

# Twice-Migrant Chinese and Indians in the United States: Their Origins and Attachment to Their Original Homeland

PYONG GAP MIN | QUEENS COLLEGE AND GRADUATE CENTER OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
SUNG S. PARK | UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

*China and India, the two most populated countries in the world, also have the largest overseas populations scattered all over the world. Following the global migration flow, many overseas Chinese and Indians have re-migrated from their diasporic communities to the United States in the post-1965 immigration era. This article, focusing on twice-migrant Chinese and Indians in the United States, has two interrelated objectives. First, it shows twice-migrant Chinese and Indians' regions and countries of origin that roughly reflect their global dispersals. Second, it examines their attachment to their original homeland using two indicators: use of ethnic language (a Chinese or an Indian language) at home and their choice of ancestry. It uses the combined 2009-2011 American Community Surveys as the primary data source. This article is significant because by using an innovative data source, it describes the origins and ethnic attachment of the two largest twice-migrant groups in the United States.*

**Keywords:** *the Chinese overseas population, the Indian overseas population, Re-migrants (twice migrants), Middleman minorities, Ethnic attachment*

## Introduction

Under the impact of globalization, the international migration of people from less developed to highly developed Western countries and even some Asian countries has expanded (Castles and Miller 2009; Massey 1999). Among immigrant-receiving countries, the United States has annually received the largest number of immigrants in the contemporary mass migration period that began in the 1960s and 1970s. The United States has received over one million immigrants per year since the late 1980s. Contemporary immigrants to the United States include large numbers of the so-called “twice-migrant” people (Bachu 1985) who re-migrated from diasporic communities established outside of their original homelands. In particular, Chinese and Indian immigrants in the United States include very large numbers and proportions of twice-migrant people. As will be shown later in two tables, the most recent census data indicate that approximately 320,000 ethnic Chinese immigrants and 270,000 ethnic Indian immigrants are twice-migrant people who respectively comprise about 13% of Chinese or Indian immigrants. Small numbers of twice-migrant Chinese and Indians in the United States may be those who were born in China or India and migrated to another country and then re-migrated to the United States.

The remigration of huge numbers of ethnic Chinese and Indians from their diasporic communities is not surprising when considering the following two factors. First, as the two most populous countries in the world, China and India have the largest overseas populations scattered all over the world. According to Skeldon (2001), by 2000, approximately 33 million people of Chinese ancestry had resided outside of mainland China and Taiwan. Overseas Chinese are heavily concentrated in Southeast Asian countries. But they are also visible in other Asian countries, North America, South America, Oceania, Europe, and the Caribbean Islands. According to Non-Resident Indians Online, there are more than 29 million Indians outside of India. Indian diasporic communities are found in the Caribbean Islands, especially British Guyana and Trinidad/Tobago. But ethnic Indians have also settled in many other former British colonies, such as Fiji, South Africa, Uganda, Kenya, and Canada, as well as Great Britain. Second, overseas Chinese and Indians, like Jews in Eastern Europe and the Middle East, are likely to have had a stronger motivation to emigrate to the United States and other Western countries than native people in their settlement countries, because of prejudice, discrimination, and anti-middleman violence they encountered

there. We will return to this issue later in this article.

Two major research questions regarding twice-migrant Chinese and Indians in the United States are: (1) from what regions and countries of the world have they originated? and (2) to what extent do they attach to their original homeland, China or India, culturally and psychologically (in identity), compared to their countries of settlement prior to their remigration? Mittelberg and Waters (1992) used the term "proximal host" to refer to the nearest host group to which the host society assigns an immigrant group. The Chinese and Indian immigrants in the United States who have directly migrated from mainland China/Taiwan or India and their children comprise the proximal hosts for twice-migrant Chinese and Indians. The concept of the proximal host suggests that twice-migrant immigrant groups are likely to be gradually incorporated into their nearest host groups. However, how fast twice-migrant Chinese and Indians will be incorporated into the Chinese or Indian communities in the United States depends upon the level of their attachment to their original homeland, China or India. Given this, answering the second question, posed above, is very important.

Conducting a survey of twice-migrant Chinese and Indians who have originated from different countries to measure their attachment to China or India would be nearly impossible because there is no sampling frame. Even if it were possible, such a survey study would be very time-consuming and expensive. Partly for this reason, researchers have neglected to study twice-migrant immigrant groups settled in the United States and other major immigrant-accepting countries. Fortunately, we can roughly measure ethnic attachment among Chinese, Indian and other twice-migrant groups in the United States, using the proxies of ethnic attachment from census data. As will be shown in the next section, the U.S. Census provides data about immigrants' ethnic background, countries of origin, language used at home, and choice of their ancestry. Through the use of census data, this means that we can examine twice-migrant Chinese, Indian and other groups' attachments to their original homelands, and even the intergroup differences among two or more different twice-migrant groups and the differences among different diasporic subgroups within each twice-migrant group.

This article intends to examine twice-migrant Chinese and Indian immigrants' regions and countries of origin and their attachment to their original homeland. It will show not only the Chinese and Indian difference in ethnic attachment, but also the subgroup differences within each group. We will find that ethnic Chinese immigrants show a higher level of ethnic attachment than ethnic Indian immigrants, with significant subgroup

differences within each ethnic group. But this is a descriptive study that does not intend to test one or more hypotheses. Thus we discuss the reasons for the Chinese-Indian differences and subgroup differences based on secondary sources after presentations of major findings, instead of discussing them in the theory section.

