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Abstract
The historical development of contemporary Chinese and Vietnamese community based organizations (CBOs) and their communities in the United States are situated within the larger processes of globalization, international migration, and American cultural politics. Few studies in the research literature have examined the critical roles of community service organizations within ethnic enclaves in linking immigrant agency and macro-institutions within global cities. This paper contributes to this body of research and examines the historical development and current role of ethnic community based organizations in immigrant social adjustment capacity building in urban ethnic enclaves in the San Francisco Bay Area.

This study utilizes segmented assimilation and segmented labor theories and comparative historical and ethnographic methods to examine two Chinese and two Vietnamese community service organizations serving immigrants/refugees in the San Francisco Bay Area. The procedures included concentrated participant observation, 61 key informant interviews of primarily executives and providers at the community organizations, documentary materials collection/analysis, and coding and interpretive analysis.

The findings showed that all four ethnic CBOs in this study were established in the post-1965 civil rights, open immigration period and have become experienced hands in the immigrant service industry with more than three decades of community service. Over time, they have developed a longstanding reputation and trust with their ethnic communities, were familiar with the newcomers’ culture and language, provided immigrants the point of access to a diverse range of social and health services, and served as leading advocacy agencies in ethnic community empowerment projects.

Overall, the two Chinese and two Vietnamese CBOs represented fundamental community building blocks and central sites of selective acculturation processes at the immigrant community level. In particular, they served as fundamental sites of community leadership, services, and empowerment within ethnic enclaves where critical local immigrant/ethnic and national health and human services resources and exchanges were mediated.
However, organizational and community resource gaps exist between Chinese and Vietnamese CBOs. The Vietnamese CBOs had much less organizational capacity in relation to the Chinese CBOs due to their much shorter history of American resettlement, poor enclave service infrastructure due to the smaller immigrant/refugee populations and ethnic concentrations, and lack of affluent and business ethnics to adequately lead and fiscally support them. In addition to ethnic CBOs, local government agencies and other mainstream nonprofit organizations represented major immigrant service resources, but their language and culturally proficient capacities to serve these immigrant/refugee and limited English proficient populations were often inadequate.

Finally, discrimination and exclusion persist for ethnic CBOs even though they have become old hands in the immigrant service industry due to their enclave roots and ethnic-specific affiliations. Even with the transformation of their organizational mission and affiliations from an ethnic-specific one to a mainstream multicultural one, their capacity to expand beyond the ethnic enclave is limited by the segmented service market. Organizational expansions for these ethnic CBOs tended to be limited to new urban ethnic enclaves than full-incorporation into the capital-intensive immigrant service sector. Ethnic specific immigrants service organizations and the immigrants they serve and represent are key stakeholders that global and multicultural development can do without and like other mainstream service organizations deserve full incorporation and equitable organizational status in American society.
Introduction

Contemporary Chinese and Vietnamese community organizations and the historical development of their communities in the United States are situated within the larger processes of globalization (Skeldon 1997; Sassen 1998; Hu-DeHart 1999), transnational migration (Schiller et al. 1992; Wang 1997; Ong 1999), and cultural politics (Lowe 1996). Growing American imperialism in the Asian region together with rapid Asian development has led to dramatic increases in transnational migrant flows to the United States from Asia over the past few decades (Skeldon 1997; Sassen 1998). These transnational migrants have tended to come from Asian countries with the strongest political ties and economic partnerships with the United States (Sassen 1998).

Like other immigrants to this immigrant nation, Asian immigrants have come in search of the success embodied in the American dream and a hope for a prosperous future (Takaki 1989; Chan 1991). Uprooted and transplanted, every wave of Asian immigrants like other immigrants has had to go through dramatic social, economic, and cultural transitions. Through ethnic resilience, perseverance, and community solidarity, Asian immigrants have struggled and fought to survive and prosper in American society (Takaki 1989; Chan 1991).

However, the outcomes have not been as successful and extravagant as initially perceived. Over many generations in America, the dominant lived experiences of Asian Americans reveal an alternative immigration history of voices silenced, lost hopes, and unfulfilled dreams (Takaki 1989). The racialized constructions of Asians as “yellow peril” and “model minority” unveil the deep ethnic and racial tensions that continue to plague Asian immigrants and Asian Americans across generations (Lowe 1996).
Victimization, discrimination, and exclusion have been at the heart of this neglected history of Asian communities in America.

Until 1965, the major sources of immigration to the United States were from European countries (Arnold, Minocha and Fawcett 1987). However, in the post-1965 open immigration area, in addition to Latino populations from Central and South America, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders [AAPIs] have become one of the fastest growing racial groups in terms of immigration and population growth in the United States (Fong and Shinagawa 2000; Zhou and Gatewood 2000).

From 1960 to 2000, AAPIs grew by 1,355 per cent from less than 900,000 or 0.5 per cent to 11.9 million or 4.2 per cent of the US total population (Barringer, Gardner and Levin 1993; US Census 2002). Comparatively, the total US population increased by 157 per cent over the same period. Immigration accounted for three-fourths of the total AAPI growth and the foreign born AAPIs represent almost two-thirds of the total AAPIs today (Shinagawa 2000). The Chinese is the largest AAPI subgroup and represent 2.9 million or 24 per cent of the total AAPI population and the Vietnamese is the fifth largest AAPI subgroup and represent 1.2 million or 10.3 per cent (US Census 2002). By 2050, AAPIs are projected to quadruple and rise to almost forty million or 10 per cent of the total US population (Shinagawa, 2000).

Chinese and Vietnamese enclaves have steadily grown in size and concentration across the United States over the past few decades (Zhou 1992; Hein 1995; Lin 1998; Zhou and Bankston 1998). Over time, contemporary Chinese and Vietnamese community infrastructure have reflected these developments (Lai 1996; Zhou and Bankston 1998). Vibrant ethnic enclaves have served as critical buffers for mobile
immigrant populations in transitioning to American society (Portes and Rumbaut 1990). Within such enclaves, in addition to interpersonal kinship and friendship networks, community organizations have served as primary sites where Asian newcomers and Asian Americans can access culturally appropriate resources to address their resettlement, social adjustment, and community empowerment needs (Hein 1997; Zhou 2000).

Few studies in the research literature examine the role of community organizations within ethnic enclaves as cultural and social brokers for mobile immigrant populations. This research study hopes to address this gap and examines the roles of four ethnic (two Chinese and two Vietnamese) community based organizations [CBOs] in the San Francisco Bay Area in mediating immigrant and refugee social adjustment and capacity building. In particular, through provider perspectives, this study examines the potential advantages of ethnic CBOs over other organizations as providers of immigrant resources and the provision of social adjustment and capacity building through these organizations.

