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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Ethnicity, the cultural characteristics of different ethnic groups, has been a fact of life in the United States from the inception of the republic when British, French, Dutch and Spanish colonists began to mold the country. Today the interest in ethnicity is evidenced by popular literature and television programs such as Roots and Centennial, by the increasing interest in family genealogy, and by the resurgence of ethnic festivals and traditions across the country.

Over the past 20 years, needs assessments, journal articles and books have analyzed the different sub-cultures that comprise American society and have pointed to the specific needs and characteristics of the families within these sub-cultures in such areas as education, health, employment, and finances. Recent social legislation requires that needs of ethnic and minority groups be met as a function of federal, state, and local government programs (U.S. Government, 1975 & 1976). In 1975 social service agencies began addressing the specific needs of Indochinese refugees, one of the newest American ethnic groups, and the largest group of refugees ever to arrive in such a compressed period of time. These political and economic refugees include people from Laos, Kampuchea (formerly Cambodia), and Vietnam. Each group is culturally
different from the others and within each national group there is further cultural diversity.

As of March, 1981, some 475,480 Indochinese refugees had settled in the United States. Over 500,000 refugees still live in refugee camps awaiting resettlement (Dept. of State, 1981b). Currently the United States is accepting 14,000 refugees per month. The initial estimate of the total Indochinese refugees expected to come to the United States was 130,000. To date, over three times that number have settled in United States communities and each month more arrive.

Unlike other recent refugee groups that have come to the United States, Indochinese refugees could look to no existing indigenous ethnic community for guidance and cultural kinship in the adjustment process. Consequently, there were no occupational or social networks into which the refugees could immediately assimilate. Indochinese families face acculturation problems as they attend local schools, engage in business and social relationships, and compete for jobs and services. Their languages, family structures, life styles, world views, and value systems are radically different from those held by most Americans. In addition, many refugees face problems related to acceptance by the host community due to ignorance, prejudice, and preconceived notions that cause difficulties among those in the American community. For most Indochinese, adjusting to the new environment requires obtaining access to needed financial, occupational, medical, and educational resources (Skinner & Hendricks, 1979). Many of the Indochinese families coming to the United States are non-English speakers, unable to utilize their old job skills, and in need of retraining to enter United States job markets. Learning a new language and retraining both require time.
To meet primary human needs until they are self-supporting, these people must rely heavily on the utilization of community services.

Indochinese families are vulnerable to crisis and conflict during their migration process due to role changes, generational conflict, and suspicion of government and government activities. Migrating families striving for stability during the resettlement process have differing degrees of "success." Each family must create its own unique coping patterns and new lifestyles in which that particular family can continue to function. Currently, Indochinese families can be found in each stage of the migration process.

Traditionally, the Indochinese family met all crises and conflicts with resources generated through the extended family (Thuy, 1976). Indochinese refugee families are often forced to rely on government supported agencies for the assistance they need to survive. It is at this point that government policy impacts on Indochinese family behavior. If policy makers are to serve the best interests of the United States as a whole, as well as Indochinese individuals and families, they must become better acquainted with the responses of Indochinese to social services and to the procedures through which resources may be provided. The same information is needed in relation to other minority groups in this country.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to gain knowledge of the migration process and ethnic factors impacting on the social service utilization of Indochinese refugee families. The knowledge thus gained can then be used by service professionals to improve the planning and implementation
of services for Indochinese refugee families. The following paragraphs outline the four objectives underlying the purpose of this research.

Before a population with social service needs can be helped, it is first necessary to understand the unique characteristics of this population. Indochinese refugee families have experienced an uprooting from Southeast Asian culture into American culture through the process of migration. This process has different stages which bring to focus specific human needs. Therefore, the first objective of this research is:

1. To provide a theory of migration applicable to Indochinese refugees experiencing resettlement into and adjustment to American life.

Once a theoretical framework is established to aid in understanding Indochinese refugee families in general, it is important to obtain an accurate profile of the specific Indochinese population needing services. Oklahoma has two large urban areas of refugee resettlement: Tulsa and Oklahoma City. Does the profile of Indochinese vary between these two major cities of refugee concentration? How does the profile differ from the national profile? The second objective of this research is:

2. To provide a profile of Indochinese refugees living in Tulsa and Oklahoma City.

Social service policy makers and providers are constantly challenged to provide ethnically sensitive services to minority groups in the United States. What effect do selected ethnic factors have on Indochinese family service utilization? The third objective of this research is as follows:

3. To increase the body of knowledge regarding the effects of the role of language and ethnic ties on social service
utilization by Indochinese refugees.

Large federal appropriations have been allocated to state and local service providers to assist Indochinese families in becoming economically self-sufficient. In Oklahoma, programs for refugee resettlement have been administered primarily through the auspices of Catholic Charities, the Oklahoma Department of Health and Human Services, and recently, the Vietnamese American Association (VAA) in Oklahoma City. A comprehensive profile of Indochinese families in Oklahoma and an increased knowledge of the migration process and the impact of ethnic and language factors on service utilization should encourage re-thinking of policies for refugee families. Therefore, the fourth objective for this research is as follows:

4. To delineate policy implications for future laws and agency strategies regarding Indochinese refugee families in Oklahoma.

The Organization of the Dissertation

In the chapters to follow, the ideas discussed in the introduction are more fully presented. A brief overview of these chapters may help the reader place this material in context.

A somewhat unorthodox approach is taken in Chapters II and III of this dissertation. These chapters present an unusually extensive literature review and delineation of background material. The intent is to assist the reader to understand the complex historical, social, and political events leading to the mass migration of Indochinese refugees. Rather than merely setting the stage for a research project, these two chapters are conceptualized as presenting their own unique contribution to the body of knowledge concerning the Indochinese refugee migration.
A five-stage Developmental Migration Model (DMM) is developed in Chapter II. Utilizing the DMM framework, an overview of the Indochinese refugee migration is presented. The two migration stages, Preflight and Flight Process, are discussed in the second part of Chapter II.

Chapter III examines the last three migration stages of the DMM as they affect Indochinese refugees in the United States. The Initial Entry section discusses United States refugee legislation and the United States climate of acceptance towards Indochinese refugees. The Settling In section provides a national profile of Indochinese refugees in the United States and discusses social services provided to Indochinese families. The Adjustment section addresses current research concerning Indochinese families. In the last part of Chapter III, a social service utilization research study is outlined. The two hypotheses to be tested in this research are the following:

Hypothesis #1: English language proficiency of Indochinese refugees is positively related to the use of community family services by Indochinese families.

Hypothesis #2: The extent of involvement of Indochinese refugees in the ethnic community is positively related to their utilization of social services approved by the ethnic community.

Chapter IV outlines the research methods utilized for the Oklahoma studies. The chapter opens with a Strategies section which discusses the techniques utilized for studying the two urban Indochinese populations in Oklahoma. The Sampling section discusses the problems of sampling the Vietnamese in Tulsa and Oklahoma City. The Measurement section examines the demographic indicators utilized for the Oklahoma Profile study and the variables tested in the Service Utilization Study. Finally, the data Analysis section discusses the statistics used in this research.
Chapter V presents the findings of the two studies. For the Oklahoma Profile of Indochinese refugees, category percentages of the demographic variables for the two urban samples are compared. The findings are presented against the DMM stages. For the Service Utilization Study, category percentages and correlation analysis results are reported.

Chapter VI, the concluding chapter of the dissertation, presents conclusions, implications, and recommendations. The conclusions and implications are discussed separately for the Developmental Migration Model, the Oklahoma Profile, and the Service Utilization Study. Then recommendations for further research and for action by policy makers and service providers are offered.
CHAPTER II

THE MIGRATION PROCESS: FROM INDOCHINA TO THE UNITED STATES

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a background for the reader and to develop a theory of migration that will assist service providers in their understanding and service planning for Indochinese refugee families assimilating into American community life. Building on literature from family relations, psychology, sociology, and social work, the first section of the chapter develops a theoretical framework of the migration process: the Developmental Migration Model (DMM). In the DMM, five stages of migration are outlined. Each stage is then discussed theoretically. The possible impact each stage might have on migrating Indochinese families coming to the United States following the Vietnam War is explored.

The second section of the chapter looks in depth at the preflight characteristics of Indochinese refugee families. A brief history of Vietnam, Kampuchea (formerly Cambodia), and Laos provides a perspective on these three countries prior to the war. A short history of the Indochinese wars is given to aid understanding of the events leading up to the mass migration of Indochinese in 1975. Areas of cultural diversity and cohesiveness are discussed showing the complexities and uniqueness of Indochinese refugees.

The last section describes various flight processes Indochinese
families have experienced, based upon the time of the migration and country of origin. The chapter concludes at the point where refugee families reach the United States.

Overview of Migration Process

Theoretical Framework

The goal of refugee family services is to enhance the adaptation and assimilation process of Indochinese into American life. In order for these services to meet the needs of refugee families, it is important to understand that such families have unique problems that are tied to the migration process. Several migration theories of refugee and immigrant adaptation are found in the literature. Five different theories are considered in this section.

Kunz (1973) analyzes refugee movement commonalities to create a general theory of refugee migration. However, his theory is a typology of refugees in the flight process rather than a delineation of a general migration developmental process. He delineates three types of refugee categories (anticipatory refugees, intermediate refugees, and acute refugees) based upon the degree of the push to leave their homeland and the preparedness refugees experience. Anticipatory refugees have the least amount of push to leave coupled with the greatest opportunity and time to prepare their exit. Acute refugees, at the other extreme, have the greatest push to leave quickly and least time to prepare for their exits. Intermediate refugees lie between these two extremes.

Kunz' (1973) theory uses the preflight characteristics of the refugees (gender, age, educational background, resources, and assimilation potential)
to understand refugee populations. These characteristics give service providers predictive insights into the kinds of services a refugee population might need at the initial stage of resettlement into the United States. While valuable, Kunz' typology does not maximize understanding of the migration process. It does, however, point to the importance of the preflight stage for predicting successful adaptation (see Table I).

Goldlust and Richmond (1974) offer a multivariate model of immigrant adaptation, which Pisarowicz (1979) adapts to the Indochinese refugee process. This model takes into account the premigration characteristics and conditions of the refugees (as in Kunz' theory) and adds the situational determinants within the receiving society to predict mutual adaptation. This theory alerts service providers formulating resettlement service plans to the importance of considering the community resources and the climate of acceptance facing the refugees, the two determinants Goldlust and Richmond delineate.

Montero (1979a, 1979b) provides a descriptive model called Spontaneous International Migration (SIM) which describes the Vietnamese pattern of resettlement as a series of recognizable migration stages from "homeland" to "final assimilation" (see Table I). This model is based upon his analysis of five telephone surveys with the same sample of Vietnamese families conducted between July, 1975 and August, 1977. Montero predicts a rapid movement through each stage.

Adler (1979) describes four stages of the adjustment process based upon Maslow's (1962) needs hierarchy. In the first stage, refugees are pushed towards satisfying basic physiological and safety needs. In the second, social needs come to dominate. In the third, self-esteem requirements (indicated by job satisfaction and majority community recog-
TABLE I
DEVELOPMENTAL MIGRATION MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration Theories</th>
<th>Migration Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I Preflight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunz (73)</td>
<td>II Flight Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinetic Model</td>
<td>III Initial Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldlust &amp; Richmond (74)</td>
<td>IV Setting In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisarowicz (79)</td>
<td>V Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Variate Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montero (79,a)</td>
<td>The Homeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous International Migration (SIM)</td>
<td>Temporary Camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adler (79)</td>
<td>Private Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maslow (62)</td>
<td>Ethnic Enclaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Adjustment</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sluzki (79)</td>
<td>Preparatory Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration Process</td>
<td>Act of Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Period of Over-Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Period of Decompenstation or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trans-Generational Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nition) takes primary importance. The final stage of the adjustment process is reached when self-actualization (striving for full realization of personal uniqueness and potential) is addressed.

Sluzki (1979) suggests that the migration process occurs in five specific stages. First, in the "preparatory" stage, families make their decision to migrate. Next, in the "act of migration" stage, groups vary greatly in experiences. Individual groups sharing the same migration experiences often form strong alliances. Sluzki's "period of overcompensation" stage requires that families develop new adaptive skills for dealing with their new culture. Often families in this stage need to focus their attention on the essentials of life, avoiding the broader implications of life in the new culture. Fourth, the "period of decompensation" stage is filled with conflicts, symptoms, and difficulties as different family members begin to engage more fully into the new culture. Families often need special services to settle family crises in this stage. Finally, the "transgenerational impact" stage examines families in the assimilation and adjustment process.

While the above theories make valuable contributions, Adler (1979) and Sluzki (1979) offer service providers the most comprehensive insights concerning the needs of migrating families in the process of assimilation. Table I presents the five theories integrated within a framework of five stages referred to throughout this dissertation as the Developmental Migration Model (DMM) (Brown, 1981b). The DMM considers the contribution of each component theory while, at the same time, it operates as a more wholistic framework. The DMM contributes important knowledge to potential service professionals assisting refugee populations. Regardless of their background, refugees face cultural uprooting,
migration, and family conflict. The DMU stages are discussed in the following five sections.

Stage I: Preflight

The time that Indochinese families have available to consider and prepare for leaving their homelands varies widely. Some have to make their decision within a few hours, others plan their migration for months before risking the move. Few Indochinese families have the luxury of being anticipatory refugees able to prepare and to come with maximum economic resources to help in their resettlement into the American culture. Some are in Kunz' (1973) "intermediate refugee" category, but most Indochinese families are in the "acute refugee" category. The acute migrants in the first wave fled just ahead of the oncoming Communist forces. Later refugee waves have included thousands of ethnic Chinese who were forced to leave their homes because of political and economic pressures.

Whatever the motives or social forces causing the decision to migrate, few Indochinese are able to bring many possessions. Furthermore, most refugees leave extended kin groups behind. Family members often have to develop new roles during this stage. Some of these roles break down the harmony of established extended family patterns. In the first wave, for example, many adult children influenced their parents to leave the homeland. These sons and daughters, with their superior English language fluency and U.S. contacts, took the lead in the decision to migrate and the formulation of exit plans. Figure 1 depicts the factors impacting on Stage I migrating families.
Figure 1. Developmental Migration Model, Factors Impacting on Migrating Families during Stage I-Preflight and Stage II-Flight
Stage II: Flight Process

This stage has no prescribed rituals. If the duration is protracted (such as in the case of temporary settlement camps), families often establish strong alliances with the people exposed to the same experiences (e.g. interim camp marriages). Families and wider groups sharing this process often build strong relationship networks that carry on after the migration process has ended. At times, these networks influence final settlement decisions. The trauma experienced during this stage may impact on the mental health and resettlement adjustment of Indochinese families. Many Indochinese families have been exposed to a variety of traumatic experiences including starvation, death of family members, loss of friends, loss of possessions, and health problems, in addition to the loss of their homeland.

Current regulatory government policies directly affect families in the first and second stages of migration and indirectly affect those in the third and fourth stages by limiting the numbers of refugees allowed into the U.S. at any one time and by defining characteristics of refugees acceptable for U.S. immigration. The rate of refugee migration to the U.S. is affected by the availability of sponsors, by the health and occupations of the potential U.S. refugees, and by the presence of Indochinese relatives already located in the U.S. These policies often cause long delays which impact on the mental and physical health of refugee families awaiting migration and/or those resettled families waiting for relatives and friends to join them.

Stage III: Initial Entry

Stage III requires that the family develop new adaptive mechanisms
enabling them to deal with a new language, job, and family lifestyle. During this stage, the first priority is one of sheer survival and the satisfaction of basic needs. Conflicts and symptoms of anxiety tend to remain dormant, whereas family rules, regulations, and styles tend to appear slightly exaggerated. Many individuals within the family have so narrow a focus of attention on life essentials that the broader implications of life in the new culture are not in focus or even fully recognized for some time. Indochinese families often cling to their old norms during this stage and do not actively engage with the new environment beyond the necessary survival level. Ethnic group networks are very important to families in this stage. Figure 2 presents factors impacting on migrating families in Stages III and IV.

Indochinese refugees, in the Initial Entry stage, are greatly affected by the regulatory policies of the government. These refugee policies are implemented through resettlement agencies (called VOLAGS), sponsors, and local agencies. They impact on the family's relocation, initial finances, housing, job search, education, job training, language training, and health services. The goal of the agencies and sponsors is to help the refugees settle into American life as quickly as possible. Emphasis at this time is not on giving the refugee family many choices of services and job possibilities, but rather on getting them jobs and providing them with the immediate essentials for daily life. As a result, skilled workers and professionals often end up in emotionally unsatisfying, unskilled jobs. They are often separated from friends and relatives living elsewhere in the U.S. Levels of dissatisfaction, usually focused upon climate, job, or family, frequently become apparent at the end of this stage.
Figure 2. Developmental Migration Model, Factors Impacting on Migrating Families during Stage III-Initial Entry and Stage IV-Settling In
Stage IV: Settling In

After basic family needs have been satisfied and the refugees begin to engage more fully in the new cultural milieu, many families need help. The task of settling into American life may be difficult, painful, and complex, but it is unavoidable. Children are often the generators of conflict as they highlight clashes of language, education, values, and roles in their differential adaptation to the new culture. Parents, often forced to rely on their children's superior English language skills and American cultural knowledge, are placed in uncomfortable, nontraditional roles. Families emerge from this process with differing outcomes. Some families gain new individual and collective strengths; other families may become splintered into factions. Some escape into the new culture, while others idealize the old culture and live for the day they will return to their country of origin.

Families in Stage IV of the migration process have greater access to support services and have a wider variety of options open to them. In addition to services of federal, state, and local government agencies, religious agencies, and private agencies, the Indochinese have begun to organize to help each other satisfy needs and wants. As they gain economic and linguistic mobility, they tend to relocate in certain areas where they can maximize this self-help process.

Often government supported services, although available to Indochinese consumers, are underutilized (Sedanko, 1978). Indochinese family and ethnic networks are preferred avenues of obtaining help. Ethnic organizations and associations are being established throughout the U.S. for self-help, religious, political, professional, and student
purposes. These organizations provide Indochinese refugees with a sense of cultural identity and greater service accessibility. Some of these organizations are now in competition with local service agencies for federal funding available to provide services to newly arriving refugees. As the ethnic professional services become available, the urge to relocate should diminish. (see Figure 2 for factors impacting on Stage IV migrating families).

Despite the original policy of dispersing the Indochinese refugees evenly throughout the U.S., the tendency of Indochinese families to relocate in certain areas had become apparent by 1979 (Gordon, 1980). Secondary relocation takes place for reasons of climate, job opportunities, family and friend reunification, existing Asian populations and local attitudes toward minorities (Andrews & Stopp, 1979; Pho, 1979; Bach & Bach, 1980). This migration causes confusion and problems for local service providers, but enhances emotional and economic stability for the refugee families.

Stage V: Adjustment

Indochinese refugee resettlement impacts on American communities and professionals in many ways. Competition for jobs, housing, and services between Indochinese refugees and other ethnic minorities has occurred in several U. S. communities (Pisarowicz, 1979; Seguin, 1979; Taniwaki, Valencia & Warner, 1979). Refugee relocation and settlement have created many new jobs for Americans and refugees. Government funded research projects concerning Indochinese families have provided many professionals and researchers with funding, publication possibilities, and opportunities for building careers. Indochinese service
and education professionals are critical of the implicit federal, state, and local policies which have restricted the number of Indochinese professionals participating in the decision making process and sharing the responsibilities of making top level decisions concerning Indochinese resettlement (Thuy, 1980). This criticism by Indochinese professionals is healthy and suggests that the Adjustment stage has been successfully reached by some Indochinese (see Figure 3).

Families striving for cybernetic balance through the five DMM stages have differing degrees of success. Each family must create its own unique coping patterns and new lifestyle. The time required for adjustment may take more than one generation. As the Indochinese change and adapt to new patterns of living, the communities in which they live also change due to the impact of these "new Americans," The major institutions at local, state, and national levels are impacted by each new group migrating to the U.S. The media, government policies, resources, education systems, food patterns, cultural patterns, and marriage patterns are just a few of the systems that will be impacted and changed by the Indochinese migration to the U.S.

It is hoped that service providers having a basic knowledge of the migration process from Stage I (Preflight) to Stage V (Adjustment) will be better prepared to develop and implement service plans for their Indochinese clients. The next section of this chapter examines the historical and cultural factors that help explain the character of Indochinese families prior to their migration to the United States.

Preflight Characteristics

To fully understand the Indochinese refugees that have come to the
Figure 3. Developmental Migration Model, Factors Co-impacting on Migrating Families and Institutions during Stage V - Adjustment
United States, it is important to consider them in the context of the DMM stages. The historical and cultural characteristics of the Indochinese help service providers to understand the dynamics of the Pre-flight Stage. The following section describes the historical and cultural antecedents of preflight. This helps to provide insight as to why the Indochinese people migrated away from their homelands in such large numbers at such high risk to their lives.

There are a number of historical and cultural themes which impact on Indochinese refugees during their assimilation process. These themes have assisted the Vietnamese in developing a strong national identity and becoming a people equipped to handle and accommodate change. In this section, historical themes, such as links to Chinese culture and history, cultural borrowing from other countries, internal and external conflicts, and population migration patterns will be discussed. The cultural themes to be discussed for Indochina (including Laos and Kampuchea) will be the diversity of geography, ethnic origins and patterns, and urban/rural contrasts.

**Indochinese History: Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos**

The Vietnamese of today have their origins in the people who lived below the Yangtze river in China. The earliest Vietnamese kingdom, known as the Nan Yueh (pronounced Nam Viet), was founded in the Red River Valley in about 1040 B.C. (Williams, 1976). In 111 B.C. the Chinese under the Han Dynasty conquered the Vietnamese kingdom and continuously occupied it for the next 1,000 years. Despite this long occupation, the Vietnamese kept their language, folk culture, and patriotism alive (Fitzgerald, 1972). Although they adopted religious practices and forms
of government from the Chinese, they adapted them to meet their own needs.