This study partly contributes to the literature on overseas Chinese and Indian populations in general, because U.S. Chinese and Indian remigrants' countries and regions of origin, and their ethnic attachment will reflect their settlement in different countries and regions, as well as their ethnic attachment prior to their remigration to the U.S. There are many studies that focus on particular overseas Chinese or Indian groups settled in particular countries or regions, but this article provides an overview of all major Chinese and Indian overseas groups scattered all over the world. It also contributes to studies of "the so-called "twice-migrant" minorities in the United States. The United States has more twice-migrant minorities than any other immigrant-receiving country in the world. But there are limited studies of contemporary twice-migrant minorities in the United States (Bozorgmehr 1997; Desbarats 1986; Gold 1992; Min 2012; 2013; Mittelberg and Waters 1992; Wariku 2004). As previously indicated, the levels of their attachment to China or India will tell how soon they will be incorporated into their proximal host in the United States, Chinese or Indian Americans.

Bachu (1985) who coined the term "twice migrant" immigrants or minorities used it to refer to third or higher-generation Indians who had lived in East Africa for a few generations and re-migrated to Great Britain beginning in the 1920s. We use the term in the same way, and thus we consider twice-migrant Chinese and Indian immigrants from various diasporic communities to the United States overwhelmingly as third- or higher-generation overseas Chinese and Indians (see Min 2013). The Chinese or Indians born in their home country who originally migrated to another country and re-migrated to the United States are likely to compose a tiny fraction of twice-migrant Chinese or Indian respondents in the sample. These twice-migrant Chinese and Indians are likely to maintain much higher levels of ethnic attachment, similar to direct-migrant Chinese and Indian immigrants, than multi-generation twice-migrant Chinese or Indians. But the proportion of the same-generation twice migrants is so small for each group that their much higher level of ethnic attachment may not have a statistically significant effect on ethnic attachment among other twice-migrant Chinese or Indians. Particular Chinese or Indian subgroups may include larger proportions of respondents born in China or India. However,

since we examine ethnic attachment among Chinese or Indian twice-migrants divided into different subgroups, we can observe the positive effect of a larger share of homeland-born twice migrants on their ethnic attachment for specific subgroups.

## IPUMS of the 2009-2011 Community Surveys as Major Data

We have used IPUMS of the 2009-2011 Combined American Community Surveys to assess the sizes of ethnic Chinese and Indian twice migrants and their regions and countries of origin. We first selected the foreign-born population from the sample and then selected only single-race Chinese and Indians by using the two population classification questions about Hispanic origin and race. The third step of our analysis was to check ethnic Chinese and Indian immigrants' countries of birth. If they were born outside of mainland China or Taiwan for Chinese, or India, Pakistan or Bangladesh for Indians, we considered them twice-migrant overseas Chinese or Indian immigrants.

To examine ethnic attachment, we eliminated the 1.5 generation who came to the United State at 12 or before from the sample because most of these American-raised people are likely to use English at home. By contrast, more than 90% of first-generation (who came to the U.S. at 13 or older) twice migrant Chinese and Indians are likely to speak a Chinese/Indian language or the language of their birth country at home. Thus we believed that limiting to the sample of first-generation immigrants alone is more effective for our purposes.

The American Community Surveys include two variables that we can use as indicators of ethnic attachment. The first is the variable regarding use of a language other than English at home. The ACS asks the respondent the following questions: "Does this person speak a language other than English at home?" If the answer is "yes," the respondent goes to the next question, "What is the language?" and records the name of the language. For "direct migrants," "a language other than English" is usually the language of the respondents' birth country. But for the "twice migrant" Chinese or Indian respondents, it can be either their original ancestral language or the language of their birth country. If they speak a Chinese or Indian language, we can consider them to have a stronger cultural attachment to their ancestral homeland than those who do not.

The other variable that can be considered as an indicator of ethnic

attachment is the ancestry question. Twice migrant Chinese and Indians can choose either Chinese/Indian or their country of origin (birth) ancestry. We can consider those choosing the Chinese/Indian ancestry as holding a stronger Chinese/Indian ethnic identity. The ACS asks each respondent the following questions: "What is this person's ancestry or ethnic origin?" The respondent is allowed to choose as many answers as possible. But the code book includes only the first two ancestries. We took only the respondent's first choice as the indicator of his/her ancestry or ethnic origin in this article. Most multiracial respondents (children of interethnic or interracial marriages) are likely to choose two or more ancestries. But, since we have included only single-race twice-migrant Chinese and Indian immigrants, the vast majority of the respondents provided only one ancestry. Both China and India are multiethnic societies, and thus many respondents gave a sub-ethnic category, such as a Manchurian, Cantonese or Hong Kong for Chinese, and Gujarati, Panjabi or Keralan for Indians. We include them in the Chinese or Indian ancestry.

