EXTERNAL DEPENDENCE AND ADAPTATION OF CHINESE AND VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES [1]

Winston Tseng, Ph.D.
University of California, Berkeley
School of Public Health

Paper Presented at ISTR Sixth International Conference
Toronto, Canada
July 11-14, 2004

[1] The work for this paper was supported by NHLBI training grant number T32 HL07365 during 2003 to 2005.

ABSTRACT

Contemporary Chinese and Vietnamese immigration and community organization in the United States are becoming increasingly central features of multicultural America. Few studies in the research literature have examined community based organizations (CBOs) within ethnic enclaves. This paper seeks to address this gap and examines the environment and structure of Chinese and Vietnamese CBOs serving immigrant populations in the San Francisco Bay Area. Resource dependence theory is utilized to examine key external resources and entities that ethnic CBOs depend on for survival and how they manage and adapt to these external dependencies. Fieldwork was conducted from January 2001 to November 2001 at 2 Chinese and 2 Vietnamese CBOs and 61 key informant interviews were conducted. A triangulation methodology was utilized that incorporated a combination of case study, grounded theory, and ethnographic approaches. The findings show that Chinese and Vietnamese CBOs play critical roles mediating language, cultural, and structural exchanges between the immigrant community and mainstream institutions. These CBOs are situated within ethnic community, government, nonprofit, and corporate arenas and depend most on ethnic community and government sources of support for survival. The major external resource entities they depend on include other ethnic CBOs, ethnic elites, self-sufficient ethnics, newcomers, and government social welfare institutions. The major types of resources they acquire from external entities include financial, legitimacy, human, networking, informational, and technical resources. The viability of these ethnic CBOs demands adapting to the changing trends and politics in ethnic community and government arenas. However, ethnic CBOs are not passive players in the immigrant service industry. Diversification of inter-organizational resource networks and utilizing their immigrant community capital to negotiate more favorable terms for resource exchange across the immigrant service industry can mediate external dependencies and cultivate more organizational self-sufficiency.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary Chinese and Vietnamese immigration and community organization in the United States, situated within the macro contexts of globalization (Skeldon, 1997; Sassen, 1998), political conflicts and alliances between the United States and the Asia-Pacific region (Schiller et al., 1992; Weiner, 1997), and domestic cultural and racial politics (Lowe, 1996), are becoming increasingly central features of multicultural America (Portes & Rumbaut, 1990; Zhou & Gatewood, 2000). In particular, three major events, the Immigration Reform Act of 1965 as part of the civil rights movement, global restructuring in the Pacific region, and US involvement in the Vietnam War, have served as the backdrop to the rapid population influx from Asia and the rapidly growing Asian American communities over the past four decades (Fong, 2000).

The United States is a nation of immigrants and descendents of immigrants (Kennedy, 1964; Portes & Rumbaut, 1990; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Immigrants have played and continue to play critical roles in contributing to the prosperity and success of America. Amongst them, as part of the post-1965 open immigration policies, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AAPIs) have become one of the fastest growing immigrant and ethnic/racial groups (Fong & Shinagawa, 2000; Zhou & Gatewood, 2000). From 1960 to 2000, AAPIs increased by 1,355% from less than 900,000 and invisible to 11.9 million or 4.2% of the total US population (Barringer, Gardner & Levin, 1993; US Census, 2002). In comparison, from 1960 to 2000, the total US population increased by 157% from 179.3 million to 281.4 million.

Three-fourths of the total AAPI growth has been a consequence of immigration and almost two-thirds of the AAPIs today are foreign born (Shinagawa, 2000). Chinese currently represent the largest AAPI subgroup with 2.9 million or 24% of the AAPI population and Vietnamese represent the fifth largest AAPI subgroup with 1.2 million or 10.3% of the total AAPI population (US Census, 2002). By 2050, it is estimated the AAPI population will almost quadruple in size and represent approximately 40 million or almost 10% of the total US population (Shinagawa, 2000). In addition, these dramatic numbers may actually grow much more over the next decades than the estimated figures as American political and economic alliances with Asian countries strengthen and growing conflicts arise across the Pacific (Sassen, 1998).

The history of AAPIs has been a history of exclusion and discrimination as well as strength and resilience (Takaki, 1989; Chan, 1991). Major historical events of institutional racism, prejudice, and violence such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the Japanese internment during World War II, and more recently the post-9/11 institutional discrimination on South Asian and Arab American communities continue to plague AAPIs and other minority groups. American incorporation of Asian populations into the United States continues to be on unequal terms by colored lines (Wei 1993; Ong 1994; Lowe 1996). The power of regulating Asians into American society and concern for their social welfare and health have continued to be influenced by the racial constructions of the founding fathers of the United States and the dominant racial discourses of the American social elite (Hing 1993; Kim 1994). As a result, many Asians in

America, whether American-born or foreign-born, continue to be perceived and treated as outsiders and often receive unequal and inadequate access to American mainstream sources of support and opportunities for advancement.

However, alongside such barriers to American incorporation, AAPIs have built communities of solidarity and resilience (Takaki, 1989; Chan, 1991; Espiritu, 1997) and fought and persevered through numerous barriers and challenges as a part of racial minority status in American society. Over the past decades, the socioeconomic and political capacities of Asian American communities have increased substantially alongside the dramatic growth of both the Asian-born and American-born populations (Espiritu, 1992; Wei, 1993; Min, 1995), especially in regions of the country with major Asian concentrations such as New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. Unlike pre-1965 contexts of Asian exclusion and segregation, the civil rights movement transformed the cultural political landscape from a Eurocentric paradigm to a new multicultural paradigm and growing government engagement in addressing civil rights inequities and community development for racial minorities.

