

## **Occupational Structures of Chinese Immigrants in Early Malaya and North America**

**Mak Lau-Fong**  
*National University of Singapore*

**Him M. Lai**  
*San Francisco State University*

### **The Framework**

Occupational structure is realized upon occupational choice that is related to a variety of socio-demographic factors. These factors are spatial and time specific in a social and historical context (Duncan and Schnore, 1959). Those for the 19th-century immigrants certainly assume a set that is unique to the immigrants' organizing principle and the host country's work environment. The Chinese immigrants in early Malaya and North America are illustrative of the framework to be presented below.

The Chinese immigrants have too often been taken as a homogeneous group or as a community, a view commonly held by recipient countries where the population of Chinese immigrants formed only a minute minority. In the case where it was not, they were merely described as *structurally* clannish (Freedman, 1967; Crissman, 1967). The dynamics of most Chinese immigrant societies flowed beyond the structural perspective, as is evident in the analysis of Chinese immigrants in the early Malaya, whose organizing principle had been dialect group identity (Mak, 1985). In contrast, Chinese immigrants to North America were relatively homogeneous in dialect group identity.

For most of the early immigrants, the primary motive to emigrate is to improve on their life chances; and that can be expressed in terms of getting a job that could earn them a subjectively better living. Formation, change, and persistence of occupational patterns of the immigrants naturally constitute an excellent frame of reference for contrasting between a socially relatively homogeneous group and a heterogeneous one.

Apart from the internal dynamics of the Chinese immigrants, impact of the host country's immigration policy which to a considerable extent underlies the social attitude toward the Chinese immigrants, is instrumental in the formation

of their occupational patterns. Both group dynamics and immigration policy are conceived of as constraint.

Given the externally imposed constraint and internally created constraint, four models of occupational choice may be constructed. The two extreme models are each characterized by "externally free — internally free" (EF/IF) and "externally constrained — internally constrained" (EC/IC) conditions. The other two may be seen as partially constrained models, of which one is characterized by "externally constrained but internally free" (EC/IF) conditions, and the other by 'externally free but internally constrained' (EF/IC) conditions. The EF/IC model may be illustrated by the Chinese immigrants in the early Straits Settlements or Malaya, while the North American experience was closer to the EC/IC model. It is our conviction that a simpler pattern of occupational activities is more likely to be associated with the EC/IF model, while a more complicated one with the EE/IC model.

## The Internal Constraint

That Chinese immigrants in the early Straits Settlements were dialect bound is well-documented. The effects permeated not only into residential settlements and social organization, but also occupational structure. A number of early observations had associated some trades and occupations with certain dialect groups<sup>1</sup> (e.g., Braddell, 1855: 115ff.; Siah, 1848; Vaughan, 1854).

An ecological perspective stressing on the role of secret organizations has been offered to account for such a relationship between the contract laborers and their type of job (Mak, 1985:65ff.). Instead, Yen (1986:118-24) suggests clan ties, or its extended territorial connections, as an explanatory factor. The suggestion is plausible, insofar as the level of generalization is confined to only voluntary/freed contract laborers. One has yet to be convinced as to how the hundreds of thousands of workers could congregate to work in sparsely inhabited areas like tin mining sites, and plantations of various kinds, if formal organization of laborers was inefficient.

It certainly makes sense to see these workers as bonded through their dialect origins, but clan network may be more useful in explaining the occupation-dialect group affinity for the voluntary immigrants and the freed contract laborers. And yet this occupational snowballing effect operated primarily on the later immigrants, and the occupational choice of the first immigrants was believed to be an historical accident. Shortly, we shall present some observations on such an occupational pattern.

In contrast to Malaya where Chinese immigrants originated from different areas in Fujian, Guangdong and Guangxi provinces, the overwhelming majority of Chinese immigrants to North America before World War II came from a relatively small area which includes the Pearl River Delta as well as the adjoining Tam River basin. There is, however, a surprisingly great diversity of speech in this relatively small area. Although the Cantonese dialect is dominant, the speakers are distributed between two strikingly different sub-dialects. The

Yuehai subdialect is spoken by people from the region around Guangzhou (Sanyi or Sam Yup), as well as those from Xiangshan and other districts south and east of Gungzhou, while the Siyi (Sze Yup) subdialect is prevalent in the counties with heavy emigration through which the Tam River flows.

Among the immigrants were also speakers of Hakka and Southern Fujianese dialects living in village enclaves of the Cantonese speakers. These differences are sufficient to promote group solidarity as well as to give rise to internal constraints on occupational choices. However, such constraints were only clearly discernible in areas with a large enough Chinese population and a diversified economy.

Inter-group competition existed from the earliest days of settlement — between Xiangshan and Siyi, between Sanyi and Hakka, between Sanyi and Siyi, between secret societies or *huiguan*, etc. The rivalries occasionally erupted into physical violence as groups supported by their respective organizations tried to protect the common interests of the group and to establish turf rights (Barth, 1964: 77-108).

## The External Constraint

Capitalism, imperialism and colonialism surely account well Asian migratory movements before the Second World War (Bonacich, 1984: 60-78). The host country's economic and political environment was no less deterministic of the nature of the immigration. The inter-play of these two vital sets of conditions produced different categories of immigrants. Except for a few incidents of slave trading in especially the American Continent, the bulk of the Chinese immigrants throughout the 19th-century (Yen, 1985) fall into two principal categories: contract or credit-ticket and freed immigrants.

There had apparently been attempts to import Chinese contract labor at the beginning of the Gold Rush in America, but strong anti-slavery sentiments in California and more importantly the failure of the courts to uphold the sanctity of contracts led to cessation of this practice. Instead, a credit ticket system that was widely practised among the Colonists in Southeast Asian arose to take its place to institutionalize Chinese immigration.

Under this system, the immigrant was advanced his passage and repaid the debt from his wages after arrival. The system put the immigrants under debt bondage rather than a servile contract as was the case with the contract workers. Enforcement of debt payment was backed by the power of the *huiguan* (territorial association) which had been established by the 1850s. This system was also used in Canada and became the vehicle by which many Chinese laborers came to the North America up to time when Chinese exclusion laws were promulgated in the United States and Canada.

A credit ticketed immigrant was under obligation only to repay debts incurred by his passage. But with a debt hanging over his head of which full payment was expected within a few years, the immigrant probably had few options as to the type of work and the location of worksites. Thus up to enactment

of the Exclusion Act such immigrants provided the bulk of the unskilled labor supply.

Chinese laborers in North America were recruited under a so-called "Chinese contract" system. This is similar to the "baogong" or "Chengbao" (contract) system of China, where a "gongtou" (foreman) recruited workers to implement a contract for a defined scope of work such as constructing a stretch of railroad, a season of canning salmon at a cannery, earthwork for erecting a specific length of a levee.

