This paper aims to analyze the spatial transformation of Chinese American’s “ethnoburbs” and the migration trends among them. With well-established Chinese Americans moving out of the old “ethnoburbs” to the new ones and new immigrants filling into the old “ethnoburbs”, the population of both old and new “ethnoburbs” is increasing, but the internal migration flows reflect the spatial transformation of the Chinese suburban communities. Using a comparative analysis of community landscape, spatial patterns, socioeconomic status of residents, and public services between the old “suburban Chinatown” Monterey Park and the newly thriving Chinese “ethnoburb” Rowland Heights in suburban Los Angeles, this paper examines the disparities and connections between old and new Chinese “ethnoburbs”. The transformation of Chinese “ethnoburbs” and internal migration flows among them reflect a way to achieve Chinese immigrants’ American Dream.
SPATIAL TRANSFORMATION AND INTERNAL MIGRATION AMONG CHINESE ETHNOBURBS - A WAY TO CHINESE IMMIGRANTS’ AMERICAN DREAM

A Thesis

Submitted to the

Faculty of Miami University

In partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts

Department of Geography

by

Wan Yu

Miami University

Oxford, Ohio

2010

Advisor: ________________________
James M. Rubenstein

Reader: ________________________
Stanley W. Toops

Reader: ________________________
David L. Prytherch
# Table of Contents

Table of Contents ........................................................................................................................................... ii  
List of Tables .................................................................................................................................................. v  
List of Figures .................................................................................................................................................. vi  
List of Charts ................................................................................................................................................ vii  
List of Maps ................................................................................................................................................ viii  
Acknowledgements ......................................................................................................................................... ix  

## Chapter 1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................... 1

## Chapter 2 Literature Review ..................................................................................................................... 7

2.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................................... 7

2.2 Ethnic segregation and assimilation ........................................................................................................ 8

2.2.1 Factor and causes of segregation ........................................................................................................ 8

2.2.2 Values of segregation .......................................................................................................................... 11

2.2.3 Consequences of segregation ........................................................................................................... 11

2.3 Chinese Americans and Chinese communities in the U.S .................................................................. 13

2.3.1 Chinese Americans and Chinese immigrants .................................................................................. 13

2.3.2 Chinese communities in the U.S ...................................................................................................... 14

2.3.2.1 Chinatowns and inner-city enclaves ......................................................................................... 14

2.3.2.2 The Chinese suburbia ................................................................................................................ 16

2.3.2.3 The Chinese ethnoburb ............................................................................................................. 20

2.4 Conclusion ............................................................................................................................................... 22

## Chapter 3 Research Methodology ......................................................................................................... 24

3.1 Research Background ............................................................................................................................. 24

3.2 Research Methods .................................................................................................................................. 24

3.3 Data Source ............................................................................................................................................ 25

3.3.1 Statistical Data .................................................................................................................................. 25

3.3.2 Semi-structural Interviews .............................................................................................................. 25

3.3.2.1 Data Collection ......................................................................................................................... 25

3.3.2.2 Interview Questions .................................................................................................................. 26
Chapter 4 Spatial Disparities between Monterey Park and Rowland Heights

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Urban Patterns of Chinese neighborhoods at City of Monterey Park

4.2.1 History of Chinese settlement at Monterey Park

4.2.2 Residential patterns of Chinese settlements at Monterey Park

4.2.3 Commercial patterns of Chinese settlements at Monterey Park

4.2.4 Public space and community services

4.2.4.1 Parks and recreations

4.2.4.2 Libraries

4.2.4.3 Health care

4.2.4.4 Other community services

4.3 Urban Patterns of Chinese settlements at Rowland Heights

4.3.1 History of Chinese settlements at Rowland Heights

4.3.2 Residential patterns of Chinese settlements at Rowland Heights

4.3.3 Commercial patterns of Chinese settlements at Rowland Heights

4.3.4 Public space and community services

4.3.4.1 Community libraries

4.4 Disparities on Spatial Patterns of Chinese between two ethnoburbs

4.5 Conclusion

Chapter 5 Demographic Disparities Between Monterey Park and Rowland Heights

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Chinese at Monterey Park

5.2.1 Demographics of Chinese at Monterey Park
List of Tables

Table 2.1 Chinese settlement patterns and community forms in the U.S.………………19
Table 5.1 Median household income at Monterey Park and Rowland Heights, 2000……55
Table 6.1 Years of settlements for interviewees at Rowland Heights…………………..64
List of Figures

Figure 4.1 Condominiums in Monterey Park ................................................................. 31
Figure 4.2 Condominiums in Monterey Park ................................................................. 31
Figure 4.3 Single-family homes in Monterey Park ......................................................... 32
Figure 4.4 Fortune Shopping Plaza on Garvey Avenue ................................................. 34
Figure 4.5 Fortune Shopping Plaza on Garvey Avenue ................................................. 34
Figure 4.6 Shopping Plaza on Garfield Avenue ............................................................ 35
Figure 4.7 Hong Kong Supermarket on Garfield Avenue ............................................. 35
Figure 4.8 One business center on Garvey Avenue ....................................................... 36
Figure 4.9 One business center on Garvey Avenue ....................................................... 36
Figure 4.10 EastWest Bank on Garvey Avenue .............................................................. 36
Figure 4.11 Pacific Bank on Garvey & Garfield Avenue .................................................. 36
Figure 4.12 Barnes Park on McPherrin Avenue, Monterey Park ...................................... 38
Figure 4.13 Barnes Park on McPherrin Avenue, Monterey Park ...................................... 38
Figure 4.14 Mountain view of Chinese community at Rowland Heights ....................... 43
Figure 4.15 Single-family houses at Rowland Heights ................................................ 43
Figure 4.16 Apartments on Desire Avenue, Rowland Heights ...................................... 44
Figure 4.17 Apartments on Colima Road, Rowland Heights ......................................... 44
Figure 5.1 Chinese apothecary stores on Garvey Avenue ............................................ 52
Figure 6.1 Four closed stores for subleasing on Garvey Avenue ................................... 67
List of Charts

Chart 4.1 Occupied housing units of Chinese at Rowland Heights, 2000 ..................42
Chart 5.1 Ethnicity of Monterey Park, 1980 .......................................................50
Chart 5.2 Ethnicity of Monterey Park, 1990 .......................................................50
Chart 5.3 Ethnicity of Monterey Park, 2000 .......................................................50
Chart 5.4 Ethnicity of Rowland Heights, 1980 ...................................................54
Chart 5.5 Ethnicity of Rowland Heights, 1990 ...................................................54
Chart 5.6 Ethnicity of Rowland Heights, 2000 ...................................................54
Chart 5.7 Chinese household income distribution at Monterey Park, Rowland Heights, and
Los Angeles County, 1999 ..............................................................................55
Chart 5.8 Occupations of Chinese at Rowland Heights, 2000 ..............................56
Chart 5.9 Age distribution of Chinese at Monterey Park and Rowland Heights, 2000 ....57
Chart 5.10 Entry year of Chinese to the U.S. at Monterey Park and Rowland Heights ....59
Chart 5.11 Occupation of Chinese in two ethnoburbs, 2000 .................................69
Chart 6.1 Residence in 1995 of Chinese Americans at two ethnoburbs ..................63
List of Maps

Map 1.1 Chinese in Los Angeles, 1990 ................................................................. 4
Map 1.2 Chinese in Los Angeles, 2000 ................................................................. 5
Map 4.1 City of Monterey Park Map ................................................................. 29
Map 4.2 Percentage of Chinese alone in Monterey Park, 2000 ........................... 30
Map 4.3 Map of Business Improvement District in Monterey Park ................. 33
Map 4.4 Park Facilities Map in Monterey Park ............................................... 37
Map 4.5 Percentage who are Chinese alone at Rowland Heights, 2000 ........... 42
Map 5.1 Persons in management and professional Occupations ..................... 53
Acknowledgements

I owe a huge debt of gratitude to my advisors Dr. James M. Rubenstein and Dr. Stanley W. Toops, as well as to my committee member Dr. David L. Prytherch at Miami University, for their support on helping me complete this thesis. This thesis would not be possible without their sincere help and guidance.

I would like to thank the Department of Geography at Miami University for their encouragement and support throughout my master study, and for funding my research in Los Angeles. I also want to thank all the organizations and individuals that helped me conducting this research during my fieldwork, including Chinese First Fundamental Church in Monterey Park as well as all the volunteers in this study. I also want to give special thanks to Dr. Wei Li at Arizona State University who granted me great help on my thesis.

My final and deepest acknowledgement goes to my family and all my friends, for their endless help and support throughout my master study. Without their encouragement, I am nowhere near who I am now.
Chapter 1 Introduction

The geography of Chinese ethnic communities in the U.S. metropolitan areas is an interesting phenomenon for urban geographers to study ethnicity and ethnic settlements, not only because Chinese immigrants usually have a large population in big cities, but also because they are inclined to be more spatially compact than other ethnic groups (Clark & Ware, 1997). The term “Chinatown” is one specific example of what Chinese communities look like in the U.S. It often comes with the image of street gangsters, poor sanitary restaurants, and cheap labors which altogether compose an exotic oriental landscape (Mckeown, 2001). However, after the early 1960s, Chinese who lived in the inner-city enclaves started their suburbanization process (Fong, 1994, Fan 2002). Many professional and well-developed Chinese moved from the city to the suburbs, creating a new type of suburban landscape. The Flushing area in New York and the San Gabriel Valley in Los Angeles are typical examples for the new kind of Chinese suburban communities (Kaplan, 2001). Although Chinese in the suburbs are more open to the host society than those staying in the enclaves, their communities remain a strong heritage of Chinese culture, such as the preference of same ethnic neighborhoods and particular types of housing (Lin & Robinson, 2005), which are easily mirrored on community landscapes. These Chinese cultural elements, mixed with American suburban background, contribute to the distinct spatial outcome of suburban Chinese communities. Since the 1990s, when globalization highly increased the interdependence and interactions between the U.S. and China, there has been increasing amount of new Chinese immigrants directly settled down in American suburbs (Li, 2005). These new Chinese immigrants, ranging from labor migrants to high skilled professionals, have brought much more Chinese cultural impact into these ethnic suburbs than those former Chinese residents did (Chen and Yang, 1996). They are new to the U.S. and many of them have close business or social connections to China. The increasing transnational interactions of new immigrants with their ethnic origins, accompanied with early immigrants’ cultural preference, keep the assimilation process of Chinese ethnic group from moving forward (Lagurre, 2005; Lin and Robinson, 2005). This low level of social assimilation is clearly
reflected on the highly spatially segregated Chinese suburban communities (Heibert and Ley, 2003). Thus, the spatial patterns of Chinese ethnic suburbs represent the characteristics of Chinese immigrants living in.

The new type of suburban Chinese community has been conceptualized by Li (1997) as an ethnoburb model. She defined ethnoburbs as “suburban ethnic clusters of residential areas and business districts in large metropolitan areas...Ethnoburbs are created through deliberate efforts of that group within changing global/national/local contexts.” (Li, 1997) She demonstrated that San Gabriel Valley in East Los Angeles, with the large Chinese residential, industrial and business concentration, is one typical example of Chinese ethnoburbs. Li’s ethnoburb concept describes the contemporary and future spatial pattern of Chinese communities by explaining the rapid population growth of Chinese in San Gabriel Valley suburbs, yet the diversity and migration flows among different ethnoburbs, namely, the migration flows under the ethnoburb conceptual framework need further research. Literature on Chinese ethnic settlements mostly concentrates on the ethnic settlements as general (Fan, 2002; Kaplan, 2001; Kaplan, 2005; Li, 2005) or on one aspect of Chinese ethnic communities (Chen and Yang, 1996; Li, 2002; Tseng, 1994; Zhou, 1996). Analysis on the internal migration inside one particular kind of ethnic communities, such as ethnic suburbs, has rarely been observed.

Grounded on this concern, this thesis focuses on the comparison of spatial patterns and demographic characteristics of Chinese ethnoburbs to examine the migration flows among them. Thus, the research questions are as follows:

1) What are the spatial and demographic differences among Chinese ethnoburbs?

2) What are the internal migration flows among different ethnoburbs?

3) What is the sequence of migration flows?

To answer the first research question, I compare the settlement patterns and the demographics of two Chinese ethnic suburbs, one older Chinese ethnoburb and one new Chinese ethnoburb, to examine diversities among Chinese ethnoburbs. Secondly, by stating the spatial and demographic disparities among Chinese ethnoburbs, I demonstrate the existence of three internal migration flows among them and explore the manifestation of each migration flow. Finally, by answering how the Chinese in ethnoburbs migrate from old
ethnoburbs to the new ones, I conclude that the spatial transformation of Chinese ethnoburbs is intertwined and manifested by the internal migration flows of Chinese among them. It also reflects Chinese immigrants’ American dream.

To analyze the differences among the ethnoburbs, I select two Chinese ethnoburbs each representing ethnoburb emerged at different time to conduct the comparative analysis. With the largest Chinese population in the U.S., Los Angeles has the most diverse suburban Chinese communities and is always considered as the model of new patterns of residential segregation of the nation (Clark and Ware, 1997). Chinese settlements in Los Angeles began its suburbanization process after the 1960s (Fong, 1994). But the process of suburbanization is not the same with what happened with other cities. While the majority of immigrants living in the suburbs such as San Gabriel Valley, the inner city Chinatown kept growing by functioning as a tourist spot (Li, 1997; Lin and Robinson, 2005). In past several decades, the suburban Chinese cluster in Los Angeles experienced a rapid demographic and economic growth. By 1990, there were more than 158,000 Chinese people living in the San Gabriel Valley (Li, 1998). It has become the largest suburban Chinese population cluster in the United States. Li’s ethnoburb concept indicated San Gabriel Valley as a new spatial pattern of ethnic settlements, which helped my study field locate in San Gabriel Valley as well.

The selection of case study areas derives from the changing demographic statistics on 1990 and 2000 census data. According to the census map, by 1990, community with highest percentage of Chinese population in Los Angeles was Monterey Park with 22.0 percent. However, after ten years, by 2000, coinciding with the Chinese concentration at Monterey Park gradually expanding northwards, there was a new Chinese population cluster emerging at the east side of San Gabriel Valley, centering in the community of Rowland Heights. Thus, each representing ethnoburbs established at different time, City of Monterey Park and Rowland Heights Community become the case studies of my research.
The city of Monterey Park, known as the “suburban Chinatown” (Fong, 1994), witnessed a long history of Chinese settlements. After the first Chinese influx wave in the mid 1960s and the second one in the 1970s (Fong, 1994), Monterey Park gradually became the first suburban concentration of Chinese immigrants and the cultural center of the San Gabriel...
Valley Chinese communities (Lin & Robinson, 2005). Replacing the inner city Chinatown, it now acts as the immigration port for new Chinese immigrants to the U.S. (Fong, 1994). However, after the rapid population growth from the 1970s to the 1980s, Monterey Park has experienced a drastic slow growth in recent years, compared with its peripheral areas. The residential density in Monterey Park kept growing and finally hindered further population growth. Some Chinese professionals with more wealth decided to move out to less dense areas. In contrast to Monterey Park’s slow growth, on the east edge of San Gabriel Valley, several new Chinese neighborhoods have experienced the rapidest population growth in the past decade due to the large amount of Chinese immigrants flowing in. Since the late 1980s, many upper and middle class Chinese have moved into those neighborhoods. Rowland Heights, which used to be a White and Hispanic community in the 1950s, has gradually become one of the Chinese population clusters in San Gabriel Valley. With the percentage of Chinese population roaring from 10.9% in 1990 (Census Bureau, 1990) to 29% in 2000 (Census Bureau, 2000), Rowland Heights is rivaling Monterey Park in many aspects of Chinese immigrant lives (Li, 2009). As an example of the newly emerged suburban Chinese neighborhoods, Rowland Heights is considered as my second case study.

To conduct field work at Monterey Park and Rowland Heights, this thesis adopts both quantitative and qualitative research methods. First, it uses census data to obtain the demographic and social characteristics of Chinese in Monterey Park and Rowland Heights and compare the differences between them. Based the census data, I examine differences of socioeconomic status and ethnic backgrounds between these two communities to investigate the disparities among ethnoburbs. In addition, qualitative data are collected from fieldwork, such as interview data and participant observation data, to capture the cultural and geographic characteristics of these suburban communities. The 27 semi-structural interviews document the Chinese residents’ migration backgrounds, their conceptions of the community, their daily lives, and their social networks. Participant observation data, mainly from the observer’s three-month-long fieldwork in 2008 at the two communities, is used to complement the interview data to describe the community functions and geographic patterns.

