DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 315 HE 004 031

AUTHOR Yoshioka, Robert B.; And Others
TITLE Asian-Americans and Public Higher Education in California.
INSTITUTION California State Legislature, Sacramento. Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.
PUB DATE Feb 73
NOTE 164p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Educational Improvement; Equal Education; *Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Relations; *Higher Education; Master Plans; *Minority Groups; *Racial Discrimination; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Asian Americans; California

ABSTRACT

Asian Americans in urban, suburban, and rural areas of California encounter complex social, economic, and psychological problems. Many are confronted by political insensitivity, economic exploitation, overt and covert racism as well as blatant and de facto forms of discrimination. Most educational institutions in California fail to respond to the educational needs of Asian Americans. Access to higher education does not assure the opportunity to learn about the problems facing the various communities; no forum is provided in which Asian students can explore creative solutions to these problems in the formal course of their studies. This document describes the situation of Asian Americans in postsecondary education and recommends reasonable alternatives that will hopefully result in a greater degree of educational self-determination for Asian Americans as well as the general populations. (HS)

ASIAN-AMERICANS AND PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

ROBERT B. YOSHIOKA, COORDINATOR
PAT HAYASHI
KIRKMAN LOK
KAZUAKI A. OTA
JOYCE SAKAI
COLIN WATANABE

PREPARED FOR

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

ASIAN AMERICANS AND PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

Robert B. Yoshioka, Coordinator
Patrick S. Hayashi
Kirkman Lok
Kazuaki Ota
Joyce K. Sakai
Colin Watanabe

Prepared for

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

California Legislature
Assembly Post Office Box 83
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Assemblymen	Senators
John Vasconcellos (Chairman)	Howard Way (Vice Chairman)
Willie Brown	Alfred Alquist
Jerry Lewis	Dennis Carpenter
Ken Meade	Mervyn Dymally
John Stull	Albert Rodda

Patrick M. Callan, Consultant
Daniel Friedlander, Assistant Consultant
Sue Powell, Assistant Consultant
Elizabeth Richter, Secretary

February, 1973

This is one of three reports on minority participation - quantitative and qualitative - in California higher education. The papers were commissioned by the California Legislature's Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.

The primary purpose of these papers is to give legislators an overview of a given policy area. Most of the papers are directed toward synthesis and analysis of existing information and perspectives rather than the gathering of new data. The authors were asked to raise and explore prominent issues and to suggest policies available to the Legislature in dealing with those issues.

The Joint Committee has not restricted its consultants to discussions and recommendations in those areas which fall exclusively within the scope of legislative responsibility. The authors were encouraged to direct comments to individual institutions, segmental offices, state agencies--or wherever seemed appropriate. It is hoped that these papers will stimulate public, segmental and institutional discussion of the critical issues in postsecondary education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Responsible and responsive government is possible when the public it serves is conceptualized pluralistically rather than monistically. Sound policy is generated by taking into account the diversity of articulated positions in an orderly and reasonable manner by duly elected deliberative bodies. It is our purpose to present several alternative "visions" of our educational system, and to recommend courses of action based on our demonstrated special interests and needs without sacrificing the general thrust of higher education as we perceive it; that is, its function of relating to the needs of the larger societal context. We seek to project alternative courses of action which better serve our educational priorities without compromising anyone's quest for quality and excellence. We will describe the situation of Asian Americans in postsecondary education and recommend reasonable alternatives which will hopefully result in a greater degree of educational self-determination for us as well as for the general population.

Asian Americans in urban, suburban, and rural areas of California encounter complex social, economic, and psychological problems. Many of us are confronted by political insensitivity, economic exploitation, overt and covert racism as well as blatant and de facto forms of discrimination. Substandard social service and health care delivery systems are endemic in many of our communities. These problems defy simplistic solutions. It is clear that Asian

Americans must take the lead in our quest for realistic solutions since our disadvantaged members distrust the well-meaning attempts made by "outsiders" who try to resolve our problems for us. But members of such communities cannot hope to solve their own complex problems without the expertise that can best be acquired through some kind of formal educational experience.

Most educational institutions in California fail to respond to the educational needs of Asian Americans. For example, young immigrants (first generation "Americans") who attend elementary and secondary schools are frequently bewildered by the foreign language environment in which they find themselves. Mastery of English is a critical skill. Without minimal fluency, these youngsters are unable to define or articulate their difficulty and therefore receive little or no aid from their teachers and counselors. Because they cannot effectively utilize their time in school, they soon find that they are unprepared for postsecondary education. A cycle of educational failure is set in motion.

