



Title

A Primer on Asian Americans and Asian American Studies for Public Administration

Author(s)

Lee, C. Aujean
Forney, Aarika

Citation for Final Version

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Public Integrity on July 6, 2022 available at:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/10999922.2022.2089475>.

Link for This Version

<https://shareok.org/handle/11244/337065>

Repository Statement

This version of the publication has been made available via the University of Oklahoma's SHAREOK institutional repository, administered by the University of Oklahoma Libraries.

Feedback Form

The University of Oklahoma Libraries invites you to [share with us](#) how finding an open access version of this article benefited you. All responses will be treated anonymously, unless you choose to disclose your name or other personally identifiable information, and responses may be used for promotional purposes.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Public Integrity* on July 6, 2022 available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/10999922.2022.2089475>.

A Primer on Asian Americans and Asian American Studies for Public Administration

C. Aujean Lee,* Assistant Professor, Regional and City Planning, Regional and City Planning,
University of Oklahoma

Aarika Forney, PhD Student, Political Science, University of Oklahoma

*corresponding author

830 Van Vleet Oval, 257 Gould Hall, Norman, OK 73019

aujean@ou.edu, ORCID: 0000-0002-7592-9522

Disclosure statement: No potential competing interest was reported by the authors.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Scott Robinson for reviewing an earlier draft of the paper.

A Primer on Asian Americans and Asian American Studies for Public Administration

Abstract

This article serves as an introduction for public administration and public institutions about Asian Americans. The experiences of Asian Americans and the field of Asian American Studies can inform a more nuanced understanding of how racial categories are constructed and community-led efforts that lead to institutional change. Asian Americans offer important insights for public administration, including how to contend with intra- and intergroup differences, how racialization upholds white supremacy, and how to document community-based histories of activism and engagement with public institutions. We end with recommendations to rethink diversity and racial climate in the field. Through a more in-depth understanding of racial categories, public institutions can improve resource distribution and decision-making.

Keywords: Asian Americans, racialization, social equity, representative bureaucracy, pedagogy

Introduction

As the United States becomes increasingly diverse, public administration (PA) must increase institutional capacity to serve diverse populations. While there are PA studies on diversity and social equity, the field has undertheorized race. For example, Sabharwal et al. (2018) found that most PA literature on diversity began in the 1990s; only 22% of these studies empirically examined issues of diversity beyond mere description. Guy (2010) noted how PA journals have increasingly published on gender and diversity overall, but lag on race/ethnicity. Additionally, though white racial identities are the most represented in PA, they are the least studied (Heckler, 2017).

This scarcity of attention on race has consequences, in which PA includes discourse about inclusion, but excludes in practice (Guy, 2010, p. 175). By avoiding direct references to race, PA and public institutions perpetuate racial disparities and strengthens white supremacy¹ (Gooden, 2014; Heckler, 2017). For example, Foldy and Buckley (2014) found that employees in social work organizations that avoid discussions on race impose more microaggressions on colleagues than their counterparts in race-conscious organizations.

White supremacy is a system of institutions, laws, policies, and practices that upholds benefits that whites receive while oppressing other racialized groups (Heckler, 2017). For example, Heckler (2017) uses the G. I. Bill of Rights and Fair Housing Act rules in 2008 to identify gaps between desired equity in “color-blind” policies and resulting racial disparities. As whites obtain benefits in society, white supremacy is embedded into public institutions because these institutions reflect racialized systems that benefit whites (Macalpine & Marsh, 2005). White supremacy in turn spreads to the wider society through these public institutions.

¹ We do not capitalize white to align with Crenshaw (1991) because whites do not constitute a cultural group.

Asian and Asian American scholars have shaped PA with research on diversity and public management (Sabharwal, 2014), public service motivation (Pandey et al., 2008), and nonprofits (Guo & Acar, 2005; Guo & Saxton, 2014). Others have published studies on gender (Bae et al., 2017; DeHart-Davis et al., 2006; Sabharwal, 2013) and PA in Asian countries (Cheung, 2013; Ko, 2013; Quah, 1999; Song, 2018; Zouridis & Thaens, 2003). Yet, increasing the representation of Asian and Asian American scholars must be in tandem with research that centers Asian American experiences.

Research on Asian Americans in the United States exists predominantly outside of major PA journals, despite their long history in the country that includes subjugation to exclusionary policies and creating sociopolitical change. In a search of five PA journal digital databases in March 2022, 5 articles in *Public Administration Review* focused on Asian Americans as the primary group of analysis or theoretical discussion while *Public Integrity*, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, and *The American Review of Public Administration* had 1 article each; *Public Administration Quarterly* had 0 articles (Appendix 1). The journals included articles that mention Asian Americans in one paragraph or less and/or only include them as a control variable.

This contribution serves as an introduction to Asian American experiences and Asian American Studies, which offer insights for PA. First, they instruct about how to work with intra- and intergroup differences because Asian Americans encompass more than 40 ethnic groups who arrive from or have origins in East Asia, Southeast Asian, or South Asia. These communities have varying geopolitical contexts, immigration or citizenship statuses, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Second, PA is limited in its understanding of the origin and evolution of socially constructed racial categories (Gooden & Portillo, 2011). An improved understanding is

foundational to then inform how public institutions distribute resources, make decisions, and develop policies to address racial disparities (Alexander & Stivers, 2010; Heckler, 2017; House-Niamke & Eckerd, 2020). Using Asian Americans as an example, we demonstrate how Asian Americans have been racialized to uphold white supremacy through “yellow peril,” “the model minority myth,” and the “perpetual foreigner.” Third, PA can learn how to document activism that leads to social equity in the country (Gooden & Portillo, 2011) by drawing from more than 50 years of Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies, which are fields of study that document communities’ history of advocating for social equity and inclusive policies.

We end with recommendations for PA around numeric representation, legacies of exclusion, and racial climate (Hurtado et al., 1999). With a deeper understanding of racial categories such as Asian Americans, PA can better inform diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) frameworks that shape higher education and public institutions.

