

Community Impacts of Migration: Recent Ilokano Migration to Hawai'i

Amefil R. Agbayani

Immigration has been and continues to be of great importance to Hawaii's social and economic life. The 1980 census shows 14.2 percent of the state's population is foreign born. With the 1965 amendments to U.S. immigration laws, Hawai'i has received more immigrants proportional to population than any other state and over four times the national average. Over 80 percent of these immigrants are Asian; over half are from the Philippines. Of those from the Philippines, most are from the Ilocos provinces.

The first section of this article is a brief overview of immigration to Hawai'i historically and currently. The final section will present findings of a portion of a study on Ilokano migration conducted by the East-West Population Institute and the Institute of Philippine Culture of Ateneo de Manila University.

Migration, 1850-1975

When viewed historically, the 14.2 percent foreign born population of Hawai'i in the 1980s is relatively small. A major part of Hawaii's history can be summarized by information on place of birth of persons from 1853 through 1975 (see Table 1). In the 1850s, when American whalers used Hawai'i ports for provisioning their ships, 97 percent of the population were Hawaiians born in Hawai'i, 1 percent were U.S. born Caucasians, and 2 percent were foreign born Europeans and Chinese.

By 1900 there were dramatic changes: 38 percent Hawai'i born (Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian); 3 percent U.S. mainland born (Caucasian missionaries, plantation owners and military); and 60 percent foreign born (Japanese, Chinese and Portuguese immigrant plantation workers). By 1940, a majority of the population (66%) was Hawai'i born (mostly Hawaiians, part-Hawaiians and children of Portuguese, Japanese, Chinese and Korean immigrants); 13 percent mainland U.S. born (Caucasians in business and the military); and 21 percent foreign born (Filipino and Japanese immigrants). The proportion of foreign born in Hawai'i has decreased from the 1900 high of 58.9 percent to a low of 9.8 percent in 1970.

The effects of implementing the 1965 amendments to the immigration laws are reflected in the 1975 data which show an increase over the 1970 data. The 1975 distribution is 65 percent Hawai'i born (Caucasian, Hawaiian, Japanese,

Table 1
Population of Hawaii by Place of Birth, 1853-1975
(Based on national boundaries as of 1978)

| | 1853 | 1900 | 1920 | 1940 | 1960 | 1970 | 1975 |
|----------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Total | 73,138 | 154,001 | 255,912 | 423,330 | 632,772 | 768,559 | 833,449 |
| Native Born | 72,002 | 63,221 | 149,943 | 334,939 | 563,875 | 692,964 | 724,758 |
| Hawaii | 71,310 | 58,931 | 136,349 | 278,506 | 421,168 | 455,060 | 536,709 |
| Mainland U.S. | 692 | 4,238 | 10,816 | 54,224 | 128,992 | 178,531 | 181,000 |
| U.S. territory | — | 52 | 2,778 | 2,209 | 4,965 | 17,286 | 7,049 |
| Not reported | — | — | — | — | 8,750 | 42,087 | — |
| Foreign Born | 1,136 | 0,780 | 105,969 | 88,391 | 68,897 | 75,595 | 105,765 |
| China | 364 | 21,741 | 11,164 | 4,868 | 3,541 | 4,663 | 7,169 |
| Indochina | — | — | — | — | — | — | 3,159 |
| Japan | — | 56,234 | 60,690 | 37,362 | 24,658 | 19,685 | 24,144 |
| Korea | — | — | 3,498 | 2,454 | 1,124 | 2,063 | 4,901 |
| Philippines | 5 | — | 18,728 | 35,778 | 28,649 | 3,175 | 48,029 |
| Other | 767 | 12,805 | 11,889 | 7,929 | 10,925 | 16,009 | 18,363 |
| Not reported | — | — | — | — | — | — | 2,925 |
| Percent | | | | | | | |
| Hawaii | 97.5 | 8.3 | 53.3 | 65.8 | 66.6 | 59.2 | 64.4 |
| Mainland | 0.9 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 12.8 | 20.4 | 23.2 | 21.7 |
| Foreign | 1.6 | 58.9 | 41.4 | 20.9 | 10.9 | 9.8 | 12.7 |

Source: Nordyke 1977.

Filipino, Korean and Chinese); 22 percent mainland U.S. born (mostly Caucasian); and 13 percent foreign born (primarily Filipino and Japanese).