For the Chinese, these dramatic changes led to increasing government support and rapid Chinese immigration in the post-1965 period that facilitated a dramatically build up of economic and human resources to support Chinese community development (Zhou, 1992; Lin, 1998). For the Vietnamese, in addition to the civil rights movement, the Vietnam War created the pre-text for rapid flows of refugees from Southeast Asia from 1975 and the establishment of the largest refugee resettlement program in US history as part of American Cold

War policies to take political responsibility and accommodate such flows (Robinson, 1998). Vietnamese communities in the US did not exist prior to 1975, but their development was initiated and has been sustained by substantive US government support and the continuing rapid flow of refugees and immigrants from Southeast Asia consequent to 1975 (Hein, 1995; Robinson, 1998). Contemporary transnational migration from China and Vietnam continues to steadily flow into the United States through family reunification and labor immigration channels (Min, 1995; Fong, 2000).

Even with a rapid growth of Chinese and Vietnamese populations, there continues to be cultural and structural challenges for the Chinese and Vietnamese communities from Asian minority identification, a lack of critical mass nationally, and institutional exclusion by race. Asian populations are often not counted and continue to be excluded in the national debates on race and diversity (Lowe, 1996). However, given the dramatic potential future growth of Asian populations in the United States and the increasing importance of Asian development in global restructuring, more studies need to be done to examine the issues facing Asian populations and their potentially increasing impact on national development.

Within the Chinese and Vietnamese communities, in addition to interpersonal family and friendship networks, community organizations have been central sites of social adjustment and community solidarity and resilience (Lai, 1996; Hein, 1997; Zhou & Bankston, 1998; Zhou, 2000). Few studies have examined community organizations within ethnic enclaves. This study seeks to

address this gap and examines the environment and structure of Chinese and Vietnamese community based organizations (CBOs) serving immigrant and refugee populations in the United States. First, the study explores the background and financial status of these ethnic CBOs. Second, the study examines organizational structure and resources and the relationship between the ethnic CBOs and their environment. Third, the study explores the key inter-organizational networks for survival and advancing organizational interests.

RESOURCE DEPENDENCE THEORY

This research study utilizes resource dependence theory to examine the key external resources and entities that ethnic CBOs depend on for survival and how they manage and adapt to these external dependencies.

Organizations are the fundamental building blocks of communities and nations and are defined as “social structures created by individuals to support the collaborative pursuit of specific goals” (Scott, 1998), fundamental features of modernity, and a pervasive characteristic of contemporary life (Weber, 1920/1946; Weber, 1924/1947; Blau & Scott, 1962; Scott, 1998). Organizations have primary objectives of survival and expansion, continue to define and redefine their mission clearly to maintain organizational identity and activity, and are formally and legally acknowledged by the state or some institutional body which confers them legitimacy for carrying out their mission (Pfeffer, 1997).

Resource dependence theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Pfeffer, 1987) departs from functionalist theories of organizations, has roots from critical

dependency and population ecology theories, and conceives organizations as open systems (Katz & Kahn, 1966; Scott, 1998). According to the open systems perspective (Scott, 1998, p. 28), "Organizations are systems of interdependent activities linking shifting coalitions of participants; the systems are embedded in – dependent on continuing exchanges with and constituted by – the environments in which they operate." Through population ecology perspectives, resource dependence theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) proposes that organizations are constrained by their external forces and internal organizational decision-making and actions are conducted in ways that try to best manage and adjust to their environments.

According to Pfeffer and Salancik (1978, p. 2), "Organizations survive to the extent that they are effective. Their effectiveness derives from the management of demands, particularly the demands of interest groups upon which the organizations depend for resources and support…The key to organizational survival is the ability to acquire and maintain resources…However, no organization is completely self-contained. Organizations are embedded in an environment comprised of other organizations…Organizations must transact with other elements in their environment to acquire needed resources."

Power and control over organizations (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Pfeffer, 1987) is accrued by the importance of the resources the external social actor or group possesses, its discretion over resource allocation and usage, and its concentration of control over this critical resource. Those external social actors or groups that control the particular environmental resources that organizations

depend upon can influence their actions and behaviors. In addition, managers and administrators within organizations make decisions and take actions that seek to manage the external constraints that ensure an organization's survival and to establish more internal organizational stability. In the process, new formations of dependence and interdependence are produced. These new configurations subsequently affect inter-organizational and intra-organizational distributions of power and behavior. In sum, the social behavior of organizations tends to go along with those demands of those interest groups or stakeholders that hold the most power over organizational resources and viability.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research study was based on a collective case study of 4 ethnic CBOs (2 Chinese and 2 Vietnamese) serving immigrants and refugees in the San Francisco Bay Area. The methodologies utilized included a combination of case study (Yin, 1984), grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), and ethnographic (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995) approaches.

Fieldwork was conducted from January 2001 to November 2001 and 61 key informants were interviewed. The fieldwork process included gathering information about community organizations within the Chinese and Vietnamese communities from key community providers and researchers, recruiting select organizations and key informants to participate in the study, the development of an interview questionnaire used for in-depth interviews, concentrated participant

observation at community organizations (i.e., spending three to four weeks at each of the organizations as full-time participant and observer of daily program activities, meetings, and events), semi-structured in-depth interviews of two to three key informants of executives from each of the organizations, numerous other staff and a few non-staff key informant interviews (formal and informal), collection of a variety of internal documentary materials about these organizations, and taking field notes from concentrated participant observation and formal and informal interviews. The analysis process took place during and subsequent to the fieldwork process and included transcribing interviews, coding analysis (descriptive, interpretive, and analytical) of interview transcriptions, field notes, documentary materials, and other field data, writing memos, drawing diagrams, developing key themes and frameworks from the analysis, and writing up of the findings.

