected Country of Birth and Selected Metropolitan
Statistical Area of Residence in 1987

SMSA	All Countries	Cambodia	Laos	Vietnam	All SE-Asians
Total	96,474	12,206	6,560	20,617	39,383
Miami, Fl	24,281	1	-	8	9
Los Angeles, CA	6,343	729	61	1,522	2,312
New York, NY	5,708	353	11	535	899
Anaheim-SA, CA	3,341	342	180	1,895	2,417
Chicago, ILL	2,513	321	107	353	781
Washington, DC -MD metro	2,384	274	157	781	1,212
Stockton, CA	2,370	1,135	262	588	2,835
San Jose, CA	2,354	275	33	1,465	1,773
Boston, HA	2,142	655	42	660	1,357
Oakland, CA	2,080	274	100	642	1,016
San Diego, CA	1,939	325	308	614	1,247
Seattle, WA	1,906	551	178	554	1,283
Minneapolis- St. Paul MN	1,900	354	801	313	1,468
Dallas, TX	1,618	385	219	481	1,085
Philadelphia, PA	1,491	515	44	435	994
Tampa, FL	1,490	75	97	277	449
Houston, TX	1,431	121	35	771	927
Atlanta, GA	1,403	418	115	366	899
San Francisco, CA	1,362	108	29	633	770
Sacramento, CA	1,111	67	267	459	793
Fresno, CA	784	117	417	83	617
Portland, OR	765	111	75	344	530
Denver, CO	683	92	85	260	437
Detroit, HI	644	7	36	35	78
Fort Lauderdale FL	623	-	3	6	9
New Orleans, LA	623	38	18	334	390
Fort-North, OX	587	81	148	224	453
Lowell, MA-NH	561	355	73	50	478
Modesto, CA	547	264	43	74	381
Tacoma, HA	535	334	13	80	427
Riverside-SB, CA	526	81	25	201	307
Providence, RI	500	342	31	14	387
St. Louis, MO	441	34	31	152	217
Newark, NJ	439	--	---	40	40

Rochester, NY	438	77	53	199	329
Rochester, MN	430	268	13	39	320
Orlando, Fl	424	3	16	118	137
Phoenix, AZ	403	25	11	191	238
Salt Lake, UT	363	117	29	103	249
Hartford, CT	354	18	68	73	159
Nashville, TN	354	86	126	17	229
Jersey City, NJ	344	4	-	40	44
Nassau-Suffolk, NY	335	3	-	51	54
V. Palm Beach, Fl	326	-	-	29	29
Des Moines, IA	274	89	91	57	237
Grand Rapids, MI	246	7	11	131	149
Merced, CA	244	3	203	4	210
Cleveland, OH	234	50	5	27	82
Baltimore, MD	225	6	1	51	58
Milwaukee, WI	219	8	143	15	166
Other MSA’s	11,169	1,970	1,333	3,515	6,818
Non-MSA	2,667	338	413	708	1,459

Source: U.S. Dept. of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Service, Immigration Statistics: FY 1987

TABLE 5

Refugees And Asylees Granted Lawful Permanent Resident Status
By Selected Country of Birth and Selected Metropolitan
Statistical Area of Residence in 1988

SMSA	All Countries	Cambodia	Laos	Vietnam	All SE-Asians
Total	110,721	9,255	10,349	21,407	41,011
Miami, FL	22,989	2	11	22	35
Los Angeles, CA	10,145	1,129	113	2,774	4,016
New York, NY	6,479	347	29	713	1,089
W. Palm Beach FL	4,543	-	2	37	39
Anaheim-SA, CA	3,215	258	152	1,963	2,373
Fort Lauderdale FL	2,970	-	-	18	18
Boston, MA	2,737	622	52	810	1,484
Washington, DC-MD metro	2,518	178	200	725	1,103
San Jose, CA	2,491	146	46	1,582	1,774
San Diego, CA	2,419	156	775	704	1,635
Philadelphia. PA	2,020	545	64	591	1,200
Oakland, CA	1,988	166	334	514	1,014
Chicago, ILL	1,979	180	57	285	522
Seattle, WA	1,715	366	243	524	1,133
Minneapolis St. Paul MN	1,373	104	749	162	1,015
Fresno, CA	1,302	206	752	57	1,015
Dallas, TX	1,213	160	239	425	824
Houston, TX	1,205	127	104	630	861
San Francisco, CA	1,195	59	44	524	627
Stockton, CA	1,146	542	147	190	879
Newark, NJ	1,016	10	23	60	93
Tampa, Fl	1,009	41	93	119	253
Orlando, Fl	991	2	27	97	126
Atlanta, GA	978	104	200	261	565
Lowell, MA-NH	909	562	69	77	708
Naples, FL	861	-	-	-	-
Portland, OR	721	24	185	279	488
Modesto, CA	648	239	140	47	426
Detroit, M1	631	3	61	31	95
Riverside-SB, CA	631	66	80	215	361
Tacoma, WA	601	394	38	56	488