Post-1965 Migration to Hawai'i

The 1965 amendments to the immigration and nationality laws reflected major changes in American immigration policy. They abolished the national origin quota system and allowed for family reunification and the entry of professionals and workers identified as needed by the United States. Two significant results were the total increase of immigrants and an increase in the proportion of Asian immigrants. Asians represented one out of fourteen immigrants before the changes and one out of three immigrants after 1965.

The impact on Hawai'i was even more pronounced because of the historical migration from Asia and proximity to Asia. The data on migration to Hawai'i from 1965-1981 is shown in Table 2. This table is limited to immigrants using the technical definition of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and does not include U.S. nationals from Samoa, undocumented persons or other foreign born persons.

The largest number of legal immigrants reporting Hawai'i as their intended residence comes from the Philippines—59,318 or 53.6 percent, followed by Korea—14,000 or 12.7 percent, China/Taiwan (6.6%) and Japan (6.2%). The estimated distribution of immigrants by age and sex (based on 1978 immigration data) shows a large number of children and youth (29% are 17 and under) and a median age of 26.0 for males and 26.6 for females. The male to female ratio is 90 males to 100 females. The vast majority of resident aliens lives on Oahu.

Of Hawaii's 14.2 percent foreign born population, the largest number is from the Philippines (60,555), followed by Japan (22,738). The proportion of foreign born for ethnic groups in Hawai'i is high for the following: Vietnamese (86.0%), Other (62.3%), Korean (54.1%), Filipino (45.8%), Samoan (28.1%) and Chinese (22.1%) (see Table 3).

An analysis of the 1975 Census Update Survey of Hawai'i revealed that recent Asian foreign born persons are in "occupational and income levels far below what would be expected, given their educational levels. Longer residence appears to result in greater improved income, but not occupational improvement" (Wright and Gardner 1983). This same study found that a "high proportion of Filipino immigrants are in both service and agricultural jobs," and that "the availability of immigrants willing to take low-paying service jobs has

Table 2
Immigrants Admitted to Hawaii by Country of Birth
Reporting Hawaii as State of Intended Residence, 1965-1981

| Year | Total | China/ Taiwan | | Korea | | Japan | | Philippines | | Other Countries | |
|-------------------|---------|------------------|-----|-------------------|------|-------|-----|-------------|------|--------------------|------|
| | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 1965-74 | 53771 | 3338 | 6.2 | 4748 ¹ | 8.8 | 3873 | 7.2 | 30651 | 57.0 | 9764 | 18.2 |
| 1975 | 7012 | 555 | 7.9 | 1476 | 21.0 | 587 | 8.4 | 2913 | 41.5 | 1394 | 19.9 |
| 1976 ² | 9671 | 784 | 8.1 | 1793 | 18.5 | 556 | 5.7 | 4081 | 42.2 | 2302 | 23.8 |
| 1977 | 7825 | 527 | 6.7 | 1488 | 19.0 | 495 | 6.3 | 3568 | 45.6 | 1572 | 20.1 |
| 1978 | 9053 | 409 | 4.5 | 965 | 10.7 | 394 | 4.4 | 4398 | 48.6 | 2664 | 29.4 |
| 1979 | 8944 | 586 | 6.6 | 1192 | 13.3 | 365 | 4.1 | 5016 | 56.1 | 1650 | 18.4 |
| 1980 | 6729 | 555 | 8.2 | 1153 | 17.1 | 260 | 3.9 | 3983 | 59.2 | 717 | 10.7 |
| 1981 | 7634 | 553 | 7.2 | 1185 | 15.5 | 295 | 3.9 | 4708 | 61.7 | 816 | 10.7 |
| Total | 110,639 | 7307 | 6.6 | 14000 | 12.7 | 6825 | 6.2 | 59318 | 53.6 | 20879 | 18.9 |

¹The figure 4,748 covers the period between 1969-74; Korea was previously included with "Other Countries."
²Adjustment, year ended June 30 through 1976 and September 30 thereafter.

Sources: Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development, 1974, 1975, 1976.

