Winter 2018

On the utility of Asian Critical (AsianCrit) Theory in the field of education

Samuel D Museus
Jon Iftikar, *University of Wisconsin - Madison*

On the utility of Asian critical (AsianCrit) theory in the field of education

Jon S. Iftikar & Samuel D. Museus

Published online: 16 Jan 2019.

Submit your article to this journal ⬈

Article views: 171

View Crossmark data ⬈

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

ARTICLE

On the utility of Asian critical (AsianCrit) theory in the field of education

Jon S. Iftikar[a] and Samuel D. Museus[b]

[a]Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA;
[b]Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

ABSTRACT

Despite the powerful influence of race and racism on the experiences and outcomes of Asian Americans in US education, coherent conceptual frameworks specifically focused on delineating how White supremacy shapes the lives of this population are difficult to find. The AsianCrit framework, grounded in Critical Race Theory (CRT) and the experiences and voices of Asian Americans, can begin filling this gap. In this article, we review an AsianCrit framework and examine Asian American issues in education through seven AsianCrit tenets to demonstrate their utility in the analysis of and advocacy for Asian Americans in U.S. education. We end by discussing implications of how AsianCrit can provide a framework to guide future research, policy and practice, as well as a foundation for discourse around the racialized experiences of Asians Americans and other racially marginalized groups in education.

Introduction

There is substantial evidence that White supremacy continues to play a significant role in shaping education systems and the experiences of Asian Americans within them (Buenavista & Chen, 2013; Museus, 2014; Museus, Ledesma, & Parker, 2015; Museus & Park, 2015). Yet, there is a paucity of racially conscious frameworks that are grounded in the experiences of Asian Americans in US education and can be used to advance knowledge of the role of White supremacy in shaping lives within this population. To address this limitation, Museus and Iftikar (2014) developed an Asian Critical Theory (AsianCrit) framework to aid in analyzing the role of racism in Asian American experiences. The purpose of the current article is to demonstrate the utility of the AsianCrit framework in understanding Asian Americans within U.S. education.

In the following section, we provide a brief discussion of historical context that constitutes the backdrop for understanding the racialized experiences of Asian Americans in US society and education. Next, we discuss Critical Race Theory (CRT), which has been utilized to understand the ways in which White supremacy shapes education and experiences within it, as well as delineate the limitations of CRT in generating a holistic understanding of how race and racism shape Asian American experiences in US education. We then provide an overview of an AsianCrit framework and discuss how its tenets can be used to analyze a range of Asian American experiences and issues in education. In doing so, we aim to demonstrate its utility in analyzing this population within US education contexts and generating new insights about White supremacy

---

broadly. Finally, we provide a set of implications of the AsianCrit framework and this discussion for future educational research and practice.

Before moving forward, it is important to share our positionality because it shapes the ways in which we see the world (Milner, 2007). We both grew up in the US and identify as multiracial or multiethnic Asian Americans. We come from diverse ethnic backgrounds and one author identifies with an indigenous community. We also originate from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, with one author being raised in a more affluent family and the other primarily growing up in working-class Southeast Asian American communities. These identities fuel our work as scholars and educators. Both of us have spent most of our lives in US education systems. We have studied the racial realities of diverse Asian American and other marginalized populations in various regions of the US for over a decade (from Hawaii to the East Coast), and we have collectively published over 70 books, articles, and book chapters related to racism, racial equity, and Asian American experiences. We have both held instructor and faculty positions in Asian American Studies and education programs, working with Asian American students and communities in a range of different racial and political contexts across the nation. As a result of these experiences and knowledge acquired from them, we assume that racism is an endemic aspect of US society that profoundly shapes the lives of people within it, we believe that White supremacy and racial oppression work differently in different contexts and lives, and systemic racism is deeply rooted in the history of US and Western societies.

Historical context and the racialization processes

When communities from Asia began crossing oceans and arriving in the US, they had little in common with each other (Omi & Winant, 1994; Tamura, 2001, 2003). Today, Asian immigrants in the US represent over 48 different ethnic groups with distinct histories, cultures, and political systems (Museus, 2014). These include Bhutanese, Burmese, Cambodian, Chinese, Hmong, Indian, Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, Lao, Pakistani, Taiwanese, Thai, and Vietnamese Americans, in addition to many other ethnic groups. These communities speak different languages, espouse divergent values, and embrace disparate traditions and norms. However, White Supremacy continues to fuel racialization processes that lump all of them into one category and characterize them as a monolithic racial group with inferior traits or characteristics that justify their victimization (Museus, 2014; Museus & Kiang, 2009; Suzuki, 2002; Teranishi, 2010). This incongruence between the diversity within Asian America and monolithic racial constructions forced upon it a hallmark of the Asian American experience today, but they have roots that have been deeply embedded in Western societies for centuries.

For over 2000 years, Western societies have sought to dominate the Eastern world (Said, 1994). Within this context, Western scholars have engaged in what Said (1994) labeled *orientalism*, or the construction of negative generalizations of 'exotic' Asians that are used to patronize and dehumanize societies and peoples of Asia (Said, 1994). For example, cultural representations that existed in the early years of contact between Western explorers and people of Asia depicted the latter as despotic, untrustworthy, sexually deviant, and strange *others*.

Racist constructions of Asians have continued to permeate Western societies and shape the lives of Asians within the US Throughout the 19th Century, Asians were depicted as a yellow peril—a menace and danger to Western civilization (Espiritu, 1993; Lowe, 1996). The resulting xenophobia partly led to policies, such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907, which excluded Asian immigrants from entering the US This racialization also led to direct violence toward Asians in the US, including murders, mob attacks, and lynching of Chinese railroad workers. Throughout US history, these depictions re-emerged in various forms. During World War II, such stereotypes fueled xenophobia toward Japanese Americans. Again, in the 1980s, Japan's economic competitiveness led to heightened racism

toward Asian Americans, including those who were not of Japanese descent (Wu, 2001). And, for several decades, South Asian Americans who do not identify with the Islamic faith have been subject to xenophobic violence and exclusion that is targeted toward Muslims.