In the following chapters, I discuss this thesis in several steps. In chapter 2, I revisit the theoretical debates on ethnic segregation and Chinese ethnic communities. In particular, I
discuss Li’s ethnoburb concept and arguments upon this concept. In chapter 3, I briefly discuss the methodology of my research and the demographic result of the census data. In Chapter 4, I examine the spatial differences between Monterey Park and Rowland Heights by comparing the urban patterns of their residential, commercial, and public areas. In Chapter 5, I investigate these two communities’ demographic differences by using the census data on the socioeconomic status and interview data on the cultural characteristics. In Chapter 6, I identify three migration flows among different Chinese ethnoburbs and conclude that the existence of migration flows among ethnoburbs will lead to the spatial transformation process of Chinese ethnoburbs. In the last chapter, I summarize my assumptions and arguments on the internal migration and spatial transformation of Chinese ethnoburbs.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

To analyze the spatial and demographic disparities of Chinese ethnoburbs, theoretical study is addressed under the frameworks of ethnic segregation, assimilation, and the Chinese American experiences. The first section of the literature review discusses the main themes of ethnic segregation as follows: causal factors of spatial segregation; measurements of segregation; the consequences of segregation and the assimilation progress. From an urban sociology approach, this paper adopts Park’s (1937) invasion and succession model to explain:

1) spatial and demographic diversities among different ethnoburbs, to answer the first and second research question;
2) economic, social, and cultural forces underlying the ethnoburbs dynamics and the casual factors of the migration flows.

Secondly, I revisit literatures on contemporary Chinese American experiences and Chinese communities. Previous studies on Chinese American experiences have explained the changing process of Chinese Americans’ demographics and the newly suburban ethnic clusters. Research topic on how Chinese scatter over Chinese ethnoburbs has been less investigated. Adopting the “model minority” theory by Kwong (1996) to examine the ongoing migration trends among ethnoburbs, this thesis categorizes the Chinese in ethnoburbs into four subgroups: early Chinese immigrants who came to the U.S. before the 1980s and who migrated from the inner-city Chinatown to Monterey Park; the Chinese professionals who came to the U.S. after the 1980s; the working-class Chinese; the second generation of Chinese immigrants. The working-class Chinese stands for the “downtown Chinese” whereas the other three subgroups represent the “uptown Chinese” in Chinese ethnoburbs. As a result of the socioeconomic disparities among Chinese subgroups and their changing demographics in the past two decades, settlement patterns of Chinese Americans have changed significantly as well.
2.2 Ethnic segregation and assimilation

2.2.1 Factor and causes of segregation

There are several theoretical perspectives explaining segregation. The first two common theoretical perspectives believe ethnic segregation as a result of individual preference. They believe it is because of the social competition or the economic status, that ethnic segregation is a “natural product” of individual selection process.

Ecological theory, based on the urban sociology in University of Chicago, emerged in the early 20th century to explain the impact of European immigration in the mega cities in the midwest and northeast of the US. From ecological theory’s perspective, social competition between social groups, such as visible minorities, leads to different spatial distributions of ethnic groups in cities (Kaplan, 2001, p60). Ecological theory also thinks “as members of minority groups become less socially and economically distinct from the host group, segregation levels decrease” (Kaplan, 2001 p.63).

Driedger (1999) from an ecological perspective, uses his analysis in the ethnic segregation in Canadian three big metropolitan cities to explore the different types of spatial patterns. He finds out the different segregation patterns are results of different historical, demographic and social factors. He thinks, it is because of the social competition that makes French and English residents in Montreal located on opposite sides of the mountain, also, because of the large population of the visible minorities (31.6%), Toronto has changed from a dominant British city to a more “recent visible minority segregation type” (Driedger, 1999). Massey and Gross (1989) also use their study in black and Hispanic segregation in the U.S. metropolitan areas to argue that black segregation will decline when the black population percentage is not high enough, but will increase when the black population consists a large portion of the total population. They interpret this to means that “there is little impetus for desegregation because whites can maintain their preference for limited interracial contact” (Johnston, 2007 p.826). And also, Clark and Ware (1997) assume that the number of blacks in suburban counties is not yet large, which may be one of the reasons that why the segregation level in suburban communities in Southern California is high and they explain this phenomenon as one result of social competition.
Specifically, on the aspect of spatial outcome of ethnic and class segregation, Park (1936) advocates the invasion and succession model to illustrate the spatial transformation of ethnic communities. According to the invasion and succession model, ethnic ghettos emerge when white middle class move out of city to the suburbs and leave the inner city to lower class and ethnic groups (Alba, 1997; Ley, 1983; Park, 1936; Ward, 1971). Later, the minority groups who have well developed themselves will follow the trends of mainstream society and move to the suburbs, whereas the urban ghettos where they used to live will be filled up by new immigrants or other ethnic groups with lower socio-economic status (Fan, 2002; Li, 2006). The spatial transformation of ethnic groups communities towards the same trend of the mainstream groups but varies on the spatial distribution of the demographic situations due to the ethnic groups in certain (Li, 2002). Under the invasion and succession model, ethnic communities, notwithstanding in the inner city or in the suburbs, are highly socially segregated, but eventually lead to the social and cultural assimilation.

The second theoretical perspective is known as neoclassical economics which argues economic competition between individuals in the housing market as the most important reason that creates segregation. Uneven residential distribution is caused by “individual's ability to pay for housing, though preferences for the group composition of neighborhoods are legitimate concerns given economic value by the market” (Kaplan, 2001 p.62).

These two perspectives emphasize the socioeconomic status as the main force that causes spatial segregation. Much geographical research on the African Americans segregation is under this frame. A main reason for the black-white segregation is that most African Americans have lower income than white people. When they have the same socioeconomic status, such as education and income, the degree of segregation will decrease. Clark and Ware (1997) analyze the black residential segregation and socioeconomic status in the southern California counties to examine if, at the same level of income and educational status, the black segregation will decrease. They, from a more neoclassical economics perspective, find out that the socioeconomic status influences the segregation through individual preferences in housing market. “Preferences for particular combinations of ethnic neighbors continue to play an important role in the neighborhoods that individual families choose.” (Clark and Ware, 1997 p.13) Their result shows lower residential segregation level with increasing level
of black socioeconomic status, but with the same of income and education, the segregation level between black and white is still high.

Other perspectives believe, rather than the individual choices, forces beyond the ethnic groups are the main factors for ethnic segregation. Institutional perspective sees that the segregation level is controlled by the powerful agents in society (Kaplan, 2001). These perspectives emerged from the empirical work on black segregation in metropolitan areas in the United States and often see that segregation is an involuntary outcome of social discrimination. Institutional perspectives have more logic in explaining the inner city enclaves and ghettos and ethnic residential patterns before the globalization context. For example, Darden (2000) uses his analysis in the black residential segregation in Detroit to examine whether socioeconomic status plays an important role in forming black segregation in Detroit urban and suburban areas. He finds out that in the same level of education and income, the segregation between black and white is still high and there is not much direct relationship between the socioeconomic status and the segregation level between blacks and whites in Detroit. However, institutional perspective can not well explain why the suburban ethnic clusters with high socioeconomic status exist and grow by themselves. For example, Fong (1994) argues that because of the discrimination and prejudice in suburban housing market and government, there were not so much minority groups in suburban Los Angeles, which made Monterey Park “one of the whitest spots in Southern California” during that age (Fong, 1994, p18). But after the municipality changed their attitude from hostile to more friendly toward minority people, the first wave of Chinese immigration occurred and made Monterey Park’ population dominant by minority groups (85%) in 1970 (Fong, 1994, p21). However, he can not use the governmental policies to explain the reason why Monterey Park kept growing rapidly in the later decades.

Different from the former frame of causal factors, Kaplan (2001) uses a contingent perspective to understand the residential segregation. He thinks ethnic segregation results from many factors, either historical, economic, or cultural. He suggests that “groups, contexts and scale are the key to understanding the nature of segregation” (Kaplan, 2001, p61). He analyzed the segregation experiences of Chinese communities in New York and Los Angeles using global, national and local scales and then concluded that because of the differences
existing at each scale, the Chinese settlement in New York is tighter while Los Angeles more loosely scattered.

2.2.2 Values of segregation

Since most former discussion on segregation was under the environment between whites and blacks in the United States, the value of segregation is always thought to be negative and needed to be fixed. After analyzing Massey and Denton’s five dimensional segregation model’s relationship with the “anti-segregationist social and political values” (Sundstrom, 2004, p62), Sundstrom argues that “a just and good society ought not to be segregated residentially, economically, politically, and socially!” (Kaplan, 2005; Sundstrom, 2004, p70) However, other scholars argue that the value of segregation depends on different situation and has different meanings. Peach (1996) summarizes that a “good” segregation should be formed by individual’s voluntary choices and a “bad” segregation that is caused by the forces that push the ethnic groups to segregate from others, namely, it is involuntary practice. Based on Li’s definition on ethnoburb and the rapid historical growth of San Gabriel Valley, Rowland Heights is one example of “good” segregation because the good housing and beautiful view are the reasons attract upper-class Chinese immigrants to move in. But Monterey Park does not perfectly fit in Peach’s “good or bad” segregation model. The earlier immigrants who moved into Monterey Park were seeking its friendly political environment and a better living condition compared to inner city Chinatown. Monterey Park was an example of “good” segregation before the 1990s, evident as the Chinese population growing rapidly during that period. But recently, living condition in Monterey Park is declining due to the high residential density and Chinese small business. Monterey Park is not Chinese immigrants’ best choice. “People stop in Monterey Park but moving out is the ultimate goal after they establish themselves.” (Fong, 1994, p33) Then Monterey Park is becoming a “bad” segregation that hinders residents’ improvement.

2.2.3 Consequences of segregation

Most scholars studying ethnicity share the same opinion that based on the current globalizing context, segregation process cannot stay still, instead, it is a dynamic process. The consequences and steps following segregation is an issue that attracts a lot of scholars’ attention. On one hand, some geographers claim that segregation is only the first step of an
immigration process which will finally lead to the assimilation and integration to the main society. On the other hand, some scholars, mostly based on their empirical work, argue that the segregation process will not end up as a “melting pot” but toward a multicultural mosaic.

Research about assimilation originated from the research of ethnic isolation by the Chicago School of urban sociology. Park (1925) argues that “the most meaningful forms of social interaction take place in local, everyday settings, and that groups separated by distance scarcely know each other”. (Hiebert and Ley, 2003, p18; Park, 1925) Heibert and Ley (2003) state that the level of social assimilation equals with the degree of spatial assimilation. Park’s opinion is broadly accepted by ethnic geography researchers, because most researchers use spatial and demographic differences to measure cultural and social disparities. My research is also based on this theory by using the spatial and demographic differences between Monterey Park and Rowland Heights to measure the social or ethnic separation between them.

After the 1960s, many scholars continued to adopt the assimilation paradigm to analyze the processes of ethnic groups. A famous concept of assimilation was by Gordon (1964), who identifies seven “Assimilation Variables”: “(1) Cultural or behavioral assimilation; (2) Structural assimilation; (3) Identificational assimilation; (4) Marital assimilation; (5) Attitude receptional assimilation; (6) Behavior receptional assimilation; (7) Civic assimilation” (Gordon, 1964, p137). Gordon argues that cultural-behavioral assimilation is the first stage to happen when immigrants newly arrive in the host society (Gordon, 1964). He also argues that cultural assimilation is a “generational process” toward “an inevitable destination” (p.138). But he also claims that ethnic groups can be cultural assimilated without significant structural assimilated.

Gordon’s assimilation model had a profound influence in ethnic segregation and assimilation field. But some alternative perspectives had been aroused. Lin and Robinson (2005) use the Chinese residential patterns in Los Angeles ethnoburb as an opposite example to critique Gordon’s assimilation model. Using the 2000 census data, they think the persistent population growth and Chinese language retainment over the ethnoburbs indicate that Chinese ethnoburbs in Los Angeles still persist a high ethnic identity and will not be toward assimilation process.
Fong’s (1994) analysis on “Chinese City” Monterey Park, on the other hand, provides empirical result supporting Gordon’s assimilation model while also answering Lin and Robinson’s (2005) question. Fong (1994) thinks the composition of Chinese immigrants in Monterey Park is constantly changing which makes Gordon’s model seem unsuitable for this “Chinese city”. But, he argues the intergenerational cultural assimilation defined by Gordon is exemplified by the many Chinese immigrants who have moved to other areas of the San Gabriel Valley after living in Monterey Park for a number of years. It is, because the large number of newly arrived Chinese immigrants who use the city as a way station until they can move out, that makes the false impression that all Chinese immigrants remain unassimilated and Monterey Park as “Chinese City”.

2.3 Chinese Americans and Chinese Communities in the U.S.

2.3.1 Chinese Americans and Chinese immigrants

The impact of geopolitics, immigration policies, global economy, and social context on Chinese Americans experience is well recognized by Chinese American geographers. Chinese Americans’ early history in the U.S. started with prejudice and persecutions: when Chinese immigrants first landed on the west coast, they faced a harsh treatment which lead some of the population later migrate eastward (Brown and Pannell, 1985; Fan, 2002; McKeown, 2001). These early Chinese immigrants were mostly peasants from rural villages at southeast China, thus Cantonese became the popular dialect among Chinese American society at that time (Pan, 1998; Fan, 2002). Along the 19th and 20th century, Chinese population was slim and grew slowly till the 1950s when a countable Chinese immigrants came to the U.S. as political refugees, known as the 1949 Chinese (Fan, 2002). However, it was 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments, which “abolished the national origins quota system and eliminated national origin, race, or ancestry as bases for immigration the U.S.” (Fan, 2002 p.281), that stimulated the first wave of Chinese immigrants to the U.S. The growing population of Chinese immigrants was accelerated when globalizing economy and China’s “open door” policy increased the connection and interactions between China and the U.S. This changing global economic and political context triggered the second wave of
Chinese immigrants (Fan, 2002; Fong, 1994). Till 2000, there are more than 2.43 million Chinese living in the U.S., accounting 3.7% of the population in the country (Census Bureau, 2000).

Different from other ethnic groups, Chinese Americans, even in the early years, barely stayed at the bottom of the social hierarchy (McKeown, 2001). Without much public assistance from the mainstream society, the proficiency of this group draws many attentions from scholars (Kwong, 1996; Fong, 2000; Fong, 2002). Kwong (1996) demonstrated this proficiency of Chinese Americans emerged since the 1970s as a “model minority” which is portrayed as “minority groups with higher education level and higher percentage in professional fields than national average.” (Kwong, 1996 p.78)

In addition to the studies on the economic achievement of Chinese Americans, many social geographers also put their foci on the social segregation and cultural isolation of this ethnic group. Clark’s (1998) observation adopts a large range of dimensions, including “home ownership, educational attainment, income and poverty rates, English language acquisition, residential segregation, naturalization, and inter-marriage” (Clark, 1998 p.833), to establish the degree of assimilation or segregation of ethnic minorities in California. He asserted that Asian immigrants, especially Chinese Americans, are melted into the American mainstream faster than Latin Americans. Moreover, Lin and Robeson’s (2005) state that, based on the analysis of the language use at home as an indicator of cultural isolation, “ethnic persistence is still occurring in the majority of the population of Chinese immigrants” (Lin and Robenson, 2005 P.57), even in the ones living in the suburbs.

2.3.2 Chinese communities in the U.S.

2.3.2.1 Chinatowns and inner-city enclaves

As other ethnic groups, Chinese settlements in the U.S. experienced the inner city enclaves to the prosperity of both urban and suburban growth. Geographical debates on the early Chinese settlements primarily address on the sustainability of the ethnic communities and social isolation as the consequences of ethnic spatial segregation. In the 19th century, issues about Chinatown were mainly on the “anti-Chinese sentiments from the economic and
political battles between business owners and white workers” (Fong, 1994 p.8) because of the cheap Chinese labors. Before the 1950s, literatures mentioning Chinatown mainly discussed the American mainstream social issues.