## Findings: Regional and National Origins

### *Twice-Migrant Chinese*

Table 1 shows the number of ethnic Chinese immigrants who re-migrated from other parts of the world, compared to Chinese immigrants from mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong. Data show that there were more than two million foreign-born ethnic Chinese in the United States around 2010. Approximately 64% of them were born in mainland China, with another 8% and 15% respectively born in Hong Kong and Taiwan. Most people born in Taiwan and even some of those born in Hong Kong are likely to identify as Taiwanese or Hong Kongese rather than as Chinese. However, IPUMS of the 2009-2011 American Community Surveys have classified them into a single Chinese category.

Approximately 317,000 Chinese immigrants, accounting for 13% of all foreign-born Chinese in the United States, originated from Chinese diasporic communities outside of China and Taiwan. As expected, the majority (72%) of these twice migrants were born in Southeast Asian countries. A higher proportion of overseas Chinese settled in Southeast Asian countries than those settled in other areas is likely to have re-migrated to the United States for two major reasons. First, Southeast Asian countries, with the exception of

TABLE 1  
ETHNIC CHINESE IMMIGRANTS' BIRTHPLACES [1]

Birthplace	N	% of Total	% of Total Diasporic Population
China	1,554,670	63.9	-
Hong Kong	204,559	8.4	-
Taiwan	357,013	14.7	-
Diasporic Communities	317,224	13.0	100.0
Southeast Asia [2]	228,266	9.4	72.0
E. Asia, S. Asia & Other Asian [3]	40,857	1.7	12.9
Other Areas [4]	48,101	2.0	15.2
Total	2,433,466	100.0	-

SOURCE.—the American Community Surveys (ACS)

NOTES.—

[1]: These figures represent weighted samples from the ACS 2009-2011.

[2]: Southeast Asian countries include: Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam, and Myanmar.

[3]: East Asian countries include: Japan, Korea and "East Asia, ns." South Asian countries include: India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Nepal. Other Asian countries include Asia whose countries were not specified.

[4]: Other areas include Pacific Islands, Oceania, Europe, Canada, Latin America, the Caribbean Islands and the Middle East.

Singapore, have much lower standards of living than Western countries, including the United States. Thus they are likely to have a higher level of motivation to emigrate to the United States than those settled in Western countries such as Canada, Europe, Australia and New Zealand. Second, due to their middleman role between European ruling groups and native people, Chinese residents encountered high levels of anti-Chinese sentiments and even legal restrictions against their commercial activities in many Southeast Asian countries, such as Vietnam, the Philippines and Malaysia, immediately after the latter became independent from Western colonial rule in the post-war period (Heidhues 1974; Potson et al. 1994; Wickberg 1965).

A surprisingly large number of ethnic Chinese immigrants (over 40,000) originated from East and South Asia. In particular, three countries – Japan, Korea and India – have sizeable Chinese and Taiwanese populations. Many Chinese immigrants have migrated to Japan and Korea since the early 1980s. But a majority of ethnic Chinese immigrants in the United States originating from these Asian countries are likely to be descendants of the pre-1980

Chinese migrants there. Although both Japan and South Korea have well-developed economies, their official minority policies and the nationalistic sentiments of the general public may have pushed unusually large numbers of Chinese residents to the United States. Also, proportionally more Chinese residents in India may have chosen to re-migrate to the United States than those settled in Western countries because of limited economic opportunities there.

The vast majority of Chinese residents in non-Asian countries are settled in North America, Oceania, Europe, and the Middle East. The bulk of the international migration of Chinese to these non-Asian countries occurred in two periods: (1) the 1850s to the 1920s and (2) the 1970s to the present. In the post-1970s period, large numbers of Chinese have immigrated annually to the United States, Canada and Australia (Castle and Miller 2009). Table 1 reveals that twice-migrant Chinese from non-Asian countries comprise only 15% of all twice-migrant Chinese. But Chinese residents settled in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Europe alone may compose a larger proportion of all overseas Chinese than 15%. However, a much smaller proportion of them is likely to have moved to the United States than those settled in Southeast Asian countries because of the high standards of living and their favorable minority policies.

### *Twice-Migrant Indians*

Table 2 shows the numbers of ethnic Indians who re-migrated to the U.S. from other Indian diasporic communities. First, it is interesting to find large numbers of immigrants from Pakistan and Bangladesh identified as Indian. Most of them are likely to be Hindus, as there are many Hindus in Pakistan and Bangladesh. Since Hindus in Pakistan and Bangladesh, two heavily Muslim countries, experienced discrimination and physical violence, it is not surprising that once they immigrate to the United States, they identify as Indian. But we do not consider the immigrants from these two South Asian Muslim countries “twice migrant” Indians because almost all of them are likely to have originated from those Muslim countries. Many Hindus in Pakistan could not move to India and many Muslims in India could not move to Pakistan when India was divided into the two countries in 1947. When Pakistan was divided into Pakistan (West Pakistan) and Bangladesh (East Pakistan) in 1971, Hindus continued to stay in the two divided countries.

