

1978

A comparative study of the resettlement status of Indochinese refugees in Portland

Rosalynn R. Ringor
Portland State University

Chareundi Van-Si
Portland State University

Steven Hernandez
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

 Part of the [Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons](#), [History Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Ringor, Rosalynn R.; Van-Si, Chareundi; and Hernandez, Steven, "A comparative study of the resettlement status of Indochinese refugees in Portland" (1978). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 2756.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.2744>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE RESETTLEMENT STATUS OF
INDOCHINESE REFUGEES IN PORTLAND

by

ROSALYNN R. RINGOR

CHAREUNDI VAN-SI

STEVEN HERNANDEZ

A practicum submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University
1978



approved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to express our appreciation to many people for their interest, encouragement, and assistance in the development of this project. We especially wish to thank the following: Jerry Burns, Kurt Fiesel, and Jean Immel of the HEW Indochinese Refugee Program, Salem, Oregon, for their valuable assistance in the development stages of the project; the Portland Indochinese Cultural and Service Center staff for their help in sample construction, questionnaire development, and translations; the ESL (English-as-a-Second-language) instructors and staff at Portland Community College and Portland State University for their part in the preliminary phase survey; and countless others; and finally, a special thanks to the Indochinese refugees in Portland who shared their thoughts and feelings with us.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
 CHAPTER	
I PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW	1
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	5
Historical Perspectives	6
Immigrants, Refugees, and Assimilation Theory.	7
Special Assimilation Problems of Refugees	10
Social Services	13
III RESEARCH DESIGN AND EXECUTION	40
Population	40
Sampling Information	40
Data Collection Methods	42
Development of the Questionnaires	43
Some Variables and Possible Influences to Resettlement	44
Questionnaire Translations	46
Distribution of the Questionnaires and Response Rates	46
Data Tabulation and Analysis	47
IV FINDINGS	50
Preliminary Phase	50

CHAPTER	PAGE
Major Phase	53
Statistical Analyses	61
V . SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	62
Preliminary Phase	62
Major Phase	63
Further Research	65
VI COMMENTS	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY	71
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRES	73
APPENDIX B: MAJOR PHASE TABULATED DATA	100

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I Items/Goals Considered Most Important to Successful Resettlement by 50% of the Total Average of Indo-chinese Refugees	51
II Items/Goals Considered Least Important to Successful Resettlement by 20% of the Total Average of Indo-chinese Refugees	51
III Percentage Distribution of Indochinese Responses to Barrier Conditions to Successful Resettlement.	52
IV Distribution by Ages of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees	54
V Distribution of Respondents' Sex by Ethnic Group	54
VI Distribution of Marital Status Among Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees	55
VII Range of Former Occupations Among Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees	55
VIII Distribution of English Reading Ability Among Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees	56
IX Distribution of English Speaking Ability Among Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees	56
X Distribution of Length of Stay in America Among Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees	57
XI Desire to Return Home Among Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees	57
XII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Own a Home	100
XIII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Live with their Families	100
XIV Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Own a Car	100

TABLE	PAGE
XV Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Have a Driver's License	101
XVI Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Have a Job	101
XVII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Have a Job Suiting their Education and Skills	101
XVIII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Have Recertified Degrees	102
XIX Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Have or Have Not Had Job Training	102
XX Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Have or Have Not Had ESL Training	102
XXI Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Have American Friends	103
XXII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Practice their Religion	103
XXIII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Participate in Cultural Activities	103
XXIV Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Have Bank Accounts	104
XXV Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Have Health Insurance	104
XXVI Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Have Auto Insurance	104
XXVII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Have Access to Medical Services	105
XXVIII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Participate in Recreation Activities	105
XXIX Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Have or Have Not Applied for Permanent Residency	105
XXX Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Are or Are Not Willing to Americanize their Names	106

TABLE	PAGE
XXXI Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Know Where to go for Medical/Health Problems	107
XXXII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Know Where to go for Race Discrimination Problems	107
XXXIII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Know Where to go for Marriage Problems .	107
XXXIV Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Know Where to go for Welfare Problems ..	108
XXXV Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Know Where to go for Employment Problems	108
XXXVI Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Know Where to go for Political Problems	108
XXXVII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Do or Do Not Know Where to go for School Problems .	109
XXXVIII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Feel Social Service Workers Understand Their Problems and Help Them	109
XXXIX Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Feel Social Service Workers Treat Them Respectfully	109
XL Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Feel They Don't Have to Wait Too Long for Services	110
XLI Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Have Found Places to Live Via Social Service Agencies	110
XLII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Have Found Jobs Via Social Service Agencies	110
XLIII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Have or Have Not Encountered Language and Communication Problems with Social Agencies	111
XLIV Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Have Encountered Cultural Misunderstandings With Social Service Agencies	111

TABLE	PAGE
XLV Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Have Encountered Other Problems With Social Service Agencies ;	111
XLVI Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Feel Racial Discrimination Has Affected Their Resettlement	112
XLVII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Feel They Have Come Up Against Pressure in Taking a Job	112
XLVIII Distribution of Successful and Unsuccessful Refugees Who Feel They Have Attained Success in Their New Life	112

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW

This study sought to explore the resettlement of Indochinese refugees to their new life in Portland, Oregon. Three basic areas were under consideration. The first area dealt with demographic data: who are the refugees and what are their pasts? The second area focused on aspects of successful resettlement: what do refugees seek in order to consider themselves successfully resettled, and how do their ideas of successful resettlement collate with their present state of resettlement? The third area dealt with the effectiveness of resettlement programs: how have various assistance programs been helpful to the refugees, and are the refugees aware of the community's social services resources?

Approximately 2400 Indochinese refugees have settled in the Portland area --- 1650 Vietnamese, 480 Cambodians, and 265 Laotians. They began arriving in May, 1975, with the majority arriving during the following summer and fall. Of the 2400 people in the area, a large percentage are children.

Man's story is, in large measure, the story of his wanderings. Throughout recorded history, invasions, wars, and conquests were followed by large-scale movements of populations. Migrations in early modern history include the Moors and the Jews as they fled from Spain, the Huguenot refugees in 16th century France, and some of the early English settlers in America, and many, many more.¹

Throughout its history, the United States has played a role as a

melting pot of immigrants and refugees. In recent history, refugees from countries falling under Communist rule have been welcomed by Americans. Examples include the Hungarian refugees of the post World War II era, the Cuban refugees after Castro's takeover, and the European migrants fleeing Europe as the Iron Curtain fell. In recent years, Indochinese refugees have migrated to the United States, coming mainly from the countries of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

The plight of refugees in this country is an uncertain one. There are no consistent, standard policies which guide social service agencies in working and assisting refugee groups as they enter the country. Specific legislation is enacted, on state and federal levels, whenever a specific refugee group enters the country and whenever the need is demonstrated.

The majority of the Indochinese refugees first came to this country under the auspices of sponsor organizations and voluntary agencies based in the various receiving states. These organizations and agencies, such as the U.S. Catholic Conference, Church World Service, the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, the Hebrew Immigration and Aid Society, and nondenominational agencies such as the International Rescue Committee, the Tolstoy Foundation, etc., having experience with immigrants, relocated the refugees throughout the country. Refugee camps were set up, with Camp Pendleton in California and Englin Air Force Base in Florida being the two largest camps.²

Only two of the nine agencies which arranged sponsorship for the refugees have offices in Portland. These are the U.S. Catholic Conference and the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service. Most of the refugees in the Portland area came under the auspices of these two agencies. However, refugees sponsored through other agencies also reside in the

area.

The Indochinese Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1975 made it possible for Indochinese refugees in the United States to receive public assistance. This assistance ended in September, 1977. In most states where refugees were resettled, the sponsor organizations and voluntary agencies, with federal assistance, provided the major support in assisting the refugees and have continued to do so. The State of Oregon, however, is in a different situation. The major support for assisting Indochinese refugees in Oregon originated from the state level, with a major portion of refugees having been on public assistance at one time or another. The role of sponsors and voluntary agencies in Oregon has not been lessened, however. They continue to support and assist refugees in resettling in the state.

Indochinese refugees appear to be in a quandary. From a review of current literature and previous research on immigrants and refugees, we can construct a better understanding of the Indochinese refugees' situation in our society.

NOTES

- ¹ John Stoessinger, "Refugees," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1973 ed.
- ² Galen Beery, "Special Report, Indochina Refugees: Resettlement Progress," The Christian Century, October 1976, p. 931.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Literature on refugees and immigrants was surveyed in order to gain an overall picture of these populations as they resettled and adjusted into a different culture and society.

An overview of the problem of the "refugee," or the "man without a country," according to Tatiana Schaufuss requires a thorough understanding of the sociological and psychological factors which created this problem, together with sufficient information which deals with its historical and present aspects.¹

~~Despite common characteristics, Indochinese refugees differ according to their historical, ethnic, religious and social customs.~~ They come from closely knit societies and retain autonomy in differentiated areas of resettlement in their new country. There is a diverse range of occupational backgrounds among the refugees. Educational levels are also diverse, with approximately 50 percent of the heads of households having, at least, a secondary school education and 25 percent having college educations.²

~~The Indochinese came into lands occupied by other cultural groups.~~ Many came, according to Francis Brown, seeking new opportunities for themselves and their children, and because they feared political persecution in their homeland.³ Minority groups have flourished in every state, but problems of the Indochinese refugees are only recent.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Land of Indochina

The land of Indochina -- Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos -- was controlled by French colonialists from 1893 to 1954. During this period, continuous hostilities against French rule produced refugee problems within the country.⁴ The three nations, through much struggle and hardship, gained their independence from France almost simultaneously. Vietnam has been independent since 1953. And, according to Geneva agreements, was divided into two sections, north and south.

After the acquisition of Indochinese independence, pro-western governments came in, held power, and influenced the newly-independent nations. As a result, nationalist movements were formed: the Viet Cong in Vietnam, the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, and the Pathet Lao, in Laos. With the support of North Vietnam and China, these movements launched campaigns and attacks on the pro-western influences.⁵

The Fall of Indochina: Refugee Migration

In the spring of 1975, the land of Indochina fell into communism.⁶ Cambodia fell on April 17, 1975; Vietnam on April 30, 1975. Laos was the last to fall into communism. The political takeover in Laos was not so overpowering as in the other two countries since a coalition government managed to ease the tension of the people. This made the transition to communism less abrupt and violent. Thousands of right-wing officials and soldiers of the old government, merchants and middle-class Laotians began fleeing the country across the border into Thailand in mid-May, 1975. The flight accelerated after the communist victory at the end of 1975.⁷

The collapse of Vietnam and Cambodia was so sudden that refugees were stranded in camps. These people were, for the most part, those who had close association with Americans or those who were bitter personal or political foes of the communists. The vast majority of these refugees had little time to decide whether to stay or to leave the country.⁸

Most of the Vietnamese and Cambodian refugees were eventually sponsored and assisted with such needs as food, shelter, employment, language skills, and moral support. The Laotians, on the other hand, who were the late-comers, were virtually neglected. Sponsors were difficult to procure. Many factors contributed to this state of affairs. The United States, for one thing, was in the midst of the 1976 recession. It was also a Presidential election year. At this time, the bad memories of the Indochinese war faded away from American public and political minds; and the Vietnamese and Cambodians seemed to have pre-empted American attention and goodwill, as well as any available employment opportunities.

While 150,000 Indochinese refugees were resettled in America, some 80,000 others remained in the camps in Thailand. The majority of these people were from Laos. In July, 1977, the White House approved the resettlement of 15,000 more refugees; 7,000 of these were boat cases.⁹

IMMIGRANTS, REFUGEES, AND ASSIMILATION THEORY

The literature indicates that the movement of a person from one society and culture to another society and culture involves a drastic change in that person's life pattern. A number of terms have been used to describe the process through which societal and cultural differences among individuals and groups are gradually reduced to a common culture and varied behavior patterns are fused into a social unity. Among the

terms used to describe this process have been "assimilation," "integration," and "absorption." Much theoretical confusion has been generated in the study of this process by the use of overlapping terms and vaguely defined concepts.

Milton Gordon, in Assimilation in American Life, called for the rigorous and systematic analysis of the concept of assimilation that would break it down to all its component aspects. He notes that two major aspects of this concept are cultural assimilation and structural assimilation. Cultural assimilation refers to the change of cultural patterns to those of the host society, structural assimilation to the large-scale entrance of immigrants into the primary group life of the host society. According to Gordon, cultural assimilation can be called absorption and structural assimilation, integration.¹⁰

Eleanor Rogg comments that in a society of large-scale immigration, such as the United States, the situation is not one in which immigrants are forced into the mold of the original Anglo-Saxon settlers. Nor are immigrants absorbed into one great melting pot and cooked up as homogenized Americans. Instead, a structurally plural network of ethnic and other groupings emerged. In such a society, cultural assimilation can occur rapidly, but structural assimilation tends to be slow.¹¹

According to Rogg, two main indices have been used historically to measure cultural assimilation: acculturation and personal adjustment. Acculturation measures the extent to which the immigrant has learned the norms, roles, and customs of the absorbing society, as well as how effectively he has internalized them. Personal adjustment measures the individual's contentment with the new country, his ability to handle the many new difficulties and frustrations he faces in daily living in a new physi-

cal and social environment.

The immigrant arrives in his new country with various images and expectations about future roles and indentifications. S. Eisenstadt in The Absorption of Immigrants, sees four phases in the process of the immigrant's institutionalization of role expectations.¹² First, the migrant must acquire various skills. He must learn to make use of the society's language, technical opportunities, and ecological orientations. Second, he must perform many new roles. Third, he must rebuild his idea of himself and his status-image by acquiring new values and by trying them out in relation to the new roles required of him. Finally, he must extend his participation in society away from exclusive participation in his migratory primary group into other spheres of the larger social system of his new country. Milton Gordon believes that this final stage, called structural assimilation, is rarely attained by first-generation immigrants, particularly immigrants of peasant, working-class, and lower-middle-class backgrounds.¹³

In a study of premigration traits related to immigrant assimilation, Jerold Heiss found that migrants who have shown some degree of ability and drive during their early adulthood; those who were socially mobile, were more likely to become assimilated.¹⁴ Youth at the time of migration and family support for migration also seem to favor assimilation.

James Vander Zanden, in American Minority Relations, states, "the higher the educational, income and occupational levels of the incoming group, the more rapid the assimilation....similarly, groups at higher educational, income and occupational levels tend to have greater access to the means for upward mobility, which in turn tend to be associated with a higher rate of assimilation."¹⁵

Milton Gordon theorizes that, "people of different social classes tend to act differently and have different values even if they have the same ethnic background."¹⁶

The literature indicates that immigrants will assimilate more readily to a similar class position in the host society.¹⁷ There is a positive relationship between acculturation and social mobility in the United States. The immigrants who have high social status are the most acculturated; the most acculturated tend to have high social status.¹⁸

SPECIAL ASSIMILATION PROBLEMS OF REFUGEES

If the immigrant is not positively motivated to emigrate from his homeland, literature indicates it will be more difficult for him to accept changes in his customary ways of behaving in the host society. This is the case with refugees -- people often torn against their will from their homelands.¹⁹

Historically, immigrants to America have tended to be young persons from lower class origins who were attracted to the shores of this country by the lure of greater wealth. Refugees, on the other hand, tend to come from all age groups and class levels. Most are formerly middle and upper middle class members of their homeland who leave behind many material assets. They are usually hopeful that their stay in their host societies will only be temporary; they anticipate a return to their homelands and don't concern themselves with adjusting to a new way of life in their host countries.²⁰

Resettled refugees generally enter the occupational ladder at a significantly lower level than the rung from which they left. Most refugees, in order to resettle, will accept any kind of work. However, as Joseph

Sechectman points out, signs of dissatisfaction over not using their skills, and over the realization of their loss of status, may begin to appear among them.²¹ Former professionals find they are not able to re-establish themselves immediately; they need to pass various exams and obtain licenses. H. Murphy, in Flight and Resettlement, notes that sometimes the professional requirements of the two countries are so dissimilar that the immigrant is forced to give up his life's work and begin anew.²²

Education and age are major factors related to regaining lost occupational and class status. Murphy indicates that among the educated, the younger regain their former status most rapidly.²³ Among the less educated, only a few regain their former status regardless of age. The literature, in general, views education as the most effective factor accelerating assimilation. Raymond Breton and Maurice Pinard note that education affects both the extent to which immigrants establish contacts outside their own group, and the rate at which outside contacts are made.²⁴

Another special problem of refugees concerns the emotional trauma of their migration and its effect on their assimilation. In a study of Hungarian refugees, S. Alexander Weinstock found that refugees who were most affected by the Communist takeover in Hungary, those who themselves or whose relatives suffered in some way, acculturated most rapidly. According to Weinstock, among refugees, "catastrophic misfortune acted to sharpen their aggression and to increase their resourcefulness, that rejection and dispossession created in them a burning desire to make a place for themselves and to prove their worth."²⁵

Mental and emotional illness among refugees was another special problem indicated by the literature. Henry P. David comments that "a predic-

table percentage of refugees do become psychological casualties, engaging in anxiety-reducing behavior that may range from anti-social acting out to withdrawal into psychosis....later attempts to change behavior patterns may be far more difficult to implement."²⁶ Other studies and case reports among various refugee groups since the end of World War II support this statement. L. Eitinger, in studies of refugees in Norway, reported that refugees showed great somatic over-concern and high incidences of somatic complaints.²⁷ Naditch and Morrissey, in a study of Cuban refugees, found a generally high rate of psychopathological symptoms.²⁸

In studies conducted on Indochinese populations, similar findings were reported. Lin, Tazuma, and Masuda find that Vietnamese refugees have witnessed feelings of homesickness, grief over the losses incurred during the process of evacuation or fleeing, uncertainty about the future, and endless incidents of frustration.²⁹ They have also observed many Vietnamese suffering from various forms of psychosomatic symptoms accompanying general feelings of nervousness and sadness.

Many Indochinese have been victims of cultural shock -- the cultural and social changes involved in their abrupt uprooting that often accompany a transition from a rural, relatively slow-paced way of life to an urbanized, fast-paced, and competitive society. Depression and mental dysfunctions have befallen many who left families, relatives, friends, fortunes, and traditions in their native lands.³⁰

In Paris, an observation made Edith Lenart, after a number of visits to the Refugee Centers, was that Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Laotians tend to react quite differently to the problems of readjustment.³¹ A Vietnamese, for example, tends to face up to the new challenge and feels confident that he can cope. The Cambodian tends to find it hard and more dif-

difficult to confront the unfamiliar and his natural reactions is to turn inward upon himself. The Laotian prefers to ignore the challenge and tries to live from day to day. The Muong people, a Laotian tribal group, suffer the most and object to all forms of restriction.

The Report of the Uncle Counselor, a Los Angeles-based Southeast Asian Mental Health Project, found that refugees initially became dependent on their American sponsors for the satisfaction of basic needs, and they later rebelled against accepting their sponsors' authority and guidance in the attempt to fulfill their own needs for social acceptance and self-respect, and to take charge of their own destinies.³² To gain independence, refugees moved to apartments and began living on welfare. The situation bred family disruption, loss of social identity, and major shifts in value systems and behavior patterns.³³

The treatment of depression and other mental health problems of the refugees through conventional western therapy was usually ineffective because of language and cultural factors. To meet these special mental health needs, bilingual paraprofessionals were trained.³⁴

Thus, the resettlement process has proven difficult for a majority of the Indochinese refugees as they are not prepared to challenge the fast-paced way of life in a competitive society. Psychosocial problems are observed among immigrants and refugees in the process of assimilating, acculturating, or adapting to American culture. The following sections will explain the variety of social services instituted by public and private agencies to help Indochinese refugees adjust to American life.