Around the 1950s, there was a growing amount of literatures analyzing Chinese immigrants in inner city enclaves and how the highly-segregated communities function in the city. Barth (1964) discusses the reason why Chinese immigrants lived in a poor condition from an internal perspective. His studies concluded the reason for the low quality communities to the hostility on the Chinese immigrants themselves, because, according to Barth, “Chinese immigrants were not real immigrants who wanted to settle in the U.S. but sojourners who wanted little more than to make money and go back home to China. This rootless status finally created great bitterness among white workers and then made Chinese immigrants hard to enter the mainstream society.” (Barth, 1964; Fong, 1994 p.161)

Also, there are sociology studies on the occupations and job situations of Chinese immigrants and their impacts on the spatial structure of Chinese communities. Siu (1953) uses her studies in Chinese businessmen to claim that the initial Chinese sojourner mentality attributed to creating and reinforcing a “previously unmet business niche” (Siu, 1953) which, according to Kaplan and Li (2006), is the primary reason for the emergence and formation of Chinese communities.

From the 1970s, there were more studies on the Chinese communities, mostly concentrating on the spatial and social dynamics at the two biggest Chinatowns in the U.S., the ones at San Francisco and New York. Using interview data from the Chinese residents, Nee and Nee (1972) reveals the struggling history of early Chinese immigrants, the spatial and social evolution of San Francisco’s Chinatown, and the socio-political conflicts among its various segments. From a more profound view inside the Chinese ethnic community, Wong (1988, 1998) argues that Chinese Americans is a heterogeneous ethnic group, with powerful Chinese businessmen at the top of the social hierarchy and cheap labors at the bottom. Furthermore, McKeown (2001) also indicates that, since the nineteenth century, rules and managements had been generally executed and protected by Chinese gangs in inner city Chinatowns of Chicago, to protect the Chinese enclaves from the anti-Chinese sentiments outside of the community. Particularly focusing on the ethnic economy, Zhou (1992)
conceptualizes the “enclave economy” model to explain the formation and sustainability of Chinese enclaves in New York. She argued that “the Chinese there are not exploited but are in fact provided with viable employment and business opportunities impossible to find out side of the community... The enclave economy is not a failure of assimilation. Instead, the adaptation and integration of second- and third-generation Chinese Americans will be enhanced by the increased economic opportunities the enclave economy provides for the first generation.” (Fong, 1994 p.9; Zhou, 1992) Zhou’s model indicates that the formation of Chinese enclave is a voluntary process which Chinese residents prefer living inside instead of leaving the community.

After 1980, the impact of globalization had changed the geographical approach on the dynamics and transformation of Chinese communities to a large extent. Kwong (1996) discusses how international events and geopolitics affect the migration from China to the U.S. and the experiences of Chinese immigrants. Based on his analysis, he thus advocates the “model minority” concept to describe the proficiency Chinese immigrants achieved in such a short time under the changing international economic and political context.

2.3.2.2 The Chinese suburbia

After the 1980s, Chinese Americans started their suburbanization process which drew increasing scholarly attention on the suburbanization of Chinese settlements. Fong (1994) firstly describes this rapidly growing suburban population and settlements at Monterey Park in Los Angeles and defined it as “first suburban Chinatown” according to its large Chinese population. Fong, in his book, reveals how Chinese immigrant influxes happen, how these Chinese people struggle and prosper in American suburbs, and how they gradually create a unique suburban landscape through troubles and conflicts. He believes that the suburban Chinatown of Monterey Park was formed by multiple forces, including the changing political, economic, and social context in the U.S. and in China. He also indicates that as more and more Chinese immigrants buying houses with “bags of cash”, most of the Whites would leave the community due to the skyrocketing housing prices and overcrowding living condition. Increasing small Chinese businesses also cause low tax income to the government and cultural isolation issues, which lead to the outage of political and cultural conflicts such
as “Chinese no more”. According to Fong, the social and political conflicts associated with the large influx of Chinese population are inevitable. He also concluded that because of the rapidly increasing Chinese population, more and more Chinese immigrants will stop at Monterey Park as their first stop, changing the suburban community from the “Chinese Beverley Hill” to the new “immigration port”; more and more well-developed Chinese will leave Monterey Park to other affluent communities as their “ultimate goal”. Based on Monterey Park’s model, Fong advocated a transition of race and ethnicity relations in the formation of ethnic suburbs, in which “old theoretical dichotomies of black versus white, minority versus majority, is not adequate...and a better understanding of the international, multiracial, multicultural, and dynamic class reality is demanded.” (Fong, 1994 p.174)

Despite literatures on the existence and formation of Chinese suburbs, the social dynamics and threads inside the suburban communities are also discussed by ethnic geographers. By examining the Chinese suburban experiences at Los Angeles, New York, and Vancouver, Li and Kaplan (2006) analyze the ethnic economy activities, its impacts on the ethnic landscape, and how the spatial patterns of the ethnic communities affects the ethnic economy in return. Focusing on the social and cultural dynamics of Chinese suburbs, Li (1999) analyzes two ongoing social issues inside the thriving Chinese American community. The large cultural gap between the new Chinese immigrants and the mainstream society, the consequent cultural adjustments, public welfare, economic development, and governmental administration are considered as one of the crucial issues Chinese ethnic suburbs need to solve. Li also points out Nativism is the other challenge many Chinese suburbs are facing. She assumes the spirit of Nativism posits at the business development and job market. “Whenever the economy is booming, the level of labor demand is high, and jobs are plentiful, people tend to be more “tolerant” toward immigrants... However, during economic recessions and early stages of recovery, immigrants are more likely to become easy target and scapegoats, changed with taking jobs away from “Americans”.”(Li, 1999 p.11) The stimulus of both issues rests on the large influx of new immigrants to the U.S. which is still growing. Thus, according to Li’s argument, along with the increasing Chinese population, social and cultural issues inside Chinese suburbs will get more intense.

While admitting the fact of emerging Chinese settlements in the U.S. suburbs, many
ethnic geographers drew their attention on the migration trend from inner city Chinatown to the Chinese suburbs. A “model minority” notion emphasizing the “convergence of poverty issues and class disparities” (Kwong, 1996 p.55) was demonstrated to explain the geographical distribution of one specific ethnic group and the spatial transformation of their communities. Kwong’s “model minority community” concept categorizes certain ethnic groups into “downtown” and “uptown” people, taking Chinese Americans as one example. According to his argument, downtown minorities are the individuals with much lower median household income and a high percentage of the population below the poverty level, whereas the uptown minorities are a type of “model minority” which are much better educated with professional skills. This distinction of the downtown and uptown minorities affects their upward mobility to the mainstream thus shapes their decision making on their housing choice- the downtown minorities living in the spatially concentrated urban enclaves and the uptown minorities living in the ethnically mixed communities (Kwong, 1996). In this model Kwong suggests the spatial outcome of ethnic communities as consistently ethnic segregated.

In addition, Li (2005, 2009) reexamines the contemporary Chinese settlements and identifies the migration trends behind them. Believing in the impact of changing international economic and political interaction on the formation of ethnoburbs, she categorizes the contemporary Chinese settlements into six patterns emerged by time (Table 2.1). She indicates that the two major shifts of the Chinese population were affected by U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act in 1965 and the China’s “Open-door Policy” combined with warming diplomatic relationship in 1980. Both of these changes happened on the global and national context had stimulated a large amount of Chinese immigrants flowing into the U.S. In her model, it is the well developed Chinese immigrants and second generation Chinese Americans, which in Kwong’s model as the uptown Chinese, that stimulated the first migration trends from inner city Chinatown to the suburbs. Whereas uptown Chinese started to leave old Chinatowns, more new comers, known as the downtown Chinese, rushed in because the changing global context prompts the international migration from China to the U.S. Thus, with uptown Chinese moving out to suburban communities and downtown Chinese moving into the inner city enclaves, Chinese settlements in both urban and suburban areas prospered, creating a unique pattern of suburbanization process in the U.S.
Table 2.1 Chinese settlement patterns and community forms in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Settlement main characteristics</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Immigration policy/Quotas</th>
<th>Urban structure</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1882</td>
<td>Dispersal: small/isolated areas</td>
<td>Rural: mining field or construction sites</td>
<td>&quot;Open&quot; immigration</td>
<td>West frontier; few major cities</td>
<td>Locke, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882-1943</td>
<td>Clustered: Chinatown as ghetto</td>
<td>Forced segregation internal ethnic economy</td>
<td>Exclusion – Chinese Exclusion Act in effect</td>
<td>Job and housing market discrimination</td>
<td>San Francisco, Chinatown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-1965</td>
<td>Mainly clustered: Chinatown as enclave</td>
<td>Declining/surviving Chinatown &amp; economy starting dispersal to suburb</td>
<td>Transition – 1945 yr worldwide immigrant quota for all ethnic Chinese</td>
<td>Both job and housing market open to Chinese</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1980</td>
<td>Clustered &amp; dispersal: downtown vs. uptown</td>
<td>Revitalization Chinese dispersion suburb emerging &quot;satellite&quot;</td>
<td>Non-discrimination: 1965 Immigration Act 20,600 yr quota (Taiwan &amp; HK)</td>
<td>Suburbanization of job and housing at full speed</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-present</td>
<td>From clustered to dispersal: globalizing ethno-spectrum</td>
<td>Globalizing Chinatown growing &quot;Ethnicity&quot; booming ethno-suburb emerging &quot;aspirity,&quot; cultural community</td>
<td>Selection 1990 Immigration Act: 10,000 yr quota for HK; investor EB-5 visa; 1992-2002: 3300-35,250 H-1B visas per year*</td>
<td>Fast pace of global economic integration &amp; competition; increasing demands for hetero-immigrants</td>
<td>Manhattan, Flushing and Silicon Valley, Phoenix, St. Louis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: INS Yearbook (1992-2002); including Mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong.
function, by serving the residential and services needs of new immigrants whose economic and social networks are more international in scope than older immigrants.” (Fan, 2002 p.268) The distinct characteristics of the Chinese suburbs favor the well-off Chinese immigrants’ needs, thus attract them moving out of the Chinatown to settle at American suburbs.

From a contingent perspective, Kaplan and Holloway (2001) emphasize the importance of scale in measuring residential differentiation in understanding the spatial transformation of Chinese settlements and examine the reasons underneath. They argue that the formation of Chinese communities is a contingent process which can be affected by casual factors in many scales, globally, nationally, and locally. The spatial outcomes of Chinese suburbs in different cities, or even countries, can vary largely in regard to the various casual factors in every scale. In this circumstance, summarizing a universal model of spatial transformation model is hard to achieve.

In conclusion, despite the inconsistent geographical understandings on the migration trends and the casual factors, theoretical analysis on the Chinese American suburbanization agrees on the cognition of increasing suburban Chinese population.

### 2.3.2.3 The Chinese ethnoburb

In the past two decades, the accelerating suburbanization process of Chinese Americans has led the arguments on the new types of Chinese communities under theoretical discussion. Instead of admitting previous models on Chinese suburbs, Li (1997, 1998) introduces a new “ethnoburb” concept to explain the extensively emerging Chinese ethnic suburbs in San Gabriel Valley, Los Angeles. In her article, Li proposes a model of “ethnoburb” as suburban ethnic settlements. Under the framework of Park (1936)’s “invasion and succession” model and Kwong (1996)’s “model minority” theory, the “ethnoburb” concept asserts that contemporary ethnoburbs “has emerged under the influence of international geopolitical and global economic restructuring, changing national immigration and trade policies, and local demographic, economic and political contexts... Ethnoburbs are suburban ethnic clusters of residential areas and business districts in large metropolitan areas. They are multiethnic communities, in which one ethnic minority group has a significant concentration, but does
not necessarily comprise a majority.” (Li, 1997 p.2) Li also discusses the distinctions between ethnoburbs and other urban ethnic settlement forms, drawing the conclusion that ethnoburbs, compared to the urban ghettos and enclaves, are communities constructed with “voluntary relative concentration of ethnic population, relatively lower percentage of ethnic people, much greater polarization of socio-economic status and occupational structure of ethnic residents, and immigrants from various backgrounds.” (Li, 1997 p.3) The primary characteristic of the ethnoburb is the nature of a truly multi-ethnic community. In contrary to Chinatown’s community of mixed age groups with a much larger percentage of elderly people, ethnoburb is a much more energetic neighborhood with younger age groups from various ethnic groups. Thus, Li states that inner city ethnic enclaves, such as Chinatowns, would eventually disperse, or occupied by other ethnic groups, into “ethnoburbs” as Chinese immigrants move toward the assimilation process.

In Li’s “ethnoburb” assumption, San Gabriel Valley at Los Angeles, with almost thirty percent non-Hispanic Caucasian, approximately thirty percent Hispanic, and more than twenty percent Asian Americans (Census Bureau, 2000), is recognized as one conceptual model for Chinese ethnoburb. City of Monterey Park, known as the “first suburban Chinatown”, is portrayed as the first emerging Chinese ethnoburb in the U.S.

While Li introduces a new “ethnoburb” concept to advocate a new type of Chinese settlements, many other geographers dispute the “ethnoburb” concept as a solid model to represent the contemporary suburban Chinese settlements.

From their research at the same Chinese communities, Lin and Robinson (2005) argue that Chinese settlements in San Gabriel Valley is not a model of “ethnoburb” but one kind of ethnic enclaves. They assume that Chinese ethnoburbs are “the end result of convergent historical and urban process”. (Lin and Robinson, 2005 p.51) However, their observation on the recent growth trends of Chinese ethnoburbs in San Gabriel Valley suggests a demographic growth rather than a dispersal, which challenges the spatial dispersal character of “ethnoburb”. In addition, Lin and Robinson also analyze the linguistic assimilation level of Chinese immigrants in San Gabriel Valley to mirror the cultural assimilation process. They demonstrate that the cultural assimilation occurring in Chinese ethnoburbs is limited, whereas cultural persistence consists most of the Chinese population in the Chinese ethnoburbs. Based
on their observation, they consider the ethnoburbs model is a theoretical challenge to the assimilation theory, spatially and culturally. Thus, the contemporary Chinese settlements’ patterns is spatially and culturally expanding and reinforcing instead of dispersing and disappearing, which indicates that the ethnoburb model is still a hypothesis in Chinese American experiences.

From a sociology perspective, Laguerre (2005) questions the “ethnoburb” concept by examining the “New Chinatown” phenomenon in San Francisco Richmond District. Laguerre argues that the “new Chinatown” should be defined as a “panethnopolis” model, “a global neighborhood with majority population of Chinese immigrants and of other ethnic groups of mostly Asian descent.” (Laguerre, 2005 p.41) He also indicates this panethnopolis model rests at the same theoretical position as “satellite Chinatown” (Zhou, 1992), “suburban Chinatown” (Fong, 1994), “uptown Chinatown” (Kwong, 1987), “ethnoburb” (Li, 1999); “multiracial city” (Saito, 1998), “Mandarin Park” (Horton, 1995), “Chinese Beverly Hills” (Eljera, 1996), and “technopolis” (Laguerre, 2003). Based on the analysis of the formation, development, and social integration of the new Chinatown, Laguerre argues that social assimilation and spatial dispersal is not the end form of Chinese settlement urban process. Namely, new types of Chinese settlements can also be shaped by social and cultural formation. The emergence of the new Chinatown in Richmond District as an example of panethnopolis reflects the “ongoing interactions of immigrants with their homelands and global networks of connecting diasporic nodes.” (Laguerre, 2005) Thus, he refers that the “ethnoburbs” notion wouldn’t be sustainable. Instead, all multi-racial communities would be eventually transformed into one-race dominating ethnic neighborhoods.

2.4. Conclusion

In conclusion, from the literature reviews above, it is obvious that debates on either the spatial patterns of ethnic segregation in general, or the Chinese settlements in particular, mostly focus on the emergence and manifestation of the new suburban clusters. Analysis on the dynamics and migration trends under one certain type of ethnic settlements, especially
suburban communities, are rarely discussed. With the American suburban background mixed with the distinct Chinese American experiences, this project calls a new theoretical perspective to investigate. Positing the research purpose in this theoretical gap, this thesis examines the diversities and internal migration flows underlying the ethnoburb conceptual framework.
Chapter 3 Research Methodology

3.1 Research Background

According to the 2000 census data (Census Bureau, 2000), Chinese concentrate at two regions in Los Angeles County. One region incorporates City of Monterey Park, Alhambra, San Gabriel, and Rosemead; the other one includes Hacienda Heights, Rowland Heights and Diamond Bar. Within each concentration, the percentage of ethnic Chinese population is not equally distributed either. Over the west San Gabriel Valley, City of Monterey Park is one of the oldest and densest Chinese ethnoburbs with the highest percentage of Chinese population in Los Angeles. Whereas after ten years, from 1990 to 2000, Rowland Heights Community, on the other side of the valley, rapidly emerged as a new population hub of Chinese, representing the most booming Chinese ethnoburb in east San Gabriel Valley. Thus, Monterey Park and Rowland Heights are selected as two study cases of this project to compare their spatial and demographic differences and investigate the migration flows between traditional Chinese ethnoburbs and new Chinese ethnoburbs.