Borrowing from other invaders has occurred throughout the history of Vietnam. Each invasion has left its impact on Vietnamese culture. The Portugese laid the foundations for the Romanization of the Vietnamese language still in use today (Williams, 1976). The French missionaries added another religion to Vietnam by converting 10% of the population to Catholicism. They also left the French school system (Thuy, 1976) which South Vietnam adopted during the 75 year history of French colonialism. The Japanese renewed Vietnamese faith in Eastern cultural superiority by sweeping the European colonialists out of Southeast Asia and shattering the myth of white invincibility (Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, 1970). Finally, the Americans gave the South Vietnamese a taste of western materialistic culture, free enterprise, and a desire for democracy.

The Vietnamese have never lived in total peace for lengthy periods. Throughout their history they have been in conflict, militarily and culturally, with outside invaders such as the Chinese (111 B.C. to 939 A.D.), the Portugese (1535-1600), the French (1600-1954), the Japanese (World War II), and more recently the Chinese Communists and the Americans (Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, 1970; Williams, 1976).

When not involved with outside invaders they have been involved in civil war and internal power struggles. These often developed between the ruling families of the North versus those in the South. Two times in the history of Vietnam, the country has been geographically divided into North and South at the 17th parallel. Between 1613 and 1673, the Trinh family dominated the North and the Nguyen family dominated the South (Williams, 1976). The second official division came between 1954
and 1975 when the Communist National Liberation Forces under Ho Chi Minh dominated the North and the South Vietnamese forces, supported by the Americans, dominated the South (Devillers & Lacouture, 1969).

Three major periods of migration have been documented in Vietnamese history. They reveal that many current refugees in the U.S. have had previous migration experiences within their national history, some within their own lifetime. The first migration came shortly after the Vietnamese Kingdom gained its political independence from China in 949 A.D. Vietnam spent the next 900 years pushing its borders southward to gain control of the fertile Mekong Delta. In the process of southern migration, they came as invaders displacing the Champa people (early forebears of modern day Kampucheans) (Williams, 1976).

The second major historical migration of the Vietnamese was compacted into 300 days when 900,000 North Vietnamese, fearing the Communist government of Ho Chi Minh, came south with the French and American sponsored South Vietnamese forces in 1954. These refugees consisted of three major groups. The first was more than 100,000 Vietnamese troops of the colonial army and their dependents. The second and largest group consisted of more than 600,000 Vietnamese Catholics. The last group of refugees consisted of Chinese merchants fearing there would be no free enterprise under Communism (Williams, 1976). Units of the U.S. Seventh Fleet played a major role in moving the refugees south, and the U.S. government provided $93 million for their resettlement (Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, 1970).

The third migration, which started in 1965 (and is still in process), involved refugees leaving their homes due to war and forced resettlement in safer areas. Three million people were officially registered as
refugees in 1965 due to bombing, crop destruction and forced relocations. These people were either placed in refugee camps in Vietnam or settled in cities, increasing urbanization from 15% of the South Vietnamese population in 1960 to 50% in 1969 (Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, 1970). Following the end of the Vietnamese war in 1975, thousands of Vietnamese displaced by the war, or fearing loss of economic or political freedom, or forced out by the new government left their homelands to resettle in other lands.

Although Vietnam has supplied most of the Indochinese refugees coming to the U.S., Kampuchea and Laos have also been areas of Indochinese refugee migration. A brief sketch of these two countries is necessary before an in-depth analysis of the flow of refugees can be discussed.

Kampuchea, the size of the state of Missouri, forms a large fertile basin for the lower Mekong River (see Figure 4). Nearly one-tenth of its 66,000 square miles is water. The fertile plains are surrounded by heavily forested hills and mountains (Gettleman, Gettleman, Kaplan & Kaplan, 1970). Kampuchea has a tropical monsoon climate with year round temperature variations between 68°F and 97°F. This country was dominated by one city, Phnom Pehn, and the national government. Prior to the Vietnam War, it was essentially an agricultural country whose major products included rice, rubber, fish, and timber (Dept. of State, 1981a).

Kampuchea's history is filled with political and military struggles. From 802 until 1432 the Kambuja Period, known as the Golden Age, re-united the old Chen La Empire into the Khmer Empire. The powerful Khmer empire, at its peak in the 12th and 13th centuries, covered
Figure 4. Indochina
a large part of Southeast Asia now occupied by Kampuchea, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam. Royal patronage to the arts, architecture and learning helped develop cultural forms which continue to the present day. After 1215, the Empire started to decline with the infiltration of the Thai. Wars with Thailand continued for centuries (National Indochinese Clearinghouse, 1979a; White, 1982).

The French influence in Kampuchea started in the mid-19th century and continued until Kampuchea obtained its independence in 1954. France's primary interest in Kampuchea was defensive. It needed Kampuchea to prevent others from challenging its new, rich colony in Vietnam (Gettleman et al., 1970). Few Kampucheans were educated during the French occupation. They did not have any meaningful participation in the affairs of their own country. Refugees from Kampuchea may not be as strongly nationalistic as the Vietnamese refugees due to their different homeland experiences.

Laos, a landlocked country of 91,000 square miles, is situated in the middle of the Indochina Peninsula (see Figure 4). It averages about 150 to 200 miles in width from east to west and extends nearly 700 miles from north to south. It is a mountainous country with narrow river valleys in the north which give way to sparsely forested tablelands in the south. A long mountain chain separates Laos and Vietnam, creating many rivers which flow westward toward the Mekong River. Laos is bordered by China, Burma, Kampuchea, Thailand, and Vietnam (Dept. of State, 1979).

Laos is an agricultural country with 90% of the population engaged in subsistence farming. The Lao villagers are traditionally self-sufficient, growing their own food, producing their own fibers, and
spinning and weaving their own cloth. Laos has mineral potential which to date has only been marginally tapped due to a poor transportation system.

The first historic record of the Lao people comes from the Chinese Chronicles of the 6th century B.C., which refers to the Lao as "barbarians." By the 8th century A.D., the Lao had created a military kingdom called Chao which thrived until its destruction by Kublai Khan in 1253 A.D. The first recorded migration of the Lao people occurred after this destruction when they migrated south and displaced the indigenous people living in the region (National Indochinese Clearing House, 1979a). The founding of the kingdom of Lan Xang in 1353 A.D. marked the beginning of the Lao people living in and controlling their present geographic location.

Lan Xang, conquered by Burma in 1571, was liberated by Siam (Thailand) twenty years later. Siam kept Lan Xang a vassal until 1694 when Laos divided into three separate autonomous kingdoms. During the 18th and 19th centuries until 1830, Laos was marked by interfamilial quarrels which contributed to widespread instability. Laos was politically dominated by Thailand, Burma, and Annam (a section of Vietnam), during this period. French intervention in Laos started in the 1880's. Following a half century of French rule, Laos emerged from World War II with very few developed resources. Few of the Laotians were educated, and commerce was dominated by French and Chinese merchants (Gettleman et al., 1970). The initial push for Laos' independence came in 1941 with the revival of an age-old power struggle among aristocratic Lao families. In 1950, with the help of the Vietminh (Vietnamese Nationalists), the Pathet Lao was created to throw out the French colonists.
France granted Laos its independence in 1953.

Refugees coming from Laos may have few transplantable skills usable in the U.S., considering their subsistence agricultural economy and limited educational opportunities. It is important that service providers be familiar with the backgrounds from which their Laotian clients have come to adequately address their unique needs.

Cultural Diversity

The geography and history of Indochina have created regional variations among the peoples of this area. Modern Vietnam has had only a brief history as one country. Differences existed between northern Vietnam (Tonkin and most of Annam) and southern Vietnam (Cochin China and southern Annam) (see Figure 4). The north had more of a Chinese cultural orientation, while the south had been exposed to Khmer and Hindu influences. In the north, the climate was harsher and the economy was primarily industrial, while the south was a rich rice basket. French colonial rule was always more secure in the South, where rice as well as rubber resources were exploited (Dept. of State, 1978). Sully (1971) vividly describes geographical differences in national character between the northern and the southern regions.

North Vietnam, the 'cradle of Vietnamese civilization' has produced a type (of man) reputed to be overly ambitious, sometimes quarrelsome, and aggressive in all his pursuits. The Northerner supposedly is convinced of his intellectual superiority and is contemptuous of those from other regions, especially the easy going Southerners.

The Southerner is a product of his environment: South Vietnam was long a frontier region, settled by Vietnamese pioneers in a march south that continued through the 19th century. Land in the South is fertile, and in peacetime, life has tended to be slower and easier than elsewhere in Vietnam. The Southerner has a reputation - perhaps because French
economic and cultural influences have been more dominant in the south - of being more open to Western ideas, more adaptable to progress, less rigid and inhibited by traditional ways of doing things. (pp. 15-16).

These regional differences may be reflected in differential assimilation patterns by Indochinese refugees coming to the U.S. from these two Vietnamese regions.

Ethnic variations, in addition to regional variations, impact upon refugee cultural diversity. Ethnic groups add to the complexity of trying to give the Indochinese refugee a character profile. Five major ethnic groups enhance the cultural diversity of Indochina. Each will be briefly described.

The Vietnamese speaking peoples, known as the Viet, populate Vietnam's coastal lowlands and deltas of the Red and Mekong Rivers and make up over 87% of Vietnam's people. They share a common culture, which has emerged from a largely peasant society engaged in wet-rice cultivation (Zasloff & Brown, 1978). The Vietnamese people boast a history of centuries of struggle against outside invaders which helps to create a strong national pride in the Vietnamese people coming as refugees to the U.S.

The Chinese have lived throughout Indochina for thousands of years. Some came as farmers, but most filtered down from China to settle among the Vietnamese as traders and laborers. They have traditionally clustered in ports and urban centers and carried on most of Indochina's trade and commerce. Many of these people maintain dual cultures, observing their adopted land's customs and language in business dealings while preserving their Chinese identity in family life (Williams, 1976). Many of the more recent waves of Indochinese refugees are of Chinese origin.

The Khmer, representing 85% of the Kampuchean population, traditionally organized themselves into several nomadic tribes. They are
mainly farmers involved in rice cultivation living in small villages, each village independent and governed by a council of elders (Gettleman et al., 1970). Today, the Khmer are the leaders of the Communist party.

The Lao, the culturally dominant group in Laos are ethnically and linguistically related to the Thai. They traditionally dwell in the plains and valleys, leading an existence based on subsistence wet-rice agriculture. The social structure of the Lao divided people into the elite and peasantry. The elite tended to remove themselves to urban centers and return to the village only during elections. Feelings of loyalty between the peasants and the elite have been destroyed in recent times (Gettleman et al., 1970). The Lao elite formed the ruling class of Laos before the Communist takeover. This small minority held most of the major political and non-political offices in the country. Many of the elite maintained profitable business alliances with Chinese and Europeans. These people also were the first and second echelons of the staff and line organization of the royal army. Laotian refugees, depending upon which social class they came from, would have differing skills and needs in the process of resettling into the U.S.

The tribal Meo or Hmong, as they are also called, reside traditionally in the mountains of Laos and Kampuchea. They are known for their aggressive and activist character. Many were hired by the U.S. as soldiers during the Indochinese war (Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, 1970). They traditionally grew opium which provided a large percentage of the Lao government's revenues (Gettleman et al., 1970). Most of the tribal people in Indochina have not benefitted from economic development and education available to the majority ethnic groups. They have had little voice in government decisions and policies. These people
might have many unique needs and problems in adapting to American society.

The last cultural theme that brings diversity to Indochina is the dichotomy between the rural village people and the urban city dweller. The city dwellers of Indochina often lost their ethnic identities, quickly becoming assimilated to their urban cultures. Urban people are greatly affected by modern western civilization through direct contact and education. Until recently, Indochinese cities were few in number and functioned almost exclusively as places of residence for the elite and those who served them. In rural areas, technology and circumstances are similar to those existing thousands of years ago. For this reason, the chasm between cities and villages today is one of centuries as well as one of distance (Williams, 1976). Indochinese refugees coming from these two very different settings have different needs and skills for coping with their new life in the United States.

Cultural Cohesiveness

What gives the Indochinese a sense of cohesiveness and identity amidst all the diversity they experience in their countries of origin may be 1) their religious values and 2) their strong family and village systems. Buddhism, the prevailing religion of this area, is a religion whose strength does not lie in organization, but in the deep roots of the psychological and moral values held by the people (Thich, 1967). It is a religion that shapes the lives of the people by dictating conduct within all spheres and for all social classes. The spiritual force of this religion cannot be easily grasped, for it represents an inner attitude, a disposition more than a specific program or ideology.

The Indochinese family serves many purposes and unifies and struc-
tures people's daily lives. Thuy (1976) vividly describes the Vietnamese family:

The Vietnamese family is the back-bone of the Vietnamese. It is also a socially self-sufficient and autonomous unit. In a way, it is a mini-commune where its members live and share together, a maternity center where children are born (especially in rural areas), a funeral home where funeral rituals are observed, an adoption agency where adoptions by a relative are arranged, an orphanage where orphans are brought up and given love and affection, a courtroom where conflicts or disputes between members are settled, a welfare center where assistance and social security services are rendered, a hospital where patients are treated, a nursing home where the elderly are taken care of, an educational center where family and formal education is provided, a bank where money is available, a council where all important decisions affecting one or more than one family member are made and carried out, and a place where all members share the joys, the sadness, the enjoyments, the sufferings of life... The Vietnamese family has been so indispensable for the existence and survival of Vietnamese society and of the nation that it has been said without exaggeration that if anyone wishes to destroy that society or nation he must first destroy the Vietnamese family. (p. 21-22)

After family, village membership is the second highest personal loyalty. Vietnamese villages rather than the clan stand as the primary community. Village units are very self-sufficient, requiring little help from the central government. This self-sufficiency has given villagers a keen sense of permanence and a strong sense of community (Fitzgerald, 1972; National Indochinese Clearing House, 1979b).

From the brief historical and cultural review above, it becomes apparent that the Indochinese refugees are a complex group of people used to variations in ethnic group, language, religion, geography, and rural/urban experiences. The historical heritage they share is a strong sense of nationalism, French colonialization, internal and external conflicts, and migration experiences. The unifying system that balances out the differences in these people appears to be their strong family structures, village loyalties, and religious values.
**Indochinese Wars**

The history of the war in Indochina helps to explain the large migration of Vietnamese, Kampucheans, and Laotians to the United States and other nations. The roots of this war started as World War II was ending. The struggle for independence from France by the Vietnamese, the Kampucheans, and the Laotians eventually led to the French withdrawal from Indochina in 1954. The end result of this war split Vietnam into two countries, North and South Vietnam. This division led to the migration of some 900,000 people from North Vietnam to the South (Devillers & Lacoutre, 1969). Many current Vietnamese refugee families experienced this earlier migration.

The United States involvement in Indochina started in 1950 with economic aid supporting France's conflict in Indochina (Gleb & Betts, 1979). Along with the Korean Conflict, which started in 1950, Vietnam was regarded as the second front of a larger struggle to check Communist expansion.

When the French left Vietnam in 1954 following the division of Vietnam into North and South Vietnam, the United States continued economic support of the South Vietnamese government. The second Indochinese war began in 1957. Gradually, the United States became more financially and militarily committed to this struggle. By 1967, over one-half million American troops were in Vietnam (Williams, 1976). In 1970 Kampuchea became involved through U.S. air attacks and the South Vietnam invasion of Kampuchea. North Vietnamese forces came to the support of the Kampuchean Communist forces.

American disillusionment with the Indochinese War led to a gradual decrease of U.S. economic support and a phase-out of American forces.
Finally, in 1975, the Indochinese war ended with the victory of the Communist North Vietnamese forces in Vietnam and the Communist take-over in both Kampuchea and Laos (Gleb & Betts, 1979).

The end of the war in Indochina started the large migration of people from Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos to the United States. For a more detailed account of the Indochina wars see Appendix A. The next section focuses on the flight process of the Indochinese refugees to the U.S.

Flight Process

To better understand the Indochinese refugees coming to the United States, it may be helpful to follow the flight process they experienced en route. This section will discuss both the waves of Indochinese refugees and the temporary camps in Southeast Asia which are the refugees' first stopping places en route.

Refugee Waves

One of the outcomes of the Indochinese war was the large exodus of refugees leaving Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea. Since 1975, over one million people have left this area (Marsh, 1980). The first wave of refugee resettlement to the United States came immediately following the end of the Indochinese War in April, 1975, when 135,000 ethnic Vietnamese, Kampucheans, and Laotians who were closely connected with the U.S. military effort, quickly left their homelands. Many of this group feared that association with the Saigon regime or the American effort carried the risk of subsequent discrimination or punishment by the new regimes. Between 1975 and 1978, the number leaving Indochina
and arriving in countries of first asylum was approximately 30,000.

After May of 1978, Indochinese refugee departures dramatically increased. The motives for this exodus varied according to ethnic and class backgrounds and geographical regions. These specific motives for flight have an impact upon resettlement adjustment. Each wave of refugees has a different experience and subgroups within the wave have differing coping skills and resources with which to sustain the flight.

Since the flight process for Indochinese refugees has varied according to the political and economic circumstances of the country from which they come, each country is discussed separately.

In Vietnam, the new government was plagued with domestic problems. Post war construction was slow, much agricultural land had been devastated by the war, natural disasters ruined the rice harvests, and the management of the new government was full of problems. Former city dwellers were expected to undertake pioneer agricultural labor for which they were unsuited both physically and temperamentally. The absorption of the South Vietnamese into the new united country was difficult because of their reluctance to give up their earlier political identification and western life style (Osborne, 1980).

In 1978, the Vietnamese government made a new policy of stopping free enterprise and issuing new national currency (Osborne, 1980). These changes greatly limited the possibilities for the large group of ethnic Chinese businessmen and traders to pursue their former livelihood. The 1979 invasion of Vietnam by the People's Republic of China caused the ethnic Chinese in Vietnam to be regarded as politically and economically dangerous to the state (AFL-CIO, 1979; Girardet, 1980). These two incidents started a major outflow of ethnic Chinese refugees from Vietnam.
The Vietnamese government promoted and assisted the exit of the ethnic Chinese, often for high monetary fees (Niehaus, 1979).

A second major push for Vietnamese migration came from the re-education camps prepared for former South Vietnamese military personnel, politicians, government officials, civil servants, and others who might be a threat to the new government. An estimated 100,000 to 500,000 people were detained in Vietnamese reeducation camps for varying periods of time (AFL-CIO, 1979; Niehaus, 1979). Many Vietnamese fled their country to escape the new government policies. This large exodus of ethnic Chinese and Vietnamese was accomplished mainly by boat. The dramatic plight of these "Boat" people brought worldwide concern (Hohl, 1978; Butler, 1979a, 1979b). From 10 to 50% of the numbers who left Vietnam are estimated to have drowned or been killed by attacking pirates while others suffered trauma and deprivation before reaching areas of first asylum (AFL-CIO, 1979). Refugees experiencing traumatic exodus are expected to have special, unique needs in the resettlement process.

Political and economic factors are the major pushes for Kampuchean refugees. Once Kampuchea was captured by the Khmer Communists in 1971, the major cities were immediately evacuated, large numbers of the former government officials and army were liquidated, and the restructuring of the economy and society was begun (Zasloff & Brown, 1978. The refugee policies of the Kampuchea Government from April, 1975 until January, 1979, contributed to a large exodus of Kampucheans from their country. Many Kampuchean refugee families sustained trauma and loss during their migration which might impact their resettlement adjustment.

Developments in Laos generated large numbers of refugees (Osborne, 1980). In 1975, many politicians and military officers associated with
the former government quickly left Laos. Later, persons who found the new government's policies unattractive joined the refugee population. Economic conditions also encouraged Lao migration. Laos, one of the poorest countries in the world, had a GNP per capita estimated at $90.00 (U.S.) in 1980 (Suhrke, 1981). Approximately half of the Laotian refugees came from the upland ethnic group known as the Hmong (or Meo). The Hmong people, widely recruited by the U.S. to fight Communist-led Lao forces, played a prominent role during the war (Suhrke, 1981). After the Laotian Communist takeover, they continued to fight, and many decided that they had no alternative but to flee into Thailand as military defeat became more likely. The tribal Hmong refugees come to the resettlement process with quite different skills and needs than do the urban dwelling ethnic Chinese or Vietnamese refugees.

Interim Camps

Upon leaving their country of origin, Indochinese refugees have faced differing migration stopovers en route to the United States. Some have been to several refugee camps before reaching their final destination. Locations of first asylum include Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, the Philippines, China, and Hong Kong (see Figure 5).

Thailand has received the largest number of refugees. Thai refugee policies attempted to find a middle path that would not jeopardize relations with either China or Vietnam (AFL-CIO, 1979; Osborne, 1980; Suhrke, 1981). The large economic drain on Thailand's resources limited the feasibility of accepting endless numbers of refugees.

Malaysia refused to accept refugees as permanent settlers. In 1979, with the continued exodus of ethnic Chinese refugees from Vietnam by
Figure 5. Indochinese Refugee Routes and Interim Camp Locations
boat, many newly arriving refugees were forcibly expelled because of the strong political reaction against the presence of ethnic Chinese refugees. Singapore accepted refugees only if they were assured onward passage for resettlement elsewhere. Refugee boats were often turned away after renewing water and fuel supplies (Osborne, 1980).

Indonesia and the Philippines followed a policy of isolating refugees from the general population. In 1980, the United Nations opened two new holding camps for 10,000 refugees in Indonesia and 17,500 in the Philippines. These camps were intended to decrease the pressure of refugees on first asylum countries and to provide more language training opportunities (Dept. of State, 1981b).

China has received some of the largest numbers of Indochinese refugees. Chinese policy has been to accept all those who left Vietnam as refugees. Hong Kong, despite overcrowding, has not turned away any Indochinese refugees. Accommodation problems predominate but Hong Kong's chronic labor shortage has enabled large numbers of refugees to work while awaiting resettlement (Osborne, 1980).