There are a number of limitations in this study. The study focused only on Chinese and Vietnamese community organizations and excluded organizations in other ethnic/racial communities. Also, the study targeted community organizations that primarily serviced immigrant and refugee populations. Further, the study focused primarily on social and health services organizations and did not explore other types of organizations such as businesses, legal, media, arts and cultural, and many other types of organizations within such communities. Finally, the study focused on community organizations in the San Francisco Bay Area. The findings may not be applicable to other ethnic/racial communities and regions of the US and around the world.

In the following sections, the 4 community organizations will be referred as Chinese Immigrant Service Center (CISC), Chinese Community Service Center (CCSC), Vietnamese Immigrant Service Center (VISC), and Vietnamese Community Service Center (VCSC). The names reflect in part their differences in ethnic identification and organizational size and capacity.

BACKGROUND AND FINANCIAL STATUS OF ETHNIC CBOs

All four ethnic CBOs in this study were established by ethnic community leaders and advocates at the grassroots level with key financial, legitimacy, and technical support from politically affluent ethnic groups, government agencies, and foundations during the early stages of post-1965 rapid influx of immigrants and refugee flows from Greater China (i.e., China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan) and Southeast Asia (i.e., Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos) to the United States based on the field data from concentrated participant observation, key informant interviews, and documentary materials. These organizations served immigrant populations and addressed major resettlement challenges facing them in adjusting and incorporating into American society. And over the past 3 or more decades, these organizations have survived numerous political, fiscal, and ethnic community challenges with primarily government and ethnic community support and have built up their reputations as leading community organizations that spearhead immigrant services within their respective ethnic communities.

CHINESE IMMIGRANT SERVICE CENTER

CISC was established in 1969 in San Francisco Chinatown and has been a leading agency serving Chinese immigrants for over three decades. Their mission was to:

> "Provide multilingual services that help Chinese immigrants adapt to life in the US and serve as a bridge between 2 cultures, enhancing physical, mental, and social and economic well-being of immigrants, thus facilitating their effort to become self-sufficient, contributing members of the community" (CISC Annual Report, 2000-01).

In year 2000, their total revenue was $455,110 and as of 2001, they had a full-time staff of 6 persons, all self-sufficient Chinese immigrants, as well as numerous part-time staff and volunteers to provide basic social services such as information and referral, direct assistance, citizenship, employment, ESL, computer training, and other services to primarily low income Chinese immigrants in San Francisco.

The composition of its executives was made up of primarily Chinese American elites and a few non-Chinese members from select government agencies or corporations and provided key inter-organizational linkages to facilitate the acquisition of critical financial, legitimacy, technical, and informational resources from various external arenas necessary for organizational survival and advancing organizational interests. The key inter-organizational networks included organizations in the government sector (e.g., State, County, and City agencies), in the ethnic community sector (e.g., a

national political action organization based in San Francisco representing Chinatowns across America, a local community coalition made up of local Asian community organizations, government agencies, and schools serving Asian Pacific Islander families and children, a local Southeast Asian community organization, a local Latino community organization, and local Chinese media organizations), in the nonprofit sector (e.g., local and national foundations and local public media organizations), and in the corporate sector (e.g., local banks, utility companies, service industry corporations, high tech corporations).

CHINESE COMMUNITY SERVICE CENTER

CCSC was established in 1968 in Oakland Chinatown and has also been a leading agency serving Chinese immigrants for over three decades. Their mission was to:

> "Empower the most vulnerable members of the Asian community, especially the elderly, the newcomers and those with limited English skills, by providing them with the assistance necessary for them to lead self-sufficient independent lives" (CCSC Program Brochure, 2001).

In year 2000, their total revenue was $5,074,886 and as of 2001, they had a full-time staff of 100 persons, most of which were self-sufficient Chinese immigrants, and provided long-term care services (e.g., adult day health care, recreation, and in-home supportive services), basic social services (e.g., information and referral, direct assistance, citizenship, ESL, computer training),

and child day care services to primarily low income Chinese immigrants and other groups in Alameda County.

Its executives were made up of primarily Chinese American elites and a few non-Chinese members from select government agencies and corporations and provided key inter-organizational linkages for organizational support. The key inter-organizational networks included organizations in the government sector (e.g., State, County, and City agencies), in the ethnic community sector (e.g., a local community coalition made up of 20 to 30 Asian community organizations and a local Asian medical services organization), in the nonprofit sector (e.g., local and national foundations), and in the corporate sector (e.g., local banks, utility companies, corporations in service industry, and corporations in high tech sector).

VIETNAMESE IMMIGRANT SERVICE CENTER

VISC was established in 1976 in downtown San Jose and has been a leading agency serving Vietnamese refugees and immigrants for almost three decades. Their mission was to:

> "Ensure refugees become self-sufficient and to preserve and promote Indochinese cultures and traditions" (VISC Annual Financial Report, 1999-00).

In year 2000, their total revenue was $623,797 and as of 2001, they had a full-time staff of 17 persons, mostly self-sufficient Vietnamese refugees/immigrants, and provided basic social services such as information and referral, direct assistance, citizenship, employment, ESL, and computer training to assist

primarily low income Vietnamese and other refugees/immigrants in Santa Clara County.

Its executives were made up of all Southeast Asian American elites and provided critical inter-organizational linkages to external sources of support. Its key inter-organizational networks included organizations in the government sector (e.g., Federal Office of Refugee Resettlement, State, and County agencies), in the ethnic community sector (e.g., a national political advocacy organization based in Washington, DC representing Southeast Asians, a local community coalition serving refugees and immigrants, and local Vietnamese media organizations), in the nonprofit sector (e.g., local and national foundations and local public broadcasting agencies), and in the corporate sector (e.g., local banks, utility companies, high tech firms, and others).

VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY SERVICE CENTER

VCSC was established in 1975 in the San Francisco Tenderloin District, has satellite agencies in the South Bay and East Bay, and has been a leading agency serving Vietnamese refugees and immigrants in the San Francisco Bay Area for almost three decades. Their mission was to:

> "Develop and administer programs that serve the needs of Southeast Asian communities of Northern California. Our programs include self-sufficiency, economic viability, advocacy, community empowerment, leadership development, acculturation and cultural preservation" (VCSC Annual Report, 2001).

In year 2000, their total revenue was $882,001 and as of 2001, they had a full-time staff of 22 persons, mostly self-sufficient Vietnamese refugees/immigrants, and provided basic social services (e.g., refugee resettlement, information and referral, direct assistance, citizenship, employment, ESL, food distribution), small business development services (e.g., micro-loan program, technical assistance), and translation and interpretation services to primarily low income Vietnamese and others across the San Francisco Bay Area.

Its executives were made up of primarily Southeast Asian elites and a few non Southeast Asian members from select government agencies and corporations and provided important inter-organizational linkages for organizational resource acquisition. Its key inter-organizational relationships included organizations in the government sector (e.g., Federal Office of Refugee Resettlement, Federal Small Business Administration, State, County, and City agencies), in the ethnic community sector (e.g., a national political advocacy organization based in Washington, DC representing Southeast Asians, a local community coalition serving refugees and immigrants, local Vietnamese media organizations), in the nonprofit sector (e.g., local and national foundations), and in the private sector (e.g., local banks, utility companies, high tech firms, hotels).

ORGANIZATIONAL REVENUE SOURCES

The major organizational revenue sources came from government, foundational, ethnic community, and corporate sources according to the year 2000 annual financial reports for the 4 ethnic CBOs (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

ORGANIZATIONAL REVENUE SOURCES, FISCAL YEAR 2000

REVENUE SOURCES	Government	Foundations	Contributions & Donations	Organizational Income	Other	Total Revenues
Chinese Immigrant Service Center	$188,599 41%	$18,800 4%	$153,926 34%	$93,785 21%	$0 0%	$455,110
Chinese Community Service Center	$3,306,526 65%	$441,807 9%	$761,175 15%	$508,841 10%	$56,537 1%	$5,074,886
Vietnamese Immigrant Service Center	$485,578 78%	$91,366 15%	$39,762 6%	$7,091 1%	$0 0%	$623,797
Vietnamese Community Service Center	$706,692 80%	$114,713 13%	$11,000 1%	$49,596 6%	$0 0%	$882,001

Government Support

The largest revenue streams for all 4 ethnic CBOs came from the public or government sector (see Table 1). 78% (VISC) and 80% (VCSC) of the total revenues for the 2 Vietnamese CBOs came from government sources compared to 41% (CISC) and 65% (CCSC) for the 2 Chinese CBOs. Clearly, they all

heavily depended on government financial support for their programs. However, the Vietnamese CBOs were substantially more dependent on government sources for their revenues than the Chinese CBOs.

For VISC, the largest government funding streams came from County sources with pass-through funds from the Federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) and from the State of California Department of Community Service and Development (DCSD). For VCSC, the largest government revenue sources came from County sources with pass-through funds from the Federal DHHS ORR, the Federal U.S. Small Business Administration, and City and County Community Development Departments with pass-through funds from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

For CISC, the largest government revenue sources came from the City and County Community Development Departments with funds pass-through from the Federal HUD and from the State of California DCSD. For CCSC, the largest government funding streams came from the State of California Department of Health Services (DHS) and County Social Services both with pass-through funds from the Federal DHHS, the State of California Department of Education (DOE) with pass-through funds from the Federal Department of Agriculture (DOA), and local City sources.

In sum, ethnic CBOs primarily depend on various government resources to support their community mission and programs and as a consequence act in part as satellite government organizations in local communities according to a

number of key informants. To paraphrase the words of the Executive Director of CCSC, as culturally proficient providers of social and health services to immigrant populations, ethnic CBOs are addressing a critical need in the local community and in part doing the work for government in serving these communities. A strong partnership between ethnic CBOs and government agencies to assist immigrant and refugee populations is clearly reflected in the financial statements of these ethnic CBOs.

Other Sources of Support

Besides government support, other major sources of financial support included from contributions and donations, foundational support, and organizational income. Contributions and donations was another important source of revenues for these ethnic CBOs, particularly for the Chinese CBOs. These contributions came primarily from the ethnic businesses, affluent ethnics, and local corporations and accounted for 34% (CISC), 15% (CCSC), 6% (VISC), and 1% (VCSC) of total organizational revenues (see Table 1). Contributions and donations included from fundraising, cash donations, and in-kind donations.

Contributions from ethnic businesses and affluent ethnics facilitated their interests of building up and supporting their communities. For the Chinese CBOs, community contributions was strong because the Chinese community infrastructure in the San Francisco Bay Area has developed over many generations and was vibrant with community business and political resource networks according to a board member at CCSC. On the other hand, for Vietnamese CBOs, community contributions was weak because the Vietnamese

community infrastructure of less than 3 decades in America was still very underdeveloped compared to the Chinese community according to the executive director at VCSC. In addition, ethnic businesses and local corporations took active roles in supporting ethnic CBOs because such ties served their interests for recruiting cheap immigrant labor. Thus, ethnic businesses, affluent ethnics, and local corporations made contributions and donations to network and influence the ethnic CBOs to address their interests.