Table 3
Distribution of Foreign Born in Hawaii by Ethnicity, 1980

| | Number | Foreign Born (N) | Foreign Born (%) |
|--------------------------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Total | 964,691 | 137,016 | 14.2 |
| White | 311,068 | 15,154 | 4.9 |
| Black | 16,966 | 467 | 2.7 |
| Hispanic | 71,399 | 9,358 | 13.1 |
| American Indian, Eskimo, Aleutian | 2,605 | 83 | 3.2 |
| Asian and Pacific Islander | | | |
| Japanese | 239,734 | 22,738 | 9.5 |
| Chinese | 55,916 | 12,340 | 22.1 |
| Filipino | 132,075 | 60,555 | 45.8 |
| Korean | 17,453 | 9,434 | 54.1 |
| Vietnamese | 3,403 | 2,927 | 86.0 |
| Hawaiian | 118,251 | 807 | 0.7 |
| Guamanian | 1,630 | 46 | 2.8 |
| Samoan | 14,349 | 4,033 | 28.1 |
| Asian Indian | 708 | 496 | 70.0 |
| Other | 7,140 | 4,453 | 62.3 |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 1983.

certainly fueled the economic growth of the State." Another study using the same data found that "On the whole, the Filipino immigrants stand below the non-migrants in the host society's social and economic structure" (Carino 1981).

Early Filipino Immigrants to Hawai'i, 1906-1946

The first Filipinos were brought to Hawai'i in 1906 as plantation laborers like most of the early immigrants to the islands. The great bulk of the workers was from three Asian groups: Chinese were dominant in the 1850s, Japanese during the 1880s and the first two decades of the twentieth century, and Filipinos were in the majority since that time (see Table 1).

Between 1909 and 1931, 113,000 Filipinos migrated to Hawai'i, 55,000 stayed in Hawai'i, 39,000 returned to the Philippines, and 18,000 moved onward to the Pacific Coast of America. A final group of over 7,000 came to Hawai'i in

1946 to work on the sugar plantations. Some of the structural and historical forces that influenced these Filipinos to leave their homeland and come to Hawai'i include: 1) American colonization of the Philippines and Hawai'i at the turn of the century; 2) the condition of peasants in resource poor areas like the Ilocos; and 3) the need for cheap labor in Hawaii's sugar industry.

Among the conditions that kept early Filipino immigrant workers at the lowest status of the society were: a) they were the last major immigrant group and occupied the lowest status in an ethnically stratified plantation society; b) most were illiterate, single male workers; c) most regarded themselves as temporary residents; and d) they were nationals of a U.S. colony and deprived of many political rights and protection.

Recent Ilokano Immigration to Hawai'i

The Philippines is second only to Mexico in sending immigrants to the United States. From 1970-79, an average of 34,000 Filipinos each year migrated to the U.S. About ten percent or 4,000 migrate to Hawai'i. The most current and comprehensive survey of recent Filipino immigrants is the Philippine Migration Study conducted by the East-West Center Population Institute and the Institute of Philippine Culture of Ateneo de Manila University. The study consists of six separate surveys, four in the Philippines and two in Hawai'i. The research data used in this article is from one of these surveys, the 1982 Honolulu Destination Survey (see Table 4). Interviewing was carried out in Oahu census tracts where Filipinos comprised at least 15 percent of the population. Persons eligible for interview were adults born in the Ilocos who entered the United States at age 18 or older between 1965 and 1981. Interviews were completed with 1,484 individuals belonging to 853 households. The interviewers were bilingual (Ilokano/English) Filipinos.

Filipino immigrants in Hawai'i come from various regions in the Philippines, but the study sample was only Ilokano immigrants. Estimates of Ilokanos in Hawai'i range from a high of 90 percent to a conservative estimate of 70-80 percent. Ilokanos have been the vast majority of Filipino immigrants to Hawai'i in the early period (1906-46) and more recently since the 1965 amendments. Filipinos in Hawai'i differ from Filipinos migrating to the mainland U.S. Two important differences are their place of origin in the Philippines and their socioeconomic position. Unlike Filipinos on the mainland, Filipinos in Hawai'i are predominantly from the rural Ilocos region and occupy a lower socioeconomic status in Hawai'i.