While Asian Americans are still viewed as a threat to Western civilization in certain contexts, the dominant monolithic racial depiction of Asian Americans arguably became the model minority myth in the middle of the 20th century. The model minority stereotype, suggests that Asian Americans are universally successful and do not face racial challenges (Museus, 2009; Museus & Kiang, 2009; Osajima, 1995; Suzuki, 2002), and its prominence can be traced back to the Watts riots (Suzuki, 1977). In 1965, after California highway patrolmen pulled over a Black man in Watts, California, bystanders protested the officers' actions, which they viewed as another example of police violence against Black communities and riots ensued. In the wake of the riots, the Secretary of Labor, Daniel Moynihan (1965), released a report that acknowledged the impact of racism on Black communities but juxtaposed Black households headed by women and high male unemployment rates with the perceived strong and productive cultures and family networks within Asian American populations. The report was interpreted as suggesting that Black families were to blame for existing racial inequalities (Fultz & Brown, 2008), and these events solidified the model minority myth in public discourse, as they fueled a narrative that Asian Americans were better than Blacks but inferior to Whites (Kim, 1999; Wu, 1995).

The myth's origins have led scholars to argue that the model minority stereotype reinforces racism toward other communities of color and pits Asian Americans against these other groups (Matsuda, 1996; Yu, 2006). In addition, the valorization of Asian Americans relative to Black communities, through the model minority myth, can contribute to the internalization of anti-Black perspectives and reinforcement of White supremacist ideology among some Asian Americans and members of other racial groups (Kim, 1999).

Moreover, the model minority myth has evolved over the years and been deployed to reinforce White Supremacy in a variety of ways that harm Asian Americans. For example, the myth perpetually masks inequities *within* Asian American communities, fuels misconceptions that Asian Americans are impervious to racial challenges and do not need support, and justifies the exclusion of Asian Americans from racial discourse (Lee, 2006; Museus, 2014; Museus & Kiang, 2009; Ngo, 2006). The myth can also fuel resentment toward Asian Americans (Kim, 1999). Due to the reality that US society has forced socially constructed stereotypes onto this population in ways that profoundly impact their lives, most scholars studying Asian Americans in education have recognized the need to conduct analyses of how race and racism shape the experiences of people within this community (e.g. Buenavista & Chen, 2013; Lee, 2006; Museus & Park, 2015; Teranishi, 2010).

It is important to note that Asian American ethnic groups are racialized differently as well. For example, while Asian Americans are often racialized as model minorities, Southeast Asian Americans are both constructed as a model and deviant minorities (e.g. as gang members, dropouts, and welfare sponges), depending on the context (Lee, 2006; Museus & Park, 2015; Ngo & Lee, 2007). However, much remains to be learned about the racialization of Southeast Asian American experiences and more holistic understanding of how their struggles diverge from or converge with other communities of color.

In addition to shaping the ways in which Asian Americans experience racism, these racist social constructions have influenced Asian American communities' responses to them as well. For example, during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, Asian American activists embraced and (re)framed the term as an empowering collective identity that connected diverse Asian Americans with other oppressed and exploited groups (Aguilar-San Juan, 1994). Membership within Asian America has thus been and continues to be both structured and fluid, shaped by both systems of racial oppression and resistance to them. The label 'Asian American' also symbolizes the reality that racialization processes profoundly impact these communities.

Rationale for an Asian critical theory (AsianCrit) framework

Over the last two decades, CRT has garnered substantial attention in education and is increasingly utilized to examine how White supremacy and racism shape the lives of people of color. In the 1970s, critical legal scholars created CRT so that they could more meaningfully address White supremacy in legal practice and doctrine and to give voice to legal scholars of color and communities of color experiencing racism within the legal system (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Since CRT's genesis, it has been adopted by scholars outside of the law and used as a framework to analyze systems of racial oppression in other arenas, such as education.

Although it can be argued that there is no one universally agreed upon set of core CRT tenets, Delgado and Stefancic (2001) offered one widely cited set of central tenets, which we outline herein. They include the following seven interrelated beliefs:

1. *Social constructionism* is the principle that there is no biological basis for racial categories, and race is a socially constructed phenomenon (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).
2. *Racism as normal* suggests that racism is endemic to society (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Put another way, racism is a natural and normal part of everyday life and a perpetual feature of US social fabric.
3. *Differential racialization* is the notion that different racial groups are racialized in varied ways, and the same racial group can be racialized in different ways in different time periods and contexts (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).
4. *Interest convergence* suggests that Whites who wield disproportionate decision-making power in society only support laws, policies, or programs that improve the lives of people of color when they also benefit themselves (Bell, 1980).
5. *Anti-essentialism* argues that there is no essential experience or trait that defines a racial group (Grillo, 1995; Harris, 2003). For instance, there is no singular 'Asian American experience' or 'Black experience'.
6. *Intersectionality* refers to the ways that racism intersects with capitalism, heterosexism, patriarchy, ableism, and other structural forces to shape the forms of oppression and exploitation as well as individual identities (Crenshaw, 1991).
7. *Storytelling* is grounded in the belief that stories of oppressed and exploited people constitute valuable knowledge and can be utilized to counter dominant narratives (Delgado, 1989; Chon, 1995).

Education scholars have adopted CRT as a useful tool to challenge White supremacy and colorblindness, as well as to analyze the ways that systemic racism subjugates people of color, in education (e.g. Delgado, 1989; Museus, Ravello, & Vega, 2012; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009). For example, these scholars utilize CRT to center the voices of communities of color in education discourse and shed light on how education policies and practices that are seemingly neutral can reinforce White supremacy.

Although CRT has helped education researchers center race and White supremacy in their analyses, it is important to acknowledge that CRT does have limitations when applied to Asian Americans. First, several scholars have noted that CRT has disproportionately informed scholarship focused on Black and White populations (Gotanda, 1995; Harris, 1994; Phillips, 1998; Valdes, 1996; Yosso, 2005). Such scholarship is vital, given the serious racial oppression faced by Black communities. Yet, in-depth critical analyses of other racial groups can also contribute to more holistic understandings of race, racialization, and White supremacy.

Second, while CRT is general enough that it can be applied to analyze all communities of color (e.g. Gee, 1996; Phillips, 1998), researchers studying non-Black communities of color have to do extra work to adapt and tailor CRT tenets to their focal populations before they can engage in deeper and more nuanced analyses of these groups. In contrast, critical frameworks

that are grounded in the specific experiences, issues, and histories of these other communities of color can stimulate more nuanced and deeper inquiry into their experiences (e.g. Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Yosso et al., 2009).

