Asians Pacific Islanders United States

Herbert Barringer
Robert W. Gardner
Michael J. Levin

THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE 1980s

A Census Monograph Series

ASIANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Herbert R. Barringer

Robert W. Gardner

Michael J. Levin

for the
National Committee for Research
on the 1980 Census

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION / NEW YORK

Preface

This volume is one of a series of monographs commissioned by the Social Science Research Council's National Committee for Research on the 1980 Census, and also supported by the Russell Sage Foundation and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

The subjects of this monograph, Asian Americans and Pacific Islander Americans, are distinct and quite different entities. Consequently, they are treated completely separately. Chapters 2 through 8 are about Asian Americans; Chapter 9 deals with Pacific Islanders.

Each of the chapters in this book can be read independently, but we recommend that Chapter 2 be read first, since it deals with the history of Asian immigration and sets the stage for much of what follows. Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5 give basic demographic and social profiles of Asian Americans. Chapters 6, 7, and 8 hang together, all treating the subject of socioeconomic conditions.

For purposes of correspondence, we should point out that Chapters 2, 3, and 4 were the primary responsibility of Robert Gardner. Michael Levin produced Chapter 9, while Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8 were the obligation of Herbert Barringer. Because we read and criticized each other's drafts, we assume joint responsibility for the volume as a whole. Nevertheless, for further clarification or information, please contact the relevant author.

Acknowledgments

In any project like this, it is difficult to know where to start in acknowledging support, patience, and hard work. We should start by thanking the Social Science Research Council's National Committee for Research on the 1980 Census and the Russell Sage Foundation and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation for financial support. Lisa Nachtigall, director of Publications, has been most patient and helpful.

The initial suggestion that this volume become a part of the SSRC–Russell Sage Ethnicity Monograph Series from the 1980 Census was from William Wetzel of the Census Bureau, who got in touch with Charles Westoff of the National Committee. Westoff in turn contacted Lee-Jay Cho, director of the East-West Population Institute. That institute, by the way, gave generously of time, money, and administrative support for the project. The Center for Korean Studies, University of Hawaii, provided funds for computer time.

We are especially grateful to Professor William Liu, former director of the Pacific/Asian American Mental Health Research Center, for a copy of the specially prepared Public Use Samples (PUMS) "A" data tape on Asian Americans. Marie Pees and Diana Smith, Population Division, Bureau of the Census, assisted Michael Levin in providing special tabulations on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

Dr. William H. Sewell provided us with invaluable suggestions as our good shepherd, and Professor Charles Westoff, director of Princeton University's Office of Population Research, showed unfailing patience in overseeing the project. Among others, Won-Moo Hurh, David Takeuchi, Kiyoshi Ikeda, Hagen Koo and Alvin Y. So have read manuscripts and provided a wealth of good advice. Of course, they are not responsible for what became of it.

Shanta Danaraj acted as principal research assistant throughout the long course of this project. She set up computer files, conducted much of the computer analysis, and generally kept things together. At various stages, Macrina Abenoja, Quang Liu, Gerald Plett, Ruth Sahara, Shawn

Uesugi, and Su-Yong Yi in Hawaii and Emily Lennon in Washington helped immensely with research assistance.

Finally, colleagues at the East-West Population Institute, including Fred Arnold, James Fawcett, and Peter Xenos, contributed much thoughtful advice.

Some parts of this manuscript have in one form or another appeared in the following publications:

Robert W. Gardner, Bryant Robey, and Peter C. Smith, "Asian Americans: Growth, Change and Diversity," *Bulletin of the Population Reference Bureau* 40:4 (October 1985).

Herbert Barringer and Gene Kassebaum, "Asian Indians in the United States," *Sociological Perspectives* (January 1990).

Herbert R. Barringer, David T. Takeuchi, and Peter Xenos, "Education, Occupational Prestige and Income of Asian Americans," *Sociology of Education* 63 (January 1990).

Herbert R. Barringer and Sung-Nam Cho, *Koreans in the United States: A Fact Book, Papers,* Center for Korean Studies, University of Hawaii, #15 (December 1989).

Finally, we wish to apologize for the late appearance of this volume. For the most part, we plead circumstances beyond our control.

Contents

9

PACIFIC ISLANDERS IN THE UNITED STATES

> When Micronesians of today leave their islands for higher education abroad they also leave behind this sense of place and belonging and enter a social context that not only fails to give definition, but also encourages the expression of one's own needs and desires, one's individuality. . . . . In the social context of the islands control is clear, enforced, and external; in the new context control is unclear, sporadic, and expected to be much more internal than external. The result, not infrequently, is a sense of lost security and realization that a strange, if not confusing world must be confronted (Workman et al 1981:5).

In 1990, the 365,024 Pacific Islanders recorded in the United States Census were 5 percent of the total Asian and Pacific Islander population. In 1980 the census counted 259,566 Pacific Islanders, constituting 7 percent of the Asian and Pacific Islander population. Although the absolute number of Pacific Islanders in the United States increased by 46 percent during the decade, their part of the total Asian and Pacific Islander population decreased because of the very large number of Asian immigrants, as seen in the earlier chapters.

Census publications before 1980 did not show any Pacific Islander group separately except Hawaiians. Therefore, data for specific Pacific Islander immigrants were available for the first time after the 1980 Census. After all 1990 results are available, we will be able to see trends for the first time. Unfortunately, as of this writing, only limited Pacific Islander counts are available for various geographic levels.

Three large geographical areas identify Pacific Islanders. Polynesia, the largest in area, covers a large triangle with Hawaii, New Zealand, and Pitcairn Islands forming the three points. The United States territory of American Samoa is in Polynesia.

Micronesia is a large oval at the equator, consisting of the U.S. territory of Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

(CNMI), the freely associated states of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau (held as a strategic trust territory by the United States for the United Nations), and Kiribati, a former British colony.

Melanesia, the largest in population, is south of Micronesia and to the west of Polynesia.

No 1990 counts are yet available for these three areas. In 1980, the Pacific Islander population in the United States was about 85 percent Polynesian, 14 percent Micronesian, and 1 percent Melanesian. Of the 270,278 Polynesians in 1980, Hawaiians (172,346), Samoans (39,520), and Tongans (6,226) were the largest groups. Among the 35,508 persons of Micronesian background, more than 8 of every 10 were Guamanian. The Fijian population was the largest Melanesian group, with a total of 2,834.

The largest groups in 1990 were the same—Hawaiians (211,014), Samoans (62,964), Guamanians (49,345), Tongans (17,606), and Fijians (7,036). Of these groups, Tongans increased the most (183 percent during the decade), and Fijians, second (146 percent). These groups experienced immigration at rates similar to those seen among the Asians. The other large groups—Hawaiians (22 percent increase in the decade), Samoans (59 percent), and Guamanians (61 percent)—increased less, but the percentage increases were still considerable compared to the total U.S. population. The Samoan and Guamanian increases were less than Tongans and Fijians because larger numbers were present at the beginning of the decade. They were also less than the Asian increases partly because the populations of the sending populations were relatively small. The Hawaiian increase, although smaller than the others, was also probably larger than could be expected by natural increase alone, so it must indicate some reidentification to Hawaiian from other groups.

This chapter will focus on characteristics of Samoans, Tongans, Guamanians, and other Micronesians. The "Micronesian" category as defined for this paper includes all non-Guamanian Micronesians. Data on Hawaiians, the native American Polynesian group, show comparisons.

Estimates of all Pacific Islander groups except Hawaiians in the United States have been little more than approximations based on a limited supply of poor-quality migration statistics, some community-level studies, and assessments of community leaders. The 1980 Census was the first actual count of Pacific Islander immigrants using specific categories. The census was also the first to describe the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of these groups.

The largest recent migration stream has been from (and through) American Samoa (Ahlburg and Levin 1990). The United States and Germany divided Samoa into American Samoa and Western Samoa at the

turn of the twentieth century. The United States controlled American Samoa continuously in the 1900s, and New Zealand controlled Western Samoa from World War I until independence in 1962. From 1900 to 1951 the U.S. Department of the Navy administered American Samoa. The American naval base at Pago Pago in American Samoa employed many Samoans. An economic boom in Samoa after World War II continued for several years after the war. The naval presence and good economic times ended, however, when the base moved to Hawaii in 1951. The navy allowed Samoans connected with the naval base to migrate. Many did leave rather than return to subsistence farming (and a reduced standard of living). In the 1950s, unbalanced trade, a drought, and increasingly unrealistic economic expectations increased Samoans' desire to migrate to Hawaii and to the United States mainland.

Since 1951, the U.S. Department of Interior has administered American Samoa as an unincorporated territory. Military service has continued to attract Samoans, providing prestige at home, adventure abroad, education, and an American salary scale. After the early 1960s, enhanced employment and educational opportunities have also been motivations for emigration.

Persons born in American Samoa are United States nationals. This status gives them right of free entry into the United States, but has fewer privileges than citizenship. American Samoans, for example, cannot vote in federal elections.

Western Samoans made up 30 percent of American Samoa's population in 1980. Many Western Samoans migrate to American Samoa and the United States because of the lower standard of living in Western Samoa. In the 1980 U.S. Census, in fact, almost 13,000 persons had been born in Western Samoa compared to about 9,000 American Samoan–born.

Tongans, like Western Samoans, do not have free access to the United States. Much of the Tongan immigration has been reaction to the general economic situation in Tonga. Mormon Church activities also bring students and other potential migrants to the United States for extended periods. Also, like Western Samoans, many Tongans migrate to American Samoa and then on to the United States. About 800 persons born in Tonga were living in American Samoa in 1980 (2.5 percent of the resident population).

Migration from Guam has been similar to that from American Samoa. Guam became a U.S. territory after the Spanish-American War in 1898. In 1950, the Organic Act of Guam gave United States citizenship to Guam's inhabitants. Guamanians then had unrestricted entry into the United States. Guam is now negotiating for commonwealth status similar to that of Puerto Rico and the Northern Mariana Islands. Eco-

nomic motives for immigration have been most important. Guamanians travel to the United States for relatively high-paying jobs by enlisting in the armed forces.

Migration from the rest of Micronesia has been much more recent. The Spanish (from the 1500s until 1898), Germans (until 1914), and Japanese (until the end of World War II) successively governed Micronesia. In 1947, the United Nations created the United States–controlled, strategic Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI). The United States neglected Micronesia until the Kennedy administration, when it appropriated relatively large amounts of money for economic development. In the late 1960s the educational system expanded, partly because of importation of Peace Corps volunteers. Until the Federated States of Micronesia and Marshall Islands compacts took effect in late 1986, most Micronesians came to the United States for postsecondary education. We will see the extent and characteristics of the long-term migrants only after the 1990 census. Palauans remain aliens.

Western Samoans and Tongans use American Samoa as a stopover migration point. The new freely associated states of the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Marshall Islands are likely to serve as conduit for persons from Kiribati, the Philippines, and Korea. Migrants from these areas and Palau already come for jobs and later intermarry and have children. Migration from all other Pacific Islands has been minor.

Who Are the Pacific Islanders?

Except for the information of totals for the large groups from the 1990 Census, the data used in this chapter come from answers to item 4 (race of individuals) on the 1980 Census questionnaire. The sample data from the 1980 Census showed 172,346 Hawaiians, 31,393 Guamanians, and 39,520 Samoans. A special tabulation displayed information for race, ancestry, language, and birthplace. The tabulation helps assess how different methods of counting Pacific Islanders affect the estimated populations for the various groups. Table 9.1 shows some of these data.

On a sample basis, 172,346 persons were Hawaiian race. However, 202,556 persons were Hawaiian by ancestry, either alone (a single ancestry response), or in combination with other ancestry groups (a multiple response). This number was 118 percent of the race response (18 percent more).