Sacramento, CA	592	34	188	166	388
New Orleans, LA	531	16	44	308	368
Denver, CO	510	46	55	209	310
Phoenix, AZ	501	53	31	206	290
Jersey City, NJ	487	-	5	75	80
Fort-Worth, TX	477	31	171	201	403
Nassau-Suffolk	456	2	81	82	85
Honolulu, HI	433	6	137	263	406
Salt Lake, UT	431	91	85	93	269
Merced, CA	397	2	316	5	323
Lakeland, FL	394	-	9	1	10
Providence, RI	388	155	133	8	296
St. Louis, MO-IL	379	18	65	131	214
Milwaukee, WI	362	7	257	31	295
Kansas City, MO-KS	351	47	122	114	283
Nashville, TN	346	31	229	10	270
Charlotte, NC	334	57	49	140	246
Bergen, NJ	317	-	2	17	19
Springfield, MA	311	128	14	99	241
Other NSA's	13,946	1,566	2,804	4,002	8372
Non-MSA	4,140	227	603	754	1,584

Source: U.S. Dept. of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Service, Immigration Statistics: FY 1988 - Advance Report.

TABLE 6

Southeast Asian Population in the
United States: 1980 and 1970

	Number		Percent of all Asians in the United States	
	1980	1970	1980	1970
Total Asians	3,466,421	1,426,148	100%	100%
Cambodian	16,044	-	0.5	0.0
Hmonq	5,204	-	0.2	0.0
Laotian	47,683	-	1.4	0.0
Vietnamese	245,025	-	7.1	0.0

Source: Asian and Pacific Islander Population by State: 1980, 1980 Census of Population, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. p. 2.

TABLE 7

States With Largest School Enrollments of
Refugee Children April 1987 b/

State	Refugee Children	Percent
California	25,296	31.5%
Florida	7,737	9.6%
Massachusetts	5,114	6.4%
Texas	4,366	5.4%
Illinois	4,133	5.2%
Pennsylvania	2,723	3.4%
Washington	2,693	3.4%
Virginia	2,411	3.0%
Minnesota	2,400	3.0%
New York	2,296	2.9%
Rhode Island	1,942	2.4%
New Jersey	1,564	1.9%
Ohio	1,559	1.9%
All Others	15,987	20.0%
Total	80,221	100.0%

a/ All refugees not just Southeast Asians

b/ Elementary school children are counted if they have been in the U.S. for less than two years; secondary school children if they have been in the U.S. for less than three years.

Source: Report to Congress, Refugee Resettlement Program, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, 1988. p. A-21.

REFERENCES CITED

De Luca, Donald
1988 Preliminary Executive Summary: Census of St. Louis City. Prepared for the Advertising Council, Washington, D.C.

Donnelly, Nancy
1989 Seattle school children who speak Asian languages at home: residence by Census Tract, 1984-1988. Seattle, Washington: Information Services.

Morgan, Scott and Elizabeth Colsen
1987 People in Upheaval. Staten Island, NY: Center for Migration Studies.

Nicassio, P. et al.
1986 Emigration stress and language proficiency as correlates of depression in a sample of Southeast Asian refugees, The International Journal of Social Psychiatry 32:22-28.

U.S. Committee for Refugees
1988 Statistics. Refugee Reports 9(12):4-15.

U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Census
1980 Asian and Pacific Islander Population by States: 1980 Census of Population.

U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, Office of Refugee Resettlement
1988 Monthly Refugee Data Report (April).

U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, Refugee Resettlement Program
1988 Annual Report to Congress.

U.S. Dept. of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Service
1987 Immigration Statistics: FY 1987.

1988 Immigration Statistics: FY 1988 - Advance Report.