**Background and Significance**

Contemporary ethnic CBOs in the United States serving Asian populations have played central roles within ethnic enclaves (Espiritu 1992; Wei 1993; Ong 1994; Lai 1996; Lin 1998; Chung 2000). Alongside rapid Asian demographic growth and expansion of various Asian ethnic communities as a result of post-Kennedy era, open door policies, contemporary CBOs were established by ethnic community leaders and advocates across various Asian ethnic populations and have expanded over time to provide not just basic social adjustment needs to Asian newcomers, but also to promote community

Very few research studies have been conducted with a focus on CBOs as the primary unit of analysis in general. Within the Asian immigration studies literature, most such studies have tended to utilize individuals as the units of analysis and focus on particular social adjustment trends and challenges such as assimilation, education, welfare reform, health care access, or other issues, instead of focusing on organizations or communities as the central units of analysis. However, because ethnic CBOs as meso-organizations often face multiple external environmental challenges at the same time through their operations and programs and mediate conflicts between external forces and their ethnic communities, they are therefore potentially central sites where a broad range of macro and micro dynamics may be explored at the same time.

In addition, of the few existing studies that have examined the roles of ethnic CBOs within Asian populations, they have often been restricted to either focusing on organizations within particular ethnic communities, such as the Chinese (Wong, Applewhite and Daley 1990; Lai 1996; Zhou 2000), Japanese (Woodrum and Reid 1987), Filipino (Yu 1980; Alegado 1991), and Indo-Chinese (Hein 1997) communities or as pan-ethnic Asian organizations (Espiritu 1992; Wei 1993). However, they have not adequately compared such organizations across the diverse and polarized Asian ethnic populations. Furthermore, most such studies tended to be limited to examining traditional intra-ethnic and family/kinship organizations as opposed to examining the newer types of ethnic nonprofit community organizations of the post-1965 period that
partner with mainstream government institutions and build cross-cultural community coalitions to provide community services.

In sum, there has been a gap in the existing research utilizing organizations as the unit of analysis in the Asian immigration literature and in particular about the processes ethnic nonprofit CBOs play in addressing diverse social adjustment, social mobility, and social inequality challenges within ethnic enclaves. This study seeks to address this gap.

**Ethnic Pluralism and Segmented Assimilation**

This research study utilizes ethnic pluralist and segmented assimilation theories to examine Chinese and Vietnamese immigrant service community organizations. The ethnic pluralist network model (Bonacich 1972; 1973; Portes 1984; Portes and Bach 1985; Hein 1995) emphasizes the processes of conflict, social networks, and ethnic solidarity formations in assimilation. This model suggests that the formation of ethnic networks and communities has helped to promote Asian and other immigrant adaptation to life in destination countries. Dominant social groups often exploit and discriminate against new migrants instead of allowing them to fully integrate into society. The formation of cultural communities among migrants who share common ethnic identities and experiences serves as support systems for newcomers going through processes of resettlement, cultural adjustment, and social development.

In the 1980s, Alejandro Portes and associates proposed the ethnic enclave hypothesis (Wilson and Portes 1980; Wilson and Martin 1982; Portes 1984) which held that ethnic minorities empower themselves through ethnic community niches. New migrants often find ethnic solidarity to be an important means for their progression
within unequal ethnic/racial and socioeconomic environments. Within these ethnic enclaves, ethnic and economic networks help to provide critical moral and economic support for new immigrants. In the continuing adjustment struggles to their host society, maintaining strong ethnic connections and being open to working together cross-culturally have served as crucial mechanisms that help new migrants acquire and maintain the vital economic, political, and cultural capital for sustainable social advancement.

In sum, the ethnic pluralist network model (Portes and Bach 1985; Hein 1995) is based on conflict theory and emphasizes political, economic, and socio-cultural power dynamics rooted in social inequality. Asian, Latino, and other minority ethnic immigrant community formations are the main focus of analysis instead of the dominant cultural formations of host society. The model brings to center racial/ethnic and socioeconomic inequalities that impact immigrant lives and de-emphasizes integration while emphasizing adaptation. Overall, the ethnic pluralist network model has made significant contributions to expanding the terrain of migrant adaptation frameworks of the original assimilation model.

**Segmented Assimilation**

The segmented assimilation model (Portes and Rumbaut 1996; 2001) is an extension of the ethnic pluralist model and proposes that there’s no single assimilation trajectory, but multiple dimensions and trajectories of assimilation. The assimilation trajectory depends on the differential experiences, background, and achievements of the immigrants and their American born offspring. The primary factors that influence immigrant or first generation adjustment include human capital (i.e., skills, experiences,
and resources), family structure, and modes of incorporation (i.e., context of reception, public sentiment, available pre-existing ethnic communities). The upward or downward assimilation trajectories of first generation immigrants and family and community solidarity affect the consequent assimilation trajectories of their second generation American born offspring.

Portes and Rumbaut (1996; 2001) discuss three major patterns of assimilation: consonant acculturation, selective acculturation, and dissonant acculturation. In consonant acculturation, those of the second generation that are acculturating in tune with their well-adapted first generation immigrant parents and have strong family support tends to assimilate more smoothly into American society. However, ethnic identification and traditional practices are often lost in the process. In selective acculturation, those of the second generation that are acculturating at the same pace as their first generation immigrant parents, have strong family support, and maintain strong ties to their ethnic communities tend to both assimilate smoothly to American society and retain their ethnic language and cultural capacities (i.e., bilingual capabilities). However, in dissonant acculturation, those of the second generation that transition to mainstream American society at a different pace from their limited English proficient immigrant parents and lack family and ethnic community support tend to face more difficult cultural and structural assimilation barriers, often unable to get out of poor living and working conditions, and do not retain any ethnic language and cultural capacities.

Ethnic Pluralism, Segmented Assimilation, and Ethnic CBOs

Contemporary ethnic community based immigrant service organizations were established in the post-Kennedy era when substantive flows of immigrants and refugees
came from non-European regions such as Asia and Latin America and such population flows led to the development of new and expanding ethnic minority communities. The study examines community level selective acculturation processes (i.e., community support) and in particular the roles of two Chinese and two Vietnamese immigrant service organizations as resource providers within ethnic enclaves mediating immigrant social adjustment and building capacity for ethnic minorities in American society.