Literature on Race and Asian Americans in Public Administration Scholarship

PA has emerging scholarship on race/ethnicity and impacts of institutional racism, but lacks nuance in understanding race/ethnicity (Alexander & Stivers, 2010; House-Niamke & Eckerd, 2020; Witt, 2011) with little to no focus on Asian Americans (Broadnax et al., 2018). Heckler (2017) details how public institutions avoid explicit discussions of race, which maintains white supremacy and racism. Systematic reviews of PA and political science journals identified articles that mention race, but with a narrow focus on affirmative action hiring (Alexander, 1997; Sabharwal et al., 2018; Witt, 2011).

PA has incorporated Critical Race Theory (CRT), a legal framework that asserts that legal, political, and economic systems are fundamentally racist, as race is institutionalized through laws and policies (Crenshaw, 1996; Delgado & Stefancic, 1993, 2017; Riccucci, 2021).

Riccucci (2021) argues that CRT can help PA identify structural racism in public institutions in part because it explicitly seeks to address racial inequities. CRT is a burgeoning area in PA to understand policy impacts on inequities, and overt exclusion in policies, particularly in the educational system (Gillborn, 2005; Orelus, 2020). While a key theory, it is beyond the scope of our argument here because CRT focuses on how racism is institutionalized with less emphasis on decision-making around resource distribution.

The dearth of literature centering Asian Americans is noteworthy because of their growth in population and in the electorate (Kambhampaty, 2020), employment in the public sector, and exclusion in the political process (Kuo et al., 2017). Asian Americans are the fastest growing racial group--between 2000 and 2019, the number of Asian Americans increased by 81%, and are projected to comprise more than 35 million by 2060 (Budiman & Ruiz, 2021a). In 2019, non-whites and Asians comprised about 41% and 7% of the federal workforce, respectively (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2021). Yet, Asian Americans have historically low political participation in part because they used to reside in noncompetitive jurisdictions; however, Asian Americans' voting surged in 2020, and they comprised decisive votes in swing states (Dugyala & Jin, 2021). Moreover, Asian Americans experience voter suppression (Hajnal et al., 2017; Wong & Fink, 2012/2013); barriers with voting by mail (Kambhampaty, 2020); disparate enforcement of Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act and language inaccessibility (Wong & Fink, 2012/2013); and discrimination at polls (Yee, 2020).

By understanding diverse constituents such as Asian Americans, public institutions can become responsive to constituents' needs. The following describes social equity as a key component in PA, using representative bureaucracy to illustrate how social equity contributes to understanding race/ethnicity and Asian Americans. Then, we summarize how Asian Americans

and Asian American Studies inform the field. We end with recommendations for PA to strengthen DEI frameworks.

Social Equity in Public Administration

PA scholars have called for social equity to be a core value that informs the management and distribution of public services since the 1968 Minnowbrook Conference (Blessett et al., 2019; Gooden & Portillo, 2011; Guy & McCandless, 2012). Frederickson (1990, 2015) was one of the first to refer to social equity as a key pillar of PA, and believed it is critical given that policies benefit privileged groups rather than the citizenry overall. As Gooden (2014) further argued, public institutions should be motivated to address social and racial equity given their drive to provide quality services and fair practices.

Social equity frameworks investigate the ongoing impacts of race and racism in public institutions (Stivers, 2007) because racial categories continue to matter—they inform social practices, institutions, and communities (Omi & Winant, 2014). Social equity scholars have examined lasting racial disparities in the management and distribution of services, in policy formation and outcomes, and in representation of and ethics of public employees (Guy & McCandless, 2012). Furthermore, social equity frameworks have found disenfranchisement, such as with Black and Latinx disparities during COVID-19 (Medina & Azevedo, 2021; Wright & Merritt, 2020). Others have examined inequitable outcomes such as harmful environmental impacts on Indigenous and other racial groups (Liang, 2017; Liang et al., 2020; Zimmerman, 1993). Related studies further highlight differential quality of services, such as disparate academic advancement and teacher perceptions of student capabilities (Grissom et al., 2015).

Representative Bureaucracy

One strategy to address social equity is through representative bureaucracy, which asserts that groups have a right to participate in their public institutions and that increased representation can lead to more legitimacy, trust, accountability, and/or improved policy outcomes for diverse populations (Ding et al., 2021; Riccucci & Van Ryzin, 2017). Representative bureaucracy literature seeks to understand the circumstances in which representation matters in public agencies because bureaucrats have authority to form and implement policy. Bureaucrats who reflect the demographics of the served population may better align with the public interests across levels of government (Selden, 1997). In a meta-analysis of representative bureaucracy studies, Ding et al. (2021) found that organizations that reflect their community's demographics have improved performance and productivity.

This representation can be passive--in which the demographics of public sector employees match the population--or active--to which bureaucrats use their identity to advocate for, produce policies for, and/or use discretion to benefit groups with shared identities (Mosher, 1968; Selden, 1997). Passive representation not only benefits racial/ethnic groups by employing them (Riccucci & Van Ryzin, 2017), but can also lead to improved internal organizational practices (Choi & Rainey, 2010) and active representation (Lim, 2006; Meier & Nicholson-Crotty, 2006; Wilkins & Keiser, 2006). Passive representation becomes symbolic when it improves the public's perception of the institutions' legitimacy (Headley et al., 2021). Simultaneously, Headley et al. (2021) argue that passive or symbolic representation is particularly insufficient in policy areas with past injustices.

Increased non-white racial representation is associated with benefits for these populations in education and law enforcement (Bishu & Kennedy, 2020). For example, Black and Latinx teachers who share an identity with students contribute to improved student outcomes (Meier,

1993; Meier & Stewart, 1992; Morton, 2015), including lower rates of disciplinary measures (Meier & Stewart, 1992). (See Grissom et al.'s [2015] summary of representative bureaucracy and educational outcomes). Literature on policing found that a higher proportion of ethnic minorities was significantly associated with a decrease in racial profiling (Hong, 2017), and Blacks are more likely to perceive police actions as legitimate in cases where police departments employ more Blacks (Theobald & Haider-Markel, 2009).

However, representative bureaucracy literature lacks substantive scholarship on Asian Americans. Selden (1997) was one of the first to test passive representative bureaucracy across all major racial groups, including Asian Americans; this study on Farmers Home Administration loans found that districts with more Asian American employees awarded a larger percentage of resources to Asian Americans, a finding which applied to other racial groups in the study. Kim (1993) examined integration of Asian American and other groups in the federal government and found that Asian Americans were represented overall in these jobs but were also underrepresented in senior executive service positions (see also Kim [2004] and Riccucci & Saidel [1997]). Kim and Lewis (2018) further described the model minority myth and how it conceals the diversity and discrimination that Asian Americans experience. Yet, more studies are required to understand the generalizability of representative bureaucracy to Asian Americans.