There are at two salient examples of how these tailored frameworks can be beneficial: Latinx Critical Theory (LatCrit) and Tribal Critical (TribalCrit) Theory. In 1995, scholars recognized that CRT did not center issues (e.g. culture and language) necessary to understand the racial oppression faced by Latinx populations and established LatCrit to address these concerns (Valdes, 1996). LatCrit allows scholars studying Latinx populations, to begin with an assumption that White Supremacy manifests itself through processes that eradicate Latinx cultures and languages and force their cultural and linguistic assimilation. Approximately a decade later, Brayboy (2005) noted that CRT frameworks did not focus on key aspects of oppression experienced by indigenous communities (e.g. colonization, imperialism, forced assimilation, etc.) and proposed a TribalCrit framework that underscores the endemic nature of colonization, ways that US policies toward indigenous communities are rooted in imperialism, problematic nature of forced assimilation, essential role of sovereignty and self-determination for indigenous people, and importance of tribal beliefs, philosophies, customs, and traditions in understanding the realities of indigenous people. These frameworks center unique aspects of Latinx and indigenous experiences and have promoted deeper insights into the ways that these communities experience systemic oppression (e.g. Kaomea, 2009; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

Third, and closely related to the last point, CRT scholarship in education has fallen short of generating complex and holistic understandings of Asian American racial realities in education. Rather, CRT analyses of Asian Americans often focus on explaining how this population is racialized, but researchers are yet to develop a comprehensive understanding of how the aforementioned multiple and complex racialization processes shape Asian Americans' views about racial oppression and justice, other groups' perceptions of them, their ethnic communities' views of each other, their contemporary coalition-building with other groups, or institutional decision-making that excludes or marginalizes them (e.g. the allocation of resources). A critical race framework that is specifically tailored to Asian American populations might prompt analyses to begin with an assumption that these forms of racialization are key mechanisms through which Asian Americans are racialized and are designed to uphold White supremacy, thereby prompting a focus on such deeper questions and analyses.

An Asian critical theory (AsianCrit) perspective

Since the 1990s, several scholars—both inside and outside of education—have engaged CRT in the study of Asian Americans. This body of scholarship has highlighted how the model minority myth has been used as a tool of racial oppression (Chang, 1993; Museus & Kiang, 2009; Teranishi, 2010), dominant groups have utilized Asian Americans as a wedge in political debates (e.g. Affirmative Action) (Park & Liu, 2014; Poon & Sihite, 2016), and intersecting forms of oppression shape the experiences of Asian Americans (Buenavista & Chen, 2013). In 2014, Museus and Iftikar built on this previous scholarship, research in Asian American Studies, and existing CRT literature to develop an AsianCrit framework that is firmly situated within CRT but is also informed by Asian American Studies scholarship and therefore specifically tailored to Asian American experiences, issues, and concerns.

While the Asian American population includes diverse ethnic groups, the AsianCrit framework we discuss herein is pan-ethnic for multiple reasons. First, as discussed above, society racializes Asian Americans as a monolithic group, creating an externally imposed shared experience of racialization. Indeed, diverse Asian American ethnic groups are often racialized in similar ways (Takaki, 1998; Tamura, 2001, 2003). For example, there is evidence that Asian American students regularly experience racial isolation and marginalization within academic and social spaces in

school, racial hostility and violence in these environments, pressure to racially segregate to find safe space within the larger racist educational environment, pressure to assimilate to dominant White values and norms, racial silencing (i.e. the denial of voice or representation in curricular and co-curricular spaces), and vicarious racism through the observation of racism directed toward others (Lewis, Chesler, & Forman, 2000; Museus & Park, 2015; Museus & Truong, 2013). Second, focusing on race instead of ethnicity encourages analyses centered on White supremacy, systemic racism, and how these realities shape Asian American lives (Omi & Winant, 1994).

The AsianCrit framework consists of seven interrelated tenets that can be used to understand how White supremacy shapes the experiences of Asian Americans. The first four tenets were created by integrating CRT scholarship with knowledge of Asian American racial realities, while the last three are amalgamations or reiterations of core tenets of CRT that are critical in the analysis of White supremacy and Asian Americans. As we demonstrate in the following sections, the framework can help better understand how White supremacy maintains ideological tropes that structure racialized experiences and identities, interacts with global colonial and imperial projects to influence Asian American experiences, and shapes how racially marginalized people navigate, engage with, and utilize the racial categories through which White supremacy attempts to homogenize and essentialize them:

1. *Asianization* is grounded in the reality that people within the US only become 'Asian' because of White Supremacy and the racialization processes that it engenders. Specifically, White Supremacy and pervasive nativistic racism in the US result in Asian Americans being racialized as perpetual foreigners, threatening yellow perils, model and deviant minorities, and sexually deviant emasculated men and hypersexualized women (Cho, 2003; Chon, 1995; Espiritu, 1993; Lowe, 1996; Museus & Kiang, 2009). These constructions serve as vehicles through which White supremacy informs laws, policies, programs, and perspectives that dehumanize and exclude Asian Americans.

2. *Transnational contexts* emphasize the importance of situating Asian Americans and the operation of White supremacy within a network of global relationships, at individual and larger policy and structural levels. Indeed, critical analyses of the ways that past and present global economic, political, and social processes shape the conditions of Asian Americans is essential to understanding how racism influences Asian American experiences (Museus & Iftikar, 2014).

3. *(Re)constructive history* is founded on the reality that Asian Americans are typically invisible and voiceless in US history. Thus, (re)constructive history focuses on transcending this invisibility and silence to create a collective Asian American historical narrative and reanalyze existing histories to incorporate the voices and contributions of Asian Americans (e.g. Takaki, 1998; Tamura, 2001, 2003; Umemoto, 1989).

4. *Strategic (anti)essentialism* builds on the argument that race is a social construction that is shaped and reshaped by economic, political, and social forces. Based on the concepts of anti-essentialism and strategic essentialism (Grillo, 1995; Spivak, 1987), strategic (anti)essentialism recognizes and counters the ways that White supremacy racializes Asian Americans as a monolithic group in the US, but it also emphasizes that Asian Americans can and do actively intervene in the racialization process as well. For instance, Asian American scholars and activists engage in coalition building and (re)define racial categories to garner political power and influence in advocacy against White supremacy (Coloma, 2006; Umemoto, 1989).