Access to higher education does not assure us of the opportunity to learn about the problems facing our various communities; no forum is provided in which we may explore creative solutions to these problems in the normal course of our studies. Most of us are not provided the skills, direction, and motivation necessary to begin an analytical search for solutions, nor are we given the opportunity to learn about ourselves, our history, and our culture.

Asian Americans suffer from what Ralph Ellison has called the

"invisibility" of ethnic minorities; we suffer from neglect in the educational process. Most Asian American students fortunate enough to attend college generally choose safe, secure professions. Within one or two brief generations, they blend into the larger society and turn from the pressing social, political, and economic concerns of their less fortunate brethren. In this respect, they, too, illustrate the ironic dimension of the ethnic "invisibility" described above.

While many of the educational problems which we will identify in this report can best be solved by comprehensive far-reaching legislative action, we see the first steps in this process to be linked effectively with more efficient utilization of existing educational potential to aid in achieving beneficial social and educational changes for Asian Americans. We maintain that all segments of public higher education must re-examine their goals and objectives in order to define clearly the relevance of their present policies and curricula with regard to our needs.

This position paper was commissioned for specific and concrete reasons. From the outset, protracted discussions with staff members of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education made it clear that the primary thrust of our presentation was to be educational. We interpreted this charge as twofold: informational and analytical. We determined that we were to present a critical descriptive narrative detailing the nature and extent of Asian American participation in public higher education; second, we would evaluate Asian American Studies Programs throughout California in

an attempt to delineate their role and function in the general structure of public higher education.

The culmination of our study resulted in the articulation of a set of substantive recommendations which we believe should be seriously considered for implementation by the Legislature in the forthcoming revision of the Master Plan for Higher Education. Our approach took the form of the following overview presented here in chapter sequence.

I. The Problem. We begin by establishing the parameters of this study. The most critical discussion involves the definition of the term "Asian American." Subsequently, we distinguish stereotypic misconceptions applied to Asian Americans in higher education. Further, we address the comments made by the Carnegie Commission as well as the pertinent observations of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Specific reference is made to the cases of Chinese Americans, Japanese Americans, Pilipinos (Filipinos), Korean Americans, and Asian American women.

II. The Pre-College Experience. In this chapter we examine the experience of Asian American students prior to their entry into college. The statistical information disclosed by our research is of particular interest as well as our perception of the nexus of problems confronting Asian Americans vis-a-vis language.

III. The Current Status of Asian Americans in Higher Education. This section focuses on the problem of uniform and fair access to higher education for Asian Americans. Beginning with a discussion of how Asian Americans have fared under the Master

Plan, we turn to an analysis of the fallacy involved in using gross statistical data as the foundation on which to construct educational priorities. The assessment of Asian Americans provided by such data is automatically transferred to such heterogeneous groups as Pilipinos, Koreans and others ("The Etcetera People") without acknowledging that these segments of the Asian American population receive no separate statistical representation in the data itself.

IV. Placement. We examine the ways in which the three segments of public higher education address the problems of job placement for Asian Americans. We investigate the present structure of placement operations and point to areas in which these services, as adjuncts to the formal educational structure, can be made responsive to our needs.

V. Asian American Communities and Higher Education. Endeavoring to abstract significant information from Asian American community sources, we utilized a comprehensive questionnaire. This test instrument was designed to solicit data concerning perceived community needs which can be met through participation in the educational process. In so doing, we submitted a perspectival overview that is often omitted from educational policy discussions.

VI. Continuing Education and Retraining. In contradistinction to previous sections of this report, this chapter deals with specific programmatic possibilities already existing, in part, within each segment of public higher education. We set forth priorities which could be readily implemented within the current

structure of continuing education programs. To facilitate our recommendations, we discuss specific measures which would be beneficial to Asian Americans seeking to develop new skills or undertaking professional retraining. We stress (1) that provisions for bilingual training become an integral part of these programs particularly re Chinese Americans and Pilipinos; (2) that these programs be made accessible to all segments of the Asian American population regardless of statistical representation.

VII. Asian American Studies. At this juncture we move from a consideration of Asian Americans within the context of public higher education to an assessment of the impact of Asian American Studies Programs and courses on the educational structure. This section discusses systematically the institutional responses regarding Asian American Studies. Various programs are evaluated in situ. Our research suggests that they provide the creative vehicles for dealing with the nexus of articulated needs surrounding each program's inception, expansion and operation.

VIII. Recommendations. This chapter summarizes the recommendations which we make throughout the body of the report. Each recommendation is keyed to specific chapter references.

We have been guided in our research by the presupposition that it is the required task of each generation to re-interpret its history and thereby give new meaning to the present. Participation in this process enables us not only to determine, in part, the flow of events, but also to influence the creation of an alternative future for ourselves and others.