Each of the governments administering the interim camps discussed above face political and economic challenges. These countries cannot offer permanent sanctuary to the refugees and therefore make restrictive policies. Refugees living in the less than favorable conditions of refugee camps for long periods of time may have health and psychological problems to overcome when they reach their final resettlement destination. Figure 6 presents the permanent settlement locations of Indochinese refugees.

In the next chapter, the Initial Entry, Settling In, and Adjustment stages of refugee resettlement in the United States are discussed.
Figure 6. Indochinese Refugees Accepted for Permanent Settlement, November, 1980.
U.S. Committee for Refugees
Service providers with knowledge and understanding of the Preflight and Flight stages of migration may be better prepared to plan and provide needed services to Indochinese refugee families.
CHAPTER III

THE MIGRATION PROCESS: ADJUSTING
IN THE UNITED STATES

The purpose of this chapter is to present a clearer picture of the Indochinese refugee experience in the U.S. and the factors that enhance or impede the refugee acculturation process. Presently, it is only possible to examine migrating Indochinese families in terms of their Initial Entry and Settling In stages. Total adjustment for them will most likely require a generation or more.

Part one of this chapter discusses the Initial Entry stage, which includes a section on U.S. government refugee policies. The Settling In stage provides a national profile of the Indochinese and a section on social service utilization. The Adjustment stage includes a section on the current research variables that enhance or impede the adjustment of Indochinese refugees. The last part of this section discusses the Social Service Utilization study.

Initial Entry

A knowledge of legislation guiding Indochinese resettlement is important for service providers serving the Indochinese. In this section, the historical perspective of Indochinese legislation will be addressed, followed by a discussion of the most current refugee law.
Legislation

Historical Perspective on Indochinese Refugee Legislation. U.S. legislation concerning Indochinese refugees has addressed two different priorities. The first was to help Indochinese assimilate into American life as quickly and as painlessly as possible. The second was to assist state and local communities in the resettlement process so that these communities are not over burdened. At times, these two priorities have caused conflict and problems for both the Indochinese and American communities.

Currently there are five public laws addressing Indochinese refugees (see Figure 7). The main policy areas of this legislation are outlined to enhance the reader's understanding:

1. Regulatory policies providing refugee quota and definitions of alien status.

2. Regulatory policies providing funding and guidelines for refugee resettlement through government and voluntary agencies (VOLAGS).

3. Regulatory and support policies providing funding for locally implemented programs (with federal guidelines) enhancing resettlement and aiming at making the refugees economically independent. Services provided through these policies include cash assistance, medical care, special education programs for children, language instruction, job training, employment search, and family services.

Inherent in the five laws are two protections for state and local communities. First, they are protected from the adverse impact of heavy refugee concentration by policies promoting the scattering of Indochinese refugees throughout the country. A second protection is full reimbursement to state and local social service agencies for a specified period of time, after which it is assumed that refugees will be economically self-sufficient.
1975
"The Indochinese Migration & Refugee Assistance Act"
Passed May 23, 1975, Public Law - PL 94-23
a. Amended 1962 Refugee Act to include Indochinese Refugees
b. Offered services for transportation

"Appropriations - Cambodia and Vietnam Refugees"
Passed May 27, 1975, Public Law - PL 94-24
a. Funds made available to carry out the above services

1976
"Indochina Refugee Children Assistance Act"
Passed September 10, 1976, Public Law - PL 94-405
a. Provides education funds to schools for services to Indochinese children and adults

1977
"Indochinese Refugees - Records - Assistance"
Passed October 28, 1977, Public Law - PL 95-145
a. Enables Indochinese refugees to become permanent residents
b. Extends service funds through 1981

1980
"Immigration and Nationality Act"
Passed March 17, 1980, Public Law - PL 96-212
a. Revises the procedures for admission of refugees
b. Establishes a more uniform basis for the provision of assistance to all refugees to the U.S.

Figure 7. U.S. Refugee Legislation
The refugee legislation passed from 1975 through 1977 deals primarily with the Initial Entry and Settling In stages of Indochinese refugees. The principle responsibility for resettlement was given to nine voluntary agencies referred to as VOLAGS (see Table II). With the Department of Health and Human Services, the VOLAGS made every effort to disperse the refugees throughout the U.S. (Taft, 1975). They recruited sponsors from individual U.S. families, churches, and other organizations to assist the refugees in their initial entry into American life. Sponsors assumed a moral (humanitarian) obligation to help refugee families find housing, employment, and educational opportunities. No explicit financial obligation was demanded from the sponsors, although financial help was implicitly expected.

Once the Indochinese families entered local communities, they started impacting local school systems. The 1976 legislation addressed education needs. The task of educating this group was complicated by the fact that, initially, families were widely scattered within individual educational communities. Socioeconomic distinctions, Indochinese patterns of social behavior, and language structures among refugee families further complicated the education picture. The 1976 legislation generated many jobs for teachers of English as a second language, Vietnamese teachers, and school aids. Many special materials, workshops, and training programs were implemented throughout the United States to meet the needs of the staff and students in schools with Indochinese students (Buu, 1976; Kessler & Idar, 1977; Kelly, 1978; and Wei, 1980). The Center for Applied Linguistics (1981) published a guide to orientation materials for refugees and their sponsors in the area of education and social services. Of the 30 sources listed in the education section
TABLE II  
VOLUNTARY AGENCIES SERVING INDOCHINESE REFUGEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOLAGS</th>
<th>Approximate Percentage of Refugees Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Catholic Conference</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church World Service</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Council for Nationalities Service</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Immigration Services</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Relief Refugee Service</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolstoy Foundation</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of this guide, 24 sources offered information to Indochinese refugees on how to adapt to the American School System. The remaining six sources were guides for teachers to help Indochinese adapt to the American system of education. See Appendix B for a more detailed discussion of each refugee law passed between 1975 and 1978.

Current Legislation and Future Projections. The 1980 "Immigration and Nationality Act," PL 96-212, further revised the procedures for refugee admission into the United States and established a uniform basis for providing assistance to all refugees coming to the U.S. The 1980 legislation restricted eligibility for refugee financial assistance to those who have been in the U.S. for three years or less beginning April 1, 1981. An Office of Refugee Resettlement within the Department of Health and Human Services was created by this act, and the Coordinator for Refugee Affairs has the rank of ambassador-at-large and the statutory authority to develop and coordinate overall refugee and resettlement policy (Marsh, 1980).

PL 96-212 defined a refugee as any person outside his/her country of nationality who is unable or unwilling to return to his/her country because of persecution or a well founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. However, the intent of the act has been seriously challenged by both the government and the public. By the end of 1981, Indochinese resettled in the U.S. totaled over 475,000. With high inflation and unemployment, many Americans questioned the feasibility of taking in such large numbers of refugees.

Much criticism has been leveled at the implementation of the 1980 Refugee Act by black leaders, human rights activists, church groups
involved in refugee work, and civil rights organizations (Suhrke, 1981). Many critics argued that those coming out of Indochina today do not meet the refugee requirements of the 1980 Refugee Act (Moritz, 1981). Suhrke (1981) concluded, however, that U.S. Government policy will continue to follow the traditional practice of giving persons fleeing from Communist countries priority. This policy should favor the future political acceptance of Indochinese refugees and the continued funding for Indochinese resettlement programs.

The next section of this chapter addresses the climate of American acceptance to the Indochinese refugees. Political acceptance of refugees into the U.S. does not guarantee social acceptance in local communities where refugee populations resettle.

U.S. Climate of Acceptance Toward Indochinese Refugees

In May, 1975, as the first Indochinese refugees were coming to the U.S., a Gallop poll indicated that 52 percent of the national sample opposed resettlement of the refugees in the U.S., with 36 percent in favor (Gallop Opinion Index, 1975). Deming (1979) cited as the predominant reason for this rejection, a fear that the new arrivals would become welfare recipients and competition for scarce jobs. Hostility was most pronounced in the communities where the Indochinese refugees were first temporarily housed, such as Orange County, California; Niceville, Florida, and the areas surrounding Fort Chaffee, Arkansas (Stern, 1981). Governor Brown protested the 1975 Indochinese refugee influx because he believed that refugees would take jobs away from Californians when California already had nearly one million people
unemployed (Kneeland, 1975).

In contrast to these voices of rejection towards the Indochinese refugees, several vocal supporters of the refugees were also heard. President Ford (1975), in a White House press release, spoke of support for refugee resettlement from the AFL-CIO and from business, agriculture, labor, church, government, and professional groups. He reminded the country of the nation's history of acceptance of immigrants from all over the world. Senator Hayakawa (1979) spoke of the opposition to his actions from his own state regarding the refugees. His response to this opposition was, "We ourselves are boat people. Every American owes something to those fragile wooden vessels that sailed from Europe in the 17th Century with groups of misfits, riffraff and political and religious dissenters whom we have historically come to know as the Pilgrim Fathers."

Pielke (1979) speaks of the Indochinese right to refuge. Granting refuge, for Pielke, means the satisfying of basic physiological and safety needs since they are prerequisites to the satisfaction of all other needs (Maslow, 1962). In Pielke's viewpoint, the U.S. should feel obliged to grant refuge to less fortunate people in need of a new homeland.

Cotter and Cotter (1979) suggest that the Indochinese refugees have generated three major concerns:

1. The Indochinese people are ever present, painful reminders of America's long, bitter and losing involvement in Southeast Asia.

2. In race conscious America, the Indochinese people are visibly different from both the "blacks" and the "whites" who are currently the predominant racial groups in the U.S.

3. Indochinese people threaten U.S. citizens as potential competitors for scarce jobs and other economic resources.
Social service professionals should be aware of these concerns.

It would appear from a more recent Gallup poll (Gallup Opinion Index, 1979), that public opinion changed very little from 1975 to 1979 regarding the Indochinese refugees. The climate of community acceptance that Indochinese refugees face in their communities impacts upon their assimilation process into American life. It is important to understand the conditions leading to the acceptance or rejection of Indochinese refugees into their communities to help predict the needs and services Indochinese families will require for successful adjustment into U.S. life.

The next section discusses Stage IV, Settling In. The two major waves of Indochinese refugees are discussed and a profile of each group is given.

Settling In

Most Indochinese refugees living in the U.S. are currently in the Settling In stage of the migration process. In this stage, they face the challenge of becoming American citizens, establishing homes, finding jobs that satisfy their financial and psychological needs, and finding or building social relationships.

National Profile

In order to draw a national profile of Indochinese refugees, it is important to consider the two major inflow groups separately. Figure 8 shows the annual arrival of Indochinese to the U.S. from 1975 to 1980. The first group to come between 1975 and 1978 were quite different from those coming after 1978.
Figure 8. Annual Arrivals of Indochinese Refugees to U.S. according to the State Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1981.
First Wave 1975-1978. The initial group of 130,000 refugees from Indochina engaged in an acute flight pattern as American forces withdrew from the country. Mass escape was completed within the time period of April 25th to May 1st, 1975. In just two days, over 75% of the initial group of refugees left Vietnam (Liu & Murata, 1977; Gordon, 1980). This group was resettled into the U.S. by the end of December, 1975. They were scattered throughout the U.S. with California receiving over 20% of the total group (see Table III).

Refugees in the first wave were primarily young Vietnamese who came in family groups. Nearly 50% were Roman Catholic. Two-thirds were from urban centers and came from relatively affluent families. Many of them were among the educated elite and held high socioeconomic status in Vietnam (Kelly, 1977; Liu & Murata, 1977, 1978; Rahe, 1978; Montero, 1979a, 1979b; and Marsh, 1980). Two-thirds of the refugee household heads were in white collar occupations in Vietnam. Nearly one-half of these were professionals, one-fifth held management positions, and the remaining third were clerical workers or salesmen. Half of the blue-collar workers were craftsmen. They came with large families by American standards. Marsh (1980) notes that one-third of the families had households of at least six persons.

Federal welfare assistance to this initial group of refugees was relatively small. Marsh (1980) reveals that from 1976 through 1978, less than 10 cents of every dollar received by a surveyed group of Vietnamese families was from Federal aid sources. Another 1978 study of all the Indochinese in the U.S. (Kahn, 1980) reveals that only 2% of the refugees were receiving Supplemental Security Income payments. Of these 2%, over 72% comprised aged recipients, 26% were disabled and 2%
TABLE III
STATE DISTRIBUTION OF INDOCHINESE REFUGEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>2,266</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>30,495</td>
<td>142,094</td>
<td>164,743</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>8,109</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>4,352</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>5,237</td>
<td>8,871</td>
<td>8,764</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>4,563</td>
<td>4,883</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>2,411</td>
<td>5,947</td>
<td>5,948</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>4,675</td>
<td>16,312</td>
<td>17,565</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>3,352</td>
<td>7,142</td>
<td>7,477</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>5,502</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>10,691</td>
<td>11,225</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>4,811</td>
<td>5,615</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>6,835</td>
<td>8,114</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>8,029</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>14,716</td>
<td>15,830</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>4,398</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4,749</td>
<td>12,728</td>
<td>13,208</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Initial Wave</th>
<th>After Boat People</th>
<th>Current Percent Refugees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>4,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>6,177</td>
<td>6,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3,716</td>
<td>6,418</td>
<td>6,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>12,824</td>
<td>14,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>8,187</td>
<td>17,513</td>
<td>18,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>2,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>2,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>11,136</td>
<td>37,848</td>
<td>42,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>5,759</td>
<td>6,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td>12,141</td>
<td>14,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>19,313</td>
<td>22,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>6,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>144,758</td>
<td>435,202</td>
<td>475,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Refugees in the first wave coming to the U.S. from 1975 to 1978 were the wealthiest members of the fallen South Vietnam regime: the professionals, businessmen, and middle level government officials. These were the most assertive, most prominent and most ideologically, anti-communist (Taft, North & Ford, 1979). It is possible to assume that this group has good prospects of adjusting quickly into American society, having brought with them many adjustment skills and resources. However, their adjustment is not without problems (Wong, 1976; Doan, 1977; Kneeland, 1977; Moore, 1977; Liu & Yu, 1978; Miller, 1978; Hayes, Magee, Nguyen, Rustin, Shearer & Van Arsdale, 1980; Brown, 1981a; Henkin & Nguyen, 1981).

**Second Wave 1978-1980: The "Boat People".** The second large wave of Indochinese refugees, often referred to as the "Boat People" (see Chapter II), contained the lower levels of the occupational scales as well as a continuing flow of relatives of the first wave (Taft, et al, 1979). In the fall of 1978, more than 150,000 refugees left Indochina, and, in 1979, more than 270,000 Indochinese left their homelands (Brown, 1979; Butler, 1979a, 1979b; Williams, 1979; Girardet, 1980).

The resettlement of this large wave of refugees presented many challenges. These people came to countries of first asylum frightened, exhausted, and with few, if any, material resources to aid them in resettlement. Opium addiction, illiteracy, ill health, poor job skills and personal tragedies further complicated the "Boat People's" resettlement struggle (Butler, 1979a, 1979b; Deming, 1979).

By the spring of 1981, 475,484 Indochinese had been resettled into the U.S. Currently, Indochinese refugees are coming to the U.S. at the
rate of 14,000 per month. These new refugees fall mainly into four categories: 1. Family reunification cases, 2. Former U.S. Government employees with at least one year of service, 3. Persons with other ties to the U.S.—former employees of American firms or organizations, former students in the U.S., etc., and 4. Cases of special humanitarian concern (Refugee Reports, November, 1980). There is a need for a more accurate profile of the second wave of Indochinese refugees in the United States.

Eighty percent of the Indochinese in the United States are currently concentrated within 16 states. California alone has more than 34% of the Indochinese refugees (see Table IV) with Texas having 8.8% and Washington 4.6%. These three states have 48% of all the Indochinese refugees. California, Texas, Louisiana, and Virginia gained refugees through secondary migration (Bach & Bach, 1980). This shift has occurred with a reduction in numbers in some states such as Maine, the Dakotas, and Hawaii.

California appears to attract large groups of Indochinese for three main reasons, according to Andrews and Stopp (1979). First, the South California climate attracts Indochinese as it reminds many of home; second, the large Asian population of California provides a cultural milieu for incoming refugees; and third, several large refugee processing camps were initially established in California.

Texas is also an appealing location to Indochinese refugees due to its warm climate and growing economy. Houston and Dallas have been especially attractive to large numbers of refugees. Resettlement authorities also attempted to resettle Vietnamese fishermen and their families on the Gulf Coast (Andrews & Stopp, 1979).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 States</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The large concentration of refugees within a few states places a great burden on those states' resources and social service agencies. The next section of this chapter will address the social service provision and utilization by Indochinese families.

Social Service Utilization

**Social Services.** Social services are intended to nurture or restore a mutually beneficial interaction between individuals and society in order to improve the quality of life for everyone (*Social Work*, January, 1981, p. 6). To promote such an interaction, service providers attempt to help people increase their problem solving skills, obtain resources, facilitate communication between individuals, influence interactions between organization and institutions, and influence social and environmental policies. Theoretically, social service agencies and the professionals providing the services adhere to these ideal goals.

Providing services which effectively assist Indochinese families to carry out their essential life tasks and maintain beneficial interaction between themselves and American culture requires a knowledge of how ethnic factors affect social service delivery. This knowledge has been considered essential in the framework of social service strategies since the beginning of the Social Work profession (Richmond, 1917; Longres, 1982). As early as 1937, journal articles began discussing the need for social service providers to become more aware of the cultural orientations of the families that they serve (Boie, 1937). Numerous articles and books about ethnicity and social service delivery have been published since that time (Montelius, 1952; New York Cultural Project, 1955; Meir, 1959; Mizio, 1972; Urban Associates, 1972; Chu, 1977;
Over the past 20 years, needs assessments, journal articles and books have looked at specific sub-cultures that comprise American society and have pointed to the specific needs and characteristics of the families within these sub-cultures in such areas as education, health, employment, and finances (Weiss, 1970; Kiyuns, 1972; Kuykendall, 1972; Lee, 1972; Sue & Kirk, 1972, 1975; Chien, 1973; Harkness, 1973; Kiefer, 1974; Chan, 1975a; Johnson & Arvid, 1975; Ogawa, 1975; Kendis & Randall, 1976; Jung, 1976; Onoda, 1976; Reiko, 1976; Schwartz, 1976; Merry, 1977; Ittig, 1978; Morishima, 1980). Recent social legislation requires that needs of ethnic and minority groups be met as a function of federal, state, and local government programs (Title XX, Public Law 91-230 and Public Law 94-405).

In 1975, U.S. social service agencies began addressing the specific needs of Indochinese refugees. Unlike the Cuban, Hungarian and other refugee groups that have come to the United States in recent years, the United States had no existing indigenous ethnic community to which these refugees could look for guidance and cultural kinship (U.S. Senate, 1976, 1978). Consequently, there were no occupational and social networks into which the refugees could immediately fit. For most Indochinese, adjusting to the new environment has meant gaining access to needed financial, occupational, and educational resources.

Social Services for Indochinese Families. A growing body of literature concerning the Indochinese examines adjustment problems, adjustment

Services for Indochinese families are expensive and a growing business. In 1975, $400 million was allotted for relocation and social services. One hundred million of this total was for Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) services. In fiscal year 1979, total funding to the DHHS for Indochinese refugees was $147 million. Relocation costs were initially funneled through the nine VOLAGS (discussed in the Legislation Section of this chapter) to individuals and families. For each refugee, the VOLAGS were given $500 to defray the costs of relocation. How these funds were administered was up to the individual agency.

Refugees were highly dissatisfied about the way VOLAG funds were given to them. In the first resettlement wave, some VOLAGS gave a larger portion of the $500 as a transitional allowance to the individual refugee than other VOLAGS (Comptroller General of the U.S., 1977; Kelly, 1977). Catholic Services gave each refugee $100 transitional allowance plus $10 travel money. Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service gave no transitional allowance directly to the refugees but gave each person $10 pocket money. Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, settling a small group of the refugees, distributed the entire $500 to each refugee in installments (Comptroller General of the U.S., 1977). The original government contract with the VOLAGS did not require financial reporting. This has since been changed due to the criticisms and dissatisfaction expressed by the refugees.

Today, Indochinese refugees are becoming more vocally and professionally involved in the decision making process concerning the services that
directly affect them. Those refugees who are settled are also financially involved as sponsors in the resettlement of new groups of refugees (Thuy, 1980).

A variety of services are needed to meet the diverse population of Indochinese refugees. Initially, services were geared primarily toward practical, survival needs such as:

1. English language training and education
   (Kim, 1979; Grognet, 1981; Smalley, 1981; also see Legislation Section)

2. Housing
   (Lutheran Immigration & Refugee Services, 1979; Cramer, 1981)

3. Health

4. Nutrition
   (Hurlich, 1981; Tong, 1981)

5. Jobs and job training
   (Plant, 1979; Stein, 1979; Finnan, 1980; Johnson, 1981; Shearer, 1981)

6. Counseling of students
   (Martin, 1975; Skinner & Hendricks, 1978, 1979; Alley, 1980)

7. Counseling of families

Mental health services for Indochinese refugees are seen as essential to the adjustment process. Much has been written concerning the difficulties and challenges in providing Indochinese with effective mental health services (Harding & Looney, 1977; Rahe, 1978; Chu, 1979; Lin, Tazuma & Masuda, 1979; Vignes & Hall, 1979; Xuong, 1979; Burch & Powell, 1980; Cohon, 1980; Kinzie, Tran, Breckenridge & Bloom, 1980; Masuda, Lin & Tazuma, 1980; Starr, Roberts, LeNoir & Nguyen, 1980; Charron, 1981; Kinzie, 1981).
Once the Indochinese refugees started interacting within American communities, a need quickly surfaced for bilingual orientation materials to help the Indochinese to understand American culture and handbooks to help the American sponsors and professionals understand the Indochinese (Chan, 1975b; Buu, 1976; Nguyen, 1976; Yang & Barney, 1978; National Indochinese Clearing House, 1978, 1979a, 1979b; Koscanann & Tobin, 1979; Center for Applied Linguistics, 1981; Conway, 1981; Orientation Resource Center, 1981). More recently the Center for Applied Linguistics has started making bilingual orientation tapes. Newsletters (such as Refugee Reports, the Indochinese In Oregon, Indochinese Refugee Alert Bulletin, Sharing and NAVAe) keep professionals attuned to the latest information concerning refugee programs and policies. In the fall of 1981, the Journal of Refugee Resettlement published its first issue. This journal provides an avenue for service professionals to share research findings and service practices.

