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Several misconceptions shape the discourse on affirmative action and Asian Americans, and institutions of higher education should do more to challenge these myths and educate the public about the realities of this debate.
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For the last four decades, affirmative action has consistently been one of the most significant policy issues in higher education. For proponents of affirmative action, this concept serves as a symbol of equal opportunity and the struggle for racial equity. Today, affirmative action is also a critical element of the capacity of educational institutions to design diverse learning environments that are critical to fulfilling their educational and civic missions (Hurtado, 2007; Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005).

The ongoing debate over whether affirmative action policies should be allowed continues to be fought in the courts and broader public arena. As we discuss in the following sections, new challenges to the legality of affirmative action are making their way through the court system. Outside of the courts, opponents of affirmative action often challenge these policies through legislation and referenda at the state level. As a result of these realities, it is unclear what the future might hold for affirmative action. What is clearer is the reality that antiaffirmative action advocates will continue to challenge these policies. Given the reality that current challenges to affirmative action revolve around accusations that it harms Asian Americans, it is also becoming increasingly apparent that this population might play a significant role in how these challenges and responses to them unfold.

It could be argued that it has never been more important that higher education make efforts to ensure that the public is well-informed about the nature of affirmative action policies and their consequences. It would also behoove institutions of higher education to pay more attention to how affirmative action might be affecting Asian American populations and make efforts to educate the public about this relationship so that
people can make more informed assessments regarding the impact of these policies. In the following sections, we discuss the historical and racial contexts of current affirmative action debates and how Asian Americans are positioned within this discourse. Then, we outline five major misconceptions that permeate conversations about affirmative action and Asian Americans. Finally, we conclude with a set of recommendations for institutions of higher education that seek to educate the public about affirmative action and Asian Americans. Our hope is that this chapter underscores the nature of these misconceptions and offers a call to action, prompting institutions of higher education to be more proactive in educating the public about them.

Legacies of Racism and Colorblind Ideologies

Before discussing the ways in which Asian Americans are positioned in the affirmative action debate, it is useful to clarify how racism permeates the foundations of the U.S. higher education system. Higher education is deeply rooted in legacies of racism that provide ample opportunities for some privileged groups while limiting access for others (Wilder, 2013). Early higher education institutions emerged in the 1600s, during an era in which communities of color had few rights, Black people were still enslaved, and genocide was being committed against Native populations. During this time, colonial colleges were built to educate elite, White clergymen.

Institutions of higher education continued to explicitly and unapologetically deny access to communities of color until the mid-twentieth century, when widespread social movements catalyzed the implementation of policies and programs to promote greater racial equity. During this period, Asian Americans and other communities of color that were historically denied entry to many social institutions fought for greater access to them. These movements placed pressures on the government to expand access to opportunities for people of color. In 1961, as one of many policies and efforts to expand such access, President John F. Kennedy signed Executive Order 10925, which required contractors receiving government funding to take affirmative action to ensure that they do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, gender, sexual orientation, or national origin (Bowen & Bok, 1998). This policy was intended to ensure opportunity for historically oppressed groups that faced significant inequities.

While many members of society were engaged in efforts to eradicate racism during the Civil Rights Movement, many people continued to deny evidence that racism was responsible for existing racial inequities and pointed to perceived deficiencies of communities of color as the root cause of these disparities. Case in point: In 1965, the U.S. Department of Labor released the Moynihan Report, a national publication that was written by Assistant Secretary of Labor Daniel Moynihan and assessed the
causes and state of racial inequities in society. The report underscored White Supremacy as a main source of existing challenges within the Black community, but also discussed the impact that systemic racism had on the state of families in these communities. After the release of the report, media outlets and commentators focused discourse on elements of the report that reinforced deficit views of Black communities and beliefs that the collapse of the Black nuclear family was responsible for the higher poverty levels within these communities (Patterson, 2010).

The societal response to the Moynihan report underscores one salient example of how colorblind ideologies reinforce deficit views of communities of color. Colorblind ideologies suggest that people should not be judged by the color of their skin and the best way to end racism is to avoid focusing on it (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). These ideologies lead people to believe in equal opportunity, disregard the impact of racism on social outcomes, and attribute racial inequities to cultural and individual deficiencies among people of color. Scholars have noted that colorblind ideologies have become a common frame for the White majority, but they are also adopted by people of color who are socialized into U.S. society.