Approximately 270,000 Indian immigrants were born in Indian

TABLE 2  
ETHNIC INDIANS' IMMIGRANTS' BIRTHPLACES [1]

Birthplace	N	% of Total	% of Total Diasporic Population
India	1,664,484	81.4	-
Pakistan	50,807	2.5	-
Bangladesh	59,707	2.9	-
Diasporic Communities	270,153	13.2	100.0
The Caribbean Islands	85,736	4.2	31.7
E. Asia, Southeast Asia & Other Asian [2]	65,384	3.2	24.2
Great Britain, Canada and Oceania	44,517	2.2	16.5
Africa	36,691	1.8	13.6
Other European Countries, the Middle East,			
Latin America &	19,586	1.0	7.2
Nepal/Sri Lanka	18,239	0.9	6.8
Total	2,045,151	100.0	-

SOURCE.—the American Community Surveys (ACS)

NOTES.—

[1]: These figures represent weighted samples from the ACS 2009-2011.

[2]: East Asian countries include: China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, Korea and "East Asia, ns". Southeast Asian countries include: Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam and Myanmar. Other Asian countries include Asia whose countries were not specified.

diasporic communities, who make up 13% of all foreign-born Indians in the U.S. (over two million). With the exception of Indians in South Asian countries, the movement of most overseas Indians was the product of the British colonization of India. The British Empire brought Indian workers as indentured servants to its colonies in the Caribbean Islands, Fiji, Africa, and Asia to meet the shortage of labor after the British Parliament abolished slavery in their colonies in 1834 (Chattopadhyaya 1970; Jarayam 2004; Mahajani 1960; Pariag 2004; Tinker 1974). Nearly 86,000 twice-migrant Indians originated from the Caribbean Islands. Selectively, more Indians in Caribbean countries than in other areas are presumed to have migrated to the United States because of much lower standards of living and higher levels of racial discrimination in the host countries (Vertovec 1992). The second largest subgroup of twice-migrant Indians has originated from Southeast and East Asian countries. Most of them are presumed to have originated from four Southeast Asian countries: Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, and

Thailand. There are large Indian populations in these Asian countries, especially in Malaysia and Myanmar. The migration of Indians to these Asian countries is also very much a product of British colonization of Asian countries. But many other Indians moved as voluntary immigrants, especially for business ventures. Given that these Southeast Asian countries have much lower standards of living than Western countries with large Indian settlements, we can presume that proportionally more Indians there have re-migrated to the United States.

Africa is another major source of twice-migrant Indians. As previously mentioned, most Indian migrants to South Africa and East Africa became indentured servants by the British colonial government, but many others moved there voluntarily and independently for business reasons. When East African countries, such as Uganda and Kenya, became independent of British colonial rule in the 1960s, Indian residents there were subjected to physical violence, legal restrictions in their commercial activities, and even expulsion (from Uganda) (Morris 1968). Large numbers of these Indians re-migrated to Western countries, mostly to Great Britain, Canada, and the United States (Chattopadhyaya 1970). Census data show that twice-migrant Indians from Africa have the highest self-employment (23%) among all twice-migrant Indian groups and a much higher self-employment rate than immigrants from India (11%).

As expected, many Indian twice migrants in the United States have come from two Western countries: Great Britain and Canada. Many Indians moved from East and West Africa to Great Britain, Canada, and the United States (Bachu 1985). The international migration of Indians from India to these Western countries also began to start in the early 1920s and has accelerated since the 1960s. Large proportions of them are highly educated professionals and managers working in the mainstream economies. By virtue of global occupational networks, it is easy for the children of Indian immigrants settled in Great Britain and Canada to move to the United States (Poros 2010). Many other Indian immigrants in the United States have come from other non-Asian areas, which include European countries (such as Netherlands and Italy), Middle Eastern countries (including Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and Kuwait), and Oceania.

## Findings on Ethnic Attachment

### *Use of the Ethnic Language at Home*

In this section, we compare Chinese and Indians, as well as their subgroup differences in ethnic attachment using two indicators based on cross-tabulation analyses. Table 3 shows results of cross-tabulation analyses regarding twice-migrant Chinese and Indian immigrants' use of ethnic language (either a Chinese or Indian language) at home. Naturally, an overwhelming majority of first-generation Chinese immigrants (96%), as well as Taiwanese and Hong Kong immigrants, use a Chinese language at home. Seventy percent of all Chinese immigrants from diasporic communities – and 75% of Southeast Asian Chinese re-migrants – use a Chinese language at home. These figures are very high, well beyond our expectations.

Although most Chinese residents in Southeast Asia are presumed to have lived there for several generations, the vast majority of them have maintained their ancestral language. Their successful retention of mother tongue seems to be due partly to their ancestors' commercial pattern of migration and adaptation in Southeast Asian countries. One major advantage in retaining their ethnic language and other cultural traditions is that commercial activities have fostered their family, kin, and ethnic networks (Bolt 2000; Charney et al. 2003; Mackie 2003; Wang 1991; Zenner 1991).

The other advantage in preserving their Chinese cultural traditions stems from the special economic role that the Chinese merchants played there. Overseas Chinese merchants in various Southeast Asian countries played the so-called "middleman" role, distributing products made by European colonial groups to indigenous populations (Heidhues 1974; Zenner 1991). Middleman minorities who played the intermediary economic role between the producers of the ruling group and consumers of the subordinate group usually encountered hostility from both groups (Bonacich 1973; Min 1996; Reitz 1980; Zenner 1991). In reaction to host hostility, middleman merchants maintained segregated residential areas and ethnic solidarity. While Southeast Asian Chinese residents' family and ethnic networks contributed to their commercial activities, host hostility encountered due to their middleman commercial role further heightened their segregation and coethnic solidarity.