SOCIAL SERVICES

On April 29, 1975 the United States embassy in Saigon closed....

simultaneously in California, the Camp Pendleton refugee center opened and made ready to care for 1800 refugees. These two acts set in motion the eventual immigration and resettlement of some 145,700 Indochinese refugees into America.³⁵ The resettlement effort compelled coordination on the part of numerous American governmental and private agencies and the eventual appropriation of \$555,277,454.³⁶ The services subsequently extended the refugees were many, varied, and were intended to facilitate speedy refugee resettlement. What follows is a general description of the social services referred to above and the respective part they played in the resettlement cost.

Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) Task Force

The HEW Refugee Task Force assumed responsibility for refugee domestic resettlement. Thirty-five members spoke Indochinese languages, six work out of the Washington office; 29 are at ten regional offices of The Department of HEW.

Washington

The Task Force main office in Washington D.C. had four operational components concerned with resettlement liaison, information, and referral, Indochinese mutual assistance, and publications.

In the resettlement liaison division, communication with both national and local offices of the voluntary state, and local resettlement agencies was maintained throughout the resettlement process. This division dealt with problems such as social security numbers for additional refugees, samples of "unaccompanied" refugee children, needs of the H'mong refugees, and other problems.

In the information and referral unit a toll free "hotline" telephone service was maintained for refugees throughout the country. Information was provided also to the general public, Congress, federal, state and local government welfare agencies and voluntary agencies (volags).

The Indochinese mutual assistance association division identified and developed a roster of Indochinese mutual assistance associations to determine the quality of resettlement as a whole and to lend perspective to the role of the associations in the refugee community.

Publications division: The newspaper NEW LIFE was printed in three editions; a monthly Vietnamese-English edition and in alternate months, a Lao-English or a Cambodian-English edition. Articles in NEW LIFE were aimed at providing information on various aspects of American life, government, the employment outlook, and monthly summary of the news media coverage of events in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Other articles in NEW LIFE dealt with subjects such as training availability, salary ranges, future employment predictions, geographical patterns of job openings, property insurance, coping with winters in the United States, income tax information, glossaries, and orientation hand books, also, home buying and renting, the operation of the government, among others.³⁷

Reception Centers

1. Fort Chaffee, Arkansas
2. Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania
3. Camp Pendleton, California
4. Elgin Air Force Base, Florida

The reception centers were utilized to introduce Indochinese refugees into the United States. HEW was quick to add, though, that this was

done expediently, yet ensuring stable resettlement and reducing the possibility that the refugees might become public charges. The stated goal as early as the opening of the reception centers was to make the refugees "supporting" members of their communities.

The following procedures were, for the most part, followed by all the reception centers. The elements were: (A) reception, (B) immigration and naturalization service in-procession, (C) issuance of social security numbers, (D) HEW and social service counseling, (F) internalization and naturalization service (INS) final processing (security check verification), and (G) final out processing and travel.³⁸

Voluntary Agencies (Volags)

The government contracted with the following 10 volags to resettle Indochinese refugees in the United States: U.S. Catholic Conference, American Council for Nationalities Service, American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Church World Service, International Rescue Committee, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, United HIAS Service, Inc., Tolstoy Foundation, Inc., Travelers Aid-International Social Services, and Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association.

Each of the 10 agencies worked in its own way to mobilize local community resources to generate sponsors for Indochinese families. In addition, the agencies coordinated offers of assistance from the myriad of other voluntary civic groups, i.e., Parent and Teachers Associations, Chambers of Commerce, and so on. The agencies verified all sponsorship offers, and determines the potential sponsor's intentions and capacity to fulfill financial and moral obligations to the refugee family.

The resettlement agencies also operated offices at each of the re-

fugee reception centers. They were staffed by a core of professional caseworkers assisted by volunteers. The caseworkers interviewed the refugee to determine family particulars -- size, composition, job skills, and geographic preferences. Then the agency matched the refugee family with an available sponsor. If both the refugee and the sponsor were agreeable to the proposed arrangement, the refugee was released from the camp. The resettlement agencies' responsibilities did not end at this point; they remained the backstop to assist the sponsor and refugee if the need arose. The Federal government granted the responsible resettlement agency \$500 for each refugee placed with a sponsor.

State and local governments also contracted to resettle refugees, albeit in numbers much smaller than the original 10 resettlement agencies. Governmental and private organizations who aided in resettlement included for example: (A) Department of Emergency Services, State of Washington; Governor's Task Force for Indochinese Resettlement, State of Iowa; Department of Institutions, Social Aid Rehabilitative Services, State of Oklahoma; Division of Community Services, State of Maine; Governor's Cabinet Secretariate, State of New Mexico Planning Office; Don Bosco Community Center; Indianapolis Area Chapter, American Red Cross; Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association of Los Angeles; Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association of New York.³⁹

Sponsorship

HEW felt that with few exceptions refugees required sponsors to assist in insuring that the refugee did not become dependent on public assistance.⁴⁰ Sponsors were to assist refugees in obtaining housing, employment and other assistance that would lead to self-sufficiency.

These obligations were explained to sponsors. A statement to this effect was signed and contained the name and address of the sponsor. A local check was also done to determine as far as possible the sponsors' means to fulfill obligations.⁴¹

Travel

Following the reception center clearance, the refugee could travel to the resettlement site using his own funds, his sponsor's, or the government's. In order to determine eligibility for government travel expenses, the assets of the refugee or sponsor were verified by HEW before travel was authorized.⁴²

Medical Services

Fort Chaffee. U.S. Army medical personnel provided ambulatory and inpatient medical care, dental care, and inoculations. On site medical resources consisted of three dispensaries, a dental clinic, and a 200-bed hospital with a staff of 47 officers and 153 enlisted men. The Public Health Service, Communicable Disease Center was responsible for surveillance of public health problems, control of communicable diseases, immunizations, and other preventive health measures. Health problems which exceeded the capabilities of the on site medical resources were referred to local community facilities or to specific public health service hospitals.

Indiantown Gap. The dispensary that was located in the camp met the needs of those who required medical attention and emergency treatment. Approximately 350 patients a day were treated there. Those who had a serious illness and required hospitalization were transferred to the

public health hospital in Baltimore, or to the Hershey Medical Center in Hershey.

Camp Pendleton. The main hospital at Camp Pendleton offered complete services in the following areas: general medicine, internal medicine, surgery, orthopedics, pediatrics, gynecology, obstetrics and dermatology. Services were also provided by clinics in the following areas: dental, dermatology, eye, ear, nose, and throat, electrocardiogram, inhalation therapy, and urology. A diagnostic lab also handled blood testing and biopsies.

Occupational and physical therapy were also available. A preventive medicine clinic dealing with follow-ups on tuberculosis, diabetes, and other diseases also existed. Heart surgery and neurosurgery could also have been performed at the hospital.

The psychiatric unit diagnosed refugees but treated only active U.S. military personnel. Refugees and their dependents were referred to San Francisco.

The majority of schoolage children were given required inoculations for DPT, first polio, mumps, typhoid, measles, and smallpox.⁴³

Food Service

Fort Chaffee. At Fort Chaffee there existed three contracts for food service: food service, cook and dining facility, and refuse removal. Assuming 24,078 refugees, the following costs per refugee per day were calculated: food service per refugee -- \$1.59, cook and dining facility per refugee -- \$.66, refuse removal per refugee -- \$.32.

Indiantown Gap. There were 31 mess halls for the refugees. The refugees were fed an American diet, modified to suit Indochinese tastes,

from a planned 15 day menu which changed every 16th day. The mess halls were run under government contract with Manpower, Inc.

Camp Pendleton. The camp food service was handled by South East Service Inc. An attempt was made to cater to Indochinese tastes in the preparation of weekly menus. Food items included large amounts of rice and fresh vegetables, chicken, pork, and fish. The daily cost was \$1.70 per refugee.⁴⁴

Education and Training Programs

Fort Chaffee. The educational and training programs were conducted by the Southern Baptist Convention and the Christian Reform World Relief Commission. The preponderance of classes was devoted to English language training, with classes presented for all ages. Cultural orientation programs such as home economics, shorthand, accounting, and construction engineering were available for persons who were interested. There was also an educational play program for the 3 to 6 and 6 to 10 year age groups.

Indiantown Gap. A regular school program was run by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Prior to school enrollment, students were tested to determine education level. The school day consisted of five hours. The enrollment was approximately 2100, from ages 6 to 18 years. Curriculum included English, math, orientation to American schools, geography and United States history. Adult education courses were also given 2 to 3 hours per day; English language and American culture were offered.

Camp Pendleton. The goals of the Camp Pendleton program were designed to meet the needs of refugee adults and children by giving them a

minimum educational experience, providing them with the English language skills and cultural orientation necessary for transition into American communities. The core program objectives consisted of survival language training geared to the needs of each particular age group, along with general orientation to American culture and institutions. Extended objectives included:

1. For adults -- To insure that each participating adult would gain the basic facility in the English language needed to seek and obtain the basic requisites for living.
2. For children -- For participating high school age children, to insure a basic facility in English language, sufficient to function in American secondary schools. For participating elementary school age children, to insure that they would gain the basic facility in English language, including a "core" vocabulary so that they could more easily make the transition into American elementary schools.⁴⁵

Recreational Activities

Fort Chaffee. The five refugee housing areas at Fort Chaffee were equipped to provide opportunities for refugees to participate in a number of recreational activities. Indoor activities included table tennis, indoor basketball, weight lifting, boxing, gymnasium and television viewing. Outdoor sports equipment was available for soccer, basketball, badminton, and softball. A library was open daily for reading and for checking out books if it was so desired. There were also four motion picture theaters open each evening.

Indiantown Gap. In addition to sports familiar to the refugees (table tennis, volleyball, and soccer), American sports such as softball,

were introduced. Scouting programs, art festivals, sing-alongs, theatricals, swimming events and dancing were also offered.

Camp Pendleton. Children's activities were provided by the American Red Cross. Play schools were organized into two hours, six days a week, for children 3 to 6 years old, with one play facility per camp area. The American Red Cross provided exercise, recreation and educational programs to approximately 200 children per session, per camp area. Infant care items (diapers, infant sleepers, receiving and crib blankets) were provided and distributed to camps through the American Red Cross.

The YMCA coordinated all in-camp recreation activities. The YMCA also provided three activities which were targeted to the age group 18 and under: recreational activities (basketball, volleyball, soccer), entertainment and movies.

Varied children's activities provided at refugee request included: karate demonstrations, costume events, talent shows, dances, arts, and crafts classes and elementary school games.

The Salvation Army was the central receiving point for all donations of children's clothes, toys, and books. Distribution was organized on an as needed basis to individuals through the camp structure and to organized children's activities. The Salvation Army also provided infants needs such as layettes and diapers.

The U.S. Marine Corps and the Navy supported the children's care and welfare effort. Services included providing a "warm trailer" for infants and invalids during the nights of extreme cold and staffing a prenatal and postnatal care center with Navy medical personnel.

Indochinese initiatives and leadership provided organized Boy Scout, Girl Scout and Girl Guide activities. Meetings were held twice weekly and

Boy Scouts were credited for their activities through the international Boy Scouts association.⁴⁶

Early Publications

Early in the resettlement program HEW distributed the following publications: Information for Sponsors of Indochinese Refugees; The Indochinese Refugee Program: Questions and Answers; An Organization and Welcome Guide for Groups Sponsoring Indochinese Refugees; Cambodian/English, English/Cambodian Glossary; Vietnamese Refugee Orientation Handbook, United States Map; "Dear New Immigrant" Letter (explaining the legal assistance "hotline" and programs for Indochinese refugees; NEW LIFE (biweekly newspaper) printed in English, Vietnamese, and Cambodian and an English/Vietnamese Dictionary.⁴⁷

Department of Health, Education and Welfare Programs for Refugees

Health. Health screening activities were provided by the Center for Disease Control (CDS) and patient care programs by the Bureau of Medical Services early in the resettlement program. The Public Health Service (PHS) provided screening and immunization services to the refugee population. The health screening activities at the refugee camps were designed to identify and treat chronic and acute disease problems. Individuals were not released unless cleared by PHS-CDS screening. State health authorities were notified of diseases for necessary follow-up.

Indochinese refugees requiring long term medical or psychiatric inpatient or custodial care beyond that ordinarily provided in a general hospital were given such care at institutions other than reception centers and PHS facilities. If the patient was eligible under the Indochinese

Refugee Program, payment for long term care was provided through the state medical assistance program having jurisdiction at the site of the receiving center. The state, in turn, would receive reimbursement from the federal government.⁴⁸

Dentist Program

Training was made available to prepare refugee dentists for the National Board Dental Examination. The training was short term and implemented via contracts with selected dental schools. The refugee dentist was eligible for a round trip ticket from place of residence to the training location and could receive a stipend of \$250 per month during the training. There was no tuition cost to the refugee. By September, 1977, forty refugee dentists had received training at the programs' two locations.

Physician Program

A special program was also implemented for refugee physicians. The program provided educational assistance to physicians who had to pass the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates Examination. The examination is offered twice a year to foreign medical graduates as a prerequisite to their entry into an approved graduate training program, which is required for state licensure.

Approximately 484 refugee physicians received training under this Public Health Service program which was implemented at seven American medical centers.⁴⁹

Medical Records

The Public Health Service made a great effort to centralize the

medical records of the refugees. The records were of importance not only for medical reasons but also to help the refugees secure jobs, enroll in school and to obtain insurance.⁵⁰

Education

Educational activities in the reception centers were as follows: during the latter part of June, 1975, HEW awarded contracts to California, Florida, and to West Arkansas Community College at Fort Smith, Arkansas for the development and operation of English classes and cultural orientation programs at each of the four reception centers.

At all four centers the refugees were screened and assigned to classes in beginning, intermediate or advanced English. Approximately one-half of the refugees were placed in beginning English classes, one-quarter in intermediate and another quarter in advanced classes. All of the camps had evening and Saturday acculturation classes.⁵¹

Grants To State And Local Education Agencies

HEW developed policies to provide grants of \$300 to local educational agencies for each school age refugee child entering a school district. A school district enrolling more than 100 youngsters or one-percent of the total school district's enrollment received \$600 per child for each child above the 100 or one-percent threshold. The \$300 per child was considered the average cost of supplemental services for non-English speaking children. The figure of \$600 per child included \$300 for supplemental services plus an additional \$300 toward the cost of basic instruction in the heavily impacted districts which enrolled large amounts of refugee children.

This policy also provided grants to state educational agencies for leadership and training purposes including services such as inservice training, curriculum identification and development, supervision, and technical assistance to districts with small numbers of refugee children.⁵²

Bilingual Education Centers

The Bilingual Education Centers provided technical assistance to school districts enrolling Indochinese refugees. Upon request, assistance with language and cultural curriculum development, and teacher training was provided. The Bilingual Resource Center was created to improve the capabilities of schools which had little or no experience serving Indochinese students; these services were provided through 1975, 1976, and 1977.⁵³

Adult Education

Funds were provided during 1975, 1976, and 1977 for refugee adult education. The funds required no additional matching on the part of states and local educational agencies and were provided to help states instruct adult Indochinese in speaking, understanding, reading, and writing English.

Later in the resettlement program the adult education program was enlarged to include training in mathematics, promotion of literacy and the development of occupational skills.⁵⁴

Georgetown "Hotline"

Early in the program a "hotline" at Georgetown University was developed to respond directly to questions from refugees concerning post secondary education. The "hotline" functioned to supply post secondary

educational information to refugees on a nationwide basis. The information supplied under this program included college admission procedures, and grants, loans, and scholarships which were available to Indochinese students.⁵⁵

Center For Applied Linguistics

An Indochinese refugee clearinghouse was established at the Center for Applied Linguistics. The purpose of the clearinghouse was to assist the nations' schools in dealing with English language problems of the refugees. The activities included: (1) materials development, (2) dissemination of information concerning materials available for teaching English to refugee children and adults, (3) a human resources bank of the names of available American specialists in teaching English as a second language, and (4) a translation selection service through which summaries of American text books in the language of the refugees or publication of Indochinese textbooks were made available.⁵⁶

Post Secondary Education

Refugees were made eligible for financial assistance for the purpose of entering and attending post secondary schools under the following programs: Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (BEOG), Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program (SEOG), College Work-Study Program (CWS), National Direct Student Loan Program (NDSL), and Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSLP).⁵⁷

Credentials Evaluation Project

The Credentials Evaluation Project began in December, 1975 to assure refugee students of equitable treatment and to assist admissions

officers in post secondary institutions handling applications from Indochinese refugee students.

As many of the students were unable to bring their academic records with them, the project undertook the review of students' educational history, the translation of documents or recreating of missing records, and a recommendation concerning placement at the request of the institution considering the student's application.

The Office of Education also published two reports and distributed them to all colleges and universities in the nation. The reports were: Guidelines on the Admission and Placement of Refugees, and Guidelines on Admission and Placement of Refugees into U.S. Institutions of Higher Education.⁵⁸

English Testing Project

HEW Task Force contracted early in the resettlement program to administer an English language proficiency test to some 7000 refugees. This test is required of foreign students by most universities and colleges as evidence of English proficiency for admissions and placement purposes.⁵⁹

Supportive Services

Family Locator Service. HEW contracted with the Red Cross to share the costs of the Family Locator Service for Indochinese refugees. The Red Cross performed the function as part of its normal program but because of the increased volume created by the Indochinese, the federal government agreed to share the costs of the effort.⁶⁰

Young Lawyers Section/American Bar Association. HEW contracted with the Young Lawyers Section of the American Bar Association to provide legal assistance to refugees via a toll free telephone. Later in the resettlement

ment program, HEW contracted with that group to do research on legal issues concerning the Indochinese refugees. Subsequent research papers dealt with extending the constitution to refugees parolees; adoption of Vietnamese children; the dilemma of the consent requirement; constitutional problems confronting the Vietnamese refugees; the legal status of the Indochinese refugees; and legal aspects of the sponsor relationship.⁶¹

California Demonstration Project. In late 1976, HEW funded four training-employment projects in California -- the cost was \$2 million. The projects were designed for those refugees receiving cash assistance or in imminent need of it. A portion of the participants were expected to find jobs or be upgraded in their present jobs, another portion were expected to enter advanced training programs such as on-the-job situations with paid stipends. As the termination of this program, it had grown to 62 projects costing \$7 million designed to accomplish the above plus English language, vocational training, and job development.⁶²

Activities of the Office of Special Concerns. The Office of Special Concerns was created early in the program for the purpose of developing feedback from the refugees both in refugee centers and after resettlement. The Office of Special Concerns director reported directly to the director of the Interagency Task Force, and was an executive associate of the Task Force organization. There were two divisions: the in-camp division was composed of U.S. personnel, all of whom were Vietnamese linguists and detailed from the Department of State and the Agency for International Development; the post-camp division was composed of professional specialists detailed from domestic agencies such as HEW. Trained Vietnamese

and Cambodian evaluators worked on in-camp and post-camp matters and were also available to other Interagency Task Force components and cooperating agencies.⁶³

Repatriate Program

U.S. Repatriates. The Temporary Assistance for Repatriates Program provided money to U.S. citizens or the dependents of a U.S. citizen who were forced to leave Indochina under emergency conditions, who had been returned to the United States and who were not eligible for other income maintenance programs.