Colorblind ideologies heavily shape affirmative action debates as well (Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Carter Andrews & Tuitt, 2013; Park & Liu, 2014). Colorblindness masks the salience of systemic racism in disproportionately denying communities of color access to equal K-12 opportunities, rigorous college preparatory curricula, and college preparatory support services. In addition, colorblind ideologies safeguard elements of admissions processes that are racially biased and disadvantage communities of color. For example, these perspectives suggest that applicants should be judged on individual merit, and reinforce assumptions that standardized tests, grade point averages, and class rankings are legitimate and objective methods of assessing students’ prior performance, aptitude, and likelihood of success in college (Baez, 2006). In turn, these colorblind tools re-inscribe colorblind ideologies (Museus, Ledesma, & Parker, 2015).

It is important to note that colorblindness ignores the reality that legacy admissions policies provide advantages to descendants of university alumni in admissions processes and disproportionately benefit White applicants, as their parents are more likely to have attended prestigious universities compared to the parents of their racially minoritized peers (Ladewski, 2010; Lamb, 1993). In fact, studies show that applicants whose parents graduated from a university are 45% more likely to gain admission over applicants with no familial connection (Hurwitz, 2011). Similarly, applicants who have a sibling, grandparent, or other relative (e.g., aunt or uncle) who graduated from a university are 14% more likely to be admitted compared to someone with no legacy status (Hurwitz, 2011). In sum, colorblindness obscures the ways in which race shapes admissions processes to disadvantage applicants of color. Moreover, these colorblind ideologies reinforce and are reinforced by the model minority myth.
The Model Minority Myth in Affirmative Action Debates

Many scholars also consider the 1960s to mark the rise of the model minority stereotype of Asian Americans in U.S. society (e.g., Lee, 2015; Museus, Antonio, & Kiang, 2016). The Moynihan Report and society’s interpretation and application of its findings juxtaposed stereotypically cohesive Asian American families and low poverty rates with single-parent Black families and high poverty rates. The following year, stories of Asian Americans as model minorities who transcend racism, excel, and realize the “American dream” of upward mobility began to emerge in popular media outlets and this dominant narrative spread (Suzuki, 1977). Opponents of the civil right movement utilized this story of Asian Americans as overwhelmingly or universally successful to minimize beliefs in the impact of racism on the social outcomes of other communities of color. They reinforced the message that, if Asian Americans can overcome racism and succeed, then other populations of color should be able to do so as well.

Emerging federal policies and demographic trends would further reinforce the model minority stereotype. For example, the 1965 Immigration Act opened the nation’s doors to many educated professionals from Asia to fill existing science and technology jobs and help the United States meet its workforce needs (Museus, 2014). As a result, between 1970 and 1980, the Asian American population rapidly increased from approximately 1.5–3.5 million (Lee, 2008), and Asian American enrollments in higher education rose as well. The influx of relatively educated Asian immigrants pulled the average educational level of this population upward and further reinforced the existing distorted portrait of Asian Americans as model minorities (Lee, 2008; Museus, 2008; Museus & Kiang, 2009).

Since the mid-twentieth century, White supremacy has deployed the model minority stereotype to reinforce racial inequities in multiple ways (Museus et al., 2016). First, this trope is used to justify the exclusion of Asian Americans from racial discourse, their invisibility within higher education and other sectors (e.g., health and politics), and the dismissal of their racial challenges and need for support (Museus & Kiang, 2009; Suzuki, 2002). Second, the model minority trope suggests that Asian Americans have transcended racism and contributed to a false narrative that individual efforts are deterministic of social outcomes (Moses, Maeda, & Paguyo, 2018). In doing so, this skewed portrayal of Asian American experiences and outcomes masks the systemic nature of racism and downplays its disastrous effects on communities of color. Thus, this stereotype reinforces colorblind views of success that attribute racial inequities to individual deficiencies in Black, Latinx, and Indigenous communities.