As Asian Americans remain understudied in the field, they have become hypervisible during the COVID-19 pandemic. The Trump Administration used “Chinese Virus” and “Kung Fu Flu” as media outlets covered violent assaults against Asian Americans that resulted after the first identified COVID-19 case in January 2020. Between March 2020 and July 2021, more than 9,000 reports of anti-Asian incidents were collected, and 32% of incidents occurred on public streets and 30% in businesses (Yellow Horse et al., 2021). Asian Americans continue to

experience public safety and civil rights violations while public institutions issue little response. While they require public institutional support, Asian Americans and their experiences also can help inform the field on how to work with diverse groups, how racial categories are constructed and uphold white supremacy, and how to understand community-led institutional change.

What Public Administration Can Learn from Asian Americans

1. Origins of racial categories and working with diverse groups

PA can improve how to work with diverse groups by first acknowledging that racial categories are not monolithic and can lump distinct ethnic groups.² Panethnic and racial categories are a function of external and internal forces that reinforce group boundaries and power, but are also frequently challenged or altered (Espiritu, 1992; Okamoto, 2014). Accordingly, “Asian American” is a racial category that is political, asserting a community-defined identity and building solidarity among Asian ethnic groups with a shared history of oppression (Espiritu, 1992). Emma Gee and Yuji Ichioka coined the non-hyphenated term “Asian American” in the late 1960s to counter “yellow” and “Oriental,” which exoticized and marginalized Asian Americans (Okamoto, 2014). Given that the category, “Asian American,” is derived from community-based activism, this term is meant to be inclusive and encompasses those who are native-born and are immigrants.

Simultaneously, public agencies designated racial groups as an administrative category to distribute funding (Espiritu, 1992). As Okamoto (2014) describes, Blacks, Latinx, and Asians do not arrive in the United States as formed racial groups—rather, “state policies and political institutions provided new incentives and motivations for each group” (p. 10). Consequently, Asian American ethnic groups began working together to apply for public funds and to increase

² We use Espiritu’s (1992) definition of ethnicity, which refers to shared national origin, language, or cultural identity. See also Omi and Winant (2014) for how ethnicity differs from race.

their numbers who were being counted in the American political structure (Espiritu, 1992). In other words, because public agencies treat Asian Americans as a homogenous category, pan-Asian American-serving organizations formed as a “tactical reaction to American political policies and rules of access” (Espiritu, 1992, p. 83). Though formed through activism, “Asian American” is a category that has accordingly been used to ascertain needs and develop policies.

While “Asian American” represents solidarity, it also includes significant diversity. More than 23 million people identified as Asian Americans in 2019, and the Census collects data for 19 Asian groups: Bangladeshi, Bhutanese, Burmese, Cambodian, Pilipino, Hmong, Indian, Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Malaysian, Nepalese, Okinawan, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, Taiwanese, Thai, and Vietnamese. These categories are not comprehensive nor do not reflect complex migration histories that shape the diaspora and differences by generation or immigrant status. For example, some Chinese immigrants arrived as refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia, and other countries. More than half (57%) of Asians is foreign-born, and about 14% are estimated to be undocumented in 2017 (Budiman & Ruiz, 2021b). Asian Americans include tribes and Indigenous groups within Asian countries such as Cham, Karen, Masyarakat Adat, and other groups (Cham, 2012; Errico, 2017; Gilhooly & Lee, 2016).

Geopolitical events and policies have shaped Asian American socioeconomic diversity, who comprise the lowest and highest socioeconomic strata. We provide a summary below to illustrate this point (see Lee (2015) for more Asian American history). From the 1800s, they were legally excluded from immigrating, becoming citizens, or owning property (Lee, 2015). The first federal laws to exclude based on race and gender targeted Chinese Immigrants, or the 1875 Page Act and 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act. These laws were blueprints for restrictive quotas on other Asian countries, such as the 1921 Immigration Act and 1924 National Origins

Act. Early Pilipinos were not subject to these restrictive immigration laws because the Philippines was a U.S. colony from 1898 to 1946, but still faced discrimination and anti-miscegenation laws.

The 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act ended national quotas and prioritized family reunification, which increased Asian immigrants. The Immigration Act of 1990 further encouraged employers to hire high-skilled workers from Asia, the majority of whom arrive from India and China (Ruiz, 2017). In conjunction, U.S. militarism impacted Koreans arriving as military brides after the Korean War and refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, Myanmar, and other Southeast Asian countries after the Vietnam War (Lee, 2015).

There is immense socioeconomic diversity within this racial category, and aggregated statistics obscure significant disparities. More than half of Asian Americans overall had at least a bachelor's degree in 2019; however, only 18% of Laotian Americans had at least a bachelor's degree (Budiman & Ruiz, 2021b). The median annual income for Asian Americans was \$85,000. Yet, income inequality is rising the fastest among Asian Americans, with their median household income ranging between \$44,000 and \$119,000, depending on the ethnic group (Budiman & Ruiz, 2021b). Asian Americans overall are less likely to live in poverty (10%); however, one in four Mongolian Americans are living in poverty.

Consequently, public institutions cannot solely rely on racial categories to understand group needs because these categories lead to homogenization and misrepresentation. The proliferation of Asian American-serving nonprofits illustrate this point. While pan-Asian American nonprofits advocate for Asian Americans for political purposes, ethnic-specific nonprofits remain separate and focus on culturally- and linguistically-relevant services. Though Latinx outnumber Asian Americans, there are proportionally more Asian American nonprofits

than Latinx nonprofits in part because Latinx predominantly speak Spanish or Portuguese while Asian Americans have a greater diversity of languages (Hung, 2007). Public administrators should use racial categories as an initial step to identify common experiences as well as the distinctions that define ethnic groups' needs within this category.