Financial assistance included money for food, shelter, clothing, medical care, and transportation. It also included payments for special services such as foster home care for children. Also provided were guidance, counseling, and if necessary, vocational rehabilitation services.

Indochinese Repatriates. The refugees who wished to return home were processed under a voluntary removal program directed by the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. United Nations High Commissioner liaison officers were posted in the camps to establish and supervise procedures to be followed by refugees who wished to repatriate.⁶⁴

Financial and Medical Assistance

During the first three months of resettlement, HEW revised policies on financial and medical assistance to resettled refugees. They were as follows: the refugee was eligible for medical assistance immediately after resettlement and this did not depend on or imply a breakdown in the sponsorship of the refugee. Under the policy, the sponsor was expected

to continue to fulfill the moral commitment to meet routine or ordinary medical costs but the refugee medical assistance program was available to meet major medical needs if they arose.

The eligibility of a needy refugee for financial assistance did not depend on a breakdown in the sponsor-refugee relationship, this was to continue even if a sponsor became unable to continue to provide for the material needs of the refugee. As in the regular welfare programs, the refugees' eligibility for financial assistance was based on the refugees' needs in terms of the income and resources actually available to the refugee.

The state public welfare agency was not required to obtain a written statement from a sponsor when a refugee applied for financial or medical assistance. The requirement continued, though, that the state agency was to verify with the sponsor as to what assistance the sponsor was providing. A verbal statement by the sponsor to the state agency was sufficient, as the sponsor had not assumed legal responsibility for the refugee. For social services, medical assistance, and income maintenance, states were reimbursed for all costs incurred.⁶⁵

Unaccompanied Children

Children who reached the United States unaccompanied by responsible adults were the object of individual plans to assure protection, rights, care and the resolution of custody rights. To this end, arrangements were made with state or local public child welfare agencies in the states in which the camps were located to establish offices and provide professional staff on site at the camps. As most of the children were not initially available for adoption, foster placement was deemed the most appro-

priate plan for providing care, since this would permit their being reunited with their families. A master list of unaccompanied children was developed and states were asked to confirm the arrangement of follow-up visits to assist children and families with any problems that might develop.⁶⁶

U.S. Department of Labor

The U.S. Department of Labor provided on site assistance at the reception centers, through its affiliated state employment services. An assessment of refugee occupational skills was done and labor market information was provided to the volunteer agencies for their consideration in determining areas in which to resettle refugees.

Placement assistance was available free of charge to any resettled refugee through local public employment service offices operated by the State Employment Service Agencies.

Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), local "prime sponsors" could have enrolled refugees in their manpower programs.

Prior to their departure from the reception center, refugees were provided with information as to how to locate their State Employment Service Agency, when they reached their sponsor's location. It was thought that a refugee could receive service in the area of resettlement where the most specific information was available and where job interviews could be conducted by potential employers. Reports of activities of the State Employment Service Agencies from across the country, relating to refugee activities, were telephoned to the Department of Labor in Washington D.C. bi-monthly. The information was provided to the Secretary of Labor and to the Interagency Task Force.

Employment service personnel from the Labor Department were stationed at each of the resettlement centers to provide technical assistance in determining occupational skills of the refugees. Staff members were also available to the voluntary agencies for interpretation of labor market information occupational outlook data, and upon request, evaluation of sponsors' offers of employment.⁶⁷

Department of Agriculture/Food Stamps

Indochinese refugees became eligible for participation in the food stamp program on the same basis as all other applicants with the exception of citizenship or permanent resident alien status requirements, which were waived for refugees. The refugee household had to meet all other financial or nonfinancial eligibility criteria.⁶⁸

Department of Housing and Urban Development

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) had several housing programs available to refugees. The sources of subsidized housing were: low rent public housing; section 236 multi-family rental housing, rent supplement programs; and the section 8 housing assistance program. Also, homes held by HUD were regularly offered for sale and refugees were eligible to purchase them.⁶⁹

Baby Lift Children

These were the children who were flown from orphanages in Vietnam through private agencies prior to the mass evacuation. The children in this group were processed to determine their eligibility for adoption. If they were found eligible for adoption -- proceedings took place. The problem that was most substantial was attempting to make contact with the

parents in Vietnam.⁷⁰

Small Business Administration

Personnel from the Small Business Administration (SBA), including a refugee consultant, conducted general sessions plus seminars in each of the reception centers. Also a small business investment corporation was funded with \$500,000 from the SBA plus \$500,000 invested by refugees. This corporation made business loans to refugees to enable them to start small businesses.⁷¹

Legal Service Corporation

Refugees, if under maximum income guidelines established by the Legal Service Corporation were eligible for a full range of legal assistance, i.e., advice, counsel, representation, litigation and appeal on non-criminal matters.⁷²

Mental Health Projects

Five projects were funded to deal with refugee mental health problems -- primarily depression. The projects utilized Indochinese bilingual paraprofessionals, psychiatrists, physicians and clinical social workers. Because of language, and cultural problems, Western modes of psychiatric treatment were nearly useless. The projects thus sought to create novel approaches to mental health problems.⁷³

At this interval, it should be evident to the reader that the Indochinese refugees were not left to their own means subsequent to their evacuation from Indochina and arrival in the United States. Virtually every refugee was affected by the efforts of the Federal government to, through social services, facilitate resettlement. These services were

extensive as well as expensive, and were initiated to aid the refugees in resettlement. But what are the refugees' perceptions of the services? Our study is concerned with this question, as we feel the refugees attitude toward and perception of these services should be taken into account by those planning and delivering services to the Indochinese in America.

NOTES

¹John Simsopson, "The Refugee Problem," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, May 1939, p. 45.

²U.S. Cong., A Study Mission Report prepared for the Committee on the Judiciary, 95th Cong., 1st sess., December 1977, p. 56.

³Simsopson, p. 13.

⁴Louise W. Holborn, Refugee: A Problem of Our Time (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1951-72), pp. 795-800.

⁵Holborn, pp. 795-800.

⁶Robert Shaplen, "A Reporter at Large," The New Yorker, September 1977, p. 33.

⁷Shaplen, p. 33.

⁸Galen Beery, "Special Report, Indochina Refugees: Resettlement Progress," The Christian Century, October 1976, p. 931.

⁹The term "boat cases" refers to those refugees, largely Vietnamese and Cambodian who escaped their homelands by sea since the beginning of 1976. They make up the latest group in the Indochinese refugee rescue program. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees indicated that boat cases are among the most unusual and dramatic experiences. Many refugees attempted to flee their homelands in old, unseaworthy boats. Many perished out in the open sea.

¹⁰Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 11.

¹¹Eleanor M. Rogg, The Assimilation of Cuban Exiles: The Role of Community and Class (New York: Aberdeen Press, 1974), p. 3.

¹²S. N. Eisenstadt, The Absorption of Immigrants (New York: Free Press, 1955), p. 4.

¹³Gordon, p. 242.

¹⁴Jerold Heiss, "Factors Related to Immigrant Assimilation: Premigration Traits," Human Organization, 26, 1967, p. 265.

¹⁵James W. Vander Zanden, American Minority Relations (New York: Ronald Press, 1963), pp. 277-280.

¹⁶Gordon, p. 52.

¹⁷Robin Williams, American Society: A Sociological Interpretation (New York: Knopf, 1951), p. 48.

¹⁸Melford E. Spiro, "The Acculturation of American Ethnic Groups," American Anthropologist, 57, 1955, p. 1243.

¹⁹Rogg, p. 17.

²⁰Rogg, p. 18.

²¹Joseph B. Sechectman, The Refugee in the World: Displacement and Integration (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1963), p. 25.

²²H.B.M. Murphy, Flight and Resettlement (Lucerne: C.J. Bucher, Ltd., 1955), p. 91.

²³Murphy, p. 91.

²⁴Raymond Breton and Maurice Pinard, "Group Formation Among Immigrants: Criteria and Processes," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 26, 1960, p. 465.

²⁵S. Alexander Weinstock, "Role Elements: A Link Between Acculturation and Occupational Status," British Journal of Sociology, 14, 1963, p. 144.

²⁶Henry P. David, "Involuntary International Migration: Adaptation of Refugees," International Migration, 7, 1969, p. 34.

²⁷L. Eitinger, "The Incidence of Mental Disease Among Refugees in Norway," Journal of Mental Science, 105, 1959, p. 326.

²⁸Murray P. Naditch and Richard Morrissey, "Role, stress, personality and psychopathology in a group of immigrant adolescents," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 85, 1976, p. 43.

²⁹Keh-Ming lin, Laurie Tazuma, and Minoru Masuda, "Adaptational Problems of Vietnamese Refugees, Part I: Health and Mental Health Status," Unpublished report, University of Washington, 1977.

³⁰Study Mission Report, p. 70.

³¹Edith Lenart, "After War, Another Battle," Far Eastern Economic Review, April 29, 1977, p. 22.

³²The Report of the Uncle Counselor, Southeast Asian Mental Health Project, (Los Angeles: October 1976 - July 1977).

- ³³ Report of the Uncle Counselor.
- ³⁴ Study Mission Report, p. 71.
- ³⁵ HEW Task Force For Indochinese Refugees, Report to the Congress
Sept. 21, 1977 (Washington D.C.: Dept. of HEW), p. 31.
- ³⁶ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 21, 1977, p. 100.
- ³⁷ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 21, 1977, p. 41.
- ³⁸ HEW Task Force For Indochinese Refugees, Report to the Congress
Sept. 15, 1975 (Washington D.C.: Dept. of HEW), p. 17.
- ³⁹ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 35.
- ⁴⁰ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 33.
- ⁴¹ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 34.
- ⁴² HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 20.
- ⁴³ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 22.
- ⁴⁴ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 24.
- ⁴⁵ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 27.
- ⁴⁶ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 30.
- ⁴⁷ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 31.
- ⁴⁸ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 58.
- ⁴⁹ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 74.
- ⁵⁰ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 60.
- ⁵¹ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 65.
- ⁵² HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 66.
- ⁵³ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 67.
- ⁵⁴ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 67.
- ⁵⁵ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 67.
- ⁵⁶ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 68.
- ⁵⁷ HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 69.

- 58 HEW Task Force For Indochina Refugees, Report to the Congress
June 20, 1977 (Washington D.C.: Dept. of HEW), p. 56.
- 59 HEW Report to Congress, June 20, 1977, p. 56.
- 60 HEW Task Force For Indochina Refugees, Report to the Congress
June 15, 1976 (Washington D.C.: Dept. of HEW), p. 41.
- 61 HEW Report to Congress, June 20, 1977, p. 35.
- 62 HEW Report to Congress, June 20, 1977, p. 35.
- 63 HEW Task Force For Indochina Refugees, Report to the Congress
December 15, 1975 (Washington D.C.: Dept. of HEW), p. 46.
- 64 HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 50.
- 65 HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 72.
- 66 HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 74.
- 67 HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 87.
- 68 HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 93.
- 69 HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 15, 1975, p. 94.
- 70 HEW Report to Congress, Dec. 15, 1975, p. 110.
- 71 HEW Task Force For Indochina Refugees, Report to the Congress
March 15, 1976 (Washington D.C.: Dept. of HEW), p. 122.
- 72 HEW Report of Congress, June 15, 1977, p. 129.
- 73 HEW Report to Congress, Sept. 21, 1977, p. 46.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND EXECUTION

This study was conducted in two phases. As one of the purposes of the research was to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful adaptation of Indochinese refugees, criteria for defining successful and unsuccessful were necessary. This became the focus of the preliminary phase of the study. The major phase of the research concentrated on those areas identified as primary considerations of the study: refugee demographic data; indicators of successful refugee resettlement; and refugee attitudes and perceptions about social services programs and barriers to resettlement.

POPULATION

The Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian refugee populations of the Portland metropolitan area served as subject populations for the study. It was estimated from information provided by the Indochinese Refugee Program, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Salem, Oregon, that there were approximately 2500 refugees (1650 Vietnamese, 480 Cambodians, and 265 Laotians) residing in the Portland metropolitan area as of November, 1977.

SAMPLING INFORMATION

Preliminary Phase

The sampling frame for the preliminary phase consisted of Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian refugees enrolled in English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) classes at Portland Community College -- Ross Island Center and Cascade Center; Portland State University; and the Indochinese Cultural Center in Portland.

A total of 100 refugees from all three groups was set as a manageable sample population for the preliminary phase. The number of refugees in each group sample was derived by calculating the proportion of each group within its respective general Portland-area Indochinese population. As the Vietnamese population represented well over 70% of the total Indochinese population, adjustments were made in order to accommodate more representation of the less populous Cambodian and Laotian groups. Group sample sizes of 54 Vietnamese, 30 Cambodians, and 16 Laotians made up the total sample population of 100 refugees.

Major Phase

The sampling frame for the major phase consisted of the mailing lists for the publications, "Vietnamese News," "Cambodian News," and "Laotian News," distributed by the Indochinese Cultural Center in Portland, Oregon. This list included 500 Vietnamese, 97 Cambodians, and 55 Laotians, who were designated heads of households.

A manageable total sample population was set at 300 refugees. The number of refugees in each group sample was derived by calculating the proportion of each head of household group within its respective general Portland Indochinese population. The Vietnamese population with over 70% in the general Indochinese population was represented in the major phase by 235 refugees. The Cambodian population with 20% representation in the

general Indochinese population was represented in the major phase by 50 refugees. The Laotian population with 10% representation in the general Indochinese population was represented by 25 refugees.

Sample respondents were chosen from the sampling frame according to a table of random numbers.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

For both the preliminary and major phases of the study, the questionnaire was chosen as a basic means of data collection. It was felt that a questionnaire would provide the anonymity necessary to provide honest responses. This has been indicated by previous researchers of Indochinese populations to be an important issue.¹ Indochinese have been hesitant to discuss their lives in the United States as they fear that the information will be used against them; or that they might sound ungrateful to their American hosts. A questionnaire would provide the Indochinese with an opportunity to express themselves without fear of embarrassment or recrimination. Also, by expressing their thoughts in written form, they would have time to think over their responses, time that is perhaps especially needed when questions are asked that might be difficult to answer. A questionnaire could also provide a greater degree of standardization of response, making the data more manageable, while, at the same time, providing the respondents with an opportunity to comment in more detail about their thoughts and needs.

Interviewing the Indochinese in their homes as a method of data collection was also considered. The major phase provided the opportunity to interview refugees. An additional sample of 30 refugees (10

from each group) was drawn from the sampling frame.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Preliminary Phase

Since the major focus of the questionnaire, in this phase, was to define criteria for successful and unsuccessful resettlement, Maslow's hierarchy of needs was consulted in order to develop resettlement goal categories. Maslow's categories of man's needs ranged from basic needs of physiology to higher needs or metaneeds of personality development.² Fourteen goal categories, corresponding the Maslow's categories, were considered: housing, transportation, employment, education, family-friends, culture maintenance, finances, insurance, legal services, family planning, medical-health, recreation-leisure, food, and residency status. Thirty-six items reflective of these categories were formulated for the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to rank each item according to their view of its importance in successful resettlement.

An additional source of data -- 17 barrier conditions to successful resettlement -- was also presented in the preliminary phase questionnaire. Respondents were asked to indicate those conditions which prevented them from becoming successfully resettled.

A copy of the preliminary phase questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

Major Phase

Using the data collected in the preliminary phase, 15 items which were ranked consistently (over 50% of the time) "most important" were included in the major phase questionnaire as indicators of successful

refugee resettlement. Questions reflective of demographic data were presented as well as questions reflective of the refugees' perceptions and attitudes toward social service resources. Consultation with recognized leaders of each Indochinese group was conducted in the formulation of these questions.

A copy of the major phase questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

SOME VARIABLES AND POSSIBLE INFLUENCES TO RESETTLEMENT

Demographic Variables

Age. The age of a refugee may have some bearing on his or her resettlement. Younger refugees tend to have an easier time in adapting to a new culture. The group of successful refugees, therefore, is expected to be largely composed of younger persons.

Sex. Asian cultures tend to be male-dominated. The majority of heads of households are expected to be male.

Marital status. The family unit is an important aspect of Indochinese cultures. Having a spouse and a family can provide much emotional support. For refugees attempting to assimilate into a new culture, this support would seem to be most beneficial to resettlement. Thus, a refugee having a spouse and/or a family with him/her in the new country would probably be more successfully resettled than a refugee not having a spouse and/or family with him/her.

Occupation. Education and occupation are very highly correlated variables. Higher education can mean higher status occupations. Higher status occupations can lead to greater social mobility and more successful resettlement for refugees. Those refugees with higher status occupa-

tions in their homelands would be expected to be more successfully resettled than those refugees with lower status occupations in their homelands.

English language ability. Successful refugees tend to be those who are able to communicate in the language of their new country. Successful refugees, then, will be expected to have greater proficiency in speaking and reading English.

Length of stay in America. The longer the length of stay in a new country, the greater the chance for successful resettlement. The successful group of refugees will be expected to have spent a longer period of time in the United States than the unsuccessful group.

Religion. It could be expected that those who identify with a religion would be better able to adjust to a new culture, as they would be likely to receive emotional and social support from the religion and from the community of worshippers.

Attitudinal Variables

Hope to return to homeland. If the situation of being in America is seen as temporary, steps will not be taken to try to adjust to the American culture. If the respondent sees his return to his homeland as being a reality in the near future, he will perceive even more so the present situation as being temporary. A respondent who perceives his stay in America as being somewhat permanent would take the necessary measures to help himself adjust to American life.

Awareness of social service resources. Being aware of the various social service resources in the Portland area can greatly facilitate resettlement in the area. Successful refugees, then, will be expected to have more experiences and contacts with social service agencies, and know-

ledge of where to get help for problems.

QUESTIONNAIRE TRANSLATIONS

Translating of the questionnaires for both the preliminary phase and the major phase was carried out by interpreters at the Indochinese Cultural Center in Portland. For each questionnaire, several interpreters for each language (Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian) were utilized in order to work out any problems that might have occurred in the translations. Copies of each questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES AND RESPONSE RATES

Preliminary Phase

A total of 100 questionnaires (54 Vietnamese, 30 Cambodian, and 16 Laotian) were distributed in ESL classes at Portland Community College, Portland State University, and the Indochinese Cultural Center in Portland. The respondents were asked to complete the questionnaires in class, in the presence of a researcher who provided interpretation when necessary.

A total of 90 questionnaires (46 Vietnamese, 28 Cambodian, and 16 Laotian) were collected for analysis. Approximately 8 Vietnamese and 2 Cambodian questionnaires could not be collected.

Major Phase

A total of 300 questionnaires (235 Vietnamese, 50 Cambodian, and 26 Laotian) were distributed through the mail. Each questionnaire included a stamped, addressed envelope in which the respondent could return the complete questionnaire.