The areas of Chinese participation in the American economy vary widely due to the differences in the political and economic climate, as Chinese settled in various regions at different periods. The presence of a powerful white middle class and numerically large white working class in North America which used the law as well as physical violence to exclude Chinese from many occupations, severely limited the range of options for the Chinese. Thus in most regions a Chinese immigrant's occupation was fairly predictable. Up to the 1870s, except for a small number of merchants, shopkeepers and professionals, the bulk of the Chinese in the United States were employed in gold mining, railroad construction, and marshland reclamation. Others ran laundries or restaurant, or were in domestic service.

As the economy of the American West, especially that in California developed, Chinese expanded also into agriculture, coal and quicksilver mining, shrimp and abalone fisheries as well as salmon canneries (W.H. Chen, 1940: 461-5). They were mostly laborers, although there were entrepreneurs also to a limited extent.

The Chinese presence was particularly large in northern and central California which was close to San Francisco, the city with the largest concentration of Chinese in North America. In the latter city, Chinese were also found in large numbers in certain light industries. The large community there enabled the development of a fairly diversified internal economy. Thus it was not surprising that the occupations of the Chinese in San Francisco were also the most diversified.

The Chinese population decreased as one moved away from California. In these other areas, occupations of the bulk of the Chinese were limited to only a few categories of a menial or unskilled nature. Chinese also began to migrate in fairly large numbers east of the Mississippi after the 1870s. By that time anti-Chinese feelings were on the rise, and Chinese were largely restricted to the stereotypic laundry, and somewhat later, the restaurant and grocery businesses. Developments in Canada lagged those in the United States by a few years, but exhibited similar trends and patterns.

After the implementation of the Chinese Exclusion Act, some sectors of the economy dependent on Chinese labor declined and disappeared. Many industries excluded the entry of Chinese. During this period, a high percentage of Chinese had to seek their livelihoods in the service sector, as servants and cooks in domestic service, or as operators of, and workers in businesses such as restaurants, laundries and grocery stores.

Chinese immigrants to the British Straits Settlements (later Malaya) were by and large also of two categories: the contract laborers and the voluntary immigrants. The occupational choice of the first type of immigrants did not seem to be much wider than that of credit-ticketed immigrants in North America, partly because the nature of capitalism, imperialism and colonialism varied very little within a specific time period. They were recruited chiefly as laborers to work in mining sites and plantations of various types. Like in North America where the immigrants' former settlements had later developed into towns and cities, environs of worksites of the Chinese immigrants in the British Settlements were also transformed into urban areas.

The voluntary Chinese immigrants and the freed contract laborers in the Settlements have two important characteristics in their choice of occupation. First, except for the professional class of occupations which very few of them truly qualified, the early Chinese immigrants were reported to spread over in the other four major classes, namely, domestic, commercial, industrial and agricultural. The type of vocations spanned over a wide spectrum ranging from hawking to financing.

The degree of internal constraint on the immigrants is a second characteristic. For the Chinese immigrants as a whole in the Settlements, external constraints were manageable, but internally self-created constraints as a result of rigid group boundary were relatively imposing. The constraints created therefrom naturally reduced the immigrants' choice on the group basis.

## Source of Data

Information of trades and occupations of the Chinese in the Straits Settlements is available from both direct and indirect sources. The former includes mainly Census of Population reports, while the latter consists of inscriptional data, literature of occupational guilds, news reports in the Chinese newspapers, and documented observations made by contemporary local residents.

The first scientific census of population in the Straits Settlements was conducted in 1871; thence almost every decade. Unfortunately, occupational category for that inaugural issue was only classified according to three ethnic types, namely, Europeans, Eurasians and natives. The 1891 and 1901 censuses even removed the occupation entry, because the return of occupation was said to be of little value owing to "the constant changes of occupation that occur among the Native Population, especially among the Chinese." (RCSS, 1901: 6). The category on occupation resumed in 1911, but it was then classified according only to sex, and geographically it was confined to Penang, Malacca and Singapore.

The three censuses that contain some information about the Chinese and their occupations were that taken in 1881, 1921 and 1931. Remarks by the Superintendent of Census on the association between Chinese dialect groups and their occupations were available in the latter two reports.

Information on Chinese occupational guilds which is contained mainly in Wu Hua's (1975) *Handbook on Chinese Occupational Guilds*, is useful in delineating the broader categories of trade among the dialect groups.

Two Chinese newspapers, namely, *Lat Pao* (*Le Bao*) and *Thiam Nam Shian Pao* (*Tian Nan Xin Bao*), which were circulated in Singapore in the late 1890s, had customarily reported the occupational status of any people in the news.

Contemporary residents living in the old-time Settlements had also made remarks of the relationship between type of occupations and Chinese dialect groups.

Yet another important source for the topic can be found in inscriptional data. To construct the occupation-dialect group relationship from the epigraphic materials took a series of steps, beginning with a thorough scrutiny of the tens of thousands of inscribed names of donors that appeared in the temples, huiguan, burial grounds, etc., founded between 1700s and 1941.

In the second step, general names that are supposedly related to any trade/occupation with an unambiguous nature were processed<sup>2</sup>. These names which indicate a definite kind of trade or occupation include the following: dang (pawnbroking), lou (restaurant), tang (Chinese herbal medical store), yao (quarry/brickwork), guan/xuan (tea/coffee or beverage shop), juang (tailoring/clothing) banchang (sawmill) and chuan/zhou (shipping)<sup>3</sup>.

In processing occupational data, the dialect origins of the shops/shopowners was established, prior to assigning a particular occupation to a dialect group. This has been done elsewhere (Mak, 1988).

It must be noted that we excluded shopnames that are associated with any organizations that are considered to be of no dialect identity connotations, or of an integrative nature, for they do not fulfill our present purpose.

In the case of North America, information correlating occupation with dialect or subdialect group is scant and spotty. The 1880 Manuscript Census of America asked for the place of birth of the respondents and, if the information requested was filled in faithfully, should have been a valuable source. Unfortunately, either the respondents were uncooperative or the census takers were not inclined to ask detailed questions, many Chinese were listed as merely from "China", or at most "Kwangtung".

In San Francisco Chinatown, however, about half the Chinese asked by the census takers did give more specific information on their district of origin. This is the only large body of data examined for correlation between district of origin and occupation. Other than that there are only passages in documents as well as qualitative information which provide some indication of these relations. Very little data of the type discussed in the previous paragraph have been developed for other North America Chinese Communities. However, some impressionistic information is available from various sources such as accounts provided by inhabitants of the various subcommunities, or from studying of various donation lists published in newspapers, etc.