Table 4

Ilokano Survey: Agency Use

| | Use of Agencies and Services | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------|------|---------|
| | Ever Used | Never Used | N | (%) |
| Total | 34.3 (509) | 65.7 (975) | 1484 | (100.0) |
| Remittances to Philippines in last year (N=1483) (p=.0643) | | | | |
| Yes | 35.5 | 64.5 | 1162 | (78.3) |
| No | 29.8 | 70.2 | 22 | (21.7) |
| No. of return visits to Philippines (N=1474)* | | | | |
| None | 30.0 | 70.0 | 583 | (39.6) |
| One | 35.6 | 64.6 | 489 | (33.2) |
| Two | 40.2 | 59.8 | 229 | (15.5) |
| Three | 40.8 | 59.2 | 103 | (7.0) |
| Four or more | 31.4 | 68.4 | 70 | (4.7) |
| % of family in Hawaii (N=1484) (p=.0827) | | | | |
| Less than 20 | 33.6 | 66.4 | 146 | (9.8) |
| 20-39 | 17.8 | 72.2 | 288 | (19.4) |
| 40-59 | 32.9 | 67.1 | 298 | (20.1) |
| 60-79 | 36.4 | 63.6 | 341 | (23.0) |
| 80-99 | 39.6 | 60.4 | 202 | (13.6) |
| 100 | 37.3 | 62.7 | 209 | (14.1) |
| % of family in Philippines (N=1484)* | | | | |
| Less than 20 | 39.4 | 60.6 | 482 | (32.5) |
| 20-39 | 32.2 | 67.8 | 329 | (22.2) |
| 40-59 | 36.2 | 63.8 | 279 | (18.8) |
| 60-79 | 27.1 | 72.9 | 251 | (16.9) |
| 80 or higher | 30.8 | 69.2 | 143 | (9.6) |
| % of family on the U.S. mainland (N=1484) | | | | |
| Less than 10 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 1229 | (82.8) |
| 10-19 | 39.8 | 60.2 | 118 | (8.0) |
| 20-29 | 32.5 | 57.5 | 73 | (4.9) |
| 30 or higher | 34.4 | 65.6 | 64 | (4.3) |

Continued

Table 4 Continued

| | Use of Agencies and Services | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------|------|--------|
| | Ever Used | Never Used | N | (%) |
| Whose decision to move (N=1483) | | | | |
| Completely respondent's | 43.1 | 56.9 | 399 | (26.9) |
| Other's | 31.1 | 68.9 | 1084 | (73.1) |
| Marital Status (N=1484) (p=.0762) | | | | |
| Currently married | 35.4 | 64.6 | 1222 | (82.3) |
| Other | 29.4 | 70.6 | 262 | (17.7) |
| Home Ownership (N=1478)* | | | | |
| Owned | 30.5 | 69.5 | 554 | (37.5) |
| Not owned | 36.6 | 63.4 | 924 | (62.5) |
| Daily Contacts (N=1484)* | | | | |
| All/mostly Filipino | 30.8 | 69.2 | 636 | (42.9) |
| Mixed/mostly non-Filipino | 36.9 | 63.1 | 848 | (57.1) |
| Citizenship (N=1484) N.S. | | | | |
| U.S. citizen | 36.5 | 63.5 | 491 | (33.1) |
| Non-citizen | 33.2 | 66.8 | 993 | (66.9) |
| Voter Registration (N=491, eligible only) N.S. | | | | |
| Registered to vote | 37.4 | 62.6 | 398 | (81.1) |
| Not registered to vote | 32.3 | 67.7 | 93 | 19.1) |
| Current pay for workers (N=1163) | | | | |
| \$150/week or less | 28.3 | 71.7 | 283 | (24.3) |
| \$150.01-200 | 32.4 | 67.6 | 324 | (27.9) |
| \$200.01-250 | 37.8 | 62.2 | 246 | (21.2) |
| More than \$250/week | 43.5 | 56.5 | 310 | (26.7) |
| Household income (N=1463) N.S. | | | | |
| Less than \$10000 per year | 40.5 | 59.5 | 116 | (7.9) |
| \$10000-19999/year | 32.9 | 67.1 | 508 | (34.7) |
| \$20000/year or more | 34.4 | 65.6 | 839 | (57.3) |
| Adequacy of household financial condition (N=1458) N.S. | | | | |
| More than adequate | 39.6 | 60.4 | 139 | (9.5) |
| Just adequate | 33.7 | 66.3 | 1031 | (70.7) |
| Not adequate | 33.3 | 66.7 | 288 | (19.8) |