**Segmented Labor Market Theory**

Segmented labor market theory (Piore, 1979; Massey et al., 1998) proposes that labor demand inherent in modern industrial systems is the preeminent driving force to international labor migration, not the individual or household decisions based on evaluation of local and global economic markets as proposed by neoclassical and new economics of migration theories. According to this theory, international labor migration is the predominant form of transnational population movements and tends to flow from developing countries to developed countries. This theory further asserts that neither the push factors from underemployment and low wages in sending countries nor the pull factors from cheap labor needs by labor markets in receiving countries are the primary causes of international migration of labor. Instead, it is the larger economic structure of capitalist development across nations that produce a constant demand for international labor migration. In other words, transnational labor migration is a fundamental process built into global capitalist systems. In particular, four essential structural features of modern industrial societies propel and sustain international migration of labor: structural inflation, status hierarchy constraints on labor motivation, labor market demands for cheap labor, and demographic declines in the domestic labor supply.
Structural Inflation and the Labor Market

First, structural inflation (Piore, 1979) motivates employers in developed countries to hire immigrant workers that will accept low relative wages over native workers for unskilled and entry-level jobs. Employers do not have the flexibility just to raise and lower wages based on supply and demand to attract workers when there is a shortage of labor. For example, when there is a shortage of entry-level workers, employers cannot just raise the wages of such positions to attract native workers. Wages reflect the social status of the job position in relation to the overall job hierarchy. A range of informal and formal institutional mechanisms such as labor contracts, company regulations, human resource organization, and others maintains and enforces a status defined salary distribution for different level job positions. If wages are raised at the bottom, workers at every level of the organization will also expect their salaries to be raised. In sum, structural inflation means that a wage increase at one level of the job hierarchy demands wages increased proportionately for every level of the job hierarchy. As a result, employers will seek to maintain or reduce wage costs by hiring cheap immigrant workers that can accept both low wages and status for these entry-level and unskilled job positions.

Status Hierarchy Constraints on Labor Motivation

Second, the social structure of the job hierarchy (Piore, 1979) motivates workers to seek, besides good wages, also good social standing and potential for upper mobility, thus, opening up many low status jobs for migrants to fill. Workers are constrained to reject certain jobs because of low wages relative to their social status and no possibilities for career advancement. As a result, for low-end jobs where there is little
hope for promotion, employers in developed countries will tend to look for persons who will work solely for making money without the attached status considerations. For example, when native workers will not accept bottom-level positions, immigrants that are willing to work for low status with the attached low salaries will be hired. The disparity of earnings between developed countries and developing countries sometimes make the wages in developed countries very attractive even if the social status is low. In such cases, migrant workers often see their low status work to be worthwhile because of relative higher earning status in comparison to those working in their home countries.

**Labor Market Demands for Cheap Labor**

Third, in a bifurcated labor market (Piore, 1979), the labor-intensive sector selectively recruits immigrants over native workers. In the capital production industry, primary capital-intensive processes are utilized to meet basic demand while secondary labor-intensive processes are utilized to meet fluctuating demand. Workers in the primary capital-intensive sector are valued human capital and given high wages while workers in the secondary labor-intensive sector are seen as variable and given low wages. During bear cycles, such workers are expendable in the production process. In general, workers tend to be drawn to capital-intensive sector because of job security, good wages, and social mobility. On the other hand, due to job instability, low wages, poor status, and little prospects for advancement in the labor-intensive sector, employers have few incentives to attract native workers. As a result, they often turn to immigrants when there is a shortage of labor in the secondary sector.
In addition, ethnic enclaves (Portes & Bach, 1985; Portes & Rumbaut, 1990), a third labor market sector that combines features from the secondary and primary sectors, actively assist and support international labor migration from the ethnic homeland to advance development and expansion of ethnic communities in the country of destination. Within this sector, like in the secondary labor-intensive sector, low status, low pay jobs are available and are often filled by non-skilled newcomers and avoided by native workers. However, ethnic enclaves, like in the primary capital-intensive sector, can also provide some immigrants with crucial experience, knowledge and support to adapt to the destination country and give them a real possibility for social mobility. In general, ethnic communities first develop from an initial wave of pioneer immigrants that possess significant quantities of social and economic capital whom locate together in one particular geographical area. Once these pioneer immigrants settle down, establish themselves, and set up new businesses, they recruit and help bring over successive waves of new immigrants from their native countries to work for them. The initial human and financial resources that the first wave of immigrants brings with them are critical to the formation of ethnic communities. Subsequently, cultural capital through ethnic solidarity sustains and advances the ethnic community with ethnic entrepreneurs seeking out newcomers to work for their businesses. In addition, the various waves of immigrants bring with them human capital and networks with their homeland that further promote growth of the ethnic enclave economy.

**Demographic Decline in the Domestic Labor Supply**

Finally, in advanced capitalist countries, the traditional domestic sources of workers that have supplied the labor for the labor-intensive sector have declined with time forcing
employers to seek other supplies of labor such as immigrants (Piore, 1979). When there have been shortages of labor in the labor-intensive sector, employers in developed countries have increasingly turned to hiring immigrants for many entry-level positions as a long-term viable alternative to the limited domestic labor supply. Historically, women, teenagers, and rural-to-urban migrants have provided the labor resources to fill unskilled and entry-level positions with low wages. Many of them did not demand job stability because the work was seen as temporary. Also, they often did not see their work as primary to their families, but saw their work more as supportive or supplementary income. In addition, they felt these jobs gave them good experiences and brought personal growth. However, these domestic labor-intensive workers have decreased over time. With shifts in family structures and more women headed households, more women participating in the work force seek better wages, higher status, and job security. Also, educational prolongation and birth rate declines have reduced the number of teenagers available to enter the labor force. In addition, rural populations have declined dramatically as most have already moved to urban settings. As a result, the reduction of domestic labor resources has led employers to seek other flows of labor such as immigrants to help fill these entry-level and unskilled jobs when available.

In sum, because international labor migration is intrinsic to the structural framework of advanced industrial societies, only major structural economic changes that can alter labor demands of the market will be able to control the rate of international labor flows (Massey et al., 1998). Government policies that result in shifts in wages and employment rates will have little effect on limiting international labor migration.
Research Methodology

This qualitative study utilized a triangulation approach to examine four ethnic community based Asian immigrant service organizations (two Chinese and two Vietnamese) in the San Francisco Bay Area. The methodologies utilized included collective case study (Yin 1984), grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1990) and ethnographic (Miles and Huberman 1994; Hammersley and Atkinson 1995) approaches. Due to utilization of qualitative community participatory approaches, there was a 100 per cent recruitment rate. Fieldwork was conducted from January 2001 to November 2001 at the four organizations and a total of sixty-one key informants were interviewed.

Procedures utilized in this study included seeking and collecting information from key community providers and researchers about Chinese and Vietnamese communities, purposively recruiting select community organizations to participate in the study, concentrated participant observation (i.e., spending three to four full weeks from 9 am to 5 pm each workday as observer and also participant in various programs, meetings, events, and other activities at each organization), the development of an interview questionnaire for in-depth interviews, semi-structured in-depth interviews of two to three key informants of executives from each of the four organizations, numerous other organizational staff and non-staff key informant interviews (formal and informal), collection of a variety of internal documentary materials about these organizations, taking field notes of the participant observation and interviews, transcribing interviews and fieldnotes, coding analysis (descriptive, interpretive, and analytical) of interview transcriptions, field notes, and other field data, writing analytical memos, developing conceptual diagrams, and writing up of the findings.
Concentrated participant observation served as an instrument to build trust and rapport with organizational executives and staff as well as develop a comprehensive understanding of organizational operations, programs, and activities over time. The key informant interviews were critical to gain a broader understanding of the goals, programs, community networks, and challenges of ethnic CBOs alongside the trends of ethnic community and mainstream development. Key informants at these organizations, most of whom were foreign born and have achieved self-sufficiency, provided invaluable insider perspectives about the critical issues of immigrant communities and the provision of immigrant services. The collection of documentary materials helped to provide information about the historical background, fiscal status, human resources, programs, and community networks of these organizations.