In addition, foundational support was another important revenue source for ethnic CBOs. Foundational support represented the second largest revenue source for the 2 Vietnamese CBOs accounting for 15% (VISC) and 13% (VCSC) of total organizational revenues and the third largest revenue source for the 2 Chinese CBOs accounting for 9% (CCSC), and 4% (CISC) of total revenues (see Table 1). Foundation support included from the United Way and various other local and national foundations according to the year 2000 annual reports. However, such support was inherently unstable with annual application processes or reviews with no guarantees that funds would be consistently procured over the years according to the executive director at CISC. Foundational grants often increased or decreased following economic and political cycles. Thus, foundational support was not a reliable long-term funding source for ethnic CBOs.

Nevertheless, being affiliated and supported by particular foundations such as United Way had distinct advantages of bringing mainstream legitimacy to these community organizations when seeking funding according to a board

member at CISC. For example, in competition to seek program grants, community organizations under the United Way umbrella were often favored over those not affiliated with United Way by various government funding agencies and foundations during grant application evaluations.

Furthermore, these ethnic CBOs accrued substantive revenues through their programs and other activities. Organizational income represented important sources of revenues for 3 out of the 4 ethnic CBOs. For the 2 Chinese CBOs, organizational income accounted for 21% (CISC) and 10% (CCSC) of total revenues. For the 2 Vietnamese CBOs, organizational income accounted for 6% (VCSC) and 1% (VISC) of total revenues (see Table 1). The various types of organizational income included program fees, membership dues, rental income, interest income, and investment returns. Organizational income helped ethnic CBOs not be as dependent upon external funding sources and maintain fiscal stability and flexibility according to the administrative manager at VCSC.

In sum, ethnic CBOs depended on critical financial support from various organizations or entities within the ethnic community, corporate, and nonprofit sectors. Overall, government support was the most important source of financial support. Ethnic CBOs also depended on external organizations or groups within the ethnic community, nonprofit, and corporate sectors for support. Furthermore, these ethnic CBOs accrued some internal organizational revenues through their operations and programs that reduced external resource dependence and increased organizational self-sufficiency.

ORGANIZATIONAL EXPENSES

Ethnic CBOs primarily utilized their organizational revenues for program services expenses according to year 2000 annual financial reports (see Table 2).

TABLE 2

ORGANIZATIONAL EXPENSES, FISCAL YEAR 2000

ORGANIZATIONAL EXPENSES	Program Services	Management & General	Fundraising	Other	Total Expenses
Chinese Immigrant Service Center	$296,546 78%	$74,071 19%	$10,183 3%	$0 0%	$380,800
Chinese Community Service Center	$3,844,316 76%	$710,258 14%	$443,269 9%	$40,565 1%	$5,038,408
Vietnamese Immigrant Service Center	$509,886 90%	$46,453 8%	$13,062 2%	$0 0%	$569,401
Vietnamese Community Service Center	$567,212 79%	$131,279 18%	$18,454 3%	$0 0%	$716,945

Program services expenses accounted for 78% (CISC), 77% (CCSC), 90% (VISC), and 79% (VCSC) of total expenses. Other major organizational expenses included management and general expenses and fundraising expenses. For the 4 ethnic CBOs, program services expenses and management and general expenses together accounted for over 90% of total expenses

ranging from 91% to 98%. For fundraising expenses, only CCSC devoted a substantive amount of their budget for such activities, accounting for 9% of their total annual expenses or $443,269. The other 3 organizations devoted only a very small amount of their total budget for fundraising activities, just accounting for 2% to 3% of the total organizational expenses.

The major program services expenses included for social services, employment and training, long-term care, youth services, and community development according to year 2000 annual financial reports (see Table 3). By program services expenditure, social services and employment services together accounted for 100% of the total program services expenses for CISC and VISC. As for CCSC and VCSC, social services and employment services together accounted for 18% and 72% of the total program services expenses.

CCSC also devoted over three-fourths or 77% of its program budget to long-term care and 5% to youth services. Even though CCSC devoted a smaller proportion of its total budget to social services and employment services compared to the other 3 agencies, the Center still had the largest total program budget by numbers for providing social services and employment and training than any of the other 3 organizations. And for VCSC, besides social services and employment services, it also devoted 28% of its total program budget to community development programs.

For all 4 ethnic CBOs, social services and employment and training represented the core organizational services. The total program budget allocated for such programs were fairly similar across the 4 organizations ranging

TABLE 3

PROGRAM SERVICES EXPENSES, FISCAL YEAR 2000

PROGRAM SERVICES EXPENSES	Social Services	Employment & Training	Long-Term Care	Youth Services	Community Development	Total Program Services Expenses
Chinese Immigrant Service Center	$213,110 72%	$83,436 28%	$0 0%	$0 0%	$0 0%	$296,546
Chinese Community Service Center	$309,023 8%	$372,973 10%	$2,977,136 77%	$185,184 5%	$0 0%	$3,844,316
Vietnamese Immigrant Service Center	$274,492 54%	$235,394 46%	$0 0%	$0 0%	$0 0%	$509,886
Vietnamese Community Service Center	$410,105 72%	$0 0%	$0 0%	$0 0%	$157,107 28%	$567,212

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.

from $296,546 to $681,996. However, for CCSC and VCSC, they also diversified their programs beyond the core programs over the past decades and consequently were able to bring in additional organizational revenues. Their larger program budgets and multi-services reflected their stronger organizational capacity. In sum, the expansion and diversification of organizational mission and programs clearly had a positive effect on ethnic CBOs and helped to increase organizational resources, size, program budgets, and capacity.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

All 4 ethnic community based immigrant service organizations, according to their year 2000 annual financial reports, self-identified as nonprofit organizational status (i.e., 501 c 3) licensed and legitimated by the Federal Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and incorporated by the State of California. And each of the four agencies shared a general organizational structure common to most nonprofit organizational entities according to the executive directors at CISC and VCSC.