The model minority trope also influences affirmative action discourse in significant ways. When Asian Americans are invoked in conversations about affirmative action, they are typically utilized as a tool to justify either side of the debate (Chin, Cho, Kang, & Wu, 1996; Kidder, 2005; Park &
Liu, 2014). Antiaffirmative action advocates misleadingly argue that these “overachievers” are victims of affirmative action and unrewarded for their hard work and determination, while proaffirmative action advocates often ignore Asian Americans because they complicate the debate.

**Battle Over Affirmative Action in the Courts and Community**

As mentioned, it can be argued that the battle over affirmative action takes place in two arenas: the court system and broader community. In 1978, the Supreme Court heard their first case focused on affirmative action: *Bakke v. Regents of University of California*. In this case, a White plaintiff sued the University of California because he was denied admission to the University of California, Davis medical school. The Supreme Court relied on social science research indicating that diversity is an essential ingredient to facilitating a wide range of key learning outcomes in college (Chang, Denson, Saenz, & Misa, 2006; Milem et al., 2005). In their decision, the Supreme Court declared racial quotas unconstitutional but upheld the legality of affirmative action and race-conscious admission policies, concluding that institutions of higher education had a compelling state interest to admit a diverse student body because such diversity was an essential ingredient to an optimal learning environment.

Despite the fact that the Supreme Court has clearly and consistently differentiated between racial quotas and utilizing race in admissions to achieve sufficient diversity in their student bodies since the *Bakke* decision, these two practices are often incorrectly conflated in broader conversations about affirmative action (Chin et al., 1996). The common misconception that racial quotas and affirmative action are the same thing might also contribute to common misconceptions that affirmative action constitutes a “free pass” for historically marginalized students.

Since the *Bakke* decision, this diversity rationale has been the main argument among many proponents of affirmative action. Approximately 25 years later, the Supreme Court heard two cases in which White plaintiffs sued the University of Michigan because they were denied admission to the campus in *Gratz v. Bollinger* (2003) and *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003). And, another decade later, the Supreme Court heard two cases in which another White plaintiff sued the University of Texas because she was denied admission to the institution in *Fisher v. University of Texas* (2013) and *Fisher v. University of Texas II* (2016). In each of these cases, plaintiffs claimed that the university admissions policies effectively discriminated against more deserving White applicants to admit people of color. And, in all of these cases, the Supreme Court reinforced the *Bakke* decision.

Especially relevant to the current discussion is the fact that the Supreme Court’s final opinions in its last affirmative action case (*Fisher v. University of Texas II*) underscored the impact of University of Texas admission policies on Asian Americans multiple times. The Court invoking the
perceived impact of affirmative action on Asian Americans suggests that these effects played an important role in how the Court made sense of the fairness of the university’s admission practices and came to conclusions about the legality of these policies. Most notable is Justice Alito’s dissenting opinion in which he critiqued the University of Texas for not explaining how it takes affirmative action to ensure access for Asian Americans in areas in which they might be underrepresented and his perception that the university discriminated against these students. It is important to note that there is no compelling evidence that the University of Texas discriminated against Asian American applicants. What is evident is that Justice Alito’s opinion was a harbinger of the next wave of legal challenges to affirmative action, as the cases currently making their way through the courts center on arguments that race-conscious policies discriminate against high-achieving Asian Americans (Chin et al., 1996; Kidder, 2000; Takagi, 1992).

Arguably, the most visible case challenging affirmative action today is Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard, which is currently progressing through the court system. In this case, Asian American students, who were rejected by Harvard University and are led by conservative antiaffirmative action advocate Edward Blum, are suing Harvard University. The plaintiffs are accusing Harvard of illegally discriminating against Asian Americans to challenge the legality of the university’s use of race in admissions. Specifically, the plaintiffs are arguing that the university has set a cap on the number of Asian Americans who are accepted and that the institution holds Asian Americans to higher standards in comparison to applicants of other races by manipulating non-academic components of its process, including a “personal rating.” Harvard does not deny that it pursues a diverse class each year by utilizing a holistic review process and a personal rating score, but it does reject arguments that it uses racial quotas or discriminates against Asian Americans to achieve it.