3.2 Research Methods

The research methodology of this thesis incorporates both quantitative methods and qualitative methods. I adopt census data to collect the demographic and social characteristic data in Monterey Park and Rowland Heights and compare the difference. From the census data collected, I explore socioeconomic status differences and the immigration background differences between these two communities.

Qualitative data are in form of semi-structural interviews and participant observation data collected in 2008 summer fieldwork. The aim of these data is to find out the Chinese immigrants’ conception of their communities and their motivation to migrate. The interview result answers the second and third research questions and reveals the migration trends among ethnoburbs.
3.3 Data Source

3.3.1 Statistical Data

To collect Chinese experience in Monterey Park and Rowland Heights, statistical data at community, county, and state level are needed. The main source of the statistical data comes from 2000 census and 1990 census on “county” and “place” scale. Detailed tables including information on the demographical, social, and economic characteristics of Chinese immigrants in those areas are selected from two summary files (Summary File 1, Summary File 4). General demographical and social characteristics which distinguish Chinese with other race groups are based on the Summary File 1, which represents 100 percent of the total Chinese population. More detailed information on socio-economic and cultural characteristics of Chinese subgroups comes from Summary File 4, representing 1 out of 6 sample Chinese population.

Complementary statistic data are also collected from community websites and regional organizations’ public report. Based on Monterey Park’s cityhood nature, economic data and planning information is accessible from city’s website, whereas such detailed planning information of Rowland Heights Community is collected from Los Angles County Regional Plan in 2007 and East San Gabriel Valley Economic Department Annual Report in 2006 and 2008.

3.3.2 Semi-structural Interviews

3.3.2.1 Data Collection

Semi-structural interviews had been conducted at two Chinese ethnoburbs from June to August in 2008, fourteen in Monterey Park and thirteen in Rowland Heights. Twenty-seven valid interviews had been collected from Chinese in both ethnoburbs, besides two invalid interviews. Interviewees were selected randomly from the community parks, libraries or on the street, but must have more than 2 year residency in the community. All the interviews are conducted in Mandarin with interviewees presenting anonymously in this research. Interviewees were asked about their immigration background, socioeconomic status, daily activities and their conception of the community. A digital recorder was used to record
interviews under interviewee’s acknowledgement and agreement; otherwise all the information would be recorded by script. 10 interviews are recorded by digital recorders and 17 are recorded by script. All data records are kept private and confidential.

3.3.2.2 Interview Questions

Interview questions encompass information on interviewees’ immigration background, socioeconomic status, daily activities, conception of the community and identities. Interview is structured by four parts: the first part is on the basic information and immigration background, questions including age, gender, year of entry, moving history, and ethnic origin; the second part is on the socioeconomic status and daily activities, questions including household size and income, occupation, commuting time and form, housing information, and their daily activities within the community; the third part is on the community conception, asking the interviewee’s reasons to move in, their conceptions and participations to the community, and their inclination to move out, if possible; the last part of the interview is on the information of interviewee’s cultural identity, with questions on the language at home, social network, and their ethnic definition to themselves.

3.3.2.3 Data Sample

Among twenty-seven interviews, fourteen interviews were conducted at Monterey Park. Individuals including four elderly Chinese, three professional Chinese, five working-class Chinese, and two second generation Chinese Americans are engaged in the data sample, sexes are equally distributed. Thirteen interviewees were conducted with the Chinese at Rowland Heights, with five professional Chinese, three Chinese entrepreneurs, three working-class Chinese, one elderly Chinese and one second generation Chinese Americans.

3.3.3. Participant Observation

Participant observation was also conducted during observer’s two-month living at Monterey Park and two-week stay at Rowland Heights. Observation data was collected on the
aspects of community landscape, public services, and residents’ daily lives, which is applied to compare two ethnoburbs’ geographical differences.

3.4 Conclusion

To answer the research questions, I select two ethnoburbs at suburban Los Angeles, City of Monterey Park and Rowland Heights Community as the two case studies for this project. Particularly, quantitative data, such as each ethnoburb’s spatial data, in terms of statistic data from community websites and regional organizations’ public reports, as well as each ethnoburb’s demographic data, in terms of decimal census data file, are collected to reveal the demographic and spatial diversities among ethnoburbs. Qualitative data such as participant observation results and semi-structural interviews are also used in this research, to explore the migration flows among ethnoburbs.
Chapter 4 Spatial Disparities between Monterey Park and Rowland Heights

4.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the spatial differences between Chinese neighborhoods at City of Monterey Park and those at Rowland Heights Community. It aims to answer the first part of research question- what are the spatial and demographic differences among Chinese ethnoburbs? Specific observations of the two ethnoburbs are addressed in terms of urban patterns of the residential areas, commercial areas and public spaces of Chinese neighborhoods within each ethnoburb. By examining the spatial disparities between two ethnoburbs, this chapter concludes that the urban patterns of Chinese neighborhoods at City of Monterey Park is spatially compact and equipped with advanced ethnic-oriented services, whereas Chinese neighborhoods at Rowland Heights is geographically dispersed with many ethnic-oriented services sharing with other adjacent neighborhoods. With two different types of urban patterns, the two ethnoburbs also vary in the form of demographic characteristics which is discussed in chapter 5.

4.2. Urban Patterns of Chinese neighborhoods at City of Monterey Park

4.2.1. History of Chinese settlement at Monterey Park

From a typical American suburban community in the 1950s to a highly dense suburban Chinatown in the 1990s, Monterey Park (Map 4.1) witnessed the process of the Chinese immigrants settled in American suburbs and created a unique suburban landscape (Fong, 1994).
From the 1950s to the 1980s, Monterey Park had experienced series of changes, demographically, economically and socially. Before the 1960s, Monterey Park had Whites as major residents, known as “one of the whitest spots in Southern California” (Fong, 1994 p.28). However, after the passage of U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act in 1965, Monterey Park, featured as a liberal and ethnic-friendly community, had become popular among middle-class immigrants. By the end of 1980, Monterey Park had first been reported as a “majority minority” city with only 25 percentage White population (Fong, 1994). During the past two decades the ethnic composition kept diversifying, which is triggered by the blooming Chinese population as a result of the economic globalization. By the year of 2000, Monterey Park became the first city in the United States with a majority Asian population (Fong, 2002).

4.2.2. Residential patterns of Chinese settlements at Monterey Park

The present residential patterns of Monterey Park are results of the residential transformation adjusting the large influx of Chinese immigrants and capital in the 1970s. Before Chinese immigrants moved in, Monterey Park used to be a quiet ranch suburb, with single-family homes as the common residential type (Monterey Park Historical Heritage Commission, Monterey Park Oral History Project, 1991). After the arrival of Chinese immigrants who bought houses with bags of cash, the residential property price skyrocketed (Li, 1998). With many white families moving out, Chinese newcomers would rather tear
down the former single-family homes and establish their multiple-unit complexes than live in the existing houses (Fong, 1994; Monterey Park Historical Heritage Commission, Monterey Park Oral History Project, 1991). By converting one piece of property into two or even more pieces, more and more houses were constructed on smaller lots to fulfill the increasing Chinese population and expanding demand in housing market (Fong, 1994). As a result, this transformation of residential patterns was considered as real estate investment and profited many early Chinese immigrants at that time (Li, 2006). As the population density kept rising, the property size had been cut into smaller and smaller pieces. Its spatial outcome had finally reshaped the community landscape with unorganized increasing residential density, blooming ethnic economy, shrinking public spaces, and extending stress on the infrastructure (Fong, 1994). Thus, the early Chinese residents were profited by the investments and the new Chinese immigrants benefited from settling down at an ethnic-friendly suburb with an affordable purchase. However, the negative impacts of the transformation were on local municipal government’s debt (Fong, 1994; Monterey Park Historical Heritage Commission, Monterey Park Oral History Project, 1991).

Map 4.2 Percentage of Chinese alone in Monterey Park, 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 1, Matrices P1, and P7.

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ThematicMapFramesetServlet? _bm=y&-context=tm&-tm_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_M00240&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&-tm_config=|dt=gov.census.aff.domain.map.EnglishMapExtent|gif|cx=-118.2952445|DEC_1990_STF1_M00148 )

Based on Map 4.2, the highest percentage of Chinese population is located in the north...
part of Monterey Park, which represents the residential cluster of Chinese. This residential cluster is confined by Garvey Avenue from the south, Hellman Avenue from the north, Alhambra Avenue from the east, and Atlantic Boulevard from the west. According to the City of Monterey Park Zoning Plan, the two main land use categories in this Chinese residential cluster are High Density Residential (HDR) and Medium Density Residential (MDR) land use, with HDR covered most of the places on two sides and MDR surrounded in the middle. Monterey Park zoning code’s definition on High Density Residential category is “category allows a broad range of dwelling unit types which may be attached or detached. The residential units consist typically of apartments, condominiums, and townhomes built at a maximum density of 25 units per acre. The average population density is 84 persons per acre.” And Medium Density Residential category is defined as “category provides for moderate density housing either as attached or detached units at a density range of 0 to 16 units per acre. Such housing can include private and common open space. The average population density is 53 persons per acre.” (http://www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us/index.aspx?page=707#land) Thus, the residential density of Chinese in Monterey Park is relatively high, with condominiums, apartments and townhouses as the most common spatial patterns (Figure 4.1& Figure 4.2).

One woman, who moved from mainland China to the U.S. in the late 1980s, rents three houses to tenants in Monterey Park and all of them locate at this Chinese residential cluster. “There is a [land use] restriction on what kind of houses you can build. I used to own a house on the other side [of the Garvey Avenue], but it wasn’t as profitable as houses here so I sold it out in 1999 and bought this new one... The houses [in this neighborhood] had just built up and open for sale when I came here. People rushed to buy them. All of my friends recommended me to put my money on these houses as
an investment. I finally bought two sets of them and rent them out after decoration... Most of the tenants are new Chinese immigrants who just came to the U.S....Chinese people, especially the immigrants who just landed on the U.S., prefer to live with other Chinese.” As a result, the whole neighborhood is full of Chinese immigrants. “There were Mexican people living in Monterey Park, but they live at the other side [of the hills].” When I asked her how she felt about the compact residential pattern, she answered “To most newcomers, it is already spacious enough. Many of them came from places in China even denser than here. Besides, this is just their first stop. Many of them moved out after two years.”

There are many Chinese families living in single-family detached houses as well. Most of these families have at least one elderly Chinese at homes. Despite their single-family detached houses in land use category, the structures of the houses occupied almost all the lots, leaving little space for front or backyard. Even the space of yards is left out, it is usually converted into an open garage or storage. These “monster houses” (Li, 2001) are the prominent model in single-family houses in Monterey Park (Figure 4.3).

![Figure 4.3 Single-family homes in Monterey Park, (Source: Yu, 2008)](Image)

A housewife who has lived with her husband and father-in-law at Monterey Park for more than 4 years said:

“My husband and I bought this house when he got a job at Santa Monica... because it has a good Chinese neighborhood for me to make friends and for his dad to go around... Most of the single-family houses are like this, with small backyards or gardens... Lawn is little use for us and it is hard to take care of. We don’t have time or money to keep it.” After I asked her if they used the backyards for parties or barbecues, she answered “All our friends are Chinese and we don’t have parties at home. The house took us a lot of money and we want it to be best used.”

4.2.3. Commercial patterns of Chinese settlements at Monterey Park

Monterey Park’s location has distinct geographic advantages for opening businesses in
Southern California. The city is surrounded by three major freeways, San Bernardino Freeway (I-10) from the north, Long Beach Freeway (I-710) from the west and Pomona (SR 60) from the south (Map 4.1). This accessible location accelerates the commercial transportation between Monterey Park and all other places of Los Angeles.

Most of the Chinese businesses concentrate at Garvey Avenue and Garfield Avenue in Downtown Monterey Park Business Improvement District (BID). Monterey Park Downtown BID was established by Monterey Park City Council in 1986 due to the commercial request from Chinese entrepreneurs (Monterey Park Historical Heritage Commission, Monterey Park Oral History Project). The BID area encloses most of downtown Monterey Park, with Garvey Avenue and Garfield Avenue as axes (Map 4.3). Featured by a strong Chinese cultural environment, it has attracted more than 300 Chinese businesses by 2007, from tiny restaurants, individual attorney offices, to large shopping centers and banks (www. http://www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us/).

According to Fong, there are three general Chinese economic categories in Monterey Park, the small-scale ethnic operations, the professional services owned by individual Chinese, and the ethnic Chinese banks (Fong, 1994).

The small-scale ethnic operations mainly target at the Chinese population in Monterey
Park. Because the ethnic Chinese market is slim, the scale of these operations is usually small, occupying units within 300 square feet. The profit of the business is relatively low as well (Horton, 1989). Owners of these ethnic businesses are mostly early or new immigrants, hiring working-class Chinese immigrants as employees (Fong, 1994). This category of economy encompasses businesses such as small Chinese restaurants, Chinese medicine stores, antique stores, and hair salons (Figure 4.4 & Figure 4.5). Most of these businesses locate at Downtown Monterey Park along the axes of the BID (http://www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us/). Store owners prefer to gather as economic clusters to attract more clients and share parking space, thus plazas are the common spatial pattern of this category of ethnic economy. Many plazas locate near large Chinese supermarkets where people can patronize after grocery shopping. For example, one of the most popular plazas locates across the street to Hongkong Supermarket, the largest Chinese supermarkets in Monterey Park (Figure 4.6 & Figure 4.7). One owner of a Chinese restaurant said:

“The peak time [of the business] is during the weekends when a lot of students and families come to the supermarket (Hongkong supermarket) to buy groceries. When it is dinner time, the restaurant is full of people.”

Figure 4.4 & 4.5 Fortune Shopping Plaza on Garvey Avenue, (Source: Yu, 2008)
The second category of Chinese economy is small-scale professional businesses owned by new Chinese immigrants or second generation Chinese immigrants (Fan, 2002). Individual law offices, medical clinics, travel agents, and real estate agents are incorporated into this category. These types of occupation need individuals equipped with professional skills, high educational attainment, and most importantly, multi-lingual ability (Li, 2006). Thus, this economic category situates at conventional business buildings in a quiet environment within a short distance to Chinese population clusters. Since the small-scale of these businesses limits the size of offices, many of the owners choose to concentrate in one structure to share rent and infrastructural services. Figure 4.8 & 4.9 show one commercial center on Garvey Avenue which accommodates many small law offices.
The ethnic Chinese banks are financial institutions owned or operated by Chinese ethnic groups (Fong, 1994). The services of these financial institutions include personal checking and saving accounts, lending loans, and providing consultation on financial managements. These banks function as economic coordinators on capital flows between China and the U.S. (Li, 2002). Thus, they locate in larger lots at major commercial centers in BID. Figure 4.10 shows the East West Bank on East Garvey Avenue and Figure 4.11 shows the Pacific Bank at the intersection of Garfield Avenue and Garvey Avenue.
4.2.4. Public space and community services

Along with the Chinese population growth and economic development in Monterey Park, community services for Chinese people had also been improved gradually in the past two decades (Fong, 1994). Many public institutions embraced ethnic services for Chinese people, although not all of them are satisfactory (http://www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us/).