## Dialect Group and Occupation

Table 1, which is extracted from various sources, shows the relationship between dialect group and trade/occupation for 40 occupations and six dialect groups. The list of occupations is by no means exhaustive. It is unnecessary to be so, for as it is, it suffices to suggest the existence of a relationship between dialect group and occupation among the early Chinese immigrants in Singapore as one of the three Settlements.

As can be seen from Table 1, businesses related to commerce, international trading, finance and manufacturing were closely associated with the Hokkiens (mainly Southern Hokkiens), whereas more of the Hakkas and Cantonese were engaged in traditional occupations such as carpentry, smithings and herbal medicine.

More Hainanese were attracted to service-oriented occupation. A very distinct cluster of transportation-related occupations had been dominated by the Henghwa (Xinghua) and Hokchia (Fuqing) people. The Teochius were more inclined in primary production such as plantation, rearing poultry and fishing. While a number of dialect groups were engaged in work in and near the sea, such as Cantonese boat-builders, Hokchia seamen, Hokkien longshoremen and Teochiu fishermen, the Hakkas shunned it.

The Hakkas were also planters, except that they specialized more in cultivating cloves, nutmegs and later in rubber in confined areas such as Province of Welesley's Balik Pulau and Bukit Mertajam (Table 2). On the the other hand, a large number of Hainanese had also worked in rubber plantations in some rural areas in Malacca, Negeri Sembilan and Johore. Working in a rubber plantation was never a special occupational feature of any particular dialect group, except for its ecological significance indicating the residential settlement of the group.

What is more intriguing is that the Hainanese as domestic servants served mostly European households and establishments. The movement of the employers is therefore predictive of this kind of Hainanese occupations. Exodus of the Europeans and their families which would foretell the decline of the Hainanese' role in domestic services, took place only when Malaya and Singapore became independent. Since most European families were residing in the town areas instead of the then vastly uncultivated rural districts, most Hainanese were expectedly townfolks.

Where housekeeping embraces services/skills in hotel keeping, Western cuisines, and beverage preparation, therein lies the Hainanese' areas of occupational competence.

Remarks made by the Superintendent of Census that most prostitutes were of Cantonese origin, are in effect only a reconfirmation of an earlier report in the contemporary newspapers. It was reported that in Singapore's Kreta Ayer area alone, there were in the late 19th century already a few thousand prostitutes. Presumably they were Cantonese, because the residents there were predominantly Cantonese. This stereotyping was also echoed in the 1950s in Muar, Johore in a cross-dialect group reference (Li, 1970: 124, 217). The reference goes as follows: "The Teochius are reputed for their kuayteow, Hokkiens their mee; Hainanese for

**Table 1**  
**Observations on occupation-dialect group relationship,**  
**Singapore, 1848-1948.**

Trade/ Occupation	Dialect Group					
	Hok	Teo	Can	Hak	Hai	HHH
Banking	X					
Watermen	X					
Revenue farm peon/preparers of arrack & opium	X					
Pineapple/fruit planter	Z					
Import & export	X					
Sago manufacturer	X					
Boatmen/berge	X Z	X Z				
Porter/longshoreman/docker	XYZ					
Quarry	Z					
Fisherman	X	X Z				
Lime burner	X	X				
Sawmill	Z	Z				
Bricklayer & mason	X Z					
Brickmaker	Z		X			
Carpenter (home)	Z		XYZ			
Charcoal burner		X				
Poultry		Y				
Gambier & pepper planters		X	X			
Soy sauce manufacturer		Y			Z	Z
Stone cutter		X				
Dried foodstuff dealer		Y				
Clothings		Y				
Footwear		Z		Z		
Opera troupe			Y			
Cabinet & woodenbox makers			X	X		
Woodcutter & sawyer			X	X		
Pig-Slaughtere			Y			
Ship/boat-builder			X			
Machinist			Z			
Goldsmith			YZ	X		
Tailor & Shoemaker			X	X		
Domestic servant				X	Z	
Blacksmith				X Z		
Chinese dentist				X		
Leather goods				Z		
Baker				X	Z	
Pawnbroker				Y		
Chinese medicine				X		
Coffee shop operator					X Z	
Tyre trade						Z
Sailor/seaman						Z
Bicycle repair						Z

**Notes:**

Hok=Hokkien(Fujian) Teo=Teochiu(Zhaozhou) Can=Cantonese

HHH=Henghwa(Xinghua), Hockchia(Fuqing) &amp; Hokchiu(Fuzhou)

Hak=Hakka

X=Occupations rated by Braddell, 1855, Singapore.

Y=Occupations rated according to the formation of occupational guilds up to 1937 in Singapore. See Wu (1975).

Z=Occupations assigned according to a Ministry of Labour survey conducted in 1948, Singapore.

Sources: Mak (1981: 42, Table 4.3); Wu (1975); Ministry of Labour Survey (1948).



**Table 2**  
**Occupational patterns of the various dialect groups**  
**in British Malaya, 1921 and 1931.**

Dialect Group	Type of Occupation	Location	Extent of Involvement*
Hokkiens	Farmer/agriculturist Trader Shopkeeper	All All All	Extensive Predominant Predominant
Cantonese Hakka	Prostitute Planters of cloves, nutmegs, and rubber	All Balik Pulau & Bukit Mertajam	Predominant Most of them
Hainanese	Domestic Servants (European families) Shopkeeper Rubber-plantation workers	Towns  Towns Rural Malacca, N.Sembilan, & Johore	90% from this group Large number
Hokchius & Hokchias	Rickshaw pullers	Presumably town area	Most of them

\* Almost original comments.

their coffee, and the Cantonese for their 'pee'." Kuayteow is a special kind of rice noodle, and "pee" which is rhymed with mee, is a phonetic slang referring to the lady's private part.

The Hokchia and Hokchiu (Fuzhou) people were demographically insignificant minorities, whose main occupations in the early days had been in transport-related works such as pulling rick-shaws and tram/bus driving. Doubtlessly, they were urbanites.

In America, as mentioned previously, the 1880 Manuscript Census is the only source used which has quantitative data on occupations and districts of origin. The census takers counted 15, 940 people in San Francisco Chinatown, comprising 14, 179 working individuals with the rest being housewives, minors or reporting no occupation. Census takers obtained from some 44.6% of the respondents the huiguan to which they belonged — Ningyang, Hehe, Zhaoqing, Enkai, Gangzhou, Yanghe, Sanyi and Renhe, or the district in the Pearl River Delta area where they were born. These data can be categorized into one of the following major dialect and sub-dialect groups:

1. Sanyi (Nanhai, Panyu, Shunde), Guangzhou and a few from the adjacent districts of Hua Xian, Sanshui, Gaoyao, Gaoming, Qingyuan and Sihui. Hong Kong and Macao, which are similar to Guangzhou in that it has urbanized diverse populations, are also included in this group.
2. Siyi, (Xinhui, Xinning, Kaiping, Enping) and a few from the adjacent districts of Heshan, Yangjiang and Yangchun.