We compare the two items to see consistency in reporting. The two items together showed 239,546 persons reported as Hawaiian in either the ancestry and race items (139 percent of the race only response). An-

other 135,356 persons reported in *either* the race *or* the ancestry item (78 percent). These data show that some persons reported a race other than Hawaiian in item 4, but selected Hawaiian, either by itself or in combination with other ancestries, in the ancestry item.

The data also show that most of the persons reporting ancestry only (58 percent) reported a multiple ancestry response (Hawaiian and other groups).

Data for Guamanians differ. Ancestry responses of Chamorro and Guamanian were only 86 percent as frequent as the Guamanian race response. Also, a larger proportion of Guamanians reported a single ancestry group ("Guamanian" or "Chamorro") than reported in combination with some other ancestry group. The data for Samoans more closely resembled that of the Hawaiians. Although 39,520 persons reported Samoan as the race response, 51,283 wrote in a Samoan ancestry response, with 44,190 reporting only Samoan ancestry (86 percent of the Samoan ancestry responses). That is, more persons reported a single Samoan ancestry response than reported Samoan race.

Only 13,405 persons in the United States reported speaking Hawaiian at home (8 percent of Hawaiians by race). Another 27,581 persons reported speaking Samoan (70 percent), and 11,909 persons reported speaking Chamorro (38 percent). Chamorros and Samoans are often first-generation migrants, so are more likely to speak the language at home.

Data for Hawaiian birthplace are not compatible with the other responses since we cannot disaggregate non-natives from natives. Similarly, although most of the persons born on Guam were Guamanian, the census includes babies born to military personnel. On the other hand, it is likely that most of the Samoa-born persons were Samoan.

Race and ancestry items produce comparable data, but language and birthplace produce much less comparable data. Neither the 1980 nor the 1990 Census collected parental birthplace, so that item does not classify these groups.

Table 9.1 also shows similar comparisons for all Pacific Islanders, the major geographical areas of the Pacific Islands, and Tongans and Fijians, as well as the groups discussed above. As with the selected racial groups already discussed, the geographical areas showed similar numbers for race and ancestry responses, but smaller numbers for language and birthplace. Since Hawaiians make up most of the Polynesians, the relationships for Polynesian are similar to those found for Hawaiians. Tongans' and Fijians' relationships are more like those found for Samoans.

TABLE 9.1

Pacific Islanders in the United States, by Race, Ancestry, Birthplace, and Language: 1980

Pacific Island Group	Race	Ancestry	Race or Ancestry	Race and Ancestry	Single Ancestry	Multiple Ancestry	Language	Birth-place
TOTAL	259,566	345,276	406,413	198,429	192,561	152,715	83,800	320,251
Polynesian	220,278	303,517	349,698	174,097	164,940	138,577	48,843	265,319
Hawaiian	172,346	202,556	239,546	135,356	84,186	118,370	13,405	236,192
Samoan	39,520	51,283	58,303	32,500	44,190	7,093	27,581	21,943
Tongan	6,226	8,548	9,698	5,076	6,782	1,766	4,646	5,619
Melanesian	3,311	6,046	7,709	1,648	3,349	2,697	2,309	8,241
Fijian	2,834	3,571	4,862	1,543	2,462	1,109	985	7,538
Micronesian	35,508	33,325	46,149	22,684	23,081	10,244	27,125	45,384
Chamorro	31,393	27,023	38,115	20,301	18,683	8,340	11,909	38,919

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census unpublished tabulations.

Geographic Distribution

Table 9.2 shows the geographic distribution of the largest Pacific Islander groups on the basis of racial response for the states with the largest numbers of Pacific Islanders in 1990. About 44 percent of the Pacific Islanders in the United States in 1990 were living in Hawaii. Another 30 percent lived in California, and 4 percent lived in Washington.

The largest proportion of any group living in Hawaii were the Hawaiians, of course. Almost 2 out of every 3 Hawaiians were living in Hawaii in 1990, down from slightly more than 2 out of every 3 in 1980 (Table 9.3). No other group had more than half its residents living in Hawaii.

On the other hand, about half of all Samoans and Guamanians lived in California in 1990, down 5 percentage points during the decade for Guamanians, but up 5 percentage points for Samoans as they became more heavily concentrated in California. More than 4 in every 5 Fijians lived in California, and about 1 in every 4 Tongans lived in Utah.

Table 9.3 also shows the same geographic distribution for 1980, but including groups not yet tabulated for 1990. The percentage of Pacific Islanders increased by 18 percent in Hawaii during the decade. Of the states shown, the number of Pacific Islanders in Washington more than doubled (an increase of 115 percent); the Pacific Islander populations in the other states all increased considerably as well (from 67 percent in California to 74 percent in Utah).

The characteristics of Samoan migrants to Hawaii differ considerably from those who have migrated to California (Hayes and Levin 1984). Part of the reasons for the differences are historic, part are cultural, part are undoubtedly climatic. Hawaiian Samoans keep traditions more intact. Those in California find "as economic pressures increase, and Samoans move into the larger society [traditional values], as well as the typical demographic patterns, will tend to disappear" (Harbison 1986, p. 91).

Pacific Islanders adapt more easily to suburban and rural communities than to large urban areas (Rolff 1978, Kotchek 1977, 1978). Kotchek, who studied Samoans in Seattle, attributes this adapting to less ethnic visibility and freedom of choice. Pacific Islands networks there are not as strong or as extensive. She does find that some Samoans have abandoned the *faaSamoa*, but others see it as a unifying force.

San Francisco and Los Angeles, on the other hand, already reached levels of cultural density in the late 1960s to permit forming descent groups. Samoans held their first large funerals in San Francisco after a

TABLE 9.2

Pacific Islanders in Selected States by Group: 1990

Group	Number	Percentage	Hawaii	California	Washington	Texas	Utah	All Other
TOTAL	365,024	100.0	44.5	30.3	4.1	2.1	2.1	17.0
Hawaiian	211,014	100.0	65.8	16.3	2.6	1.4	0.7	13.3
Samoan	62,964	100.0	23.9	50.7	6.6	1.5	2.5	14.9
Guamanian	49,345	100.0	4.3	50.8	7.7	4.5	0.3	32.5
Tongan	17,606	100.0	17.5	45.0	2.5	3.6	22.2	9.2
Fijian	7,036	100.0	3.7	81.6	4.2	0.8	0.7	9.0
Palauan	1,439	100.0	24.9	27.6	7.9	5.1	0.3	34.3
All other	15,620	100.0	17.1	32.8	5.5	4.3	3.8	36.5

SOURCE: CB91-215, U.S. Bureau of the Census, June 12, 1991.

TABLE 9.3

Pacific Islanders in Selected States by Type: 1980

Group	Number	Percentage	Hawaii	California	Washington	Texas	Utah	All Other
TOTAL	259,566	100.0	53.0	25.5	2.7	1.7	1.7	15.4
POLYNESIAN	220,278	100.0	61.1	20.6	2.2	1.3	1.9	12.9
Hawaiian	172,346	100.0	68.6	14.1	1.6	1.4	0.5	13.8
Samoan	39,520	100.0	36.3	45.8	4.6	1.0	3.0	9.3
Tahitian	791	100.0	34.0	32.9	0.9	0.0	6.1	26.2
Tongan	6,226	100.0	23.8	37.8	1.4	0.5	29.1	7.4
All other	1,395	100.0	24.1	30.0	4.8	3.2	19.0	19.0
MICRONESIAN	35,508	100.0	7.5	51.3	5.4	4.2	0.4	31.2
Guamanian	30,695	100.0	5.3	55.4	5.7	4.2	0.2	29.2
C.N.M.I.	698	100.0	8.0	46.1	4.9	13.6	2.4	24.9
Marshallese	474	100.0	16.5	18.1	1.1	14.3	0.0	50.0
Palauan	692	100.0	44.1	29.5	2.0	4.3	0.0	20.1
All other	2,949	100.0	19.6	20.0	4.7	0.5	2.0	53.1
MELANESIAN	3,311	100.0	10.7	67.0	4.7	2.2	0.0	15.5
Fijian	2,834	100.0	9.2	72.8	5.2	1.7	0.0	11.2
All other	477	100.0	19.9	32.5	1.7	4.8	0.0	41.1
P.I. Not Reported	469	100.0	1.3	80.4	0.0	2.1	1.1	15.1

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, PC80-S1-12, 1983.

1965 fire in a Catholic parish hall (Ablon 1970). Formation of similar Samoan descent groups in San Diego and Oceanside occurred later.

Demography

Because no characteristics for Pacific Islanders are yet available from the 1990 Census, the rest of the chapter will present data from the 1980 Census. All these data are now more than a decade old. Because they are also the first data available on Pacific Islands from a decennial census, they serve as benchline.

Age and Sex: Pacific Islanders in the United States are a very youthful population, consistent with their high mobility. For example, the median age for each of the specified Pacific Islander groups was lower than the United States median age of 30.0 years in 1980. The median age for Hawaiians was 24.3 years. Among the immigrant Pacific Islander groups, the median age was highest for Guamanians (23.0 years), followed by Micronesians (22.8 years), Samoans (19.2 years), and Tongans (18.9 years).

Tongan males (20.9 years) were older than females (17.2 years), probably because of selective migration. The median for Samoan males and females (19.3 years) was about the same. However, females in the other groups were older than males, as in the total United States. In all cases, the medians by sex were lower than for the total U.S. population.

We also see Pacific Islander youthfulness in the large proportions under 15 years old, and the small proportions 65 years old and over. Although about 7 percent of the total U.S. population was under 5 years old, almost 11 percent of the Pacific Islander population fell in this group. These figures included 12 percent of the "other" Micronesians, 14 percent of the Samoans, and more than 16 percent of the Tongans (Table 9.4).

Although 11 percent of the total U.S. population was 65 years old and over, only 4 percent of the Pacific Islanders were in this age group. Even here, the 6 percent elderly of the Hawaiians skewed the total Pacific Islander distribution. Only 2 percent or less of the other selected groups were elderly. Since the elderly are less likely to migrate, and since migration of Pacific Islanders is relatively recent, these proportions are not surprising.

The distribution by age shows differences among the groups. Almost half of all "other" Micronesians were between 20 and 34 years old, primarily a student-aged population. Samoans and Tongans were younger, Hawaiians and Guamanians, in slightly older groups.

The 98 males per 100 females for Pacific Islanders in 1980 was more

TABLE 9.4

Age of Pacific Islander Persons: 1980

Age	United States (in 000's)	Total Pacific Islander	Hawaiian	Samoan	Tongan	Guamanian	Other Micronesian
TOTAL PERSONS	226,546	259,566	172,346	39,520	6,226	30,695	4,813
MALES/100 FEMALES	94.5	98.0	95.0	103.4	113.7	102.5	119.3
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under 5 years	7.2	10.8	10.0	14.1	16.3	9.1	11.8
5 to 9 years	7.4	9.9	9.2	12.4	13.0	9.7	7.4
10 to 14 years	8.1	10.5	10.0	13.3	13.0	10.2	7.4
15 to 19 years	9.3	11.7	11.6	12.0	9.0	12.7	13.1
20 to 24 years	9.4	11.4	10.8	10.5	8.3	13.9	23.9
25 to 34 years	16.4	17.4	16.4	16.9	17.1	21.7	24.7
35 to 44 years	11.3	11.3	11.7	10.4	12.8	10.5	6.7
45 to 54 years	10.0	7.5	8.5	5.3	6.2	6.2	3.3
55 to 64 years	9.6	5.1	6.1	3.1	2.3	3.5	1.1
65 years and over	11.3	4.4	5.6	2.1	2.2	2.4	0.5
Median age	30.0	23.1	24.3	19.2	18.9	23.0	22.2

SOURCES: U.S. Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-C1, Table 98, and PC80-2-1E.

balanced than the 94 males per 100 females in the United States. The ratio for Hawaiians was similar to that of the United States total, but all others had more males than females in 1980. The 103 Samoan males for every 100 Samoan females was more balanced than the 114 Tongan males and 119 "other" Micronesian males to 100 females of the respective groups.