A total of 53 questionnaires (42 Vietnamese, 11 Cambodian, and 8

Laotian) were returned undeliverable.

The questionnaires collected for analysis included 51 Vietnamese, 10 Cambodian, and 17 Laotian -- a total of 78 questionnaires. These small numbers of responses made for a rather weak data base.

Plans to interview an additional sample of nonrespondents in their homes were abandoned after numerous attempts to contact willing respondents proved futile. Initial contacts with sample respondents were made through an interpreter via telephone calls. Those contacted, for the most part, did not wish to be interviewed. Reasons most often cited included time conflicts and disinterest in the subject matter.

DATA TABULATION AND ANALYSIS

The items in both questionnaires were put on punch cards. Computer programs were prepared to tabulate the findings and convert the tabulations into percentage statistics.

An analysis of variance (one-way design) was performed on variables of the major phase questionnaire.

Ideally in a study of this nature, every individual in the universe (all Indochinese refugees in Portland) would be contacted to obtain precise answers. Cost and time restraints dictated the use of a sample of Indochinese refugees to conduct the study. The sampling frames for both questionnaires consisted of recognized Indochinese population bases -- ESL classes and heads of households. These two decisions prevented the non-ESL refugees and the non-head of household adult refugees, females, for the most part, from being included in the study. In analyzing the results of the study, these factors must be considered.

Other factors which the researchers felt should be taken into consideration when analyzing the results, the major phase findings, in particular, include: the refugees' basic unfamiliarity with surveys and questionnaires, the rate of returned undeliverable questionnaires (approximately 18%), and the possibility that questions on the major phase questionnaire may have been misunderstood by some refugees.

NOTES

¹Keh-Ming Lin, Laurie Tazuma, and Minoru Masuda, "Adaptational Problems of Vietnamese Refugees, Psrt I: Health and Mental Health Status," Unpublished report, University of Washington, 1977; and Jean Immel, Vietnamese and Cambodian Study, Unpublished report, Portland State University, 1977.

²Richard Holme, ed., Abnormal Psychology: Current Perspectives (Del Mar, California) Communications Research Machines, Inc., 1972).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

PRELIMINARY PHASE

The aim of the preliminary survey was to gain definitions of the successfully and the unsuccessfully resettled refugee, and to gain insight into the refugee's perceptions of possible barriers to realizing successful resettlement. The tables that follow illustrate the findings of the preliminary phase survey.

In the preliminary phase survey, the refugees, through their responses to 28 items, defined "successful" and "unsuccessful" as it relates to resettlement. The items presented were stated as goals, and these goals ranged from the acquisition of material objects to the opportunity to exercise religious activities.

Table I depicts those items or goals which 50% or more of the total average of the refugees considered "most important" to successful resettlement.

Table II depicts those items or goals which 20% or more of the total average of the refugees considered "least important" to successful resettlement.

TABLE I

ITEMS/GOALS CONSIDERED MOST IMPORTANT TO SUCCESSFUL
RESETTLEMENT BY 50% OF THE TOTAL AVERAGE
OF INDOCHINESE REFUGEES

<u>Item/Goal</u>	<u>Vietnamese</u> N=46	<u>Cambodian</u> N=28	<u>Laotian</u> N=16
1. Own a home	56%	84%	93%
2. Own a car	59	90	88
3. Having Oregon driver's license	47	67	81
4. Having job suitable to education	20	79	69
5. Recertification of professional degrees	16	72	73
6. Having ESL training	53	39	67
7. Obtaining job training	55	83	71
8. Having American friends	22	87	56
9. Having bank accounts	40	69	56
10. Having health insurance	47	74	87
11. Having home or life insurance	27	61	81
12. Having auto insurance	41	67	80
13. Having access to medical services	45	79	88
14. Obtaining permanent residency in America	50	61	67
15. Obtaining U.S. citizenship	44	72	67

TABLE II

ITEMS/GOALS CONSIDERED LEAST IMPORTANT TO SUCCESSFUL
RESETTLEMENT BY 20% OF THE TOTAL AVERAGE
OF INDOCHINESE REFUGEES

<u>Item/Goal</u>	<u>Vietnamese</u> N=46	<u>Cambodian</u> N=28	<u>Laotian</u> N=16
1. Rent a home or apartment	14%	18%	43%
2. Live in a rural area	65	6	7
3. Ability to ride a bus	55	11	14
4. Job equal to former job in Asia	28	29	13
5. Having no job and on welfare	35	24	67
6. Graduating from U.S. 4-yr. college	38	19	16
7. Living alone in home or apt.	62	38	33
8. Belong to cultural organization	34	18	13
9. Having credit for loans, etc.	25	11	20
10. Ability to acquire attorney	41	6	13
11. Having a large family	45	22	47
12. Being accustomed to U.S. foods	31	17	20

If the reader recalls, "barrier conditions" are those elements in the refugees' profile or environment that might hinder or prevent him from realizing "successful resettlement" status. What follows is a table indicating what percentage of the sample felt a particular "barrier condition" was a significant hinderance. Table II indicates, respectively, the Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian responses.

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INDOCHINESE RESPONSES TO
BARRIER CONDITIONS TO SUCCESSFUL RESETTLEMENT

Barrier Condition	<u>Vietnamese</u> N=46	<u>Cambodian</u> N=16	<u>Laotian</u> N=28
1. Not knowing enough English	49%	81%	29%
2. Not having a good job	39	88	21
3. Racial discrimination	24	63	14
4. Not having enough job training	26	50	11
5. Job discrimination	15	88	11
6. Lack or recertification	26	81	25
7. Finding jobs to be scarce	30	81	25
8. Cultural misunderstanding on job	37	63	25
9. Lack of financial aid for school	37	63	14
10. Inadequate housing	24	63	18
11. Family members not in U.S.	24	75	18
12. Unorganized cultural orgs.			
13. Discrimination in loans & credit	11	63	11
14. Different religious & cultural ideas	20	44	21
15. Nonavailability of certain cultural items (food, clothing)	11	63	7
16. Not having permanent resident status	22	50	11
17. Desire to return home someday	11	63	32

The Vietnamese group indicated that "not knowing enough English" hindered resettlement the greatest, while "discrimination in loans and credit," "nonavailability of certain cultural items," and "desire to return home someday," least hindered resettlement. The Laotian group

indicated "desire to return home someday," as greatest hindrance to resettlement, while "nonavailability of certain cultural itmes," was least hindering. The Cambodian group felt, as did the Vietnamese, that "not knowing enough English," most significantly hindered resettlement, while having "different religious and cultural ideas," least hindered resettlement.

MAJOR PHASE

The major phase questionnaire, when developed, was divided into three sections. Section I was concerned with the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Section II focused on questions reflective of the current lifestyles of the refugees, which, for the most part, served as indicators of the refugees' successful or unsuccessful resettlement status. Section III asked refugees to respond to items reflecting their awareness and perceptions of American social services.

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Age. None of the respondents were over 60 years of age, or under 20 years of age. The greatest number of Vietnamese and Cambodian respondents were in their thirties, while the Laotians were in their late twenties. Between successful and unsuccessful groups, no distinct differences were indicated. Table IV depicts this information.

Sex of the Respondents. As anticipated, an overwhleming majority of the respondents were male. The few female respondents in each group comprised less than 20% of the group total. Table V depicts this information.

TABLE IV
DISTRIBUTION BY AGES OF SUCCESSFUL AND
UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES

<u>Age Category</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Under 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
21 - 30 years	6(17.9%)	1(20%)	3(30%)	9(39.2%)	1(20%)	2(28.6%)
31 - 40 years	15(53.6)	1(20)	7(70)	8(34.8)	2(40)	5(71.4)
41 - 50 years	4(15.7)	2(40)	-	5(21.7)	1(20)	-
51 - 60 years	3(12.8)	1(20)	-	1(4.3)	1(20)	-
Over 60 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE V
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' SEX
BY ETHNIC GROUP

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Vietnamese</u>	<u>Cambodian</u>	<u>Laotian</u>
Male	40(78%)	7(70%)	15(88%)
Female	9(18)	2(20)	2(12)
No Responses	2(4)	1(10)	-
	N=51	N=10	N=17

Marital Status. A clear majority of the respondents were married, with a majority of spouses being present in the United States. Between successful and unsuccessful groups, no clear differences existed. Table VI illustrates this information.

TABLE VI
DISTRIBUTION OF MARITAL STATUS AMONG SUCCESSFUL
AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Single	8(28.6%)	2(40%)	-	8(40%)	2(40%)	-
Married	19(67.9)	3(60)	10(100%)	12(59.9)	2(40)	7(100%)
Spouse in U.S.	16(84)	2(67)	10(100)	6(50)	2(100)	7(100)
Divorced	-	-	-	-	1(20)	-
Separated	-	-	-	1(5)	-	-
Widowed	-	-	-	2(10)	-	-
No Response	1(3.5)	-	-	-	-	-

Former Occupations. Military occupations and students made up the majority of former occupations. Between the successful and unsuccessful groups, some differences were indicated. The successful group accounted for more professional, white-collar type occupations. The unsuccessful group accounted for more military-related, labor occupations. The students seemed to be evenly dispersed between the groups.

TABLE VII
RANGE OF FORMER OCCUPATIONS AMONG SUCCESSFUL
AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Military	5(17.9%)	1(20%)	3(30%)	6(30.6%)	2(40%)	5(71.4%)
Students	6(21.4)	1(20)	2(20)	4(17.4)	1(20)	1(14.3)
Business	2(7.1)	1(20)	1(10)	3(13)	-	1(14.3)
Gov't. Employee	5(17.9)	1(20)	-	-	-	-
Labor	-	-	1(10)	1(4.3)	1(20)	-
Education	3(10.8)	-	1(10)	5(21.7)	-	-
Medical	-	-	2(20)	-	-	-
Other Professional	1(3.5)	-	-	-	-	-
Domestic	-	-	-	-	1(20)	-
No Response	6(21.4)	1(20)	-	3(13)	-	-

English Reading Ability. The successful group accounted for more respondents with "fairly well" and "very well" reading ability. The majority of the unsuccessful group were in the "some or little ability" category.

TABLE VIII
DISTRIBUTION OF ENGLISH READING ABILITY AMONG
SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES

<u>Ability</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Very well	5(17.9%)	2(40%)	3(30%)	-	-	1(14.3%)
Fairly well	14(50)	2(40)	5(50)	4(17.4%)	3(60%)	1(14.3)
Some or little	9(32.1)	-	2(20)	16(71.9)	1(20)	4(57.1)
None	-	1(20)	-	3(10.7)	-	1(14.3)
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-

English Speaking Ability. Very respondents indicated "very well" speaking ability. The majority of the successful group indicated "fairly well" ability, while the majority of the unsuccessful group indicated "some or little" ability.

TABLE IX
DISTRIBUTION OF ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY AMONG
SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES

<u>Ability</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Very well	-	2(40%)	-	-	-	-
Fairly well	17(60.7%)	2(40)	8(80%)	3(13%)	2(40%)	2(28.6%)
Some or little	11(39.3)	1(20)	2(20)	16(69.6)	2(40)	3(42.8)
None	-	-	-	4(17.4)	1(20)	2(28.6)
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-

Length of Stay in America. The vast majority of both successful and unsuccessful groups indicated a length of stay in America of 1-2 years.

TABLE X
DISTRIBUTION OF LENGTH OF STAY IN AMERICA AMONG
SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES

<u>Length of Stay</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Less than 1 year	-	-	-	2(9%)	-	-
1 - 2 years	21(75%)	4(80%)	8(80%)	16(82)	4(80%)	7(100%)
3 - 4 years	1(04)	1(20)	2(20)	5(17.9)	1(20)	-
More than 5 years	1(04)	-	-	-	-	-
No response	-	-	-	-	-	-

Desire to Return Home. Differences in this item tended to exist between the ethnic groups rather than between the successful and unsuccessful groups. For the Vietnamese, a clear majority indicated a desire to return home. The Cambodians and Laotians, for the most part, indicated no desire to return home.

TABLE XI
DESIRE TO RETURN HOME AMONG SUCCESSFUL
AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	22(82.1%)	2(40%)	5(50%)	16(78.3%)	1(20%)	2(28.6%)
No	5(17.9)	3(60)	4(40)	6(21.7)	4(80)	8(71.4)
No response	1(.04)	-	1(10)	-	-	-

Indicators of Successful Resettlement

The tabulated data for this section of the major phase questionnaire

can be found in Appendix B.

Housing. In terms of owning a home, the majority of respondents in each Indochinese group indicated they did not own their home. The Vietnamese were more likely, however, to own their homes, compared to the Cambodians and Laotians. Between successful and unsuccessful groups, more successful respondents tended to own homes.

The vast majority of Indochinese live with their families. Between successful and unsuccessful groups, only the Vietnamese group indicated differences. More unsuccessful Vietnamese did not live with their families.

Transportation. Most Indochinese refugees own a car and have a driver's license. Between successful and unsuccessful groups, more successful respondents possessed a car and a driver's license.

Employment. Considerably more successful respondents have jobs. More Vietnamese and Laotians tended to have jobs compared to Cambodians.

The majority of those respondents who had jobs felt their present jobs were not suited to their levels of education and skills. A majority of those holding prior professional vocations indicated that they were not licensed to practice.

The number of respondents having job training was split almost evenly among the groups.

Education. A large majority of the respondents reported having ESL training. There were very little differences to be found among the groups.

Family-Friends. Successful respondents were much more likely to have American friends than unsuccessful respondents. Among the three ethnic groupings, there were little differences.

Culture maintenance. The vast majority of Vietnamese and Laotian

respondents reported active practice of their religion. Little difference existed among successful and unsuccessful groups with the exception of Cambodian respondents. Successful Cambodians reported active practice while unsuccessful respondents reported no active practice.

Participation in cultural activities was characteristic of more successful respondents than unsuccessful respondents. More Vietnamese were likely to report non-participation than Cambodians or Laotians.

Finances. Successful respondents were much more likely to possess bank accounts than unsuccessful respondents. The Vietnamese and Laotians tended to report possession of bank accounts more so than Cambodians.

Insurance. Successful respondents overwhelmingly were much more likely to have purchased health and auto insurance than the unsuccessful respondents.

Medical and health services. Responses to the question, "Do you have access to medical and health services?" were split among the groups. Little difference existed between successful and unsuccessful groups.

Recreation and leisure activities. More Vietnamese and Laotian respondents reported participation in recreational and leisure activities than Cambodian respondents. Among successful and unsuccessful groups, successful respondents were more likely to participate in recreational and leisure activities.

Residency status. The majority of respondents have not applied for permanent residency status. Among successful and unsuccessful groups, however, the more successful respondents reported applying for permanent residency. A large majority of respondents indicated an unwillingness to change their names to a more Americanized form.

Attitudes and Perceptions Toward Social Services

The tabulated data for this section can be found in Appendix B.

Thoughts of being on public assistance. The number of "no responses" to the questions in this section tended to outnumber the actual responses. The researchers felt a need to disregard these findings in light of the low response rate.

Knowing where to go for help. The successful respondents, in general, were more aware of where to get help with medical and health problems, welfare problems, employment problems, and school-related problems. The majority of respondents did not know where to get help for race discrimination problems, and marriage problems.

Experiences with social service agencies. Most successful respondents felt agency workers understood their problems and treated them respectfully. A majority of the respondents reported that agency workers were not instrumental in locating living areas or jobs.

Most respondents in all groups indicated having language and communication problems with social service agencies, along with problems due to cultural differences.

Barriers to resettlement. A majority of respondents in all groups indicated that racial discrimination sometimes affected their resettlement in the United States. More successful respondents reported racial discrimination as having always affected their resettlement.

Most respondents in all groups reported some pressure in taking a job. Very little differences existed between successful and unsuccessful groups.

Success attained. Most respondents in all groups reported having

attained some success in their life in the United States at this point in time.

More successful respondents reported "very much success" than unsuccessful respondents.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

A one-way analysis of variance was performed on the variables of the major phase survey. The successful group was compared with the unsuccessful group within each Indochinese sample. Due to the small numbers of respondents, very few significant relationships were reported. For the Vietnamese group, "English speaking ability" was found to be significantly different for the successful and unsuccessful groups ($F=5.17$, $p<5\%$), as was "I know where to go for marriage problems" ($F=4.16$, $p<5\%$). For the Cambodian group, "I have had ESL training" indicated significant differences between successful and unsuccessful groups ($F=6.00$, $p<5\%$), along with "I know where to go for medical-health problems" ($F=5.33$, $p<5\%$). For the Laotian group, "I own a home" was significantly different for successful and unsuccessful groups ($F=6162$, $p<5\%$), as was "I am not licensed to practice my professional vocation" ($F=5.20$, $p<5\%$).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The data gathered in this study provides some insight into the resettlement status of the Indochinese refugee residing in the Portland area. Patterns depicting successful resettlement, as defined by the refugees themselves, were suggested by the data. Also suggested were patterns of demographic characteristics of the refugee; and patterns regarding their attitudes and perceptions toward social service programs and barriers toward successful resettlement.

PRELIMINARY PHASE

Being successfully resettled meant, for a sample of Indochinese refugees, having access to those items which foster social mobility, financial security and employment security. It meant being able to get around -- owning a car, a means of transportation, and being able to communicate -- learning English. Successful resettlement, according to the refugees, also meant financial security -- having a job, bank accounts, having insurance, owning a home, as well as securing permanent residency status and U.S. citizenship. Employment security also contributed to successful resettlement, according to the refugees -- having job training, being recertified or relicensed, and having a job suitable to one's skills and education levels.

In line with these findings, major barriers to successful resettlement, according to the refugees, included not knowing enough English and

not having a good job. Among different Indochinese groups, the Cambodian group reported many more barriers than either the Vietnamese or Laotian groups. This implies that Cambodians are having a harder time than the Vietnamese or Laotians in resettling in the Portland area. This finding can be compared to that of Edith Lenart, who observed that Cambodians in Paris found it more difficult to adapt to the host culture than the Vietnamese or Laotians.¹

MAJOR PHASE

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The typical Vietnamese or Cambodian respondent was a married male in his thirties. He was either Buddhist or Catholic, and was likely to have had a military-related occupation in his homeland. He can speak or read "some of little English." His typical length of stay in America has been "less than 1-2 years."

The typical Laotian respondent was a married male in his twenties. He is likely to be Buddhist and have had a military career. He can speak or read English "fairly well." He has been in America for 1-2 years.

The typical successfully resettled respondent could speak and read English "fairly well" or "very well." He or she also tended to have a professional or white-collar occupation in his or her homeland. These observations support those of James Vander Zanden and Jerold Heiss on premigration traits related to immigrant adaptation. Heiss found that migrants who were socially mobile and of young adult age at the time of migration tended to adapt to the host culture more readily than migrants who were not socially mobile and not of young adult age.² Vander Zanden

found that rapid assimilation or adaptation was influenced by the migrant's previous occupational level. The higher the occupational level, the more rapid the adaptation.³

Indicators of Successful Resettlement

The group of successfully resettled refugees indicated a greater degree of adaptation to American culture. They were more likely to own a home, own a car, and have a driver's license; be more likely to have a job, have American friends, participate in cultural activities, have bank accounts, have health and auto insurance, have access to medical/health services, and have applied for permanent residency. These findings are in line with those of the preliminary phase, in which refugees indicated successful resettlement meant social mobility, financial security, and employment security.