2. Origins of racial categories that uphold white supremacy

The way that Asian Americans are racially defined has changed throughout time; yet, each iteration upholds white supremacy and systemic racism. Meanings connected to racial categories—or *racialization*—impacts public resource allocation along a hierarchy, with whites at the top (Omi & Winant, 2014). Race and racialization remain important concepts for PA because the meanings and assumptions ascribed to these racial categories affect how resources are distributed and impact group outcomes. Omi and Winant (2014) further argue these categories are shaped by socio-historical forces as groups simultaneously reproduce, redefine, or resist their racialization (see also Bonilla-Silva, 2017; Feagin, 2013).

Racializations maintain white supremacy unless they actively challenge the latter. Asian American racializations provide illustrative examples. In the late 19th century, workers were recruited from China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and India for farming, mining, and building railroads (Chan, 1989; Cheng & Bonacich, 1984; Lee, 2009). These laborers were instrumental to U.S. infrastructure; yet, they were racialized as the “yellow peril,” which signified Asians as an economic, political, and public health threat to Western civilization and positioned whites as superior to Asians (Kawai, 2005; see Mudambi (2019) for how the “yellow peril” extends to South Asians).

Asian Americans are also racialized as a “model minority,” which posits that they are successful, assimilated, educated, and apolitical (Wu, 2013). The model minority myth is

damaging for several reasons. First, it hides Asian Americans' socioeconomic diversity.

Accordingly, Asian Americans have demanded data disaggregation to capture their needs more accurately (Poon et al., 2017). Second, it reinforces negative stereotypes about Black, Latinx, and Indigenous groups and blames them for racial disparities. Accordingly, Asian Americans are positioned as a racial wedge against other communities of color rather than recognizing continued systemic racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2017; Kim, 1999; Omi & Winant, 2014). For example, the model minority myth to attack the Civil Rights Movement and contemporary affirmative action debates (Espiritu, 1992; Poon et al., 2016).

The yellow peril and model minority myth maintain Asian Americans as the “perpetual foreigner,” who are viewed as unassimilable, outsiders, and culturally inferior to whites—regardless of nativity status. The “perpetual foreigner” has been used to justify domestic and foreign policies and surveillance during World War II, the Cold War, and ongoing neocolonialism (Kim, 1999; Maira & Shihade, 2006).

Asian American racializations of “yellow peril” and “perpetual foreigner” reemerged during the COVID-19 pandemic with inaccurate concerns that Chinatowns and Chinese immigrants were the epicenter of disease (Craddock, 1995; Shah, 2001). Some perpetrators attacked Asians who was presumed to eat exotic animal meats, while Asian businesses were vandalized (Anti-Defamation League [ADL], 2020; Yellow Horse et al., 2021). Asian American racialization presumes them to be a monolithic group and has led to threats affecting other ethnic groups. Of reported incidents, 44% of victims were Chinese, 17% Korean, 9% Pilipino or Japanese, 8% Vietnamese, and 6% Taiwanese (Yellow Horse et al., 2021). Furthermore, these hate crimes connect to those committed against Sikhs, Arabs, Muslims, and other South Asians, which spiked after 9/11 and continue due to Islamophobia (Considine, 2017; Kaur, 2020). These

racializations of Asian Americans underscore that Asian American belonging is precarious. To combat these impacts of systemic racism, PA can amplify Asian American-led activism that impacts institutional change.

3. Documenting community-led activism and contributions

PA benefits from more research and understanding of social change (Gooden & Portillo, 2011). Asian American Studies is a field of study that emerged with other Ethnic Studies Departments: Asian American Studies, Black/African American Studies, Chicana/o/x/Latinx Studies, and Indigenous/Native/American Indian Studies. Asian American Studies documents, recovers, and analyzes the history and lived experiences of Asian Americans. It was founded with the philosophy of “serve the people” where education addresses community needs and promotes self-determination (Ishizuka, 2016; Maeda, 2012; Umemoto, 1989). The field emerged from activism in the late 1960s and early 1970s around issues of racism, imperialism, and U.S. militarism that contributed to the political instability in Asia (Fujino, 2008; Maeda, 2012; Umemoto, 1989). Ethnic Studies programs subsequently hired faculty from these communities, who have been foundational to higher education institutional changes.³

Asian American Studies centers community-based knowledge and curricula that challenges Eurocentric learning. First, Asian American Studies provides evidence of their activism for policy and institutional change. Early Asian immigrants were key in labor strikes that have led to employment policy changes, including the 1867 Chinese American railroad strike and 1903 Japanese American plantation strike in Hawai‘i (Lee, 2015). Pilipino activists Larry Itliong and Philip Vera Cruz worked alongside Cesar Chavez and Dolores Huerta for

³ Asian American Studies diverges from Area Studies (e.g., South Asian Studies, Southeast Asian Studies, Japanese Studies, that are linked to colonialism and national security (Ahluwalia, 2007). Asian American Studies also recognizes the diversity in the field and the need to elevate subgroup experiences in this monolithic category, such as Pilipino, South Asian, and Southeast Asian Americans (Nadal, 2018-2019).

farmworkers' rights (Scharlin & Villanueva, 1992). Asian Americans challenged exclusionary laws through courts, including *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* in 1898 (to solidify birthright citizenship) and *Korematsu v. United States* in 1944 (to challenge Japanese American incarceration during World War II) (Lee, 2015).

Second, Asian American Studies documents Asian Americans organizing against exclusionary institutions and racist policies. Examples include fighting against failures in the criminal justice system with Chul Soo Lee (Furutani, 2013) or Vincent Chin (Kurashige, 2002; Ngai, 2002), addressing racial profiling and hate crimes (Kurien, 2003), combating employment discrimination (Robinson, 2016) or advocating for environmental justice (Leong et al., 2007; Lichtveld & Dao, 2012; Tai, 1999). Third, Asian American students established nonprofits (Louie & Omatsu, 2001) that provide social services and advocate for residents (Hung, 2007; Lee et al., 2017; Li, 2011; Liu et al., 2008). Studies have further examined Asian American nonprofit leadership and financial and administrative burdens (Chin, 2018; Lee, 2020). These examples illustrate how communities of color push for inclusive policies. By incorporating Asian American Studies and Ethnic Studies, PA can elevate movements that contribute to dismantling systemic racism and exclusive policies.