5. *Intersectionality* is the notion that White supremacy and other systems of oppression and exploitation (e.g. imperialism, colonialism, sexism, heterosexism, ableism, etc.) intersect to mutually shape the conditions within which Asian Americans exist (Museus & Saelua, 2014), their racial identities and other social identities (e.g. gender, sexual orientation, and class identities), as well as their everyday experiences (Lee, 2006).

6. *Story, theory, and praxis* are founded on CRT scholars' claims that racially marginalized people's experiential knowledge can serve to challenge dominant, White, European epistemology and offer an alternative and empowering epistemological perspective that is grounded in the realities of people of color (Brayboy, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 2000). For example, Brayboy's (2005) TribalCrit offers an alternative epistemology that centers Native people's experiences with colonialism and imperialism. Story, theory, and praxis also builds on the work of CRT scholars who emphasize the value of stories (e.g. Yamamoto, 1997) and TribalCrit scholars who stress the important connections between story and theory or intersections between theory and practice (Brayboy, 2005) because these are three important interconnected elements in analysis and advocacy. Specifically, stories inform theory and practice, theory guides practice, and practice can excavate stories and utilize theory for positive transformative purposes. This tenet thus centers Asian American experiences to offer an alternative epistemology that is represented through stories and can inform theories and praxis in meaningful ways. Relatedly, the tenet recognizes the salience of imperial scholarship, or the ways that these alternative epistemologies and stories are marginalized in academic spheres (Delgado, 1992), and advocates against imperialism in scholarly arenas and for centering the voices of Asian Americans in education discourse.

7. Commitment *to social justice* highlights the notion that AsianCrit is dedicated to advocating for the end of all forms of oppression and exploitation. That is, AsianCrit aims to eradicate racism, sexism, heterosexism, capitalist exploitation, and other systemic forms of dehumanization and domination.

It is worth noting that, like LatCrit and TribalCrit, the AsianCrit perspective is not intended to replace CRT (Museus & Iftikar, 2014). Rather, AsianCrit is an adaptation of CRT that offers a refined set of distinctly tailored tenets that can advance critical analyses of White supremacy in the lives of Asian Americans. Just as CRT has created space for the ongoing critical analyses of White supremacy in education and the fostering of community among racial justice-oriented scholars and educators, AsianCrit is intended to foster spaces for the analysis of Asian American experiences within the broader CRT tradition and to offer a space for researchers, teachers, policymakers, and administrators who do critical work on and with Asian Americans in education to connect, collaborate, and share knowledge. AsianCrit can thus serve to stimulate much needed critical work on Asian Americans in education.

Utilizing AsianCrit to advance knowledge on Asian Americans in education

In this section, we discuss how the AsianCrit framework can inform analyses of White supremacy and the experiences of Asian Americans (and other racially marginalized groups) in US education contexts. In doing so, we provide examples of how the AsianCrit framework can provide insights to advance scholarship in education. The purpose of this section is to begin a discussion about the ways in which the AsianCrit framework can center critical race analyses on new questions and help generate deeper insights into the ways in which White Supremacy shapes the experiences and resistance of Asian Americans within US education.

Deepening understandings of the impact of dominant racial narratives

An AsianCrit framework can facilitate deeper analysis of how White supremacy affects Asian Americans in the US, and how majoritarian narratives about Asian Americans shape perspectives, policies, practices, and experiences in education. For example, education scholars have written about the ways that this model minority narrative leads to the invisibility of Asian Americans in education research, is linked to their exclusion from educational policy and practice arenas,

creates the misconception that Asian American students in K-12 and higher education do not need culturally responsive resources or support, and causes excessive pressure on them to achieve perfection (Museus & Park, 2015; Ngo & Lee, 2007; Suzuki, 2002).

AsianCrit can allow scholars to move beyond conducting research to illuminate that Asianization exists, begin with an evidence-based assumption that nativistic racism shapes the experiences of Asian Americans in profound ways through the model minority and yellow peril stereotypes, and ask more nuanced questions about the ways in which these processes shape Asian American realities in education. For example, scholars can utilize the framework as a conceptual lens to analyze how Asianization, through the yellow peril trope, and religious imperialism might intersect to uniquely shape the experiences of South Asian Americans in college or how South Asian American activists engage in strategic (anti-)essentialism to build coalitions with other ethnic and racial groups in efforts to combat such xenophobia and the violence that it promotes. Scholars could also utilize counterstories as a tool to challenge dominant narratives that essentialize South Asian Americans within the US education system. Such efforts could contribute to existing knowledge and advance social justice by challenging harmful racial constructions of this population, centering their voices, and expanding current levels of understanding regarding the ways in which activists engage in collective resistance.

Examining the impact of imperialism and colonialism on experiences and trajectories

The AsianCrit framework can be used to better understand the roles that US imperialism, colonialism, and White supremacy play in shaping the conditions and experiences of many Asian Americans in education contexts. The experiences of Southeast Asian Americans can help underscore this point. Scholars have acknowledged that US imperialism and colonialism has resulted in systemic violence toward and continued trauma within many Asian American communities. In the latter half of the 1900s, US military interventions in Southeast Asia contributed to the dislocation of Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, and Vietnamese refugees after the Vietnam War (DePouw, 2012; Ngo, 2006; Portes & Rumbaut, 1996; Takaki, 1998). Partly as a result of these military interventions and following dislocation, many Southeast Asian American refugees have experienced trauma resulting from political persecution, rape, murder, loss of family, and unsanitary conditions in refugee camps (Portes & Rumbaut, 1996). There is evidence that these transnational contexts significantly shape the academic motivations, identities and worldviews, and trajectories of Southeast Asian American students (Kiang, 2002, 2009; Museus, 2013), but our understanding of these relationships remains limited.

While US imperialism can help better understand Southeast Asian American experiences, it is important to recognize how such imperialism might intersect with White Supremacy and capitalism. In contrast to some Asian immigrant communities that originated from wealthier backgrounds, many Southeast Asian American refugees migrated to the US with few resources (Portes & Rumbaut, 1996). Moreover, whereas some Asian immigrant communities might experience an easier transition to the US because they come from regions that were colonized by Western empires, where English is commonplace, and where families depend on formal education and competition as a means of social mobility, many Southeast Asian Americans migrated from agrarian communities and were forced to leave them and establish lives in a new cultural context where their pre-migration knowledge and skills are not valued within education and society (Museus, 2014). These realities are partly the cause of the high rates of poverty and low rates of educational attainment within these communities.