3. Xiangshan and a few from the adjacent districts of Dongguan, Zengcheng and Boluo.
4. Hakka speaking areas including Xin'an, Guishan, Chixi and Jiaqing Zhou.

The remainder either gave their place of origin as Guangdong or China. Less than one-quarter percent were from other Guangdong regions or other provinces.

People from the Sanyi and Siyi regions were the two largest groups which together comprised almost 90% of the working population which reported their districts of origin. Chinese from the Xiangshan and Hakka speaking regions made up the remaining 10%. Since apparently there is no indication that any of the regional groups had great differences in their degree of willingness to give information to the census takers, it can be assumed that the major groups were distributed in roughly the same proportions among the people reported as being from Guangdong or China, and that certain conclusions based on analysis of the reported data are applicable to the entire Chinatown working population.

It should be noted that these population percentages were different from the percentages as calculated from membership statistics for California Chinese reported by various huiguan around the same period. From the latter set of data the percentages calculate to 82.0, 7.9, 7.3 and 2.8 respectively for the Siyi, Xiangshan, Sanyi, and Hakka groups.

The striking difference was that the Sanyi community in the city was disproportionately large, as compared to the total Sanyi population in California. This may have been due to the fact that the greater economic power of the Sanyi merchants during this period enabled members of the group to live in San Francisco where life with Chinese amenities was much more available than in areas with fewer Chinese.

The statistics show that no one occupation was completely monopolized by a single regional groups. However, by comparing the workers of each major group in an occupational category as a percentage of the total workers in that occupational category to the workers of each major group as a percentage of the total working population, a pattern emerges showing that certain occupations do exhibit a greater concentration of a specific dialect group and a corresponding relative lower participation by other groups.

Table 3 shows the relative domination of the Sanyi and Siyi, the two largest groups, in selected occupational fields in San Francisco Chinatown as derived from the 1880 Manuscript Census. The tabulation shows that the Siyi group had a clear domination in the cigar making industry, laundries, the cooking professions and among unskilled labor. The statistics also show that the majority group in Siyi, that from Xinning (Taishan), predominated in these fields.

The Sanyi group show a concentration in occupations requiring higher degree of skills. They dominated the shoemaking and garment industries. In the latter category, they were especially numerous in the tailor industry with over 60% of the workers. The performing arts, the crafts and skilled occupations as well as in clerical work also show a strong Sanyi presence. Prostitutes also were overwhelmingly from the Sanyi region (which may also have been the case in British Malaya where prostitutes were reported as being predominantly Cantonese) probably because of the close proximity to Canton.

**Table 3**  
**Correlation of occupation with dialect group,**  
**San Francisco Chinatown, 1880**

Trade/Occupation	Siyi Group	Sanyi Group
Cigarmaking	A	
Garment Making		B
Shoemaking		A
Cooks	B	
Domestics, servants	B	
Laundrymen	A	
Unskilled labor, factory workers	B	
Butchers		A
Jewellers		A
Chairmakers		B
Other artisans, craftsmen, skilled labor		B
Fish dealers, hucksters		A
Fruit, vegetable dealers, hucksters	B	
Grocers, grocery workers		A
Clerical		B
Maritime workers		A
Prostitutes		A
Actors, musicians		B

A = Greater than 65 percent of workers in category.

B = Greater than 65 percent of workers in category.

Census data show that the number of Sanyi and Siyi merchants are to be roughly in proportion to their working populations without a clear advantage leaning toward either group. However, from other sources it is known that the Sanyi merchants had a dominating voice in the Chinese community.

Sanyi merchants, by virtue of the area's geographical proximity to Canton, had long been active in the commercial ports of Canton and Hong Kong. When Sanyi merchants established themselves in America, their regional and sometimes family ties to their compatriots in Canton and Hong Kong gave them a natural advantage which enabled them to gain a near monopoly of this lucrative entrepot trade. They imported and then distributed Chinese goods all over the Americas.

The Sanyi group also dominated the merchants' guild Chaoyi Gongsuo which protected the interests of the export-import trade (Ow, 1974:142-143; Liu, 1976: 213).

Neither the Xiangshan nor Hakka groups were numerous enough in the count to form a majority in any one economic endeavor. However, data from the Manuscript Census show that Xiangshan people comprised 20.4% and 70.0% respectively in the shirt and undergarment manufacturing industries, which

were over-represented judging by only 7.8% of the total working Chinese population were from Xiangshan.

Also, reflecting the fact that Xiangshan had been one of the first areas to be affected by the opening of China to the West, Xiangshan merchants and interpreters also comprised 19.4% and 35.9% of these occupations.

Hakkas were the smallest group considered in the tabulation but the data show a definite concentration in the barber profession of 29.0%, or almost ten times their 3.3% in the total working population.

The picture derived from the 1880 Census is representative of the situation in San Francisco just before Chinese exclusion. Corresponding statistical data for other areas in North America have not been developed and analyzed.

After the Exclusion Act was promulgated in 1882, the situation changed. Chinese were systematically excluded from many occupations, and their fields of choice grow ever narrower. Some industries such as cigarmaking and shoemaking declined and disappeared. Within the Chinese community the numerically superior Siyi group which had been growing in economic strength finally broke Sanyi monopoly with a decade long boycott against Sanyi businesses in the 1890s.

In the process, Siyi merchants organized their own trade guild, the Siyi Keshang Gongsuo. Hard times brought on by the boycott forced a number of Sanyi establishments to close, while others moved to less hostile locations such as Mexico, Cuba as well as Central and South America (Ow, 1974: 60; Liu, 1976: 231). San Francisco Chinatown demographics changed as the percentage of Sanyi people in San Francisco steadily decreased relative to the other groups.

**Table 4**  
**Correlation of certain occupations with regional groups in San Francisco during the 20th century before World War II**

Occupation	Region
Shirt and ladies garments factories owners	Longdu area, Zhongshan (formerly Xiangshan)
Fishmongers	Longdu area, Zhongshan
Butcher shops	Jiujiang area, Nanhai
Tailors	Xiqiao area, Nanhai
Silk dealers	Sishan area, Nanhai
Overall factories	Shunde
Street corner fruit and Candy vendors	Xie clan villagers, Kaiping
Hardware stores	Xie clan villagers, Kaiping
Laundries	Taishan
Larger restaurants	Yu and Li clan villagers, Taishan
Domestic cooks	Yu and Li Clan Villagers, Taishan

Source (Rose Hum Lee, 1960: 174-75; Thomas Chinn, 1969: 2-3)

There is little statistical data and few quantitative studies of dialect group occupation correlation for this period. Impressions from Chinatown residents which were more qualitative than quantitative indicated that the correlation of occupation categories went beyond dialect groups to specific areas of districts and specific clan villages. There were hints of this in the 1880 Manuscript Census, but it was not possible to draw any definitive conclusions from the recorded information.