Recommendations

We offer recommendations for the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA) programs on how to address DEI and climate issues using Hurtado et al.'s (1999) aspects of climate: numeric representation, the historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion, behavioral dimensions, and psychological climate. We include short- and long-term recommendations to support faculty of color and to advance DEI in the field (Table 1).

Table 1. Recommendations to improve racial climate and DEI issues in PA

ASPECT OF RACIAL CLIMATE	SHORT-TERM	LONG-TERM
Numeric Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve data collection with detailed racial/ethnic group information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire above proportional representation
Legacies of Exclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement anti-racist pedagogies by drawing on Ethnic Studies and Gender/Queer Studies • Continue to create special issues, panels, and other forums that center non-white groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build dual degree programs, cross-list courses with Ethnic Studies and Gender/Queer Studies programs • Hire faculty with expertise in community-based pedagogy

1. *Rethinking representation*

Academic departments typically focus on numbers that meet proportional representation as benchmarks of measuring diversity (Hurtado et al., 1999). For instance, programs seek to match their student population with the region’s population composition. Currently, white students and faculty remain overrepresented in PA programs. In a study of 30 U.S. NASPAA programs, Ledezma (2019) found that white students comprised more than a third of students. A fifth of students were non-resident, 12% Latinx, 16% Black, and 16% Asian. Faculty remained predominantly white men and were slower to diversify--72% of faculty were white, 9% Black, 8% Asian, 5% Latinx, and 64% were men (Ledezma, 2019). A short-term recommendation to understand numeric representation would be to collect detailed racial/ethnic group data. For example, “Asian” aggregates significant diversity while “non-resident” does not include racial/ethnic group data.

However, meeting proportional benchmarks is insufficient to address white supremacy in the long-term without systemic changes in policy. The educational pipeline “leaks” in which underrepresented students and females decrease in progressive levels of education and employment as the proportion of white men increases (Bishu, 2022; see also Thomson Jr. et al. [2021] for disparities in income and promotion among scientists). PA should strive for an

overrepresentation of non-white groups beyond proportional quotas. Given that higher education is a policy arena with racial injustices, passive representation alone is not enough to overcome legacies of exclusion (Headley et al., 2021; Hurtado et al., 1999).

2. *Address legacies of exclusion*

- A. In the short-term, PA should draw from Ethnic Studies to create inclusive curricula that focuses on communities of color and anti-racist pedagogies (Bonnett, 2000).
- B. Create more special issues, panels, and forums that focus on Asian Americans and U.S. communities of color to move Ethnic Studies towards the center of PA.
- C. In the long-term, NASPAA programs should build joint degree programs and/or cross-list courses with Ethnic Studies and Gender/Queer Studies, which focus on social justice-based pedagogy. In a review of NASPAA MPA programs in the U.S., only 4 were identified with joint degrees with Ethnic Studies or Gender Studies as of December 2021⁴:
 - Arizona State University: American Indian Studies
 - University of Connecticut: Latino and Latin American Studies
 - Indiana University, Bloomington: African American and African Diaspora Studies
 - University of Texas at Austin: Women's and Gender Studies
- D. Programs should hire diverse faculty beyond representational benchmarks with expertise in community-based curriculum. This sensitivity is necessary given pitfalls of community engagement that can reproduce exclusionary processes (Boxelaar et al., 2006) and because fewer than half of faculty at 144 surveyed NASPAA schools incorporate service-learning (Neely et al., 2018). Community-engaged learning must include reciprocal

⁴ A few MPA programs had joint degrees with East Asian Studies or Latin American Studies, which are not included because they are Areas Studies and not Ethnic Studies.

partnerships with stakeholders and neighborhoods of color (Brudney & Russell, 2016).

These recommendations will push PA to be more proactive in addressing its own legacies of systemic racism and begin steps towards long-term institutional changes. Changes in PA higher education will subsequently improve how public institutions make decisions and distribute resources for diversifying populations.

Appendix 1. Substantive Articles in Leading PA Journals on Asian Americans

Journal	Article
Public Integrity	Miller-Stevens, K., & Taylor, J. A. (2020). Philanthropic Collaboration: A Conceptual Framework for Giving Circles. <i>Public Integrity</i> , 22(6), 575-589.
Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory	Brunjes, B. M., & Kellough, J. E. (2018). Representative bureaucracy and government contracting: A further examination of evidence from federal agencies. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> , 28(4), 519-534.
Public Administration Review	Haque, M. S. (2002). Government responses to terrorism: Critical views of their impacts on people and public administration. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 62, 170-180.
	Hill, L. B. (2002). The ombudsman revisited: Thirty years of Hawaiian experience. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 62(1), 24-41.
	Lewis, G. B., & Kim, P. S. (1997). Asian Americans in the federal service: Education, occupational choice, and perceptions of discrimination: A reply. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 57(3), 267-269.
	Menfield, C. E., Shin, G., & Strother, L. (2019). Do white law enforcement officers target minority suspects?. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 79(1), 56-68.
	Tremblay-Boire, J., & Prakash, A. (2019). Biased altruism: Islamophobia and donor support for global humanitarian organizations. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , 79(1), 113-124.
The American Review of Public Administration	Selden, S. C. (1997). Representative bureaucracy: Examining the linkage between passive and active representation in the farmers home administration. <i>The American Review of Public Administration</i> , 27(1), 22-42.

Note: Compiled by authors through a search of journal databases in Spring 2022. The list does not include papers from the Public Integrity special issue on Asian Americans. Substantive = including Asian Americans as a primary group of analysis or theoretical discussion. Excluded articles include those that mentioned Asian Americans in one paragraph or less and/or merely used them as a control variable.