Yet, there is much to learn about the effects of US militarism on the experiences of Southeast Asian Americans or how US education systems can take these transnational contexts into account in crafting culturally relevant and responsive education. For example, psychology

scholars have documented the ways in which the violence that Southeast Asian American refugees encountered can lead to long-lasting trauma among refugees, as well as their children, and underscored the reality that education can be a mechanism to heal this trauma (Lin, Suyemoto, & Kiang, 2009). Yet, education researchers have yet to develop comprehensive understandings of the various ways in which K-12 schools and higher education institutions can and do cultivate curricular and co-curricular spaces to create such healing spaces, or how such trauma and healing spaces shape identity development, sense of belonging, satisfaction, civic attitudes, and a host of other outcomes among Asian American students. There is also much to be learned about how US imperialism, nativistic racism, and capitalism intersect to shape educational trajectories of Asian Americans. The AsianCrit framework could provide a mechanism to focus analysis and shed light on these processes.

(Re)Building the past to understand contemporary struggles

AsianCrit can help inform the development of more comprehensive Asian American historical narratives in US education. Asian American Studies history courses have helped Asian American students construct a collective pan-ethnic identity and critical consciousness (Osajima, 2007). These Asian American histories add to or correct the historical record and provide critical insights into the present to inform a progressive future for Asian Americans and other racially minoritized groups. Higher education history books, however, typically exclude Asian Americans from the historical record (see, for example, Brubacher & Rudy, 1997).

Within US educational contexts, an analysis of Asian American history can advance knowledge about the current conditions of Asian American communities and how education can be (re)shaped to better serve these populations (Coloma, 2006). Examples of historical narratives that can teach society about Asian American identity and politics exist. For example, Asian American Studies scholars have documented key historical events in the development of Asian American collective identity and resistance, such as Asian American involvement in student movements of the 1960s, the emergence of Asian American Studies, or the fight for Asian American faculty who have been denied tenure due to racial discrimination (Lee, 2006; Museus, 2014; Nakanishi, 1990; Osajima, 2007; Umemoto, 1989). However, education researchers rarely study the role or contributions of Asian Americans in higher education history. A (re)constructive historical agenda might focus on might examining how Asian Americans students have resisted White Supremacy by fighting for increased diversity and equity at colleges across the nation along with their peers, how key figures have expanded knowledge in Asian American Studies, the history of Asian cultural centers on campuses across the nation, or how Asian American community organizations mobilized to advocate for policy changes, such as the designation and federal recognition of Asian Americans and Pacific Islander serving institutions.

More complex analyses of racial identity politics and resistance in education

In efforts to resist White Supremacy, Asian Americans can simultaneously combat the dehumanization of communities of color *and* reinforce racial categories and constructions of this population (Kumashiro, 2006). Asian Americans must often navigate these tensions within US education. For example, Asian Americans in education have been forced to resist the tropes that accompany Asianization processes, such as the model minority myth, by disaggregating data and excavating the diversity and inequality that exists within this population (Museus & Kiang, 2009). At the same time, such efforts have been enhanced by pan-ethnic coalitions and organizations that inevitably reify the problematic racist categorization that they aim to resist. Another example of these tensions is the reality that pan ethnic coalitions advancing social justice can also privilege the voices of some groups while marginalizing others within Asian America (Lowe, 1996), thereby

reinforcing systems of oppression through the exclusion of certain ethnic, socioeconomic, sexual orientation, and other subgroups within this population.

The concept of strategic (anti)essentialism underscores how Asian American researchers and activists build on the possibilities that the larger pan-ethnic category offers under certain circumstances, while disaggregating and differentiating subgroups to resist White Supremacy and advance the well-being of Asian American and other historically oppressed communities in other contexts. While many Asian Americans understand these processes to be central to the Asian American experience in education, the ways in which Asian Americans navigate the tensions between their collective struggles and the diversity that exists within the population are virtually unstudied in education scholarship.

AsianCrit can prompt researchers to focus analysis on and develop a deeper understanding of the ways in which Asian Americans engage in strategic (anti-)essentialism to navigate the aforementioned tensions. For example, the AsianCrit framework can prompt analysis of how diverse ethnic groups collectively advance knowledge about Asian Americans in education and advocate for racially just education policy. Within the current sociopolitical context, AsianCrit analysis can examine how Asian Americans engage in strategic (anti-)essentialism to support the legality of race-conscious admissions policies, implement institution-wide programs to culturally relevant and responsive education on college campuses, and collectively construct their own communities of support in scholarly arenas (Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund [AALDEF], 2015; Museus, 2014). AsianCrit might also encourage analysis of the ways in which certain groups might be marginalized along class, ethnic, religious, gender, sexual orientation lines within Asian American activism circles.

Understanding relative racialization and larger racial justice agendas

As discussed above, the dominant narrative of Asian Americans as a model minority has been used as a tool to uphold White supremacy (Kim, 1999; Lee, 2006). Although the relative racialization of Asian Americans and other groups has been extensively studied in other fields, such as ethnic studies, such analyses in the field of education are difficult to find. AsianCrit can help expand knowledge about how racial processes that are often viewed as only relevant to Asian Americans, such as the model minority myth, reinforce larger systems of White Supremacy and the racial oppression of other communities of color in education. The framework, for example, can prompt researchers to ask questions about how the internalization of the model minority myth among policymakers and educators might inform decision-making that reinforces or exacerbates systemic racial inequities, how the exclusion that results from the model minority myth might hinder the development of Asian Americans' critical consciousness and racial justice advocacy for other communities of color, or how White Supremacy and the model minority myth might fuel anti-Blackness among educators and students .