Attitudes and Perceptions

Data gathered in this section suggested patterns about the refugees' knowledge of social service resources; their experiences with social service agencies; and thoughts on barriers to successful resettlement.

The refugees in this study were aware of resources for help with basic needs. The vast majority indicated they knew where to obtain help for medical and health problems, employment problems, and school-related problems. They indicated not knowing where to get help for more interpersonal, complex problems such as race discrimination and marital problems. Some speculation can be made about this finding. Among the refugees, knowledge about resources for basic needs tends to be considered general knowledge and easily transferred by word of mouth.

Regarding more complex, interpersonal needs, however, knowledge of resources or discussion of these problems tends to remain within the confines of the individual and family -- the Indochinese tend not to be encouraged to seek help from others outside the family circle.

Some patterns emerged from the data regarding the refugees' experiences with social service agencies. Refugees, for the most part, felt they were treated respectfully by the social agency workers. But, they indicated that there were frequent language and communication problems between the workers and themselves. These problems, however, did not seem to deter people from obtaining help from the social agencies. The majority of the refugees indicated they did not locate living places or jobs through the social agencies. They did indicate, however, that they received some pressure from the agencies to take a job that was being offered to them.

A majority of the successful refugees seemed to be more sensitive to the effects of racial discrimination as a barrier to successful resettlement. It could be possible that on their way to achieving social mobility, and financial and employment security, these refugees came up against more racial discrimination than the unsuccessful group of refugees.

FURTHER RESEARCH

This study was merely an exploratory study, not designed to prove or disprove any existing theories. Further research is necessary to come to any definite conclusions concerning the refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos; and regarding, for example, the disadvantageous facets of accultu-

ration, since this study illustrates that successful acculturation means adapting middle class values. The research has posed and uncovered some possible patterns or relations regarding the resettlement status of the Indochinese refugees in the Portland area, and their attitudes and perceptions of American social services.

For further studies to be effective, a larger sample size should be obtained. Few significant patterns could be uncovered in the major phase due to the small numbers of respondents. A larger number of questionnaires should be distributed in order to receive a larger number of responses.

Question construction could be improved. Careful examination of the questions should be undertaken to lessen the ambiguity posed by some of them. Translations should be rigorously reviewed by several translators, testing for differing interpretations. Although not all problems of question construction would be eliminated, following these steps could lessen or avoid problems with the present construction.

Those patterns suggested by this study should be explored more thoroughly.

Longer-term research should be undertaken on the Indochinese refugees who have resettled in America. The group is unique, not only because they are refugees, but because they are much different from other previous refugees groups that have settled in America. Additional studies of adjustment or resettlement could be undertaken over the next several years.

Studies of Indochinese refugees can provide valuable insights into the social service delivery systems instituted by social service agencies.

NOTES

¹Edith Lenart, "After War, Another Battle," Far Eastern Economic Review, April 29, 1977, p.22.

²Jerold Heiss, "Factors Related to Immigrant Assimilation: Pre-Migration Traits," Human Organization, 26, 1967, p. 265.

³James W. Vander Zanden, American Minority Relations (New York: Ronald Press, 1963), pp. 277-280.

CHAPTER VI

COMMENTS

Some of the Indochinese refugees who responded to the major phase survey expressed themselves in the "Comments" section provided at the end of the questionnaire. The comments reveal emotions and needs held by the refugees in their lives in America.

Many of the refugees listed needs they felt in their resettlement in the United States. The need for education, especially English language skills, was a frequently expressed theme:

"The general lack of education has been a real problem for us. My wife wants to learn more English so that she can effectively communicate with American people" (Laotian)

"I'd like to see more English classes for the Vietnamese, please." (Vietnamese)

"Public assistance will be provided for a limited time, so I need to learn more and have a specific skill to earn a living and support my family." (Laotian)

"I feel that the larger families have the difficulties in resettlement. Sometimes I don't feel I could make it because of language barriers." (Laotian)

Other frequently expressed thoughts were those concerning the lack of social services:

"I'd like to find out more about health and social services in America" (Cambodian)

"I have a large family with a limited amount of income and the public welfare office does not provide enough money to meet my expenses." (Laotian)

"I have problems with housing, employment, and so on" (Cambodian)

"Sometimes I wonder if the social service workers only work hard because of rules and regulations stated in their job descriptions." (Laotian)

"I don't know how to get around the city...especially when I need to go to the hospital. I also need someone to translate for me at times." (Vietnamese)

"Before I moved to Portland, I had a sponsor; we are without one now. We need someone to help us with a number of things. I'd like to apply for permanent residency now." (Vietnamese)

"Family expenses can only be provided for and met if we remain on welfare, although this is not our choice" (Laotian)

"I have two brothers and three children; but I don't have my husband with me. The government helped me to learn more English six months ago, but now every program for the refugees has been terminated. That was an unthoughtful action to take. However, I understand that a four year extension of the programs is being planned. Perhaps I'll get more out of the services next time. I need more English training. At times I am very sad, I think about my future...this is very frustrating. I think I need someone to help me find a part-time job and also get to school." (Vietnamese)

Regarding socio-cultural factors, the following thoughts were prevalent:

"In America, it is difficult to locate the food ingredients used in Laotian cooking." (Laotian)

"I'd like to learn more about cultural values and ways to get along better in America." (Cambodian)

Many refugees expressed thoughts of interpersonal frustration, loneliness and other psychological concerns:

"I think the Indochinese war has done a lot to damage us. We, the Vietnamese people in America, have begun to split off into small groups. There is no togetherness, no more friendships and family deterioration is beginning." (Vietnamese)

"It is unfair for the Vietnamese who have job skills and who are unable to find jobs. This has been the most frustrating experience of my life." (Vietnamese)

"I am living by myself in America, and hoping it is only temporary. I hope to return home some day because my wife and children are still there. If my dream of returning home doesn't come true, I hope my family can come and join me here. For the time being, I do not need anything because I am too homesick to think and to do anything...I just don't know." (Vietnamese)

"Thank you very much for the questionnaire you sent me. That was nice of you..getting something from you means a lot to me. It means you care about me. I am very lonely. Every day, I have no one to talk to. Welfare is the only source of income that I have. I need more help than this. A lot of times I don't feel good because people talk about me. They think I have alot of gold and money with me...in reality, I don't. I don't think anyone likes me anymore. I hope you can help me. If you don't believe me, just drop by to see me and my family. I'd like to have some ideas to help me feel better. I hope you will come and help me. If there is anything wrong in what I have said, please forget about it." (Cambodian)

"As I look around me, I can see the American government has helped me, but I don't understand how come my fellow Vietnamese don't help each other like they did back home. There are many Vietnamese that do alot of nice talking, but little action or sincerity follows all their talk." (Vietnamese)

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beery, Galen. "Special Report, Indochina Refugees: Resettlement Progress." The Christian Century, October 1976, p. 931.
- Breton, Raymond and Maurice Pinard. "Group Formation Among Immigrants: Criteria and Processes." Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 26, 1960, p. 465.
- David, Henry P. "Involuntary International Migration: Adaptation of Refugees," International Migration, 7, 1969, p. 34.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. The Absorption of Immigrants. New York: Free Press, 1955.
- Eitinger, L. "The Incidence of Mental Disease Among Refugees in Norway." Journal of Mental Sciences, 105, 1959, p. 326.
- Gordon, Milton M. Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Heiss, Jerold. "Factors Related To Immigrant Assimilation: Premigration traits." Human Organization, 26, 1967, p. 265.
- Holborn, Louise W. Refugee: A Problem of Our Time. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1951-72: n.p., n.d.
- Holme, Richard, ed. Abnormal Psychology: Current Perspectives. Del Mar, California: Communications Research Machines, Inc., 1972.
- Immel, Jean. Vietnamese and Cambodian Study. Unpublished report, Portland State University, 1977.
- Lenart, Edith. "After War, Another Battle." Far Eastern Economic Review, April 29, 1977, p. 22.
- Lin, Keh-Ming, Laurie Tazuma, and Minoru Masuda. "Adaptational Problems of Vietnamese Refugees, Part I: Health and Mental Health Status." Unpublished report, University of Washington, 1977.
- Murphy, H. B. M. Flight and Resettlement. Lucerne: C. J. Bucher, Ltd., 1955.
- Naditch, Murray P. and Richard Morrissey. "Role stress, personality and psychopathology in a group of immigrant adolescents." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 85, 1976, p. 43.

- Rogg, Eleanor M. The Assimilation of Cuban Exiles: The Role of Community and Class. New York: Aberdeen Press, 1974.
- Sechechtman, Joseph B. The Refugee in the World: Displacement and Integration. New York: A. S. Barnes, 1963.
- Shaplen, Robert. "A Reporter At Large." The New Yorker, Sept., 1977, p. 33.
- Simsopson, John. "The Refugee Problem." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. May 1939, p. 45.
- Spiro, Melford E. "The Acculturation of American Ethnic Groups," American Anthropologist, 57, 1955, p. 1243.
- Stoessinger, "Refugees," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1973 ed.
- The Report of the Uncle Counselor. Southeast Asian Mental Health Project. Los Angeles: October 1976 - July 1977.
- U. S. Cong. A Study Mission Report Prepared for the Committee on the Judiciary. 95th Cong., 1st sess., December 1977.
- U. S. Department of HEW Task Force For Indochinese Refugees. Report To The Congress. Washington, D.C.: Sept. 15, 1975.
- . Report To The Congress. December 15, 1975.
- . Report To The Congress. March 15, 1976.
- . Report To The Congress. June 15, 1976.
- . Report To The Congress. Sept. 20, 1976.
- . Report To The Congress. Dec. 20, 1976.
- . Report To The Congress. March 21, 1977.
- . Report To The Congress. June 20, 1977.
- . Report To The Congress. Sept. 21, 1977.
- Vander Zanden, James W. American Minority Relations. New York: Ronalds Press, 1963.
- Weinstock, S. Alexander. "Role Elements: A Link Between Acculturation and Occupational Status." British Journal of Sociology, 14, 1963.
- Williams, Robin. American Society: A Sociological Interpretation. New York: Knopf, 1951.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES

PRELIMINARY PHASE SURVEY

We are graduate students from the School of Social Work at Portland State University, conducting a research project on Indochinese refugees.

We are interested in how you feel about your current living situation and lifestyle. Please help us to gain some understanding in these matters by honestly responding to the following questionnaire. Please feel free to express your true feelings. The study will be resourceful to the State and Federal governments in terms of policy making for all the Indochinese here.

Resettlement conditions

Please mark those items below which you feel you would personally need to gain in order to consider yourself successfully resettled in America.

	<u>Most Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Least Important</u>
1. Own a home	_____	_____	_____
2. Own a car	_____	_____	_____
3. Have a job equal in status to one you had in Indochina	_____	_____	_____
4. Graduating from a 4-year U.S. college	_____	_____	_____
5. Living in a home or apartment by yourself	_____	_____	_____
6. Belonging to a cultural organi- zation	_____	_____	_____
7. Having bank accounts	_____	_____	_____
8. Having health insurance	_____	_____	_____
9. Having access to legal services	_____	_____	_____
10. Having access to family planning services	_____	_____	_____
11. Having access to medical services	_____	_____	_____
12. Being able to afford leisure- recreation activities	_____	_____	_____
13. Having cultural foods available	_____	_____	_____
14. Rent a house or apartment	_____	_____	_____
15. Ability to ride a bus	_____	_____	_____
16. Having a job suiting your education	_____	_____	_____
17. Graduating from a 2-yr. U.S. college	_____	_____	_____
18. Living in a home or apt. with your family	_____	_____	_____
19. Being able to practice your religion	_____	_____	_____
20. Having home or life insurance	_____	_____	_____
21. Ability to aquire an attorney	_____	_____	_____
22. Becoming accustomed to American foods	_____	_____	_____
23. Live in a rural area	_____	_____	_____

- 24. Have an Oregon state drivers license _____
- 25. Having any that provides an income to live on _____
- 26. Gaining recertification _____
- 27. Having some American friends _____
- 28. Celebrating and participating in cultural events _____
- 29. Having credits to get loans and charge accounts _____
- 30. Obtaining permanent residency _____
- 31. Having a large family (more than 3 children) _____
- 32. Having no job and being on welfare _____
- 33. Having ESL training _____
- 34. Obtaining job training _____
- 35. Obtaining U.S. citizenship _____
- 36. Having auto insurance _____

Barrier conditions: Please mark X next to the items which you feel most likely prevents you from attaining those items marked in Part I of the questionnaire.

- 1. Not knowing enough English _____
- 2. Not having a good job _____
- 3. Racial discrimination or prejudice _____
- 4. Not having enough job training _____
- 5. Job discrimination or prejudice _____
- 6. Lack of recertified Indochinese degrees _____
- 7. Finding jobs to be scarce _____
- 8. Having cultural misunderstandings with employer _____
- 9. Lack of financial aid for schooling _____
- 10. Not having adequate housing _____
- 11. Not having family members in America _____
- 12. Not having an organized cultural association _____
- 13. Finding discrimination among loan and credit orgs. _____
- 14. Having different religious and cultural ideas _____
- 15. Not having basic cultural necessities(food, clothing) _____
- 16. Not obtaining permanent residency _____
- 17. Want to return home someday _____

VIETNAMESE PRELIMINARY SURVEY

PHÂN TÍCH SỐ KHỚP

Chúng tôi là sinh viên tốt nghiệp ban dịch vụ xã hội (Social Work) tại Trường Portland State University, đang thực hiện một dự án nghiên cứu về người tỵ nạn Đông Dương. Quan tâm đến các bạn cảm nghĩ về tình trạng và lối sống hàng ngày của quý vị. Yêu cầu quý vị giúp chúng tôi có thêm hiểu biết về vấn đề trên bằng cách trả lời trung thực các câu hỏi sau đây: Ban nghiên cứu này sẽ giúp ích cho chánh phủ tiểu bang và Liên Bang trong việc hoạch định chánh sách áp dụng cho tất cả người tỵ nạn Đông Dương.

Điều kiện định cư: (Resettlement conditions)

Yêu cầu đánh dấu 1, 2 hay 3 tùy theo khoảng trống mà bạn cần và muốn có để có thể xem như vừa ý trong sự định cư tại Hoa Kỳ.
1: rất quan trọng; 2: quan trọng hay 3: ít quan trọng.

	1	2	3
1. Sở hữu chủ một căn nhà.	_____	_____	_____
2. Sở hữu chủ một xe hơi.	_____	_____	_____
3. Có việc làm ngang với trình độ bạn đã có tại xứ nhà.	_____	_____	_____
4. Tốt nghiệp một đại học 4 năm.	_____	_____	_____
5. Sống trong một căn nhà hay muốn một mình ở apartment.	_____	_____	_____
6. Gia nhập một tổ sở Văn Hoa.	_____	_____	_____
7. Có một trường mục tại ngân hàng.	_____	_____	_____
8. Có bảo hiểm sức khỏe.	_____	_____	_____
9. Có nhờ các sở dịch vụ luật pháp.	_____	_____	_____
10. Có nhờ các dịch vụ gia đình.	_____	_____	_____
11. Có nhờ các dịch vụ Y Tế.	_____	_____	_____
12. Có thể có thời rảnh rỗi.	_____	_____	_____
13. Có trình độ văn hóa (Việt Nam, Lào, Cam Bốt) những thức ăn tinh thần.	_____	_____	_____
14. Muốn một căn nhà hay Một chung cư.	_____	_____	_____

	1.	2	3
15. Có khả năng đi xe Bus	_____	_____	_____
16. Có một việc làm với sự may rủi	_____	_____	_____
17. Tốt nghiệp đại học cộng đồng từ 2 năm.	_____	_____	_____
18. Đang sống trong căn nhà hay sống chung cư với gia đình.	_____	_____	_____
19. Có thể thực hành tôn giáo của mình.	_____	_____	_____
20. Có nhà hay bảo hiểm nhân thọ	_____	_____	_____
21. Có thể muốn một luật sư.	_____	_____	_____
22. Bắt đầu quen dùng đồ ăn Mỹ.	_____	_____	_____
23. Sống ở đồng quê.	_____	_____	_____
24. Có bằng lái xe ở Oregon.	_____	_____	_____
25. Có thể nhận bất cứ công việc gì mà đem lại lợi tức cho đời sống	_____	_____	_____
26. Lấy lại được chứng chỉ văn bằng của Đồng Dương tại Hoa Kỳ	_____	_____	_____
27. Có vài bạn thân người Mỹ	_____	_____	_____
28. Dự lễ và tham gia những hoạt động văn hóa Đồng Dương.	_____	_____	_____
29. Có tín chỉ (credit) để vay hoặc trả tiền tại một trường mục.	_____	_____	_____
30. Chấp nhận cư trú thường trực tại Hoa Kỳ.	_____	_____	_____
31. Có gia đình đông con (trên 3 con)	_____	_____	_____
32. Đang thất nghiệp và nhận trợ xã hội.	_____	_____	_____
33. Có theo học khóa huấn luyện Anh ngữ.	_____	_____	_____
34. Chấp nhận thụ huấn công việc	_____	_____	_____
35. Chấp nhận trở thành công dân Hoa Kỳ.	_____	_____	_____
36. Có bảo hiểm xe hơi.	_____	_____	_____

Nhưng điều kiện trở ngại:

Đánh dấu vào những câu hỏi sau đây xác thực nhất, mà bạn thấy trở ngại trong những câu hỏi mà bạn đã đánh dấu ở phần 1.