In the public sphere, at least six states have decided to ban affirmative action practices at public institutions of higher education via state referenda and two other states have prohibited the use of race in college admissions through legislative action (Potter, 2014). These realities underscore the fact that the public plays a critical role in shaping the affirmative action debate through the power of their vote. The public can also place pressure on elected officials to advocate for a particular perspective that might profoundly influence the nature and outcomes of policy debates. Finally, the public can provide visibility and support for the mobilization of efforts to disband affirmative action. For example, Students for Fair Admissions claims that it has 22,000 supporters backing its efforts to challenge Harvard’s use of race in admissions, and this support led the courts to conclude that their case had legal standing (Carapezza, 2018).

The focus of public discourse on individual applicants’ qualifications and admission outcomes at the expense of deeper conversations about systemic oppression and diversity could be one reason that affirmative
action has suffered several setbacks in the public arena. If public discourse is founded on colorblind beliefs in meritocracy that reinforce individual achievement as a main focus, then it could be argued that the public is more likely to use such meritocratic values as they understand and develop an (mis)perceptions these policies and adopt antiaffirmative action sentiments. Therefore, it is important to excavate common and problematic assumptions about affirmative action. The remainder of this chapter focuses on exposing major misconceptions related to discourse on affirmative action and Asian American communities specifically and their implications for policy and practice.

Five Common Misconceptions About Affirmative Action and Asian Americans

In this section, we present five common misconceptions that permeate the discourse related to affirmative action and Asian Americans in the public sphere. Our discussion of these myths is informed by an analysis of national mainstream media outlets’ coverage of affirmative action and Asian Americans over the last year. The list of misconceptions outlined herein is not intended to be exhaustive but is designed to spark discussion about the need to challenge these myths and foster greater awareness about affirmative action and Asian Americans in the public sphere.

Misconception #1: Discrimination Against Asian Americans is Affirmative Action. Dominant narratives suggest that affirmative action and any use of race in college admissions are the same thing. In addition, dominant discourses often imply that affirmative action is equivalent to the use of race to discriminate against Asian Americans in admissions practices. In reality, these are two different phenomena. As we discuss in previous sections, the purpose of affirmative action policies and programs is to ensure that historically oppressed communities of color have access to opportunities that they have been denied. Therefore, discrimination against Asian Americans, a group that has been the victim of significant racial oppression in the United States, is actually contradictory to the purposes of affirmative action. This point has been made by previous scholars, who have differentiated racial discrimination toward Asian Americans in college admissions processes—a process that has been called negative action—from affirmative action (Chin, Cho, Kang, & Wu, 1996; Kidder, 2005).

Moreover, the need to achieve diversity on college campuses has been the primary argument used to defend affirmative action policies over the last three decades (Moses & Chang, 2006). The institutions being challenged in the courts are predominantly White and the diversity rationale would justify them taking affirmative action to ensure that communities of color have access to and are represented on their campuses, as such practices would increase the level of diversity at their institutions. In contrast, it is difficult to find any institution at which Asian Americans comprise a
majority of the student body. Thus, affirmative action to achieve a diverse student body can never be executed through discrimination against Asian Americans in admissions processes. It is critical to disentangle these two separate conversations.

**Misconception #2: “Objective” Measures of Merit Prove That Asian Americans are More Deserving.** Discourse on affirmative action and Asian Americans rarely focuses on challenging problematic narrow definitions or merit and the purportedly “objective” methods of measuring it. Indeed, the vast majority of discourse around affirmative action centers the notion that Asian Americans are more meritorious than other groups, based on their standardized test scores and grade-point averages (Park & Liu, 2014). As such, this discourse appears to be based on the assumption that these simplistic metrics are the only legitimate measures of merit because they are objective. Under this assumption, any Asian American students who are denied admission and have test scores or grades that are higher than non-Asian American applicants are framed as victims of admission policies, because it is assumed that other more biased (and therefore less legitimate) measures were used to make these decisions.