4.2.4.1. Parks and recreations

Map 4.4 Park Facilities Map in Monterey Park (http://www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us/index.aspx?page=822)

According to Map 4.4, Parks and recreation facilities in Monterey Park are equally distributed across city’s territory. There are fourteen parks in use by 2008 and most of them are equipped with facilities for sport activities, specialized classes and children’s playgrounds (http://www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us/index.aspx?page=822). Due to the skyrocketed housing price and overcrowded land use, the spatial extension of open spaces in Monterey Park has shrunk down largely (Horton, 1989), and most of them are used as sports fields. Figure 4.12& 4.13 show the Barnes Park at neighborhood with high Chinese residential density. The approximate measure of the park is 28 acres, including the City Hall Square. Most of the land is used by children’s playground, tennis fields, and Amphitheater which require reservations before use. There is little open space for spontaneous recreation, such as walking paths or
picnic fields.
“*My family comes to the Park after dinner every day... because there are children's playgrounds here and my daughter likes to play with other Chinese kids... We (she and her husband) stay at this corner when she is playing, talking with other Chinese parents.*”

Said by a 35 years old housewife, whose husband works in an IT company. After I asked if she enjoyed the facilities here, she said

“The reason I come here is not for exercise or playing as those Mexicans and Whites. [Because] it is the only time I can be with my friends, chat and relax ourselves, without worrying about the housework or the kids. Plus, there is not much space for us to play and walking around. The picnic fields are always occupied and play fields are for youths. Here [the small area near children’s playground] is the place for us*.”

Figure 4.12& 4.13 Barnes Park on McPherrin Avenue, Monterey Park *(Source: Yu, 2008)*

However, this compact land use doesn’t benefit all Chinese in Monterey Park. One interviewee who is the owner of several Chinese restaurants considers the recreation place in his neighborhood unsatisfactory.

“It (Sierra Vista Park) is too small.”

Sierra Vista Park is located at the north part of Monterey Park with the approximate measure of 3 acres.

“And most of the space is used to construct children’s playground. If I want to take a walk with my wife or go jogging, it will look like I am running around my backyard... I don’t go to the park very often. I would rather go to the gym or the beach.”

4.2.4.2. Libraries

Nevertheless, many other public services in Monterey Park, such as community libraries, intend to improve Chinese residents’ benefit as a whole. Monterey Park Burggemeyer Library provides a friendly reading environment to Chinese adults and is also a useful place for Chinese American youths. In Burggemeyer Library’s first floor, there is a section of Chinese
books and newspapers serving the Chinese adults and seniors, whereas the second floor is children’s area equipped with children’s stack and playing zones. Almost all kinds of Chinese residents in Monterey Park feel comfortable and useful in this library.

One of my interviewees is a 64 years old Cantonese woman who goes to the library every day.

“I can’t read in English or Mandarin and I don’t have TV channels in Chinese at home... [but] the library has newspapers in Cantonese. I come to the library every morning to read the newspaper. This is the only way for me to know what happens in China every day.”

And another 32 years old housewife and a mother of two, also goes to the library every week.

“I usually pick a book from the Chinese fiction aisle and then go to the children’s area on the second floor with my daughter. I read my book while she is reading hers. This is our schedule every Sunday afternoon...There are Chinese fictions for children too. She (her daughter) doesn’t speak Chinese at home. We’d like her learn some Chinese in the library...She enjoys reading Chinese books.”

While Burggemeyer Library creates a welcoming environment for people out of the labor force, it also acts as an important part in working-class Chinese’s lives. A 28 years old Chinese immigrant who works at a hair salon on Garvey Avenue said:

“I usually come to the library in the evening... I have nothing to do after work...I’d like to spend some time here, read Chinese novels, watch movies, and learn English from the books.”

4.2.4.3. Health care

Public health care is another well established ethnic community service for Chinese in Monterey Park. Garfield Medical Center on Garfield Avenue and Monterey Park Hospital on Atlantic Boulevard are the two major public hospitals in Monterey Park, both of which are well equipped with Chinese medical treatments, acupuncture services, and doctors with multi-lingual background. Because of their embrace to multi-ethnic patients, these two hospitals accept more than 19,000 Chinese inpatient treatments and 54,000 outpatient visits annually, accounting the most popular hospitals for Chinese in Los Angeles (http://www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us/).
4.2.4.4. Other community services

As the Chinese population consistently increases in Monterey Park, other community services for Chinese people, such as Chinese Churches, Chinese American Museums, and Chinese Sunday Schools were gradually established to enrich Chinese lives in Monterey Park. Till 2007, there were nine Chinese churches in Monterey Park (www.city-data.com). Many of them locate at the Business Improvement District in central Monterey Park or at the Chinese residential cluster in the north of Monterey Park (http://www.ci.monterey-park.ca.us/).

4.3. Urban Patterns of Chinese settlements at Rowland Heights

The community standard district of Rowland Heights is confined by City of Industry in the North, Orange County in the South, City of Diamond Bar in the East, and Hacienda Heights in the West, with Pomona Freeway (Freeway 60), Brea Canyon Road, Fullerton Road, Colima Road, Stoner Creek Road, and the Schabarum Regional Park as its boundaries (Map 5.1). According to the census data, Chinese at Rowland Heights mainly reside in structures built in the 1960s and 1970s (Census Bureau, 2000) when the Community General Plan was toward a purpose to establish a sleepy bedroom community for predominately middle-class whites. Due to the short history of settlements in this spatially dispersed setting, spatial patterns of Chinese scatter at Rowland Heights.

4.3.1 History of Chinese settlement at Rowland Heights

Before the early 20th century, Rowland Heights was a rural community with ranches as the typical economic type (Rowland Heights Community Coordinating Council, http://www.rhccc.netfirms.com/). After the WWII, it experienced a population explosion which led the neighborhood to the peak time of developing activities and economic prosperity. Through this wave of development, Rowland Heights started its way to suburbanization. The East San Gabriel Valley Planning Commission’s General Plan in 1956 consisting of zoning ordinances, land use patterns, and community services, accelerated the systematic suburban development in Rowland Heights which has a great impact on its current spatial patterns (Los
Angeles County department of regional planning, http://planning.co.la.ca.us/). The residential development and suburbanization progress in the 1960s created large residential neighborhoods and community facilities such as schools, libraries, and recreational areas in the neighborhood (Rowland Heights Community Coordinating Council, http://www.rhccc.netfirms.com/). This infrastructural resource also fueled the later growth after the 1980s.

The large Chinese settlements at Rowland Heights started in late 1980s when middle and upper class Taiwanese and South Koreans moved in (Fan, 2002). The first group of Chinese, though only couple of households, settled down at Rowland Heights in the mid-1970s when the government composed a program enabling those veterans from WWII purchasing houses in a lower interest rate. Some Chinese American veterans moved their home from Chinatown to Rowland Heights (Chung, 1999). At that time, Rowland Heights was still a predominately middle-class white neighborhood until the 1980s. The second wave of Chinese at Rowland Heights emerged in the late 1980s after the mass Taiwanese and South Koreans moving in (Rowland Heights Community Coordinating Council, http://www.rhccc.netfirms.com/). The former Asian population at Rowland Heights had built a fundamentally diverse community environment as well as convenient facilities which favored the Chinese newcomers settling their homes. In stead of new Chinese immigrants from China, many affluent Chinese families moved from other places in Los Angeles County to this new ethnic suburb since then.

### 4.3.2. Residential patterns of Chinese settlements at Rowland Heights

According to the 2000 census data, the residential cluster of Chinese is located at the southern part of Rowland Heights (Map 4.5) which is stated for low density residential land use in Rowland Heights Community General Plan. The area is located on the mountain terrain, mainly occupied by light agricultural land use, with several residential planned development land use neighborhoods and little land for single-family houses. According to the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Zoning Ordinance, it is categorized as a combination of large lot residential, suburban residential, and suburban high density residential land use. The residential patterns falling in these categories are single family detached homes, attached homes, townhouses, and duplexes at density ranging from one to
nine dwelling units per acre.

According to the Rowland Heights Community Coordinate Council and 2000 census data, houses occupied by Chinese at Rowland Heights are mostly single-family detach houses or ranch farms (Chart 4.1). Most of these single-family detached houses are occupied by the householders instead of the renters, namely, Chinese at Rowland Heights are living with their families and they prefer bigger houses for a large family. Houses on the mountain terrain have bigger lots, more spacious rooms and a good view from the hill which attracts a lot of Chinese living in lower density single-family detached houses in the southeastern part of Rowland Heights.

Chart 4.1 Occupied housing units of Chinese at Rowland Heights, 2000

Map 4.5 Percentage who are Chinese alone at Rowland Heights, 2000 (Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ThematicMapFramesetServlet?_2000_SF1_U_M00240&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&-tm_config=|dt=gov.census.aff.domain.map.EnglishMapExtent|2000_SF1_U|th=D

EC_2000_SF1_U_M00240|lang=en)
Under close scrutiny, the residential patterns of Chinese at Rowland Heights vary among different subgroups. The Chinese professionals normally buy their houses in one-unit detached single family houses whereas the working-class Chinese live in rental condominiums or townhouses. According to the land use map, the neighborhood in the northern and eastern part of the Chinese residential cluster has relatively lower residential density with single family houses as the housing type (Figure 4.14, Figure 4.15). This hilly area has been defined as the least dense residential pattern at Rowland Heights.

On the other hand, the working-class Chinese concentrate at the Southern part which in Rowland Heights General Plan is defined as Residential Planned Development Area, a relatively complex residential area with low-density and high-density land use combined together (Figure 4.16). Compared to those in the adjacent single-family neighborhoods, housing price for the condominiums and apartments in the business areas are relatively low in order to accommodate working-class Chinese. In addition, due to the high fluidity of occupations in service industry, many working-class Chinese prefer to reside at places supplying constant and plentiful job opportunities. In this context, the community service is not as necessary to them as to the Chinese professionals. Thus, many working-class Chinese concentrate at apartment neighborhoods in downtown Rowland Heights.
4.3.3. Commercial patterns of Chinese settlements at Rowland Heights

According to the land use map of Rowland Heights, most of the commercial areas in Rowland Heights are located along Colima Road and exits of Freeway 60. Consequently, the Chinese commercial cluster is generally represented as shopping malls and plazas on Colima Road. Chinese ethnic businesses and entrepreneurs at Rowland Heights can be spatially categorized into two types: the small scale Chinese ethnic business like supermarkets and Chinese restaurants; and the large Chinese-owned financial institutions like Chinese ethnobanks. There are little professional services at Rowland Heights, compared to those at Monterey Park.

Most of the former two Chinese businesses concentrate on the central part of Colima Road with convenient accessibility and high population density. Although this location is beyond a walkable distance from the Chinese residential cluster at Rowland Heights, it still attracts a lot of customers and clientele for the following two reasons. First, because many of the Chinese at Rowland Heights work in its adjacent areas, such as City of Industry and Diamond Bar, Colima Road is on their way commuting from work to home and easy to access during the lunch time. Secondly, Colima Road, same as Garvey Avenue in Monterey Park, is the main street through Rowland Heights which makes the commercial clusters more likely to locate at.

The prevalent form of small Chinese businesses at Rowland Heights is small-scale
plazas which usually have only one story and property lots less than 50,000 square feet. However, these small plazas usually can be divided into a lot of units, leaving each unit suitable and affordable for small-scale businesses or restaurants. For example, in Diamond Plaza on Fullerton Avenue, there are more than 30 operations located in this three-story shopping center. Most of them are Chinese entrepreneurs who mainly cater to Chinese customers. On the entrance of the plaza, there is a big sign with most of the stores and restaurants names on it, and most of them are written only in Chinese characters, with few printing English translation on them. A businessman works at Diamond Bar, said:

“Starting from 9:30AM the plaza (Diamond Plaza) is getting packed! You can’t find a single parking spot in the mall, not even the valet parking place nearby. Most people coming here are Chinese, to have the dim sum in New Capitol Seafood Restaurant (one famous chain restaurant serving seafood, dim sum, and Cantonese cuisine)... There are other stores [in the plaza] too, just not as popular as New Capitol. Their businesses rely on its (New Capitol) customers.”

There is also a post on the Chinese cuisine website about the review of New Capitol Seafood Restaurant, saying:

“It was 10 to 11 in the morning but the parking lot is totally packed... Unbelievable! I managed to find a parking spot at the far end of the mall, dodged the crazy drivers honking at each other and cutting each other off, and made my way to the Restaurant that people were literally running each other over to get into, New Capitol Seafood. There was a line all the way down the stairs!” (Source: http://mmm-yoso.typepad.com/mmmmyoso/2005/09/road_trip_the_b.html)

The Chinese ethnobanks also prefer to settle down along Colima Road, although not necessarily near the plazas. Most of the Chinese ethnobanks, such as Cathay Bank, HSBC, Asian Pacific Bank, and Los Angeles National Bank, opening branches at Rowland Heights chose their branch location on Colima Road.

4.3.4. Public space and community services

Because the Chinese settlement history at Rowland Heights is relatively short, many advanced community services for this ethnic population are still absent and the existing community services are also limited. In addition, because of the dispersed residential cluster, the current spatial pattern of the public services and facilities for Chinese at Rowland Heights are generally scattered.
4.3.4.1 Community libraries

Because Rowland Heights is an incorporated area with no cityhood, its community library, founded in 1971, is still a branch of the County of Los Angeles Public Library System. Its current location is at Nogales Street and Colima Road, in the Northern part of Rowland Heights. The interior of the library is 14,000 square feet, single story, with seating capacity of approximately 80. The collection of the library includes 173,890 books, 129 magazine and newspaper subscriptions, 7,607 audio recordings and 8,860 videocassettes (County of Los Angeles Public Library, [www.colapublib.org](http://www.colapublib.org)), more than half of which are collections for ethnic groups and non-English speakers. Despite a relatively tight and compact space, Rowland Heights Library has been equipped with many services that fulfill the residents’ needs. The non-English (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Spanish, Vietnamese) materials, such as fictions and magazines, already occupied more than eight aisles, almost half of the book shelves. According to my week-long participant observation, almost 70% of the readers in the library are Asian, normally Chinese or Korean. The library also provides homework support for the students from local schools, including second language learning sessions. During the weekdays, Chinese who spend the daytime in the library are usually housewives, children (during the summer), nannies, and the elderly Chinese.

“I like the Taiwan fiction shelves here. They update the collections very fast... I usually come here once a week, borrow some books and read some newspapers,” said a housewife living on the hill, “I usually don’t spend much time in the library... it is pretty small and I prefer to read the books at home.”

To the working class Chinese at Rowland Heights, the library is not quite relevant to their lives.

“I don’t even have time to do my house work, how can I have time to read novels?”, said by a 40 years old housewife whose husband and her both work in a Chinese restaurant, “I have been here for more than 5 years and haven’t been to the library once. My son went there several times... it is for rich people and citizens. If I have time, I would rather spend it with my son.”

4.3.4.2. Health care

The public health care at Rowland Heights is relatively limited compared to Monterey Park. Most of the health care is in the form of family practice doctors or personal medical clinics which are scattered along Colima Road. The nearest public hospital is Brea
Community Hospital in Orange County which is four miles away.

4.4. Disparities on Spatial Patterns of Chinese between two ethnoburbs

Compared with the spatially dense and compact community landscape in Monterey Park, the spatial pattern of Chinese community scatters in Rowland Heights, due to the relatively short history of Chinese settlements and the spatially disperse settings. Though with similar geographical extent, the settlement patterns of Chinese communities at Monterey Park and Rowland Heights vary significantly.

In Monterey Park, the residential cluster is located at the northern part of the city, embracing the Downtown Monterey Park Business Improvement District which accommodates most of the Chinese small businesses in that area. Meanwhile, the public services, such as community library, hospitals, and senior centers all concentrate around the residential cluster of Chinese, yet only cover less than 14% of the city. Thus, this urban pattern of Chinese settlement is highly spatially segregated and concentrated.

On the contrary, Chinese neighborhoods at Rowland Heights, though under one certain land use type, function as a spatially dispersed community. The residential cluster and commercial concentration of Chinese are located on the opposite side of the community, with residential cluster in the southern part of Rowland Heights but commercial concentration gathers along the freeway 60 at the northern edge. Moreover, the public service at Rowland Heights still share with other adjacent areas, making its spatial distribution largely scattered.

4.5. Conclusion

In conclusion, two Chinese ethnoburbs in Los Angeles display different urban patterns in terms of their residential, commercial, and infrastructural locations and distributions. The urban pattern of Chinese settlements at Monterey Park is spatially segregated and concentrated, mirrored by the high density residential clusters. With advanced business industry district and well-developed public services surrounded, Chinese neighborhood at Monterey Park becomes a “walkable community” in suburban Los Angeles. In contrary to Monterey Park’s spatially compact ethnic landscape, Chinese settlements at Rowland Heights are spatially dispersed. With residential clusters on one side and commercial clusters on the
other side of the community, and limited public services shared with adjacent areas, the Chinese community’s spatial pattern at Rowland Heights scatters to a larger extent.