This study has a number of limitations. First, the study did not examine organizations across ethnic/racial communities and only focused on organizations within Chinese and Vietnamese communities. Second, the study examined social service organizations in exclusion of other community organizations such as health care, legal, media, arts and cultural, business, historical and other types of organizations within ethnic enclaves. Third, the study focused on organizations primarily serving immigrants/refugees, but excluded organizations serving other types of ethnic entities such as American born ethnics and affluent ethnics. Finally, the study was situated in the San Francisco Bay Area, a great setting for studying diverse populations, but the findings might not apply to similar organizations in other parts of the United States and globally.
In the following sections, the four organizations of this study will be referred to as Chinese Immigrant Service Center [CISC], Chinese Community Service Center [CCSC], Vietnamese Immigrant Service Center [VIS], and Vietnamese Community Service Center [VCSC]. The differentiation of the names of immigrant service versus community service reflects in part the differences in organizational size and program capacity.

**Findings**

The findings suggested that the two Chinese and two Vietnamese CBOs represented fundamental community building blocks and principal immigrant social adjustment and capacity building resources serving immigrants and refugees within Chinese and Vietnamese enclaves in the San Francisco Bay Area. These community organizations were central features of ethnic enclaves because the leadership and staff came from the communities, have already been through the cultural and structural adjustment experiences of their immigrant and refugee clientele, understood the language and culture very well, and were experienced hands in how to achieve self-sufficiency in American society. Therefore, they understood best the challenges facing their clients and were the most culturally proficient at addressing such challenges. In addition, these organizations have served their communities for over three decades, have developed a solid reputation and trust within their communities, and could be depended on as providers and advocates time and time again. Furthermore, given their expertise and experiences, even for the services they were unable to provide, as old hands, they were familiar with the community service networks within and beyond their ethnic
communities to best serve their immigrant and refugee clients and to be able to refer them to such supportive institutions for help.

These Chinese and Vietnamese CBOs were primary providers of social adjustment services that immigrants and refugees could depend on time and time again in the process of achieving basic self-sufficiency. In terms of social adjustment services, these ethnic minority CBOs provided information and referral, immigration and citizenship, and employment services. Information and referral services helped to provide cultural appropriate information and training and assist in managing the practical every day life needs of American life as well as access to a comprehensive support network of ethnic and mainstream social adjustment resources. Immigration and citizenship services helped to provide basic English language, civics, and citizenship training courses and assistance in facilitating the legal process for immigration and citizenship. Employment services helped to provide job skills training, job placement, and job retention.

In addition, these Chinese and Vietnamese CBOs were facilitators for building immigrant community capacity beyond basic social adjustment services needs. The major capacity building programs addressed every day life challenges beyond social adjustment issues and included long-term care, youth services, community development, and political advocacy. Long-term care services helped to ease the caregiving burden facing overworked immigrant adults in caring for their elderly parents. Youth services helped to reduce the childcare burden of working immigrant parents. Community development services helped to provide financial support for small business start-ups and expansion as well as further build up basic community support
infrastructure and facilities. Political advocacy programs helped to give voice and promote the interests of the larger ethnic community in mainstream politics and empower minority ethnic populations.

**Ethnic CBOs as Community Resource Providers**

According most key informant interviews and daily observation of organizational operations, programs, and activities at both the Chinese and Vietnamese CBOs, community organizations were clearly the best and most accessible resources to address diverse immigrant needs. Other major community resources included local government agencies and mainstream nonprofit organizations, but they often lacked the culturally proficient human resources to best serve the immigrant population.

Agencies like ours, community based organizations that are here whose mission is basically to serve the needs of immigrants. Government agencies are helpful, but I tell you where those are bureaucratic and those are not as culturally friendly and they don’t always have the language and cultural capacity. So yes, I will say about the ethnic CBOs, community based organizations. Those are the ones that the immigrants will turn to because who else is going to understand what they are saying or what their needs are or what their cultural nuances are where the mainstream organizations would not and would not have the capacity or the time to do that. So definitely the CBOs, the ethnic CBOs, said the executive director of CCSC.

The Chinese and Vietnamese CBOs were critical immigrant resources because they had developed a long-term relationship, reputation, and trust with the ethnic immigrant communities over decades of service, were familiar with the newcomers' culture and language, provided immigrants the point of access to a diverse range of social and health services, and served as leading advocacy agencies in ethnic community empowerment projects.

We help them in everything, from housing, social services, language, job placement. Moreover, from cultural education and also medical too, in our agency. Well, this is a very long story because I came here in ’75 myself. After
the first year, we experienced a lot of difficulty for the newcomer to the new
country. And we find out that stuff. We need to welcome the new refugee and
immigrant to this country. So based on our own experiences, we are going to
hire staff with the same experiences and then we step-by-step we learn on job
training by ourselves. And after we help for more than twenty-five to twenty-six
years, it’s like we know exactly what to do and with a priority to serve the
newcomer. I think the most important resource is the experiences of how we
provided service to immigrants/refugees over the years, said the executive
director of VISC.

In addition, besides social adjustment services, the ethnic CBOs and their
culturally competent staff made up of primarily ethnic community leaders and self-
sufficient ethnics helped to guide other self-sufficient ethnics within their communities to
move forward beyond social adjustment issues and face new challenges of personal
and community empowerment.

We can do a lot of things in building up our community. I think what we can do
right now, we encourage our clients after they have been here for sufficient time
to apply for citizenship, and then get citizenship, go out to vote, and if they’re
good enough, participate in the administrative/political process, including that if
they’re good enough, not only to go out to vote, but also to participate as a
political candidate in some positions that is appropriate to them, said the
executive director of VCSC.