| | Use of Agencies and Services | | | |
|--|------------------------------|------------|------|--------|
| | Ever Used | Never Used | N | (%) |
| Comparative household financial condition (N=1470) *** | | | | |
| Better off | 40.5 | 59.5 | 405 | (27.6) |
| About the same as most | 30.1 | 69.6 | 900 | (61.2) |
| Worse off | 41.8 | 58.2 | 165 | (11.2) |
| Current Occupation (N=1181)*** | | | | |
| Management, professional, technical | 27.8 | 72.2 | 54 | (4.6) |
| Sales, clerical | 29.1 | 70.9 | 127 | (10.8) |
| Production, operation, transportation | 42.6 | 57.4 | 277 | (23.5) |
| Service | 27.9 | 72.1 | 541 | (45.8) |
| Laborers, handlers | 51.6 | 48.4 | 93 | (7.9) |
| Farmers and farm laborers | 51.7 | 48.3 | 89 | (7.5) |
| Ever had housing problem (N=1484)*** | | | | |
| Yes | 42.3 | 57.7 | 381 | (25.7) |
| No | 31.6 | 68.4 | 1103 | (74.3) |
| Ever had job problem (N=1484)*** | | | | |
| Yes | 44.2 | 55.8 | 303 | (20.4) |
| No | 31.8 | 68.2 | 1181 | (79.6) |
| Ever had schooling problem (N=1484) N.S. | | | | |
| Yes | 42.9 | 57.1 | 42 | (2.8) |
| No | 34.0 | 66.0 | 1442 | (97.2) |
| Ever had language problem (N=1484)*** | | | | |
| Yes | 46.3 | 53.7 | 281 | (18.9) |
| No | 31.5 | 68.5 | 203 | (81.1) |
| Are Filipinos discriminated against (N=1484)*** | | | | |
| Yes | 42.2 | 57.8 | 410 | (27.6) |
| No | 31.3 | 68.7 | 1074 | (72.4) |
| Value expectancy for Ilocos (N=1484) N.S. | | | | |
| 0 | 34.1 | 65.9 | 416 | (28.0) |
| 1-2 | 37.3 | 62.7 | 236 | (15.9) |
| 3-5 | 35.4 | 64.6 | 342 | (23.0) |
| 6-9 | 31.0 | 69.0 | 329 | (22.2) |
| 10+ | 34.8 | 65.2 | 161 | (10.8) |

Continued

Table 4 Continued

| | Use of Agencies and Services | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------|------|--------|
| | Ever Used | Never Used | N | (%) |
| Value expectancy for Hawaii (N=1484) N.S. | | | | |
| 5 or less | 32.1 | 67.9 | 246 | (16.6) |
| 6-8 | 31.1 | 68.9 | 315 | (21.2) |
| 9-11 | 32.9 | 67.1 | 392 | (26.4) |
| 12-14 | 37.9 | 62.1 | 277 | (18.7) |
| 15+ | 38.6 | 61.4 | 254 | (17.1) |
| Ladder score-financial satisfaction (N=1460)* | | | | |
| 0-3 | 36.0 | 64.0 | 139 | (9.5) |
| 4 | 34.9 | 65.1 | 195 | (13.4) |
| 5 | 29.6 | 70.4 | 297 | (20.3) |
| 6 | 34.6 | 65.4 | 295 | (20.2) |
| 7 | 28.8 | 71.2 | 233 | (16.0) |
| 8-10 | 41.9 | 58.1 | 301 | (20.6) |
| Ladder score-general satisfaction (N=1461) N.S. | | | | |
| 0-3 | 36.2 | 63.8 | 94 | (6.4) |
| 4 | 35.4 | 64.6 | 127 | (8.7) |
| 5 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 249 | (17.0) |
| 6 | 33.0 | 67.0 | 303 | (20.7) |
| 7 | 30.1 | 69.9 | 269 | (18.4) |
| 8-10 | 38.2 | 61.8 | 419 | (28.7) |
| Number of previous moves (N=1484) N.S. | | | | |
| One | 33.6 | 66.4 | 917 | (61.8) |
| Two | 34.3 | 65.7 | 277 | (18.7) |
| Three | 35.6 | 64.4 | 188 | (12.7) |
| Four or more | 38.2 | 61.8 | 102 | (6.9) |
| Province of birth (N=1484) N.S. | | | | |
| Ilocos Norte | 34.9 | 65.1 | 1037 | (69.9) |
| Ilocos Sur, La Union, Abra | 32.9 | 67.1 | 447 | (30.1) |
| Number of years in Hawaii (N=1484)*** | | | | |
| Less than 1 | 13.4 | 86.6 | 127 | (8.6) |
| 1-3 | 29.6 | 70.4 | 345 | (23.2) |
| 4-6 | 37.1 | 62.9 | 213 | (14.4) |
| 7-9 | 38.1 | 61.9 | 239 | (16.1) |
| 10-12 | 41.3 | 58.7 | 339 | (22.8) |
| 13+ | 36.2 | 63.8 | 221 | (14.9) |