The spatial disparities between these two ethno-suburbs thereafter affect community conceptions from the Chinese living in the ethno-suburbs. However, different subgroups of Chinese understand and interpret the spatial pattern of residential, commercial, and public places in different ways, which would also contribute their distinct perceptions to this Chinese community. Thus, the next chapter discusses the demographic disparities of Chinese between City of Monterey Park and Community of Rowland Heights.
Chapter 5  Demographic Disparities between Monterey Park and Rowland Heights

5.1.  Introduction

Disparities among different ethnoburbs not only reflect on settlement patterns but can also be mirrored on the demographic characteristics. This chapter discusses the second part of research question- what are the demographic differences among Chinese ethnoburbs? It first explores the demographics of Chinese at City of Monterey Park and Community of Rowland Heights, in terms of their immigration backgrounds, socio-economic characteristics, and living situations. It then categorizes Chinese in each ethnoburb into subgroups, according to their immigration background and socio-economic status. The second part of this chapter compares the demographic characteristics between the two ethnoburbs and identifies their disparities. In the end, it summarizes the demographic disparities along with the spatial disparities between the two ethnoburbs and connects them to the spatial transformation and internal migration of Chinese ethnoburbs which is discussed in chapter 6.

5.2.  Chinese at Monterey Park

5.2.1  Demographics of Chinese at Monterey Park

From the 1950s to the 1980s, Monterey Park had experienced significant demographic changes. Before the 1960s, Monterey Park had Whites as majority residents, accounting for more than 85% of the city’s population (Census Bureau, 1960), and Asian population was small at that time. However, by the year of 1980, Asian population increased to one third of the population, with Chinese and Japanese outstandingly composing 14.9% and 13.9% of the total population (Chart 5.1). For the following two decades it witnessed the blooming Chinese population stimulated by the increasing globalizing economy and transnational activities (Li, 1997). According to the 1990 census, Asians in Monterey Park made up 57% of
the city’s population, and Whites make up only 12% (Chart 5.2). Chinese population remarkably grew to 36.2% of the total population, becoming the largest ethnic group living in Monterey Park. By the year of 2000, Monterey Park, with 64% Asians, stands as the first city in the United States with a majority Asian population (Fong, 2002), and the Chinese population gradually increased to 42.7% of the population (Chart 5.3).

Chart 5.1 Ethnicity of Monterey Park, 1980

Data source: 1980 census data, Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data

Chart 5.2 Ethnicity of Monterey Park, 1990

Data source: 1990 census data, Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data

Chart 5.3 Ethnicity of Monterey Park, 2000

Data source: 2000 census data, Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data
5.2.2 Socio-economic status/lives of Chinese at Monterey Park

According to Kwong’s “model minority” theory, Chinese in Monterey Park can be categorized into four subgroups due to the socio-economic status and immigration background: the early Chinese immigrants who came to the U.S. before the 1980s and migrated from the inner-city Chinatown to Monterey Park; the Chinese professionals; working-class Chinese who came to the U.S. after the 1980s; and the second and the third generation of the early immigrants (Fan, 2002; Kwong, 1996; Li, 2001). From the 14 interviews conducted at Monterey Park, there were four early Chinese immigrants, eight new Chinese immigrants, and two second generation Chinese immigrants.

Although different subgroups of Chinese have distinct characteristics, they generally share some basic socio-economic features. Compared with the household income of the Los Angeles County, household income in Monterey Park is overall below the average. Of the 14 interviews collected in Monterey Park, four people live with the salary under $20,000 a year, which is below the average income per capita in Los Angeles County ($22,711); three Chinese earn the yearly income between $20,000 and $30,000; two Chinese professionals earns between $30,000 to $60,000. Among the other five Chinese, three of them are housewives and the rest two are not included in the labor force, but all of them reported their household income under $50,000 a year. As one young housewife with a three-month-old daughter said,

“We live here (Monterey Park) not because we want to live here. My husband is a postdoctor at USC medical center with less than $30,000 income a year, and I lost my job in a supermarket because of the pregnancy...My husband’s salary is the only income of our family and this situation will not get better in the next several years.”

After I asked the reason why she didn’t want to find a job after labor, she answered

“the cost for the daycare is even more than my salary. There are cheap labors from southeast China everywhere. Chinese without good English ability can’t get a job with good payment. I will stay at home until my child goes to school.”

The economic condition of the Chinese can also be reflected on their consuming behaviors. A cashier in the CVS store on Garfield Avenue in Monterey Park said that

“We don’t see as many Chinese consumers patronizing on regular days as those during the sale time, especially on the first day of the sale. They really pay attention on the newsletters.”
5.2.3 Subgroups of Chinese at Monterey Park

Though with a low socioeconomic status in general, the four Chinese subgroups in Monterey Park have distinct disparities on their socio-economic status. The early Chinese immigrants had rooted in Los Angeles for a long time and experienced the golden time for opening ethnic businesses. Some of them already get Green Card or citizenship (Zhou, 1992). All of these, in turn, guarantee the quality of their lives. Many first generation immigrants opened their business during the influx of Chinese immigration (Horton, 1989). Most the businesses are restaurants, groceries, and small enterprises whose market is particularly toward the ethnic Chinese population. Benefited from these prosperous businesses, they are the first wealthy Chinese group in Los Angeles (Fong, 1994). Along the two busiest streets (Atlantic Avenue and Garvey Avenue) in Monterey Park, both sides of the roads are full of Chinese Apothecary Stores (Figure 5.1) and groceries selling products, such as ginseng and antlers, to the early Chinese immigrants.

New Chinese immigrants who came to the U.S. after the 1980s have the most diverse socioeconomic statuses. Chinese professionals who come to the U.S. for better education usually could get good jobs after graduation, whereas those with inadequate English ability and low educational attainment face a hard situation in job market (Li, 2006; Fan 2002). As a result, the former subgroup of Chinese with occupations such as faculties, technological engineers, and managers, stay at the upper level of the social hierarchy (Map 5.1). The latter subgroup of Chinese, whose jobs are usually cooks, waiters, and waitresses, stays at the
bottom of the social hierarchy. These two subgroups, with distinct characteristics from each other, constitute the bimodal occupational structure of new Chinese immigrants in Monterey Park (Fan, 2002).

Map 5.1 Persons in management and professional occupations (www.socialexplorer.com)

The last subgroup of Chinese in Monterey Park is the second generation of Chinese immigrants who were born in the U.S. This subgroup has the best advantage in job market and usually has a high personal income and prestigious occupations. Therefore, they stay at the top of the social hierarchy in ethnic Chinese.

In conclusion, due to the immigration background to the U.S. and educational attainment, the socioeconomic status of Chinese in Monterey Park varies in a large range. And because of this division, these four subgroups of Chinese perceive their own conceptions of Monterey Park Chinese community. These perceptions further result in the internal migration flows among ethnoburbs.

5.3. Chinese at Rowland Heights

5.3.1. Demographics of Chinese at Rowland Heights

The first large influx of Chinese started in the late 1980s at Rowland Heights. According to the census data, in 1980, the majority in Rowland Heights was still the Caucasians with Chinese population merely composing 1.4% of the total population (Chart 5.4). However, in 1990 census data, the Chinese population increased to 11% of the total population, leaving Caucasians only 55% (Chart 5.5). This demographic shifting became obvious in 2000 when the Chinese population increased to 29.9% of the total population, rivaling the White population in Rowland Heights (Chart 5.6).
The rapid demographic change in the past two decades represents the expanding settlements of Chinese at Rowland Heights. According to the 2000 Census, 50% of the population in Rowland Heights was Asians.

Chart 5.4 Ethnicity of Rowland Heights, 1980

Data source: 1980 census data, Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data

Chart 5.5 Ethnicity of Rowland Heights, 1990

Data source: 1990 census data, Summary File 1 (SF 1) - 100-Percent data

Chart 5.6 Ethnicity of Rowland Heights, 2000

Data source: 2000 census data, Summary File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data
5.3.2 Socio-economic status/lives of Chinese at Rowland Heights

Generally, Chinese at Rowland Heights are more affluent than those live in Monterey Park. According to Table 5.1, the median household income in Rowland Heights is $46,164, compared to Monterey Park’s $36,155, although both of them are below the Los Angeles county level. Chart 5.7 shows the detailed Chinese household income distribution of each place comparing with the Los Angeles level. According to the 2000 census data, Rowland Heights has the lower percentage of Chinese household income under $50,000 than those of Monterey Park, even lower than the average of Chinese in the Los Angeles County level. However, the Chinese household income ranging from $50,000 to $200,000 shows that Rowland Heights has the highest percentage in this range, indicating Rowland Heights has more Chinese families with income between $50,000 to $200,000 than Chinese in Monterey Park and the Chinese average level in Los Angeles County.

Table 5.1 Median household income at Monterey Park and Rowland Heights, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monterey Park</th>
<th>Rowland Heights</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median household</td>
<td>36,155</td>
<td>46,164</td>
<td>46,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income (dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: 2000 census data, Summary File 1 (STF 1) - 100-Percent data

Chart 5.7 Chinese household income distribution at Monterey Park, Rowland Heights, and Los Angeles County, 1999

Data source: 2000 census data, Summary File 4 (SF 4) – Sample data
With a relatively higher economic status, the occupations of Chinese at Rowland Heights mostly remain at high income jobs, varying in a small range (Chart 5.8). The percentage of Chinese with management or professional occupations accounts for 50.3% of the total population at Rowland Heights, followed by sales and office careers with 32.1%. These two types of occupations compose more than 80% of the total Chinese, making the economic status of Chinese higher than other places. The Chinese with other occupation types only make up a small number of the total population, indicating working-class Chinese are much fewer than middle-class Chinese at Rowland Heights.

Chart 5.8 Occupations of Chinese at Rowland Heights, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/transportation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/maintenance</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/office</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/professional</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: 2000 census data, Summary File 4 (SF 4) – Sample data

5.3.3. Subgroups of Chinese at Rowland Heights

Based on the socio-economic status and immigration background, Chinese at Rowland Heights can also be categorized into four subgroups: the Chinese professionals, with relatively high household incomes and technical occupations; the working class Chinese, those mostly work in service or sale industry with lower income; the second generation immigrants, including the youth who are still out of the labor force and the adults who operate ethnic businesses or work at offices with high or medium income; and the elderly Chinese immigrants most of whom have Green Cards or U.S. Citizenship. The first three subgroups compose the majority of Chinese population at Rowland Heights, with elderly
Chinese accounting for a relatively small share. Chart 5.9 shows the age distribution of Chinese at Rowland Heights compared with Monterey Park. The Chinese population above 65 years old at Rowland Heights is relatively lower than Monterey Park, whereas the population in other age level is much higher.

![Chart 5.9 Age distribution of Chinese at Monterey Park and Rowland Heights, 2000](image)

*Data source: 2000 census data, Summary File 4 (SF 4) – Sample data*

Chinese professionals at Rowland Heights are generally middle-class Chinese whose household income is between $50,000 and $150,000 a year and work in educational, administrative or management services industry (Census Bureau, 2000). Most of these Chinese professionals have stayed in the U.S. for more than 5 years (Census Bureau, 2000), which enables them to have enough savings and experiences to live in a middle-upper class suburb as their second home or for investment. Their family size is usually larger than 3 persons requiring a house at the price from $300,000 to $500,000 with at least 5 rooms.

The working-class Chinese at Rowland Heights mostly work in sales, manufacturing, and food service industries with household income less than $50,000 a year. This subgroup of Chinese usually lacks of English ability, though better than the level of working-class Chinese at Monterey Park (Census Bureau, 2000). They usually live in the apartments or condominiums in stead of single family houses and their average family size is under 3.

The second generation Chinese immigrants are mostly under 18 years old, accounting for 20.1% of the Chinese population at Rowland Heights. This subgroup of Chinese is usually
children of the middle or working class families, combined with little percent of the second generation Chinese adults.

The elderly Chinese are the ones above 65 years old, composing 9.3% of the Chinese population. Most of the elderly Chinese at Rowland Heights came to the U.S. before the 1980s and most of them stay with their families.

5.4. Disparities on demographic characteristics of Chinese between two ethnoburbs

According to Chinese subgroups mentioned above, Chinese at Monterey Park and Rowland Heights don’t vary in types but vary in composition. Monterey Park has more working-class immigrants and elderly Chinese, whereas Rowland Heights has significant larger amount of Chinese professionals. The second generation Chinese Americans at both places constitutes approximately the same demographic portion.

The immigration background of Chinese in these two places also varies by the year of entry to the U.S. Based on Chart 5.10, almost 50% of the Chinese at Rowland Heights came to the U.S. between 1980 and 1989, much higher than that of Monterey Park. This disparity indicates Chinese at Rowland Heights are mainly well-developed new immigrants who came to the U.S. after the 1980s but already established themselves. Moreover, Rowland Heights has much fewer foreign-born Chinese who came to the U.S. before the 1980s, demonstrating a smaller population of elderly Chinese than those of Monterey Park. Chart 5.9 displays the age distribution of Chinese at the two ethnoburbs in 2000. While most of the age groups of Chinese are approximately the same between the two ethnoburbs, the age group of 65 years old and above indicates a significant disparity regarding the elderly Chinese population.
Based on the 2000 census data, the economic status of Chinese at two ethnoburbs also has distinct disparities. As Chart 5.1 showing the household income of Chinese alone in 1999 at both places compared to the Los Angeles County level, Rowland Heights tops at the household income from $50,000 to $200,000 a year, even above the Los Angeles County Level. This income disparity indicates that Monterey Park has more working-class Chinese whereas there are more middle and upper class Chinese residing at Rowland Heights.

The social characteristics of Chinese in these two ethnoburbs also vary significantly in terms of occupations types and job industries. According to 2000 census data (Chart 5.11), Rowland Heights has more Chinese with sale, office, management and professional occupations, while Monterey Park has a higher percentage of Chinese with occupations in production, transportation, and service types. This occupation difference suggests Rowland Heights has a much larger population of Chinese professionals whereas Monterey Park has more working-class Chinese.
On the aspect of social assimilation level, by 2000, Chinese at Monterey Park have 53.6% of the population referred as linguistically isolated, whereas Chinese at Rowland Heights only consist 43.9% in that category.

5.5. Conclusion

Demographic disparities exist between Chinese at Monterey Park and Rowland Heights, not only on the aspect of immigration status but also in terms of their socio-economic status. Chinese at Monterey Park mostly came to the U.S. either before the 1980s or after the 1990s, indicating their population consists of “old-generation” immigrants and less-developed new comers, whereas Chinese at Rowland Heights have more Chinese who came to the U.S. during the 1980s, referring they are the well-developed ones within the new immigrants cohort after the 1980s.

Moreover, divisions of Chinese between the two ethnoburbs also exist in terms of their socio-economic status. Chinese at Monterey Park have relatively lower household income, less prestige social status, and higher level of linguistic isolation, namely, more working-class Chinese, whereas Chinese at Rowland Heights are composed of much more Chinese professionals and much fewer working-class Chinese, evident on the higher household income, larger population working in professional occupations, and lower level of linguistic isolation.

Thus, with population compositions varying remarkably, Chinese at the two ethnoburbs manifest different demographic characteristics. Associated with the different spatial patterns existing between the two ethnoburbs, Chinese communities at Monterey Park and Rowland
Heights represent an internal migration and spatial transformation as the Chinese ethnoburb develops.
Chapter 6 From Monterey Park to Rowland Heights---Migration Flows among Chinese Ethnoburbs

6.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss the internal migration flowing between the two ethnoburbs and then examine the ongoing migration directing from “old ethnoburb” Monterey Park to “new ethnoburb” Rowland Heights. It aims to explore the research question 2- What are the internal migration flows among different ethnoburbs, and research question 3- What is the sequence of migration flows? Based on this internal migration model, I identify three separate migration flows underneath the demographic trends which together result in the emergence and prosperity of “new ethnoburbs”:

1) Chinese professionals leave “old ethnoburbs” to “new ethnoburbs”, making themselves the first migration flow;

2) Chinese entrepreneurs, as the second migration flow, seek business opportunities in “new ethnoburbs” due to the rapid growth of Chinese population made by Chinese professionals’ migration;

3) Working-class Chinese seek job opportunities and better quality of life due to the booming ethnic economy in “new ethnoburbs” made by Chinese entrepreneurs’ migration, becoming the last flow of the migration trend.