In sum, according to all informants interviewed, ethnic CBOs were clearly the
most important community resources available to serve and advocate for immigrant and
refugee populations. These organizations provided a number of vital social adjustment
and capacity building programs to address the critical needs of both their newly arrived
and self-sufficient immigrant populations in transitioning to American society. Even
though many key informants also mentioned that government agencies and other
nonprofit organizations including faith based organizations were valuable immigrant
service providers, but they also said that such organizations frequently lacked the
necessary culturally appropriate services and personnel.
### Table 1 Major Program Services from Key Informant Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG. NAME</th>
<th>MAJOR PROGRAM SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Immigrant Service Center</td>
<td>(1) Employment and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Information and Referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Educational/Vocational Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Community Service Center</td>
<td>(1) Adult Day Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Youth Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese Immigrant Service Center</td>
<td>(1) Employment and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Information and Referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese Community Service Center</td>
<td>(1) Refugee Resettlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Small Business Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Immigration and Citizenship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mission and programs of the two Chinese and two Vietnamese CBOs reflected primarily the needs of the low income immigrant/foreign-born populations within their ethnic communities. The major programs according to the key informant interviews (see Table 1) and program expenses from the year 2000 annual financial reports (see Table 2) included social and health care services ranging from informational and referral, immigration and citizenship, employment, small business development, long-term care, and youth services. The year 2000 total annual program budget across the four organizations ranged from approximately $300,000 to $3.84 million dollars.
Table 2 Program Services Expenses, Fiscal Year 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM SERVICES EXPENSES</th>
<th>Social Services</th>
<th>Employment &amp; Training</th>
<th>Long-Term Care</th>
<th>Youth Services</th>
<th>Community Development</th>
<th>Total Program Services Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Immigrant Service Center</td>
<td>$213,110</td>
<td>$83,436</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$296,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Community Service Center</td>
<td>$309,023</td>
<td>$372,973</td>
<td>$2,977,136</td>
<td>$185,184</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,844,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese Immigrant Service Center</td>
<td>$274,492</td>
<td>$235,394</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$509,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese Community Service Center</td>
<td>$410,105</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$157,107</td>
<td>$567,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Social services expenses for VCSC include some employment services expenses. The employment services expenses could not be differentiated from its social services expenses based on the info from its year 2000 Annual Financial Report.

In addition, the majority of year 2000 annual organizational revenue at the four ethnic CBOs came from government sources ranging from 41 per cent to 78 per cent. Secondly, organizational revenue came from contributions and donations from local
ethnic community and corporate entities ranging from 1 per cent to 34 per cent with the Chinese CBOs receiving much more community support than Vietnamese CBOs. Third, organizational revenue came from foundations ranging from 4 per cent to 15 per cent. The diversity of these funding streams in part reflected the ethnic community organization’s multiple roles as an ethnic community organization, a nonprofit organization, and an ancillary government agency. In other words, these multiple organizational identities served multiple community service agendas of government, nonprofit, and ethnic community interest groups at both the local and national levels.

All four organizations provided the basic social adjustment services of information/referral, immigration/citizenship, and employment that immigrants adjusting to American society primarily need to achieve self-sufficiency. And two of these organizations provided services beyond basic social adjustment services. CCSC also provided long-term care and youth services. And VCSC provided small business development services. Most key informants interviewed at three out of the four organizations indicated that their organizational mission needed to change and expand to account for the shifting needs of their diverse and growing ethnic community. Many Chinese and Vietnamese immigrant families have already achieved self-sufficiency over the past few decades and now faced new challenges such as career advancement, community development, youth education, and long-term care. In sum, these programs reflected the shifting mission of these organizations over the past few decades to move beyond addressing just basic self-sufficiency needs and to begin also addressing needs of self-sufficient immigrants and American-born ethnics within their communities.

Program Utilization and Needs
Ethnic community organizations served as central sites for immigrants and refugees to access to a number of social adjustment services according to most key informants and from participant observation. Their organizational mission and programs in large part reflected such needs. To paraphrase the words of the Executive Director at VISC, the multiple challenges the immigrant and refugee clients faced reflected the central challenges of ethnic community organizations.

For both CISC and VISC, the most utilized programs included information/referral services and employment services. Information/referral services served to provide newcomers cultural orientation and culturally appropriate information about managing the practical every day situations of life in America as well as help newcomers access a range of ethnic and mainstream social adjustment and culturally competent resources. Employment services served as critical initial resettlement resources to assist newcomers get job skills training and find and retain employment in order to financially survive and support family finances in the destination country.

For CCSC, the most utilized programs included adult day health care services and social services. Adult day health care services provided both foreign-born and American-born seniors in the ethnic community culturally appropriate recreational, independent living, and rehabilitation services. Social services served to provide information/referral services as well as other basic immigrant services.

For VCSC, the most utilized services included refugee resettlement services, immigrant services, and small business development services. Refugee and immigrant services served to provide a comprehensive range of basic resettlement services including employment, information/referral, English language classes, housing, and
immigration/citizenship services. Small business development services served to assist their entrepreneurial immigrant and refugee clients to start-up new small businesses as well as expand their small businesses.

In addition, the most needed immigrant service programs primarily reflected the various basic social adjustment priorities of their low income immigrant and refugee clientele according to most key informants and from participant observation. For CISC and VISC, the most needed programs to best serve their clientele included employment services, ESL/cultural orientation, and housing referral services. Employment services served to assist immigrants with job training, placement, and retention. ESL and cultural orientation helped to train immigrant clients in daily English conversation and in practical every day situations in American society. Finding and retaining affordable housing was also a major priority for their newcomer clients, but housing services were not available. Nevertheless, these organizations tried their best to keep a heads up on such issues and refer their clients to local housing authorities should any housing assistance resources become available.

For CCSC, the most needed programs included social services, elderly services, and youth services. Social services served to address the most basic social adjustment needs of their immigrant clients including information and referral, ESL/cultural orientation, and immigration and citizenship services. Elderly services provided recreational activities, day care, and health care services to elderly clients and reduced the caregiving burden of overworked immigrant adults. Youth services provided childcare services and helped to reduce the childcare burden of immigrant parents.
For VCSC, the most needed programs included ESL/cultural orientation, citizenship services, and small business development services. ESL classes and cultural orientation helped to address the language and cultural adjustment needs of their immigrant and refugee clients. Citizenship services helped their immigrant and refugee clients apply for and attain citizenship. Small business development services assisted their immigrant and refugee entrepreneurial clients with start-up and expansion of small businesses.

In sum, the best thing about ethnic CBOs included being a stable, dependable, and reputable source of services, having cultural proficient providers to guide and help their immigrant and refugee clients achieve self-sufficiency, and providing leadership and advocacy for the immigrant and refugee populations according to most key informants. However, the range of social adjustment and other services ethnic CBOs could provide was restricted by the limited financial and human resources available to support immigrant and refugee populations from within their own ethnic communities and through mainstream resource-rich institutions.