| | Use of Agencies and Services | | | |
|--|------------------------------|------------|-----|--------|
| | Ever Used | Never Used | N | (%) |
| Reason for original move to Hawaii (N=1484) N.S. | | | | |
| Affiliation | 33.9 | 66.1 | 579 | (39.0) |
| Other | 34.6 | 65.4 | 905 | (61.0) |
| Sex (N=1484)* | | | | |
| Female | 31.6 | 68.4 | 844 | (56.9) |
| Male | 37.8 | 62.2 | 640 | (43.1) |
| Education (N=1484)*** | | | | |
| Less than 6 years | 32.1 | 67.9 | 321 | (21.6) |
| 6-9 years | 41.3 | 58.7 | 455 | (30.7) |
| 10 years | 32.8 | 67.2 | 229 | (15.4) |
| Some college (11-13 years) | 34.2 | 65.8 | 225 | (15.2) |
| College graduate (14+ years) | 26.0 | 74.0 | 254 | (17.1) |
| Age (N=1484)** | | | | |
| 18-29 | 28.0 | 72.0 | 43 | (23.1) |
| 30-39 | 37.1 | 62.9 | 34 | (29.2) |
| 40-49 | 41.4 | 58.6 | 02 | (20.4) |
| 50-65 | 31.4 | 68.6 | 05 | (27.3) |

Significance of X²: * p <.05, ** p <.01, *** p <.001

Recent Ilokano immigrants to Hawai'i are very different from the earlier immigrants in many important ways even though they are relatives of previous immigrants. The early immigrants were predominantly male, single young plantation workers who intended to return to live in the Philippines. The survey of recent Ilokano immigrants shows that nearly 60 percent of the respondents were female, 82 percent were married, and their mean age was 40. A majority of them (60%) do not intend to leave Hawai'i.

While 27 percent of the households interviewed included at least one adult member who arrived in Hawai'i prior to 1964, 74 percent included only persons who had arrived after 1964. A finer breakdown of this information shows that 78 percent of the households had at least one member who had arrived in Hawai'i since 1971; 50 percent had at least one member who arrived between 1966 and

1970; 11 percent had at least one member who arrived between 1947 and 1965; and 20 percent had at least one member who arrived before 1947.

This article will present an analysis of the 1982 survey which may be of interest to researchers, policy makers, service providers and the immigrant and local community in Hawai'i. A brief description of the sample of households and individual respondents will be presented along with an analysis of self-reported problems and patterns of utilizing agencies and social services in Honolulu.

Household Characteristics

Household level data were obtained from the first available adult who could provide information on adult members and household characteristics. Household size ranged from single member households to one 15-member household, with an average of 4.9 persons per household. This mean is much higher than the state mean of 3.2 members per household. Nearly half (49%) of the households were nuclear families and only 5 percent were single parent households. The overall sex ratio for adult members was 98.4, where 49.6 percent were male and 50.4 percent were female.

In all, 67 percent of the households were in Kalihi, 14 percent in Waipahu, 12 percent in other urban areas outside of Kalihi and 7 percent in rural areas other than Waipahu. The majority (59%) were renting, while 37 percent owned or were buying their home, and 5 percent had other housing arrangements. The highest percentage of homeowners lived in Waipahu (60%). Twenty-two percent of the households shared their dwellings with at least one other household.

Individual Characteristics

Virtually all of the individual respondents (92%) had worked at some time since their arrival. Forty percent were in service occupations (the major industry in Hawai'i is tourism), and only 5 percent were professionals. This is in contrast to the distribution of occupations for the state (14.3% in service occupations and 15.5% in professional positions).

Nearly half of the respondents was graduated from high school in the Philippines with ten years of schooling. Twenty-two percent had less than six years of schooling and 17 percent were college graduates. As noted earlier, 60 percent of the respondents were female, 82 percent were married, and the mean age was 40.

Migration History and Intentions

The average length of residence in Hawai'i for the sample was seven years. Less than a tenth had been in Hawai'i less than a year, 38 percent from one to nine years and 38 percent had been in Hawai'i for ten or more years. About sixty percent of the respondents did not intend to move from Hawai'i, over 25 percent did not know if they would move, and the rest were more or less certain that they would move.

A majority of respondents (61%) moved directly from the Ilocos and had not moved outside Honolulu since their arrival in the United States. Nineteen percent reported two moves since leaving the Ilocos, while 20 percent reported three or more moves. A majority (73%) said the decision to move to Honolulu was at least partly influenced by others rather than being entirely their own. The reasons or motives given for moving to Hawai'i were either to join relatives or affiliation (39%) or other reasons such as work or a better life (61%).