The three migration flows altogether make up the dynamic process of Chinese ethnoburbs, transforming “new ethnoburbs” into “old ethnoburbs”, or into “suburban Chinatowns”. With the ongoing migration trends occurring among Chinese ethnoburbs, newly emerged Chinese ethnoburbs gradually accommodate larger Chinese population influx, and are eventually converted into a “Port of Entry” to new Chinese immigrants.

6.2. Migration flows among ethnoburbs

According to 2000 census data, Rowland Heights has more Chinese Americans with less
than 5 years residency (Chart 6.1), indicating Chinese residents at Rowland Heights are mainly new migrants. And to these Chinese residents with less than 5 years residency, Rowland Heights has much higher percentage of migrants who came from the same county, same state, or different state in the U.S. than those of Monterey Park. This distinguished disparity represents an internal migration from other Chinese communities in the U.S. to Rowland Heights. Particularly, compared with the percentage of migrants from same state and different state, there is a significant amount of Chinese migrated within the same county, showing most of these internal migrants came from other places in Los Angeles.

Chart 6.1 Residence in 1995 of Chinese Americans at two ethnoburbs

Based on the interview data, ten out of thirteen of the interviewees at Rowland Heights mentioned that they came from other places in the U.S. Among them there are seven interviewees from Southern California, two of whom particularly moved from Monterey Park.

More interestingly, based on the interview data, there is a sequence showing different Chinese American subgroups migrate at different time. The thirteen interviewees at Rowland Heights include five Chinese professionals, three Chinese entrepreneurs, three working-class Chinese, and two elderly Chinese. Four out of five Chinese professional interviewees came to Rowland Heights before 2000; the other one came from China to Rowland Heights at 2003, not included in to the internal migrants. Two of the three entrepreneurs interviewees came in the early 1990s and one came in 2002. All three working-class Chinese came to Rowland
Heights after 2000. All the three group interviewees settled down at Rowland Heights after 1980s, reflecting the population boom of Chinese in the past two decades (Table 6.1). However, the separate migration movement of these groups indicates three different migration flows toward Rowland Heights, starting with Chinese professionals, followed by Chinese businesses, and ended with working-class Chinese migration.

Table 6.1 Years of settlements for interviewees at Rowland Heights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese sub groups at Rowland Heights</th>
<th>Year of moving in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese professionals (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese entrepreneurs (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class Chinese (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Chinese (2)</td>
<td>1 (NA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.1. First migration flow- Chinese professionals

To the Chinese professionals, Monterey Park functions as a residential, economic, and cultural center of Chinese in San Gabriel Valley. However, the high population density, poor living conditions and isolated environment drive them to leave. One of the interviewees at Monterey Park mentioned:

“[The reason to move] for me are the housing price and bad environment. With the same money, you can buy bigger houses in many good neighborhoods with fewer Chinese, like El Monte, Temple City, [and East Los Angeles]... Those neighborhoods are much cleaner and nicer than here.”

Many of the Chinese professionals in Monterey Park, although benefit from the compact commercial pattern, consider Monterey Park overcrowded and overpopulated. As most of them have jobs out of Monterey Park, Chinese professionals find it getting harder to commute from work to home.

“It always has traffic on I-10 [freeway on the north side of Monterey Park]. At regular time, it only takes me 20 minute on commute, but during the peak time, it will take me more than 45 minutes to get home.” Said by a Chinese researcher in USC..
Inconvenient transportation is not the only problem for the Chinese professionals. The increasing residential density also causes their life quality declining.

“There are newcomers moving in every day...[Did you] see that house (the house next door)? The house owner shares their house with three other guys. Many Chinese do the same thing in this neighborhood. They rent the spare bedrooms to newcomers and use that income to pay the loan...The neighborhood is changing. I don’t know my neighbors anymore.”

Besides transportation and residential density changes, diminishing open spaces and aggregated sanitation problems also prompt Chinese professionals moving out of the community.

“It is not the best place to raise children, no yards, no playground, and no diversity. I want my child grown up in a diverse neighborhood or some places with more contact to the host society... If we were rich, we definitely wouldn’t live here. [We would] move to Arcadia or some place to the east... Monterey Park is the first not the last stop of our life...[Moving out] just matters of time.”

One interviewee, a Chinese college student from UCLA, also mentioned:

“I only spent my first six months in the U.S. at Monterey Park. That is a good place for me to start. You won’t feel afraid to a new land at all. There are familiar faces everywhere. You don’t need to worry about the language problems or the cultural differences... But after I started my study, I found the place with little help for me to improve. People don’t speak English there; they live the same way as they live in China. I can’t learn anything about America from here... [Monterey Park] is like a Chinese city on the American land. For me, it is just my start point not my destination.”

On the other hand, Rowland Heights, emerging as a new and thriving Chinese community, represents a new and middle-class Chinese ethnoburb- the American Dream lifestyle. Among the thirteen interviews of Chinese professionals at both ethnoburbs, nine interviewees perceived Rowland Heights as a “new” and “middle-class” Chinese community. The large Chinese migration to Rowland Heights benefits from the expanding business district around City of Industry and Diamond Bar, especially after many small-businesses sprung up in that area. Many Chinese professionals who got jobs or opened businesses at that industrial district sought residential communities nearby to settle their home. The convenient transportation to the adjacent communities, the lower population density, the better public facilities, and the school district attract many Chinese professionals moving in. As one engineer whose job is at Diamond Bar said:

“[The reason for moving in] is just because I got a job at Diamond Bar. I got
my job in a software company in 1995 so I moved here with my family...[Why I chose this community is because] it’s near to my work and some of my Chinese colleagues live here and recommended me this place... The housing price is not that high so I can buy bigger houses for my kids and my parents.”

Due to the “push” forces from “old” ethnoburb Monterey Park and the “pull” forces from “new” ethnoburb Rowland Heights, Chinese professionals who can afford a better life move out of the “old” ethnoburb as the first migration flow. These Chinese professionals are the first group to migrate from “old” ethnoburbs to “new” ethnoburbs.

One owner of a transportation company, who came to Rowland Heights at 1986, mentioned:

“When I moved here, there was few Chinese here. The majorities were still the Whites with some Koreans... I worked in a transportation company at Diamond Bar. Then I opened my business in transportation, firstly just for local areas but later I expanded my business oversea to the Chinese companies... Later there were more and more Chinese moved in, most [of them] worked for the companies [at City of Industry, Hacienda Heights, and Diamond Bar]...There were not much Chinese stores and supermarkets at that time (in 1986)...We bought groceries from Asian markets or local grocery stores...They (the Chinese restaurants) were opened later after [Chinese moved in].”

Because many of the Chinese professionals live with families, their migration decision also affects the migration of their family members, such as their parents and the second generation. According to the census data, native-born Chinese Americans consist approximately 20% of the total population, similar to the percentage of Chinese less than 16 years old (Census Bureau, 2000). Based on this coincident statistics, we can assume that most of the Chinese youths at Rowland Heights are second generation immigrants who moved with their families.

6.2.2. Second migration flow- Chinese entrepreneurs

Chinese entrepreneurs, most of whom target the ethnic Chinese population (Fong, 1994, Li, 2009), start to adjust their business investments after the demographic shifting. After Chinese professionals move out of the “old” ethnoburb to the “new” ethnoburb, the Chinese entrepreneurs start to migrate to the new Chinese ethnoburb to seek more market opportunities.
To the Chinese entrepreneurs, “old” ethnoburb Monterey Park, although provides a broad market and labor force base, also creates fiercer business competition. Rising rent expenses, shrinking public facilities, and increasing competition caused by the unitary business types all contribute to the decreasing living condition for Chinese entrepreneurs. A former Chinese restaurant chef told me, “Running a business is not easy. There are countless Chinese restaurants [at Monterey Park]. People have too many options... If we don’t keep our price as low as possible, we would be closed.” On Garvey Avenue, one of the busiest streets at Monterey Park, many stores have been closed due to the shrinking profit or failed businesses.

Figure 6.1 Four closed stores for subleasing on Garvey Avenue (Yu, 2008)

On the contrary, Rowland Heights, with a rapidly growing Chinese population, provides Chinese businesses a new market. According to the 2006 and 2008 economic data from LAEDC (Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation), the number of business establishments at Rowland Heights is much higher than Monterey Park, yet the gap keeps growing. Many new businesses established at Rowland Heights are owned or operated by Chinese, based on the company’s Pinyin (Mandarin) name. Yet interestingly, most of the establishments with Chinese names opened in 2006 and 2008 at Rowland Heights are in the industries of wholesale trade, retail trade, manufacturing, and food services, which are the most popular industries for Chinese entrepreneurs (Fan, 2002; Logan, 2006).

Under this Chinese ethnic economy context, the operation of Chinese firms requires a minimum customer base as the threshold population which makes the Chinese entrepreneurs the second migration flow from old ethnoburb toward new ethnoburb, following the Chinese professionals’ step. The three Chinese businesses I interviewed at Rowland Heights were
opened in 1995, 1996, and 2002, all after the population boost of Chinese in the 1990s. One restaurant owner answered me,

“there were not many restaurants at that time...but were already many Chinese people [at Rowland Heights]. The Asian markets [at that time] mostly sold Korean and Japanese food, [and] they were very expensive...Then Ranch 99 opened a new chain supermarket here. More and more Chinese stores came in...The sooner you open business here, the more advantage you can get [from the market].”

Another Chinese gift shop owner told me,

“[the reason I moved here is] because my friends told me the rent here is much cheaper and there are opportunities here. The store made a lot of profit at the beginning but [the business] went bad... [after] a lot of Chinese businesses rushed in. Now, just look at the plazas on Colima Road- there are thousands of Chinese restaurants and gift shops... We can't make much profit [as we could before].”

6.2.3. Third migration flow- working class Chinese

After the migration of Chinese businesses, which prefer hiring Chinese workers as their employees (Kaplan and Li, 2006; Li, 2009), a large demand of Chinese labor emerged which triggered the third migration flow of working-class Chinese to new ethnoburbs.

To many working-class Chinese, Monterey Park is a place mixed with opportunities and dilemmas- while the large Chinese population provides them an ethnic friendly environment for living and a booming economy for working, increasing amount of labor from China also accelerates the competition in job market and consequently reduces the wages of Chinese workers. Because most of the working-class Chinese in ethnic enclaves or suburbs attain a low education level and inadequate English proficiency (Fong, 1994; Fan, 2002; Zhou, 2002), this lack of skills restrains their occupations in low-paid ethnic service industry and small ethnic businesses which don’t require high English ability or professional skills. Moreover, with little time to practice English at work or go to community college after work, most of them haven acquired little skill by living in Monterey Park. Thus, the intense Chinese linguistic environment and often long-working hours keep them from developing themselves to find a job out of the ethnic sector (Li, 1999; Zhou, 2002). In addition, the Chinese immigration influx introduces more non-skilled Chinese labors to Monterey Park, which in turn increases the competition of job hunting and aggregates the non-skilled workers’
situation. Since ethnic businesses are the only occupation option for non-skilled Chinese, more labor supply will inevitably result in the declining labor price and consequently, lower wages. Therefore, with increasing competition in ethnoburb and no access to the job market outside ethnoburb, working-class Chinese find themselves facing the declining wages and increasing housing price—finally being trapped at the bottom of this social hierarchy. An Chinese health care worker in Monterey Park said:

“Everyday is about struggling to survive. I live in Alhambra with my friends. Four of us shared a one-bedroom apartment for $1,000 rent a month... The rent in Monterey Park is even higher, I can’t afford it. I take the bus to work every day. My work is to take care of the patient ten hours a day, 6 days a week, and the paycheck is $1,100 a month. This just affords the basic living expense here... I don’t have health insurance. If I am sick, the only way for me is to go to the church for help.”

And when I asked her if she had the motivation to move out, she answered

“Life [in Monterey Park] maybe is hard, but it is the best I can get. I have nowhere to go.”

Compared with their dilemmas at Monterey Park, to most of the working-class Chinese Rowland Heights is a community where they can access more opportunities and better jobs. Most of them rent houses or apartments instead of paying the mortgage (Census Bureau, 2000). In this group, the perceptions of the community vary according to the marriage and dependents condition.

On one hand, the working-class Chinese at Rowland Heights who are still single find this community with better job opportunities and less competition. Compared with the five working-class interviewees at Monterey Park, the three interviewees at Rowland Heights have generally higher English proficiency, though still linguistic segregated. We can speak English for part of the conversations whereas the ones at Monterey Park could barely speak English. This language proficiency tends to give them advantages in job hunting. As a waitress at a Dim-Sun restaurant said,

“the restaurant only hires workers who can speak English, Mandarin, and Cantonese. Customers come from everywhere, Caucasians, people from Mainland, Taiwanese, and Cantonese... You must be able to talk with any customer when they come up.”

With a better language ability, these Chinese working-class could get relatively better salaries. Thus, the working-classes who have well-developed themselves start to migrate to new ethnoburbs. A young man works in a Chinese tea station answered when I asked his
feeling of life in this Chinese community,

“[It’s] not bad. The [Chinese] business is good and we are usually paid better here… I don’t need to worry about the traffic problems anymore and there are many supermarkets and stores in the neighborhood… I don’t need to go to anywhere else for daily needs.”

On the other hand, the working-class Chinese who are married and especially those who have dependents, have different experience of this community. They evaluate the school district and education services more important than those single working-class labors do, which makes them feel less satisfied. Since Rowland Heights’s petition for cityhood has not been approved yet, the budget for its facilities and infrastructures is still under the Los Angeles County official’s administration. On one side is the rapidly growing population especially Chinese population calling for more improvement on the education system at Rowland Heights; on the other side is the limited educational services available (5 elementary schools and 2 high schools) due to the county incorporate area fact. This unbalance causes the shortage of the education services at Rowland Heights School District. Till now, Rowland Heights still share the school district with other adjacent communities, such as Hacienda Heights and Diamond Bar. Many middle-class Chinese families send their children to schools in other districts which the working-class Chinese who have relatively low income couldn’t afford. The working-class Chinese have to send their children to this school district, which makes them less satisfied with the community. Despite the educational and public facilities issue due to the absence of cityhood, working-class Chinese families found living at Rowland Heights is better in general.

“My daughters are in high school here... It is fine, but not as good as the schools in other places, like Hacienda Heights... I and my wife need work almost 14 hours a day if we want to send our daughters to that high school. We don’t have that much money... But life is easier here than at other places- we (he and his wife) probably wouldn’t both find jobs in Chinatown or somewhere like that.” Said by a maintainer in a plaza.

6.2.4. Elderly Chinese—not involved into the migration flows

To elderly Chinese, Monterey Park is a walkable and comfortable place to live. With the average age over 60, most of the early immigrants are out of the labor force and living with
their families (Zhou, 1992). Their low mobility requires a walkable and compact place to live. And Monterey Park, in their concept, is the best and most comfortable community in Los Angeles. As one 64 years old Chinese lady said “I don’t know where else I could live if I left this place.” Because most of early Chinese immigrants have already claimed citizenship or green card, health care is affordable and crucial to them (Zhou, 1992). In Monterey Park’s public hospitals, most of the medical services, including Chinese medicine and acupuncture treatments, are incorporated into health insurance. This benefit makes those hospitals popular among senior Chinese. Many senior Chinese settle down at Monterey Park in concern of the medical services (Fong, 1994).

In addition, stores and supermarkets in a walkable distance are also a strong attraction for elderly Chinese. Since the concentration of Chinese restaurants and groceries in Monterey Park locates at Downtown BID, which is about 15 minutes walk to the Chinese residential cluster, most of the daily use are accessible for elderly Chinese. The two most popular Chinese supermarkets, Ai Hoa Supermarket and 99 Ranch Supermarket, are both located on East Garvey Avenue which is within 0.5 mile from the Chinese residential cluster.