References

- Ahluwalia, P. (2007). Afterlives of post-colonialism: Reflections on theory post-9/11. *Postcolonial Studies*, 10(3), 257-270.
- Alexander, J. (1997). Avoiding the issue: Racism and administrative responsibility in public administration. *American Review of Public Administration*, 27(4), 343-361.
- Alexander, J., & Stivers, C. (2010). An ethic of race for public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 32(4), 578-597.
- Anti-Defamation League. (2020). "Reports of Anti-Asian assaults, harassment and hate crimes rise as Coronavirus spreads." <https://www.adl.org/blog/reports-of-anti-asian-assaults-harassment-and-hate-crimes-rise-as-coronavirus-spreads>.
- Bae, K. B., Sabharwal, M., Smith, A. E., & Berman, E. (2017). Does demographic dissimilarity matter for perceived inclusion? Evidence from public sector employees. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 37(1), 4-22.
- Bishu, S. G., & Kennedy, A. R. (2020). Trends and gaps: A meta-review of representative bureaucracy. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 40(4), 559-588.
- Blessett, B., Dodge, J., Edmond, B., Goerdel, H. T., Gooden, S. T., Headley, A. M., Riccucci, N. M., & Williams, B. N. (2019). Social equity in public administration: A call to action. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 2(4), 283-299.
- Bonnett, A. (2000). *Anti-Racism*. London: Routledge.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2017). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States (5th edition)*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

- Boxelaar, L., Paine, M., & Beiling, R. (2006). Community engagement and public administration: Of silos, overlays and technologies of government. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 65(1), 113-126.
- Broadnax, W., Kim, P. S., & Lewis, G. B. (2018). Asian Americans in the public service. In *Diversity and Affirmative Action in Public Service* (pp. 179-192). Routledge.
- Brudney, J. L., & Russell, A. R. (2016). Hours aren't enough: New methodologies for the valuation of community-engaged learning. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 26(3), 277-293.
- Budiman, A., & Ruiz, N. G. (2021a). "Asian Americans are the fastest-growing racial or ethnic group in the U.S." Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/04/09/asian-americans-are-the-fastest-growing-racial-or-ethnic-group-in-the-u-s/>.
- . (2021b). "Key facts about Asian origin groups in the U.S." Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/04/29/key-facts-about-asian-origin-groups-in-the-u-s/>.
- Cham, A. (2012). *Negotiating (In)Visibility in the Cham American diaspora* [Master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles]. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7p87z4wh>.
- Chan, S. (1989). *This bittersweet soil: The Chinese in California agriculture, 1860-1910*. University of California Press.
- Bishu, S. G. (2022). Women's representation in public sector organizations: Persistent challenges and potential for change. In P. M. Shields & N. M. Elias (Eds.), *Handbook on gender and public administration* (pp. 182-194). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Cheng, L., & Bonacich, E. (Eds.). (1984). *Labor immigration under capitalism: Asian workers in the United States before World War II*. University of California Press.
- Cheung, A. B. (2013). Can there be an Asian model of public administration? *Public Administration and Development*, 33(4), 249-261.
- Chin, J. J. (2018). Service-providing nonprofits working in coalition to advocate for policy change. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(1), 27-48.
- Choi, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2010). Managing diversity in U.S. federal agencies: Effects of diversity and diversity management on employee perceptions of organizational performance. *Public Administration Review*, 70(1), 109-121.
- Considine, C. (2017). The racialization of Islam in the United States: Islamophobia, hate crimes, and “flying while Brown.” *Religions*, 8(9), 165-184.
- Craddock, S. (1995). Sewers and scapegoats: spatial metaphors of smallpox in nineteenth century San Francisco. *Social Science & Medicine*, 41(7), 957-968.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.
- . (1996). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New Press.
- DeHart-Davis, L., Marlowe, J. & Pandey, S. K. (2006). Gender dimensions of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review*, 66(6), 873-887.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (1993). Critical race theory: An annotated bibliography. *Virginia Law Review*, 79(2), 461-516.
- . (2017). *Critical race theory*. New York University Press.

- Ding, F., Lu, J., & Riccucci, N. M. (2021). How bureaucratic representation affects public organizational performance: A meta-analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 81(6), 1003-1018.
- Dugyala, R., & Jin, B. (2021, October 3). "Trauma and Trump make Asian American voters a more cohesive bloc, new poll reveals." Politico.
<https://www.politico.com/interactives/2021/asian-american-community-voting-trends-polling/>.
- Errico, S. (2017). *The rights of indigenous peoples in Asia*. Geneva, Switzerland: Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch, International Labour Office. Retrieved from https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---gender/documents/publication/wcms_545487.pdf.
- Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian American panethnicity: Bridging institutions and identities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Feagin, J. R. (2013). *The White racial frame: Centuries of racial framing and counter-framing*. Routledge Press.
- Foldy, E. G., & Buckley, T. R. (2014). *The color bind: Talking (and not talking) about race at work*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Press.
- Frederickson, H. G. (1990). Public administration and social equity. *Public Administration Review*, 50(2), 228-37.
- . (2015). *Social equity and public administration: Origins, developments, and applications*. Routledge Press.
- Fujino, D. C. (2008). Who studies the Asian American Movement? A historiographical analysis. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 11(2), 127-169.

- Furutani, W. (2013). We freed Chol Soo Lee, now what? *Amerasia Journal*, 39(3), 45-49.
- Gilhooly, D., & Lee, E. (2016). The Karen resettlement story: A participatory action research project on refugee educational experiences in the United States. *Action Research*, 15(2), 132-160.
- Gillborn, D. (2005). Education policy as an act of white supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(4), 485-505.
- Gooden, S. T. (2014). *Race and social equity: A nervous area of government*. Routledge Press.
- Gooden, S., & Portillo, S. (2011). Advancing social equity in the Minnowbrook tradition. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(suppl 1), i61-i76.
- Grissom, J. A., Kern, E. C., & Rodriguez, L. A. (2015). The “representative bureaucracy” in education: Educator workforce diversity, policy outputs, and outcomes for disadvantaged students. *Educational Researcher*, 44(3), 185-192.
- Guo, C., & Acar, M. (2005). Understanding collaboration among nonprofit organizations: combining resource dependency, institutional, and network perspectives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34(3), 340–361.
- Guo, C., & Saxton, G. D. (2014). Tweeting social change: How social media are changing nonprofit advocacy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(1), 57–79.
- Guy, M. E. (2010). When diversity makes a difference. *Public Integrity*, 12(2), 173-183.
- Guy, M. E., & McCandless, S. A. (2012). Social equity: Its legacy, its promise. *Public Administration Review*, 72(s1), S5-S13.
- Hajnal, Z., Lajevardi, N., & Nielsen, L. (2017). Voter identification laws and the suppression of minority votes. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(2), 363-379.