Conferences attuned to refugee services are occurring on a yearly basis through the National Association for Vietnamese Education and more infrequently sponsored by other local and national organizations such as the 1981 Nebraska Conference "Helping Indochinese Families in Transition," the 1979 Conference on Indochinese Refugees at George Mason University, and the small VAA conference in Oklahoma City in 1979. These conferences also give service providers opportunities to share research and program planning ideas (see proceedings of these conferences; Stopp & Nguyen, 1979; Vietnamese American Association, 1979; Meredith & Tweten, 1981).

Program models are now appearing in the service literature to assist service providers in program planning, implementation, assessment, and revision (Barger & Truong, 1978; King, 1980; Moore, 1980; Aylesworth,
Social service research publications concerning the Indochinese are growing rapidly. Needs assessments such as Boosey's (1976) in Arkansas, Sedanko's (1978) in Texas, Soberano's (1980) in New Orleans and Meredith and Cramer's (1981) in Nebraska help provide a profile of the refugee population in a particular area and their unique service needs. Service providers with access to such assessments can more competently plan and implement services to Indochinese clients.

In January, 1981, the Department of Health & Human Services began collecting information on service delivery to U.S. Indochinese refugee families (Refugee Reports, 1981). DHHS assessment teams scheduled data collection in the nine states of highest refugee concentration (see Table IV). Interviews with 500 refugees and 200 service providers were arranged to gather relevant data. The purpose of this assessment was to suggest areas where reasonable improvements might be made and what important issues needed to be brought to policy makers' attention. The results of this study have not yet been published. A DHHS assessment conducted in 1979 showed that the refugees' greatest need was to learn English. This finding encouraged DHHS to double the funding for English as a second language for FY 1980.

Mutual assistance associations have played, and will continue to play, an increasingly important role in service provision to the Indochinese. These organizations can be grouped into five categories: religious, political, self-help, professional, and student (Vinh, 1981). The establishment of these organizations is a healthy sign of Indochinese self-confidence and responsibility. These organizations strive to help the Indochinese adjust to American life, promote mutual understanding
between Indochinese and American people, and preserve Indochinese culture (Nguyen, 1980). Mutual assistance organizations also function as a linkage between Indochinese and majority culture services.

The next section of Chapter III addresses the Adjustment stage. By looking at current research concerning variables that enhance or impede the adjustment process, service providers will gain important service knowledge.

Adjustment

Research

There has been little research regarding the important variables aiding or hindering Indochinese adjustment. Adjustment variables are important in the planning stage leading to legislation at the federal, state, and local levels and also at the implementation stage of service provision. If the underlying assumptions are not valid then money, time, and effort by service providers will be wasted. Assumptions that certain variables are of great importance must be supported by reliable research.

Chuong (1976) investigated the similarities and differences in value systems among Vietnamese subgroups living in Saigon and between these subgroups and Americans shortly before the fall of the Saigon government. Findings showed that Vietnamese were more concerned about security and less concerned with individual freedom than were Americans. The study also showed that college educated Vietnamese respondents were more like their American counterparts in values than were less educated Vietnamese. This research would appear to support the assumption that college educated Indochinese refugees might adjust more rapidly and easily to American culture than less well educated Indochinese.
Smither and Rodriguez-Giegling (1979) studied the relationships of marginality and anxiety within Vietnamese and Laotian refugees. Marginality was defined as being on the edge of two cultures rather than well-integrated into one. The study hypothesized that refugees would evidence a higher level of marginality and anxiety than majority culture Americans. The study conclusion was that marginality may be unrelated to anxiety in Indochinese refugees. The authors suggest that practical worries about job, home, and family override concerns about marginality. They also suggest that an in-depth understanding of the personality variables operating during the acculturation process would, perhaps, provide a clearer picture of how this process works and how it affects the individual.

In a second study of 114 Indochinese and 32 Nicaraguan refugees, Smither and Rodriguez-Giegling (1980) hypothesized that psychological factors are more important variables to predict acculturation than sociological factors. Their findings indicate no significant correlation of sociological factors for either group. Psychological factors were significantly correlated with acculturation with the Vietnamese, but not with the Nicaraguans. Conscientiousness and likeability were the most strongly linked variables. The conclusions imply that acculturation is a psychological as well as a sociocultural process.

Liu, Lamana and Murata (1979) studied Indochinese mental health adjustment through refugee interviews and writings and also through relevant publications of government agencies, private agencies, and popular journals. Their research highlights the struggle between the host society and the refugees in the perceptions of refugee needs. They concluded that refugees desire to prolong their refugee status and the practical assistance attendant to this status. However, the government
wants to stop refugee support as soon as possible. Sources of and manifestations of depression, of felt status deprivations, and of failure by government authorities to understand the mental health needs of refugees are also highlighted.

Lerner (1980) studied adaptation of Vietnamese in the U.S. in order to delineate important variables that differentiate men who were making a relatively good adaptation to life in the U.S. from those who were making a relatively poor adjustment. One significant correlation resulted. The breakup of the patriarchal family in Vietnam, as measured by the wife working outside the household, was the single most important variable in later adaptation of Vietnamese men to the U.S. Those men whose families in Vietnam were nontraditional, e.g. the wife or mother had worked outside the Vietnam household, adjusted more readily to life in the U.S. Once a variable such as the above is identified, then legislators and service providers may be able to use this knowledge to identify individuals or groups with specific needs, and provide adjustment assistance.

Oggeri (1979) studied the unique characteristics of Vietnamese culture that affect the adjustment process of Vietnamese refugees to American culture. Oggeri applied a qualitative approach to content analysis, analyzing data collected from various sources. Those unique characteristics he found to affect refugee acculturation were:

1. World view emphasizing harmony and balance
2. Pragmatism
3. Respect for education
4. Tanh Can Cu (a philosophy embracing thrift, industriousness, patience, determination and endurance)
5. Extended family systems
6. Exaggerated importance to concept of "face"
7. Achievement orientation
8. Individualism

Service providers with a knowledge of these characteristics may be better prepared to plan and implement services for Indochinese.

Le (1978, 1980) studied Vietnamese refugees' perceptions and methods for coping with mental illness. Two hundred Indochinese were interviewed. The independent variables were religion, length of stay in the U.S. and educational level. Dependent variables were perceptions of mental illness, coping methods with mental illness, knowledge of mental illness services, attitudes toward mental health services, and perceptions of barriers to receiving mental health services.

The results of Le's study indicate that:

1. Refugees associate mental illness with psychotic or extremely violent behavior but not with lesser emotional or behavioral disorders.

2. Most Vietnamese prefer to treat mental illness within the family system rather than through community services.

3. Shame or loss of face is a crucial problem for Vietnamese seeking professional help.

4. Language barriers intensify discomfort with mental health services.

5. 63% of the respondents were not familiar with any community health programs.

Some implications of Le's results for service providers are:

1. A need for multi-service approaches to multi-dimensional problems.

2. A need for Vietnamese community participation in service planning and implementation.

3. A need for mental health programs that are based upon the
Vietnamese family structure strengthened by western mental health knowledge and methods.

All of the above studies are important and have made contributions to social service knowledge. However, further studies are needed. Full acculturization of Indochinese refugees may take 20 years or even longer. If scarce federal, state, and local funds (not to mention private and volunteer efforts) are to be spent wisely and economically, it behooves policy makers and service planners to identify and isolate the precise areas in which service providers should concentrate their efforts.

Social Service Utilization Study

The objective of providing social services to the Indochinese is only realized if these services are utilized and if they actually assist in the Indochinese refugee adjustment process. The studies discussed in the previous section give service providers information about what is needed to improve social service delivery. Knowledge of the utilization of these services may permit service providers to improve their community outreach and enable them to redesign programs and dissemination methodology to achieve wider acceptance by the Indochinese communities.

Components of ethnicity are of interest in the study of family service utilization among Indochinese refugees. This study focuses on two of these components: language and ethnic community ties.

English Language Proficiency. Many of the problems facing Indochinese refugees are related to, or attenuated by, the refugees' inability to communicate effectively in English. A 1978 needs assessment of Texas Indochinese refugees (Sedanko, 1978) found that the lack of fluency in the English language was perceived by the refugees as one of
the greatest barriers to adjusting to life in the United States. English language programs and vocational education are the two most frequently mentioned needs of Asian American families (Urban Associates, 1972; U.S. Senate, 1978).

The Sedanko study (1978) also found that the majority of refugees interviewed had not received the services necessary to meet their acculturation needs despite the availability of public and private help to ease the trauma of resettlement. Was the lack of service utilization due to an inability to communicate effectively with the service provider? Sedanko's data did not allow a firm conclusion. While the need for sensitivity to language barriers by service providers is generally recognized, a review of literature reveals that little empirical investigation has focused on the relationship between language and service utilization.

The one related study of Chinese immigrant families showed that the presence of a bilingual staff was a key factor in successful utilization of service programs (Homma-True, 1976). This study claimed to have documented a positive relationship between language proficiency and social service utilization within the Chinese community. Although the Sedanko study (1978) suggests that a similar relationship may exist within the Vietnamese community, more empirical attention is needed. Hypothesis #1 of the present research states that:

**English language proficiency of Indochinese refugees is positively related to use of community family services by Indochinese families.**

*Ethnic Ties.* Ethnic minority families often do not have equal access to majority culture opportunities for developing their capacities
and interests, nor do they have alternative private resources that would compensate for these inequalities. The federal government has set up programs to correct this imbalance by providing priority services for ethnic minority families. An evaluative study (Urban Associates, 1972) prepared for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare on services to ethnic minorities reports:

1. All of the ethnic minority families in this study (Black Americans, Asian Americans, American Indians and Spanish Americans) have serious needs and problems with their health, education, and welfare.

2. Because each group is unique, services must be delivered to each group in an individualized and culturally sensitive manner.

3. Each of the communities studied has serious complaints about the availability and method of delivery of services, as well as about the lack of cultural sensitivity and ethnic minority staff in HEW funded programs at the local level. (p. 13)

One difficulty that many Indochinese face in resettlement is that their traditions encourage service provision through family, relatives, and friends (Thuy, 1976) rather than external support agencies. Many Indochinese lost their extended family structures during the process of settlement into the United States. These refugees are motivated to seek help first from their own ethnic group (Light, 1972; Le, 1980). They have no tradition of seeking assistance from the government. Their presettlement cultural experience makes them suspicious of government aid (Thuy, 1976).

Sedanko's (1978) study supports this conclusion with the finding that Texas refugees tend to meet service needs on their own or with the assistance of other Vietnamese. Since early 1976, the Vietnamese have been regrouping in recognition of their need for physical and emotional
support. They have been moving from small towns to large metropolitan areas, forming ethnic communities in such cities as New York, Dallas, New Orleans, and San Francisco (Montero, 1979a; Bach & Bach, 1980).

The ethnic community usually has limited resources to directly aid refugees. One way of providing effective assistance may be to alert community members to external services. To the extent that particular services are positively sanctioned by the Indochinese community, they should be more acceptable to the individuals needing them. The following two assumptions were considered in formulating the second hypothesis. If established members of the Indochinese community find a community service helpful, then this service will more likely be known to other Indochinese tied to that ethnic community and will be utilized by them. If the "majority community" social services have not been helpful or are not known to the established members of the Indochinese community, they will not be utilized by others having ties to the ethnic community.

Therefore, Hypothesis #2 states that:

The extent of involvement of Indochinese refugees in the ethnic community is positively related to their utilization of social services approved by the ethnic community.

In the next chapter, the research methods of this study are examined. The problems of designing an accurate Oklahoma refugee profile are discussed. In addition, the chapter presents the methodology for the study of service utilization.
CHAPTER IV

METHODS

Chapter IV discusses the major methodological features of this study in order to address the two goals of this study which are: 1) to provide a profile of Oklahoma Indochinese use of social services in the two major cities of concentration in Oklahoma and 2) to examine two variables, language and ethnic ties, as they relate to service utilization. The first section of this chapter presents the research implementation strategies. The second discusses problems inherent in attempting to draw a sample without an accurate sampling frame. The third section focuses on the measurement of the research variables, and the last section discusses the statistical techniques chosen for the data analysis.

Strategies

The study of Oklahoma's newest ethnic population and its utilization of social services required consultation with and assistance from Indochinese professionals. The Vietnamese American Association (VAA) in Oklahoma City provided the assistance needed. The VAA was involved in a needs assessment of the Oklahoma City Indochinese at the time this study was started. The researcher had no input into the Oklahoma City study but shared the raw data for analysis. The researcher independently sampled Tulsa Indochinese to obtain a broader profile and to test two
hypotheses related to language and ethnic ties as they impact on service utilization.

The VAA offered their expertise and guidance for the training of bilingual interviewers needed for the Tulsa study. They permitted the use of a portion of their interview schedule for the Tulsa profile study.

Indochinese interviewers were recruited through a two credit workshop in the Department of Family Relations and Child Development at Oklahoma State University during the 1979 spring semester. This workshop, entitled "Vietnamese Families in Oklahoma," addressed the strengths and problems Indochinese families face in the adjustment process. Part of the course work for the thirteen male Vietnamese students enrolled in the workshop involved learning and participating in family research (see course description in Appendix C). The students assisted the researcher in drawing up a Tulsa sampling frame, translated the questionnaire into Vietnamese, and administered the bilingual interview to families in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Sampling

A major methodological challenge faced in this research was the task of drawing a random sample of Indochinese families in the State of Oklahoma. Budgetary constraints mandated that only urban families could be studied at this time. Since the Indochinese refugees in Oklahoma City, the largest urban center in Oklahoma, were already being studied, the researcher limited direct investigation to Tulsa, Oklahoma, the other major urban center in the state.

It was estimated that the Oklahoma Indochinese population ranged between 4,000 and 7,000 in 1979. A 1978 study by the VAA indicated that
approximately 95% of the Indochinese in Oklahoma were Vietnamese with about 5% Laotian; there were no figures for Kampucheans (Vietnamese American Association, 1978). It was decided to limit this study to Vietnamese in Oklahoma since they were the majority of the Indochinese population accessible to the investigator. Due to the rapidly transient Vietnamese population base and the lack of reliable household listings, no reliable sampling frame could be constructed, making probability sampling techniques virtually impossible.

The Oklahoma City portion of the data set came from the mental health survey conducted by the VAA in the fall of 1978 and the spring of 1979. The Tulsa portion came from a survey conducted by the researcher and the class of Vietnamese students mentioned above. Because of the logistical and sampling limitations described above, there was no attempt to study Vietnamese in smaller Oklahoma communities. This in itself may be a source of some bias. However, the major concentrations of Indochinese in the United States have been in urban areas (Andrews & Stopp, 1979), thus the results should have relevance for most service providers.

The VAA Oklahoma City study utilized a nonrandom sampling technique. Respondents were drawn from a list of households that had been referred to the VAA or had referred themselves. This basic list was expanded via the snowball technique of asking the original respondents for a list of Vietnamese friends (Simon, 1978, p. 142).

Fifty heads of household responded to the questionnaire administered by the VAA research team. All the respondents were Vietnamese. The questions were asked from an English questionnaire by a bilingual interviewer. If the respondent did not know English, the VAA interviewers
freely translated the questions at the time of the interview. This may have introduced some bias into the findings. A second problem may be that the sample reflected only those Indochinese who may have had a special need for VAA services and did not reflect the total population of Oklahoma City Indochinese.

The Tulsa study also utilized a nonrandom sampling technique. As an initial sampling frame, the Tulsa phone directory was utilized. The thirteen Vietnamese students assisting in this research agreed upon and compiled a list of probable Vietnamese surnames that might be found listed in the telephone directory. This presented the limitation of restricting the sample to those having phones and to those who had not changed their family name. However, no reliable list of Tulsa Indochinese was available and no Indochinese organization such as the VAA was operant in Tulsa at the time. This technique gave the investigator an initial sample list.

Using this list, 95 households were determined as probable Vietnamese. Bilingual introductory letters (see Appendix D) were sent to these households. Six of these letters were returned bearing the statement "addressee unknown." The basic list of 89 validated households was then personally contacted by the Vietnamese interviewers and then the list was expanded via the snowball technique.

One hundred five Vietnamese heads of household ultimately responded to the questionnaire delivered by the research team. The respondents answered the identical questions asked in the Oklahoma City study. However, instead of having the interviewer freely translate for those who did not know English, the questionnaire had each question written in both English and Vietnamese.
The questionnaire was prepared using the back translation method (Lee, 1977). Items were translated from English into Vietnamese and then back into English by other bilinguals who had not seen the original form. The two English versions were then compared to isolate inconsistencies and differences in meaning. The differences were resolved by discussion and compromise among 13 bilingual translators. The final version of the questionnaire was presented in both Vietnamese and English so that each question could be read by the respondent in the language of his choice (see Appendix E for questionnaire).

Measurement

For the Oklahoma Profile portion of the study, the researcher examined indicators of income, education, and other demographic data taken from the VAA study of Oklahoma City Vietnamese. These indicators were incorporated into a questionnaire administered to Tulsa Vietnamese. It should be noted that some bias may have entered from the fact the study in Oklahoma City was administered by the VAA whereas the Tulsa study was administered by the Vietnamese students. However, both groups of interviewers were given training by the same VAA team.

For the Service Utilization portion of the Tulsa study, only questions designed by the researcher and her doctoral committee were used. The independent variables of language proficiency and ethnic ties were tested against the dependent variables of service utilization. To operationalize the variables for this research, the investigator only examined social services meeting the following three criteria:

1. That they be widely needed by Indochinese refugees in successfully assimilating into American life.
2. That they be positively sanctioned by (but external to) the Indochinese ethnic community.


Three services satisfying these criteria were identified as: employment assistance, general financial assistance, and medical care assistance. Those services meeting the above three criteria are available to Indochinese families in Oklahoma through the Department of Human Services and other public and private agencies. Each respondent was asked the degree to which they utilized each service on a forced choice five-point Likert scale (see Appendix E for questionnaire).

English language proficiency (ELP) was measured by an evaluation of self-reported language skills of the respondent in relation to other Vietnamese. Although self-perception statements can often lead to questionnaire bias, it was decided that an involved objective test of English language proficiency would interfere with the completeness of the responses, given the length of the questionnaire.

The extent to which individuals felt committed to or associated with the Vietnamese community (ethnicity) was measured by asking: "To what extent do you find it important to have the high regard or approval of the Vietnamese community?" Based on Thomas' dictum, "If men define situations as real they are real in their consequences" (Thomas & Znaniecki, 1918), it was felt that self-perceptions of ethnic ties would be a more accurate indicator of involvement with the ethnic community than would be determined by asking the community's perception of the individual's involvement.

Shame, education, and income were utilized as control variables in
the service utilization study. Shame was measured by having the respondents choose one of five categories expressing the extent to which shame ever prevented them from using services. The responses ranged from no perceived prevention to very large prevention. Education was measured by having the respondents report their highest educational achievement using the following five categories: elementary, junior and senior high, college, higher education, other. Income was measured by having the respondents assign themselves to one of five categories ranging from under $400 per month to over $1,000.

Data Analysis

Analysis for the Oklahoma Profile study was limited to the demographic categories of income, education and other descriptive criteria. Category percentages were utilized. Tables were constructed showing simple percentage differences between Tulsa and Oklahoma City responses to the profile portion of the questionnaire. The various demographic indicators were correlated against the national profile discussed in the migration stages (see Chapters II and III).

For the service utilization portion of the study, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients (r) were utilized to measure the associations between variables. The range of (r) is between the values of +1.0 and -1.0. A positive correlation means that two variables tend to increase or decrease together; a negative r denotes an inverse relationship. When there is no association between the variables, r will be close to zero. The objective of correlation analysis is to determine the extent to which variation in one variable is linked to variation in the other (Nie, et al., 1975, p. 279). Squaring the Pearson's r statistic
gives a measure of the proportion of the total variation in one variable that is "explained" by the other.

Finally, partial correlational analysis was conducted to measure the associations between the major variables (language, ethnic ties, and service utilization) while adjusting for the effects of the three control variables (shame, education, and income level). Shame, closely connected to the concept of "face" discussed in Chapter III, was considered an important variable to control as were education and income level in evaluating social service utilization. The effects of each of these control variables were removed from the calculation of the simple correlation between the independent and dependent variables. This kind of analysis aids the researcher in uncovering spurious relationships, in determining the importance of intervening linking variables, and in uncovering relationships where none appear to exist (Nie et al., 1975, p. 305).

Unfortunately, the Vietnamese students who collected the completed questionnaires did not check for completeness of individual items and many instances of randomly distributed missing information were discovered in the returned questionnaires. In the interest of maximizing usable "n" in this study "pairwise" deletion of missing data was employed (Nie et al., 1975, p. 313). With this technique, a case is only deleted from the analysis if it lacks information for one of the two variables in the computation; hence "pairwise." This technique retains the largest possible sample size but must be used with caution since multiple regression computations and resulting beta weights are based on different sizes of "n" depending on which variables go into each computation. Since the computations under both pairwise and listwise
deletion of missing data showed only minimal differences in this study, pairwise deletion of missing data was employed.