Remarks given by the Superintendent responsible for both the 1921 and 1931 censuses, contained in Table 2, confirm the information given in Table 1, except that the former's coverage extended from Singapore to the Malay Peninsula. From the decade between 1921 and 1931, while the Hokkiens were still portrayed as extensively engaged in farming, trading and common shopkeeping, occupational activities of other dialect groups given in the two censuses were supplementary to that in Table 1.

### Dialect Group, Occupation and Location

What has thus been revealed is that an occupational pattern was formed along the lines of dialect origin, with realignment according to locational distribution. In the case of early British Malaya, relationship between occupational groups and their dialect origins is further specified in the following locations: Malacca, Penang, Singapore, Matang, Taiping, Teluk Anson and Ipoh.

It has been demonstrated in Table 3, above, that the businesses that had shown some trace of dominance were sawmill (by the Cantonese in Taiping), bookshop (by the Hakkas in Penang) and shipping (by the Hokkiens in Singapore). While information on Cantonese/sawmill and Hakkas/bookshop is fresh, that on Hokkien/shipping is merely a reconfirmation of data contained in Table 1. The Hokkiens had all along been extensively engaged in import and export business in Singapore which was an important port in the region during the 19th century. It is therefore of no surprise to find that they were also in the shipping venture.

As indicated in Table 5, certain dialect groups had practiced a particular kind of trade and in (or not in) a particular location. Below we shall go through some of those occupations. The occupations to be referred to are, except for one perhaps, mostly traditional which include pawnbroking, restaurant, Chinese medicine, shipping, bookstore, quarry-brick-making, tea/coffee shop, tailoring and sawmill.

*Pawnbroking:* The pawnbrokers during the period 1795 to 1910 included Hakkas, Hokkiens, Cantonese and the category of either Cantonese or Hakkas, at different locations. The case of the Hokkiens being involved in pawnbroking is temporarily constructed, pending specific data for validation. According to our inscriptional data, the two temples which received the donations from these five pawnbroking shops were in fact integrative in nature (Chen and Franke, 1982: 335-54), and the dialect origins of the donors are assigned instead on the basis of demographic dominance. During the period (1837-1910) in question, the census population of the Hokkiens and Straits-born Chinese in Malacca were over 50% from 1881 to 1911 (Mak, 1985: 71).

**Table 5**  
**Occupational patterns of Chinese dialect groups in the**  
**British Straits Settlements/Malaya, 1795-1931.**

Type of Trade	Dialect Groups	Locational Frequency						Total	Period
		M	P	S	MT	Ip	Ta		
Pawnbroking	Hakka	4		5				9	1810-1869
	Hokkien	5						5	1837-1910
	Cantonese			7				7	1890-1901
	Can/Hak		5	12				17	1795-1865
Restaurant	Hokkien	6						6	1795
	Cantonese		22	199	27			248	1880-1904
	Can/Hak		12	2				14	1795-1898
	Teochiu		1					1	1795
Herbal Medical Store	Hakka	6	3	6				15	1870
	Hokkien	22	11	16	16		2	59	1795-1931
	Cantonese		15	117	10			142	1880-1909
	Can/Hak		40	26				66	1795-1898
Tea/Coffee shop	Hainanese	2	1	6				9	1880-1920
	Cantonese			1				1	1890
	Can/Hak			1				1	1854
Tailoring/ clothings	Hainanese		3					3	1870
	Can/Hak		22					22	1865
Brickwork	Hainanese		33					33	1870
	Hokkien					1		1	1898
Shipping	Cantonese			7				7	1880
	Hokkien			68				68	1850
Bookstore	Hakka		1					1	1921
Sawmill	Cantonese				1			1	1909

Notes: M=Malacca P=Penang S=Singapore  
 MT=Matang/ Taiping Ip=Ipoh Ta=Teluk Anson  
 Can/Hak=Cantonese and/or Hakka

Source: Derived from inscriptional data (Chen and Tan, 1972; Franke and Chen, 1982).

The inscriptional data also established the occupation-dialect group affinity for the Hakkas. The Hakkas who operated a few pawnshops in Malacca were then only the second largest minority group there, with a share of about 12% of the Chinese population (Mak, 1985: 71). The effects of demographic dominance thus did not seem to have permeated in all lines of professions, particularly lower income occupations.

*Restaurant:* The locational effect is again felt in the case of restaurant business. While there were only six Hokkien-operated restaurants (i.e., operators of restaurants who had donated to Hokkien voluntary associations) in Malacca during 1795, a total of 263 Cantonese and/or Hakka restaurant proprietors had their business in Singapore rather than Malacca. Judging by the overwhelmingly large number of restaurants owned by the Cantonese, it is almost certain that the Cantonese had a better edge in the business than did other dialect groups.

*Herbal Medical Store:* The Hainanese had only a few Chinese drug stores in Malacca, as well as in the other two settlements. The Hokkiens were comparatively keener than the Hainanese in the trade which was extended beyond the three Straits Settlements to Matang/Taiping and Teluk Anson. The Cantonese in Malacca during 1880-1909 did not seem to be interested in Chinese medicine business, but their counterpart in Singapore had opened the largest number (117) of such stores there.

On the other hand, the Hakkas in Malacca appeared to be less interested in the trade, judging by the fewer confirmed cases present in Table 3. Their association with the trade would be enhanced, if many of the cases included in the category "Cantonese and/or Hakkas" were truly Hakkas.

*Tea / Coffee Shops:* The Hainanese have been stereotyped into associating with coffee shop business. The Hainanese in Penang in the 1870s initiated their contribution to such a stereotype, but not so in other locations. It is noted that in the inscriptional data, the Hainanese had operated restaurants, which in some cases, could have functioned as coffee shops. Their extensive involvement in domestic services in the early days had perhaps kept them fully occupied. The high proportion of the European residents in both Singapore and Malacca could have prevented them from entering the coffee shop business in the two locations around 1870.

*Tailoring / Clothing:* The Hainanese were more active in clothing in the 1870s in Penang. The Cantonese and/or Hakkas were also involved in the same type of business during almost the same period of time. No shops from these three dialect groups appeared in the Singapore and Malacca inscriptions.