The distributions by age for total Pacific Islanders and for Hawaiians were similar to those for the total United States population. The distributions for the other groups were more erratic. For example, although not shown here, almost 50 percent more Tongan males than females aged 25 to 44 years old were present, and almost twice as many "other" Micronesian males as females aged 15 to 19 years old.

Household and Family Size and Composition: Traditional social structure and the physical structure of the housing units influence Pacific Islander household and family size in the United States. Pacific Islander immigrant extended families remain strong and cohesive, with fluid household composition. Relatives come and go, the duration of their stays mainly dependent on their reasons for being in the household and the area (Ablon 1970, Lewthwaite et al. 1973).

The structure of houses in the United States limits the size, composition, and fluidity of the Pacific Islander households (particularly outside Hawaii). Builders construct American houses and apartments for nuclear families, with many walls and areas which can easily be "privatized," frequently a priority for Westerners. Pacific Islanders, on the other hand, often find others' desire for complete privacy verging on craziness. The Samoan *fale*, for example, "is more suited for extended family life, because it appears spacious, even when filled with people; it has no subdivisions and little or no furniture; and it is open to all sides, weather permitting" (Rolff 1978, p. 155). Daily life occurs outside the house, so as long as air can flow freely through the house, the structure is relatively unimportant. People go inside mainly to sleep.

In 1980, the composition of the Pacific Islander household and distribution of relatives within it was very different from the distribution in U.S. households in general. Although 22 percent of all U.S. household members were male family householders, only 16 percent of the persons in Pacific Islander households were in this category. This difference in these percentages is due to the larger Pacific Islander families and households. Although about 1 in every 3 persons in all U.S. households were children, more than 4 in every 10 Pacific Islanders in households were children. About half of Samoans and Tongans in households were children.

Pacific Islanders frequently stay in their parents' or a sibling's home after marriage. They may even have several children before setting up

their own household. "This type of arrangement frequently occurs when the husband is a serviceman stationed out of the area, is in the merchant marine, or is employed by one of the shipping or passenger lines" (Ablon 1970, pp. 79–80). Also, the percentage of other relatives in Pacific Islander households (10 percent) was more than twice that for the total U.S. population (4 percent). More than 13 percent of Samoans and 12 percent of "other" Micronesians living in households were "other" relatives.

The average U.S. household in 1980 had 2.74 persons and the average family 3.27. However, as in other transitory transitional populations, all Pacific Islander groups (based on the race of the householder) had larger average households (3.69 persons) and families (4.25 persons). For Samoans, especially, the differences were very large (4.86 persons per household and 5.16 persons per family). However, even Samoan family sizes are decreasing rapidly (Albon 1970; Shu and Satele 1977).

About half of all U.S. families in 1980 had a child 18 years of age or younger compared to more than two-thirds of all Pacific Islander families. The 63 percent for Hawaiians was slightly lower, presumably as a result of reduced fertility. More than 8 in every 10 Tongan and Samoan families had children under 18 in the family, as well as more than 7 in 10 Guamanians. Similarly, more than one-third of the Pacific Islander families had children under 6, as was the case with more than half of all Samoan families and more than 60 percent of Tongan families.

Marital Status: No long history of intermarriage between groups and with non-Pacific Islanders exists because most Pacific Islander immigration is recent. Hawaiians are the major exception. Data from the vital statistics for Hawaii showed 58 percent of full- and part-Hawaiian males marrying non-Hawaiian females between 1980 and 1985. About 60 percent of full- and part-Hawaiian females married non-Hawaiian males during the same period. Since Hawaiians are indigenous, unlike the other groups, the marriage experience may not be transferrable.

The data from the Hawaii vital statistics also showed 44 percent of Samoan males marrying non-Samoan females in 1980 to 1985 and 40 percent of Samoan females marrying non-Samoan males. Comparable numbers from other states are not yet available. Intermarriage reduces fertility (as seen in the fertility section), but also has other effects on individuals and the community in general. For example, "Non-Samoan spouses almost invariably reduce Samoans' involvement in *aiga* and church and often discourage the formation of extended kin households" (Rolff 1978:85). Rolff also reports that when families want to reduce their involvement in Samoan group activities they will often actively promote marriages with non-Samoans.

Micronesians, particularly the males who predominate in the mar-

riage ages, often marry non-Micronesians, and often have unexpected problems. Frequently, young Micronesian males away from home for the first time experience "suspended adolescence," a phenomenon derived from their traditional cultures. Pacific Islanders, in general, have respect for authority, and follow adolescent behavior patterns, even into their late 20s and 30s, until they marry. Once they marry, whether at age 20 or 40, they assume the role of "married," with the authority and respect that role demands.

Many of the non-Pacific Islander women, infatuated with these individuals because of their domesticity and compliance, create a kind of "teddy-bear complex." Husband and wife sometimes have rude awakenings when the newly married male expects his wife to stop acting with authority and start acting like a more passive Pacific Islander wife. Sometimes the resulting conflicts lead to separation and divorce.

Fertility: Although Hawaii and California collect some data on deaths, the United States has no reliable mortality data for all Pacific Islanders. Data on children ever born collected in the 1980 census, however, permit the estimation of fertility levels. The 1980 Pacific Islander immigrant population arrived in the United States very recently, so a high proportion of the children they report were born outside the United States. All the Pacific Islander groups except Micronesians (with 1.2 children per woman aged 15 to 44) had higher fertility rates than the 1.3 for the total United States. The rates ranged from a low of 1.6 (per woman) for Guamanian women of this age group to highs of 2.1 for Tongans and 1.9 for Samoans.

Since most women complete their childbearing by the time they reach the 35–44 age group, it is useful to compare data for women at these ages. The U.S. average was 2.6 children per woman 35 to 44 in 1980. All the Pacific Islander groups at 3.5 children per woman had higher fertility rates (including the Hawaiians at 3.3). Micronesians (3.5), Guamanians (3.7), Samoans (4.3), and Tongans (4.4) all had higher fertility levels than the Pacific average.

Pacific Islander fertility in the United States Pacific Islands territories declined at least since the mid-1960s (Levin and Retherford 1986). The own-children method of fertility estimation was used for that study and for the analysis of fertility of Asians in the United States (Retherford and Levin 1989). The latter paper also discusses fertility information for the three largest groups of Pacific Islanders in the United States—Hawaiians, Guamanians, and Samoans.

Immigrant Pacific Islander women living in the United States in 1980 had the same fertility decline seen among Pacific Islander women in their home areas. Fertility levels for Pacific Islanders were higher than those for Asians, and for the total United States population. For all Pa-

cific Islanders, the Total Fertility Rate (TFR) declined from 3.7 children per woman in 1965–1969 to 2.5 children per woman in 1975–1979. The TFR of Guamanians dropped precipitously over the same period, from 4.0 to 2.1. Hawaiians showed a more modest decline, from 3.3 to 2.3. Samoans decreased from 6.1 to 3.8 children per woman.

The data by urban and rural residence showed the expected relationships between the two areas. That is, urban fertility was lower than rural fertility. Total Pacific Islander urban fertility decreased from 3.6 to 2.5 between the years 1965 to 1969 and 1975 to 1979. Comparable rural TFRs declined from 4.1 to 2.8. Within urban and rural categories, fertility fell over the three periods. For the own-children method, the characteristic is as of census day. That is, women may have moved from rural areas (where they had some of their children) to urban areas (where they may have had other children) during the 15-year periods. The own-children method, however, assumes that the women were in the residential area of enumeration during the whole period.

The fertility of both native-born and foreign-born women declined between 1966 and 1980. The fertility of native-born was lower than the fertility of foreign-born for all Pacific Islanders and for Samoans. For Guamanians, however, the fertility of native-born women was consistently higher than for the "foreign-born" women. These data are consistent for the fertility rates Levin and Retherford found for Guam (1986).

These data show that differential fertility conformed to usual patterns: urban fertility was lower than rural fertility. Fertility of native-born was less than fertility of foreign-born. Fertility tended to fall not only for each group, but also for each category of urban-rural residence and nativity.

Comparisons with the total U.S. population suggest that assimilation occurred between 1965 and 1980. Fertility of the various racial minorities converged toward the fertility of the majority. However, especially for some groups of Pacific Islanders, differences in fertility had not disappeared by 1980.

Reproductive attitudes and values formed in the islands have more effect on fertility than U.S. sociocultural conditions because large proportions of the Pacific Islander immigrant populations arrived recently. Fertility levels in American Samoa decreased steadily for two decades. Some parts of Micronesia (notably the Northern Mariana Islands and Palau) also experienced recent decreases in fertility rates. Other Micronesian areas maintained high fertility levels (Levin and Retherford 1986). We lack information on contraceptive use for any of the Pacific Islander immigrant groups except Samoans, and only for Samoans in Hawaii. However, survey data show that in the late 1970s two-thirds of Samoan women in Hawaii had used contraceptives at some stage of their

reproductive lives (Harbison and Weishaar 1981, p. 270). The relationship between improved socioeconomic status and later fertility decline seen in other developing countries and ethnic groups in the United States applies to Pacific Islanders as well. As contraceptive use increases, Samoan (and other Pacific Islander) household and family sizes should decrease to approach total United States levels.

Migration

Mobility—the First Step: Pacific Islander immigration is partially an unintended manifestation of traditional movements, the wanderlust, part of the transition to adulthood. The "trip" has been important in most Pacific Islands societies for generations. Historically, young voyagers left in canoes or other boats to explore and settle distant islands. Historically, groups of people "moved readily between islands and valleys in search of new land, disease-free sites, wives, trading goods, etc." Connell (1984, p. 12).

Frequently in the past, young men (at least in Micronesia) would hail a passing fishing boat to request to sail and leave the island for several years. They got experience and maturity (and stories to last a lifetime, many of them true). They then returned to the island to marry, have children, and settle down (Leinwald 1981, p. 85, Levin 1976, p. 187). This pattern continues, but transformed by newer forms of travel. For example, "just as their great-grandfathers signed aboard trading and whaling vessels a century ago to 'see the world', so Namoluk young persons today, (especially young men) set off to 'see the world' on a Boeing 727" (Marshall 1979, p. 7; also, Hezel 1978, p. 26).

Levin and Naich (manuscript), in writing about civil redemption in the atoll areas of Micronesia, however, note that the "trip" has both positive and negative aspects. In the past, when young men went on canoe voyages or fishing boats, no one knew (including the young person), when or whether he would ever return. A different kind of challenge replaced the traditional danger. Many islander immigrants lack preparation for dealing with "other" world problems, both scholastic and financial.

Levin and Naich also note that the "trip" both traditionally and in the contemporary situation, can serve as a form of redemption. A young person in conflict can lessen stress in these still-communal societies by leaving the island until tempers and memories have cooled.

The stress can also come at the other end of the trip. Sometimes students drop out of school in the States, for either financial or scholastic reasons. The shame involved with not finishing a degree often makes

return to the islands difficult. By waiting, the elders on the island might "forget" the t ansgression, with redemption occurring. In either case, expiation of real or imagined sins results.

The United States government has encouraged this kind of travel with universal education through high school in the United States Pacific. Now many Pacific Islander students leave their islands to come to the United States for schooling, using the Basic Education Opportunity (Pell) Grant as their ticket. The school year BEOG pays about $2,000 per school year based on parental income. Since many Pacific Island families have low-pay pursuits such as copra collecting, most Pacific Islander students receive the full grant. Although $2000 does not cover most expenses for a year at school, students can usually scrape together airfare to the United States to claim the grant. Costs of books, food, and housing cause financial problems later.