In the next chapter, the findings of this study are examined as follows: 1) the Oklahoma profile is analyzed against the Developmental Migration Model framework, 2) language proficiency and ethnic ties are analyzed in the service utilization portion of the study.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS OF THE OKLAHOMA PROFILE
AND SERVICE UTILIZATION STUDIES

This chapter begins by examining the results of the Oklahoma City and Tulsa profile indicator questions. The analysis is presented as a comparison of the two major urban populations in Oklahoma. In addition, the chapter examines the results of the Tulsa service utilization study. The question of whether English language proficiency or ethnic ties could be used as predictors of current service utilization is examined.

Oklahoma Profile

The following profile will follow the Developmental Migration Model framework to give service providers a more comprehensive understanding of the two major urban populations of Indochinese in Oklahoma. Following a demographic overview, the known premigration, migration process, initial entry, and settling in characteristics of this population will be discussed. The adjustment characteristics will be delineated last.

Demographic Overview

Demographic characteristics show the two samples to be similar in sex but varying in age distribution, marital status, religion, and education (see Table V). Both samples reflect male opinions with approx-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior and Senior HS</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade School, etc.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Ed.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-no children</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married with children</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Vietnamese (Buddhist, etc.)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
imately 80% of the respondents of the two groups being male. The majority of both groups are relatively young with 81% of the Tulsa sample and 72% of the Oklahoma City sample between the ages of 19 and 40. Fifty-nine percent of the Tulsa sample are married compared with 68% of the Oklahoma City sample. Tulsa has a slightly larger group professing traditional Vietnamese religions (56%) over Catholic (40%) whereas Oklahoma City respondents professed 40% and 58% respectively.

The largest difference in the two groups is the disparity in education. Tulsa respondents on whole are more highly educated with 60% of the sample having attended some college or higher education. Fourteen percent of the Oklahoma City sample have some college education. Conversely, 1% of Tulsa respondents versus 42% of Oklahoma City respondents had only an elementary education. Those coming in later refugee waves often have less education than those in the first wave. This appears to be reflected in this study as discussed below.

Migration Process

The only premigration characteristic asked in this study, "What was your profession in Vietnam," is discussed later in relation to current professions. The migration process characteristics are briefly analyzed (see Table VI). Fifty-two percent of the Oklahoma City respondents compared to 36% of the Tulsa sample came with the initial wave of refugees leaving Saigon immediately following the end of the war. A further 59% of the Tulsa sample came within a year of the fall of Saigon compared to 8% of the Oklahoma City sample. This difference increases when considering populations coming most recently. Almost 38% of the Oklahoma City sample have come to the U.S. after May, 1977 compared to 5% of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrived In U.S.</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before May, 1975</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 1975 to May, 1976</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 1976 to May, 1977</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After May, 1977</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrived By</th>
<th>Tulsa</th>
<th>Oklahoma City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plane</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Plan To Relocate               | Tulsa        | Oklahoma City        |
| (Secondary Migration)           |--------------|----------------------|
| No interest                    | 36%          | 66%                  |
| Yes-for new job                | 23%          | 4%                   |
| Yes-to be with friends         | 5%           | 0                    |
| Yes-bad weather                | 14%          | 0                    |
| Yes-to travel                  | 2%           | 4%                   |
| No comment                     | 20%          | 26%                  |
Tulsa sample. Those having two or less years in the U.S. are at a different stage of adjustment when compared to those having 3 to 4 years in the U.S.

The differential in stages of adjustment may help explain the large difference between the two groups over interest in relocating to another area. Ninety-two percent of the Oklahoma City sample indicated no interest or no comment about a desire to relocate to another place compared to 56% of the Tulsa sample. Forty-four percent of the Tulsa respondents were considering a move compared to 8% of the Oklahoma City sample who planned to relocate. This may reflect a greater need for security and time to settle into American culture by the Oklahoma City sample. Tulsa Indochinese may have greater confidence in their abilities to adapt to a new location.

The difference in English language proficiency (ELP) between these two groups is another indicator of the Tulsa respondents' greater self-confidence. The ELP question in the VAA instrument that gives a comparison of both populations asked, "Who speaks English fluently in your family?" The response categories were nobody (Tulsa, 10%; Oklahoma City, 50%); everybody (Tulsa, 44%; Oklahoma City, 10%); only the respondent (Tulsa, 28%; Oklahoma City, 20%); and others (Tulsa, 18%; Oklahoma City, 20%). The self-perceptions of the respondents show that the Tulsa sample is more confident about their English speaking ability (Tulsa, 72%) compared to the Oklahoma City sample (30%). English language proficiency for the Tulsa population will be discussed in greater depth in the service utilization portion of this chapter.
Premigration Process

The only premigration characteristic that the questionnaire could determine was a respondent's profession in Vietnam (see Table VII). The Tulsa sample had a greater percentage of the sample in high paying, high status professions (27%) compared to Oklahoma City (2%). The two groups were nearly equal in middle pay, middle status professions (Tulsa, 28%; Oklahoma City, 26%). Correspondingly, the Oklahoma City sample had a higher percentage in lower paid, lower status positions (40%) than Tulsa (12%). Eight percent more of the Tulsa sample were students in Vietnam (25%) than in the Oklahoma City sample (16%). Nine percent of the Tulsa sample and 16% of the Oklahoma City sample could not be categorized.

Initial Entry and Settling In Process

It would be reasonable to assume that these same differences would show up in their professional status in Oklahoma in 1979 (see Table VIII). However, the percentage of those having high pay, high status jobs in Oklahoma is less in both cities (Tulsa, 7%; Oklahoma City, 0%). This shows a greater loss of status for Tulsa Vietnamese than Oklahoma City Vietnamese. Those respondents with lower paid, lower status jobs represented by the category unskilled workers (Tulsa, 15%; Oklahoma City, 44%) corresponds closely to the premigration classification of occupation (Tulsa, 12%; Oklahoma City, 40%). The student population is also similar to the premigration findings (currently Tulsa 25% and Oklahoma City 12%). About half of the Tulsans who were dropped from the high pay, high status jobs apparently ended up in the middle level since the proportion went up 8% to 36% whereas the proportion in Oklahoma City
TABLE VII
OKLAHOMA INDOCHINESE PROFILE
PREMIGRATION OCCUPATION CHARACTERISTICS
SPRING 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession In Vietnam</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Pay/High Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D., Engineer, Professor, Officer (Major to General), High Ranking Public Official, Large Businessman</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Pay/Middle Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, Officer (Sergeant to Captain), Public Official, (Chief of Section to Chief of Service), Small Businessman</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Pay/Low Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Military Ranks, Low Ranking Official, Clerk, Laborer</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary, Secondary, College</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Categorizable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VIII
OKLAHOMA INDOCHINESE PROFILE
CURRENT OCCUPATION
CHARACTERISTICS
SPRING 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oklahoma Profession</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.D., Engineer, Professor</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled worker, small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businessman</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College student</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled worker</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income per Month</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000+</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1,000</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-800</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-600</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 400</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very pleased</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat pleased</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not pleased</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desire Job Change</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Members Working</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self only</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and spouse</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self, spouse and family</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
remained the same. The rest of the displaced Tulsans may have ended up in the non-categorized group which jumped from 9% to 18%. The Oklahoma City figure went up 2% to 18% (perhaps the 2% dropped from the high pay, high status category). The figures, of course, do not show that there was any mobility from high pay, high status occupations to low pay, low status occupations or from low pay, low status occupations to middle pay, middle status occupations. However, the above explanation probably accounts for most of the post migration changes in job status.

When asked if they were anxious to recover the status that they had in Vietnam, 69% of the Oklahoma City sample responded in the affirmative compared to 40% of the Tulsa sample. This finding was surprising considering the findings showing relatively little change in job status for Oklahoma City Vietnamese as a group. It may be partially explained by the difference in time spent in the U.S. and in English language proficiency between the two groups. The Tulsa sample may be more confident of their ability to do well in the U.S. than the Oklahoma City population.

Another difference, perhaps related to the above finding, is the differential incomes earned by the two populations. Fifty percent of the Tulsa sample earned more than $800 per month compared to 10% of the Oklahoma City sample. At the lower end of the income scale, 80% of the Oklahoma City sample earn less than $600 per month compared to 31% of the Tulsa sample. Low income may be a motivating factor to remember the "lost status" the refugees had in Vietnam. It also reflects upon confidence in one's ability to do well in the U.S. It should be noted here that many of the low pay, low status premigrants had fair status in their village communities whereas they would be unprepared mentally
and educationally for low skilled urban life in the U.S.

Both sample populations are similar in the percentage of family members working. The major difference found is in those not working at all. Sixteen percent of the Oklahoma City sample are not working at all, a figure that is twice the percentage of the Tulsa group (8%). The two populations differ in living patterns primarily in those living alone (Tulsa, 25%; and Oklahoma City, 8%) and those who own their own homes (Tulsa, 27%; and Oklahoma City, 13%; see Table IX). The percentage of refugees owning their own cars is higher in Tulsa (86%) than in Oklahoma City (62%). As shown by the above statistics, the Tulsa respondents consistently appear to show greater prosperity than their Oklahoma City counterparts. This factor may positively influence the settling in process of the Tulsa group over the Oklahoma City group.

The extended family is an extremely important system in the lives of Indochinese people as discussed in Chapter II of this paper. Table X shows the percentages of extended family members of the respondents still in Indochina. The Tulsa respondents have a greater percentage of family members (spouses, children, and parents) still in Vietnam compared with the Oklahoma City respondents (Tulsa, 100%; and Oklahoma City, 55%). The two groups have similar percentages now living within extended family groups. The location of extended family members appears to play a role in the adjustment of Indochinese. Adjustment will be addressed in more detail later in this section.

The Tulsa and Oklahoma City Indochinese are in the process of settling into American life. Physical and mental health concerns may play a role in Indochinese Settling In and Adjustment stages. Table XI looks at the physical health concerns of the two samples. The Tulsa
# TABLE IX

**OKLAHOMA INDOCHINESE PROFILE**

**LIVING ARRANGEMENTS AND TRANSPORTATION**

**SPRING 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Arrangements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Owner</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor's House</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Cars</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Car</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Buses</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE X

OKLAHOMA INDOCHINESE PROFILE
EXTENDED FAMILY
CHARACTERISTICS
SPRING 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Close Relatives In Vietnam</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers and Sisters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living With Extended Family In U.S.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XI

**OKLAHOMA INDOCHINESE PROFILE**  
**PHYSICAL HEALTH CHARACTERISTICS**  
**SPRING 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increasingly Tired</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difficulty Sleeping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor Appetite</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Worries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Illness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headaches, dizziness</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart trouble</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomach problems</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhumatism</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment For Medical Problems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with traditional medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at home</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to doctor/hospital</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sample had a greater incidence of tiredness, loss of sleep, poor appetite, health worries, and current illness than the Oklahoma City group. When respondents were asked where they would get treatment for their medical problems, 76% of the Tulsa sample said that they would go to a doctor and/or the hospital while 38% of the Oklahoma City sample said they would use this source of help. A larger percentage of the Oklahoma City respondents (36%) said that they did not know where to get help compared to the Tulsa sample (11%). The Oklahoma City sample may exhibit these findings because 40% of them are relatively new to Oklahoma City and are not yet settled into Oklahoma life. The Oklahoma City group's lower English language proficiency may be another barrier to its seeking standard American health care. The high pay, high status premigration group (predominantly found in Tulsa) would have had a much greater exposure to the American way of life and urban health treatment practices than predominantly low pay, low status Oklahoma City premigration group. This may also explain this difference.

The mental health concerns (presented in Table XII) show that the Tulsa sample respondents confessed to a higher incidence of mental depression (Tulsa, 28%; and Oklahoma City, 12%). A higher percentage of the Tulsa group (27%) admitted to feeling anger frequently than the Oklahoma City group (10%). However, more of the Oklahoma City respondents expressed angry feelings sometimes (86%) than the Tulsa group (26%). A similar finding for the two groups was shown in the expressed feelings of depression, i.e. 21% of the Tulsans frequently felt depressed compared to 8% of the Oklahoma City group, whereas 86% of the Oklahoma City respondents felt depressed sometimes compared to 64% of the Tulsans. These findings support the theory in Chapter I concerning Stage IV,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feel Well</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-physically ill</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-mentally depressed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-both mental and physical</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Get Angry Easily</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, often</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feel Depressed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, often</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies To Diminish Sorrow</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and cigarettes</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbies</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endure secretly or cry</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Settling In. The Tulsans, who are further along in the adjustment process, are inclined to feel and express anger or depression more frequently than the more recent Oklahoma City migrants. The most popular strategies the two groups utilized to diminish their sorrows included hobbies (Tulsa, 47%; Oklahoma City, 54%); alcohol and cigarettes (Tulsa, 20%; Oklahoma City, 12%) and enduring their problems in private (Tulsa, 13%; and Oklahoma City, 28%).

One worry about marriage the Tulsa and Oklahoma City samples appear to have is the fear that they will be unable to find a suitable Vietnamese spouse. Almost twice as many Tulsans (20% versus 12%) as Oklahoma City residents expressed this fear (see Table XIII). The Tulsa group also had greater fear of having a "foreign" son or daughter. The difference between the Tulsa and Oklahoma City groups may be caused by the greater number of single Tulsans and the possible differential opportunities of meeting eligible Vietnamese. The Oklahoma City group with the established VAA has more access to ethnic group interaction than the Tulsa group which has few such opportunities. Four percent of each group were interested in finding a "foreign" spouse; 96% preferred a Vietnamese mate. This latter worry supports the need for ethnic identity and pride by Indochinese refugees.

Major concerns about family adjustment center around the respondents regret that their children adopt "modern" trends (Tulsa, 32%; and Oklahoma City, 27%). When asked their concerns about children's education, respondents regretted being unable to check their children's studies (Tulsa, 23%; Oklahoma City, 14%) and unqualified to tutor their children (Tulsa, 11%; Oklahoma City, 26%). Respondents felt concern about the influence of television on their children (Tulsa, 15%; Oklahoma City, 12%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marriage Anxiety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about finding Vietnamese spouse</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious to marry a foreigner (American)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious about having a foreign son or daughter</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern About Family Situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regret spouse Americanization</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regret children's modern trends</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxious About Children's Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time to check children's studies</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not qualified to tutor children</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about influence of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. television</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. narcotics</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Tulsa respondents higher educational background and facility in using English is reflected in these responses.

The two groups are close in regretting the passing of traditional ways. The slightly greater regret for Tulsa respondents is probably a result, once again, of lesser access to ethnic group interaction. These findings suggest that Oklahoma Vietnamese are concerned about the new roles and values their children are learning in the U.S. They may fear the loss of traditional authority and control over the younger generation.

Adjustment Process

The only factor in the VAA questionnaire that was relevant for adaptation to American life was the U.S. living standard. (This is an inherent weakness of the questionnaire.) The response to the question showed that 54% of the Oklahoma City respondents perceived this factor as the cause for their successful adaptation to American life as opposed to 29% of the Tulsa group (see Table XIV). This appears to be a contradiction to other findings showing that the Tulsa group is wealthier, better educated, and more pleased with their jobs. However, the finding is supported when examined in the context of physical and mental health worries. Perhaps more of the Tulsa group are living at a lower status than they had in Vietnam, and they, therefore, do not perceive their life in the U.S. to be at a higher standard of living. Another possible cause for the difference in perceived adaptation may well be their current stage in the migration process. The Tulsa group, having been in the U.S. longer, has had time to satisfy basic necessities and may now be more anxious to achieve their social and esteem needs (see Chapter II, Theoretical Framework). The more recently arrived Oklahoma City group,
### Table XIV

**OKLAHOMA INDOCHINESE PROFILE**
**SELF-PERCEIVED ADJUSTMENT TO AMERICAN LIFE**
**SPRING 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are You Adapted To American Life</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes—because of high living standard</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No—fast paced mechanized life</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No—generation gap</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No—weather</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No—all above</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Affected Most By*</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment, job dissatisfaction, low salary</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorry over loss of property and life in Vietnam</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about family in Vietnam</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tulsa sample answered more than 1 category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Satisfying In Current Life</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment, job, economics</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No forced military service</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education possibilities for a. children</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. self</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Helpful Change In Life Style</th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on the other hand, in its search for (Stage III) physiological and security needs, is more easily satisfied with any job, home, or other solutions to basic needs. The presence of the VAA, in this respect, is probably a powerful factor in the self-perception of the Oklahoma City respondents as "adapted."

The major barrier to adjustment for Tulsa respondents appears to be their worry about family members still in Vietnam (53%) and their loss of property and life in Vietnam (15%) coupled with previously discussed job dissatisfaction (22%) and language barriers (27%). These strong ties to their extended families and country of origin are potent factors in their sense of well being. Conversely, Oklahoma City respondents have a smaller percentage of close family members still in Vietnam so this is not as large a concern for them (16%). However, language barriers appear to affect their adaptation the most (52%) followed by job dissatisfaction (22%) and worry about family members in Vietnam (16%).

When asked about the most satisfying factors in their current life, both groups valued educational opportunities for themselves and their children (Tulsa, 60%; Oklahoma City, 44%). Consistent with the Tulsan's higher educational levels, a higher percentage of Tulsa Vietnamese cited this factor. The next greatest factor was job opportunity (Tulsa, 28%; Oklahoma City, 26%). Education seems to be the key that both groups believe will improve their quality of life in the U.S., with enhanced employment opportunities as a result of this education.

When asked about their thoughts for the future, 20% of the Tulsa group thought it "will be great" compared to 2% of the Oklahoma City group. However, 54% of the Oklahoma City group thought it might be
"somewhat better," compared to 36% of the Tulsa group. Three percent of the Tulsa group thought it would be worse and none of the Oklahoma City group answered that category. Both groups had a large percentage of "no comment" (Tulsa, 30%; Oklahoma City, 26%).

Fifty-six percent of each view the future as being "somewhat better" or "great." This group apparently expects to achieve a good adjustment into American life. These individuals are probably self-reliant, upward striving people. Conversely, the group who believes the future will be about the same or worse or are unwilling to give comment are perhaps the population that will need the greatest assistance from service providers in the future.

The two VAA questions regarding social services and assistance revealed that 79% of the Tulsa group and 70% of the Oklahoma City group perceived that they received none at all (see Table XV). For both questions, a large proportion of the "positive" respondents chose the catch-all category of "other" (Tulsa, 12% and 23% respectively; Oklahoma City 10% and 26% respectively). It is, thus, difficult to ascertain the biggest sources of the assistance that these families do receive. The largest source of known assistance for the Tulsa group is scholarships (20%) with food stamps a low second (4%). These two sources are reversed for the Oklahoma City sample (scholarships, 10% and food stamps, 12%).

The profile findings reveal two important variables affecting the adjustment process, ethnic ties and English language proficiency. The next section of this chapter presents the findings of the service utilization portion of the study done in Tulsa.
### TABLE XV

**OKLAHOMA INDOCHINESE PROFILE**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AND ASSISTANCE RECEIVED**

**SPRING 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tulsa (N=105)</th>
<th>Oklahoma City (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receiving Social Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Types Of Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent assistance</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual assistance</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feelings About Sponsor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Help</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could do better</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No help</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Utilization

The following discussion of the findings of the Tulsa Service Utilization study examines whether ELP or ethnic ties may be viable predictors of current service utilization. The two predictors are examined separately against the three service utilization indicators selected. The findings are then summarized.

Table XVI shows the use of selected services by Vietnamese families in Tulsa. Almost 70% of the respondents use these services only rarely or not at all. It would appear that available services are not highly utilized by Vietnamese families in Tulsa even though the families have service needs. Medical services are the most highly utilized services by Tulsa Vietnamese followed closely by employment and financial services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Employment Services n=65</th>
<th>Financial Services n=63</th>
<th>Medical Services n=62</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>16.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>23.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>45.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English Language Proficiency

In order to test Hypothesis #1 (English language proficiency of Vietnamese refugees is positively related to use of community family services by Vietnamese families), the researcher asked the respondents to evaluate their ELP compared to other Vietnamese. A bivariate correlation matrix (r) of the study variables was prepared.

Table XVII shows the respondents' evaluation of their English language proficiency compared to other Vietnamese. Over 30% of the respondents evaluated their English proficiency to be "good" or "very good" when compared with other Vietnamese. This indicated that approximately one-third of the Tulsa sample perceive themselves as able to communicate in English, at least to some extent. However, over one-half of the respondents evaluated their relative English language proficiency as "O.K." and the remaining 15% as "poor" or "very poor." A significant percentage of this sample perceives difficulty in communication in the English language.

Table XVIII presents the bivariate correlation matrix (r) for the indicators of English language proficiency, ethnic community ties, and the three service utilization indicators. English language proficiency, as measured, does not appear to be strongly associated with either use of employment services (r = -.140), financial services (r = .095), or medical services (r = -.027). Squaring the three correlations (r² = 2%, 1%, and 0%) shows that ELP does not appear to be significantly related to the use of social services. The correlation analysis does not provide sufficient support for the first hypothesis. Consequently, the hypothesis (English language proficiency of Vietnamese refugees is
### TABLE XVII
ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY COMPARED TO OTHER VIETNAMESE (n=87)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. K.</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E.L.P.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethnic Ties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employment Service</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Financial Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Medical Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
positively related to use of community family services by Vietnamese families) was rejected.

The rejection of Hypothesis #1 needs some discussion. Elsewhere in the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to directly associate English language proficiency and utilization of social services. In response to the question, "To what extent does your English language proficiency prevent you from using social services?", 44% of the respondents answered "some," "a large," or "a very large" extent. In fact, 27% of the Tulsa sample identified language barriers as one of the most difficult problems that they faced in the U.S. However, when the separate measure of perceived English language proficiency was statistically correlated with service use indicators, the relationship was low, as indicated above.