*Brickmaking:* The Cantonese and Hakkas were found to be engaging in brickmaking in Singapore in 1855 (Table 1). Twenty five years later in 1880, the Cantonese were still in the trade (Table 3). They had seven brick quarries in Singapore. The Hokkiens in Singapore, on the other hand, showed no interest in the business at all. But their counterpart in Ipoh had set up one brick quarry there around 1898.

Correlating different dialect and subdialect groups with occupational categories for other North American cities has not attracted much interest of research as that for the early Malaya. Some general observations on the affinal

relationship among the Chinese subdialect groups or even territorial clans can be made, however. The findings would be of great value even as a supplement to the Chinese immigrant society in early Malaya, where social alignment was of several levels from the highest provincial level to the lowest mono-surname village level. While realignment of groups within a particular dialect group was not uncommon in early Malaya (Mak, 1988), unfortunately, relevant data on occupational affinity at the subdialect level have not been available.

Clan and regional feelings within a particular dialect group were major factors in governing social and economic relationships among North American Chinese during the nineteenth century. Workers were usually recruited among fellow kinsmen, fellow Villagers, and people from the same residential area in China. The huiguan sometimes actively encouraged this practice by insisting that labor contractors belonging to the organization recruit workers belonging to the same huiguan (Ow, 1974: 143). The penalty for violators was expulsion from the organization, which was clearly recorded in the Sam Yup Association's minutes of 29th day, 11th moon (month), 11th year of the Guangxu reign era.

Work gangs would comprise mostly fellow villagers and clansmen. For example, a list of workers at Rock Springs working for railroad at the time of the 1885 massacre, shows that the largest group of workers belonged to the Liao (Leo) clan (House of Representatives Report No. 2044), while numerous members from the Liu (Lou, Low) clan were recruited to work at Calvin Sampson's shoe factory in North Adams, Massachusetts in 1870 (1870 manuscript Census).

When an historical accident occurred resulting in the Chinese from a particular area (in a district) or clan village in China settling down successfully in a particular North American town or locality, ties of all level would spark off a linked or chain migration of people from the same area in China to the locale to seek aid and support from their compatriots. Eventually this would lead to a concentration of Chinese from the same clan village or the same area in that locality. Assisting each other to find work, these Chinese would also tend to congregate in the same occupations.

This segregation of the Chinese population by people originating from specific districts or clan villages, was, and to some extent still is, the situation in many Chinese communities. Larger communities such as San Francisco and New York have a number of such concentrations, but small communities will usually have people from only one clan village or one area dominating. Table 6 below shows some examples of clan villagers and area groups connected with Chinese communities other than the large San Francisco, New York City, Los Angeles and Vancouver communities.

As mentioned earlier, the external constraints set by main-stream society's discrimination against Chinese; left only a few options open to the Chinese. Their occupations in most localities except in cities with a large Chinese population, were limited to predictable occupations such as in laundries, restaurants, grocery stores and being domestics. Thus there was little opportunity in smaller Chinese communities for the Chinese to diversify their occupations. In such communities, the numerical dominances of a group in a locality will usually merely ensure their playing a prominent role in the prevalent occupation of the Chinese in the locale.



**Table 6**  
**Concentrations of Chinese from specific areas in**  
**districts and specific clan villages in different localities**

Localities in China	Localities in America
Cai clan villages, Taishan	Rio Vista in Sacramento River delta (late 19th, early 20th century)
Chen clan villages, Taishan	Seattle
Deng clan villages, Kaiping	Phoenix
Huang clan, Ganbian, Taishan	Riverside (late 19th, first half 20th century)
Jin Clan villages, Taishan	Tucson
Kuang clan villages, Taishan	Sacramento
Li clan villages, Taishan	Baltimore, Washington D. C.
Li clan villages, Heshan	Winnepeg
Ma clan villages, Taishan	Edmonton, Nanaimo, B. C.
Mei clan villages, Taishan	Chicago
Situ clan villages, Kaiping	Oxnard
Tan clan villages, Kaiping	Moutreal, Halifax
Wu clan villages, Taishan	San Antonio
Yu clan villages, Taishan	Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh
Zhou clan village, Kaiping	Delta region, Mississippi, Quesnellemouth, B. C.
Haiyan area, Taishan	Portland, Oregon
Hua Xian	Central Valley, California
Huangliangdu, Zhongshan	San Francisco Peninsula
Longdu, Zhongshan	San Francisco Armona, Suisun
Sidadu, Zhongshan	Locke, California
Panyu	Hanford

For example, many Chinese ran grocery stores in Arizona and in the Mississippi Delta region. In Phoenix, Arizona Deng (Ong) clan villagers from Kaiping ran most Chinese grocery stores, but in the delta region of Arkansas and Mississippi, many were from Zhou (Jue, Chow) clan villages in Kaiping. In a few areas local conditions enabled some groups to predominate in occupational categories other than the stereotypical one mentioned above. Some examples are listed in Table 7.

These same processes which resulted in people from the same area in China tending to enter the same economic fields in North America are still operative after World War II<sup>4</sup>. In the California's Central Valley, south of Stockton, Many Hua Xian people left truck gardening and established a network of grocery stores and supermarkets in smaller cities and towns. In New York City, immigrants from the Fuzhou area opened numerous Chinese restaurants outside Chinatown.

**Table 7**  
**Correlation of people from districts/areas and clan villages**  
**with occupational categories**

Location in America	Location in China	Occupation Category
Suisun	Langdu, Zhongshan	Farming
San Francisco Peninsula	Huangliangdu, Zhongshan	Flower nurseries
Rio Vista, Calif.	Cai clan villages, Taishan	Potato farming
Sacramento River Delta	Sidadu, Zhongshan	Pear orchards
Vancouver, B. C.	Suburbs Longdu, Zhongshan	Truck gardening
British Columbia	Longdu, Zhongshan	Shingles factory workers
Central Valley, Calif	Pingshan and Luochang, Hua Xian	Truck gardening

## Discussion

Findings presented above have firmly established the relationship between Chinese dialect/locality groups and their occupations. They also strongly suggest that the concept of occupational affinity be redefined to include the element of location. Earlier observations on the affinity between dialect groups and occupations are void of this element. That is, occupational affinity has been inappropriately taken as a generalized concept which applies to any occupation being practiced by a particular dialect group anywhere.

Apart from the territorial element, the concept of occupational affinity in question should not be construed to mean a "one dialect group, one occupation" relationship. Surely, it is nonsensical to conceive a dialect group as being affiliated with a particular trade, when a few other dialect groups were also carrying out the same trade. A criterion that may be derived from the data is the maximum number of groups that were involved in the same trade. It is recommended that an occupation-dialect group relationship exist, if not more than two dialect groups were practicing the same trade in the same locations. In the event that a trade was essential, such as drugs and groceries, the number of dialect groups involved in it is less significant than a predominant position favorable to a particular dialect group.