The United States As Safety Valve: Emigration, then, is a kind of safety valve for increased pressure on human and natural resources in the Pacific Islands. Many Pacific Islanders have left for education. The safety valve works both ways. Pacific Islanders can settle in the United States. Also, the sending islands can avoid the potential problems both of returning migrants and many new participants joining the local labor force. As Connell notes, "as long as the 'safety valve' of emigration remains open there will be reduced pressure on South Pacific states to provide employment opportunities and welfare services in a more self-reliant context" (1984, p. 32).

Several channels of Pacific Islander immigration seem to be developing: (1) service in the armed forces; (2) school attendance followed by employment; and (3) employment during periodic stays in the United States. All groups except the Hawaiians, who are not immigrants, use the military channel for migration. The second channel, education followed by employment, might be called the "Micronesian" model; the third channel, employment combined with circular mobility, is the "Samoan" model, a model likely to become more widespread throughout the United States' Pacific Islands. These second and third channels will be discussed later.

Migration for Military Service: We cannot measure immigration for Hawaiians since they are native. Hawaiians and Guamanians had proportions of veterans in 1980 that did not differ much from the proportion for the total United States. On the other hand, much of the early Samoan immigration was the result of military activity in American Samoa, attracting young males into the service. Others moved as part of the *fitafita* guards in the mid-1950s. Many of these Samoans later retired to the States. The military continued to be attractive to Samoans into the 1970s because of the opportunity to leave Samoa (often to escape

the *faa'Samoa*), and as a source of adventure. In 1980, more than 18 percent of Samoan males (many of whom were U.S. nationals) had served in the military. However, fewer than 6 percent of Micronesian males and only about 3 percent of Tongan males—few of whom were citizens—were veterans.

One example illustrates use of military service for migration. Ala'ilima describes the case of a man who lived with different relatives in Hawaii, and delivered his entire paycheck to them. When he decided to keep a small part, this uncle accused him of cheating, so he moved in with his sister, who was to send some of his paycheck to his parents. She did not follow through, so he joined the armed forces. "This, he says, was the best decision he ever made" (1986, p. 125).

In recent years, however, the pull of the military for Samoans has diminished somewhat. Rolff notes, for example, "during the 1970s, most high school seniors in . . . American Samoa were insufficiently prepared to pass the military entrance examinations" (1978, p. 177). The school system in American Samoa seemed to be unable, for cultural or educational reasons, to prepare students for the exams. Rolff also found "many contemporary young Samoans do not like the regimented life of enlisted men. And . . . they want to avoid long periods of separation from their families" (1978, p. 177).

In many cases, young Micronesian males join the military for the same reasons as Samoans. Under the compacts of free association, Micronesians enlist because the military gives increased income, an escape from family or other problems, and the chance for adventure.

What starts as "military" migration can turn into a more general migration. Janes (1984), for example, finds three waves of Samoan migrants: those migrating under military auspices in the 1950s, family-oriented migration from the late 1950s to the late 1960s, and a more recent immigration of elderly.

Birthplace: A total of 83,037 Pacific Islander persons were born outside the United States, but had immigrated before 1980 (Table 9.5). Of these, 45,669 (55 percent) were born in Micronesia, 29,127 (35 percent) in Polynesia, and 8,241 (10 percent) in Melanesia.

Fiji made up the largest proportion of Melanesia-born (more than 90 percent). Since a much smaller proportion reported as Fijian, many of these immigrants were Fijian Indian, about half of Fiji's population. These persons presumably reported as Asian Indian on the race item. Very few persons were born in the other areas of Melanesia. The United States has never had the close, formal ties with Melanesia that it has had with American Samoa in Polynesia or Guam and the rest of Micronesia.

More than 4 out of every 5 persons born in Micronesia were born on Guam. Unfortunately, the census cannot distinguish between chil-

TABLE 9.5

U.S. Population with Pacific Islander Birthplace: 1980

Birthplace	Number	Percent	Percent Excluding Guam	Percent of Group
TOTAL (1)	83,037	...	46,255	...
Percent	...	100.0	100.0	...
POLYNESIA	29,127	35.1	63.0	100.0
American Samoa	9,361	11.3	20.2	32.1
Cook Islands	130	0.2	0.3	0.4
French Polynesia	1,014	1.2	2.2	3.5
Norfolk	188	0.2	0.4	0.6
Tonga	5,619	6.8	12.1	19.3
Western Samoa	12,582	15.2	27.2	43.2
Other Polynesia	233	0.3	0.5	0.8
MICRONESIA	45,669	55.0	98.7	100.0
Guam	36,782	44.3	79.5	80.5
Kiribati	106	0.1	0.2	0.2
Northern Marianas	2,137	2.6	4.6	4.7
Trust Terr. of P.I.	5,066	6.1	11.0	11.1
Fed. St. Micronesia	1,401	1.7	3.0	3.1
Chuuk	542	0.7	1.2	1.2
Kosrae	110	0.1	0.2	0.2
Pohnpei	378	0.5	0.8	0.8
Yap	371	0.4	0.8	0.8
Marshall Islands	1,197	1.4	2.6	2.6
Palau	1,003	1.2	2.2	2.2
Other T.T.P.I.	1,465	1.8	3.2	3.2
Other Micronesia	1,584	1.9	3.4	3.5
MELANESIA	8,241	9.9	17.8	100.0
Fiji	7,538	9.1	16.3	91.5
New Caledonia	144	0.2	0.3	1.7
Papua New Guinea	425	0.5	0.9	5.2
Other Melanesia	134	0.2	0.3	1.6

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census unpublished data.

(1) Excludes Hawaii, Australia, New Zealand, Oceania, not elsewhere classified, and the American territories of Canton and Enderbury Islands, Johnston Atoll, and Midway Islands.

dren of military and children of civilians. These statistics include some births to parents who were military (or on civilian contract) temporarily on Guam. Persons from the former Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands made up the largest proportion of the rest of the Micronesian immigrants. Interpretation of the numbers shown for the constituent areas of

the Federated States of Micronesia, Marshalls, and Palau, however, requires some caution. The relatively large number of "other" Micronesians were persons who presumably wrote "Micronesia" for birthplace.

Western Samoa was the largest Polynesian sender of migrants, with 43 percent of the total (and 15 percent of all Pacific Islander immigrants). Western Samoa is not a U.S. territory, but migrants move from Western Samoa to American Samoa, and then on to Hawaii and the United States mainland. The second largest group of migrants was from American Samoa. The 9,361 persons were 32 percent of the Polynesians. Tongans, who use essentially the same route as the Western Samoans, were the third largest Polynesian immigrant group (19 percent).

Short-term Migration: Another measure of migration, this time measuring shorter-term migration, comes from the question on residence in 1975. Both the U.S. and Pacific Islands censuses included this question. We can look at migration between the areas, but here we will be looking at migration to the United States. Of the 180,765 Pacific Islander persons 5 years and over in 1980, 82,934 (46 percent) were living in the same house in 1980 as in 1975 (Table 9.6). More than half of all Hawaiians were living in the same house, but less than 30 percent of the Tongans and Guamanians, and only 1 in 10 of the other Micronesians.

Persons living abroad 5 years before the census presented the opposite case. While about 2 percent of all persons in the United States had lived abroad in 1975, almost 10 percent of the Pacific Islanders fell in this category. The percentage for Hawaiians abroad was even less than the U.S. average, but other Pacific Islanders had very high rates. More than 6 out of every 10 "other" Micronesians were abroad in 1975, as well as 3 out of every 10 Guamanians, 1 in 3 Tongans, and 1 in 6 Samoans. These data show that a large part of the migration for some groups occurred in the 5 years before the census.

Of those in a different house in 1975, more than half of each group continued to live in the same county. Of those who lived in a different county, however, more marked differences existed between the groups. About half of the persons in the United States who lived in a different county lived in the same state. However, only about 4 in every 10 Pacific Islanders (and about the same proportion of Hawaiians and Micronesians) lived in the same state if they lived in a different county in 1975. Only 3 in every 10 Samoans were in this category, and only 1 in 6 Tongans. If Samoans and Tongans moved out of the county between 1975 and 1980, they were also likely to move out of the state altogether.

Of those who did move out of the state, most had lived in the West in 1975. Only 20 percent of those in this category for the whole United States lived in the West in 1975 compared to 71 percent of the Pacific

TABLE 9.6

Residence in 1975 for Pacific Islanders: 1980

Residence in 1975	United States (in 000's)	Total Pacific Islander	Hawaiian	Samoan	Tongan	Guamanian	Other Micronesian
PERSONS 5 YEARS +	210,323	180,765	124,358	22,855	3,815	22,196	3,567
Same house	112,695	82,934	65,322	8,556	1,116	6,260	433
Percent	53.6	45.9	52.5	37.4	29.3	28.2	12.1
Diff. house in U.S.	93,696	80,452	57,349	10,214	1,424	9,433	953
Same county	52,750	51,027	37,590	6,033	843	5,438	495
Percent	56.3	63.4	65.5	59.1	59.2	57.6	51.9
Different county	40,946	29,425	19,759	4,181	581	3,995	458
Same state	20,588	11,608	8,177	1,221	97	1,670	170
Percent	50.3	39.4	41.4	29.2	16.7	41.8	37.1
Different state	20,358	17,817	11,582	2,960	484	2,325	288
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Northeast	22.5	6.4	5.7	7.1	3.5	9.1	16.0
Midwest	25.5	6.4	6.2	5.8	0.0	7.1	13.5
South	31.4	16.1	13.2	15.4	5.0	32.6	27.4
West	20.5	71.1	74.9	71.6	91.5	51.2	43.1
Abroad	3,932	17,379	1,687	4,085	1,275	6,503	2,181
Percent	1.9	9.6	1.4	17.9	33.4	29.3	61.1

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-C1, Table 101, PC80-2-1E.

Islanders, and 92 percent of the Tongans. Micronesians became more dispersed over time, perhaps partly because of the lessening of the family bonds with migration. Further, many of the Micronesians were students.

A detailed analysis of the Pacific Islanders by year of immigration does not yet exist. However, if the Samoa-born respondents in Shu and Satele's 1976 survey of Samoans in southern California were representative of Samoan migrants in the United States, two-thirds had immigrated during the previous 15 years, and 24 percent in the previous 5 years (1977, p. 74). Of the 50 householders interviewed in Hawaii by Franco in 1983, 40 percent had immigrated during the previous 9 years (1983, p. 9). No secondary sources of information were available on year of immigration for other Pacific Islander groups.

Also, surveys have been fairly unsuccessful at seeking information on the subjective motivations of Samoan migrants. In Franco's recent survey of Samoans living in the Kalihi area of Oahu, for example, 23 of the 50 respondents cited "kinship-related" reasons for migration, and 17 cited their children's or their own education (1983, p. 11). Education of children appears in several surveys as either the primary reason for immigrating or among the most important (Baker 1976; Ala'ilima 1966; Ablon 1971; Enesa 1977), but the relative weight given to this motivation depends on the way of getting the information. Some of the surveys emphasized "economic" motivations such as the desire for wage employment and the opportunity to increase prestige by the generosity that a money income permits (Ala'ilima 1966; Baker 1976; Forster 1956), whereas others found little evidence of such motivations (Franco 1983; Enesa 1977).

Also, much variation exists in the emphasis placed on Samoan social structure as a specific motivation for migration. Shu and Satele stress the desire of many young Samoans to escape "traditional constraints" (1977, p. 10), and Rolff mentions the wish to escape the "matai system" (1978, p. 58). Although these data refer only to Samoans (no data are yet available for other groups), Samoans continue to be a special case since they carry their social structure within them; most other Pacific Islander immigrants do not have the same set social structure.

Many Pacific Islanders have trouble abandoning their traditional societies as they move into American society. For example, at one Oregon college, faculty found that Micronesian students have difficulties budgeting their money, tend to be reluctant to try different foods, and some male students have drinking problems. "A Micronesian who gets drunk, exhibits disruptive behavior, and is taken down to the police station, stands out in a way that an American student would not simply because of his physical appearance. The professors felt that, as a result, the en-

tire Micronesian student population suffers for the action of a handful" (Leinwand 1981, pp. 118–119).