A 1977 national sample reported by Montero (1979a) may provide some clarification. Montero found that English language proficiency did not appear to be related to employment rates:

The rate of employment for those reporting that they do not understand English at all is 88.8%. For those who speak, read, and write English well, the rate increases to 97%. It is difficult to explain the virtual lack of relationship between English language proficiency and the rate of employment. (p. 49)

It may be that the motivation to obtain needed services such as employment, financial aid, or health care is great enough that some alternative for language proficiency is found. For example, the language barrier may be overcome with the assistance of the Vietnamese ethnic community which would aid in: (a) providing an awareness of available services, and (b) facilitating communication with service providers.

Supporting the above speculation is the response to the question, "How did you learn about these services?" Over 65% of the respondents
answered that Vietnamese friends, family or neighbors told them of the services. Nine percent learned about them from American friends, 8% from their sponsors, and the remaining 17% from churches, schools, social workers, nurses, and the media. It would appear that the majority of the Tulsa respondents are in direct communication with the ethnic community in learning about community services available to them. Ethnic ties, therefore, appear to be of greater importance to knowledge of services than ELP.

**Ethnic Ties**

In order to test Hypothesis #2 (the more an individual is tied to the ethnic community, the more likely he/she is to utilize social services approved by the ethnic community), the researcher asked the respondents to evaluate their need for positive acceptance within the ethnic community. A bivariate correlation of ethnic ties was made with the three service utilization indicators. Table XIX indicates how important it is to the respondent to have the high regard of the Vietnamese community. Fifty-five percent of the respondents felt it important or very important to have their ethnic community's high regard. Nearly one-third had mixed feelings about the Vietnamese community, and 15% denied the importance of ethnic community ties. The data suggest that these ties are generally important to Vietnamese.

Some association is found between Vietnamese involvement in the ethnic community and their social service utilization (see Table XVIII). The correlation between ethnic ties and employment service is \( r = .329 \) \( (r^2 = 11\%) \). The correlations for financial assistance \( (r = .218; r^2 = 5\%) \) and for medical assistance \( (r = .266; r^2 = 7\%) \) are somewhat smaller.
TABLE XIX
THE EXTENT IT IS IMPORTANT TO HAVE
THE HIGH REGARD OF THE
VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY
(n=80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither important nor unimportant</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While these correlations are modest, there are some grounds for tentatively supporting the hypothesis that the more an individual is tied to the ethnic community, the more likely he/she is to utilize social services approved by the ethnic community.

Another research finding supports the importance of ethnic community ties for Indochinese families. Tulsa Vietnamese are inclined to seek help from within their ethnic community. Table XX gives the sources of help reported by Tulsa Indochinese. Twenty-nine percent of the services utilized are supplied through Vietnamese friends or through the individual's and family's efforts. This would seem to indicate that the Tulsa Vietnamese have a relatively high incidence of independence from government assistance. Similar findings among Texas Vietnamese are reported by Sedanko (1978) and support the assertion that Vietnamese traditionally help themselves and their own family groups.

Summary

The first hypothesis was rejected in this study on the basis of the above analysis. The second hypothesis, while not strongly supported by the research data, was tentatively accepted. Even though ELP was rejected as a determiner of service utilization, it still appears to be a problem in effective service utilization.

To further understand the two hypotheses, the three social service utilization indicators were examined while controlling for possible related extraneous variables using partial correlation analysis. The researcher considered that the most important variables to control were shame, educational level, and income. Shame was considered to be a factor since traditional Asian society encourages shame as a behavioral
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Government Providers</th>
<th>Private Providers</th>
<th>Self Arranged and Vietnamese Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services n=55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services n=44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services n=43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>28.03%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Government Providers include:** Department of Welfare, CETA, Health Department, State Employment

**Private Service Providers include:** Catholic Charities, Churches, Red Cross, Sponsors

**Self Arranged and Vietnamese Providers include:** Vietnamese friends, family, and self paid services
influence (Morales & Sheafor, 1980). Family loyalty plays an important role in Vietnamese conduct and acts as a source of pride and shame (Thuy, 1976; Nguyen, 1976). If using social services supplied by outside agencies would cause the family to feel shame, there should be a measurable difference in the relationship between ethnic ties and service use for those who feel shame and those who do not. Similarly, highly educated and upper income Vietnamese could be expected to evidence different relationships between ethnic ties and ELP with service use than lower educated and low income Vietnamese. Table XXI presents the bivariate and partial correlations while controlling for shame, education, and income. As can be seen, the relationships were basically unaffected when the effects of shame, education, and income were removed.

Although it was not hypothesized, there may be a fairly high degree of intercorrelation between the use of one social service within a context of general social service use. This is indicated by the following correlations:

\[ r = .402 \] financial services and employment services
\[ r = .478 \] employment services and medical services
\[ r = .658 \] financial services and medical services

The correlation between financial service and employment service may be partially explained by the source of financial assistance providing help along with employment assistance. Often government sources of financial aid are predicated upon the recipient's regular participation in an employment search. The highest correlation found, between financial and medical services, may be partially explained by the high cost of medical care. Vietnamese families needing medical care may also need financial help to pay for this care.

For the service utilization portion of this study, there was an
TABLE XXI
BIVARIATE AND PARTIAL ASSOCIATIONS CONTROLLING FOR SHAME, EDUCATION & INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Bivariate</th>
<th>Partial Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELP</td>
<td>Ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td>(n=57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance</td>
<td>(n=57)</td>
<td>(n=53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance</td>
<td>(n=57)</td>
<td>(n=53)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. English Language Proficiency
obvious interest in obtaining results which could be generalized beyond the sample. However, it was not clear that this sample was representative of any larger population. A comparison of the Tulsa sample with a 1977 national survey of Vietnamese refugees (Montero, 1979a) revealed rough similarity in time in the U.S., age, monthly income, federal public assistance rates, employment rates, and the proportion of refugees experiencing downward job mobility in the U.S. Where the Tulsa sample is atypical, however, is in the area of education. In the national sample, 50% of the heads of household had at least a secondary education and 25% were college graduates. In the Tulsa sample, 94% of the respondents had at least a secondary education and 59% were college educated (25% of the Tulsa sample are currently college students). This difference predicates that generalization beyond the Tulsa sample may be invalid and misleading.

In the next chapter, the conclusions and recommendations from this research are discussed. The Developmental Migration Model, the Oklahoma Profile, and the Social Service Utilization Study are each addressed separately.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to develop a theory of migration applicable to Indochinese refugees, compile a profile of Oklahoma Indochinese and study the effects of two ethnic factors on social service utilization. The first section of this chapter includes conclusions and implications of the three different phases of this research. The last section lists the research and policy recommendations.

Conclusions and Implications

Developmental Migration Model

The purpose for developing the Developmental Migration Model was to gain knowledge of the effects of the migration process on Indochinese refugee families. With the aid of the Developmental Migration Model, service providers should be in a better position to evaluate the needs and strengths of the refugee families they serve. Knowledge of how Pre-flight, Flight, Initial Entry, Settling In, and Adjustment stages directly affect migrating families should speed up the helping process and enable service providers to anticipate future problems and needs.

The Developmental Migration Model provides a framework of easily collected data on a refugee family which aids in predicting how successfully the refugee will pass through the various stages of acculturation.
The emergent framework also aids in the determination of where the refugee is in this process and how best to provide the services needed.

The researcher has gone beyond the model and has developed an evaluation tool of Indochinese refugee service needs (Brown, 1981b) which is based on the DMM data (see Appendix F). This tool gives service providers a way of organizing the raw data in a form which is concrete and easily delineates complex information.

The Developmental Migration Model framework may also be of use in the evaluation of other migrating families such as Cuban refugees and economic migrants seeking better employment possibilities. Service providers aware of the five migration stages should be better prepared to assess and plan the kinds of service help that migrating families can best utilize, depending upon the stage of the migration process in which they are currently involved. Prevention programs are more possible to plan with a Developmental Migration Model perspective.

The National Profile delineated in the DMM presents important knowledge of refugee concentrations. Going beyond the statistics presented and looking geographically at the 20 states of highest refugee concentration reveals five main patterns of state groupings (see Figure 9).

The three west coast states, California, Oregon, and Washington, have more than 50% of all the Indochinese refugees in the United States. The three gulf coast states have the next highest concentration with 13%. Six northern midwestern states contain 12% of the Indochinese in the United States followed by four east central coastal states with 7.7%. The last area of significant regional concentration are the four west central states of Utah, Colorado, Kansas, and Oklahoma containing 5.8% of the Indochinese. Together, these 20 states have 90% of all Indo-

Figure 9. Regional Concentrations of Indochinese Refugees
Chinese refugees. National planners with this understanding should plan regional offices in these five areas to serve the special regional needs of Indochinese refugees.

The DMM is also an educational tool for service providers to appreciate the complexity of their Indochinese clients. It is important that the cultural, as well as personal, uniqueness of Indochinese families be recognized. The DMM established in this research brings into focus the diverse cultural and national backgrounds of the refugees. In addition, it highlights the difference between the initial wave of refugees and later wave of "Boat People." These people do not all have the same needs or style of life. It is essential for service providers working with Indochinese families to understand and be sensitive to the uniqueness of this complex group of people. More information is needed about the "Boat People" to compile a more accurate profile of these Indochinese refugees coming since 1978.

The next section of this paper looks at the Oklahoma profile conclusions and implications.

Oklahoma Profile

The purpose of the Oklahoma Profile Study was to provide a current profile of the two major urban groups of Oklahoma Indochinese. One conclusion drawn from the findings is that the residents of each city are quite different in several important ways. The Tulsa group has better English language proficiency, is more highly educated, and appears to be further into the Settling In migration stage than the Oklahoma City Indochinese study group.

Due to the uniqueness of these two different refugee populations,
service providers must address different problems in each community. English language classes for Indochinese families are a more pressing need in Oklahoma City than in Tulsa. The profile findings also bring to focus the disparity of economic and transportation resources available to the two groups. The Oklahoma City group has less knowledge of how to obtain medical services than the Tulsa group. These findings suggest that Oklahoma City service providers are addressing the more concrete daily survival needs characteristic of the Initial Entry stage of migration whereas the Tulsa group is more concerned with psychological adjustment needs.

The profile findings alert service providers to the greater physical and mental health concerns of the Tulsa population than their Oklahoma City counterparts. Another conclusion drawn from the Oklahoma profile study is that Indochinese families in both cities place great importance on education for themselves and their children (see Table XIV in Chapter V). This finding suggests that one area in which help may be welcomed, accepted and utilized is the academic setting. Services based on an educational approach and provided in a nonthreatening setting may be better utilized than those services offered in traditional social service agency settings. Examples of this are parenting classes, American culture classes, and English language classes that address practical subjects at the same time. Haught (1979) speaks of the increasing number of Indochinese utilizing the nation's community colleges for English classes, vocational courses, and professional and academic study. She believes that this inexpensive academic opportunity offers important adjustment help. The Oklahoma profile supports Haught's findings with 25% of the Tulsa sample and 12% of the Oklahoma City group currently
being college students.

An implication from this research for Oklahoma service providers is the utilization of neighborhood schools as special service settings for Indochinese families. Services offered at schools can be provided without the stigma attached to social service agencies. Their location may be more accessible to Indochinese families as well. Tulsa, without a VAA equivalent, may be a good location to test this idea. School settings might be operative in increasing more social interaction between the majority culture Americans and Indochinese families. The adjustment process is always two dimensional. Indochinese families are being impacted by, and at the same time, are impacting upon American culture. Facilitating greater exposure for majority Americans to know and interact with Indochinese Americans ought to facilitate this adjustment process.

The profile study supports the conclusion that refugee families place great importance on their extended family ties. Although it appears from the 1979 profile study that Tulsa Vietnamese are more worried about their extended family in Vietnam than Oklahoma City Vietnamese, a 1980 VAA study in Oklahoma City shows that 80% of those interviewed were significantly concerned for their relatives left behind in Vietnam compared to 16% in the 1979 Oklahoma City sample (Vietnamese American Association, 1980). This may be an indication that the Oklahoma City Vietnamese are shifting from the Initial Entry stage to the Settling In stage of the migration process. Family worries contribute to feelings of depression. Service providers in both cities must help address family reconciliation needs and mental health needs of Indochinese families.
The purpose of this research was to examine two types of ethnicity (language and community ties) and their relationship to service use among the Vietnamese in Tulsa. One conclusion from this research is that language proficiency is not a critical component in social service use. However, the study findings do indicate that English language proficiency is perceived as a problem for 27% of the Tulsa sample group. English language proficiency is an important factor in the adjustment process for Indochinese.

The second conclusion from this research is that ethnic ties play a role in service utilization of Vietnamese. Ethnic ties may even make up for language barriers. Indochinese lacking ELP but tied to the ethnic community receive help in getting needed services from their ethnic cohorts with greater ELP. In this sense, ethnic ties serve in the mediation of external social services.

From the findings, it is clear that Tulsa Vietnamese are inclined to seek help from within their ethnic community. These helping networks should be supported and strengthened whenever possible. If government funded services for ethnic minority families do not meet the needs they are intended to fulfill, new options clearly must be explored. The ethnic factors discussed in this study should be considered in the formulation of service programs. New definitions and strategies for providing services in ethnically sensitive ways also need to be considered. Currently, overhead and administration costs represent a high proportion of the monies earmarked for aid to Indochinese. The results of this study appear to support the movement of channeling more service funds for Indochinese families through ethnic service agencies. Where that is
impossible, training ethnic paraprofessionals to aid existing service agencies in helping ethnic communities may be necessary. Ethnicity as a factor in service delivery cannot be ignored.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations for further research, policy, and services are made based upon the findings of this research.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

There is a need to:

1. replicate the DMM framework for other migrating groups such as the Cuban and Haitian refugee groups and economic migrant populations such as the Mexicans.

2. compile a more complete profile of the later wave of Indochinese refugees known as the "Boat People" to aid policy makers and service providers in serving this unique population.

3. conduct a content analysis of programs serving ethnic populations to identify those factors which are related to service utilization.

4. replicate the service utilization study with other Indochinese refugee populations to determine if findings regarding the relationship of ELP and ethnic ties to service utilization are consistent with findings in other states.

5. further test the profile and service utilization instruments for validity by doing another study in Tulsa and Oklahoma City.

6. study service provision strategies and evaluation of these strategies for ethnic populations to determine their usefulness.

**Recommendations for Policy Makers and Service Providers**

1. Policy makers and service providers need to be more sensi-
tive to the unique needs of ethnic populations in their policy decisions and service implementation.

2. Service agencies providing help to ethnic populations should attempt to hire more ethnic professionals and paraprofessionals.

3. Policy makers and service providers should be encouraged to utilize the current literature sources of program development, evaluation, and service strategies concerning the ethnic populations they serve.
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French Conflict

The history of the war in Indochina helps to explain the huge migration of Vietnamese, Kampucheans, and Laotians to the United States and other nations. The roots of this war started as World War II was ending. With the Japanese power crumbling, Vietnamese Nationalists called the Vietminh (a coalition of Communist and nationalist forces) rushed to win power before French colonial rule could be reimposed. In March, 1944, the Vietminh under Ho Chi Minh's leadership organized the Democratic Republic of Vietnam committed to the destruction of Japanese military occupation and French colonialism. This new government gained power in Hanoi, Saigon, and the imperial city of Hue, making the Democratic Republic of Vietnam a reality (Gleb & Betts, 1979).

Following the end of WWII, the French returned to their colonial interest in Vietnam. They seized Saigon in September, 1945, and disbanded the factionalized Vietnamese coalition government. In March, 1946, the French made an agreement with the Vietminh which recognized the creation of the Vietminh state in the north as an autonomous member of the Indochinese Federation and the French union (Williams, 1976). In November, 1946, however, the French moved north to crush the Vietminh forces which made attempts at a settlement futile. On December 20, 1946, the first Indochina war officially began.

At the start of the war, the French brought back the former Vietnamese Emperor Bao Dai from retirement in Hong Kong to head a rival
regime against Ho Chi Minh, the Vietminh leader (Gleb & Betts, 1979). The course of the war took the pattern of the cities being in control of the French and the villages and rural areas being controlled by the Vietminh. French convoys moving along the roads linking cities were regularly ambushed by the Vietminh. The modern military power of the French forces turned out to be of little avail in the guerrilla war fought by small units of the Vietminh (Gleb & Betts, 1979).

The Khmers of Kampuchea, inspired by the Vietminh success in Vietnam, organized their own resistance against the French in 1946. The Pathet Lao (The Lao National Movement), also organized a French resistance which increased France's military involvement in Indochina. In the summer of 1953, France granted Laos and Kampuchea their independence to concentrate all their military resources in Vietnam. In March, 1954, the French and Vietminh came to a fixed point of conflict at Dienbienphu near the Laotian border. To engage in this decisive battle, both sides had to overcome formidable supply problems. The Vietminh military moved food, ammunition and disassembled heavy weapons and equipment to the war zone with the help of bicycles and peasant farmers. The French, by contrast, were dependent upon air delivered supplies. Therefore, the Vietminh tunneled close to the French lines bringing guns and anti-aircraft weapons to attack the airfield. Dienbienphu was captured on May 7, 1954 by the Vietminh. The political impact of this defeat brought about the withdrawal of France from Vietnam (Williams, 1976; Devillers & Lacouture, 1969; Millett, 1978).

A ceasefire agreement, finalized in Geneva in July, 1954, divided Vietnam at the 17th parallel. Vietminh troops were to move north and the French and South Vietnam troops were to move south. For 300 days,
a cease-fire was maintained to allow some 900,000 people to leave North Vietnam and become refugees in the south (Devillers & Lacouture, 1969). Many of the early Vietnamese refugees coming to the United States had been refugees from North Vietnam to South Vietnam in 1954.

United States Involvement in Indochina

In January, 1950, prior to France's withdrawal from Indochina, Communist China and the Soviet Union granted diplomatic recognition to the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam. This prompted the U.S. to recognize South Vietnam, the Kingdom of Cambodia (Kampuchea) and the Kingdom of Laos as independent states within the French Union. In May, 1950, a full scale U.S. aid program was announced for France's involvement in Indochina (Gleb & Betts, 1979). Along with the Korean Conflict, which also started in 1950, Vietnam was regarded as the second front of a larger struggle to check Communist expansion. The stand of the French against the Vietminh was seen as supportive of American resistance in Korea. Washington began aiding the French effort with military equipment, supplies and advisers. At the time of France's withdrawal from Vietnam, U.S. aid covered 80% of the costs of the Indochina War (Gleb & Betts, 1979). When Dienbienphu fell in 1954, the U.S. supported Ngo Din Diem as the new Premier for the South Vietnam Government, then headed by Bao Dui, working in association with the French. Diem, a well educated Roman Catholic patriot, assumed the presidency of South Vietnam in 1955. He crushed all resistance to his rule and ignored the planned 1956 plebiscite required by the Geneva accords of 1954. He feared a nationwide vote would favor Ho Chi Minh. His Vietnamese support was derived mainly from the Catholics and urban middle class, many of whom
were refugees from the north.

In 1957, the second Indochinese war began when the North Vietnamese Communists started a campaign to defeat Diem's power in the South by terrorizing and assassinating pro-Diem officials. The Viet Cong (South Vietnamese Communists) joined by the North Vietnamese army utilized the strategies that defeated the French. They confined their attention to the villages and countryside leaving Diem's forces to control the urban centers and the main roads (Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, 1970).

To help him with the Communist threat, Diem looked for help and guidance within his family. The Ngo family regime became very unpopular with many South Vietnamese. In December, 1960, South Vietnamese resistance fighters announced the creation of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam (NLF). The NLF, sanctioned by the Hanoi government, was dedicated to the overthrow of the South Vietnamese Government (Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, 1970).

U.S. military personnel gradually became involved in Vietnam. At first, they were known as military advisers and as early as July, 1959, two U.S. military advisers had been killed in action. In May, 1960, the U.S. announced an increase in military advisers to 685. By December of 1961, over 3,200 U.S. military personnel were in South Vietnam and they ceased to be called advisers. U.S. forces increased weekly, and by December, 1962, the U.S. forces totaled 11,300 (Millett, 1978).

The Ngo Regime started persecuting the Buddhist majority in 1963 which caused the Buddhists to openly defy the Ngo government. A Buddhist monk in Saigon protested the South Vietnam regime by drenching his robes in gasoline and setting himself aflame. A news photo showing
him with his hands in an attitude of prayer as he died shocked the world and weakened the Ngo family influence in Washington. President Kennedy ordered a reduction of the financial aid that kept the Ngo regime in power (Williams, 1976). This rebuke encouraged Saigon's senior military officers to overthrow the Ngo family regime via a November, 1963 military coup.

Following the Ngo family, a series of coups and counter coups brought 11 governments to power in two years. In 1965, the government headed by Nguyen Cao Ky and Nguyen Van Thieu came to power which put a stop to government instability (Lippman, 1978). The U.S. government was hopeful that this stable government would achieve greater success against the Communists.

By 1967, over one half million American troops were in Vietnam. These troops, together with the South Vietnamese army, and troops from neighboring countries, totaled 1,300,000. Through the military intervention in Vietnam, both North and South Vietnam suffered heavier aerial bombardment than had been inflicted on the Axis powers throughout all of World War II and still there was no indication of peace. In 1970, the Nixon administration tried a new offensive by agreeing to the invasion of Kampuchea. The rationale for the attack was to prevent Communist North Vietnam forces from using Kampuchea as a staging ground. The Kampuchean leader, Shinouk, was toppled and, in March, 1970, General Lon Nol seized power. He aided the American and South Vietnam forces in their attempt to clear eastern Kampuchea of Communists. This resulted in the South Vietnamese soldiers going on a looting rampage in the homelands of their ancient enemies the Khmers. Vietnamese Communist forces were promptly dispatched from Hanoi to aid the Kampuchea Communist forces
(called the Khamer Rouge). This help enabled the Khamer Rouge to triumph against the Lon Nol forces in 1975. The new Communist government of Kampuchea then launched a policy of forcing the evacuation of the cities and resettlement of the people to labor as peasants. The results of these policies led to thousands of political and economic refugees leaving Kampuchea (Williams, 1976).