1. Không hiểu đủ trình độ Anh văn _____
2. Không có một việc tốt _____
3. Sự kỳ thị chủng tộc hay tôn thường dèn mình. _____
4. Không có đủ công việc huấn nghệ. _____
5. Công việc kỳ thi hoặc bị làm tôn thường. _____
6. Thiếu văn bằng và chứng chỉ Đổng đương. _____
7. Tìm một công việc, thật hiếm. _____
8. Có sự ngôn ngữ bất đồng giữa bạn và nhân viên cùng sở. _____
9. Thiếu trợ giúp tài chánh để tiếp tục việc học. _____
10. Không hội đủ điều kiện để thuê nhà. _____
11. Không có thân quyền ở Hoa Kỳ. _____
12. Không có một tổ chức của Hội Văn Hoa. _____
13. Tìm kiếm một sự phân biệt rõ rệt trong số tín chỉ hay hội cho vay. _____
14. Có một tín ngưỡng hay một văn hoá mà ý tưởng khác với ý tưởng Hoa Kỳ. _____
15. Không thể thu thập được những vật dụng cần bản văn hóa ở đây (thức ăn, quần áo, v.v....) _____
16. Không chấp nhận cù ngụ thường trú. _____
17. Muốn trở về quê hương một ngày gần đây. _____

CAMBODIAN PRELIMINARY SURVEY

ការធ្វើការស្រាវជ្រាវដំបូង ដើម្បីដឹងពីស្ថានភាពជីវភាពរស់នៅ

យើងអាចធ្វើការស្រាវជ្រាវដំបូងដោយចាប់ផ្តើមពីសាលា ហាង ឬការងារស្រាវជ្រាវដំបូង
 ដើម្បីដឹងពីស្ថានភាពជីវភាពរស់នៅ និងការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន ។
 យើងអាចចាប់ផ្តើមការស្រាវជ្រាវដំបូងបានដោយចាប់ផ្តើមពីសាលា ហាង ឬការងារស្រាវជ្រាវដំបូង
 ដើម្បីដឹងពីស្ថានភាពជីវភាពរស់នៅ និងការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន ។
 យើងអាចចាប់ផ្តើមការស្រាវជ្រាវដំបូងបានដោយចាប់ផ្តើមពីសាលា ហាង ឬការងារស្រាវជ្រាវដំបូង
 ដើម្បីដឹងពីស្ថានភាពជីវភាពរស់នៅ និងការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន ។

ស្ថានភាពជីវភាពរស់នៅ ។ -
 ការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន ។ ឬការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន ។ ឬការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន ។
 ឬការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន ។ ឬការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន ។ ឬការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន ។

	១ សំខាន់បំផុត	២ សំខាន់	៣ មិនសំខាន់
១. - បានធ្វើការស្រាវជ្រាវ	---	---	---
២. - បានដឹងពីស្ថានភាពជីវភាពរស់នៅ	---	---	---
៣. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលធ្វើបាន	---	---	---
៤. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលមិនធ្វើបាន	---	---	---
៥. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន	---	---	---
៦. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន	---	---	---
៧. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន	---	---	---
៨. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន	---	---	---
៩. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន	---	---	---
១០. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន	---	---	---
១១. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន	---	---	---
១២. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន	---	---	---
១៣. - បានដឹងពីការងារដែលធ្វើបាន ឬមិនធ្វើបាន	---	---	---

LAOTIAN PRELIMINARY SURVEY

ການສຳຮວດຂອບເຂດ

ພວກຂ້າພະເຈົ້າໄດ້ສຶກສາຈາກສຳນັກງານອົບໂລນສັງຄົມສົງຄາມແຫ່ງນະຫວີຫຍາລັຍປອດຜນສະເຕດ
ກຳລັງຫຳລັງການສຳຮວດກ່ຽວກັບຊາວອົບພິກອິນດູຈີນ:

ພວກຂ້າພະເຈົ້າສົນໃຈກ່ຽວກັບສຸກນະການຈິວິດການເປັນຢູ່ຂອງພວກທ່ານໂດຍສະເພາະ ກະລຸນາຈ່ວຍເຫຼືອ
ໃຫ້ພວກຂ້າພະເຈົ້າໄດ້ຮັບຄວາມເຂົ້າໃຈນຳດ້ວຍ ໂດຍໃຫ້ການຕອບຄຳຖາມຂ້າງລຸ່ມນີ້ຢ່າງຈິງໃຈ ສັນນະກະລຸນາຕອບ
ຕາມສບາຍໃຈໂລດ ການສຳຮວດສຶກສານີ້ຈະເປັນປະໂຫຍດໃຫ້ແກ່ຮັບການຂອງຮັດແລະຮັດຍານກ່າວດ້ວຍໃນການຈັດຕັ້ງ
ນະໂຍບາຍຈ່ວຍເຫຼືອຊາວອົບພິກອິນດູຈີນ:

ສາຍການເປັນຢູ່ຂອງຊາວອົບພິກ:

ກະລຸນາໃຫ້ການຕອບຄຳຖາມແຕ່ລະຂໍ້ຕາມລຸດ 1 ຫາ 16 ທີ່ ຢູ່ເບື້ອງຂວາ ຄຳຖາມເຫຼົ່ານີ້ຖາມເຖິງວ່າ
ທ່ານຈະເຮັດຈະຫຳຜນວ່າໃດຈຶ່ງຈະເຮັດວ່າທ່ານນັ້ນສຳເລັດເປັນພັນຖານພໍຢູ່ພັນອຸດົມສົມບູນດີໃນສະຫະຣັດອະເມຣິກາ:

	ເປັນປະໂຫຍດຫລາຍ	ສຳຖຽງ	ບໍ່ເປັນປະໂຫຍດ
1. ຢາກມີເຮືອນ	_____	_____	_____
2. ຢາກມີລົດ	_____	_____	_____
3. ຢາກມີທຶນທຳລາຍການເຕມອນກັນກັບຢູ່ບ້ານ	_____	_____	_____
4. ຢາກຮຽນຈົບຈາກນະຫວີຫຍາລັຍສີ່ປີ	_____	_____	_____
5. ຢາກຢູ່ເຮືອນຫລືຢູ່ບ້ານຜູ້ດຽວ	_____	_____	_____
6. ຢາກເອົາຮ່ວມໃຈສູນກ່າວວິທານະຫຳລາຍ	_____	_____	_____
7. ຕ້ອງການຢາກມີກິດເປີດເຜີຍຢູ່ທຶນາຄານ	_____	_____	_____
8. ຢາກມີປະກັນພັນສຸຂະພາບ	_____	_____	_____
9. ຕ້ອງການຢາກຮັບຄວາມຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອພາຍໂຕກິດຫມາຍ	_____	_____	_____
10. ຕ້ອງການວາງແຜນຄອບຄົວ	_____	_____	_____
11. ຕ້ອງການຢາກຮູ້ຈັກແລະຢາກໄດ້ຮັບການຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອຫ່າງ ດານຄວາມເຈັບປ່ວຍ	_____	_____	_____
12. ຢາກມີເງິນແລະເວລາພໍໄດ້ທຽວແລະບອຍໃຈ	_____	_____	_____
13. ຢາກໃຫ້ມີອາຫານລາວຫລືເຮັດຄອງຄົວຂາຍຕາມຮ່າງອາຫານ	_____	_____	_____

	ເປັນປະໂຫດຫລາຍ	ສຳກາງ	ບໍ່ເປັນປະໂຫດ
໑໔. ຢາກເຊົາເຮືອນຫລືເຊົາຫ້ອງຢູ່	_____	_____	_____
໑໕. ສາມາດອໍລິດເນເອງໄດ້	_____	_____	_____
໑໖. ຢາກນິອາຈິບສິນກັບຄວາມຮູ້	_____	_____	_____
໑໗. ຮຽນຈົບຈາກວິທຍາລັຍຫ້ອງສອງປີ	_____	_____	_____
໑໘. ຢາກຢູ່ບ້ານຢູ່ເຮືອນກັບຄອບຄົວ	_____	_____	_____
໑໙. ຢາກມີເສຣີພາຍປະຕິບັດນັບຊື່ສາສນາອິດສອງ	_____	_____	_____
໒໐. ຢາກມີທ່າອຸ່ນປະກັນພັນ	_____	_____	_____
໒໑. ຢາກມີຜູ້ຊ່ວຍໝາຍຄວາມທາງຄຸນນິດໝາຍ	_____	_____	_____
໒໒. ຢາກກິນອາຫານອະເນຣິກັນໂດດາມສບາຍ	_____	_____	_____
໒໓. ຢາກຢູ່ນອກເມືອງ	_____	_____	_____
໒໔. ຢາກມີໃບຂັບຂີ່ລົດ	_____	_____	_____
໒໕. ຢາກມີວຽກການພໍ່ຢູ່ພື້ນ	_____	_____	_____
໒໖. ຢາກມີໃບອະນຸຍາດຝັກຫັດງານ	_____	_____	_____
໒໗. ຢາກມີເສຣີອນຟຸງຄົນອະເນຣິກັນ	_____	_____	_____
໒໘. ຢາກສະລິມສລອງບຸນຕ່າງກກຽວກັບວັດໜາຫັນເຮົາ	_____	_____	_____
໒໙. ຢາກມີໂອກາດຍື່ນເງິນຈາກໜາຄານໂດ	_____	_____	_____
໓໐. ຕ້ອງການຢາກຢູ່ແບບຖາວອນ	_____	_____	_____
໓໑. ຢາກມີຄອບຄົວໃຫຍ່ (ມີລູກຫລາຍກວ່າສາມຄົນຂຶ້ນໄປ)	_____	_____	_____
໓໒. ຕ້ອງການຢາກກິນວວຍຝຸ່ນ ບໍ່ຢາກເຮັດວຽກ	_____	_____	_____
໓໓. ຕ້ອງຢາກຮຽນພັກຊ່ອນພາສາອັງກິດ	_____	_____	_____
໓໔. ຕ້ອງການຢາກພັກຊ່ອນງານເພື່ອຈະໄດ້ອາຈິບດີ	_____	_____	_____
໓໕. ຕ້ອງການຢາກຕັດສິນຊາດ	_____	_____	_____
໓໖. ຢາກມີປະກັນພັນລົດ	_____	_____	_____

ບັນດາຂັ້ນໄດ້ຮັບຄວາມສຳເລັດ:

ຢູ່ຂ້າງລຸ່ມນີ້ຂໍໃຫ້ທ່ານຕອບຄືວ່າ ຢູ່ຂ້າງຂວາມີໂຕຕັ້ງກັບແນວຄິດທີ່ພາໃຫ້ທ່ານບໍ່ໄດ້ຮັບຄວາມອຸດົມສົມບູນ ທີ່ທ່ານໂຕຕອບໄວ້ໃນຕາຕະລາງນີ້.

- ໑໑. ບໍ່ຮູ້ຈັກພາສາອັງກິດ _____
- ໑໒. ບໍ່ມີວຽກຫາກເຮັດເປັນຕົວ _____
- ໑໓. ມີຄວາມລັງກຽດຫວັງດ້ານເຈດຽນຊາດພົວພັນ _____
- ໑໔. ບໍ່ມີລູກຟ້າຟ້າໃນວຽກການ _____
- ໑໕. ມີການລັງກຽດໃນການຊອກວຽກ _____
- ໑໖. ບໍ່ມີໃບອະນຸຍາດຫລືໃບປະກາດຫວ່າງການ _____
- ໑໗. ຊອກຫາວຽກການບໍ່ຄອບຄົວ _____
- ໑໘. ມີການເຂົ້າໃຈຜິດພາດຂອງການແລະນາຍຈ້າງ _____
- ໑໙. ບໍ່ມີທຶນສຶກສາໄປຮຽນ _____
- ໑໐. ຊອກເຮືອນແລະບ່ອນຢູ່ຢາກ _____
- ໑໑. ຍັງຂາດບາດພັນອ່ງນາຢູ່ນຳ _____
- ໑໒. ບໍ່ມີສະໜັບສະໜູນຈາກບັນດາບັນດາບັນດາ _____
- ໑໓. ມີການລັງກຽດໃນການຢືນຢັນຈາກທຸກຄຳຄຳ _____
- ໑໔. ຄວາມເຊື່ອຢູ່ບຸກຄົນສາມາດແລະລັງກຽດທຸກຄຳຄຳແຕກຕ່າງກັນກັບອະນຸຍາດໃຫ້ເຮົາແລະເຮົາເຮົາເຮົາເຮົາເຮົາ _____
- ໑໕. ບໍ່ໄດ້ຮັບອະນຸຍາດເປັນຕົວຢ່າງອອນໄລ _____
- ໑໖. ຢາກກັບບ້ານມີໃດນັ້ນ _____

MAJOR PHASE SURVEY

We are from Portland State University and are conducting a research project on Indochinese refugees. As you know, some special services that were designed to meet the needs of the Indochinese have been reduced or delayed in one way or another. Many people in government and other agencies may not know exactly what kinds of needs or services interest you in order to live successfully in America. In America, one way to find out what kinds of needs or services interest you is through the use of a questionnaire or survey. By using a questionnaire or survey, you can express your opinions and ideas anonymously, in a democratic way. So, your honest answers to this questionnaire can help to determine your current and future living situations in America.

We ask that you please complete this questionnaire now. We are not asking for your name. We need your help so please feel free to express your opinions. It is urgent and important, we beg you not to throw this questionnaire away. Fill it out and mail it today, please.

Thank you very much for your time. (An envelope and a stamp are enclosed for convenience in responding to us.)

I. Personal Information

Mark X next to the items which are true for you. Please answer as many as possible.

Example: I use the bus. Yes X No _____
I have a secure job Yes _____ No _____

1. What is your nationality? Vietnamese _____ Cambodian _____ Laotian _____
2. What is your year of birth? _____
3. What is your present marital status? Single _____ Married _____
Divorced _____ Separated _____ Widowed _____
If married, is your spouse here with you in America? Yes _____ No _____
4. What is your sex? Male _____ Female _____
5. How long have you been in America? Less than 1 year _____ 1-2 years _____
3-4 years _____ 5 or more years _____
6. Can you speak English? Very well _____ fairly well _____ some or little
English _____ none at all _____
7. Can you read English? Very well _____ fairly well _____ some or little
English _____ none at all _____
8. What is your religion? Catholic _____ Buddhist _____ Moslem _____
Protestant _____ Other _____ none _____

II. Current Living Situations

Mark X next to the items that are true for you. Please answer as many as possible. If you are unable to answer an item, skip it and go on to the next item.

- A.
1. Do you own a home in the United States? Yes ___ No ___
 2. Do you own a car? Yes ___ No ___
 3. Do you have a driver's license? Yes ___ No ___
 4. Do you have a job? Yes ___ No ___
 5. If you have a job, does it suit your education or skill level? Yes ___ No ___
 6. If you have a doctor's, dentist's, or other professional degree, have you been licensed to practice your vocation in the United States? Yes ___ No ___
 7. Have you had ESL training? Yes ___ No ___
 8. If you had ESL training, how long was it? Less than 1 year ___
1-2 years ___ more than 2 years ___
 9. Do you have American friends? Yes ___ No ___
 10. Do you have a bank account? Yes ___ No ___
 11. Do you have health insurance? Yes ___ No ___
 12. Do you have auto insurance? Yes ___ No ___
 13. Do you have access to medical services? Yes ___ No ___
 14. Have you applied to be a permanent resident? Yes ___ No ___
 15. Are you willing to change your name to make it more Americanized? Yes ___ No ___

- B.
1. Do you live with your family? Yes ___ No ___
 2. Do you actively practice your religion? Yes ___ No ___
 3. Do you plan to return home someday? Yes ___ No ___
 4. Are you working actively to return home? Yes ___ No ___
 5. Have you had job training? Yes ___ No ___
 6. If you had job training, how long was it? Less than 1 year ___
1-2 years ___ more than 2 years ___
 7. Do you participate in cultural activities? Yes ___ No ___
 8. Are you able to participate in recreational activities such as movies, nightclubs, theater, etc.? Yes ___ No ___

III. Please share your comments regarding the following. Mark X next to those items that are true for you. Please answer as many as possible.

- A. What are your feelings about being on public assistance?
- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| I accept being on public assistance (welfare) | Yes ___ No ___ |
| I enjoy being on welfare | Yes ___ No ___ |
| I don't like being on welfare | Yes ___ No ___ |
| I appreciate being on welfare | Yes ___ No ___ |
| I am not on welfare now and don't intend to be on welfare in the future | Yes ___ No ___ |
- B. How much has racial discrimination affected your resettling in America?
Almost always ___ sometimes ___ never ___
- C. How much pressure have you come up against in taking a job?
Almost none ___ little ___ some ___ much ___ very much ___

D. Do you know where to go for the following problems?

- Medical and health problems Yes _____ No _____
- Race discrimination problems Yes _____ No _____
- Marriage problems Yes _____ No _____
- Welfare problems Yes _____ No _____
- Employment problems Yes _____ No _____
- Political problems Yes _____ No _____
- School problems Yes _____ No _____

E. What are the best things you have experienced with social service agencies (churches, welfare service, cultural center, etc.)?

- The workers understand my problems and needs and help me. Yes _____ No _____
- The workers treat me with respect. Yes _____ No _____
- I don't have to wait too long for services. Yes _____ No _____
- They helped to find me a place to live, and I'm happy with it. Yes _____ No _____
- They helped me to find a job, and I'm happy with it. Yes _____ No _____
- They helped me with other things. Yes _____ No _____
- Please list _____

F. What are the problems you have encountered with social service agencies?

- Language or communication problems Yes _____ No _____
- Cultural differences and misunderstandings Yes _____ No _____
- Other problems Yes _____ No _____
- Please list _____

G. How much success do you feel you have attained in your new life at this point?

Very much _____ some _____ little _____ very little _____

Comments _____

VIETNAMESE MAJOR SURVEY

CUỘC THĂM DÒ CỦA TRƯỜNG ĐẠI-HỌC PORTLAND STATE

Chúng tôi thuộc trường Đại-Học Portland State đang tổ chức một cuộc nghiên-cứu về người ty-nạn Đông Dương. Như quý vị biết một vài dịch vụ đặc-biệt được tạo ra để đáp ứng những nhu-cầu người Đông Dương đã bị giảm thiểu hay đình trệ bằng cách này hoặc cách khác. Nhiều người trong chính-quyền và những cơ-quan khác có thể không biết rõ những loại nhu-cầu hoặc dịch-vụ mà quý vị quan tâm để có một cuộc sống hữu-hiệu tại Mỹ. Ở Hoa-Kỳ phương-cách tìm biết những loại nhu-cầu dịch-vụ mà quý vị quan-tâm đến là việc dùng bằng câu hỏi hoặc bằng một cuộc thăm dò. Bằng những phương-thức này quý vị có thể bày tỏ những ý-kiến và của mình mà không cần nêu ra danh tính vì vậy những câu trả lời thành-thật của quý vị có thể giúp quyết định phần nào tình trạng định sống hiện tại và tương-lai của quý vị ở Mỹ.

Quý vị vui-lòng hoàn tất bằng câu hỏi sau đây. Chúng tôi sẽ không hỏi tên quý vị. Chúng tôi cần sự giúp đỡ của quý vị. Vì vậy xin tự-do phát biểu ý-kiến. Xin đừng đánh mất bằng câu hỏi này vì công việc này khẩn-thiết và quan-trọng. Vui-lòng trả lời những câu hỏi và gửi đi vào ngày hôm nay.

Cám ơn quý-vị nhiều thì giờ đã dành cho chúng tôi (Phong bì và tem có kèm san để tiện việc gửi đến chúng tôi.)

2.

I. TÌNH TRẠNG BẢN THÂN

Chỉ dấu (X) vào những câu trả lời thích hợp với tình trạng của bạn. Xin hãy trả lời càng đầy đủ càng tốt.

Vi dụ: Tôi dùng xe buýt. Có X Không _____

Tôi có một công việc vững chắc. Có _____ Không X

1. Quốc-tịch của bạn? Vietnam _____ Cam Bốt _____ Lào _____
2. Năm sinh? 19___. Nghề nghiệp (lúc còn ở Việt-nam) _____
3. Tình trạng gia đình? Độc thân _____ Có gia đình _____ Ly-di _____
Ly-thân _____ Góa-bụa _____
Nếu có gia đình, người hôn phối của bạn có mặt ở Mỹ không? Có _____ Không _____
4. Bạn thuộc về phái nào? Nam _____ Nữ _____
5. Bạn ở Mỹ được bao lâu? Dưới 1 năm _____ Từ 1 đến 2 năm _____ Từ 3 đến 4 năm _____
Từ 5 năm trở lên _____
6. Bạn có nói được tiếng Anh không? Rất giỏi _____ Khả thông thạo _____
Một chút ít _____ Không nói được _____
7. Bạn có thể đọc Anh ngữ không? Rất giỏi _____ Khả _____ Một ít _____
Không đọc được _____
8. Tôn-giáo của bạn? Công-giáo _____ Phật-giáo _____ Tin-lành _____
Tôn giáo Khác _____ Không tôn-giáo _____

II. TÌNH TRẠNG SINH SỐNG HIỆN TẠI

Ghi dấu (X) cạnh bên phần trả lời thích ứng với bạn. Xin trả lời càng đầy đủ càng tốt. Nếu câu nào không thể trả lời được, cứ để trống, tiếp tục trả lời câu hỏi kế tiếp.