Social Characteristics

Educational Attainment: Education, in fact, may be the cause of a brain drain for several of the Pacific Island nations. Ballendorf describes the Micronesian school system as essentially a type of education mill with export to the United States as its product. "The total school age population participating is one of the highest in the world for a developing area: well over 90 percent" (Ballendorf 1977, p. 5).

This democratization of the school system caused an education explosion; "the total population of Truk District may be doubling every 22 years, but its high-school graduate population has been doubling every four" (Hezel 1978, p. 26). In 1967 about 300 Micronesians studied outside Micronesia. About 900 Chuukese studied outside in 1973, 2200 in 1975, and 3000 by 1977. A brain drain develops because of "frustration at home, higher living standards in the United States and the ability of Micronesians to adjust to the American culture and society as a result of their exposure during stateside college attendance" (Hezel 1978, p. 7).

Similarly, a study of high-school students in American Samoa in 1974 found that 62 percent intended to go to the United States after graduation. "Only 37 of the almost 400 graduating students said they planned to attend the Community College of American Samoa" (*Pacific Islands Monthly* 1974 45 [August]:9).

Naich (personal communication), among other of the newer Micronesian-cum-analysts, disagrees with Hezel and Ballendorf's assessment of the cause of Micronesian migration. "The limited job opportunities back home and other factors are probably the most convincing explanations; education itself is not. . . . Those who drop out of college tend to remain in the U.S., and those who complete their college education generally return home." Little evidence exists yet to support these positions for Pacific Islanders who come first for education and then stay on. The 1990 census should give us longitudinal data to enlighten us somewhat further.

Although a larger proportion of Pacific Islanders were enrolled in high school (26 percent of all Pacific Islanders 3 years old and over and enrolled in school) than the total U.S. population (25 percent), a smaller proportion of Pacific Islanders were enrolled in college (17 percent compared to 20 percent for the total population). These figures show indirectly that a smaller proportion of Pacific Islanders continued to college.

Ample evidence shows Micronesians are coming to the United States

to attend college. Almost 1 in 4 enrolled Guamanians and 6 in 10 enrolled "other" Micronesians were in college in 1980.

Pacific Islanders attended public colleges in the same proportions as the total U.S. population. More than 80 percent of the United States population enrolled in college in 1980 were in public colleges. Only 39 percent of Tongans, however, were enrolled in a public college, probably because such a large proportion were enrolled at Brigham Young University in either Utah or Hawaii.

Also, a smaller percentage of Pacific Islanders 3 and 4 years old were enrolled in school (30 percent) than the U.S. population (33 percent). For 5- and 6-year-olds, however, the percentages reversed (90 percent for Pacific Islanders compared to 86 percent for the total United States). The percentages for ages 7 through 17 were fairly similar for the two groups, but then a divergence occurred. Only 45 percent of the Pacific Islanders 18 and 19 were in school, compared to 52 percent for the total United States population. Many Pacific Islanders who finished high school did not go on to college. Although more than half of all Tongans and "other" Micronesians in this age group were attending school in 1980, less than half of the Hawaiians, Samoans, and Guamanians were in school.

Of the 20- and 21-year-olds, only "other" Micronesians were attending school in the same proportions as the total U.S. population. While 1 in every 3 persons in this group were enrolled in school, only 1 in 4 persons in the other groups were enrolled.

"Other" Micronesians stayed in school, or came to the United States at older ages for schooling. Only 9 percent of the United States population 25 to 34 were enrolled in schools (and 10 percent of the Pacific Islanders), but 20 percent of the other Micronesians were in school. Also, 7 percent of the other Micronesians 35 years and over were in school compared to 2 percent of the total United States population.

Part of the larger proportion of dropouts among Pacific Islanders comes from the cultural tendency to coddle young children. Pacific Islanders have high expectations for youths, often reinforced with physical violence, particularly among Samoans. Often inherent conflicts exist between this relationship and that found between the teachers and students in the schools.

Ala'ilima, for example, describes these difficulties of moving from the Samoan family structure into the classroom. She notes that the teacher wants the students to speak up. The teacher "is forbidden by her morality and by our law to give him a blow on the head when he has gone too far" (1972, p. 58). Rules become obscured.

Similarly, Rolff (1978, p. 211) notes that migrant families keep adolescents busy "to the point of exhaustion." Family concerns always precede individual ones. Education becomes difficult, "even though many

parents verbally urge their children to do well in school" (Rolff 1978, p. 211).

Only a few studies look at employment expectations of Micronesians while in school. In one study, Larson found that 18 of his small sample of 26 students intended to stay in the United States after graduation. Of these 18, 12 said they would take a job "for the money." In fact, "half of the students who would take a job 'for the money' gave some indication that they needed the money in order to buy their return trip back to Truk" (Larson 1979, p. 30).

Naich (personal communication), once again, is at the other end of the continuum. In tracing his redemption hypothesis, he finds that many Micronesian former students in North Carolina, Oklahoma; Oregon, and Arizona who have been in the United States for a long time do want to return home "some day." Many did not want to go home right away because they were ashamed to go. Rather, either they did not do well in school or they did something in the United States to damage their own or their family's reputation. They decide to wait it out a little longer in the (often vain) hope of getting back into school or repairing the damaged reputation. Especially for those students given a feast by their islands before leaving for the United States, the parental admonition—to study hard, remember why they are away from home, not to come back without a degree—can have long-term effects. Many feel guilty about returning home empty-handed.

In any case, many Pacific Islanders immigrated to the United States for education. The proportions of high-school graduates among Pacific Islander immigrants were similar to the proportion for the total United States population in 1980. Although 16 percent of the United States population 25 years and older had attended college for 4 or more years, the proportion was almost as high for Micronesians (15 percent). Percentages were somewhat lower for Tongans (13 percent) and much lower for Samoans, Guamanians, and Hawaiians.

Pacific Islander males were more likely to graduate from high school and college than Pacific Islander females (Table 9.7). About 67 percent of all United States males and 66 percent of the females 25 years and over were high-school graduates, compared to 69 percent for Pacific Islander males and 65 percent for the females. On the other hand, only 11 percent of the Pacific Islander males were college graduates (only slightly more than half the 20 percent for the total United States). About 8 percent of the Pacific Islander females were college graduates (compared to 13 percent for the United States).

The individual groups also showed differences. Although 11 percent of all Pacific Islander males were college graduates, more than 13 percent of the Tongans and 22 percent of the "other" Micronesians were in

TABLE 9.7

Cumulative Level of School Completed for Pacific Islanders: 1980

Years of School Completed	United States (in 000's)	Total Pacific Islander	Hawaiian	Samoan	Tongan	Guamanian	Other Micronesian
MALES 25 + YRS	62,416	56,712	38,917	7,514	1,427	6,704	899
Elementary							
0 to 8 yrs	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
High school							
1 to 3 yrs	81.5	85.1	85.8	85.0	82.4	83.8	84.8
4 yrs	67.3	69.4	70.0	65.7	67.7	71.2	78.1
College							
1 to 3 yrs	36.1	30.2	29.7	26.8	34.8	29.7	61.2
4 yrs	20.1	11.2	11.5	9.8	13.1	8.9	21.9
5 + yrs	10.3	5.4	5.4	4.6	7.8	3.7	9.3
FEMALES 25 + YRS	70,420	62,106	44,464	7,393	1,094	6,906	853
Elementary							
0 to 8 yrs	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
High school							
1 to 3 yrs	82.0	83.0	84.8	78.9	76.4	79.8	78.1
4 yrs	65.8	65.2	67.0	56.6	64.0	64.7	63.5
College							
1 to 3 yrs	28.1	23.5	23.7	19.0	28.2	24.6	34.8
4 yrs	12.8	7.6	7.9	4.8	12.6	7.5	10.0
5 + yrs	5.3	3.5	3.7	2.2	5.6	3.7	2.9

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-C1, Table 102, PC80-2-1E.

this category. Similarly, 13 percent of Tongan females and 10 percent of "other" Micronesian females were college graduates. Since "other" Micronesians moved to the United States for schooling, the small number of college graduates showed that some continued to stay in the United States after graduation.

Education information in the form of school attendance and educational attainment showed the heterogeneity of the Pacific Islander groups. Hawaiians showed one pattern—lower participation rates for higher ages being consistent with long-term residence. Hawaiians showed the spectrum of training leading to a large variety of occupations (albeit a large number at the lower end of the continuum). Guamanians and other Micronesians immigrated largely for educational training, many expecting to return after schooling. Their distribution was heavier at the other end. Samoans and Tongans were intermediate, some migrating for schooling with the intention of returning to the sending islands. Others intended to remain, or already were second- and third-generation migrants, so looked statistically more like the Hawaiians. It was unclear whether the Samoans and Tongans would become even more like the Hawaiians over time. Also, the 1990 census will help show whether Micronesians have also become permanent residents in large numbers, and also move in that direction as well.

Of the Pacific Islander immigrant groups, Micronesians were the most prominent in the education statistics, since the largest proportion of their population came to attend college. Some Micronesians approached tertiary education rather haphazardly. In fact, a superficial reading might lead to the conclusion that many were enjoying the "trip" referred to earlier in the migration section. A study published in 1977 noted that a "review of the colleges attended by most Micronesian students reveals that acceptance is not a major obstacle since most of the institutions, with all due respect, are likely candidates for the 'Who's Who' of obscure American Colleges" (Harlan 1977, p. 3). In fact, Harlan further noted that many of these colleges were "low quality institutions that are dependent on federally aided students for a large part of their income" (1977, p. 17).

On the other hand, many of the Micronesian students had no specific educational goals or selected unrealistic paths of study. For example, Tun and Sigrah (1975, p. 21) noted for Hawaii "that 90 percent [of the Micronesian students] want to be teachers, even though there are too many teachers in Micronesia." (What was true in 1975 may no longer be true.)

A later study found that students in business accounted for 21 percent of college students, while others studied education (17 percent), political and social science (13 percent), health sciences (12 percent),

agriculture and marine resources (4 percent), and engineering and law (4 percent) (TTPI Bulletin of Statistics 1977, p. 32). Part of the selection probably came from job expectations as perceived by the students or as dictated by their governments.

Why Some Can't Adapt: The Problem of Language Acquisition and Use: Although the 1980 census data showed that Pacific Islander immigrants were proficient in English (Table 9.8), each respondent assessed his or her own ability. That is, no objective measure of English language ability for non-English speakers existed.

Only about 7 out of every 10 Pacific Islanders in the United States in 1980 spoke English at home, compared to 89 percent of the general population. Hawaiians skewed the Pacific Islander data since more than 90 percent of that group spoke English at home. Some "noise" may be in the data, in fact, since only 81 percent of the Hawaiians who spoke a language other than English at home spoke an Asian or Pacific Islander language.

Only half of the Guamanians spoke English at home, less than one-fourth of the Samoans, one-fifth of the "other" Micronesians, and only 1 in 8 of the Tongans.

Most of those who did not speak English at home spoke an Asian or Pacific Islander language, ranging from 96 percent of the Samoans to 77 percent of the Guamanians. Almost 80 percent of the Hawaiians who spoke an Asian and Pacific Islander language spoke Hawaiian. About 98 percent of the Samoans in this category spoke Samoan, 96 percent of the Guamanians spoke Chamorro, and most Tongans spoke Tongan. About 11 percent of the "other" Micronesians spoke Chamorro at home (presumably persons from the Northern Mariana Islands), and most others spoke other Micronesian languages.

The 6 in 10 of the Pacific Islanders over 17 years old and speaking an Asian or Pacific Islander language in 1980 who also spoke English very well included more than 7 of every 10 Hawaiians and Guamanians. On the other hand, only slightly more than half of the adult Samoans spoke English very well. This lack of English-speaking ability was more prominent among "other" Micronesians (only 46 percent speaking English very well), and Tongans (36 percent) (Table 9.9).