Furthermore, the public facilities such as churches, libraries, and parks are also close the Chinese residential cluster. From the fourteen interviews I collected in Monterey Park, all of the interviewees mentioned their daily needs can be satisfied in this community and eleven of them mentioned those are “within a walkable distance”. As one 64 years old woman said:

“Everything here is easy to get... I don’t have a car but I do groceries shopping for my family... I usually leave home in the morning when my son and daughter-in-law go to work. Then I go to the library, chat with my friends, go to the community Mah-jong center to play a while, and buy groceries on my way home. After dinner I always go to the park [Garvey Ranch Park] with my family... I can see my friends and neighbors there too. If I am sick, I can even go to the hospital (Garfield Medical Center) by my own. It just takes me 10 minutes to walk there...in Monterey Park, you don’t need a car to survive.”

Living in the comfortable environment and walkable community, the elderly Chinese choose to stay at Monterey Park with no motivation to leave. Thus, most of them are not actively involved into the migration flow. One businessman interviewee living at Temple City, said he visits his parents at Monterey Park twice a week. His parents chose to stay at a senior condo at Monterey Park when he moved out of Monterey Park to Temple City.
“They are more comfortable here [at Monterey Park] and feel more secure. They stayed with me at my home (at Temple City) for two weeks, just two weeks, and they told me they were not comfortable there and wanted to move back. Here (at the senior condo) they have friends and places to kill time... They (the senior condo) have nurses and physiotherapists to take care of them. I feel safe to put them there.”

When I asked him why his parents feel more comfortable at Monterey Park, he said,

“[because] there are more Chinese there- they don’t need to speak English at all. The restaurants and stores are just couple of blocks away and every place has Chinese translators. They feel like home.”

Although most elderly Chinese are not active to participate in the migration flow, few still migrate with their families to new ethnoburbs. As mentioned before, when the Chinese professionals and working-class started to move out, their migration also triggered the elderly Chinese to move with them. According to 2000 census data, Rowland Heights has 92.8% of the elderly Chinese who live with family, much higher than Monterey Park’s 74.1%. Their migration, in many cases, is not voluntarily decided by themselves and they usually spend most of the time at home so the community landscape and services don’t affect their lives in a large extent. I met a 71-year-old Chinese man at the backyard of his 11,000 square feet house in the hilly neighborhood at Rowland Heights, when he was watering the cucumbers planted at his backyard. He lived with his son’s family and took care of the little kid at home.

“I don’t go out much.... I can’t speak English. If I go out alone, I don’t even know how to ask the way back home in English. My son and my grandson usually go out with me for dinner or for grocery every weekend. They are busy during the weekdays and I usually do some housework or watch TV at home... I plant cucumbers and tomatoes, a good way to kill time.”

6.3. Dynamic process of Chinese ethnoburbs

Underlying the migration trends, the three individual migration flows occurs sequentially: with living environment becoming worse, Chinese professionals become the first migration flow moving out of old ethnoburbs and heading to new ethnoburbs; then the Chinese entrepreneurs find better opportunities and new market for their businesses, starting their migration flow to new ethnoburbs; after the Chinese businesses prospering in new ethnoburb, working-class Chinese with better skills make their way to the new job market for better salaries and less stressful environment. Thus, through these three flows occurring in a
migration sequence, the internal migration process from old ethnoburb to new ethnoburb completes- Chinese Americans gradually settle down and create their ethnic landscape at new ethnic suburbs.

With elderly Chinese staying still and new immigrants coming from China, old ethnoburbs remain their high dense community landscapes, functioning as a residential, commercial, and cultural center of the suburban area, as well as for the “immigration port” of new immigrants from China. With majority of the residents lacking English proficiency, the Chinese cultural environment at old ethnoburb becomes intense which in turn attracts more new comers from China to settle as their first stop in the U.S. This snowball impact of new immigrant settlements increase the cultural isolation of the old ethnoburb and gradually reshape the community patterns. According to Li’s definition, “ethnoburbs” are “multiethnic communities, in which one ethnic minority group has a significant concentration, but does not necessarily comprise a majority.” (Li, 1997 p.7) One of the fundamental characteristics of “ethnoburb” is its multi-ethnic demographic composition. With the increasing Chinese population and cultural elements, more and more ethnic groups would move out of old ethnoburbs. Along Garvey Avenue at Monterey Park, only 23 out of 91 of the stores or restaurants have signs in both Chinese and English; most of the rest only post Chinese signs on the front door, exclusively catering for Chinese customers. Till 2008, Chinese composed 43.25% of the population at Monterey Park, standing as the largest ethnic group in the city. The settlement pattern of the community is transforming from a multiethnic ethnoburb into a “suburban Chinatown”.

After the three migration groups gradually settle down, the new ethnoburb becomes a multiethnic community with a considerable Chinese population, and attracts more well-developed Chinese moving in. The Chinese population soon booms. For example, Rowland Heights’s Chinese population share had tripled from 1990 to 2000. With the increasing Chinese population at higher socio-economic level, more properties will be needed in the real estate market. This large demand on the housing market would soon elevate the housing price, shrink down the open space, and increase the community density, which would finally drive the most affluent Chinese families moving out for even less dense and newer suburbs, which starts a new migration circle and the emergence of new ethnoburbs. With the
wealthier Chinese professionals moving out, Chinese with lower socio-economic status move in, cutting the property into more pieces to sublease or sell to the new comers. After the large amount of Chinese rushing in, the commercial and public services for Chinese residents would be implemented. The new ethnoburb would gradually turn into an “old” ethnoburb and functioning as a residential, commercial, cultural center in that region.

6.4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the comparative analysis of geographical and demographic disparities between Monterey Park and Rowland Heights reveals that Monterey Park, as an “old” ethnoburb, accommodates Chinese residents with various background, whereas Rowland Heights, though with the same groups reside in, excels at the amount of Chinese professionals. Moreover, the settlement pattern of Monterey Park is much denser and segregated than that of Rowland Heights, despite the advanced public services built along the settlement history. Thus, the geographical and demographic disparities stimulate the internal migration among Chinese ethnoburbs, heading from “old” ethnoburbs to “new” ethnoburbs. The manifestation of internal migration trends among Chinese ethnoburbs can be interpreted into three separate migration flows which occur by different stages: starting with Chinese professionals moving out of “old” ethnoburbs, followed by the Chinese entrepreneurs seeking market opportunities after the growing population, and ended with the migration of working-class Chinese who endeavor to find job opportunities and better lives. The three migration flows altogether build the migration trends from “old” ethnoburbs to “new” ethnoburbs. Furthermore, the ongoing migration trends among ethnoburbs also suggest the dynamic process of Chinese ethnoburbs-transforming “new” ethnoburbs into “old” ethnoburbs and, eventually, to the Chinese immigrants’ “Port of Entry”.
Chapter 7 Conclusion and Discussion

7.1. Concluding Remarks

Using comparative analysis between two Chinese “ethnoburbs”- City of Monterey Park and Rowland Heights Community in suburban Los Angeles, this thesis provides an empirical insight on the diversities and internal migration among Chinese ethnoburbs emerged over time. By demonstrating a spatial transformation and the existence of internal migration among Chinese immigrants in the metropolitan area of Los Angeles, this study tries to fit into current academic debate on the emergence of American “twenty-first century gateway cities” (Singer, 2008) and the broader context of global restructuring of the labor market and international migration issues.

Based on the literatures and geographical debates on ethnic segregation/assimilation and Chinese American experience context, I posit the theoretical basis of this thesis on the invasion and succession theory and the cultural-pluralism approach (Kwong, 1996; Hiebert and Ley, 2003; Li, 1999). Previous theories on ethnic segregation or assimilation mainly discuss ethnic communities as spatial outcome under national, regional, local context. After globalization significantly increased the interaction and connection among countries, the impact of global context on the spatial outcome of ethnic segregation in the community scale has gained attention. The “ethnoburb” concept (Li, 1997; Li, 1998) thus is generated to describe a new type of multi-racial ethnic suburb as the spatial outcome of the changing global economic and political contexts. Chinese ethnoburbs are under large impacts of globalizing economy and geopolitics between China and the U.S. by accommodating ever increasing influx of new immigrants from China each year. However, due to the significant differences of the socioeconomic status and backgrounds between the early Chinese immigrants and Chinese newcomers, their ways to shape the community vary to a great extent. Previous theoretical debates on ethnoburbs mostly focus on the emergence, manifestation, and characteristics of “ethnoburbs”, arguing if it is a new type of Chinese settlement patterns. Literatures investigating the diversities and internal dynamics among different ethnoburbs are rare. Analyzing Chinese ethnoburbs that have emerged over time is
imperative in understanding the contemporary Chinese immigrant experiences and the future patterns of Chinese settlements in the U.S.

After the U.S. immigration policy changes according to the Immigration Act of 1990, the number of international migrants to the U.S. reached its peak in the past two decades. Previous theories on the ethnic segregation and assimilation have been challenged when meet contemporary new and growing immigrant population. Based the large influx of the new immigrants to the U.S. in the last two decades, Singer (2008) advocates the emergence of American “twenty-first gateway cities”, arguing that the current immigration gateways in the U.S. has gradually shifted from the big metropolitan areas, such as New York and Los Angeles, to the second tier cities, such as Dallas, Washington D.C., and Phoenix. Furthermore, more immigrants has moved to the American suburbs as their “new immigration gateways” and previous “gateway cities” will eventually fade away. Singer’s research roused up the theoretical debates on the future of American “gateway cities” and the issues surrounding the increasing immigrant population in American suburbs.

Grounded on the previous theoretical concerns, the research questions of this thesis are addressed as follows:

1) What are the spatial and demographic differences among Chinese ethnoburbs?
2) What are the internal migration flows among different ethnoburbs?
3) What is the sequence of migration flows?

To pursue the research questions, a comparative analysis was conducted on the settlement patterns and demographic characteristics of different Chinese ethnoburbs. Two Chinese ethnoburbs are selected to represent ethnoburbs emerging at different time: City of Monterey Park, with history of Chinese settlement for more than fifty years, known as the “first suburban Chinatown”, stands for the “old ethnoburbs”; Rowland Heights Community, a thriving ethnic suburb emerged after the 1980s, demonstrates “new ethnoburbs”. With the comparison of socioeconomic status of Chinese residents, urban patterns of Chinese neighborhoods, community landscape, and public services between the “old ethnoburb” Monterey Park and the “thriving ethnoburb” Rowland Heights, this paper gradually answers the research questions:

1) What are the demographic and spatial differences among Chinese ethnoburbs? There
are significant differences in terms of urban patterns and demographic characteristics among different ethnoburbs. The urban patterns of “old ethnoburbs” are spatially compact and segregated whereas “new ethnoburbs” are geographically dispersed and scattered. In terms of demographic disparities, whereas “old” ethnoburbs are mostly occupied by four subgroups of Chinese—early Chinese immigrants (elderly Chinese), working-class Chinese, Chinese professionals, and second generation Chinese Americans, Chinese residents in “new” ethnoburbs are mostly from the later three subgroups of Chinese. The demographic differences, associated with the different urban patterns of ethnoburbs, influence each Chinese subgroup’s perception of the community, which further impact their motivation to migrate internally.

2) What are the internal migration flows among different ethnoburbs? Migration flows exist among ethnoburbs, heading from the old ethnoburbs to the newly emerged ethnoburbs. The reasons for the migration trends are divided into two parts. On one hand, in old ethnoburbs, the large amount of new immigrants cause changes of urban patterns in terms of increasing residential and commercial density, worsening transportation, and shrinking public space. The current spatial pattern favors elderly Chinese and the new comers, but damages the Chinese professionals’ life qualities. Thus, different subgroups of Chinese residents have their perceptions of the community which later stimulates their decision to migrate. On the other hand, in newly emerged ethnoburbs, smaller population results in the urban patterns of lower residential density, larger properties, and better living environment which all attract wealthier Chinese to settle down.

3) What is the sequence of migration flows? As to the manifestation of the migration flows, it is the Chinese professionals who have highest socioeconomic status and mobility become the first migration flow. The second migration flow is the Chinese entrepreneurs who target the growing market and seek their business opportunities in new ethnoburbs. The last migration flow is the working-class Chinese who fill the labor demand of commercial activities in the new ethnoburbs, seeking for better job opportunities and better lives. However, this relatively dispersed spatial pattern in new ethnoburbs doesn’t benefit elderly Chinese who need more established ethnic facilities and social networks within walkable distance. As a result, elderly Chinese choose to stay in old ethnoburbs. Thus, three subgroups
of Chinese in old ethnoburbs eventually migrate to the new ethnoburbs, leaving elderly Chinese sharing the communities with newly arrived immigrants from China, the internal migration among ethnoburbs has been built.

7.2. Discussion

This thesis aims to reveal the spatial transformation and internal migration flows among Chinese ethnoburbs in the U.S. With two Chinese ethnoburbs in suburban Los Angeles as case studies, the finding of this thesis, however, is not an isolated case.

On the aspect of geographical scale, even both of the case studies of this thesis are located in suburban Los Angeles, the model of migration flows and spatial transformation among ethnoburbs could be implied on other regions in the U.S. as well. Singer (2008) and Li (2009) demonstrate that ethnic suburb, or “ethnoburb”, is not a unique ethnic settlement pattern occurring in Los Angeles or in large metropolitan areas in the U.S. Surprisingly, many newly-emerged ethnoburbs are located in the peripheral areas of second-tier U.S. cities, such as Dallas, TX and Mesa, AZ. As a result of the growing suburban ethnic population, ethnoburbs in those regions will gradually become more diverse. Therefore, the internal migration flows and the spatial transformation among ethnoburbs may occur as well.

In addition, the internal migration and spatial transformation among ethnoburbs are based on, yet not limited to, Chinese immigrant experiences. This thesis identifies three migration flows among Chinese ethnoburbs based on the distinct demographic and socio-economic characteristics of Chinese immigrants over decades. However, ethnic Chinese are not the only immigrant group witnessed significant demographic change in the 20th century, nor the only immigrant group remaining high segregation level. Large influx of immigrants from other ethnic origins to the U.S. may generate diverse ethnoburbs and internal migration flows among them too. Moreover, “ethnoburb” is not a unique case in contemporary ethnic minority experiences in the U.S. as well. After globalization restructuring the international labor market and the changes of immigration policies in many immigrant receiving countries, the international migration has become a worldwide phenomenon since the 1980s (Johnston, 2007). Research investigating suburbanization of
ethnic settlements in other immigrant receiving countries has also been well addressed (Finney and Simpson, 2007; Wrench and Modood, 2001).

In sum, although the geographical and demographical scale of this thesis is limited due to its location of case studies and selected ethnic group, the research findings could be implied into larger theoretical frameworks of international migration and ethnic communities.

7.3. Final Conclusion

This thesis explores the spatial and demographic disparities and internal migration flows among Chinese ethnoburbs in the U.S. By investigating two ethnoburbs in suburban Los Angeles - City of Monterey Park and Rowland Heights Community, this thesis identifies three internal migration flows moving from “old ethnoburbs” to “new ethnoburbs”, which leads to the spatial transformation of Chinese ethnoburbs.

Starting with Chinese professionals moving in and ending with new “Ports of Entry”, ethnoburbs evolve over time, creating unique community landscape in the American suburbia. The reason for this spatial transformation of Chinese ethnoburbs is the constant inflow of Chinese immigrants from China. As the increasing amount of new immigrants from China settling at old ethnoburbs and establishing themselves, more and more well-developed Chinese will move into new ethnoburbs, which in turn result the increasing population density of new ethnoburbs and a new wave of seeking “newer” ethnoburbs as the end. Thus, the spatial transformation of Chinese ethnoburbs has been established, addressing the destiny of Chinese ethnoburbs to the new “Ports of Entry”. As long as the globalizing economy context exists and the consistent influx of new Chinese immigrants land at their “Port of Entry”, the migration flows will keep running and the spatial transformation of the ethnoburbs will continue. Therefore, the spatial transformation of Chinese ethnoburbs and the internal migration flows among them reflect the way to Chinese immigrants’ “American Dream”.
Appendix--- Interview Question Sheet

Location
Name
Language

Background:
Gender ; Age ; Ethnic origin ;
Marriage ; Years in the U.S. ; Years in this neighborhood ;
Why they came to the U.S.

Socioeconomic characteristics:
Personal income ; Household income ;
Occupation and industries they work in ;
Where they work ;
If they have any business/interaction in the other communities ;
How many persons in a family ;
House/condo/apartment they live in ;

Conception of neighborhood
The reason they moved here ;
Community participation ;
Feeling to this community ;
Inclination to move out ;

Cultural identity
Language at home ;
Social relationship with local residents ;
Define themselves ;
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