A.

1. Bạn có mua nhà ở Mỹ không? Có _____ Không _____
2. Bạn có xe hơi không? Có _____ Không _____
3. Bạn có bằng lái xe không? Có _____ Không _____

3.

4. Bạn có việc làm không? Có _____ Không _____
5. Nếu bạn có việc làm công việc này có thích hợp với khả năng giáo dục hoặc trình độ chuyên môn không. Có _____ Không _____
6. Nếu bạn có văn bằng Bac-Si, Nha-Si hoặc các văn bằng khác, bạn có được cấp giấy hành nghề tại Mỹ không? Có _____ Không _____
7. Bạn đã được học lớp Anh-ngữ dành cho người ngoại-quốc chưa (không phải người Mỹ)?
Có _____ Chưa _____
8. Nếu bạn đã được học, thời gian là bao lâu? Dưới 1 năm _____
Từ một đến 2 năm _____ Trên 2 năm _____
9. Bạn có những người bạn Mỹ không? Có _____ Không _____
10. Bạn có trường mục ở nhà bạn không? Có _____ Không _____
11. Bạn có bảo hiểm sức-khỏe không? Có _____ Không _____
12. Bạn có bảo hiểm xe-hỏi không? Có _____ Không _____
13. Bạn có được cung ứng những dịch-vụ sức khỏe không? Có _____ Không _____
14. Bạn đã làm đơn để vào thường-trú chưa? Có _____ Không _____
15. Bạn có muốn đổi tên của bạn giống như tên của người Mỹ không? Có _____ Không _____

B.

1. Bạn có sống với gia đình không? Có _____ Không _____
2. Bạn có một đời sống đúng với tinh thần tôn giáo của bạn không? Có _____ Không _____
3. Bạn có dự định trở về Việt-Nam một ngày nào đó không? Có _____ Không _____
4. Bạn có được huấn luyện về nghề-nghiệp không? Có _____ Không _____
5. Nếu bạn có được huấn luyện về nghề-nghiệp, thời gian là bao lâu?
Dưới 1 năm _____ Từ 1 đến 2 năm _____ Hơn 2 năm _____
6. Bạn có tham dự vào những hoạt động văn-hóa không? Có _____ Không _____
7. Bạn có thể tham dự vào những hoạt động giải trí như xem chiếu bóng đi phòng trà, rạp hát?
Có _____ Không _____

4.

III. Xin g^op y'ⁱ kiến v^ao nh^ung c^au h^oi sau. Ghi đ^au (X) v^ao nh^ung ph^an tr^a l^oi thⁱch ung v^oi b^an. Xin tr^a-l^oi c^ang đ^ay đ^u c^ang t^ot.

A. B^an nghĩ gⁱ v^e vi^ec đ^uc tr^o c^ap ti^en X^a-H^oi?

- T^oi b^ang l^ong nh^an tr^o c^ap x^a-h^oi? Co' _____ K^ho^ong _____
- T^oi thⁱch l^anh tr^o c^ap x^a-h^oi? Co' _____ K^ho^ong _____
- T^oi k^ho^ong thⁱch l^anh tr^o c^ap x^a-h^oi? Co' _____ K^ho^ong _____
- T^oi c^am kⁱch vi^ec l^anh tr^o c^ap x^a-h^oi? Co _____ K^ho^ong _____
- T^oi k^ho^ong l^anh tr^o c^ap x^a-h^oi b^ay gⁱo v^a c^ung k^ho^ong c^o y'ⁱ đⁱnh l^anh tr^o c^ap đ^o trong t^uo^ong-l^ai? Co' _____ K^ho^ong _____

B. B^an c^o bi^et đ^en nh^ung n^oi n^ao xin gⁱu^p đ^o n^eu b^an c^o nh^ung v^an đ^e sau đ^ay:

- V^an-đ^e Y-t^e v^a s^uc-k^ho^e Bi^et _____ K^ho^ong _____
- V^an-đ^e k^y-thⁱ ch^ung-t^oc Bi^et _____ K^ho^ong _____
- V^an-đ^e h^on nh^an Bi^et _____ K^ho^ong _____
- V^an-đ^e tr^o c^ap x^a-h^oi Bi^et _____ K^ho^ong _____
- V^an-đ^e tⁱm vi^ec l^am Bi^et _____ K^ho^ong _____
- V^an-đ^e chⁱn^h-trⁱ Bi^et _____ K^ho^ong _____
- V^an-đ^e gⁱa^o-đ^uc tr^uo^ong h^oc Bi^et _____ K^ho^ong _____

C. Nh^ung đⁱeu gⁱ t^ot nh^at m^a b^an đ^a nh^an đ^uc b^oi nh^ung c^o-q^uan đⁱch-v^u x^a-h^oi (C^o q^uan an-sⁱn^h x^a-h^oi, Tr^ung-T^am V^an-H^oa Đ^ong Đ^ung, C^ac nh^a th^o, c^ac H^oi-Đ^oan)

- Nh^ung nh^an vi^en hi^eu c^ac v^an đ^e v^a nh^u c^au c^ua t^oi v^a gⁱu^p đ^o t^oi. Co' _____ K^ho^ong _____
 - Nh^ung nh^an-vi^en ti^ep đ^ai t^oi ân-c^an Co' _____ K^ho^ong _____
 - T^oi k^ho^ong ph^ai ch^o đ^oi l^au k^hi xin gⁱu^p đ^o Co _____ K^ho^ong _____
 - H^o gⁱu^p t^oi tⁱm đ^uc ch^o ở v^ua y' Co _____ K^ho^ong _____
 - H^o gⁱu^p t^oi tⁱm đ^uc vi^ec l^am v^a t^oi thⁱch th^u v^oi vi^ec l^am n^ay Co' _____ K^ho^ong _____
- H^o c^ung gⁱu^p t^oi nh^ung c^ong vi^ec k^hac (Xⁱn li^et k^e nh^ung c^ong vi^ec đ^o đ^ui đ^ay)

5.

D. Những vấn-đề nào bạn gặp phải với những cơ quan dịch vụ xã-hội?

- Vấn-đề ngôn ngữ và cảm-thông Có _____ Không _____
- Hiểu lầm vì ngôn-ngữ khác biệt Có _____ Không _____
- Những vấn-đề khác (xin liệt kê) Có _____ Không _____
-
-

E. Vấn-đề kỹ-thị chủng-tộc ở Mỹ có ảnh-hưởng đến việc định cư tại đây nhiều không?

Luôn luôn _____ Hầu như luôn luôn _____ Thỉnh thoảng _____ Không bao giờ _____

F. Có bao nhiêu khó-khăn bạn gặp phải khi nhận một công việc? Hầu như không _____

Ít _____ Một vài _____ Nhiều _____ Rất nhiều _____

G. Bạn có thành công trong cuộc sống mới vào giai đoạn này không? Rất nhiều _____

Nhiều _____ Một vài _____ Ít _____ Rất ít _____

LAOTIAN MAJOR SURVEY

ການສຳຮວດ - ມະຫາວິທຍາລັຍປອດລິນສເຕດ໌

ພວກເຮົາຈາກນະຫາວິທຍາລັຍທຳການສຳຮວດກຽວກັບຊາວອົບພົວພັນອື່ນ ທ່ານຄົງຮູ້ແລ້ວວ່າ ການຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອ
ພິເສດສຳຫລັບຊາວອົບພົວພັນອື່ນ ທີ່ໂຕວາງແຜນໄວ້ແລ້ວນັ້ນໂດຍທຳລາຍລັງແລະຈັກຊາໄປ ທາງໃດທາງນັ້ງໂດຍ
ບໍ່ຊາບລາຍລະອຽດເປັນທີ່ແຈ້ງ ບອກຈາກນອກດ້ານຜູ້ນຳທາງອັດທະນະສຸນອຳນວຍຄວາມສດວກຕ່າງໆ ຍັງ
ບໍ່ຮູ້ກະຈ່າງແຈ້ງວ່າຄວາມຕ້ອງການ ແລະຄວາມຈຳເປັນຂອງທ່ານນັ້ນແທ້ແທ້ແທ້ ທ່ານຢູ່ດີກິນດີໃນການ
ສ້າງຊີວິດໃໝ່ ການສຳຮວດເປັນວິທີໜຶ່ງທີ່ທ່ານສາມາດອອກສຽງໂຕແບບປະໂຫຍດ ໂດຍບໍ່ອອກຈື່ຂອງ
ທ່ານເອງໂດຍສະເພາະ ສັນນະທານຕອບຄຳຖາມໂດຍຄວາມຈິງໃຈຂ້າງລຸ່ມນີ້ໄປນັ້ນຈະເປັນຜົນປະໂຫຍດໂຕແກ່ຊາວ
ອົບພົວພັນອື່ນທັງປວງ.

ພວກເຮົາອໍາວ່າຄວາມກະລຸນາຈາກທ່ານຕອບຄຳຖາມ ບໍ່ຈຳເປັນຕ້ອງໃສ່ຊື່ ການສຳຮວດນີ້ສຳຄັນແລະເປັນປະໂຫຍດ
ຫລາຍ ຂໍນອນນຳທ່ານຢ່າແກງຖມເດີ ກະລຸນາຕອບແລະສົ່ງມາໂລດ ຈະເປັນພະລຸນຸດ.

ຂໍອອກອີກຂອບໃຈທ່ານສະລະເວລາ (ກະລຸນາໃຈຊ່ອງໜຶ່ງສັດຕິສະເຕມໃຫ້ແລ້ວ ສົ່ງຂໍ້ການສຳຮວດຄືນໃຫ້
ພວກເຮົາ-- ຂອບໃຈ--)

ກ. ຊີວະສ່ວນຕົວ: ໃຫ້ທ່ານຂຽນຕົ້ນໃສ່ ຫລືຫມາຍ x ໃສ່ຫລັງຄຳທີ່ຖືກກັບຕົວທ່ານໂດຍສະເພາະ ກະລຸນາ
ຫມາຍເຫາຫທ່ານສາມາດ.

ຕົວຢ່າງ: ຂ້ອຍໄຊອິດເນເປັນ _____ ແນນແລ້ວ x ບໍ່ແນນ _____
ຂ້ອຍມີງານທຳເປັນຕຳວອນ _____ ແນນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ແນນ x

- ໑. ທ່ານສົນຈາດໃດ? ວຽດນາມ _____ ຂເມນ _____ ລາວ _____
- ໒. ທ່ານເກີດປີໃດ? ເກີດປີ ໑໙ ____ . ແຕ່ກ່ອນຕອນຢູ່ບ້ານທ່ານມີອຳເພີຫຍັງ? _____
- ໓. ທ່ານປະຈຸບັນແຕ່ງງານແລ້ວບໍ່ຫລືວ່າຍັງໂສດຢູ່? ຍັງໂສດຢູ່ _____ ແຕ່ງງານແລ້ວ _____
ປະຈຳ _____ ແຍກກັນຢູ່ຈົ່ວຄາວ _____ ເປັນນ້າຍ _____
- ໔. ຖ້າແຕ່ງງານ ລຸກດ້ວຍຫລືຫວັງທ່ານຄອບຄົວ ນາຢູ່ເມືອງອະເລມິການກັກນັບ? ເອີ _____ ບໍ່ນາ _____
- ໕. ທ່ານເປັນເພດຫຍັງ? ເພດຊາຍ _____ ເພດຍິງ _____
- ໕. ທ່ານໄດ້ມາຢູ່ອະເລມິການປານໃດ? ຫລຸດປົນງລິງມາ _____ ຣະຫວ່າງປົນງຫາສອງປີ _____
ຣະຫວ່າງ ໓ ຫາ ໔ ປີ _____ ປະມານ ໔ ປີ ສົມໄປ _____.
- ໖. ດ້ານການຢາກພາສາອັງກິດຂອງທ່ານເດ? ຢາກດີຫລາຍ _____ ຢາກພໍໃຈໄດ້ _____
ໄດ້ເລີກນອຍ _____ ບໍ່ໄດ້ຈັກດີ _____

6.

ກ. ການການອ່ານອັງກິດຂອງທ່ານເດ? ອ່ານໄດ້ຫລາຍ _____ ພໍໃຊ້ໄດ້ _____ ໄດ້ເລັກນ້ອຍ _____
ບໍ່ໄດ້ຈາກຄ _____.

ຂ. ຫານຖືສາສນາຫຍັງ? ຖືສາສນາຄຳໂຫລິກ _____ ຖືສາສນາພຸດ _____ ຖືສາສນາໂປຣເຕສຕັງ _____
ຖືສາສນາອື່ນ _____ ບໍ່ມີສາສນາ _____.

ຂ. ການເປັນຢູ່ແລະຈຸດປະຈຸບັນ. ອີ່ໄຫ້ທ່ານຫມາຍ x ໃສ່ຫລັງຄຳຕັກກັບຕົວທ່ານເອງ. ຖ້າຕອບບໍ່ໄດ້
ຂ້າມຕອບອີ່ໄຫມໄປເລີຍ.

ກ. ຢູ່ອະເນຣກາຫານມີເຮືອນບໍ່? ມ _____ ບໍ່ມີ _____

ຄ. ຫານມີອາໄສບໍ່? ມ _____ ບໍ່ມີ _____

ງ. ຫານມີໃບອັບຣິດບໍ່? ມ _____ ບໍ່ມີ _____

ດ. ຫານມີງານຫຍັງບໍ່? ມ _____ ບໍ່ມີ _____

ດ. ຖ້າມີງານທຳ ງານນັ້ນສົມກັບການສຶກສາຫລືການພັກຫັດ
ງານຂອງທ່ານບໍ່? ຈິ, ສົມ _____ ບໍ່, ບໍ່ສົມ _____

ຝ. ຖ້າທ່ານເຮັດເປັນນາຍແຜດ ຫລືເຮັດເປັນວິຊາຊີວະມາກອນ
ຫານໄດ້ຮັບອະນຸຍາດພັກຫັດຢູ່ສະຫາຣິດອະເນຣກາບໍ່? ໄດ້ຮັບ _____ ບໍ່ໄດ້ຮັບ _____

ກ. ຫານໄດ້ຮັບການພັກຊ່ວຍຍາສາອັງກິດບໍ່? ໄດ້ຮັບ _____ ບໍ່ໄດ້ຮັບ _____

ຂ. ຖ້າໄດ້ຮັບ ໄດ້ໄຊເວລາດົນປານໃດ? ໄຊເວລາລຸດປານີ່ງລົງມາ _____ ໄຊເວລາລະຫວ່າງ ໑ ຫາ ໒ ປີ _____
ໄຊເວລາຫລາຍກວ່າ ໒ ປີຂຶ້ນໄປ _____.

ຝ. ຫານມີເຮືອນເປັນຄົນອະເນຣກາບໍ່? ມ _____ ບໍ່ມີ _____

໑໐. ຫານມີກົງເວັງຢູ່ຫະນາຄານບໍ່? ມ _____ ບໍ່ມີ _____

໑໑. ຫານມີປະກັນພັຍສຸຂະພາບບໍ່? ມ _____ ບໍ່ມີ _____

໑໒. ຫານມີປະກັນພັຍຣີດບໍ່? ມ _____ ບໍ່ມີ _____

໑໓. ຫານຮູ້ຈັກໄປຫາສະຖານທ່ຽງໂຫລວານຊ່ວຍເຫລືອ
ຫາງດານຄວາມເຈັບເປັນບໍ່? ຮູ້ຈັກ _____ ບໍ່ຮູ້ຈັກ _____

໑໔. ຫານໄດ້ຂໍອະນຸຍາດຢູ່ຖາວອນແລ້ວບໍ່? ຂໍແລ້ວ _____ ບັງປັ້ນໄດ້ອີ່ _____

໑໕. ຫານຊອບຢາກປ່ຽນຊື່ໄຫ້ເປັນອະເນຣກາບໍ່? ຊອບ _____ ບໍ່ຊອບ _____

໓.

ຂ.

- ໑. ຫານມີຄອບຄົວແລະຢູ່ນ້ຳກັບບໍ່? ຄອ ບໍ່ຢູ່
- ໒. ຫານຫ້າມິຕິທິຄະຣະບູຊາກຽວກັບສາສນາບໍ່? ຄອ ບໍ່
- ໓. ຫານວາງແຜນຈະກັບບານມີໄດ້ນັບໆບໍ່? ຄອ ບໍ່
- ໔. ຫານເຄີຍໄດ້ມີການຝຶກງານບໍ່? ເຄີຍ ບໍ່
- ໕. ຖ້າມີ ຫານໄດ້ໂຊເວລາດົນປານໃດ? ຫລຸດຢູ່ນັ້ນຈຶ່ງລົງມາ _____ ລະຫວ່າງ ໑ ຫາ ໒ ປີ _____ ຫລາຍກວ່າ ໒ ປີຂຶ້ນໄປ _____.
- ໖. ຫານສລອງສະເລີມບຸນແລະງານຮີດຄອງປະເພນີຕ່າງໆບໍ່? ຄອ, ສະເລີມ _____ ບໍ່ສະເລີມ _____
- ໗. ຫານຄົບວັນໄປມ່ວນຊຸ່ນຕ່າງໆບໍ່? ຕົວຢ່າງ ໄປເບິ່ງຊີເນມາ, ໃນຄລັບ, ນະຄອນ ແລະ ອື່ນໆອີກ. ຄອ, ເຄີຍໄປມ່ວນຢູ່ _____ ບັນນາໄປ _____

ຄ. ກະລຸນາຈາກຫານອອກຄວາມຄິດເຫັນຕອບຄຳຖາມຕໍ່ໄປນີ້ ຕອບໂຕຫມິດຕາມຄວາມສາມາດຂອງຫານ.