The successful retention of their mother tongue among Chinese

TABLE 3  
ETHNIC CHINESE AND INDIANS IMMIGRANTS' USE OF ETHNIC LANGUAGE AT HOME (%) BY BIRTHPLACE [1]

Birthplace	N	Foreign-Born Ethnic Chinese		
		% of Those Who Use One of the Chinese Languages [2]	% of Those Who Use Another Non-English Language	% of Those Who Use English
China	37,217	95.6	1.0	3.4
Hong Kong	4,573	92.9	0.7	6.4
Taiwan	8,982	94.4	0.6	5.0
Diasporic Communities	7,467	70.4	16.2	13.4
Southeast Asia	5,745	75.1	15.8	9.1
E. Asia, S. Asia & Other Asian	900	71.8	18.5	9.7
Other Countries	822	37.0	16.3	46.7
Foreign-Born Ethnic Indians				
Birthplace	N	% of Those Who Use One of the South Asian Languages [3]	% of Those Who Use Another Non-English Language	% of Those Who Use English
India	37,706	92.4	0.8	6.8
Pakistan [4]	1,000	88.1 [4]	4.0	7.9
Bangladesh [5]	1,117	94.5 [5]	1.5	4.0
Diasporic Communities	5,623	38.1	15.9	46.0
The Caribbean	2,011	4.4	2.7	92.9
E. Asia, Southeast Asia & Other Asian	1,362	45.2	35.4	19.3
Great Britain, Canada and Oceania	637	69.4	2.1	28.5
Africa	909	71.3	9.6	19.1
Other European Countries, the Middle East & Latin America	319	42.2	27.0	30.8
Nepal and Sri Lanka	385	51.5	39.5	9.1

SOURCE.—the American Community Surveys (ACS)

Notes.—

[1]: Figures based on unweighted N and weighted percentages. This sample consists of individuals who arrived in the US after the age of 12.

[2]: This includes Chinese, Cantonese, Mandarin, "Miao-Yao, Mien," "Miao, Hmong," and "Formosan, Taiwanese."

[3]: This includes Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, Gujarathi, Marathi, Panjabi, Sinhalese, Kannada, India nec, Pakistan nec, Other Indo-European, Telugu, Malayalam, and Tamil.

[4]: More specifically, 62% of those born in Pakistan speak Urdu.

[5]: More specifically, 88% of those born in Bangladesh speak Bengali.

residents in South East Asian countries is also due partly to their high concentration in several Southeast Asian countries, accounting for large proportions of the populations there. For example, Chinese residents in Singapore make up three-fourths of the population while those in Malaysia compose more than 30%. There are also large Chinese populations – ranging from one to six million – in other Southeast Asian countries, such as Thailand, Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines. Chinese residents in these Southeast Asian countries have an advantage over those in East Asian or Western countries because they are presumed to have established more Chinese institutions, including ethnic language schools, thereby making social interactions with co-ethnic members easier.

Re-migrant Chinese from non-Asian countries – Western countries, the Middle East and Latin America – have a much lower rate (37%) of using a Chinese ethnic language than those settled in Asian countries. Two closely related factors seem to have contributed to their lower level of mother-tongue retention: the more involuntary nature of their ancestors' migration to their settlement countries, and their lack of business involvement. Another factor may be their familiarity with English in their settlement countries, which would increase the likelihood that they use English in the U.S. In fact, nearly half of them use English at home.

Despite their fluency in English, 92% of immigrants from India use an Indian language. By contrast, only 38% of twice-migrant Indians use an Indian language. This is a much lower rate than that of their Chinese counterparts (70%). This can be explained by their history as coolie migrants. The coolie migration pattern of original Indian immigrants, their smaller population sizes in settlement countries, and their lack of enclaves and territorial communities all seem to contribute to their huge disadvantages in preserving their mother tongue, compared to twice-migrant Chinese. Also, the majority of twice-migrant Indians were born in English-speaking countries, compared to a small proportion of their Chinese counterparts, which also seems to explain the significant Chinese-Indian difference in use of mother tongue. In addition, a greater linguistic diversity among twice-migrant Indians, compared to their Chinese counterparts, may partly account for the Indian disadvantage.

The subgroup differences within the twice-migrant Indian group are as significant as the difference between Chinese and Indian groups. The rates of mother-tongue use at home range from only 4% for Caribbean Indians to 69% for Indians from Great Britain, Canada and Oceania. Indians from Africa show the highest rate (71%) of use of the ethnic language. Caribbean

Indians' nearly complete loss of mother tongue can be explained by their typical coolie migration and adaptation patterns, their lack of territorial communities, linguistic diversity, lower-class backgrounds, and use of English as the standard language in Caribbean countries.

A high rate (71%) of mother-tongue use among African Indians can be explained by their concentration in commercial activities, typical middleman roles, moderately segregated residential patterns, and high educational levels (Chattopadhyaya 1970; Moodley 1980; Morris 1968). Indian merchants in Africa who encountered host hostility by both white ruling members and local black residents seem to have maintained separate neighborhoods and strong social networks among themselves. Moreover, they may have had little motivation to learn and use an indigenous ethnic language in each African country of their settlement, especially because English was used in many British colonies (South Africa and Kenya). Table 3 shows that while less than 10% of Indian immigrants from Africa use another non-English language (most likely a local African ethnic language), over 19% of them use English.