Connections to the Philippines and to Hawai'i

Only a tenth of the sample had 80 percent or more of their family in the Philippines. A majority (55%) had less than 40 percent of their family in the Philippines. A majority (60%) of the respondents had visited the Philippines at least once since their move to Honolulu. Most respondents (78%) maintained ties with relatives in the Philippines through sending remittances at least once during the preceding year.

Over half of all respondents had 60 percent or more of their family in Hawai'i, and less than 10 percent of the sample had under 20 percent of their family in Hawai'i. A majority (57%) reported that their daily contacts were primarily mixed or with nonFilipinos. Over 80 percent of the respondents who were U.S. citizens were registered to vote; only 33 percent of the respondents were U.S. citizens.

Economic Achievement in Hawai'i

Of the employed respondents, 24 percent earned \$150 a week or less, while 27 percent earned over \$250 a week. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents lived in households where the combined yearly income was \$20,000 or more. Less than 10 percent of the households were under the official poverty level. Most of the respondents (71%) lived in households where the household informant judged the household income as adequate, while 20 percent judged it as

inadequate. A majority (61%) lived in households which, according to the informant, were about the same as most other Filipino households. Nearly 40 percent of the respondents rated their current financial situation as relatively high.

Problems and Satisfaction

Respondents were asked if they had ever had problems with jobs, housing, schooling and language. Housing problems were reported by 26 percent, jobs by 20 percent and language by 19 percent. A small percentage (3%) reported schooling problems (this question referred to the adult respondents and not to children in the household). Of a total of 425 other problems mentioned by respondents, the three most named were: high prices, cost of living, inflation (n=78); low pay, insufficient earnings or desire for better pay (n=51); and visa, citizenship and petitioning related problems (n=33). Twenty-eight percent of respondents thought Filipinos were discriminated against.

In addition to questions on problems, respondents were asked about their current level of satisfaction and expectation of achieving important values in Hawai'i and in the Philippines. In general, they were relatively satisfied in Hawai'i. Only 15 percent rated their current general satisfaction as relatively low (scores of 0-4), compared to 38 percent who reported midlevel satisfaction (scores of 5-6) and 47 percent who reported relatively high levels of general satisfaction (scores of 7 or more). A majority (67%) of the respondents had relatively low expectancies (scores of 0-5) of achieving important values in the Ilocos. In contrast, 83 percent of the respondents had relatively high expectancies (scores of 6-15) of achieving important values in Hawai'i.

Agency or Service Use

Respondents were asked if they had ever used specific services or agencies. With the exceptions of unemployment compensation which was used by 21 percent of the respondents and food stamps which were used by 5 percent, each of the other identified agencies or services was used by less than 2 percent of the respondents. The agencies or services listed were the Kalihi-Palama Immigrant Service Center, Susannah Wesley Community Center, Operation Manong, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, housing assistance and Medicaid. Of the 10 percent who used other agencies, the top three agencies were all employment assistance. In summary, very few respondents reported utilizing agencies or

services, and the most used services of agencies were employment or unemployment assistance services.

Problems and Use of Agencies

Of interest to service providers and policy makers is the provision of services to those with problems. While keeping in mind that the survey questionnaire did not relate problems to particular services, it is possible to look at the relationship of those who mentioned problems to those who said they had ever used services and agencies. For the following discussion, 784 of the respondents who mentioned one or more problems were defined as "problem reporters" in contrast to the remaining 700 respondents who reported no problem and were defined as "reported no problem." The use of any agency or service constituted an "agency user." By this definition, 509 respondents were agency or service users and 975 reported no use.

Although very few persons reported ever using any service or agency (except unemployment compensation), it is gratifying to see that a higher proportion of those reporting problems also reported agency use. Thirty-six percent of the sample reported no problems and no agency use, and 23 percent reported both problems and agency use. Nearly a third of the sample (30%) may be a target population for service providers, i.e., those who reported at least one problem but no agency use. A number of persons (11%) reported no problems but reported using a service. This may be because many of the services used are in the nature of entitlements or benefits, and the users may not have perceived that any problems led to their use.