Chinese versus Vietnamese Community Resources and Capacity of Ethnic CBOs

Comparing between Chinese and Vietnamese communities in the San Francisco Bay Area, there were differences in the social demography, infrastructure, and community resources available at CBOs to serve their low income immigrant and refugee clientele according to key informant interviews, field observations of daily program staff interactions with clients and community coalition meetings, and from year 2000 annual reports.
First, by population size, the current Chinese population is two and a half times larger than the Vietnamese population in the United States (US Census 2002). Second, even given the history of Chinese exclusion and discrimination, Chinese communities and CBOs have already been established in the United States for over 150 years. On the other hand, Vietnamese communities and CBOs developed in the United States only after the Vietnam War in the post-1975 period. Therefore, the existing infrastructure and resources available through various the Chinese community organizations together tended to be much more comprehensive and effective to meet the various immigrant needs than through the Vietnamese community organizations. Third, contemporary Chinese newcomers continued to come to the United States from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds (e.g., skilled and unskilled, well educated and poorly educated) with diverse resettlement needs. And many brought financial and professional human resources that contributed to their communities. On the other hand, Vietnamese newcomers that came to the United States currently tended to be primarily poorly skilled and poorly educated immigrants with common basic resettlement needs and a more difficult time with social adjustment.

For example, based on participating and observing community coalition meetings through CISC and information collected from various Chinese community resource guides, there were immigrant service and other organizations serving Chinese immigrants within San Francisco Chinatown. Other types of Chinese community organizations in San Francisco Chinatown including for community development, financial services, legal services, medical care, youth services, long-term care, media, cultural and performing arts, historical preservation, ethnic and kinship association,
religion and spirituality, and more. Together, these community organizations provided a comprehensive and diverse range of ethnic community resources to serve Chinese and other populations around San Francisco Chinatown and the greater San Francisco Bay Area.

Many of these Chinese community organizations, according to a board member at CISC, formed coalitions and collaborated with each other to raise community program funds and seek competitive grants as well as make sure they could best share and pool their community resources and reduce competition between each other for the same funding sources and clientele. They also worked together to promote community empowerment and advocate for the greater interests of the larger Chinese community.

Chinese Americans represented one of the most powerful ethnic groups within the pan-Asian community with a number of prominent Chinese Americans in the government and corporate sectors and a critical mass of social elite in the United States. Therefore, various affluent ethnic entities or associations within the Chinese community sector were able to support and contribute a great deal to the various Chinese community organizations as well as utilize ethnic CBOs as platforms for advancing their political and community development interests.

At the same time, as China has become a global power and with substantive political and economic capital throughout Greater China, more and more home country resources have become available to support overseas Chinese communities in the United States and other parts of the world. Rapid economic development facilitated the transnational flows of substantive financial, human, and cultural resources from Greater China to support a number of overseas Chinese organizations and their activities in the
United States. And leading Chinese CBOs have often become central sites for such cultural political exchanges in the name Chinese community building and empowerment. However, even given the growing number of vibrant Chinese communities and resourceful Chinese CBOs across the United States, such community resources continued to be limited to the few pockets of major Chinese concentrations across the United States such as San Francisco, Los Angeles, New York, and Honolulu.

On the other hand, for Vietnamese community organizations, their community resources were much more limited, according to interviews of organizational leadership at the Vietnamese CBOs. The Vietnamese elite in the United States over the past three decades has yet to build up a critical mass of social elite and community infrastructure comparable to the concentrations of vibrant Chinese communities across the United States. In addition, still in the early stages of national development, the political and economic institutions of Vietnam lacked the capacity and resources to help build up overseas Vietnamese communities.

As a result, the financial, social, health, cultural, legal, and other resources available to serve immigrants/refugees in the Vietnamese communities were much smaller compared to the Chinese communities in the United States. In contrast to the concentration of Chinese CBOs and other sources in the major Chinese communities across the United States to address a broad range of community issues, there were relatively fewer CBOs and other resources within Vietnamese communities. And most Vietnamese CBOs even in the major regions of Vietnamese concentration lacked sufficient community resources to be able to address issues beyond basic organizational and community self-sufficiency. Their primary financial resources
continued to come from the US government sector, even with refugee funds dried up. There was still only very little financial support for CBOs from the Vietnamese community, American mainstream sources, or from their home country. On the other hand, substantial financial resources from US and other overseas Vietnamese communities as remittances have contributed substantially to the ongoing development of Vietnam.

For those community needs unavailable within the Vietnamese community that Vietnamese immigrants/refugees depended on, such as legal services, community development, health care, and others, Vietnamese CBOs often sought to build cross-cultural coalitions and networks with other Asian ethnic CBOs and pan-ethnic CBOs or with other mainstream and nonprofit agencies in order to help their immigrant and refugee clients access a more comprehensive range of community services and support than was available within the Vietnamese communities. In addition, Vietnamese community organizations depended on working with other Vietnamese CBOs and various organizations cross-culturally beyond the Vietnamese community to be able to access key organizational resources necessary to survive and remain viable. Further, the Vietnamese community has yet achieved a level of community capacity like that in the Chinese community in part because of the much shorter history of community development and fewer number of critical mass self-sufficient and affluent ethnic groups relative to the Chinese.

According to the executive director at VCSC, the Vietnamese community still has a long way to go in terms of advancing up the American social ladder of success. However, he said they were certainly not the first newcomers to this country and there
were many great examples they should follow such as the Italian, Chinese, and Jewish communities. Even given the short history of Vietnamese populations in the United States, the Vietnamese community has continued to grow rapidly with lots of upward potential. When the Vietnamese elite and self-sufficient Vietnamese populations reached a critical mass with more and more successful mainstream foreign born or American born Vietnamese in the United States as well as a stronger and more developed and resourceful Vietnam, the overseas Vietnamese community in the United States would be able to more successfully build up their community and raise their political voice. For now, community resources continued to be limited in the Vietnamese community because those Vietnamese Americans that have been in the United States the longest (i.e., thirty years) have only recently achieved self-sufficiency and the issues of Vietnamese community empowerment and development were only beginning to be addressed.

Community Capacity Building and Ethnic CBOs

The key to building vibrant Chinese and Vietnamese communities, according to many key informants, was through community capacity building. At one level, it meant developing more and better community resources and infrastructure within the ethnic community to improve the quality of life of its members. At another level, it meant uniting as an ethnic community to build a stronger political voice that could better represent the ethnic community interests against outside interests. Further, it meant collaborating across ethnic/racial communities and minority/majority divides to build up community resources and to build a stronger voice together to advance shared common interests and goals. In sum, community capacity building entailed community
development and political empowerment through the collaboration of ethnic minority community organizations and mainstream institutions to build up healthy local and national communities.

The Chinese and Vietnamese CBOs represented invaluable sources of community leadership, services, and advocacy within their respective ethnic communities. As the rapidly growing foreign-born and American-born ethnic populations grew over the past decades, these organizations expanded and grew to meet their growing demands. Initially, these ethnic CBOs addressed only the most basic social adjustment issues facing the newest members of their communities such as ESL, cultural orientation, and employment services. However, over time, ethnic CBOs grew with their communities and also began to encounter and address a growing number of community building issues such as neighborhood development and political empowerment. Further, the growth of these community organizations in part facilitated the capacity building process and development of their ethnic communities.