We can understand the great tendency of Indians from Africa to use an Indian language at home; however, we have difficulty in explaining the same tendency (73%) of Indians from the three English-speaking areas – Great Britain, Canada, and Oceania. We noted in the same table that Chinese immigrants from non-Asian countries, presumably mostly English-speaking countries, have a much lower rate (only 37%) of use of mother tongue than those from Asian countries. By contrast, Indian immigrants from these English-speaking countries show a substantially higher rate of use of an Indian language than even those from two South Asian countries, Sri Lanka and Nepal (52%). It is possible that most of Indian re-migrants from the three English-speaking Western countries are fluent in an Indian language because a significant proportion of them are first-generation emigrants from India. Post-1960s Indian immigrants in Great Britain, Canada and the U.S. are known to maintain active transnational social networks among themselves (Dhingra 2012; Poros 2010).

### *Choice of Ancestry*

Table 4 shows the Chinese-Indian and subgroup differences in reporting a Chinese or Indian ancestry or ethnic origin. Those who chose a Chinese or Indian ancestry are more likely to have had stronger psychological attachment to the Chinese community/China or the Indian community/India than those who did not. We noticed that several hundred Chinese and

Indian respondents who answered the question of mother-tongue use did not answer the ancestry question. Many seem to have not responded to this question because they had difficulty in choosing between their original ancestral land (China or India) and their country of origin.

It is interesting to note that 42% of immigrants born in Taiwan chose Chinese ancestry. Most of them are likely to be children of Chinese-born refugees who fled to Taiwan when the Communist government was established in 1949 in China. An exceptionally high proportion (85%) of Chinese immigrants from diasporic communities, only slightly lower than immigrants from China (97%), chose Chinese ancestry. In terms of choosing Chinese as their ancestry, as well as in their use of a Chinese language, Chinese immigrants from Southeast Asian countries show a slightly higher level of ethnic attachment than those from other areas. Since the majority of twice-migrant Chinese lived in countries with large Chinese populations and large or moderate Chinese population centers, they seem to have identified strongly with their Chinese ethnicity. Chinese residents in Southeast Asia seem to have advantages in retaining Chinese ethnic identity, not only due to their strong networks with other co-ethnic members, but because of their proximity to their homeland. But even those from other areas far from China show strong psychological attachment to China.

The lower panel of Table 4 shows the proportion of twice-migrant Indians who chose Indian ancestry and their subgroup differences. For both Pakistani and Bangladeshi immigrants who identified as Indian, the majority chose Pakistani or Bangladeshi ancestry, with only 32% and 20% choosing Indian ancestry, respectively. The majority (about 52%) of twice-migrant Indians chose Indian ancestry. This is a much smaller proportion than that (85%) of twice migrant Chinese who chose Chinese ancestry. This finding indicates that twice-migrant Indians have a substantially lower level of ethnic attachment than their Chinese counterparts.

There are significant subgroup differences in twice-migrant Indians' choice of Indian ancestry. Consistent with use of an Indian language at home, two subgroups – Indians from Africa and those from Great Britain, Canada and Oceania – show exceptionally high levels (respectively, 92% and 84%) of ethnic attachment in ancestry. Indians from Africa seem to have strong emotional attachment to India as their homeland and no attachment to their settlement countries in Africa for the same reasons (discussed above) they use an Indian language at home. A majority of Indian immigrants from those English-speaking countries most likely reject their birth countries as their ancestral homelands because of negative historical connotations with the

TABLE 4  
ETHNIC CHINESE AND INDIANS IMMIGRANTS' CHOICE OF ANCESTRY OR ETHNIC ORIGIN (%) BY BIRTHPLACE [1]

Foreign-Born Ethnic Chinese				
Birthplace	N	% of Those Who Chose Chinese [2]	% of Those Who Chose Taiwanese	% of Those Who Chose Other
China	35,807	97.4	0.3	2.3
Hong Kong	4,440	94.7	0.2	5.1
Taiwan	8,792	42.4	55.9	1.7
Diasporic Communities	6,700	84.6	1.4	14.0
Southeast Asia	5,294	87.3	0.8	11.9
E. Asia, S. Asia & Other Asian Countries	660	69.4	4.2	26.5
Other Countries	746	79.9	3.5	16.6
Foreign-Born Ethnic Indians				
Birthplace	N	% of Those Who Chose Indian (or East Indian or Punjabi)	% of Those Who Chose Other South Asian [3]	% of Those Who Chose Other
India	36,911	96.5	0.2	3.3
Pakistan	958	31.6	55.8	12.5
Bangladesh	1065	19.6	69.8	10.5
Diasporic Communities	5,085	52.9	1.1	46.0
The Caribbean	1,915	54.1	0.0	45.9
E. Asia, Southeast Asia & Other Asian	988	50.8	3.0	46.2
Great Britain, Canada and Oceania	621	83.6	2.9	13.5
Africa	895	91.5	0.2	8.3
Other European Countries, the Middle East & Latin America	299	65.9	2.0	32.0
Nepal and Sri Lanka	367	23.1	67.8	9.1

SOURCE.—the American Community Surveys (ACS)

NOTES.—

[1]: This is based of respondents' first ancestry. Figures based on unweighted N and weighted percentages. This sample consists of individuals who arrived in the US after the age of 12.