The model minority myth can also function to pit Asian Americans against other communities of color (Matsuda, 1996; Yu, 2006), and these dynamics could fuel tensions in the historical and contemporary relationships between marginalized communities. For example, in the 1990s, tensions between Korean American shop owners and African Americans during the Los Angeles riots resulted in violence that negatively affected both communities (McFerson, 2006). It has been noted that such tensions are deeply informed by larger material and ideological structures of White dominance through which groups of color are pitted against each other. Specifically, the model minority myth fueled Black resentment toward Asian Americans, and stereotypes of Black deviant and dangerous promoted anti-Blackness among Asian Americans. While such Asian-Black relations have been studied extensively in ethnic studies, these intergroup relations are grossly virtually invisible in education scholarship. AsianCrit might prompt critical analyses of how Asian American and Black students view one another, how White Supremacy and forms of racialization fuel tensions and conflict between them, and the ways in which these two groups navigate tensions as they engage in social justice activism.

Conclusion

The purpose of this article was to introduce the AsianCrit framework and demonstrate how its application to current educational issues can prompt new questions and help advance knowledge about how racism and White supremacy affect Asian Americans in US education and advocating for greater racial equity. Our discussion demonstrates how the AsianCrit tenets can offer a conceptual lens to understand a wide range of Asian American issues in education. These examples, however, only scratch the surface regarding the ways in which AsianCrit can help expose how White supremacy and other forms of oppression and exploitation shape the realities of Asian Americans in US education.

In sum, the AsianCrit framework leverages both the strengths of critical race theory and in-depth knowledge about Asian Americans' specific racial realities and racialized experiences. However, it is important to note that the framework also has limitations. For example, it is unclear whether and how the AsianCrit tenets can be effectively applied across cultural and national contexts. Scholars have demonstrated that some of the racial constructions that result from *Asianization* are relevant in other Western nations (Gillborn, 2008; Mayuzumi, 2015), and it is possible that AsianCrit can be utilized in these other settings. However, given that other countries have different histories, relationships with Asian nations and populations, and demographic characteristics, more work must be done to determine whether and how the AsianCrit tenets would be utilized within or adapted to fit those contexts.

In addition, the framework discussed herein does not clarify how racism might differentially shape the experiences of Asian Americans who grew up in the US and international Asian immigrants who more recently entered the country. This is especially relevant to education, given the increasing presence of Asian international students in both secondary and postsecondary education. Future research can examine whether and how the AsianCrit framework might be extended to facilitate analyses of Asian international student experiences. For example, a focus on transnational contexts might reveal the imperialist aspects of the increasing numbers of international students from Asia to the US As in previous iterations of US imperialism, Asians from abroad are being exploited to benefit the US materially, politically, and symbolically. International Asian students have become sources of economic capital through the non-resident tuition they provide (Rhee & Sagaria, 2004). These students also serve as symbolic capital to US educational institutions by allowing these organizations to represent themselves as diverse and globally engaged, even in cases in which such diversity and global engagement are superficial (Iverson, 2008).

Finally, the AsianCrit perspective does not explain how language shapes the experiences of Asian Americans. It might be argued that the framework should explicitly include linguistic elements (e.g. assumptions that Asian Americans cannot speak English, which further fuel racism toward them). There is evidence that linguistic realities are salient aspects of some Asian American experiences (Nguyen, 2012), and researchers can utilize the AsianCrit framework to analyze issues related to White supremacy and language (e.g. bilingual education, English as a Second Language, linguicism, accent discrimination, etc.).

The aim of the current article is not to generate a comprehensive analysis of how an AsianCrit perspective can inform a specific issue in US education, but rather to stimulate thought and dialogue about the various ways that researchers can apply the AsianCrit framework to critically analyze Asian Americans in educational contexts. Our hope is that researchers and educators can utilize the framework, but also facilitate its growth and evolution. For example, future studies can focus on one AsianCrit tenet and use that tenet to analyze multiple issues Asian Americans face in education or draw from the entire framework to deeply explore one important educational issue. Moving forward then, AsianCrit can contribute to alternative discourses about and analyses of Asian Americans, and also, more broadly, White supremacy, racial inequity, and race relations in US education.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Jon S. Iftikar is a doctoral candidate in Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. His research focuses on developing new theoretical models and frameworks for analyzing racialized identities, experiences, and inequities in higher education utilizing critical and cultural studies approach.

Samuel D. Museus is Professor of Higher Education and Student Affairs and Founding Director of the National Institute for Transformation and Equity (NITE) at Indiana University, Bloomington. His research agenda focuses on diversity and equity, institutional environments, and diverse student outcomes. His current research is focused on the impact of organizational environments on racial and ethnic minority college student access and success.

ORCID

Jon S. Iftikar http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2111-5643
Samuel D. Museus https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0507-301X

References

Aguilar-San Juan, K. (Ed.). (1994). *The state of Asian America: Activism and resistance in the 1990s*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund [AALDEF]. (2015, November 3). *Over 160 Asian American and Pacific Islander groups file amicus briefs in U.S. Supreme Court in support of affirmative action*. Retrieved from http://aaldef.org/press-releases/press-release/over-160-asian-american-and-pacific-islander-groups-file-amicus-briefs-in-support-of-affirmative-act.html

Bell, D.A. (1980). "Brown v. Board of Education" and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review 93*(3), 518–533. doi:10.2307/1340546

Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, *37*, 425–446. doi:10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y

Brown, K., & Bell, J. (2008). Demise of the talented tenth: Affirmative action and the increasing underrepresentation of ascendant Blacks at selective higher educational institutions. *Ohio State Law Journal*, *69*, 1229–1283.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1997). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities* (4th ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Buenavista, T. L., & Chen, A. C. (2013). Intersections and crossroads: A counter-story of an undocumented Pinay college student. In S. D. Museus, D. Maramba & R. Teranishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and their implications for higher education* (pp. 198–212). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing

Chae, H. S. (2004). Talking back to the Asian model minority discourse: Korean-origin youth experiences in high school. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *25*, 59–73. doi:10.1080/07256860410001687027

Chang, R. S. (1993). Towards and Asian American legal scholarship: Critical race theory, post-structuralism, and narrative space. *California Law Review*, *81*, 1241–1323. doi:10.2307/3480919

Chang, M. J. (2011). Battle hymn of the model minority myth. *Amerasia Journal*, *37*, 137–143. doi:10.17953/amer.37.2.m1j0q8767202t21q

Cheung, K. K. (2005). (Mis)interpretations and (in)justice: The 1992 Los Angeles 'riots' and 'Black-Korean conflict.' *Melus*, *30*, 3–40. doi:10.1093/melus/30.3.3

Cho, S. K. (2003). Converging stereotypes in racialized sexual harassment: Where the model minority meets Suzie Wong. In A. K. Wing (Ed.), *Critical race feminism: A reader* (pp. 349–356). New York: New York University Press.