The notion that standardized tests and high school grades are more objective than other measures of assessing merit lacks sufficient evidentiary basis. Scholars have provided evidence that bias permeates the process of constructing and utilizing test instruments and disadvantages communities of color (Jencks, 1998). Researchers have also generated a plethora of evidence that stereotypes of people of color as academically deficient cause spotlight anxiety, or fear of confirming these stereotypes when taking tests (Whaley, 2018). Finally, more well-resourced communities have greater access to resources, rigorous curricula, and test preparation programs, which are linked to improved test performance and achievement (Lareau, 2011; Li & Xiong, 2018). Given that Black, Latinx, Native American, Pacific Islander, and Southeast Asian American students tend to come from less resourced communities, they are less likely to have access to resources to perform on standardized tests as effectively as their White peers who might have similar levels of ability and motivation. In sum, racial and cultural bias permeate these measures of merit that are misleadingly framed as objective.

**Misconception #3: Diversity and Merit are Mutually Exclusive, and Supporting Asian American Applicants Means That You Value Merit Over Diversity.** Affirmative action discourse often positions diversity and merit as oppositional to one another (Chin et al., 1996). As a result, the discussion is often framed as a debate over whether achieving a diverse student body or embracing values of merit is more important. For example, one recent National Public Radio article quoted an Asian American student and stated that she is “on the fence about affirmative action: Diversity on college campuses is important, but she also believes that admissions should be based on merit” (Chow, 2018). The implication of this juxtaposition is
that, if one believes that diversity is more important, then they should support affirmative action policies and be okay with the sacrifices of individual Asian American applicants who are denied admission but are more deserving than their peers with lower test scores and grades. This comparison also suggests that, if one does not consider diversity to be more important than relying on objective assessments of merit, then they should be against affirmative action policies and believe that Asian American applicants with higher test performance should always be admitted over their counterparts with lower scores and grades.

Diversity and merit are not mutually exclusive. College applicants and students are more prepared to function in a diverse society if they are open to and accepting of diverse communities (Chang et al., 2006). In addition, if higher education has a responsibility to prepare college students and graduates to function in a diverse society, then college applicants with particular characteristics—such as deep knowledge of often invisible and underserved communities—are especially prepared and qualified to contribute to more robust learning environments for all students on these campuses and a diverse democracy after college (Museus, 2019). Thought about in this way, diversity and merit are inextricably intertwined. Moreover, under this conceptualization of merit, Asian Americans arguably have opportunities to excel equal to other groups.

**Misconception #4: Asian Americans are Competing Against Other People of Color for the Same Seats in College.** Discourse on affirmative action often suggests that a seat that is not given to a qualified Asian American who is denied admission must be allocated to another person of color who is not Asian American nor equally qualified (Zaveri, 2018). This overly simplistic framing of college admissions processes pits Asian Americans and other communities of color against each other.

The reality is that seats that are not occupied by Asian Americans can be filled by many Asian Americans or other people with lower test scores for many different reasons. To name a few examples, the spot could be given to a White applicant whose parents have a relationship with the institution, another Asian American applicant who brings geographic diversity to the campus, or another person who has more experience engaging in community service activities. Equally important, given that discrimination against Asian Americans should never be considered affirmative action as discussed above, any consideration or examination of admission policies that might be discriminating against communities of color should be based on comparisons between the White majority and the specific community of color in question. However, it is important to note that, without concrete evidence of discrimination taking place, unequal acceptance rates do not equate to discrimination.

**Misconception #5: Asian Americans are Uniformly Harmed by Race-Conscious Policies.** The model minority myth is associated with assumptions that Asian Americans are all the same and universally
successful (Museus & Kiang, 2009), which contributes to misconceptions that Asian Americans are always more qualified than non-Asian Americans according to colorblind and purportedly objective measures of merit. This misconception can lead to false narratives that Asian Americans are consistently and uniformly victims of any admission policies or practices that utilize assessment measures beyond test scores and grades.

Many scholars have debunked this myth and noted that Asian Americans have benefited from affirmative action agendas and policies (Chin et al., 1996; Kang, 1996; Park & Liu, 2014; Wu, 1995). These researchers note that Asian Americans benefit from the positive outcomes that result from diversity in college, that some Asian American subgroups are underrepresented and should be beneficiaries of affirmative action, and that affirmative action could be a mechanism to combat the effects of negative action. In addition, there is evidence that Asian Americans continue to be underrepresented in many spheres of society, such as leadership positions (see Chapter 7), media (Smith, Choueiti, & Pieper, 2017), and politics (Krogstad, 2015). Thus, there are still many arenas in which Asian Americans can benefit from affirmative action and the utilization of race to ensure equal opportunity for historically oppressed groups.