The standard of English proficiency that many migrants achieve on their home islands is often inadequate for employment in the United States. Samoan immigrant parents often cite their children's improved English ability as a primary reason to immigrate to the United States. Many of these parents, however, want their children to know the Samoan language and to continue to use it at home (Maga/1964).

The Samoan language remains in use in Samoan households. Shu and Satele found (1977, p. 39) that 86 percent of respondents spoke Sa-

TABLE 9.8

Language Spoken at Home for Persons 5 Years and Over for Pacific Islanders: 1980

Language Spoken at Home	United States (in 000's)	Total Pacific Islander	Hawaiian	Samoan	Tongan	Guamanian	Other Micronesian
IN HOUSEHOLDS	210,247	223,974	151,046	32,508	5,171	26,465	3,757
Speak only English at home	187,187	159,537	136,152	7,538	645	13,313	755
Percent	89.0	71.2	90.1	23.2	12.5	50.3	20.1
Speak a language other than English at home	23,060	64,437	14,894	24,970	4,526	13,152	3,002
Speak Asian/Pacific Islander language	(NA)	55,647	12,057	24,055	3,580	10,183	2,422
Percent	(NA)	86.4	81.0	96.3	79.1	77.4	80.7
Speak other language	(NA)	8,790	2,837	915	946	2,969	580

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-C1, Table 99, PC80-2-1E.

NA: Not available.

TABLE 9.9

Ability to Speak English for Persons 18 Years and Over for Pacific Islanders: 1980

Ability to Speak English	Total Pacific Islander	Hawaiian	Samoan	Tongan	Guamanian	Other Micronesian
ersons 18 + years	41,646	10,178	15,707	2,294	8,958	1,990
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Speak English:						
Very well	60.6	71.4	53.9	36.4	71.7	45.8
Well	29.3	23.5	32.6	37.2	24.1	44.7
Not well	8.7	4.9	11.5	22.1	3.7	8.3
Not at all	1.4	0.2	2.1	4.3	0.4	1.2

)URCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-C1, Table 99, PC80-2-1E.

moan in their homes. About the same proportion considered Samoan to be their first language. Only 8 percent of this sample reported that they were unable to speak English at all. The authors concluded that about half of the respondents either were not fluent in English or could not speak it. However, 43 percent of the sample householders would consider using an interpreter to help explain medical problems to an English-speaking doctor (Shu and Satele 1977, p. 40).

Micronesians also have difficulties with the language transition. At two Oregon colleges, for example, the "students tend to be shy and embarrassed by their perceived inability to communicate well in English which inhibits the students' abilities to make friends quickly and deters the students from participating in class" (Leinwald 1981, p. vi).

Micronesians by nature do not talk much with strangers or other outsiders in authority (Levin and Naich, manuscript). Frequently Micronesians do not even communicate well among themselves. The problem is less linguistic than cultural—respect for authority requires listening, not speaking. Micronesians offer the classic case of being seen but not heard.

Language data from the language item on the sample show that 67,720 persons spoke a Pacific Islander language at home in 1980 (Table 9.10). Of these, 48,917 (72 percent) spoke Polynesian languages, 17,089 (25 percent spoke Micronesian languages, and 1,174 (3 percent) spoke Melanesian languages. The 27,475 persons speaking Samoan formed the largest Pacific Islander group speaking a specific language. The 13,694 Hawaiian speakers and 12,063 Chamorro speakers were second and third largest groups. Also, 4,857 persons spoke Tongan.

Immigration for Education and Employment: Many Pacific Islanders must work part-time or full-time since financial aid for education is

TABLE 9.10
Pacific Islander Language Spoken at Home: 1980

Language Spoken at Home	Number	Percent	Percent of Group
TOTAL	67,720	(x)	—
Percent	(x)	100.0	—
Polynesian	48,917	72.2	100.0
Samoan	27,475	40.6	56.2
Tongan	4,857	7.2	9.9
Hawaiian	13,694	20.2	28.0
Other Polynesian	2,981	4.4	6.1
Micronesian	17,089	25.2	100.0
Chamorro	12,063	17.8	70.6
Chuukese	508	0.8	3.0
Kosraean	1,239	1.8	7.3
Marshallese	511	0.8	3.0
Palauan	1,027	1.5	6.0
Yapese and Ulithian	687	1.0	4.0
Other Micronesian	1,054	1.6	6.2
Melanesian	1,714	2.5	100.0
Fiji	1,033	1.5	60.3
Other Melanesian	681	1.0	39.7

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census unpublished data.

rarely enough to cover their expenses. As time passes and the Pacific Islanders work but do not remain in or reenter colleges, a kind of *de facto* immigration occurs. Since skills are lacking, English language ability deficient, and because many Pacific Islanders settle in small cities without adequate transportation, most take jobs at and remain in entry-level positions.

Return migration *is* problematic. For American Samoans, for example, a pattern of circular mobility has developed between Hawaii and Samoa, and between the United States mainland and Samoa, particularly for those who adapt less well to American society (Franco 1978; Lyons 1980). Lyons found, for example, "over 40 percent (176 out of 393) [of his sample] had visited some place outside the Samoan Islands and 41 percent (158 out of 384) indicated they had visited Hawaii or the United States mainland" (1980, p. 68). Also, Lyons (1980, p. 72) noted "the relationship between return visiting and migration to American Samoa is an important dimension of the migration streams," with many short visits occurring in his study.

Micronesians have a more difficult time practicing this type of mo-

bility because of the distances and costs (air transportation between Hawaii and Samoa charged at domestic rates, between Micronesia and Hawaii at international rates). Also, the minimum wage in American Samoa is less than in the United States. Rates in Micronesia are even lower, so families are hard pressed to help when Micronesian graduates are ready to return to Micronesia. Many cannot get home, even if they want to go, because they cannot afford a ticket. Finally, as Levin and Naich (manuscript) note, many who want to return have not been thoroughly "redeemed," and therefore cannot easily return to "face the music."

As Pacific Islanders have trouble adjusting to labor force participation in the United States, many also have difficulty adjusting to the different circumstances in their home areas if they return. Serious psychological and financial risks exist for Pacific Islanders who try to adjust to the island life-style, particularly abandonment of the more material aspects of the West—MTV and movies and tape recorders. In fact, ". . . return migrants, despite or more probably because of the status (in the modern and nontraditional sense) they have gained from migration, are a 'source of dissatisfaction with village life and the predominantly subsistence economy' (Meleisea and Meleisea 1980, p. 37), introduce new discontents, values and aspirations, do not settle long themselves and induce others to follow their lead" (Connell 1984, p. 24). Naich (personal communication), however, notes that "returnees who are not part of the *status quo* or the Establishment tend to bark like some restless mad dog. They tend to move to the left (hence, viewed as troublemakers). But they shut their mouths up once they're absorbed into the system, or once they create their own 'Establishment'."

Also, as the Pacific Islanders find limited economic opportunities in the United States, many of the problems with potential return have to do with a different kind of limited employment opportunities. Some Micronesians on Pohnpei, for example, do not engage in subsistence activities, but desire only "continued and increased access to the goods and prestige provided by employment" (Petersen 1979, p. 37). In a study of Palauans in Hawaii, Vitarelli found that "if and when the subjects return to Palau, the overwhelming majority want to work in upper level white-collar jobs . . . Unfortunately, however, it seems likely that there won't be enough jobs for all who return to Palau looking for them" (1981, p. 18). Very few jobs are available in Micronesia, for example. Many of the available jobs are filled in recent years by those persons having only limited education. These people will not be retiring for many years, leaving the increasing numbers of educated young people with few job prospects.

Thompson summarizes the increased expectations of Micronesians:". . . an army of agriculture graduates will do nothing for agricul-

tural production if they are only content to work as government extension agents but are unwilling to farm" (1981, p. 4). Thompson also notes that if returning students have impossibly high expectations, "returnees become more, not less, dependent on the government for their livelihood" (1981, p. 4).

Employment

Pacific Islanders seek jobs, not careers: Those Pacific Islander immigrants who do stay must adapt to the marketplace to compete. Pacific Islander immigrants, partly because they lack a commitment to immigration and want to maintain cultural ties with their sending islands, find themselves in a dilemma. Labor force participation in American society centers on the market economy. The socioeconomic position occupied by most of the population reflects an ability to compete in labor markets as well as fluctuations in the market demand for labor. Most Pacific Islanders try to enter labor markets containing large numbers of other immigrants (particularly Asians and Mexicans) with similar aspirations and abilities. Obviously, markets are highly competitive for the few Western-oriented skills that many Pacific Islander immigrants have. Furthermore, these markets have probably become more competitive in recent years as the American economy has moved through various recessions. The assessment of the socioeconomic position of Pacific Islanders must therefore consider the structural and institutional factors influencing how they find work.

Different Pacific Islander groups participate in the labor market in different ways, depending partly on the migration flow and partly on cultural circumstances. Micronesians, for example, arrive mostly as single individuals and do not have to worry about supporting families. Sometimes an extended family of sorts develops when students or former students force other Micronesians to support them. Some of these dropouts (or "drop-ins") have worked, "but others—unable to continue school and unwilling to return home—spent their time living off other students: borrowing money, and living and eating in student apartments without paying rent" (Tun and Sigrah 1975, p. 25).

Tongan immigrants, like Samoan and Chamorro immigrants, come as family units. In her study of Tongan immigrants to Salt Lake City, Chapman found that all households communally redistributed incomes, continuing the extended family structure found in Tonga (1972, p. vii). Samoans in Hawaii were more like the Tongan example than Samoans in California, closer to the U.S. average (Hayes and Levin 1984a).

Labor Force Participation: In 1980, 62 percent of the persons 16

years and older in the United States were in the labor force. All the Pacific Islander groups except Micronesians had close to or greater proportions in the labor force. About 71 percent of Tongans, for example, were in the labor force, followed closely by 70 percent of Guamanians. Hawaiians and Samoans had percentages similar to those of the United States population with 65 percent and 60 percent, respectively.

Major differences existed in male and female labor force participation, but these paralleled the differences for the total United States. For males, in fact, the percentage of Pacific Islander males in the labor force was slightly greater than for the total United States (76 percent compared to 75 percent). Fully 86 percent of all adult Tongan males were in the labor force, as were 81 percent of Guamanian males. On the other hand, only 69 percent of "other" Micronesian males were in the labor force. More than half of all Pacific Islander females in 1980 were in the labor force. Guamanians had the largest proportion at 58 percent, and "other" Micronesians the lowest at 39 percent. The proportion of females in the labor force was smaller than for males for all groups. Although the patterns for males did not vary very much, significant differences existed for females. Micronesian and Samoan females 16 years and over had the lowest proportions in the labor force, while Guamanians and Tongans had higher proportions in the labor force.

The unemployment rates for 1980 are only of historical interest now. Although a slightly higher percentage of Pacific Islander males were unemployed (7.5 percent) than for the United States (6.5 percent), more than 9 percent of the Tongan, Samoan, and "other" Micronesian males were unemployed. Although the percentage unemployed was the same for both sexes in the United States, Pacific Islander females were less likely to be unemployed than males. Samoan females, for example, were more likely than males to be unemployed. For most of the other groups, males had higher unemployment. The rates for Tongans were widest—9.3 percent of the males, but only 4.3 percent of the females being unemployed.

All Pacific Islander groups except Tongan and Micronesian females had unemployment rates higher than the U.S. average in the 1980 census. As the impact of the Compacts of Free Association begins, more Micronesian immigrants will probably come for schooling. Micronesians will also come to work since they can flow freely into and out of the United States. Labor force participation rates and unemployment rates could increase.