Chon, M. (1995). On the need for Asian American narratives in law: Ethnic specimens, native informants, storytelling and silences. *UCLA Asian Pacific American Law Journal*, *3*, 4–32.

Chutuape, E. D. (2016). 'Chinese-Mexicans' and 'Blackest Asians': Filipino American youth resisting the racial binary. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *19*, 200–231. doi:10.1080/13613324.2013.792801

Coloma, R. S. (2006). Disorienting race and education: Changing paradigms on the schooling of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *9*, 1–15. doi:10.1080/13613320500490606

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and the violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*, 1241–1299. doi:10.2307/1229039

Delgado, R. (1989). Storytelling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. *Michigan Law Review*, *87*, 2411–2441. doi:10.2307/1289308

Delgado, R. (1992). The imperial scholar revisited: How to marginalize outsider writing, ten years later. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, *140*, 1349–1372. doi:10.2307/3312406

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

DePouw, C. (2012). When culture implies deficit: Placing race at the center of Hmong American education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *15*, 223–239. doi:10.1080/13613324.2011.624505

Dong, S. (1995). Too many Asians: The challenge of fighting discrimination against Asian-Americans and preserving affirmative action. *Stanford Law Review*, *47*, 1027–1057. doi:10.2307/1229181

Espiritu, Y. (1993). *Asian American panethnicity: Bridging institutions and identities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Findlay, S., & Köhler, N. (2010). Too Asian. *Maclean's*, *123*, 76–81.

Fultz, M., & Brown, A. (2008). Historical perspectives on African American males as subjects of education policy. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *51*(7), 854–871. doi:10.1177/0002764207311994

Gee, H. (1996). Changing landscapes: The need for Asian Americans to be included in the affirmative action debate. *Gonzaga Law Review*, *32*, 621–658.

Gillborn, D. (2008). *Racism and education: Coincidence or conspiracy*? London: Routledge.

Gotanda, N. (1995). Critical legal studies, critical race theory and Asian American Studies. *Amerasia Journal*, *21*, 127–135. doi:10.17953/amer.21.1-2.2j46202k85658662

Grillo, T. (1995). Anti-essentialism and intersectionality: Tools to dismantle the master's house. *Black Women's Law Journal*, *10*, 16–30. doi:10.15779/Z38MC6W

Haffejee, B. (2015). African refugee youths' stories of surviving trauma and transition in U.S. public schools. *Journal of Muslim Mental Health*, *9*, 3–23. doi:10.3998/jmmh.10381607.0009.101

Harris, A. P. (1994). The jurisprudence of reconstruction. *California Law Review*, *82*, 741–785. doi:10.2307/3480931

Harris, A. P. (2003). Race and essentialism in feminist legal theory. In A. K. Wing (Ed.), *Critical race feminism: A reader* (2nd ed.) (pp. 34–41). New York: New York University Press.

Iverson, S. V. (2008). Capitalizing on change: The discursive framing of diversity in U.S. land-grant universities. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *41*, 182–199. doi:10.1080/10665680801972849

Kaomea, J. (2009). Contemplating Kuleana: Reflections on the rights and responsibilities of non-indigenous participants in programmes for indigenous education. *Alternative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *5*(2), 78–99. doi:10.1177/117718010900500205

Kiang, P. N. (2009). A thematic analysis of persistence and long-term educational engagement with Southeast Asian American college students. In L. Zhan (Ed.), *Asian American voices: Engaging, empowering, enabling* (pp. 21–58). New York: NLN Press.

Kim, C. J. (1999). The racial triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics and Society*, *27*, 105–138. doi:10.1177/0032329299027001005

Kim, S., & Stockdale, S. (2005, April 14). For Asian women, fetish is less than benign. Yale News, Retrieved from http://yaledailynews.com/blog/2005/04/14/for-asian-women-fetish-is-less-than-benign/

Kumashiro, K. K. (2006). Toward an anti-oppressive theory of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *9*, 129–135. doi:10.1080/13613320500490879

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 257–277). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lee, S. J. (2006). Additional complexities: Social class, ethnicity, generation, and gender in Asian American student experiences. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *9*, 17–28. doi:10.1080/13613320500490630

Lewis, A. E., Chesler, M., & Forman, T. A. (2000). The impact of 'colorblind' ideologies on students of color: Intergroup relations at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Negro Education*, *69*, 74–91.

Lin, N., Suyemoto, K. L., & Kiang, P. N. (2009). Education as catalyst for intergenerational refugee family communication about war and trauma. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, *30*(4), 195–207. doi:10.1177/1525740108329234

Lowe, L. (1996). *Immigrant acts: On Asian American cultural politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Matsuda, M. J. (1996). *Where is your body? And other essays on race, gender, and the law*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Mayuzumi, K. (2015). Navigating Orientalism: Asian women faculty in the Canadian academy. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *18*, 277–296. doi:10.1080/13613324.2014.946495

McFerson, H. M. (Ed.). (2006). *Blacks and Asians: Crossings, conflict and commonality*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Milner, H. R. IV, (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational Researcher*, *36*, 388–400. doi:10.3102/0013189X07309471

Moynihan, D. P. (1965). *The negro family: The case for national action*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Museus, S. D., & Iftikar, J. (2014). Asian critical theory (AsianCrit). In M.Y. Danico (Ed.), *Asian American society: An encyclopedia* (pp. 95–98). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications and Association for Asian American Studies. doi: 10.4135/9781452281889

Museus, S. D. (2013). Unpacking the complex and multifaceted nature of parental influences on Southeast Asian American college students' educational trajectories. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *84*, 708–738. doi:10.1353/jhe.2013.0031

Museus, S. D. (2014). *Asian American students in higher education*. New York: Routledge.

Museus, S. D., & Iftikar, J. (2014). Asian Critical Theory (AsianCrit). In M. Y. Danico & J. G. Golsom (Eds.), *Asian American society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications and Association for Asian American Studies.