Certain aspects of previous work exposure, or of group trait might be explanatory of occupational continuity. For example, the Hakkas, because of their previous experience back home, preferred to cultivate and to farm on the

hilly slopes in the Qing Taiwan. This is said to be a group trait more than their being a loser in the fierce competition for arable land among the early immigrants (Shih, 1985). For certain occupational activities that were not traceable to prior exposure back home, the thesis of "historical accident" (RFMS, 1947) seems to be more promising.

The same thesis is also applicable to the contract laborers. Whatever specific jobs they might have been promised before sailing overseas, their occupational fate was entirely in the hands of the recruiters, and later the employers. Any laborer could end up anywhere in the British Malaya and in any type of cultivative work.

While the historical accident thesis could explain well the formation of the occupational patterns among the first Chinese immigrants, other explanations are required to account for the persistence of the patterns. Four factors may be identified for the persistence of the occupational patterns thus far presented, namely, the social desirability/undesirability of the occupation, capital commitment, mode of social organization for the trade group, and the acquired reputation of the trade group.

The presence of any of these factors alone is deemed sufficient to discourage and keep away other dialect groups from intruding into the business line. This does not, however, happen at the individual level, for the occupational structure was segmented into blocks of dialect groups. This is primarily an internally constrained model. The Cantonese, or perhaps more specifically the Sanyi women's being stigmatized for involving in prostitution exemplifies the concept of social undesirability. The incumbents would not have to do much to keep out members of other dialect groups.

Capital intensive business by itself can be very exclusive. The richer Chinese were the Hokkiens, especially those of Zhang-Quan-Yongchun origins, who had already resided in Malacca for a few generations before the advent of the British. While previously living near the ports prompted these Southern Hokkien's involvement in the finance, import/export, and shipping businesses, sound financial backing enabled them to monopolize the trade. The much poorer Cantonese, Hakkas, Hokchiu, Henghwa and Hokchia people (Mak, 1983; 1987) were no competitors at all.

Financially disadvantaged dialect groups also could have their ways to make some businesses exclusive to themselves. They could organize themselves into controlling the supply and flow of materials and information required for the trade. One form of this sharing-blocking system is to form occupational guilds. Such controls are a vital economic function of the guilds, aside from other socioeconomic aspects. The Hokchia and Henghwa people's exclusive involvement in bicycle, tire and rickshaw businesses in the early Straits Settlements falls into the social organization category. The Teochiu's monopoly of poultry and charcoal burning businesses is just another example. In the United States, the flower growers in the San Francisco Peninsula formed chrysanthemum and aster growers associations in which the membership were from nursery owners from Huangliangdu.

Lastly, the association of a trade with a dialect group can be externally

constructed through the clients' impression. Once a trade reputation has been established for a dialect group, other dialect groups would find it difficult to set their feet in. The Cantonese cuisine illustrates well this point.

When a kind of trade requires artistic skills and fine workmanship, the apprenticeship system would be crucial to explain why a certain standard can be maintained. Obviously, an apprenticeship system works better if both the trainer and trainee can understand each other socially. That places a premium on dialect origin.

Dialect is not just a communicative speech; it implies also a whole world of subcultural traits. Apprenticeship spells fusion. The graduated trainees would eventually set up their shops and maintain the link with the former mentors. They were thus linked not only by trade, but also by origin of dialect. This was how an occupation-dialect group relationship could develop in crafts and traditional trades.

The Hakka people's blacksmithing and goldsmithing, and the Hainanese' coffee and tailoring require such live-in training to pass on the skills. Work skills of this kind may or may not be a continuity of what they had previously learned back home before emigration. Their taking up of the first trade in either the Straits Settlements or North America, was after all an historical accident, although the perpetuation of it was not.

## Conclusion

The occupational structures of the early Chinese immigrants in both North America and British Malaya have largely substantiated the constructed models on the impact of group heterogeneity and job market on the affinity between dialect group and occupation. The findings allow us to conclude that a simpler occupational pattern is likely to be associated with an immigrant group that is internally freed from constraint but externally under close surveillance by the host country. On the other hand, a more complex occupational structure is likely to emerge out of an internally heterogeneous group that receives less constraint from the external legal-economic environment.

We have shown how the occupation-dialect group affinity was formed and perpetuated through the use of subcommunal resources. But the data also suggest capitalization on class resources by certain dialect groups in the early Malaya.

In his analysis of successful entrepreneurs of ethnic minorities in America, Light (1984) has formulated a theory based on differential access to class and ethnic resources. The more successful entrepreneurs are likely to be those who have access to both types of resources. In the British Malaya, the Southern Hokkiens, especially those from the Zhang-Quan-Yongchun prefectures, were those who had access to both class and subcommunal resources.

Data in the Table 1, 2, and 5 above indicate that the Southern Hokkiens were more enterprising in their lines of trade. Many of them were in specialized trades

and professions, as compared to other dialect groups' traditional vocation.

All sources of evidence underline the fact that dialect group identity serves as a very vital access to ethnic/subcommunal resources, and these resources had been broadly and fully utilized among the early Chinese subcommunal immigrants. From getting a job to burial, each dialect group provided adequate assistance to its own members. Basically, this subcommunal or ethnic resources of entrepreneurship, as Light (1984: 210) puts it, depend upon pre-modern values and solidarity. The operation of the locality/dialect group network which is indicative of the subcommunal aspect of the resources, aptly describes the formation process of the occupation-dialect group affinity. What then differentiated the type of occupations/trades between dialect groups was differential access to class resources.

The history of pioneer immigrants explains partly the class background of the Southern Hokkiens. They had migrated to Malacca as early as the 1690s, and they had been in the ruling hierarchy as long as the Kapitan system lasted (Wong, 1964). They were well connected with the Hokkien elites in Penang and especially those in Singapore (Mak 1983; 1985:160-179; 1987; 1990).

The class resources of the Southern Hokkiens were formed and pulled together through a very effective social linkage, i.e., in-group marriage. Example of this group's marriage between influential families are numerous. Certainly there was formed a class consciousness among the Southern Hokkiens.

Besides the subcommunally almost homogeneous Malacca Chinese kapitancy which spells a unique way of life, the very rigid system boundaries maintained by the Zhang-Quan-Yongchun Hokkiens is a sign of class consciousness through a mediate structuration process.

In North America, there was only one dominating dialect group. But nonetheless, differentiation based on locality and clan village groups was also evident. The limited data available on North America appears to agree with the discussion in the preceding paragraphs. For example, the Sanyi group with their natural dialect and regional links to Canton merchants (and perhaps even some links to the *hong* merchants) had a commercial advantage which the merchants were quick to seize by monopolizing the lucrative import-export trade.