As American disillusionment with the Indochinese war increased, the strategy of Vietnamization was initiated. This strategy was to phase out American forces slowly enough not to jeopardize the battlefield situation, but fast enough to assuage American political opinion (Gleb & Betts, 1979; Nelson, 1982). Supplies continued to be sent to Saigon to help Vietnamese forces. U.S. Air Force personnel based in Thailand flew combat missions against North Vietnam. In January, 1973, peace talks produced a cease-fire agreement, but it was not effective. Finally, in 1975, the 2nd Indochinese war came to a close. The Communist North Vietnamese forces with their Southern allies, the National Liberation Forces, were victorious. When Saigon, the last city to be surrendered, was evacuated by the American Embassy in April, 1975, over 130,000 South Vietnamese became refugees abroad.

Laos, due to its strategic position, was important to both North and South Vietnamese forces during the war. The North Vietnamese controlled the Pathet Lao (Laotian Communists) and the United States controlled the Laotian Government with the help of CIA trained troops and bombing planes (Nelson, 1982). Finally, after 25 years of national division and conflict, the Pathet Lao gained control of the government in December, 1975, and established the People's Democratic Republic (Zasloff & Brown, 1978). In the wake of this Communist victory, more
than 100,000 people fled Lao as political refugees.

The end of the war in Indochina started the large migration of people from Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos to the United States. In the next section, United States reaction to the war will be addressed.

United States Reaction to the War

Throughout the war in Indochina, there were two battlefronts: militarily, in Indochina, and politically, in the United States. The U.S. struggle was a clash between the political imperative not to loose a country to Communism versus the social and moral counterdesire not to get embroiled in an endless Asian land war. Popular support for the war in Indochina varied due to public reactions to the news coverage of the war and the bombing practices. The war was most highly supported by public opinion in 1965. This support slowly decreased until mid 1967 when opposition to the war outweighed support. Finally, in 1971, more than 60% of the U.S. population were against the war and less than 30% of the population were in favor of the war effort (Muller, 1973).

This was the first war in history to be graphically chronicalled for Americans through the medium of television. Daily news coverage displayed the evidence of the destruction and atrocities of war. Civil protests in the form of demonstrations, songs, literature, drama, draft card burnings, and draft evasions were used as weapons against the war on the home front. Many Americans refused to fight; some spent time in prison, others fled the country. In the political realm, President Johnson resigned from the 1967-68 presidential race partially due to the unpopularity of his Indochina War Policies (Lippman, 1978). President Nixon was elected in 1968 on a promise to end the American involvement
and to bring "peace with honor" to Indochina (Lippman, 1978). The political climate of the U.S. at the end of the Indochinese War was one of economic insecurity and distrust of government. Following the resignation of President Nixon over Watergate, President Ford was left with the task of guiding the country through the return of the war veterans, draft resisters, and the new influx of Indochinese refugees.
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PL 94-23

In 1975, the first legislation PL 94-23 was passed. Known as the Indochinese Migration and Refugee Assistance Act, this law authorized emergency assistance for the transportation, maintenance, and resettlement of Indochinese refugees. It also permitted assistance to state and local public agencies to provide services for refugees. Vocational training was authorized to facilitate the assimilation of refugees into American society (U.S. Senate, 1975). The principle responsibility for resettlement was given to nine voluntary agencies.

PL 94-24

Legislation PL 94-24, also passed in 1975, made the initial appropriations for carrying out the projects outlined in PL 94-23. Approximately 300 million dollars was made available for social rehabilitation services through public agencies to assist the refugees' assimilation into American life. PL 94-24 mandated that these social service programs were to be limited to those refugees considered at high risk of becoming dependent on public assistance unless they received help with pressing problems. The major purpose of this assistance was to help vulnerable individuals and families achieve and maintain self-support.
The 1976 "Indochina Refugee Children Assistance Act", PL 94-405, provided Federal assistance to states in order to assist local education agencies to provide special English language instruction and bilingual education for refugee children and emergency adult education programs for adult Indochinese refugees. Guidance and counseling for educational, career, and employment opportunities in conjunction with special projects were designed to develop occupational and related skills. Many of these programs were authorized under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA) and the Vocational Education Act of 1963.


In 1977, PL 95-145, "Indochinese Refugees - Records - Assistance," was passed. It outlined the process of enabling refugees to become U.S. permanent residents. This act further extended the period during which refugee assistance could be provided. The funds appropriated in this act reimbursed state and local public agencies for non-federal share of costs under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and medicaid and medicare programs.
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VIETNAMESE FAMILIES IN OKLAHOMA

COURSE OUTLINE
WORKSHOP: VIETNAMESE FAMILIES IN OKLAHOMA

FRC 3810 or 5810 (1 - 2 Credits)
Approved for "Humanities Credit" for students
in College of Business and College of Engineering

Open to all OSU students--there are no prerequisites. Vietnamese undergraduates and graduate students particularly encouraged. Graduates will have a supervisory role.

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

The course will consider social, emotional, historical, psychological, religious, and cultural problems faced by Vietnamese families in Oklahoma. Specific curricula will be developed for individual student interests. Guest lecturers will be encouraged.

EVALUATION:

Evaluation will be based on individual projects and field experience, there will be no exams. Students will be responsible for class presentations.

INDEPENDENT STUDIES:

Each student will choose a topic of interest to research and write up and present to the class. Possible suggestions for these areas are:

1. family structure and marriage patterns
2. cultural values
3. ceremonial practices around birth, marriage, death, etc.
4. religious background and current religious practices
5. identity crisis in the U.S.

FIELD EXPERIENCES:

I. Field experiences related to independent items 1 through 5 will be decided by interested students and course instructor.

II. All students will be asked to participate in creating a questionnaire to:

A. Assess the needs for Oklahoma Vietnamese Families in the areas of:
   1. family and educational services
   2. physical and mental health services
   3. employment and job training

III. All students will be trained in the administration of these questionnaires in their local communities.

REGISTRATION:

CID 37544  FRC 3810 is Section 3  Credit 1-2  Friday 12:30-1:20 HEW 330
or (undergraduate credit)
CID 31548 FRCD 5810 is Section 1 Credit 1-2 Friday 12:30-1:20 HEW 330
(graduate credit - permission of instructor required)

This course has been approved for "Humanities Credit" for students in College of Business and College of Engineering. Verification can be made in appropriate Dean's Office.

For further information, please contact:
Sara Brown or Godfrey Ellis
at 333 HEW or x5061
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LETTER TO VIETNAMESE FAMILIES IN TULSA
Dear Vietnamese family,

The Department of Family Relations in the faculty of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University and the American Vietnamese Association in Oklahoma City are working together to learn of the special needs Vietnamese families have in Oklahoma. We are concerned with knowing the special needs your family face in order to better plan family services for the Vietnamese Community.

In the next few weeks you will be receiving a call from a Vietnamese student asking you to participate in an interview. Your opinions will be most helpful. We believe that Oklahoma's Vietnamese families should have an opportunity to share their opinions which will enable your special needs to be better known.

We look forward to talking to you. Once all the opinions of the Tulsa Vietnamese families are known, a report will be written to help Oklahoma service providers better understand Vietnamese families.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Dr. Godfrey Ellis
Associate Professor
Department of Family Relations
and Child Development
Faculty Associate
Family Study Center

Sara N. Brown
Research Coordinator

Kính Thưa Quý Vị,

Phân Khoa Kinh Tế Giả Định thuộc Viễn Đài Học Oklahoma State (OSU) và Hội Việt Mỹ tại Oklahoma City đang phối hợp trong việc tìm hiểu những nhu cầu đặc biệt của các gia đình Việt Nam tại Oklahoma City. Chúng tôi rất quan tâm đến vấn đề tìm hiểu những nhu cầu đặc biệt của quý vị, ngài hầu có thể soạn thảo những chương trình tốt đẹp hơn, nhằm mục đích giúp đỡ Cộng Đồng Người Việt.

Trong vài tuần tới, một sinh viên Việt Nam sẽ đi thăm, đón quý vị để xin được phỏng vấn. Y kiến của quý vị sẽ rất hữu ích. Chúng tôi tin tưởng rằng sự chung thştuán của quý vị là một động gổ lớn lao và hữu hiệu trong việc cài tiến đối song của Cộng Đồng Người Việt.

Sau khi thu thập ý kiến của quý vị, chúng tôi sẽ dự kế một bản tường trình gửi đến những cơ quan đảm trách việc giúp đỡ người Việt Nam. Với bản tường trình này, chúng tôi hy vọng những cơ quan trên sẽ thông hiểu những nhu cầu của quý vị hơn để giúp đỡ quý vị một cách thiết thực.

Chúng tôi thành thật đa tạ sự hợp tác của quý vị.

Trân trọng, Kính Chào.

Điện Thoại: (405) 624-5057

Oklahoma State University
DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY RELATIONS
AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074
241 HOME ECONOMICS WEST

159
APPENDIX E

PROFILE AND SERVICE UTILIZATION QUESTIONNAIRE
1. **SEX (PHÁI)**
   A. Male (Nam) ( )
   B. Female (Nữ) ( )

2. **AGE (TUỔI)**
   A. From 19 to 25 (Từ 19 đến 25) ( )
   B. From 26 to 30 (Từ 26 đến 30) ( )
   C. From 31 to 40 (Từ 31 đến 40) ( )
   D. From 41 to 50 (Từ 41 đến 50) ( )
   E. From 51 to 60 (Từ 51 đến 60) ( )
   F. Over 60 (Trên 60) ( )

3. **EDUCATION (GIÁO DỤC)**
   A. Elementary (Grade 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th)
      Tiều Học (Lớp 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) ( )
   B. Junior and Senior High (Grade 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th)
      Trung Học Đệ Nhất Cấp và Đệ Nhị Cấp (Lớp 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12) ( )
   C. College (Year 1, 2, 3, 4)
      Đại Học (Năm Thứ 1, 2, 3, 4) ( )
   D. Higher Education (Year 1, 2, 3, 4)
      Giáo Dục Cao Đẳng (Năm Thứ 1, 2, 3, 4) ( )
   E. Other (Nghỉ học khác) ( )

4. **RELIGION (TÔN GIÁO)**
   A. Ancestor worship (Thỗ Ông, Bà) ( )
   B. Buddhism (Phật Giáo) ( )
   C. Catholicism (Công Giáo) ( )
   D. Protestantism (Tin Lành) ( )
   E. Others (Nghỉ học khác) ( )

5. **FAMILY SITUATION (TÌNH TRẠNG GIA ĐÌNH)**
   A. Single (Độc thân) ( )
   B. Married with children (Có gia đình và con) ( )
   C. Married without children (Có gia đình, không con) ( )
   D. Widowed (Góa phụ) ( )
   E. Divorced (Ly dị hoặc là không sống chung) ( )
   F. Others (Tình trạng khác) ( )

6. **WHO ARE LIVING WITH YOU (ÔNG (BÀ) DANG SÔNG VỚI AI?)**
   A. You live by yourself (Single, divorced, widowed)
      Sống một mình (độc thân, ly dị, goa phụ) ( )
   B. Spouse (Vô) ( )
C. Spouse and Children (Vợ và Con) ( )
D. Spouse, children and parents (Vợ, con và Cha Mẹ) ( )
E. Spouse, children, parents, brothers, sisters (Vợ, con, Cha Mẹ và Anh Chị Em) ( )
F. Others (Những người khác) ( )

7. WHAT WAS YOUR PROFESSION? (Before you came to the USA)
ONG (BẠ) LÀM NGHỀ GÌ? (Trước Khi đến Hoa- Kỳ)
A. M.D., Engineer, Professor, Other Intellectual profession Cao Học, Kỹ Sư, Giáo Sư, Những nghề trí dực khác
B. Officer (Major to General) High ranking officials (Director to Secretary of State) Tướng Lãnh Cao Cấp ( )
C. Business, Industrial, Contractor (Bộn Bản, Kỹ Nghề, Thầu Khoản) ( )
D. Officer (Sergent to Captain) Officials (Chief of Section to Chief of Service) Teacher (Sĩ Quan (Trung Sĩ đến Đại Uy) (Quan Trưởng) Thầy Giao ( )
E. College Student, Elementary Student (Sinh Viên Đại Học, Học Sinh) ( )
F. Soldier, Officials (Binh Sĩ) ( )
G. Small business, worker, laborer (Tiểu Thương, Thợ) ( )
H. Others (Những nghề khác) ( )

8. WHAT'S YOUR PROFESSION NOW? (HIỆN THỜI ONG (BẠ) LÀM NGHỀ GÌ?)
A. M.D., Engineer, Professor (Cao Học, Kỹ Sư, Giáo Sư) ( )
B. Skill worker, Laborer, Small business (Thợ chuyên môn, Lao động, Buôn bán nhỏ hoặc Thương gia nhỏ) ( ),
C. Unskilled worker (Không có nghề chuyên môn) ( )
D. College student, Student (Sinh Viên Đại Học, Học Sinh) ( )
E. Others (Những nghề khác) ( )

9. ARE YOU PLEASED WITH YOUR PRESENT JOB? (ONG, BẠ Có HẢI LONG VIỆC LÀM HIỆN TẠI KHÔNG?)
A. Very Pleased (Rất hài lòng) ( )
B. Pleased with the job but not with salary (Thich việc làm nhưng không đồng lòng tiền lương) ( )
C. Pleased with the salary but not with the job (Bảng lòng tiền lương nhưng không thích công việc nhà) ( )
D. Pleased with the job and the salary but not with the staff (Thích công việc và tiền lương nhưng không thích ban điều hành) ( )
E. Not very pleased (but it's all right) Không thích làm (nhưng tất được) ( )
F. Others (Vẫn đề khác) ( )

10. ARE YOU PLANNING TO CHANGE THE JOB? ONG BẠ CÓ ĐỨNG ĐỊNH THAY ĐỔI VIỆC LÀM KHÔNG?
A. Yes, I am looking for a new job (Vâng, đang tìm việc mới) ( )
B. Yes, If I can find a better job (Vâng, nếu kiếm được việc tốt hơn) ( )
C. No (Không) ( )
D. I want to quit to go back to school, to rest, or because of family situation (Muốn nghỉ việc để đi học, để dưỡng sức, hay vì lý do gia đình) ( )
11. INCOME (Per Month) LƯƠNG THANG?
A. Under $400 (Dưới 400$) ( )
B. From $400 to $600 (Từ 400$ đến 600$) ( )
C. From $600 to $800 (Từ 600$ đến 800$) ( )
D. From $800 to $1000 (Từ 800$ đến 1000$) ( )
E. Over $1000 (Trên 1000$) ( )

12. DO YOU HAVE ANY PROFESSIONAL SKILLS THAT YOU CONSIDER THE MOST IMPORTANT?
NGHỆ CHUYÊN MỌN NÀO QUAN TRỌNG NHẤT?
A. Medical skills (Y Khoa) ( )
B. Building skills (Xây cất) ( )
C. Skills in electricity (Diên tử) ( )
D. Skills in electronics (Diễn tử) ( )
E. Administrative and fiduciary skills (Quản trị) ( )
F. Educational skills (Giáo Dục) ( )
G. Art skills (Nghệ thuật) ( )
H. Mechanical skills (Mây móc) ( )
I. Tailoring skills (May) ( )
J. Others (Những nghề khác) ( )

13. HOW MANY PEOPLE IN YOUR FAMILY ARE HOLDING A JOB?
BAO NHIEU NGUOI TRONG GIA DINH DANG CO VIỆC?
A. Myself (Tôi) ( )
B. Myself and my spouse (Tôi và người hôn phối) ( )
C. Myself and my spouse and my parents (Tôi, người hôn phối và cha Mẹ) ( )
D. Myself and my spouse, my parents or one of my parents and 1 to 3 of my children
(Tôi, người hôn phối, cha mẹ, hoặc cha hay mẹ và 1 đến 3 đứa con) ( )
E. Myself, my spouse, my parents or one of my parents and 4 to 6 of my children
(Tôi, người hôn phối, cha mẹ, hoặc cha hay mẹ và 4 đến 6 đứa con) ( )
F. Nobody (Không có ai) ( )
G. Others (Trường hợp khác) ( )

14. ARE YOU RECEIVING ANY SOCIAL AIDS?
ONG BẠ CÓ NHAN TRÒ CẤP CỦA XÃ HỘI KHÔNG?
A. Social security (unemployment) Trợ cấp thất nghiệp ( )
B. Cash money (Tien mat) ( )
C. Medicaid and Medicare (Trợ cấp Y-Tế) ( )
D. Food Stamps (Thẻ mua, thức phẩm) ( )
E. None (Không có trợ cấp) ( )
F. Others (Trường hợp khác) ( )

15. ARE YOU RECEIVING ANY OTHER TYPE OF AID?
ONG BẠ CÓ NHAN TRÒ CẤP NAO KHÁC?
A. Scholarship (Hoc bổng) ( )
B. Renting assistance (Trợ giúp tiền mượn nhà) ( )
C. Aid from individual or association (Trợ cấp từ cá nhân hoặc hội) ( )
D. Others (Tại trợ khác) ( )
16. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR PRESENT PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE?
ONG BA CAM THAY CÔNG VIỆC HIỆN TẠI RA SAO?
A. I can work about as well as before (Lâm việc tốt như thường lệ) ( )
B. It takes an extra effort to get started at doing something.
C. I have to push myself very hard to do anything.
D. I can't do any work at all (Không thể làm bất cứ việc gì cả) ( )

17. DO YOU FEEL USUALLY TIRED? (ONG BA THƯỜNG CÂM THAY MỆT KHÔNG?)
A. Not more than before (Không mệt như trước) ( )
B. Getting tired more easily than before (Để mệt hơn trước) ( )
C. Getting tired doing almost anything (Để mệt bất cứ làm chuyên gì) ( )
D. Others (Chuyên khác) ( )

18. DO YOU SLEEP WELL? (ONG BA CÓ NGỦ NGON KHÔNG?)
A. As well as usual (Ngủ ngon như thường) ( )
B. I don't sleep as well as I used to (Không ngủ ngon như trước) ( )
C. I wake up 1-2 hours earlier than usual and find it hard to get back to sleep.
D. I wake up several hours earlier than I used to and cannot get back to sleep.

19. DO YOU HAVE A GOOD APPETITE? (ONG BA CÂM THAY ĂN CÓ NGON KHÔNG?)
A. Not worse than before (Không tồi hơn trước) ( )
B. Not as good as usual (Không, ngon, như thường lệ) ( )
C. Much worse now (Tệ hơn trước) ( )
D. Others (Trưởng hợp khác) ( )

23. ARE YOU WORRYING ABOUT YOUR HEALTH? (ONG BA CÔ LUУ Y ĐEN SỨC KHỞI KHONG?)
A. I am no more worried about my health than usual
B. I am worried about physical problems such as aches and pains or upset stomach, or constipation.
C. I am very worried about physical problems, and it's hard to think of much else.
* Câu hỏi từ 24 đến 25, chúng tôi không để cập ở đây.