The board of directors represented the top of the organizational hierarchy and was responsible for raising funds and policy making. The board also made decisions of executive succession and hired an executive director (or chief executive officer) to run the organizational operations. The executive director was expected to manage the organizational operations and finances, make key decisions and take actions to sustain and build organizational resources and

capacity, and balance various external interest groups that the organization depended on for survival and legitimacy.

Key administrative personnel under the executive director included a development officer, chief financial officer, accountant, other administrative staff, and volunteers to manage general organizational operations. Then there were program specific personnel including a program director for each program, other program staff, and volunteers to help facilitate the various program services. In addition, the organizational clientele composition reflected their organizational mission and identity.

ORGANIZATIONAL HUMAN RESOURCES

The majority of organizational executives and staff (i.e., human resources) at the 4 ethnic CBOs were recruited from the ethnic community sector according to their year 2000 Annual Reports, daily field observations, and key informant interviews. The board members were made up of primarily ethnic elites and a few select others from government agencies, corporations, and/or foundations outside of the ethnic community sector. Board members set organizational agendas and provided key inter-organizational linkages to facilitate the acquisition of critical financial, legitimacy, informational, and technical resources from various key external sources.

The staff composition was primarily made up of ethnic elites in the management positions with skilled self-sufficient ethnics making up most of the remaining administrative and program staff. Clearly, all 4 ethnic CBOs depended heavily on the educated and skilled human resources within their communities to

sustain its daily operations and programs. The strong ethnic composition of the staff was clearly central to providing the best culturally proficient serves to the largely ethnic-centered clientele. However, such ethnic-centered provision sometimes restricted groups outside of the particular ethnic community from access services through these organizations.

Ethnic Elites

Ethnic elites working at ethnic CBOs were affluent and influential members of their ethnic communities. They often participated in the mainstream workforce as professionals such as doctors, nurses, lawyers, bankers, engineers, professors, politicians, and more. Other ethnic elites worked within the ethnic communities running ethnic businesses, schools, faith-based organizations, and other community organizations. In addition, ethnic elites tended to be fluent in both English and their native languages and in tune with both ethnic community and mainstream cultures.

Within the Chinese and Vietnamese communities, the social status and political authority of ethnic elites were legitimated by various political factions, community associations, ethnic businesses, and other community institutions. For some, their social standing was accrued prior to arriving in the United States. For example, they might have been former (or current) government officials, corporate executives, or professionals in their home countries. And for others, their social standing was accrued mainly in the United States through social advancement and political participation in both the ethnic and mainstream communities. However, for most ethnic elites, they were not social elites in

mainstream society. Their status might only be considered middle class status in the American mainstream. Also, their status and power outside of their ethnic communities tended to be limited due to minority ethnic affiliation.

Ethnic elites provided critical leadership, legitimacy, finances, and networks to ethnic CBOs. Typically, ethnic CBOs were established by key ethnic elites and advocates at the grassroots level to help address major unmet and neglected community needs. As executives at ethnic CBOs, they helped to set organizational policy, managed organizational operations, and linked ethnic CBOs to critical ethnic community and mainstream resource streams. In addition, some ethnic elites utilized ethnic CBOs as political platforms to advance their community agendas.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIENTELE

In addition to the dependency on the ethnic community for organizational human resources, all 4 organizations also depended heavily on their ethnic communities for their supply of clientele according to daily field observations of program activities and key informant interviews. According to the executive director at VISC, the needs of its immigrant/refugee clients reflected the core mission of ethnic CBOs because immigrants represented a majority within their ethnic communities, new blood and growth of the ethnic communities, and the dynamic supply flow that keeps such ethnic immigrant service organizations viable as cultural brokers between newcomers and the mainstream American society in a very competitive nonprofit organizational marketplace. According to the executives at all 4 ethnic CBOs, low income immigrants represented the

primarily clientele supply and ranged from approximately 80% to 100% of the total clientele composition.

Even though all 4 ethnic CBOs primarily served immigrants from their ethnic communities, the key informants at 3 out of 4 agencies also emphasized that they served diverse populations. For example, the refugee resettlement programs (e.g., ESL and job training) at the 2 Vietnamese CBOs, according to several key informants, served all refugees including those that came from Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America, and other parts of Southeast Asia. Also, according to the executive director at CCSC, their adult day health care and child care programs served a diverse clientele that included Vietnamese, Korean, and African-American clients in addition to majority Chinese clientele.

The contradiction in clientele focus reflected tensions between addressing ethnic-centered needs versus government guidelines. Their primarily mission was to serve and represent all immigrants within their ethnic communities. However, they also tried to best comply with government guidelines that demanded that they served all low income, immigrant, and/or other target groups across diverse populations. All 4 ethnic CBOs heavily depended on government funding sources to support their major programs and had to comply with such demands. But because they were situated within ethnic enclaves, few non-Chinese and non-Vietnamese immigrants sought help through these organizations unless they were directly referred to them from outside sources.

Overall, the Chinese and Vietnamese CBOs depended on their ethnic communities for their primary source of immigrant clientele. Any changes to the

composition, size, and needs of the ethnic population affected the supply of clientele of these ethnic CBOs. However, through diversification of their community clientele base beyond the ethnic enclave, ethnic CBOs might be able to reduce their dependency on the ethnic community for clientele supply. But diversification of clientele could also lead to a shift in the ethnic organizational mission and programs and might lead to loss of legitimacy as representatives of ethnic communities and incite feelings of betrayal by certain traditional factions within the ethnic communities.

For 3 of the 4 ethnic CBOs, their organizational leadership emphasized the critical need to expand their clientele base beyond the ethnic community and be inclusive of diverse populations because their government funding sources demanded it. In addition, diversification of sources of clientele supply could potentially facilitate increased sources of mainstream support for building organizational capacity as well as the long-term betterment of the ethnic communities themselves in integrating into American society. Nevertheless, there continued to be some delays and limitations in advancing such efforts to mainstream their clientele and mission because of their long reputation and standing as ethnic CBOs as well as their lack of mainstream recognition and legitimacy due to minority ethnic affiliation.