The group's proximity to an urban area with highly developed arts and crafts also gave its members an advantage in establishing themselves in the more desirable skilled occupations in America. Immigrants from the more remote areas with less access to such connection and resources, however, had to start further down in the economic scale and were usually relegated to the unskilled and menial occupations.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Dialect group is primarily a social group which draws its cohesiveness from the similarity in dialect origin. Its economic stress was relatively mild, in contrast to the concept of *bang* which is a social, economic and political (power) group nested in a power structure such as the Chinese Chamber of Commerce. See

Cheng (1985:23-30).

- <sup>2</sup> A data base computer package known as dBase was used to accomplish this processing task.
- <sup>3</sup> Other titles referring to hao, zan, dian (roughly small trading firms, godowns, or provision/grocery shops) are excluded, because of ambiguous dominance of the trade relative to dialect groups. Such ambiguity would arise from the simple fact that small trading and/or selling of groceries were economic activities that were too common as well as essential to be monopolized by any single dialect group.
- Another noteworthy point to make is the interpretation of the term "lou". It means not only restaurant, but also brothel. We assume that donations from brothels would not, on grounds of social morality, be acceptable by temples and kindred associations, and thus "lou" is not referred to as brothels.
- <sup>4</sup> During the 1870s, the Taiwanese began to operate motels and hotels in southern California, while in the 1880s Chaozhou (Teochiu) immigrants from Southeast Asia have opened many supermarkets in the San Francisco Bay Area handling American, Chinese and Southeast Asian food products.

## REFERENCES

- Barth, Gunther  
1964 *Bitter Strength*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Braddell, T.  
1855 "Notes on the Chinese in the Straits", *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia* 9, 2: 109-124.
- Chan, N.C.  
1946 *Handbook of Chinese in America*. New York: The People's Foreign Relations Association of China.
- Chan, Sucheng  
1986 *The Bitter-Sweet Soil*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Chen C.H. and Y. S. Tan  
1971 *Xin-jia-po huo-wen bei-min ji-lu* (A collection of Singapore Chinese Inscriptions). Hongkong: Chinese University of Hongkong Press.
- Cheng, Lim-Keak  
1985 *Social Change and the Chinese in Singapore*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Chen, Wen-Hsien  
1940 *Chinese Under Both Exclusion and Immigration Laws*. Chicago: University of Chicago *Ph.D. thesis*.
- Cheng, L. and E. Bonacich, eds.  
1984 *Labor Immigration Under Capitalism: Asian Workers in the United States before World War II*. Berkeley/L.A: University of California Press.

- Crissman, L.W.  
 1967 "The segmentary structure of urban overseas Chinese communities." *Man* 2, 2: 185-204.
- Duncan, O.D. and L.F. Schnore  
 1959 "Cultural, behavioral and ecological perspective in the study of social organization." *American Journal of Sociology*, 64:132-146.
- Franke, W. and T.F. Chen  
 1982 *Chinese Epigraphic Materials in Malaysia*, 3 vols.  
 1987 Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.
- Freedman, M.  
 1967 "Immigrants and Association: Chinese in 19th-century Singapore." In L.A. Fallers, ed., *Immigrants and Associations*. Hague: Mouton Press.
- Gibson, Rev. O.  
 1877 *The Chinese in America*. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.
- House of Representatives  
 1886 *Providing Indemnity to Certain Chinese Subjects*. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents.
- Lai, David Chuenyan  
 1988 *Chinatowns: Towns within Cities in Canada*. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia Press.
- Lee, Rose Hum.  
 1960 *The Chinese in the United States of America*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Li, Yih-Yuan  
 1970 *Yige yizhi de shizhen* (An Immigrant Town). Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica.
- Light, Ivan  
 1984 "Immigrant and ethnic enterprise in North America", *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 7, 2:195-216.
- Liu, Pei Chi  
 1976 *Meiguo Huaqiao shi* (A History of the Chinese in the United States of America). Taipei: Overseas Chinese Affairs Commission of the Legislative Yuan.
- Lyman, Stanford M.  
 1969 "Social Demography of the Chinese and Japanese in the United States of America," *Social History, A Canadian Review* 3:51-81.
- Mak, Lau-Fong  
 1981 *The Sociology of Secret Societies*. Singapore/London: Oxford University Press.  
 1983 "Subcommunal participation and leadership cohesiveness of the Chinese in 19th-century Singapore," *Modern Asian Studies* 17, 3:465-88.  
 1985 *Fang-yen-quan ren-tong* (Dialect Group Identity). Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica.

- 1987 "Chinese subcommunal elites in 19th-century Penang." *Tonan Ajia Kenkyu* 25, 2:254-264.
- 1988 "Chinese locality and dialect groups in the 19th-century Straits Settlements," *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica*, 63:87-108.
- 1990 "Chinese immigrants: differentiation and integration," *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica*, 69:27-44.
- Ministry of Labour  
1984 *Labour Survey of 1948*. Singapore: Ministry of Labour.
- Ow, Yuk  
1974 *1850 zhi 1974 nian lu-mei sanyi zong-huiguan jian shi* (A History of the Sam Yup Benevolent Association in the United States, 1850-1974). San Francisco: Sam Yup Benevolent Association.
- Reports on the Census of Population in the Straits Settlements (RCSS), 1871, 1881, 1891, 1901, 1911.
- Reports on the Federated Malay States (RFMS), 1947.
- Reports on the Census of British Malaya, 1921, 1931.
- Siah, U-Chin  
1848 "The Chinese in Singapore," *Journal of the Indian Archipelago* 2:283-9.
- Shih, Tien-Fu  
1987 *Qingdai zai dai hanren de zhuzhi fenbu he yuanxiang shenhua fangshi* (The Han People in the Qing Taiwan: Their Ecological Distribution and Life Style Back Home). Taipei: National Normal University, *Department of Geography Research Monograph No. 15*.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Manuscript Census*, 1870, 1880.
- Vaughan J.  
1854 "Notice on the Chinese of Penang," *Journal of the Indian Archipelago* 8, 1:1-27.
- Wrickberg, Edgar, ed.  
1982 *From China to Canada: A History of the Chinese Communities in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd.
- Wong, C.S.  
1964 *A Gallery of Kapitan's*. Singapore: Dewan Bahasa.
- Wu Hua (Ngow Wah).  
1977 *Xinjiapo huazhu huiguan zhi* (Handbook of the Chinese Associations). Vol. 3. Singapore: Southseas Society.
- Yen, Ching Hwang.  
1985 *Coolies and Mandarins*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.  
1986 *A Social History of the Chinese in Singapore and Malaya, 1800-1911*. Singapore/London: Oxford University Press.