26. DO YOU FEEL WELL? (ÔNG BÀ CẢM THẤY KHÔNG KHÔNG?)
   A. Well physically and mentally (Sức khỏe và tâm trí vẫn bình thường) ( )
   B. Well physically, not mentally (depressed)
      Khỏe nhưng tâm trí bất an ( )
   C. Well mentally not physically
      Tâm trí bình thường nhưng không khỏe ( )
   D. Not at all (mentally and physically)
      Sức khỏe và tâm trí đều sa sút ( )
   E. No, ill mentally and physically
      Không bình hoan tâm trí lẫn tinh thần ( )

27. DO YOU HAVE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING?
   (ÔNG BÀ CÓ BI NHỮNG CHỨNG BỆNH SAU DÁY KHÔNG?)
   A. Chronic headache, dizziness, loss of sleep
      Đau đầu, chóng mặt, mất ngủ ( )
   B. Heart disease (Dau tim) ( )
   C. Tuberculosis (Ho Lao) ( )
   D. Stomachache (Dau bao tiêu) ( ),
   E. Chronic rheumatism (Phong thấp) ( ),
   F. Mental illness (Tinh thần suy nhược) ( ),
   G. None (Không bị những chứng bệnh nào cả) ( )
   H. Others (Bệnh khác) ( )

28. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT YOUR ILLNESS COULD BE TREATED?
   (ÔNG BÀ CÓ TIN RẰNG CHỨNG BỆNH CỦA ÔNG BÀ SẼ DƯỚC CHỮA TRỊ KHÔNG?)
   A. Yes (Tôi tin điều đó) ( )
   B. No, not sure (không chắc) ( )
   C. No, not at all (Hoàn toàn không chữa được) ( )
   D. No, not entirely (Chỉ chưa được một phần nào thôi) ( )
   E. I don’t know (Không biết) ( )
   F. Others (cảm nghĩ khác) ( )

29. DO YOU FEEL LIKE GETTING ANGRY EASILY?
   (ÔNG BÀ CÓ BỊ CẢM XÚC MÔT CÁCH ĐẾ DÀNG KHÔNG?)
   A. Yes, with total loss of self control
      Vâng, hoàn toàn không tự kiểm soát được ( )
   B. No, not easily (Không dễ dàng) ( )
   C. No, I don’t get angry at all (Chăng giận ai cả) ( )
   D. No answer (Không biết) ( )

30. DO YOU FEEL DEPRESSED VERY OFTEN?
   (ÔNG BÀ CÓ THƯƠNG HAY CHÂN NÂM KHÔNG?)
   A. Yes, always (Vâng, luôn luôn) ( )
   B. Sometimes (thỉnh thoảng) ( )
   C. Never (Khổng bao giờ) ( )
   D. No answer (Không biết) ( )

31. WHAT DO YOU DO TO DIMINISH YOUR SORROW? (To be asked when depressing
   TRỌNG LỰC CHÂN NÂM ÔNG, BÀ THƯƠNG LÂM GI? sorrow is present)
   A. Alcohol/Drugs/Cigarettes
      Uống rượu, hút thuốc ( )
   B. Hobbies (Reading, Movies, Traveling) -Đọc sách, xem Ciné, Du lịch ( )
   C. Gambling (Danh bạc) ( )
D. Looking for companionship (Tim bạn) ( )
E. Enduring it secretly. (Chiu dụng một cách ẩn thầm) ( )
F. Crying (Khóc nức nó) ( )
G. Others (Bằng cách khác) ( )

* Câu hỏi số 32: Chúng tôi không muốn để cấp đến

33. ARE YOU ADAPTED TO THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE?
ONG BA CÓ THÍCH ƯNG VÔI DÔI SÔNG HOA KỲ KHÔNG?
- A. No, it's too mechanized, too hasty (Không, vì quá máy móc) ( )
- B. No, because of the generation gap (Không, bởi vì sự ngăn cách thế hệ) ( )
- C. No, because of the weather (Không, bởi vì thời tiết) ( )
- D. All of the above (Tất cả nguyên do) ( )
- E. Others (Nhung nguyên do khác) ( )

34. DO YOU HAVE ANY CLOSE RELATIVE STILL IN VIET NAM?
ONG BÀ CÔN NGƯỜI THƯỞNG ÔI LẠI VIỆT NAM KHÔNG?
- A. Spouse (Người hồn phối) ( )
- B. Both parents or one of them (Cha, Mẹ hoặc cả hai) ( )
- C. The same as now (Như hiện tại) ( )
- D. Worse than now (Tệ hơn hiện tại) ( )
E. Worried about close relatives still in Vietnam (Lo lắng về người thân ở lại Việt Nam) ( )
F. Worried about spouse still in Vietnam (Lo lắng về người hồn phối ở lại Việt Nam) ( )
G. Other (Khác) ( )

35. SINCE YOU ARE IN THE USA WHAT HAS AFFECTED YOU THE MOST?
Từ khi ở Mỹ bạn cảm thấy ảnh hưởng gì nhiều nhất?
- A. Unemployed (Thất nghiệp) ( )
- B. Not pleased with the job (Không hài lòng với việc làm) ( )
- C. Salary too low (Lương quá thấp) ( )
- D. Sorry over the loss of the property and the way of life in V.N. (Xin lỗi về sự thay đổi trong việc sống ở Việt Nam) ( )
- E. Worried about spouse still in Vietnam (Lo lắng về người hồn phối ở lại Việt Nam) ( )
F. Worried about close relatives still in Vietnam (Lo lắng về người thân ở lại Việt Nam) ( )
G. Being left by your lover, impoliteness of the children, behavioral problem from your spouse (Biếng yêu bởi, sự vô lê của con cái, bất đồng về lối ăn ở của người hồn phối) ( )
- H. Language barrier (Khó khăn về ngôn ngữ) ( )
- I. None (Không có gì cả) ( )
J. Others (Khác) ( )

36. WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT YOUR FUTURE?
ONG BA NGHỊ GI VỀ TƯƠNG LAI?
- A. Great, Nice (Rất khá) ( )
- B. It might be better than the present (Có thể khá hơn hiện tại) ( )
- C. The same as now (Như hiện tại) ( )
- D. Worse than now (Tệ hơn hiện tại) ( )
- E. No comment (Không có ý kiến) ( )
F. I don't know (Không biết) ( )
G. Others (Khác) ( )

37. IS THERE ANY EVENT IN YOUR LIFE THAT YOU CANNOT FORGET?
SỰ KIỆN NÀO ĐÃ XAY RA VA LÀM Ở NGÀY BAO GÌ QUÝN ĐƯỢC?
- A. Spouse, parents, children dead of killed
  Chết chốc của người hồn phối, Cha Mẹ hoặc con cái ( )
B. Being jilted (Bị lừa gạt) ( )
C. Unsuccessful in career, education (Thất bại trong việc làm, học vấn) ( )
D. Being exiled (Bị lưu đày) ( )
E. Accident or serious illness (Tai nạn hay bệnh nặng) ( )
F. Close relatives left behind (Những người thân thuộc còn sót lại) ( )
G. All of the above (Tất cả sự kiện trên) ( )
H. None (Không) ( )
I. Others (Sự kiện khác) ( )

* Câu hỏi từ 38 đến 41 không được cập nhật

42. DO YOU RENT OR OWN THE HOUSE YOUR’RE LIVING IN?
Nhà ông bà hiện cư ông do ông bà làm chủ hay thuê?
A. I own the house (Tôi là sở hữu chủ căn nhà) ( )
B. I rent the house (Tôi thuê nhà ở) ( )
C. The house belongs to our sponsor (Căn nhà này thuộc của người bảo trợ) ( )
D. Others (Trường hợp khác) ( )

43. WHAT KIND OF TRANSPORTATION DO YOU HAVE?
Phương tiện đi chuyển nào ông bà đang dùng?
A. Over 4 cars (Nhà có hơn 4 chiếc xe hơi) ( )
B. From 1 to 3 cars, (Có từ 1 đến 3 xe hơi) ( )
C. No car (Không có xe) ( )
D. Using bus (Xử dụng xe buýt) ( )
E. Car pool (Đi chung xe) ( )
F. Others (Phương tiện khác) ( )

44. WHO SPEAKS FLUENTLY ENGLISH IN YOUR FAMILY, TRONG GIA ĐÌNH .OP, A.I LA NGƯỜI NỘI TIẾNG ANH KHA?
A. Every body (Tất cả mọi người) ( )
B. Only me (Chỉ riêng tôi) ( )
C. Nobody (Không có ai) ( )
D. Others (Một người xét khác) ( )

45. DO YOU LIKE TO BE WITH FRIENDS?
Ông bà có thích sống cùng bạn bè không?
A. No (Không) ( )
B. Yes, but I don’t have any (Có thích, nhưng tôi không có bạn) ( )
C. Yes, usually with Vietnamese friends (Có, thường sống với bạn Việt Nam) ( )
D. Yes, usually with American friends (Có, thường sống với bạn Mỹ) ( )
E. Others (Khác các câu trên) ( )

46. WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT YOUR SPONSOR? (Individual or group)
Ông bà nghĩ thế nào về người bảo trợ (Cả nhân hay hội đoàn)
A. Great help, nice people (Hoa là người rất tốt) ( )
B. Fair (Hoa là người tốt) ( )
C. The sponsor could do better (Hoa có thể làm khác hơn) ( )
D. No help (Hoa không giúp đỡ được gì) ( )
E. No comment (Không ý kiến) ( )
47. DO YOU PLAN TO MOVE TO ANOTHER STATE? If Yes, What is the reason?
ONG BA CÔ ĐỊ TỈNH ĐI CHUYỂN QUA TỈNH BẰNG KHÁC KHÔNG,
Neu có, nguyên do gì?
A. No (Không) ( )
B. Yes, to look for a more compatible job
Cô, để tìm một công việc khá quan hệ thích hợp hơn ( )
C. Yes, because I don’t have any friends here
Cô, bỏ vì tôi không có bạn ở đây ( )
D. Yes, because of the bad weather here
Cô, bỏ vì thời tiết quá xấu ( )
E. Yes, to see a different place (Cô, tìm một địa điểm khác) ( )
F. No comment (Không ý kiến) ( )
G. Others (Trường hợp khác) ( )

48. WHEN DID YOU ARRIVE TO THE U.S.?
ONG BA ĐẾN HỘA KỲ KHI NÀO?
A. Before May 75. (Trước Tháng 5 Năm 75) ( )
B. From 5/75 to 5/76 (Khoảng thời gian 5/75 đến 5/76) ( )
C. From 5/76 to 5/77 (Khoảng thời gian từ 5/76 đến 5/77) ( )
D. After 5/77 (Sau tháng 5 Năm 77) ( )

49. HOW DID YOU GET TO THE U.S.?
ONG BA ĐẾN HỘA KỲ BẰNG PHƯƠNG TIỆN GÌ?
A. By plane (Bằng máy bay) ( )
B. By ship (Bằng tàu) ( )
C. By boat (Bằng ghe, thuyền) ( )
D. Others (Bằng phương tiện khác) ( )

50. WHY ARE YOU ANXIOUS ABOUT YOUR CHILDREN’S EDUCATION?
TẠI SAO ONG BA LO LÀNG VE HỌC VĂN CỦA CON CAI?
A. Not enough time to check (control) their studies
Không đủ thời gian để kiểm soát sự học của chúng ( )
B. Not qualified to teach (to tutor) them
Không đủ khả năng để dạy (hay kèm) chúng ( )
C. Because of some shows on T.V. might affect on their education
Tại vì một vài chương trình trên VTV Truyền Hình ảnh hưởng đến học hành của chúng ( )
D. Narcotics addict [Hút sach (nghiện thuốc)] ( )
E. Others (Khác) ( )

51. ARE YOU ANXIOUS ABOUT TRYING TO RECOVER YOUR STANDING YOU ONCE HAD IN VIET NAM?
ONG BA CÔ LO NGHỊ HỘI PHỤC CHỨC VI CỬ KHÔNG?
A. Yes, so much I can’t eat or sleep
Cô, rất nhiều nên không ăn hay ngủ được ( )
B. Yes, quite a bit (Cô, ít thôi) ( )
C. Yes, (Some) or a little bit (Cô, hơi một chút) ( )
D. No (Không) ( )

52. REGARDING YOUR JOB, WHAT ARE YOU CONCERNED ABOUT?
ONG BA LO LÀNG TRONG CÔNG VIỆC KHÔNG?
A. Cannot match strength with the American
Không so sánh được với người Mỹ ( )
B. Do not have a good health (Không có sức khỏe tốt) ( )
C. Do not understand English (Kem Anh Ngữ) ( )
D. The work is too much mechanical—Not enough time to rest
Công việc nặng nhọc—Không đủ thời gian để nghỉ tay ( )
E. Others (Chuyên khác) ( )
53. WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT YOUR FAMILY SITUATION?
ONG BA NGHI GI' VE TINH TRANG GIA DINH?
A. Regret spouse "Americanization" (Võ Chồng "My Hoa") ( )
B. Regret children following "modern trends" too fast, too early
        (Con cai bien, do % qua nhan qua som theo khuynh hướng Âu Mỹ) ( )
C. Others (Nhung tinh trang khác) ( )

54. ARE YOU ANXIOUS ABOUT MARRIAGE?
ANH HOÀNG CHI CÔ LO LÁNG CHUYỂN HÔN NHÂN KHÔNG?
A. Yes, anxious to not find any Vietnamese spouse
        (Co, lo khong tim duoc ngubu hon phoi Viet Nam) ( )
B. Yes, anxious to get married to a foreigner
        (Co, lo lang viec hon nhan ngoai chung) ( )
C. No (Không) ( )
D. Yes, to have a foreigner son or daughter
        (Co, lo se co con re hoac con dau ngoai quoc) ( )
E. Other (Chuyen khác) ( )

55. SHOULD A MEMBER OF YOUR FAMILY GET SICK, WHAT WOULD YOU DO?
ONG, BÀ SẼ LÀM GÌ NEU NGƯỜI NHÀ BỊ BỆNH?
A. Help him at home (traditional medicine)
        (Chua benh tai gia (theo lôi cõ truyen)) ( )
B. Take him to a doctor/a hospital (Đưa đến Bác Sĩ hay nhà thương) ( )
C. Don't know what to do (Khong biết phải làm gì) ( )
D. Others (Cach khác) ( )

56. WHAT'S YOUR HOBBY OR HOBBIES? (THU TIEU CUÁ ONG BA LA GÌ?)
A. Movies (Cine) ( )
B. Sports (Thể thao) ( )
C. Playing chess and cards (Danh có, Bài) ( )
D. Reading, fishing, and gardening (Đọc sách, câu cá, và trồng hoa) ( )
E. Shopping (Đi mua sắm) ( )
F. Traveling (Du lịch) ( )

57. WHAT IN YOUR CURRENT LIFE SATISFIES YOU THE MOST?
VAN ĐỂ NÀO LÀM ONG BÀ HẢI LỒNG NHẤT?
A. The high economical level (Mức sống cao) ( )
B. The nice housing (Nha cửa đẹp) ( )
C. Exemption of military service (Miễn thi hành nghĩa vụ quân dịch) ( )
D. All children can go to school (Con cai đều duoc đi hoc) ( )
E. The opportunity to improve my knowledge (Co nối hoi mo mang kien thuc) ( )
F. Good job (Công việc làm tốt) ( )
G. Others (Văn đề khác) ( )

61. WHAT IS THE MOST HELPFUL CHANGE THAT YOU WANT TO HAPPEN TO YOUR CURRENT LIFE HERE IN U.S.A.?
SỨ THAY ĐỔI NÀO ĐƯỢC ĐÂY ĐƯỢC COI LÀ HƯU İCH NHẤT?
A. Transportation (Phương tiện đi chuyền) ( )
B. Job (Nghe nghiệp) ( )
C. Housing (Nhà ở) ( )
D. Finance (Tài trợ) ( )
E. Others (Thư khác) ( )

SUPPLEMENTARY: PHẦN BỘ TỤC:

1. How many members in your family speak English?
Trong gia đình Ông Bà có bao nhiêu người nói tiếng Anh?
Poor (Chết difícil) ( )
Fair (Được) ( )
Good (Khá) ( )

2. How many members in your family want to enroll in English Classes?
Bao nhiêu người trong gia đình Ông Bà muốn đi học lớp Anh Ngữ?
Beginning class (Sơ cấp) ( ),
Intermediate class (Trung cấp) ( )
Advanced class (Cao cấp) ( )
Vocational English class (Anh Ngữ Hưởng Nghề) ( )

3. How many members in your family are unemployed?
Trong gia đình Ông Bà có bao nhiêu người thất nghiệp?
Men (Ông) ______, Age (Tuổi) ______
Women (Bà) ______, Age (Tuổi) ______

4. How many members of your family are underemployed and need a better job?
Bao nhiêu người trong gia đình Ông Bà có việc làm và đang cần một việc làm khác thích hợp hơn?
1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

5. How many members in your family need a job?
Trong gia đình Ông Bà có bao nhiêu người cần việc làm?
1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( )

6. How many members in your family need a vocational training before getting a job?
Bao nhiêu người trong gia đình Ông Bà cần được huấn luyện nghề trước khi tìm việc?
1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( )
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Have comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. HOW DID YOU LEARN ABOUT THESE SERVICES? (LÀM SÁO ANH BIẾT ĐÓC NHƯNG Có QUAN NAY?)

1. Vietnamese friends, family, neighbors
   Từ những người bạn Việt Nam, gia đình, người hàng xóm
2. American friends, or neighbors
   Những người bạn Mỹ, hay người Mỹ hàng xóm
3. Social worker, outreach worker
   Nhân viên xã hội
4. Health nurse
   Y tá điều dưỡng
5. School
   Trường học
6. Doctor's office
   Văn phòng lạc Sĩ
7. Newspaper, yellow pages of Phone book
   Báo chí, phần giấy vàng trong quyển Điện thoại niềm giám
8. Sponsor
   Người bảo trợ
9. Church
   Nhà thờ
10. County Home Economist
    Văn phòng Thương mãi

III. IF YOU HAVE NEVER USED THESE SERVICES TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THESE THE REASONS YOU HAVE NOT USED THEM?
    ĐE NEU BAN CHUA BAO GIO DUNG ĐEN NHƯNG Có QUAN NAY, THÌ NHƯƠN NÀN NÀO BAN KHÔNG XU DUNG?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Some help</th>
<th>Small help</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not need them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not find</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't have transportation to use them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel ashamed to use them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not know I could use them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. HERE IS A LIST OF PEOPLE WHO MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE BEEN HELPFUL TO YOU SINCE YOU MOVED TO OKLAHOMA. PLEASE TELL ME HOW MUCH, IF AT ALL, THEY HAVE HELPED YOU.
TÔI ĐÃ RA 1 DÀNH SÁCH SAU Đây LA NHỮNG NGƯỜI NAY Có THỂ HAY KHÔNG THỂ GIÚP ĐÔ ANH VÌ, KHI ANH VỀ SỐNG TẠI TIỂU BANG OKLAHOMA XIN ANH VUI LONG SU GIÚP ĐÔ NHU THỂ NÀO NEU NHỮNG NGƯỜI NAY GIÚP ĐÔ ANH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Little help</th>
<th>No help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Vietnamese professional
   Giới chức Việt Nam
5. Teachers
   Giáo Sư
6. Doctors
   Lạc Sĩ
7. Psychiatrists
   Nhà phân tâm học
8. Health nurses
   Y tá điều dưỡng
9. Church minister
   Núi Sư

V. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU FIND IT IMPORTANT TO YOU TO HAVE THE HIGHEST REGARD OR APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING PEOPLE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rất quan trọng</td>
<td>Quan trọng</td>
<td>Không quan trọng</td>
<td>Không quan trọng</td>
<td>Không quan trọng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. American friends
   Ban Mỹ
2. Sponsor
   Người Bảo Trợ
3. American Community
   Cộng Đồng Người Mỹ
4. Vietnamese Friends
   Bạn Việt Nam
5. Vietnamese Community
   Cộng Đồng Việt Nam

VI. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU FIND THE FOLLOWING DIFFICULT IN OKLAHOMA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Somewhat difficult</th>
<th>Not very difficult</th>
<th>Not at all difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rất khó khăn</td>
<td>Khó khăn</td>
<td>Bịn-thương</td>
<td>Không cần</td>
<td>Không quan trọng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Getting to know Oklahoma families?
   Làm quen với những gia đình địa phương (Oklahoma)
2. Talking to Oklahoma people
   Nội chuyện với người Oklahoma
3. Talking to teachers and other service professionals
   Nội chuyện với giáo sư và nhân viên của những cơ quan
4. Allowing my children to
to sleep in our room.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Somewhat difficult</th>
<th>Not very difficult</th>
<th>Not at all difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rất khó khăn</td>
<td>Khó khăn</td>
<td>Bình thuong</td>
<td>Không cần quan trọng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Getting used to the Oklahoma weather.
Chỉ để quen với thời tiết ở Oklahoma chưa?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rất giỏi</td>
<td>Giỏi</td>
<td>Tốt</td>
<td>kém</td>
<td>Quá kém</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY COMPARED TO OTHER VIETNAMESE PEOPLE? OTHER THAN THOSE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rất giỏi</td>
<td>Giỏi</td>
<td>Tốt</td>
<td>kém</td>
<td>Quá kém</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. HOW CLOSE ARE YOUR NEAREST VIETNAMESE NEIGHBORS? SECOND NEAREST NEIGHBORS?

A. Closest neighbors
Lang gieng nhất gần

B. Second closest
Lang gieng kế

1. Same building
Cùng nhà

2. 1 block away
Cách 1 dặm

3. 2-3 blocks
Cách 2-3 dặm

4. 4-6 blocks
Cách 4-6 dặm

5. More than 1 mile
Cách hơn 1 dặm

IX. WHAT DO YOU REQUIRE TO MAKE YOUR LIFE HAPPIER IN OKLAHOMA?

Những nhu cầu cần thiết nào để bạn có thể sống thọai mai hơn tại Oklahoma?
APPENDIX F

EVALUATION TOOL OF INDOCHINESE REFUGEES
SERVICE NEEDS AND DISCUSSION
### Evaluation Tool of Indochinese Refugee Service Needs

*Sara N. Brown, M.S.W. (1981)*

#### Pre Migration Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>md</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Religion
- Jobs
- Education
- English Proficiency
- Extended Family Ties
- Reason for Leaving

#### Migration Process

- Date Left Homeland
- Date Arrived USA
- Method of Migration
- Time in Camps
- Number of Camps
- Location of Camps
- Health in Process
- Trauma of Exit

#### Extended Family Characteristics

- Still in Homeland: None
- Some
- Many
- In Process of Migration: Relocated
- Where:
- With Family Unit:
- Deceased:

#### Host Community Characteristics

- Climate
- Rural or Urban
- Unemployment Rate
- Other Minority Groups
- Job Potential
- Education Facilities
- Attitudes Toward Indochinese:
- Non
- Welcome
- Welcome
- Presence of Indochinese Community:
- None
- Some
- Large
- Established

#### Diagram of Family: Give Ages, Sex & Initials

#### Service Agency Interaction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOLOG</th>
<th>CETA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Current Family Characteristics

- SES
- Religion
- Jobs: Wife
- Husband
- Children
- English Proficiency
- Health:
- Physical
- Mental
- Housing:
- Transportation
- Recreation:
- Media Utilization:
- Newspapers, U.S./Indochinese

#### Host Community Characteristics

- Physical Health Services
- Mental Health Services
- Public Schools
- DHS Services
- Ethnic Service Agency
- Private Service Agency
- Legal System
- Other
TOOL DISCUSSION

The first step in using the tool is to diagram the family being evaluated, giving the sex and age of each family member. The premigration characteristics are then assessed, giving number values to socioeconomic status, English language proficiency, and extended family ties. Information about the migration process is shown with numerical values given to health and exit trauma. Extended family characteristics are listed, showing the location of important family members.

Current family characteristics are listed with number values given to socioeconomic status, English language proficiency, health, housing, and transportation. Service agency interactions of the family are recorded and the last section evaluates the host community characteristics. This tool ideally should be filled out from the viewpoint of the Indochinese family itself. Areas of conflict, strength or tenuous relationships between families and the characteristics given on the tool will also be drawn. Those families having the highest composite scores and showing the greatest relationships of strength should have the highest adjustment potential. Further research with this tool is indicated.

Once the evaluation has been completed, this tool offers service providers a quick, fairly comprehensive evaluation of an Indochinese family's areas of strength and need. Service providers with an accurate knowledge of services available in the community can then direct these families to the community resources available to them. This tool might
also be used as a case summary that can be quickly shared in case consultations and service planning sessions.
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