Profile of Problem Reporters

"Problem reporters" are characterized as having fewer connections or social support in Hawai'i and are less successful economically than persons who report no problems. Problem reporters had fewer members of their family in Hawai'i and more family members in the Philippines. More of them gave reasons other than affiliation for their reason for migrating to Hawai'i. They also scored higher on expectancies of achieving important values in the Ilocos. More were noncitizens, had been in Hawai'i less than three years and had more previous moves before migrating to Hawai'i. Problem reporters had either never visited the Philippines or visited four or more times. More of them sent remittances to the Philippines.

More problem reporters did not own their own home and were in households with less than \$10,000 annual income. They also had a lower mean score on financial satisfaction and current general satisfaction. Most of them were laborers, farmers and in production/operation/transportation than in service or professional categories. Problem reporters were also more likely to have used an agency, to agree that there is discrimination against Filipinos and to have most of their daily contacts with nonFilipinos or a mixed group.

Profile of Agency Users

"Agency users" are characterized as having more connections or social support in Hawai'i and are more economically successful than persons who reported never using an agency. They had fewer members of their family in the Philippines and more in Hawai'i and had been in Hawai'i longer than persons who had never used an agency or service. Those who had gone back to the Philippines one to three times were more likely to have used services than those who had never been back or had returned four or more times. Agency users were more likely to have a higher mean current pay but not to be a home owner. In addition, agency users were more likely to have reported housing, language and job problems as well as to agree that there is discrimination against Filipinos.

Problem Reporters and Agency Users

A higher proportion of those reporting problems also reported using an agency or service. A number of items characterize both agency users and problem reporters. Both agreed that there is discrimination against Filipinos and had most of their daily contacts with nonFilipinos or a mixed group. Both were not home owners and considered themselves financially better off or worse off rather than the same as other Filipinos. Both had sent at least one remittance to the Philippines in the past year and reported that the decision to move to Hawai'i was their own. More problem reporters and agency users were in production/operation/transportation, laborer/handler and farming occupations.

Conclusion

Immigration should be understood primarily within the context of the global economic system where economically advanced economies create a demand for certain kinds of immigrants. The historical and present economic role that Ilokano (and other Asian) immigrants played in Hawai'i was as "cheap labor" for

the sugar plantations and "cheap labor" as service workers in today's tourist economy. Within this political economy framework, it is still appropriate to study and be responsive to the adjustment and integration of recent immigrants in their new community. The problems mentioned by the 1982 Ilokano sample confirm the findings of other studies that immigrants continue to have problems with jobs, housing, discrimination, language and use of services.

Reformist efforts to seek equal access to better jobs, housing and social services may, in fact, be complementary to efforts to change fundamental economic inequalities. In Hawai'i, recent small but significant changes have been accomplished by local and immigrant groups. Most of these efforts have utilized American legal language and concepts of civil rights and affirmative action. Perhaps the most significant illustrations are three litigations involving members of the Filipino community. The first is the Domingo case where a Filipina successfully sued the City and County of Honolulu which had denied her a job because she was a noncitizen and lacked sufficient length of residency in Hawai'i. The Mangrobang case requires the State of Hawai'i to provide equal access to health care for nonEnglish or limited English speakers. A new case involves a recent Filipino immigrant who was not hired because of his accent.

Cases such as these three as well as countless other efforts to empower recent immigrants as well as local born groups (e.g., unionization) may help change the traditional role of immigrants as "cheap labor" or shorten the time spent in that role.

Acknowledgment

This paper was presented at the Conference on Asia-Pacific Immigration to the United States sponsored by the East-West Population Institute in Honolulu. I wish to gratefully acknowledge the technical assistance and comments of Fred Arnold, James Fawcett, Robert Gardner, Julia Hecht and Patricia Masters of the Population Institute of the East-West Center.

References

- Carino, Benjamin V. 1981. Filipinos on Oahu, Hawaii. *Papers of the East-West Population Institute*, No. 72. East-West Population Institute, East-West Center.
- Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development 1974. Hawaii's In-Migrants, 1973. Statistical Report No. 101.

_____ 1975. Hawaii's In-Migrants, 1974. Statistical Report No. 108.

_____ 1976. Hawaii's In-Migrants, 1975. Statistical Report No. 112.

Nordyke, Eleanor C. 1977. *The Peopling of Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i.

United States Bureau of the Census 1983. *1980 Census of Population*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wright, Paul and Robert W. Gardner 1983. Ethnicity, Birthplace and Achievement: The Changing Hawaii Mosaic. *Papers of the East-West Population Institute*, No. 82. East-West Population Institute, East-West Center.