Although the recorded rates were fairly low in 1980, for Samoans at least, studies describe unemployment as one of the major problems Samoans face in the United States. Part of the unemployment problem for Samoans occurs because of lack of prior training and language skills, and

because of negative stereotyping. Also, many Samoans live in Honolulu, San Francisco, and southern California. These areas of high competition attract other immigrant groups seeking the same unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. Franco (1984), for example, has examined the relationship between low educational attainment of Samoans and high unemployment. He found that the U.S. school system, combined with problems with the English language, has not led to completely successful socialization.

Researchers site Samoan unemployment rates ranging from 29 percent (Shu and Satele 1977, p. 69–70) up to 65 percent (informant quoted by Maatz 1978). The Census Bureau defines labor force participation in a very specific way. The census does not include as part of the labor force persons who have stopped looking for work because they have become discouraged, become unpaid family baby sitters or household workers, or are working for a matai or other leader in the community without pay. Unemployment rates include them in neither the numerators nor denominators. These persons may be in the labor force but unemployed in the surveys taken by Shu and Satele and others. Since the labor force definition differs, comparisons with census rates are not always possible. The very high rates other researchers get at least show Samoan perceptions of high unemployment.

Sometimes "unemployment" is actually unpaid employment. For example, Ablon found that Samoans with young children make every effort to have overlapping jobs to watch the children. However, even then, they may need a baby sitter. They might recruit one of the relatives from home. "These young women share the economic fortunes of the family with whom they live. Most eventually go on to jobs outside of the household, frequently as nurses' aides in the same institutions where older women of their households work" (Ablon 1970, p. 79).

Several Pacific Islands' cultural factors contribute to this perceived high unemployment. Since Islanders pool and redistribute incomes, family members can become alienated, leading to youthful "unemployment, underemployment and undereducation" (Rolff 1978, p. 224). The repercussions of reducing job commitments and concomitant income are minor, and "sanctions are limited usually to scoldings and demands that they find work" (Rolff 1978, p. 220).

The dual factors of job sharing and job covering also affect unemployment rates. For example, if Pacific Islander employees take leave for a feast or a funeral, "others will willingly assume the extra tasks" (Lewthwaite et al. 1973, p. 151). Similarly, Pacific Islanders frequently move in and out of the work force for one reason or another, with other family members or other members of the Pacific Islander community replacing them.

Also, as Omari notes, "Low paying jobs . . . do not add to the prosperity and status of the household, nor do jobs where opportunities for advancement are limited . . . Consequently, the Samoans are under criticism by the community for having thirty percent of their people on welfare and an unemployment rate of 36.3 percent" (Omari 1972, p. 10).

Class of Worker: Pacific Islander groups had proportions of private wage and salary workers that did not differ much from the 76 percent for the United States in 1980. On the other hand, Hawaiians (7 percent), Samoans (8 percent), and especially Guamanians (16 percent) were employed as federal workers in far greater proportions than the 4 percent for the total United States. Nearly 5 percent of all workers in the United States worked for state government, compared to 9 percent of all Hawaiians. Also, 16 percent of Micronesians worked for state government (the latter being notable, since the 291 Micronesians in this category were probably non-citizens in 1980).

Occupation and Industry: Table 9.11 shows occupations by sex. For both sexes combined, for the managerial and professional occupations, all Pacific Islander groups except Hawaiian (17 percent) were far below the 23 percent for the total United States. Although 30 percent of the United States' population were employed in technical, sales, and administrative occupations, smaller proportions of Tongans (19 percent) and Micronesians (23 percent) and a larger percentage of Guamanians (34 percent) were employed in this category. On the other hand, 34 percent of all Micronesians, 26 percent of Tongans, and 22 percent of Hawaiians had service occupations, considerably above the 13 percent for the total United States. Also, although 18 percent of the United States' employed population were operators, fabricators, and laborers, 27 percent of the Samoans and 25 percent of the Tongans had these occupations.

At 18 percent, Pacific Islander males were twice as likely as U.S. males in general (9 percent) to be in service occupations in 1980. Pacific Islander males were more likely to be operators, fabricators, and laborers, but less likely to be managers and professionals or technicians. Pacific Islander females were even more likely to be in service occupations than the total U.S. population. More than 1 in every 4 Pacific Islander women had service occupations, compared to about 1 in 6 for the total population.

Again, there have been very few independent studies of Pacific Islander occupations. Most evidence suggests that Pacific Islanders remain at entry-level occupations. For example, the "employment of Tongans in Salt Lake (City) has not reached the point where it could be termed specialization. Most of the jobs can be learned rapidly by anyone; custodian, seamstress, laundress, landscaper" (Chapman 1972, p. 92).

TABLE 9.11

Occupation for Pacific Islanders: 1980

Occupation	United States (in 000's)	Total Pacific Islander	Hawaiian	Samoan	Tongan	Guamanian	Other Micronesian
EMPLOYED MALES							
16 years +	56,005	54,029	37,201	6,476	1,470	6,435	1,119
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Manag. and prof. specialties	23.6	15.1	16.0	11.8	10.7	13.6	13.6
Tech, sales, and admin.	19.0	15.9	15.2	16.4	11.9	20.7	14.8
Service occupations	9.2	17.6	17.1	17.3	22.4	16.3	35.0
Farm, forestry, fish	4.3	4.7	5.2	2.9	10.2	2.6	5.0
Precision production, craft and repair occupations	20.7	19.5	19.7	17.6	16.8	22.5	13.0
Operators, fabricators and laborers	23.2	27.2	26.8	34.0	28.0	24.2	18.6
EMPLOYED FEMALES							
16 years +	41,634	43,789	31,198	4,622	811	5,531	538
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Manag. and prof. specialties	21.5	16.1	17.3	13.3	10.9	13.6	13.4
Tech, sales, and admin.	45.6	43.7	43.9	40.4	32.6	50.4	40.5
Service occupations	17.9	26.1	27.1	23.2	32.2	20.6	27.5
Farm, forest, fish	1.0	1.0	1.1	0.3	0.6	0.3	3.7
Precision production, craft and repair occupations	2.3	2.6	1.9	5.3	3.5	3.5	4.1
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	11.7	10.5	8.7	17.4	20.3	11.5	10.8

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-C1, Table 104, PC80-2-1E.

Also, Pacific Islanders seek jobs that are people-oriented, rather than machine-oriented. If one or a set of relatives starts working for a particular corporation or agency, however, others will frequently follow. The families, and community in general, work as employment agencies. For example, "The gravitation of Samoan men into ship-building, metal-jobbing and construction work and of women into nursing thus reflects more than chance or even prior experience at Pago Pago or Pearl Harbor, and these strong patterns of family and community guidance are also evinced in the characteristic clusterings of Samoan employment" (Lewthwaite et al. 1973, p. 151).

Rolff (1978, pp. 177–178) has compared military and civilian employment, and the relationship between the two. She notes Samoans like service industries and occupations because they "ensure residential adaptability" and "wages appear to be high in comparison to those in the Armed Forces" (1978, pp. 177–178). Rolff also notes that these jobs are less secure than the military since the former sometimes involve layoffs and lack fringe benefits. Rolff concludes, "the employment shift had thus contributed to the increased marginalization of Samoans in the American economy."

In 1980, the largest proportion (22 percent) of the employed population in the United States 16 years and over was working in manufacturing industries. The largest proportions of Guamanians (24 percent), Samoans (23 percent), and Tongans (20 percent) were also in these industries. The largest proportions of Hawaiians, however, were in retail trade and professional and related services (health, education, and other professional services). About 38 percent of employed Micronesians were in professional and related services compared to 20 percent of the total U.S. employed population. Also, 29 percent of the total Micronesian population were working in education compared to 9 percent for the total U.S. population. Of course, many of these employed persons may have been students, and were working on or near their college campuses. Other large proportions of Micronesians were also working in retail trade (18 percent) and manufacturing industries (17 percent).

In general, the distribution of the Pacific Islander work force differed considerably from the work force of the total United States in 1980. For example, although 14 percent of the employed in the United States were in the manufacturing of durable goods, 18 percent of Guamanians worked in these industries (although only 6 percent of the Hawaiians were making durable goods). Hawaii, where most Hawaiians work, has few durable goods manufacturers. Also, while 4 percent of the U.S. population was in personal, entertainment, and recreational industries, 6 percent of the Guamanians worked in these industries. On the other hand, other Pacific Islander populations—Micronesians (9 percent), Sa-

moans (9 percent), Hawaiians (10 percent), and Tongans (16 percent)—were in these industries in more than double the proportions of the total U.S. population. Also, 5 percent of the United States population was employed in public administration, compared to 10 percent of the Hawaiians and 11 percent of the Guamanians.

Labor Force Participation in All of 1979: Until now, the discussion of labor force participation has focused on the week before enumeration (or April 1, 1980). The 1980 census also asked a series of questions on labor force participation during all of 1979. The use of a full year allowed analysis of movement into and out of the labor force over the year (using weeks worked and weeks of unemployment). Full- and part-time employment came from hours usually worked per week.

All Pacific Islander groups except Micronesians did full- and part-time work in about the same proportions as the rest of the country. For the United States, 98 percent of all persons 16 years and over in the labor force in 1979 actually worked at some time in 1979. Also, of the total persons, 59 percent worked 50 or more weeks, and 26 percent worked less than 40 weeks. Among the Micronesians, only 37 percent worked 50 or more weeks, while fully 48 percent worked less than 40 weeks. All Pacific Islander groups experienced more unemployment at some time during 1979 than the U.S. average of 19 percent of the work force. Also, all groups had higher proportions of workers unemployed for 15 or more weeks than the total U.S. population.

Only about 6 in 10 Pacific Islander males worked the whole year in 1979, compared to about 2 in 3 for the total U.S. population (Table 9.12). Fewer than 4 in 10 of the "other" Micronesian males worked the whole year (while more than 1 in 3 worked less than half the year). Many of these Micronesians were students so presumably could work for only part of the year. Pacific Islander males were also more likely to be unemployed at some time during the year than was the total U.S. male population.

About half of the Pacific Islander females worked the whole year, about the same proportion as the U.S. population in general. However, only about 3 in every 10 "other" Micronesian females worked the whole year. Also, the Pacific Islander females were more likely than the total U.S. population to be unemployed at some time during 1989.

About 1 in every 5 Pacific Islanders worked part-time (1 to 34 hours per week) in 1979. Only "other" Micronesians varied considerably from this average. About 2 in every 5 of them worked part-time.

About 4 in every 10 U.S. families in 1979 had 2 workers, and another one-third had 1 worker. These proportions were about the same for Pacific Islanders. On the other hand, a slightly smaller proportion of

TABLE 9.12

Labor Force Status in 1979 for Pacific Islanders: 1980

Labor Force Status in 1979	United States (in 000's)	Total Pacific Islander	Hawaiian	Samoan	Tongan	Guamanian	Other Micronesian
MALE, 16+ IN LABOR FORCE							
1979	65,770	68,116	45,521	8,894	1,666	9,117	1,432
Worked in 1979	64,868	66,476	44,500	8,554	1,630	8,939	1,407
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
50 to 52 weeks	66.5	60.8	62.1	60.0	61.3	59.9	38.5
27 to 49 weeks	19.4	21.6	21.1	21.7	21.1	22.4	25.5
1 to 26 weeks	14.1	17.6	16.8	18.3	17.5	17.7	36.0
With unemployment in 1979	11,758	14,627	9,343	2,121	443	1,921	405
Percent	17.9	21.5	20.5	23.8	26.6	21.1	28.3
FEMALE, 16+ IN LABOR FORCE							
1979	50,796	53,511	37,896	5,852	965	6,764	819
Worked in 1979	49,610	51,554	36,655	5,479	912	6,536	796
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
50 to 52 weeks	50.9	49.4	51.2	43.6	53.7	46.2	30.2
27 to 49 weeks	25.4	24.6	24.1	25.4	15.9	27.6	23.9
1 to 26 weeks	23.8	26.0	24.6	31.0	30.4	26.2	46.0
With unemployment in 1979	9,912	12,079	7,855	1,760	218	1,680	231
Percent	19.5	22.6	20.7	30.1	22.6	24.8	28.2

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-C1, Table 106, PC80-2-1E.