KEY INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL COALITIONS AND NETWORKS

For all 4 ethnic CBOs, important inter-organizational networks in the ethnic community, government, nonprofit, and corporate sectors connected them to vital

financial, legitimacy, human, technical/informational, and other resources necessary for organizational survival and in advancing organizational interests according to key informant interviews, participant observation at organizational and community coalition meetings, and the year 2000 annual financial reports. In particular, those inter-organizational relationships built within the ethnic community and government sectors tended to be the strongest. However, those relationships built within the nonprofit and corporate sectors were also important.

For CISC, the key inter-organizational networks according to a program director were with a national political action organization based in San Francisco representing Chinatowns across America, a local coalition made up of Asian community organizations, government agencies, and schools serving Asian and Pacific Islander families and children, the local City and County Community Development Departments, a pan-Asian national legal defense organization based in San Francisco, and the United Way Foundation.

For CCSC, their key networks according to a board member and the executive director were with a local coalition made up of 20 to 30 Bay Area Asian community organizations, a local Asian medical services organization, and various local County and City agencies.

For VISC, the key organizational networks according to the executive director and administrative manager were with a local coalition of 20 to 30 refugee/immigrant service organizations and local County agencies, Federal Office of Refugee Resettlement, and local corporate networks.

For VCSC, the key networks according to the executive director and administrative manager were with a national political advocacy organization based in Washington, DC representing Southeast Asian Americans, a national political advocacy organization representing Vietnamese Americans, a local coalition of 20 to 30 refugee/immigrant service organizations, Federal agencies such as the Office of Refugee Resettlement and US Small Business Administration, local County agencies, and local corporate networks.

However, the key networks mentioned here represented just the tip of the iceberg for all 4 ethnic CBOs. According to field participation in community coalition meetings and key informant interviews, all 4 CBOs have numerous formal and informal inter-organizational collaborations locally and nationally with various ethnic communities, governmental, nonprofit, and corporate organizations and each network served particular agendas and/or needs.

For example, ethnic CBOs would join with local and national community coalitions to advance common ethnic/racial and/or immigrant interests and raise the political voice of their respective ethnic/racial communities. Also, to be more competitive and to increase organizational capacity, ethnic CBOs would often coordinate and pool resources with CBOs similar to them in organizational mission across ethnic/racial communities to apply for program grants such as for ESL classes, employment services, and citizenship services as well as to provide more comprehensive services and outreach to local ethnic communities.

In addition, these organizations worked closely with various government agencies at the County, State, and Federal levels as well as foundations to

provide a range of government/foundation assistance programs, served as culturally competent brokers between such agencies and immigrants/refugees, and represented the multiple community interests such as community building, low income housing assistance, job assistance, elderly care, bridging the digital divide, and other community assistance and outreach efforts of the various government agencies and foundations.

Furthermore, these organizations often coordinated with numerous local corporations acting as middlemen to help mediate the flow of cheap immigrant labor from the ethnic community sector to the corporate sector. In other words, these ethnic CBOs assisted their immigrant clients with language and job skills training, finding short-term and long-term employment, and retaining employment that were vital to supporting immigrant family finances and achieving financial self-sufficiency. At the same time, ethnic CBOs assisted local corporations to recruit low cost immigrant labor into their unskilled and professional labor force. For example, according to the executive director of VISC, the collaboration between Silicon Valley corporations and ethnic CBOs over the past few decades has been quite a successful partnership.

In sum, the key inter-organizational networks and dependencies of ethnic CBOs across ethnic community, government, nonprofit, and corporate sectors influenced and shaped their organizational mission and programs. These organizations served multiple interests through their mission and programs ranging from addressing local ethnic community needs to national development agendas. In addition, building both ethnic community and mainstream networks

helped to strengthen the legitimacy and mission of these ethnic CBOs as well as helped ethnic CBOs acquire the vital resources necessary for both organizational survival and expansion.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings show that the Chinese and Vietnamese immigrant service CBOs mediate cultural and structural exchanges between the immigrant community and mainstream social welfare and health care institutions. These ethnic CBOs are situated within the ethnic community, government, nonprofit, and corporate arenas and depend most on ethnic community and government sources of support for survival. The major external resources they depend on include financial, legitimacy, human, networking, informational, and technical resources. The major external resource entities they depend on include other ethnic CBOs, ethnic elites, self-sufficient ethnics, newcomers, government agencies, and foundations.

Ethnic CBOs are dependent on external resource rich entities and seek to acquire key organizational resources from them. In exchange for such resources, external entities demand ethnic CBOs to serve their interests. Those external entities with most authority over the market share and distribution of the critical organizational resources that ethnic CBOs depend on for survival have much power to influence and shape the structure and mission of these organizations. Ethnic elites and government funding agencies have much control

over the mission and programs of ethnic CBOs. Foundations and corporations have little control over ethnic CBOs.

However, when the resources are plentiful and readily available from diverse sources, then the resource rich entities do not necessarily have as much power over ethnic CBOs. In addition, diversification of organizational operations and programs as well as facilitating stable sources of organizational income help to reduce external dependencies and create organizational self-sufficiency. Furthermore, ethnic CBO resources that external entities value and depend can be used as bargaining chips to acquire resources, delay or avoid compliance with external demands, and strengthen organizational self-sufficiency.