[2]: This includes Chinese and Cantonese.

[3]: Other South Asian ancestries include Bengali, Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Sri Lankan and Nepali.

colonial British Empire and other British colonies (Canada and Oceania).

We previously noted that only 4% of Caribbean Indians used an Indian language at home. But the majority of them (54%) chose Indian ancestry. Proportionally, more Caribbean Indian twice migrants than those from East and Southeast Asia (51%) chose Indian ancestry. But we should not interpret this as an indication that Caribbean-born Indian immigrants are more attached to India than the other Indian subgroups. It seems to suggest that Caribbean Indians are less willing to accept their birth countries (Guyana or Trinidad/Tobago) as their homeland than those from East and Southeast Asia. Only 23% of Indians from Nepal and Sri Lanka, the lowest percentage among all Indian subgroups, accepted Indian ancestry, with the majority choosing Nepalese or Sri Lankan ancestry. Their multigenerational residence in both countries seems to be the major reason for their strong attachment to it.

## Conclusion

Overseas Chinese and Indians who are scattered all over the world comprise the two largest diasporic populations in the world. The global population movement since the beginning of the 1960s has led large numbers of people of Chinese and Indian ancestries in diasporic communities to re-migrate to the United States. The long historical and social science literature on the international migration of Chinese and Indians to various parts of the world suggests that overseas Chinese residents are likely to maintain a substantially higher level of ethnic attachment than their Indian counterparts. Moreover, the literature also suggests that Chinese and Indian diasporic communities have significant sub-ethnic differences in ethnic attachment.

Since census data do not provide information on Chinese and Indian immigrants' migration histories, settlement patterns and economic adaptations, we cannot conduct multivariate analyses to explain the Chinese-Indian difference and the subgroup differences within each ethnic group in their use of mother tongue at home and choice of China or India as their ancestral homeland. This is the major limitation of this article. Nevertheless, it makes a significant contribution to studies of overseas Chinese and Indians for two reasons. First, it provides empirical data that show the areas and countries of origins of twice-migrant Chinese and Indians. Statistics in Tables 1 and 2 roughly reflect the global distributions of overseas Chinese and

Indians. Second, and more importantly, this article sheds much light on Chinese and Indian diasporic subgroups' attachment to their ancestral homelands. Several dozens of historical and social science books and journal articles, many of them cited in this article, have already provided theoretical postulations and historical information about the global migrations and adaptations of Chinese and Indians to different parts of the world. Yet none of them has provided concrete empirical data about particular Chinese and Indian diasporic subgroups' levels of ethnic attachment. This article provides more concrete, measurable data for their ethnic attachment than any of the previous studies. It provides comparable data with which to compare not only twice-migrant Chinese and Indians, but also subgroups within each ethnic group.

The major findings from this study also have important policy implications. Chinese and Indian governments must be seriously interested in strengthening their overseas populations' attachment to their countries. The major findings from this study are likely to be of great use to policymakers for Chinese and Indian governments. Moreover, they are also likely to be very interesting to leaders of the Chinese and Indian communities in the U.S. However, under the impact of racialization, twice-migrant Chinese and Indian immigrants who are currently detached from their ancestral homelands are likely to be gradually incorporated into the Chinese and Indian communities in the U.S. in the future. The findings regarding the significant Chinese-Indian differences in ethnic attachment suggest that it may take much longer for the children of twice-migrant Indians to be incorporated into the Indian ethnic community in the U.S. than their Chinese counterparts.

This article is motivated by the global re-migration of overseas Chinese and Indian residents settled all over the world to the United States since the mid-1960s. Chinese and Indian immigrants in the United States have the largest numbers and probably largest proportions of twice-migrant members from countries other than their home countries. Many Jews from Iran, the former Soviet republics, and other Jewish diasporic communities have also re-migrated to the United States, but we cannot study twice-migrant Jews in the United States because the U.S. Census does not capture the Jewish category, which is not a racial, but a religious category. However, there are many other racial minority immigrant groups with sizeable twice-migrant populations in the United States, such as Filipino and Japanese groups. It seems promising to conduct more research on other twice-migrant groups such as these in the future.