**Major Capacity Building Programs**

The major programs at the four ethnic CBOs that addressed broader community issues beyond immigrant social adjustment programs included long-term care, youth services, community development, and political empowerment according to key informant interviews and field observations and participation in organizational and political advocacy meetings. Long-term care and youth services helped to ease the caregiving burden of the overworked immigrant adults (i.e., the sandwich generation) to care for their elderly parents and children. Community development programs helped the immigrant population start-up and maintain ethnic businesses as well as help to build up
the housing and support infrastructure of the ethnic communities. Political empowerment programs helped to bridge the ethnic/racial and socioeconomic disparities between ethnic community members and members of the dominant mainstream society as well as served to promote and advance the ethnic community interests in mainstream politics.

According to a Board Member at CCSC, for the Chinese immigrant population in the San Francisco Bay Area, their needs went beyond the initial resettlement challenges of language, cultural orientation, and employment. Because many immigrants needed to work full-time to financially survive in American society, they also needed additional assistance in caring for their elderly parents as well as their children. Therefore, there was a compelling need for his agency to expand their services in the past decade to provide for these additional community needs that were not previously accessible to Chinese immigrants such as long-term care and youth services. Long-term care services included adult day health care and senior recreational activities. They also had been planning to expand their long-term care services to include the Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly model [PACE]. Youth services included childcare, youth development, and Chinese language classes. These programs helped to ease the caregiving burden for immigrant families.

For long-term care services at CCSC, according to the Executive Director, the primary funding source was Medi-Cal, a federally funded program with the state regulating the funds and setting the guidelines. For youth services at CCSC, the primary source of funds came from city departments that also utilized in part Federal funds allocated for youth education programs.
According to the Executive Director at VCSC, for the Vietnamese refugee/immigrant population in the San Francisco Bay Area, most of them have currently achieved financially self-sufficiency. And now, there were a number of community empowerment issues that needed to be addressed such as with improving the quality of life and raising the political voice of Vietnamese communities. He felt that it was the responsibility and the role of his agency to spearhead such a movement and guide the Vietnamese community to build a better and more prosperous life in America.

As a result, there had been a need in the past decade for his agency to expand their services to small business development services and political advocacy to help Vietnamese Americans build up their ethnic communities. The small business development program included micro-loan, technical assistance, and merchant’s outreach. These services helped immigrants to start-up and expand small businesses as well as offer technical support and information. Political advocacy activities included organizing community gatherings about community empowerment and leadership issues, voting and elections, and collaboration efforts between local and national ethnic political interest groups to advocate for Vietnamese communities. In addition, the organization was planning to establish a Vietnamese Chamber of Commerce to spearhead the development of new trade networks between the Vietnamese businesses in the United States and in Vietnam in the very near future.

For the small business development program at VCSC, according the Executive Director, the primary funding sources came from the Federal Small Business Administration [SBA] for micro-loan assistance and from the county community development department with funds allocated from the Federal Housing and Urban
Development Department [HUD] for technical assistance. For the political advocacy events at VCSC, according to the Executive Director, they were sponsored by a number of ethnic community organizations, corporations, foundations, and other interest groups primarily locally and a few nationally.

These two larger ethnic CBOs in this study mentioned above, CCSC and VCSC, were able to provide additional community service programs beyond social adjustment programs because of their diversification strategy of resource support and program development. On the other hand, the two smaller ethnic CBOs in this study, CISC and VISC, were only able to provide basic social adjustment programs such as ESL classes, employment and training, and immigration/citizenship assistance and did not have sufficient financial resources to support other capacity building projects.

However, it did not mean they did not participate in the capacity building process. For all four ethnic CBOs, they actively participated in a number of ethnic community capacity building projects often through their own subsidized funds as well as served as participants of local and national community coalitions and political advocacy groups through their ethnic/racial and mainstream networks and collaborations with other ethnic CBOs, private nonprofit organizations, and government agencies. Such collaborative projects included organizing annual events celebrating ethnic cultural holidays, community fundraising activities, annual food and holiday gift distribution drives, mediation efforts to help bridge the ethnic/racial divide at schools and in the local neighborhoods, community education and outreach meetings, political advocacy meetings and activities, and more.

**Key Capacity Building Networks**
The key capacity building networks for the two Chinese and two Vietnamese CBOs included with other local ethnic community organizations that shared common community missions, local community coalitions that worked together across ethnic/racial communities and supported each other on capacity building issues, and local and national ethnic/racial and mainstream political advocacy organizations representing and advancing ethnic community interests according to key informant interviews, participation and field observation in community coalition meetings and events, and year 2000 annual reports. By working together with multiple ethnic community advocacy groups on a number of common community issues such as affordable housing, civil rights, health disparities, elderly care, education, and more, these ethnic CBOs helped to build up networks linking community resources and raise the political voice for their ethnic communities.

Local and national ethnic/racial community coalitions pooled their resources together to seek funds and provide community resources to their respective ethnic/racial communities across the country. The larger and reputable the coalitions were, the more support and legitimacy they received from mainstream funding agencies for their operations and programs.

Ethnic community organizations worked together with each other and other community organizations to seek funding and other support from government agencies, foundations, and other sources to provide a more comprehensive range of community resources to the ethnic community than was available through resources within one organization or one ethnic community. Being a reputable community organization and working with other such organizations to seek grants was critical to acquiring the
financial support from funding agencies because of the competitive nature of grant-based programs in the immigrant service industry.

For example, according to the Administrative Manager, VCSC collaborated with two other local Vietnamese Community Organizations and a Jewish Community Organization to win a new county grant in 2001 funded to provide job assistance and outreach to low income populations in the local community. By working together, they were able to gain more recognition and support from the local county agency about the seriousness of employment challenges facing their respective ethnic communities.

In another example, according to the Executive Director of VCSC, after the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act [PRWORA or welfare reform] was passed in 1996, his organization worked with two other ethnic community organizations including a Chinese community organization and a Latino community organization to seek grant funds to provide citizenship programs to address the new social welfare concerns of their respective ethnic/racial communities. After welfare reform in 1996, there was a big rush by many immigrants to seek citizenship in order to be able to continue to receive federal welfare assistance. There was the fear that they would lose welfare benefits formerly available to them as non-citizen permanent residents. By working together, these organizations were able to gain recognition (more volume) about the critical needs facing immigrant populations after welfare reform and gravity of Federal welfare cuts to non-citizens. Consequently, these organizations received California state funding for their citizenship programs as well as influenced the state to take up the responsibility of extending welfare benefits for non-citizen permanent residents.
In addition, local and national community organizations formed political advocacy coalitions to develop local and national political agendas common across the ethnic/racial communities and advocate for common community goals through organizing voting blocks and lobbying county, state, and Federal government agencies. Also, mainstream political advocacy organizations worked together with ethnic/racial community coalitions to develop regional and national agendas to represent the interests of diverse ethnic/racial populations nationwide and gain support for mainstream community development projects.