There are a number of critical and valuable resources ethnic CBOs provide to external entities across ethnic community, government, nonprofit, and corporate sectors that mediate external dependence. Ethnic CBOs provide critical legitimacy, leadership, human, culturally competent, social adjustment, and community development resources to the various ethnic community entities including the newcomers, self-sufficient ethnics, ethnic elites, and other ethnic CBOs. The prosperity of the ethnic community depends in part on the resourcefulness and success of these organizations. In addition, ethnic CBOs provide cultural competent, community legitimacy, community outreach, and other resources to government agencies, foundations, and corporations to connect them with and help them assist and recruit immigrant/refugee and limited English speaking populations.

In sum, these interdependent relationships and exchanges between the ethnic CBOs and external entities are often unequal in favor of the agendas of powerful government and corporate stakeholders, but both the ethnic community and mainstream stakeholders benefit overall from such exchanges. The survival of ethnic CBOs depends on their capacity to build and sustain key resource exchange networks especially in the ethnic community and government arenas that facilitate the acquisition of critical resources they need to keep their organizational operations running. Ethnic CBO mission and programs continue to adapt and change primarily to reflect the changing trends and policies of ethnic community and government leadership. However, ethnic CBOs are not passive players. Some, especially longstanding ethnic CBOs, are experienced hands in the immigrant service industry, resilient and flexible to political and fiscal challenges, and have been quite adept at utilizing their immigrant community capital to negotiate more favorable terms for resource acquisition and compliance to external ethnic community and mainstream demands. Within ethnic enclaves, a number of ethnic CBOs have developed flexible structural niches to be able to continue to both advance their mission of serving and building up their ethnic communities and mediate mainstream institutional needs of immigrant incorporation. Finally, with the discontents of globalization (Sassen, 1998) increasingly contested in immigrant neighborhoods, ethnic CBOs have become fundamental features that local and global development can do without.

REFERENCES

Barringer, H., Gardner, R. W., & Levin, M. J. (1993). *Asians and Pacific Islanders in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Blau, P. M., & Scott, W. R. (1962). *Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach*. San Francisco: Chandler.

Chan, S. (1991). *Asian Americans: An Interpretive History*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Espiritu, Y. L. (1997). *Asian American Women and Men*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Fong, T. F. (2000). The History of Asians in America. In T. F. Fong & L. H. Shinagawa (Eds.), *Asian Americans: Experiences and Perspectives* (pp. 13-30). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Fong, T. F., & Shinagawa, L. H. (2000). Introduction. In T. F. Fong & L. H. Shinagawa (Eds.). *Asian Americans: Experiences and Perspectives* (pp. 1-10). Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London: Tavistock.

Hein, J. (1995). *From Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia: A Refugee Experience in the United States*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

Hein, J. (1997). Ethnic Organizations and the Welfare State: The Impact of Social Welfare Programs on the Formation of Indochinese Refugee Associations. *Sociological Forum*, *12*(2), 279-295.

Hing, B. O. (1993). *Making and Remaking Asian America Through Immigration Policy, 1850-1990*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Kennedy, J. F. (1964). *A Nation of Immigrants*. New York: Popular Library.

Kim, H.-C. (1994). *A Legal History of Asian Americans, 1790-1990*. (Vol. 34). Westport: Greenwood Press.

Lai, H. M. (1996). Chinese Organizations in America Based on Locality of Origin and/or Dialect-Group Affiliation, 1940s-1990s. *Chinese America: History and Perspectives*, *10*, 19-92.

Lin, J. (1998). *Reconstructing Chinatown: Ethnic Enclave, Global Change*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lowe, L. (1996). *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (Second Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Min, P. G. (1995). An Overview of Asian Americans. In P. G. Min (Ed.), *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues* (pp. 10-37). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Ong, P. (Ed.). (1994). *The State of Asian Pacific America: Economic Diversity, Issues, and Policies*. Los Angeles: LEAP Asian Pacific American Policy Institute and University of California at Los Angeles, Asian American Studies Center.

Pfeffer, J. (1987). A Resource Dependence Perspective on Intercorporate Relations. In M. S. Mizruchi & M. Schwartz (Eds.), *Intercorporate Relations: The Structural Analysis of Business* (pp. 25-55). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pfeffer, J. (1997). *New Directions for Organizational Theory: Problems and Prospects*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1990). *Immigrant America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Robinson, W. C. (1998). *Terms of Refuge: The Indochinese Exodus and the International Response*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: New Press.

Schiller, N. G., Basch, L., & Blanc-Szanton, C. (Eds.). (1992). *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Scott, W. R. (1998). Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Shinagawa, L. H. (2000). Contemporary Asian American Socioeconomic Status. In T. F. Fong & L. H. Shinagawa (Eds.), *Asian Americans: Experiences and Perspectives* (pp. 31-39). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Skeldon, R. (1997). *Migration and Development: A Global Perspective*. Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Takaki, R. (1989). *Strangers from a Different Short: A History of Asian Americans*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2002). *The Asian Population: 2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration.

Weber, M. (1920/1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, H. H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1924/1947). *Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, A. H. Henderson & T. Parsons (Eds.). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Wei, W. (1993). *The Asian American Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Weiner, M. (1997). The Global Migration Crisis. In G. Wang (Ed.), *Global History and Migrations* (pp. 95-115). Boulder: Westview Press.

Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Zhou, M. (1992). *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of Urban Enclave*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Zhou, M. (2000). Social Capital in Chinatown: The Role of Community-Based Organizations and Families in the Adaptation of the Younger Generation. In M. Zhou & J. V. Gatewood (Eds.), *Contemporary Asian America* (pp.

315-335). New York: New York University Press.

Zhou, M., & Bankston, C.L. (1998). *Growing up American: How Vietnamese children adapt to life in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Zhou, M., & Gatewood, J. V. (Eds.). (2000). *Contemporary Asian America: A Multidisciplinary Reader*. New York: New York University Press.