Museus, S. D., & Kiang, P. N. (2009). The model minority myth and how it contributes to the invisible minority reality in higher education research. In S. D. Museus (Ed.), *Conducting research on Asian Americans in higher education: New directions for institutional research* (pp. 5–15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Museus, S. D., Ledesma, M. C., & Parker, T. L. (2015). *Racism and racial equity in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Museus, S. D., & Park, J. J. (2015). The continuing significances of racism in the lives of Asian American college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *56*, 551–569. doi:10.1353/csd.2015.0059

Museus, S. D., Ravello, J. N., & Vega, B. E. (2012). The campus racial culture: A critical race counterstory. In S. D. Museus & U. M. Jayakumar (Eds.), *Creating campus cultures: Fostering success among racially diverse student populations* (pp. 28–45). New York: Routledge.

Museus, S. D., & Saelua, N. (2014). The power of intersectionality in higher education research: The case of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education. In D. Mitchell Jr. (Ed.), *Intersectionality and higher education: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 68–77). New York: Peter Lang.

Museus, S. D., & Truong, K. A. (2013). Racism and sexism in cyberspace: Engaging stereotypes of Asian American women and men to facilitate student learning and development. *About Campus*, *18*, 14–21. doi:10.1002/abc.21126

Nakanishi, D. T. (1990). Why i fought. *Amerasia Journal*, *16*(1), 139–158.

National Education Association (2012). *API students at increased risk for bullying*. Retrieved from: http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/API-StudentsatIncreasedRiskforBullying.pdf

Ngo, B. (2006). Learning from the margins: The education of Southeast and South Asian Americans in context. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *9*, 51–65. doi:10.1080/13613320500490721

Ngo, B., & Lee, S. (2007). Complicating the image of model minority success: A review of Southeast Asian American education. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*, 415–453. doi:10.3102/0034654307309918

Nguyen, H. T. (2012). What role do race, ethnicity, language and gender play in the teaching profession?. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *15*(5), 653–681. doi:10.1080/13613324.2011.624504

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Osajima, K. (1995). Racial politics and the invisibility of Asian Americans in higher education. *Educational Foundations*, *9*, 35–53.

Osajima, K. (2007). Replenishing the ranks: Raising critical consciousness among Asian Americans. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, *10*, 59–83. doi:10.1353/jaas.2007.0006

Park, J. J., & Liu, A. (2014). Interest convergence or divergence? A critical race analysis of Asian Americans, meritocracy, and critical mass in the affirmative action debate. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *85*(1), 36–64. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2014.0001

Phillips, S. L. (1998). The convergence of the critical race theory workshop with LatCrit theory: A history. *University of Miami Law Review*, *53*, 1247–1256.

Poon, O. A., & Sihite, E. (2016). Racial anxieties, uncertainties, and misinformation: A complex picture of Asian Americans and selective college admissions. In M. Zhou & A. C. Ocampo (Eds.), *Contemporary Asian America: A multidisciplinary reader* (3rd ed., pp. 508–528). New York, NY: NYU Press.

Poon, O. Y., Squire, D., Kodama, C., Byrd, A., Chan, J., Manzano, L., … 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*, 469–502. doi:10.3102/0034654315612205

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1996). *Immigrant America: A portrait* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Rhee, J., & Sagaria, M. A. D. (2004). International students: Constructions of imperialism in the Chronicle of Higher Education. *The Review of Higher Education*, *28*, 77–96. doi:10.1353/rhe.2004.0031

Said, E. W. (1994). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2002). A critical race counterstory of race, racism, and affirmative action. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *35*, 155–168. doi:10.1080/713845284

Spivak, G. (1987). *In other worlds*. London: Routledge.

Suzuki, B. H. (2002). Revisiting the model minority stereotype: Implications for student affairs practice and higher education. *Working with Asian American College Students: New Directions for Student Services*, *2002*, 21–32. doi: 10.1002/ss.36

Suzuki, B. H. (1977). Education and the socialization of Asian Americans: A revisionist analysis of the 'model minority' thesis. *Amerasia Journal*, *4*, 23–51. doi:10.17953/amer.4.2.x203l74863857108

Takaki, R. (1998). *Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans* (rev. edition). New York: Little, Brown & Company.

Tamura, E. H. (2001). Asian Americans in the history of education: An historiographical essay. *History of Education Quarterly*, *41*, 58–71. doi:10.1111/j.1748-5959.2001.tb00074.x

Tamura, E. H. (2003). Asian Americans and educational history. *History of Education Quarterly*, *43*, 1–9. doi:10.1111/j.1748-5959.2003.tb00112.x

Teranishi, R. T. (2010). *Asians in the ivory tower: Dilemmas of racial inequality in American higher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Tran, M., & Chang, M. J. (2013). To be mice or men: Gender identity and development of masculinity through participation in Asian American interest fraternities. In S. D. Museus, D. C. Maramba, & R. T. Teranishi (Eds.), *The misrepresented minority: New insights on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and their implications for higher education* (pp. 68–92). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Umemoto, K. (1989). 'On strike!' San Francisco State College strike, 1968-69: The role of Asian American students. *Amerasia Journal*, *15*, 3–41. doi:10.17953/amer.15.1.7213030j5644rx25

Valdes, F. (1996). Latina/o ethnicities, critical race theory, and post-identity politics in postmodern legal culture: From practices to possibilities. *La Raza Law Journal*, *9*, 1–31. doi:10.15779/Z38236B

Warmington, P. (2009). Taking race out of scare quotes: Race-conscious social analysis in an ostensibly post-racial world. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *12*, 281–296. doi:10.1080/13613320903178253

Wu, F. H. (2001). *Yellow: Race in America beyond Black and White*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Wu, F. H. (1995). Neither Black nor White: Asian Americans and affirmative action. *BC Third World LJ*, *15*, 225.

Yamamoto, E. K. (1997). Critical race praxis: Race theory and political lawyering practice in post-civil rights America. *Michigan Law Review*, *95*, 821–900. doi:10.2307/1290048

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*, 69–91. doi:10.1080/1361332052000341006

Yosso, T., Smith, W., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*, 659–690. doi:10.17763/haer.79.4.m6867014157m707l

Yu, T. (2006). Challenging the politics of the 'model minority' stereotype: A case for educational equity. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *39*, 325–333. doi:10.1080/10665680600932333