- ກ. ຫານມີຄວາມຮູ້ສຶກຢ່າງໃດໃນຖານວ່າຫານກິນວວຍແຟ? (ໃຫ້ທານຕອບຕາມຄຳເວົ້າຂອງທານໄວ້ແລ້ວ)
 - ຂອຍຍອມຮັບກິນວວຍແຟ ຮັບ ບໍ່ຮັບ
 - ຂອຍຮູ້ສຶກພໍໃຈກິນວວຍແຟ ພໍໃຈ ບໍ່ພໍໃຈ
 - ຂອຍບັນນາກິນວວຍແຟ ແນ່ນແລ້ວຂອຍບັນນາ _____ ບໍ່ຂອຍບັນນາ _____
 - ປັດຍນດຫ້າໂດຍຢູ່ວວຍແຟ ຍິນດີ ບໍ່ຍິນດີ
 - ປະຈຸບັນຂອຍບໍ່ໂດຍກິນວວຍແຟແລະກໍ່ບໍ່ຕົງໃຈວ່າຈະກິນໃນໂອກາດຫນ້າ ຄອແນ່ນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ແນ່ນ _____

ຂ. ຫານຮູ້ຈັກໄປຫາບ່ອນທີ່ໂຕຄວາມຊ່ວຍເຫລືອບໍ່ ຖ້າຫາກມີບັນຫາດັ່ງຕໍ່ລົງໄປນີ້:

- ບັນຫາກຽວກັບຫວານຢາແລະສຸຂະພາບ ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____ ບໍ່ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____
- ບັນຫາກຽດຊົງກຽວກັບຜິວໜັງ ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____ ບໍ່ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____
- ບັນຫາຄອບຄົວກຽວກັບຜິວແລະເນັ້ນ ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____ ບໍ່ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____
- ບັນຫາກຽວກັບວວຍແຟ ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____ ບໍ່ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____
- ບັນຫາກຽວກັບຊອກງານທຳ ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____ ບໍ່ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____
- ບັນຫາກຽວກັບການເນີນອົງ ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____ ບໍ່ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____
- ບັນຫາກຽວກັບໂຮງຮຽນ ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____ ບໍ່ຮູ້ຈັກໄປ _____

໔.

ຄ. ຢູ່ໃນອະນະນິການ ມີສິ່ງໃດທີ່ສຸດທ່ານໂດຍປະສົບປະການກັບອົງການຊ່ວຍເຫລືອຕ່າງໆ ເຊັ່ນຕອງການວວຍ
ແຟ ສູນວັດທະນະທຳອິນດູຈີນ ໂບດວັດ ແລະຄັລິບ ສະມາຄົມຕ່າງໆ.

- ຜູ້ໂຫລ່າວາມຊ່ວຍເຫລືອອຸປະກອນ ເຂົ້າໃຈບັນຫາແລະຄວາມຕ້ອງການ
ຂອງຂອຍດີ ແລະກໍຊ່ວຍເຫລືອຂອຍດ້ວຍ ຕົວເມນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ຕົວເມນ _____
- ເຂົ້າຊ່ວຍເຫລືອຂອຍໂດຍມີຄວາມນັບຖືດີ ຕົວເມນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ຕົວເມນ _____
- ຂອຍບໍ່ຕ້ອງໂຊ່ວລາລຳຖ້າດີພໍສອນອົບການຊ່ວຍເຫລືອ ຕົວເມນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ຕົວເມນ _____
- ເຂົ້າຊ່ວຍເຫລືອຕາບອນຢູ່ໄຫ ແລະຂອຍກໍພໍໃຈນຳ ຕົວເມນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ຕົວເມນ _____
- ເຂົ້າຊ່ວຍເຫລືອຕ່າງການທຳໄຫ ແລະຂອຍກໍພໍໃຈນຳ ຕົວເມນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ຕົວເມນ _____
- ນອກຈາກນີ້ເຂົ້າກັບຊ່ວຍເຫລືອສິ່ງອື່ນອີກ _____ ຕົວເມນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ຕົວເມນ _____
(ຖ້າມີສິ່ງອື່ນອີກ ຂໍໂຫລ່າຂຽນໜ້າລົງໃສ່ແຖວຂັດຂ້າງລຸ່ມນ)

໑. ບັນຫາທີ່ທ່ານປະເສີນກັບອົງການຊ່ວຍເຫລືອຕ່າງໆນັ້ນມີຫຍັງແດ່? ບັນຫາດັ່ງກ່າວໄປນັ້ນແມ່ນບໍ່?

- ບັນຫາກ່ຽວກັບທາງພາສາແລະການໂລມບໍ່ເຂົ້າໃຈກັນ ຕົວເມນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ຕົວເມນ _____
- ບັນຫາເຂົ້າໃຈກັນພໍດີແຕ່ອາດຈະມີບັນຫາປະເສີນກັນກະທຳຂອງ
ເຮົາແລະເຮົາແຕກຕ່າງກັນ ຕົວເມນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ຕົວເມນ _____
- ຍັງມີບັນຫາອື່ນໆອີກ _____ ຕົວເມນແລ້ວ _____ ບໍ່ຕົວເມນ _____
(ຖ້າມີ ໃຫ້ຂຽນລົງຂ້າງແຖວລຸ່ມນ)

ຈ. ຫາກຄິດວ່າການກຽມຊັບທາງດ້ານຜິວໜັງ ມີຜົນສະທ້ອນໃນການຕັ້ງຊີວິດໃໝ່ຂອງທ່ານບໍ່? ຖ້າມີ ມັນອະ
ຫລາຍເທົ່າໃດ?

ມີຢູ່ເລີຍໆ _____ ມີເກືອບທຸກເທື່ອ _____ ມີບາງຄັ້ງບາງຄາວ _____ ບໍ່ມີເກືອບເທື່ອ _____

ສ. ການຫາທ່ານຕັດສິນເອົາງານທຳນັ້ນ ຫາກມີຂໍ້ບັງຄັບຕ່າງໆນອຍຫລາຍຢ່າງໃດ? ບໍ່ສູນສິ່ງບັງຄັບ _____

ມັນອຍນຶ່ງ _____ ມີຈຳໃດຈຳນຶ່ງ _____ ມີຫລາຍສົມຄວນ _____ ມີຫລາຍອິດທິ _____

ຊ. ການຕັ້ງຊີວິດໃໝ່ແຕ່ເລີຍມາຈົນເຖິງປະຈຸບັນນີ້ ຫາກຄິດວ່າໂຕຜົນສຳເລັດຫລາຍເທົ່າບໍ່? ຫລາຍແຫງ _____

ຫລາຍສົມຄວນ _____ ຈຳໃດຈຳນຶ່ງ _____ ໂດຍອະດີດ _____ ໃໝ່ອຍອິດທິ _____

APPENDIX B

MAJOR PHASE TABULATED DATA

TABLE XII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES WHO
DO OR DO NOT OWN A HOME

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	10(35.7%)	1(20%)	2(20%)	-	-	1(14.2%)
No	18(64.2)	4(80)	8(80)	22(95.6%)	5(100%)	6(85.7)
No response	-	-	-	1(4.3)	-	-

TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT LIVE WITH THEIR FAMILIES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	21(75%)	4(80%)	8(80%)	11(47.8%)	2(40%)	7(100%)
No	7(25)	-	2(20)	12(52.2)	1(20)	-
No response	-	1(20)	-	-	2(40)	-

TABLE XIV

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL
WHO DO OR DO NOT OWN A CAR

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	27(96.4%)	5(100%)	7(70%)	11(47.8%)	2(40%)	5(71.4%)
No	1(3.5)	-	3(30)	12(52.1)	3(60)	2(28.5)
No response	-	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE XV

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT HAVE A DRIVER'S LICENSE

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	28(100%)	5(100%)	10(100%)	13(56.6%)	2(40%)	6(85.7%)
No	-	-	-	10(43.4)	3(60)	1(14.2)
No response	-	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE XVI

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT HAVE A JOB

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	24(85.6%)	3(60%)	8(80%)	11(47.8%)	1(20%)	5(71.4%)
No	3(10.7)	2(40)	2(20)	11(47.8)	4(80)	2(28.5)
No response	1(3.5)	-	-	1(4.3)	-	-

TABLE XVII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES WHO DO OR DO NOT
HAVE A JOB SUITING THEIR EDUCATION AND SKILLS

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	9(32.1%)	1(20%)	6(60%)	13(56.6%)	1(20%)	-
No	15(53.5)	3(60)	4(40)	1(4.3)	3(60)	4(57.1%)
No response	4(14.2)	1(20)	-	9(39.1)	1(20)	3(42.8)

TABLE XVIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT HAVE RECERTIFIED DEGREES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	5 (17.8%)	2 (40%)	3 (30%)	4 (17.3%)	3 (60%)	-
No	10 (35.7)	1 (20)	6 (60)	6 (26)	-	7 (100%)
No response	13 (46.4)	2 (40)	1 (10)	13 (56.5)	2 (40)	-

TABLE XIX

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO HAVE OR HAVE NOT HAD JOB TRAINING

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	12 (42.9%)	2 (40%)	5 (50%)	16 (69.6%)	-	2 (28.6%)
No	13 (46.4)	2 (40)	4 (40)	6 (26.1)	1 (20%)	5 (71.4)
No response	3 (10.7)	1 (20)	1 (10)	1 (4.3)	4 (80)	-

TABLE XX

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO HAVE OR HAVE NOT HAD ESL TRAINING

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	16 (57.1%)	3 (60%)	9 (90%)	12 (52.1%)	4 (80%)	4 (57.1%)
No	9 (32.1)	2 (40)	1 (10)	9 (39.1)	1 (20)	3 (42.8)
No response	3 (10.7)	-	-	2 (8.6)	-	-

TABLE XXI

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT HAVE AMERICAN FRIENDS

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	26(92.8%)	4(80%)	9(90%)	6(26%)	1(20%)	2(28.5%)
No	2(7.2)	1(20)	1(10)	16(69.5)	2(40)	5(71.4)
No response	-	-	-	1(4.3)	2(40)	-

TABLE XXII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT PRACTICE THEIR RELIGION

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	18(64.3%)	4(80%)	5(50%)	16(69.6%)	-	4(57.1%)
No	9(32.1)	-	5(50)	7(30.4)	5(100%)	3(42.9)
No response	1(.6)	1(20)	-	-	-	-

TABLE XXIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT PARTICIPATE IN CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	15(53.6%)	3(60%)	6(60%)	2(8.7%)	-	4(57.2%)
No	13(46.4)	2(40)	4(40)	19(82.6)	2(40%)	2(28.6)
No response	-	-	-	2(8.7)	3(60)	1(14.2)

TABLE XXIV

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT HAVE BANK ACCOUNTS

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	24(85.7%)	2(40%)	8(80%)	10(43.4%)	-	2(28.5%)
No	4(14.2)	3(60)	2(20)	12(52.1)	3(60%)	5(71.4)
No response	-	-	-	1(4.3)	2(40)	-

TABLE XXV

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT HAVE HEALTH INSURANCE

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	22(78.5%)	4(80%)	8(80%)	5(21.7%)	1(20)	-
No	5(17.8)	1(20)	2(20)	19(82.6)	3(60)	7(100%)
No response	1(3.5)	-	-	-	1(20)	-

TABLE XXVI

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT HAVE AUTO INSURANCE

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	23(82.1%)	5(100%)	10(100%)	10(43.4%)	1(20%)	5(71.4%)
No	4(14.2)	-	-	11(47.8)	3(60)	2(28.5)
No response	1(3.5)	-	-	2(8.6)	2(20)	-

TABLE XXVII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO MEDICAL SERVICES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	6(25%)	3(60%)	8(80%)	7(30.5%)	1(20%)	3(42.9%)
No	18(64.3)	2(40)	2(20)	11(47.8)	2(40)	4(57.1)
No response	4(10.7)	-	-	5(21.7)	2(40)	-

TABLE XXVIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT PARTICIPATE IN RECREATION ACTIVITIES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	16(57.1%)	-	6(60%)	11(47.8%)	1(20%)	1(14.2%)
No	8(32.2)	4(80%)	4(40)	12(52.2)	2(40)	5(71.6)
No response	4(10.7)	1(20)	-	-	2(40)	1(14.2)

TABLE XXIX

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO HAVE OR HAVE NOT APPLIED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCY

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	16(57.1%)	2(40%)	3(30%)	7(30.4%)	-	1(14.2%)
No	8(32.2)	3(60)	7(70)	16(47.8)	2(40%)	6(85.8%)
No response	4(10.7)	-	-	4(17.4)	3(60)	-

TABLE XXX

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO ARE OR ARE NOT WILLING TO AMERICANIZE THEIR NAMES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	6 (25%)	2 (40%)	6 (60%)	3 (10.7%)	-	3 (42.9%)
No	20 (66.8)	3 (60)	4 (40)	18 (80.6)	2 (40%)	3 (42.9)
No response	2 (8.2)	-	-	2 (8.7)	3 (60)	1 (14.2)

The following tables represent the tabulated data from the "Attitudes and Perceptions" section of the major phase survey.

TABLE XXXI

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT KNOW WHERE TO GO FOR
MEDICAL/HEALTH PROBLEMS

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	20(71%)	4(80%)	7(70%)	6(26%)	2(40%)	3(43%)
No	7(25)	-	3(30)	16(70)	2(40)	4(57)
No response	1(4)	1(20)	-	1(4)	1(20)	-

TABLE XXXII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT KNOW WHERE TO GO FOR
RACE DISCRIMINATION PROBLEMS

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	7(25%)	2(40%)	3(30%)	3(13%)	-	1(14%)
No	21(75)	3(60)	7(70)	3(13)	3(60%)	6(86)
No response	-	-	-	17(74)	2(40)	-

TABLE XXXIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT KNOW WHERE TO GO FOR
MARRIAGE PROBLEMS

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	6(21%)	1(20%)	7(70%)	4(17%)	2(40%)	3(43%)
No	21(75%)	1(20%)	3(30%)	13(75%)	1(20%)	4(57%)
No response	1(4)	3(60)	-	6(26)	2(40)	-

TABLE XXXIV

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT KNOW WHERE TO GO FOR
WELFARE PROBLEMS

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	24(86%)	5(100%)	8(80%)	9(39%)	2(40%)	5(71%)
No	4(14)	-	2(20)	11(48)	2(40)	2(29)
No response	-	-	-	3(13)	1(20)	-

TABLE XXXV

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT KNOW WHERE TO GO FOR
EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	27(96%)	3(60%)	6(60%)	11(48%)	1(20%)	2(29%)
No	1(4)	2(40)	4(40)	10(43)	2(40)	5(71)
No response	-	-	-	2(9)	2(40)	-

TABLE XXXVI

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT KNOW WHERE TO GO FOR
POLITICAL PROBLEMS

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	5(18%)	1(20%)	6(60%)	2(9%)	-	1(4%)
No	23(82)	4(80)	4(40)	19(82)	3(60%)	6(86)
No response	-	-	-	2(9)	2(40)	-

TABLE XXXVII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO DO OR DO NOT KNOW WHERE TO GO FOR
SCHOOL PROBLEMS

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	18(64%)	4(80%)	7(70%)	8(35%)	2(40%)	3(43%)
No	10(36)	-	3(30)	12(52)	1(20)	4(57)
No response	-	1(20)	-	3(13)	2(40)	-

TABLE XXXVIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO FEEL SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS UNDERSTAND
THEIR PROBLEMS AND HELP THEM

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	16(57%)	2(40%)	4(40%)	1(4%)	2(40%)	5(71%)
No	8(20)	1(20)	3(30)	16(20)	2(40)	-
No response	4(14)	2(40)	3(30)	6(26)	1(20)	2(29)

TABLE XXXIX

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO FEEL SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS
TREAT THEM RESPECTFULLY

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	16(57%)	1(20%)	6(60%)	9(39%)	2(40%)	5(71%)
No	4(14)	1(20)	3(30)	10(43)	1(20)	-
No response	8(29)	3(60)	1(10)	4(18)	2(40)	2(29)

TABLE XL

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO FEEL THEY DON'T HAVE TO WAIT
TOO LONG FOR SERVICES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	12 (43%)	-	5 (50%)	6 (26%)	2 (40%)	4 (57%)
No	7 (25)	1 (20%)	5 (50)	8 (35)	1 (20)	2 (29)
No response	9 (32)	4 (80)	-	9 (39)	2 (40)	1 (14)

TABLE XLI

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO HAVE FOUND PLACES TO LIVE VIA
SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	6 (21%)	1 (20%)	6 (60%)	7 (30%)	1 (20%)	5 (71%)
No	16 (57)	1 (20)	3 (30)	9 (40)	2 (40)	1 (14)
No response	6 (21)	3 (60)	1 (10)	7 (30)	2 (40)	1 (14)

TABLE XLII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO HAVE FOUND JOBS VIA SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	15 (54%)	1 (20%)	2 (20%)	-	2 (40%)	6 (86%)
No	5 (17)	1 (20)	6 (60)	12 (52%)	1 (20)	1 (14)
No response	8 (29)	3 (60)	2 (20)	11 (48)	2 (40)	-

TABLE XLIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO HAVE OR HAVE NOT ENCOUNTERED LANGUAGE AND
COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS WITH SOCIAL AGENCIES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	12(43%)	1(20%)	6(60%)	12(52%)	3(60%)	5(71%)
No	11(39)	3(60)	3(30)	6(26)	1(20)	2(29)
No response	5(18)	1(20)	1(10)	5(22)	1(20)	-

TABLE XLIV

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO HAVE ENCOUNTERED CULTURAL MISUNDERSTANDINGS
WITH SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	10(36%)	1(20%)	6(60%)	11(48%)	4(80%)	5(71%)
No	9(32)	2(40)	3(30)	5(22)	-	1(14)
No response	9(32)	2(40)	1(10)	8(35)	1(20)	1(14)

TABLE XLV

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO HAVE ENCOUNTERED OTHER PROBLEMS WITH
SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Yes	2(7%)	-	1(10%)	-	2(40%)	3(43%)
No	4(14)	1(20)	3(30)	7(30%)	1(20)	3(43)
No response	22(79)	4(80)	6(60)	16(70)	2(40)	1(14)

TABLE XLVI

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO FEEL RACIAL DISCRIMINATION HAS
AFFECTED THEIR RESETTLEMENT

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Always affected	10(36%)	-	3(30%)	3(13%)	-	1(14%)
Almost always affected	1(4)	-	3(30)	5(22)	-	1(14)
Sometimes affected	16(57)	3(60%)	3(30)	11(48)	4(80%)	2(29)
Never affected	1(4)	-	-	-	-	2(29)
No response	-	2(40)	1(10)	4(18)	1(20)	1(14)

TABLE XLVII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES WHO FEEL
THEY HAVE COME UP AGAINST PRESSURE IN TAKING A JOB

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Almost no pressure	2(7%)	2(40%)	-	2(9%)	-	1(14%)
Little pressure	2(7)	-	3(30)	5(22)	1(20)	1(14)
Some pressure	16(57)	1(20)	3(30)	7(30)	-	-
Much pressure	6(21)	1(20)	4(40)	7(30)	2(40)	1(14)
Very much pressure	-	-	-	-	1(20)	4(57)
No response	2(7)	1(20)	-	2(9)	1(20)	-

TABLE XLVIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL REFUGEES
WHO FEEL THEY HAVE ATTAINED SUCCESS IN THEIR NEW LIFE

<u>Response</u>	<u>Successful</u>			<u>Unsuccessful</u>		
	<u>Viet</u> N=28	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=10	<u>Viet</u> N=23	<u>Cam</u> N=5	<u>Lao</u> N=7
Very much success	6(21%)	1(20%)	1(10%)	1(4%)	-	-
Much success	1(4)	2(40)	1(10)	2(8)	-	-
Some success	12(42)	1(20)	4(40)	5(22)	3(60%)	1(14%)
Littel success	5(18)	-	3(30)	5(22)	2(40)	1(14)
Very little success	3(11)	-	-	5(22)	-	5(71)
No response	1(4)	1(20)	1(10)	5(22)	-	-