- Headley, A. M., Wright, J. E., & Meier, K. J. (2021). Bureaucracy, democracy, and race: The limits of symbolic representation. *Public Administration Review*, 81(6), 1033-1043.
- Heckler, N. (2017). Publicly desired color-blindness: Whiteness as a realized public value. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 39(3), 175-192.
- Hong, S. (2017). Black in blue: Racial profiling and representative bureaucracy in policing revisited. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 27(4), 547-561.
- House-Niamke, S., & Eckerd, A. (2020). Institutional injustice: How public administration has fostered and can ameliorate racial disparities. *Administration & Society*, 53(2), 305-324.
- Hung, C.-K. R. (2007). Immigrant nonprofit organizations in U.S. metropolitan areas. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(4), 707-729.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. ASHE ERIC Higher Education Report, 26(8). George Washington University.
- Ishizuka, K. L. (2016). *Serve the people: Making Asian America in the long sixties*. Brooklyn: Verso.
- Kambhampaty, A. P. (2020, October 20). "Asian Americans are the fastest-growing racial group in the electorate—but many face additional obstacles to voting by mail." *Time*. <https://time.com/5901094/asian-americans-vote-by-mail/>.
- Kaur, H. (2020). Making citizenship, becoming citizens: How Sikh Punjabis shaped the exclusionary politics of belonging. *Amerasia Journal*, 46(1), 107-122.
- Kawai, Y. (2005). Stereotyping Asian Americans: The dialectic of the model minority and the yellow peril. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 16(2), 109-130.

- Kim, C. J. (1999). The racial triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics & Society*, 27(1), 105-138.
- Kim, C.-K. (2004). Asian American employment in the federal civil service. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 28(3/4), 430-459.
- Kim, P. S. (1993). Racial integration in the American federal government: With special reference to Asian-Americans. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 13(1), 52-66.
- Kim, P. S., & Lewis, G. B. (2018). Asian Americans in the public service: Success, diversity, and discrimination. In *Diversity and Affirmative Action in Public Service* (pp. 179-192). Routledge.
- Ko, K. (2013). Knowledge accumulation in Asian public administration research: a critical review. *Public Administration and Development*, 33(4), 320-324.
- Kuo, A., Malhotra, N., & Mo, C. H. (2017). Social exclusion and political identity: The case of Asian American partisanship. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(1), 17-32.
- Kurashige, S. (2002). Detroit and the legacy of Vincent Chin. *Amerasia Journal*, 28(3), 51-55.
- Kurian, P. A. (2003). To be or not to be South Asian: Contemporary Indian American politics. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 6(3), 261-288.
- Ledezma, G. (2019). *NASPAA 2018-2019 Self-Study Diversity Insights*. NASPAA.
<https://www.naspaa.org/sites/default/files/docs/2021-04/DiversityInsightsReport2018-19.pdf>.
- Lee, C. A. (2020). Evolving activism in an anti-immigrant administration: Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander nonprofit experiences after the 2016 election. *Amerasia Journal*, 46(3), 346-362.

- Lee, C. A., Wong, K., & Pfeiffer, D. (2017). On the frontlines of immigrant homeownership: Asian American nonprofits during the Great Recession. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 46(6), 1209-1230.
- Lee, E. (2009). Asian American Studies in the Midwest: New questions, approaches, and communities. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 12(3), 247-273.
- . (2015). *The making of Asian America: A history*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Leong, K. J., Airriess, C. A., Li, W., Chen, A. C.-C., & Keith, V. M. (2007). Resilient history and the rebuilding of a community: The Vietnamese American community in New Orleans East. *The Journal of American History*, 94(3), 770-779.
- Li, B. (2011). We are already back: The post-Katrina struggle for survival and community control in New Orleans East's Vietnamese community of Versailles. *Asian American Law Journal*, 18(1), 25-55.
- Liang, J. (2017). Latinos and environmental justice: Examining the link between degenerative policy, political representation, and environmental policy implementation. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(1), 60-89.
- Liang, J., Park, S., & Zhao, T. (2020). Representative bureaucracy, distributional equity, and environmental justice. *Public Administration Review*, 80(3), 402-414.
- Lichtveld, M., & Dao, V. T. (2012). The Versailles social movement and implications for Asian American environmental health in post-Katrina New Orleans. In Yoo G., Le MN., Oda A. (eds.) *Handbook of Asian American Health* (pp. 411-419). Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2227-3_30
- Lim, H.-H. (2006). Representative bureaucracy: Rethinking substantive effects and active representation. *Public Administration Review*, 66(2), 193-204.

- Liu, M., Geron, K., & Lai, T. A. M. (2008). *The snake dance of Asian American activism: Community, vision, and power*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Louie, S., & Omatsu, G. K. (Eds). (2001). *Asian Americans: The movement and the moment*. Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center Press.
- Maeda, D. J. (2012). *Rethinking the Asian American movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Maira, S., & Shihade, M. (2006). Meeting Asian/Arab American Studies: Thinking race, empire, and Zionism in the US. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 9(2), 117-140.
- Macalpine, M., & Marsh, S. (2005). "On being white: There's nothing I can say": Exploring whiteness and power in organizations. *Management Learning*, 36(4), 429–450.
doi:10.1177/1350507605058138.
- Medina, P. S., & Azevedo, L. (2021). Latinx COVID-19 outcomes: Expanding the role of representative bureaucracy. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2021.1910411>
- Meier, K. J. (1993). Latinos and representative bureaucracy testing the Thompson and Henderson hypotheses. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3(4), 393-414.
- Meier, K. J., & Nicholson-Crotty, J. (2006). Gender, representative bureaucracy, and law enforcement: The case of sexual assault. *Public Administration Review*, 66(6), 850-860.
- Meier, K. J., & Stewart Jr, J. (1992). The impact of representative bureaucracies: Educational systems and public policies. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 22(3), 157-171.