Pacific Islanders had no family workers in 1979, and a slightly larger proportion had 3 or more workers.

More family members would still be welcome in the house even if the educational attainment and economic status of Pacific Islanders were not lower than for the total United States. Extended families are common among Pacific Islanders, causing both more workers and dependents per family. Shu and Satele note, "it may also be a matter of economic necessity that relatives find it more advantageous to live together rather than separately" (1977, p. 33). Finally, because of the extended family, and since some of the immigrants may not be able legally to get welfare benefits, fewer families would have no workers.

The Tongans—the group least likely to have legal status—had the lowest proportion of families with no workers (2 percent) and the largest percentages of families with 3 or more workers (20 percent). Less than 10 percent of the Guamanians and Micronesians had no family workers. All groups had proportions of families with 3 or more workers per family above the U.S. average, once again, probably because of the continuation of the extended family ethos.

Income and Poverty

Income: The 80.5 million households in the United States in 1980 had a 1979 median income of $16,800 and a mean income of $20,300 (Table 9.13). Hawaiians ($16,600), Tongans ($16,200), Guamanians ($16,900), all had median incomes above $16,000 in 1979. Samoans at $13,800 and Micronesians at $11,100, however, were significantly below the United States average. Similarly, although none of the Pacific Islander groups had mean incomes above the U.S. average, Samoans ($16,500) and Micronesians ($13,000) were considerably below the U.S. mean. Family income showed similar patterns. Tongan family income did not differ very much from Tongan household income since few Tongans lived alone or only with non-relatives. Tongan family income, then, was more than $3,000 below the median for the total United States.

None of the groups approached the United States' total per capita income of $7,300. The per capita income of Hawaiians was $5,700, that of Guamanians was $5,500, of Tongans was $3,700, of Samoans was $3,600, and of Micronesians was $3,000 (less than half the U.S. total).

As noted earlier in the section on work in 1979, Pacific Islanders tended to work fewer weeks and fewer hours per week than the total United States population. Therefore, their income levels were lower. Rolff (1978, p. 147) notes, for example, "Many of the employed . . . hold marginal positions in the American economy as they work in factory and

TABLE 9.13

Income in 1979 of Pacific Islanders: 1980

Income in 1979	United States (in 000's)	Total Pacific Islander	Hawaiian	Samoan	Tongan	Guamanian	Other Micronesian
FAMILIES	59,190	52,785	36,153	6,963	1,236	6,543	738
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than $5,000	7.3	9.3	8.7	13.1	6.1	7.9	16.4
$5,000–$9,999	13.1	15.3	14.3	20.2	20.5	12.6	24.7
$10,000–$14,499	14.7	16.4	15.2	19.1	18.0	19.1	24.4
$15,000–$19,999	15.1	14.3	13.8	14.5	15.2	16.2	14.0
$20,000–$24,999	14.3	13.2	13.7	10.3	18.8	13.3	10.4
$25,000–$34,999	19.1	17.7	18.6	14.3	12.5	19.3	4.2
$35,000–$49,999	10.7	10.0	11.3	6.6	5.5	8.6	4.5
$50,000 or more	5.6	3.8	4.4	1.8	3.5	3.0	1.5
Median (dollars)	NA	17,984	19,196	14,242	16,717	18,218	(NA)
Mean (dollars)	———	20,616	21,495	16,968	18,587	20,959	(NA)
Married-couple families	48,990	39,811	26,474	5,428	1,172	5,206	538
Median (dollars)	NA	20,847	22,242	16,276	16,793	19,847	(NA)
Mean (dollars)	———	23,123	24,478	18,801	18,698	22,905	(NA)
Female H/H, no husband present	8,205	10,225	7,701	1,267	46	960	124
Median (dollars)	NA	8,340	8,600	6,647	18,929	9,550	(NA)
Mean (dollars)	———	11,561	1,200	9,030	17,677	11,650	(NA)
Per capita income (dollars)	7,298	5,220	5,691	3,573	3,671	5,533	(NA)

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-C1, Table 107, PC80-2-1E.

service jobs subject to frequent layoffs or high turnover rates. These people's incomes are therefore fluctuating and unreliable."

Also, Pacific Islanders have difficulty amassing any wealth because of societal demands. Lower household and family incomes, and much lower per capita rates reflect this income dispersion. The social impacts are less readily seen in the statistics, but are still there. Often, an individual must by custom give up material goods or income he may want for himself or his family to maintain cultural equilibrium.

Income levels, while low, are still higher than those found in the U.S. outlying areas (although the standard of living is also lower in most of the territories). In fact, increased financial opportunity is often the reason for immigration (Harbison 1986, p. 89).

Remittances: Many Pacific Islander migrants, like their Asian counterparts, send money back to their families in the home countries. These monies are remittances. The 1980 Census could not measure remittances directly since the census collected only income. In theory, data on Samoan remittances to American Samoa, at least, could come from that concurrent census. However, "remittances" was not a separate category on the American Samoa questionnaire in 1980 (although it will be in 1990). The category that was available, "income from other sources," showed households who received "other income" receiving an average of $4,300 during 1979 (Summary Tape File 3A, Tables 71 and 72). The 1980 census did not collect "remittances" data from the other U.S. territories, but the 1990 census collected the data.

The tradition of remittances among Pacific Islanders has been most prominent among the Samoans, whose strong family ties remain unbroken by separations due to military enlistment or migration for work or sub-family unification. A large part of the early nonmilitary Samoan migration was to New Zealand, and the decision to migrate was not always the individual's alone. For example, Graves et al. found that only about half of the men and 16 percent of the women immigrated on their own initiative. Families commonly sent their single daughters to New Zealand, since they were more likely than sons to send remittances home. Families paid more than 3 out of every 4 fares (Graves et al. 1983, p. 14). Ieremia (1971) and Lyons (1980, p. 144) have also discussed the encouragement of migration for remittances for the United States Samoan community. Further, Ala'ilima and Stover discuss a Samoan male who joined the military to escape an uncle's pressure to give up all his previous civilian income. "Of the $280 he earned the first month, he kept $80 and sent $200 to his parents [in American Samoa]" (1986, p. 125).

Remittances have monetary importance since they increase the lower incomes received in the territories (except Guam). They also have social value in reinforcing kinship and other social and economic ties. Again,

most of the research in this area is on Samoans. Ala'ilima and Stover record, for example, that one Samoan sends money back to Samoa because "if she did not respond she would no longer 'feel like a Samoan.' It is important to her sense of identity to continue to be an active member of her family of origin even though she may never return" (1986, p. 142).

Poverty: Although 17.0 percent of all persons in the United States were below poverty level, and only 13.9 percent of Guamanians and 15.8 percent of Hawaiians, 21.8 percent of Tongans, 29.5 percent of Samoans, and 37.9 percent of Micronesians were below poverty in 1979 (Table 9.14).

The data for families in poverty were equally striking for some groups. About 13.4 percent of all families in the United States in 1979 were below poverty level, compared to 11.6 percent of the Guamanian families, 14.3 percent of Hawaiian, 18.0 percent of Tongans, 25.5 percent of Micronesian and 27.7 percent of Samoan families.

Conclusions

Pacific Islanders in the United States in 1980 made up about one-tenth of 1 percent of the total United States population. Hawaiians were the majority of this minuscule population, making the Pacific Islander immigrant population even tinier. Yet, the 1980 and 1990 censuses both included separate entries for Samoans and Guamanians, showing their importance to federal agencies. Tongans, Micronesians, and other Pacific Islander groups also received special attention.

Many Pacific Islander immigrants come to the United States as part of a "trip," a traditional transition to adulthood. Some of the Islanders join the military and end up settling in the United States permanently. Other Islanders migrate for schooling, and then marry, have children, and settle here. Others come as family units. Many of these families, like most immigrants, come poor, and "look" very poor in the census statistics.

Part of this perceived poverty exists because Pacific Islanders are younger and have larger households and families and higher fertility than the rest of the U.S. population. As noted earlier, traditional social structure and the physical structure of the housing units influence Pacific Islander households and families in the United States. Once again, Pacific Islander immigrant extended families remain strong and cohesive, with fluid household composition.

The continuum of labor force participation and general adaptability

TABLE 9.14

Income in 1979 below Poverty Level for Pacific Islanders: 1980

Poverty Status in 1979	United States (in 000's)	Total Pacific Islander	Hawaiian	Samoan	Tongan	Guamanian	Other Micronesian
PERSONS 15 YRS + FOR WHOM POVERTY DETERMINED	(NA)	28,304	17,059	5,751	622	2,836	1,245
Percent below poverty level	(NA)	16.4	14.4	25.5	17.5	13.9	37.9
Percent female	(NA)	59.6	64.1	54.7	48.4	56.1	NA
FAMILIES	7,919	8,479	5,174	1,917	223	761	193
Percent below poverty level	13.4	16.1	14.3	27.5	18.0	11.6	25.5

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, PC80-1-C1, Table 108, PC80-2-1E.

among Pacific Islanders shows that the farther from the Pacific Islands in time, space, and orientation, the more integrated into American society. Because this chapter is already very long, data by U.S. targeted immigration area are not presented. In another paper (Levin, manuscript), data for Samoans in American Samoa, Hawaii, and California show the continuums of adaptation for time, space, and orientation.

The census data on Samoans in 1980, for example, show that although many Samoans in California were in the lower levels of employment, they were firmly in the labor force. In Hawaii much larger proportions were unemployed or, as yet, unemployable (Hayes and Levin 1984a). Since many Samoans and other Pacific Islanders in Hawaii have left their islands only physically, psychologically remaining at home, continuing extended family structure, they may not assimilate as much. Families so much larger than the U.S. average are almost certain to have different life-styles as well.

Pacific Islanders often stay in entry-level employment positions to balance traditional and Western cultural constraints. However, frequently the Western constraints far outweigh the traditional ones. Connell's statement about Pacific Islanders in general is probably true for the United States immigrants:

> Most migrants from the South Pacific, including some of those with skills, are in the 'secondary segment' of the labor force . . . where social, institutional and economic barriers prevent movement into the 'primary segment' so that they remain in unskilled jobs with low wages, unstable tenure, poor working conditions, few benefits, high unemployment and low unionisation (1984, p. 42).

That Pacific Islanders were disproportionately in poverty is clear from the 1980 census data. What is less clear is how to interpret income levels in cultural terms—both the Western and the Pacific Islander terms. Samoans in Samoa, at least, expect remittances. If these remittances were to show up in the income and poverty statistics, the economic situation of Samoans would look even worse. The financial loss, however, is often offset by the cultural gain.

Therefore, the Pacific Islander community continues to look inward for financial and social reinforcement:

> Though modified in different settings, the *faaSamoa* continues to be maintained in response to institutional racism, some individual prejudice, and the deprivation of economic and social rewards which result from these conditions. That Samoans in the United States once again adhere to the *faaSaoma* is not simply a matter of conservatism, but rather of poverty and lack of social recognition from non-Samoans. The

> various Samoan social networks, ceremonial redistributions, and modified forms of traditional social inequality are all means of coping with such deprivation (Rolff 1978, p. 8).

Since the 1980 Census was the first to provide data for all groups except Hawaiians, the 1990 Census will be the first decennial census to permit tracing trends for Pacific Islander immigrants. In a few years, when these new data become available, we will be able to assess the statistical changes in the Pacific Islander community. That will be the time to start testing hypotheses. That will also be the time for Pacific Islanders to consider their place in American society, where they have been, and where they are. Pacific Islanders, both individually and collectively, will then have to assess if they want to be part of the traditional-Western continuum.