For example, both VISC and VCSC were members of a national Southeast Asian political advocacy organization based in Washington, D.C. and worked with their national organization on addressing a variety of issues pertaining to Vietnamese and other Southeast Asian populations in the United States.

It’s been great because the national organizations representing Southeast Asians, Vietnamese, and Asian & Pacific Islanders have been great at getting together key Asian American and Pacific Islander leaders in the Federal government to come meet and talk with the community leaders from across the country about key concerns including issues such as advocacy/empowerment and digital divide/inclusion, said the executive director of VCSC.

Further, organizational leadership within the ethnic community organizations often helped to serve as the informal linkages between the ethnic community groups they represented and served and the local and national political, corporate, and nonprofit entities that have vested community interests. These informal relationships between the ethnic community leaders and the mainstream entities served to facilitate formal and informal collaborations between ethnic CBOs and government agencies, corporations, and nonprofit organizations and advance community service and development agendas.
Discussion and Conclusions

The findings showed that ethnic community organizations in the San Francisco Bay Area were central sites of community level selective acculturation processes (i.e., community support) and in particular fundamental sites of community leadership, services, and empowerment within ethnic enclaves where critical local and national community resources and exchanges were mediated. All four ethnic CBOs in this study were experienced hands with over more than three decades of service. They have developed a longstanding reputation and trust with their communities, were familiar with the newcomers' culture and language, provided immigrants the point of access to a diverse range of social and health services, and served as leading advocacy agencies in ethnic community empowerment projects. Other major community resources included local government agencies and other nonprofit organizations, but they often lacked the culturally proficient human resources to best serve the immigrant and limited English proficient communities.

The core mission and services of the four ethnic CBOs reflected the social adjustment needs and community empowerment concerns of their primarily low income immigrant and refugee clients. The major social adjustment programs these ethnic CBOs provided included informational and referral, immigration and citizenship, and employment. Information/referral services served to provide newcomers cultural orientation and culturally appropriate information about managing the practical every day situations of life in America as well as help newcomers access a range of ethnic and mainstream social adjustment and culturally competent resources. Immigration and citizenship services helped immigrant and refugee clients and their families weave
through the American legal processes to apply for and attain permanent residence and citizenship. Employment services served as critical initial resettlement resources to assist newcomers get job skills training and find and retain employment in order to financially survive and support family finances.

There were additional programs at these ethnic CBOs that addressed broader community issues beyond immigrant social adjustment and included long-term care, youth services, community development, and political empowerment programs. Long-term care (e.g., adult day health care) and youth (e.g., childcare) services helped to ease the caregiving burden of the sandwich generation (i.e., working immigrant parents). Community development programs (e.g., neighborhood/business development) helped the immigrant population start-up and expand ethnic businesses and community facilities as well as help to build up the support infrastructure of the ethnic communities. Political empowerment programs (i.e., political advocacy activities) helped to bridge the ethnic/racial and socioeconomic disparities between minority ethnic community members and members of the dominant mainstream society as well as served to promote and advance the ethnic community concerns in mainstream politics.

Overall, the best thing about ethnic CBOs included being a stable, dependable, and reputable community resource, having capacity to provide a variety of social adjustment assistance including ESL classes, cultural orientation, employment assistance, and more to help their immigrant and refugee clients achieve self-sufficiency, and serving as representatives and advocates for ethnic community advancement. However, the capacity of one ethnic CBO certainly could not serve all the needs of the newcomer and self-sufficient ethnics within the ethnic communities.
But through local and national community coalitions, the various ethnic CBOs together were able to pool their resources and coordinate community assistance efforts with each other, government agencies, and other nonprofit organizations to together provide a comprehensive range of services such as social, health, employment, cultural, community development, legal, political, and other services to accommodate for the initial immigrant resettlement and subsequent community empowerment needs.

In addition, capacity building networks were key to building up community resources through ethnic CBOs to serve immigrant and refugee populations. The key capacity building networks for the four CBOs in this study included with other local ethnic community organizations that shared common community missions, local and national community coalitions that worked together across ethnic/racial communities and supported each other on community services and capacity building issues, and local and national mainstream political advocacy organizations with vested interests in ethnic community developments and promoting ethnic community agendas. By working together across ethnic/racial community and mainstream advocacy groups on a number of common community issues such as affordable housing, civil rights, health disparities, elderly care, education, and more, these ethnic CBOs helped to build up community resources and raise their political voice for their ethnic communities in the American mainstream.

Furthermore, through ethnic community organizations, ethnic community leaders played major roles in driving ethnic community development. Ethnic community leaders served as role models for success in American society and also as mediators between the ethnic community and other ethnic/racial groups as well as mainstream institutions
in American society. In addition, ethnic community leaders served to represent and advocate for ethnic community interests in the government, corporate, and nonprofit arenas.

Finally, the differential histories and contexts of Chinese versus Vietnamese community development have affected the developments of the ethnic CBOs and other neighborhood organizations. The context of Chinese community development over 150 years in the United States together with the rapid Asian development and contemporary immigrant flows from Greater China (i.e., Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong) have helped to build up stronger and expanding community institutional infrastructure in concentrated urban and suburban spaces over the past four decades across the United States for more and more Chinese services, businesses, and other organizations to develop, expand, and flourish. On the other hand, the relative short history of Vietnamese immigration and community development in the United States of just three decades together with the slow development of communist Vietnam over the past decades have served to restrict the rate of development for Vietnamese CBOs and other ethnic neighborhood organizations in the few urban ethnic concentrations across the United States.

Overall, even given such intra-Asian differences in community resources and development between Chinese and Vietnamese communities, these culturally proficient community service organizations to best serve both Chinese and Vietnamese immigrant populations remain inadequately financed and limited to primarily pockets of Chinese and Vietnamese enclave concentration in a few major urban regions across the country. Even after more than one and a half century of Asian settlement and these CBOs
becoming old hands in the immigrant service industry, the dynamics of ‘yellow peril’ and Asian exclusion persist for these CBOs due to their enclave roots and ethnic minority affiliations. Even with the transformation of their organizational mission and affiliations from an ethnic-specific one to a mainstream multicultural one, their capacity to expand beyond the ethnic enclave is limited by the segmented service market. Organizational expansions for these ethnic CBOs tended to be limited to new urban ethnic enclaves than full-incorporation into the capital intensive service sector. Ethnic specific immigrants service organizations and the immigrants they serve and represent are key stakeholders that global and multicultural development can do without and like other mainstream service organizations deserve full incorporation and equitable organizational status in American society. The continuing growth and prosperity of Chinese and Vietnamese community organizations in the United States will depend on the continuing rapid growth of both Asian immigrant and Asian American populations, cultivating and sustaining fiscal relationships with key American mainstream political and economic funding institutions, and the incorporation of Asian voices and leadership in American cultural politics.
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