- Morton, T. S. (2015). Improving educational outcomes for Latinos: A study of the interactive policy effects of representative bureaucracy and personnel stability. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 14*(4), 301-319.
- Mosher, F. C. (1968). *Democracy and the public service*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mudambi, A. (2019). South Asian American discourses: Engaging the yellow peril-model minority dialectic. *Howard Journal of Communication, 30*(3), 284-298.
- Nadal, K. L. (2018-2019). The Brown Asian American Movement: Advocating for South Asian, Southeast Asian, and Filipino American communities. *Asian American Policy Review, 29*. <https://aapr.hkspublications.org/2020/02/02/the-brown-asian-american-movement-advocating-for-south-asian-southeast-asian-and-filipino-american-communities/>.
- Neely, S. R., Cogburn, J. D., & Phelps, Hillen, J. (2018). Measuring the practice of engagement in public administration. *Teaching Public Administration, 36*(3), 276-300.
- Ngai, M. M. (2002). The legacy of Vincent Chin: A twentieth anniversary commemoration. *Amerasia Journal, 28*(3), 1-6.
- Okamoto, D. G. (2014). *Redefining race: Asian American panethnicity and shifting ethnic boundaries*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Orelus, P. W. (2020). The cost of being professors and administrators of color in predominantly white institutions: Unpacking microaggression, isolation, exclusion, and unfairness through a critical race lens. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education, 14*(2), 117-132.

- Pandey, S. K., Wright, B. E., & Moynihan, D. P. (2008). Public service motivation and interpersonal citizenship behavior in public organizations: Testing a preliminary model. *International Public Management Journal*, 11(1), 89-108.
- Poon, O. A., Dizon, J. P. M., & Squire, D. (2017). Count me In!: Ethnic data disaggregation advocacy, racial mattering, and lessons for racial justice coalitions. *Journal Committed to Social Change on Race and Ethnicity*, 3(1), 92-124.
- Poon, O., Squire, D., Kodama, C., Byrd, A., Chan, J., Manzano, L., Furr, S., & Bishundat, D. (2016). A critical review of the model minority myth in selected literature on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(2), 469-502.
- Quah, J. S. (1999). Corruption in Asian countries: Can it be minimized? *Public Administration Review*, 59(6), 483-494.
- Riccucci, N. M. (2021). Applying Critical Race Theory to public administration scholarship. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 4(4), 324-338.
- Riccucci, N. M., & Saidel, J. R. (1997). The representativeness of state-level bureaucratic leaders: A missing piece of the representative bureaucracy puzzle. *Public Administration Review*, 57(5), 423-430.
- Riccucci, N. M., & Van Ryzin, G. G. V. (2017). Representative bureaucracy: A lever to enhance social equity, coproduction, and democracy. *Public Administration Review*, 77(1), 21-30.
- Robinson, R. S. (2016). Hijab in the American workplace: Visibility and discrimination. *Culture and Religion*, 17(3), 332-351.

Ruiz, N. G. (2017). "Key facts about the U.S. H-1B visa program." Pew Research Center.

<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/04/27/key-facts-about-the-u-s-h-1b-visa-program/>.

Sabharwal, M. (2013). From glass ceiling to glass cliff: Women in senior executive service.

Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 25(2), 399–426.

—. (2014). Is diversity management sufficient? Organizational inclusion to further performance.

Public Personnel Management, 43(2), 197–217.

Sabharwal, M., Levine, H., & D'Agostino, M. (2018). A conceptual content analysis of 75 years of diversity research in public administration. *Review of Public Personnel*

Administration, 38(2), 248-267.

Scharlin, C., & Villanueva, L. V. (1992). *Philip Vera Cruz: A personal history of Filipino immigrants and the Farmworkers Movement*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Asian American Studies Center and UCLA Labor Center.

Selden, S. C. (1997). Representative bureaucracy: Examining the linkage between passive and active representation in the farmers home administration. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 27(1), 22-42.

Shah, N. (2001). *Contagious divides: Epidemics and race in San Francisco's Chinatown*.

University of California Press.

Song, M. (2018). Gender representation and student performance: Representative bureaucracy goes to Korea. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 48(4), 346-358.

Stivers, C. (2007). "So poor and so Black": Hurricane Katrina, public administration, and the issue of race. *Public Administration Review*, 67, 48-56.

- Tai, S. (1999). Environmental hazards and the Richmond Laotian American community: A case study of environmental justice. *Asian Law Journal*, 6, 189-208.
- Theobald, N. A., & Haider-Markel, D. P. (2009). Race, bureaucracy, and symbolic representation: Interactions between citizens and police. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19, 409-426.
- Thomson Jr, R. A., Salazar, E. S., & Ecklund, E. H. (2021). The very ivory tower: pathways reproducing racial-ethnic stratification in US academic science. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 44(7), 1250-1270.
- Umemoto, K. (1989). "On strike!": San Francisco State College strike, 1968-69: The role of Asian American Students. *Amerasia Journal*, 15(1), 3-41.
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2021). "Annual reports on the federal workforce fiscal year 2019." <https://www.eeoc.gov/sites/default/files/2021-07/2019%20Annual%20Report%20Workforce%20Tables.zip>.
- Wilkins, V. M., & Keiser, L. R. (2006). Linking passive and active representation by gender: The case of child support agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16, 87-102.
- Witt, M. T. (2011). A noteworthy absence: How and why race and racism is ignored by public administration scholarship. *History Compass*, 9(7), 549-561.
- Wong, D., & Fink, N. (2012/2013). 18 Million and Rising: The fight against Asian American voter suppression. *Asian American Policy Review*, 23, 57-71.
- Wright, J. E., & Merritt, C. C. (2020). Social equity and COVID-19: The case of African Americans. *Public Administration Review*, 80(5), 820-826.

Wu, E. D. (2013). *The color of success: Asian Americans and the origins of the model minority*. Princeton University Press.

Yee, A. (2020, December 10). "How a Boston suburb corrected voter rights violations against Asian Americans." *NBCNews*. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/how-boston-suburb-corrected-voter-rights-violations-against-asian-americans-n1250454>.

Yellow Horse, A., Jeung, R., Lim, R., Tang, B., Im, M., Higashiyama, L., Schweng, L., & Chen, M. (2021). Stop AAPI Hate National Report 3/19/20-6/30/21. *Stop AAPI Hate*. <https://stopaapihate.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Stop-AAPI-Hate-Report-National-v2-210830.pdf>.

Zimmerman, R. (1993). Social equity and environmental risk. *Risk Analysis*, 13(6), 649-666.

Zouridis, S., & Thaens, M. (2003). E-government: towards a public administration approach. *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 25(2), 159-183.