## References

- Bachu, Parminder. 1985. *Twice Migrants: East African Sikh Settlers in Britain*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Bolt, Paul J. 2000. *China and Southeast Asia's Ethnic Chinese: State and Diaspora in Contemporary Asia*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Bonacich, Edna. 1973. "A Theory of Middleman Minorities" *American Sociological Review* 35 (4): 583-94.
- Bozorgmehr, Mehdi. 1997. "Internal Ethnicity: Iranians in Los Angeles." *Sociological Perspectives* 13 (3): 387-408.
- Castles, Stephen, and Mark Miller. 2009. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movement in the Modern World*, Fourth Edition. New York and London: The Guilford Press.
- Charney, M. W., B.S. Yeo, and T. C. Kiong (eds.). 2003. *Chinese Migrants Abroad*. New Jersey: World Scientific.
- Chattopadhyaya, Haraprasad. 1970. *Indians in Africa: A Socio-Economic Study*. Bookland Private Limited.
- Desbarats, J. 1986. "Ethnic Differences in Adaptation: Sino-Vietnamese Refugees in the United States." *International Migration Review* 20 (3): 405-27.
- Dhingra, Pawan. 2012. *Life behind the Lobby: Indian American Motel Owners and the American Dream*. Stanford University Press.
- Gold, Steven. 1992. *Refugee Communities: A Comparative Field Study*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Heidhues, Mary Sommers. 1974. *Southeast Asia's Chinese Minorities*, Longman. International Labor Organization. HIV/AIDS and Mobility in South Asia.
- Jayaram, N. (eds). 2004. *The Indian Diaspora: Dynamics of Migration*. Walnut Creek, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mahajani, Usha. 1960. *The Role of Indian Minorities in Burma and Malaya*. Bombay: Vora & Co.
- Mackie, Jamie. 2003. "Five Southeast Asian Chinese Empire Builders: Commonalities and Differences." Pp. 3-32 in *Chinese Migrants Abroad*, edited by M.W. Charney, B.S. Yeo, and T. C. Kiong. New Jersey: World Scientific.
- Massey, Douglas. 1999. "Why Does Immigration Occur? Theoretical Synthesis." Pp. 34-52 in *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, edited by Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz and Josh DeWind. New York: Russell Sage Publications.
- Min, Pyong Gap. 1996. *Caught in the Middle: Korean Communities in New York and Los Angeles*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. "Twice-Migrant Koreans in the U.S.: Their Countries of Origins, Socioeconomic Characteristics, and Ethnic Attachment." *Journal for Diasporic Studies* 6 (2): 155-76.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013, "The Attachment of New York Caribbean Indian Immigrants to Indian Culture, Indian Immigrants, and India." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39 (10): 1601-16.
- Ministry of External Affairs, Indian Government. 2001. *The Indian Diaspora*. <http://indiandiaspora.nic.in/contents.htm>.
- Mittelberg, David, and Mary Waters. 1992. "The Process of Ethnogenesis among Haitian and Israeli Immigrants in the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15 (2): 412-35.
- Moodley, K. 1980. "Structural Inequality and Minority Anxiety: Responses to Middleman Groups in South Africa." Pp. 217-35 in *The Apartheid Regime: Political Power and Racial Discrimination in South Africa*, edited by R. M. Price and C. G. Rotberg. Berkley, CA: University of California, Institute of International Studies.
- Morris, Harold S. 1968. *Indians in Uganda*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pariag, Florence. 2004. *East Indians in the Caribbean*. Arawak Publications.
- Poros, Maritsa. 2010. *Modern Migrations: Gujarati Indian Networks in New York and London*. Stanford University Press.
- Reitz, Jeffrey. 1980. *The Survival of Ethnic Groups*. Toronto: McGraw Hill.
- Skeldon, R. 2011. "China: An Emerging Destination for Economic Migration." *Migration Information*. Accessed August 15, 2013. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?ID=838>.
- Tinker, Hue. 1974. *A New System of Slavery: The Export of Indian Labor Overseas: 1830-1920*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vertovec, Steven. 1992. *Hindu Trinidad: Religion, Ethnicity, and Socio-Economic Change*. London: McMillan Education Ltd.
- Wang, Gungwu. 1991. *China and Chinese Overseas*. Singapore: Time Academic Press.
- Wariku, Natasha. 2004. "Cosmopolitan Ethnicity: Second-Generation Indo-Caribbean Identities." Pp. 361-92 in *Ethnographies of the New Second Generation*, edited by Philip Kasinitz, John Mollenkopf, and Mary Waters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Wickberg, Edgar. 1965. *The Chinese in Philippines Life, 1950-1898*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
- Zenner, Walter. 1991 *In the Middle: A Cross-Cultural Analysis*. State University of New York Press.

**PYONG GAP MIN** is Distinguished Professor of Sociology at Queens College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. He also serves as Director of the Research Center for Korean Community at Queens College. The areas of his specializations are immigration, ethnicity, immigrant businesses, immigrants' religious practices, and family/gender, with a special focus on Korean and Asian

Americans. He is the author of five books, the editor or a co-editor of 12 books, and the author of more than 100 articles and book chapters. His books include *Caught in the Middle: Korean Communities in New York and Los Angeles* (1996), the winner of two national book awards, and *Preserving Ethnicity through Religion in America: Korean Protestants and Indian Hindus across Generations*, the winner of the three national book awards. He received the Distinguished Career Award from the International Migration Section of the American Sociological Association in August 2012. *Address:* Department of Sociology, Queens College, Flushing, NY 11367 [*E-mail:* pyonggap.min@qc.cuny.edu]

**SUNG S. PARK** is a doctoral student in Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles. Using nationally representative survey data, her research focuses on three areas of family complexity in Western countries: immigrant families, intergenerational relationships across the life course, and race-ethnic differences in intergenerational support. Her work has been supported by the California Center for Population Research and the National Institute for Aging. *Address:* 264 Haines Hall, 375 Portola Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1551 [*E-mail:* sung.s.park@ucla.edu]