Recommendations for Institutional Policy and Practice

The preceding discussion has several important implications for institutions of higher education that seek increased public support for affirmative action policies. Due to space limitations, we offer a few of them herein.

Invest Resources and Energy in Educating the Public. If institutions of higher education want the public to understand how affirmative action impacts all communities, they must invest more resources and energy in educating the public about the facts related to these policies. Too many misconceptions continue to shape public discourse and opinions about affirmative action and Asian Americans, providing opportunities for antiaffirmative action advocates to exploit these myths, mobilize people against affirmative action, and spread misinformed but convincing arguments to challenge these policies. Therefore, institutions should make concerted efforts to expose pervasive misconceptions and educate the public about facts related to affirmative action’s impact on Asian Americans.

Begin with Differentiating between Affirmative Action and Negative Action in Public Discourse. The notion that affirmative action for Black, Latinx, Native American, or Pacific Islander populations requires decreased access for Asian Americans heavily shapes discourse around these policies (Ruthig, Kehn, Gamblin, Vanderzanden, & Jones, 2017). This zero-sum framing functions to conflate affirmative action and negative action, enabling antiaffirmative action opponents to exploit these myths, mobilize people against affirmative action, and spread misinformed but convincing arguments to challenge these policies. Therefore, institutions should make concerted efforts to expose pervasive misconceptions and educate the public about facts related to affirmative action’s impact on Asian Americans.
This zero-sum perspective can also exacerbate racial tensions within and across communities of color and hinder efforts to mobilize collective support for affirmative action policies. Discussions about discrimination against Asian Americans in admissions should start with a clarification of the distinction between negative action and affirmative action.

**Clarify How Affirmative Action is Used to Ensure Equal Opportunity for Asian Americans.** It is common practice for colleges and universities to ignore Asian Americans in discussions about diversity in general and in conversations about affirmative action in particular. This exclusion is not surprising, given that the model minority stereotype that dominates thinking about this population suggests that they do not face race-related challenges (Museus & Kiang, 2009). However, if institutions neglect Asian Americans in conversations about affirmative action, it might leave the former ill-equipped to effectively respond to accusations that they are discriminating against this population. In contrast, if institutions can clearly articulate how they are considering Asian Americans in their efforts to construct a diverse student body, then they might be able to more effectively dissolve support for challenges to affirmative action. However, doing so requires that institutions thoughtfully engage this population in conversations about affirmative action. Such articulation can also allow institutions to monitor their processes and ensure they are not allowing implicit biases to lead to negative action.

**Center Legacy Admissions and Other Biased Aspects of Admissions Processes in the Debate.** Existing evidence related to legacy admissions and bias in academic performance measures suggests that dismantling affirmative action will not eradicate inequities faced by Asian American and other communities of color within admissions processes. Centering these racially inequitable aspects of admissions processes in conversations about affirmative action can help promote a more complex understanding of college admissions by challenging colorblind meritocratic perspectives and misconceptions surrounding the purpose and impact of affirmative action policies. Focusing on these aspects of the debate can also clarify and expand awareness regarding how affirmative action provides balance in admissions processes that are already designed to disadvantage Asian Americans and other communities of color.

** Adopt and Develop More Equitable Definitions and Measures of Merit.** Institutions rely on traditional definitions of merit that are assumed to be objective but perpetuate structural inequity and bias. As the Harvard case illustrates, they also utilize other measures of assessment in holistic review processes. Campuses should consider how they can execute holistic review of applicants in ways that center their qualifications from an equity-oriented perspective (Garces & Jayakumar, 2014; Museus, 2019). For example, the National Institute for Transformation and Equity (NITE) published a brief that outlines six criteria to evaluate applicants’ capacities to contribute to a diverse learning environment and democracy, including...
knowledge of underserved communities, collectivist orientations, compassion, commitment to serve underserved populations, understandings of systems of oppression, and commitments to challenging injustice (Museus, 2019). Such equity-oriented tools should be engaged, utilized, refined, and leveraged to create a national movement to center equitable, rather than inequitable, definitions of merit.
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