Methodologically, this project is divided into three phases. (1) we have maintained a continuous and extensive review of the literature; (2) We developed, administered and evaluated two questionnaires in order to generate new information re Asian Americans; (3) We synthesized the results of our study and the raw data we had gathered while integrating this information into the body of the report.

Regarding the survey which we conducted, limitations were imposed upon its validity by the absence of uniform reporting nomenclature used by the respondents. Operating within these limits, however, we have been able to respond appropriately to the need for data verification of our conclusions. It must be pointed out here that the overall lack of useful and specific data concerning the Asian American population in toto compels us to conclude that extensive investigations must be initiated before we can establish conclusively the most fruitful recommendations for broadening and expanding ethnic studies programs.

Before preparing a draft of this report we were able to submit our working papers to the Asian American community at a meeting which was held in San Jose, 4 November 1972. Based upon this critiquing session we subsequently made available the first draft of this report to interested parties. We sought to include the many helpful comments in our revisions.

For the reader's convenience, the footnotes are placed at the end of each chapter. The appendix contains the working bibliography, statistical tables, historical chronology, institutional

response and the two questionnaires developed for this report.

We wish to thank members of the Asian American community for their valuable suggestions offered while this report was in progress. In addition, we wish to thank Ferris Yayesaki, Judy Wilkin, Barbara Yoshioka, James Burchill and George Toy for their critical observations, unstinting assistance and encouragement so freely given during the stages of this project. We assume sole responsibility for any errors in judgment and interpretation that may be contained in this report.

Robert B. Yoshioka

Patrick S. Hayashi

Kirkman Lok

Kazuaki Ota

Joyce K. Sakai

Colin Watanabe

Davis, California

December 8, 1972

I. THE PROBLEM

The thrust of this project is aimed at re-interpreting the educational experience of Asian Americans. We believe that despite years of hard work and effort, educational opportunities for Asian Americans remain restrictive; that under the present circumstances our participation in the educational system confirms prevailing positive and negative stereotypes; that the various sectors of public higher education respond to Asian American needs from a position which assumes cultural and educational homogeniety and, finally, that this situation results in the exclusion of most of the Pilipinos, Korean Americans, Asian American women and the poor from full and meaningful participation in the educational process.

Each of these various ethnic groups that is subsumed under the classification Asian American has unique problems with regard to questions of access, quality and choice in higher education. While it is true that certain segments of our population have reached, or already exceed, parity in postsecondary education, many of our number are still excluded from full and self-determined participation.

We intend to address ourselves to the following problems:

(1) The question of definition: The Asian American.

(2) The pitfalls involved in using statistics to evaluate the "success" of Asian Americans in postsecondary education.

(3) Bilingualism as it affects the education of Asian Americans.

(4) Chinese Americans in higher education.

(5) The Japanese American: education and its relationship to socio-economic and socio-cultural mobility.

(6) The sin of omission: case studies of the forgotten Americans: The Pilipino, The Korean American, Asian American women, and the Poor.

(7) The other Asian Americans: "The Etcetera People:" East Indians, Vietnamese, Burmese, Pacific Basin Peoples, Thais, Laotians, Malaysians and Indonesians.

Definition

The term "Asian American" (variously set down as "Amerasian," "Asian," "Asian-American," or "Oriental") is misleading in its underlying presumption of homogeniety. As an identifiable minority, Asian Americans are a heterogeneous grouping of individuals composed primarily of persons whose ethnic identity is partly Pilipino, Chinese, Japanese or Korean and partly American. Generally included under the same classification are Sihks, Indonesians, Thais, Burmese, Vietnamese, and people from the Pacific Basin who have immigrated to the United States to settle and work out their destinies. It is important to emphasize the diversity of the individuals and groups included in the general category of "Asian American" because it is this fundamental understanding of our heterogeniety from which must logically follow the wealth and plurality of the recommendations which we propose at the end of this report in order for public higher education to deal realistically with our oftentimes divergent needs and priorities.

Asian Americans do not represent a solid and affluent middle-class constituency; nor are we as a group separatist, isolationist, or revolutionary. Within our social, cultural, political and economic microcosm is mirrored every degree of human awareness of society's problems as well as every possibility for finding answers to these problems--solutions ranging from the most conservative to the most radical.

As Americans of Asian descent we experience difficulty in affirming our cultural heritage. We are forced to disavow our ethnicity (our history) save for minor (but highly visible) cultural remnants. For various reasons we have consciously clung to these sometimes for commercial and highly remunerative reasons. Ironically, many of us are stereotyped by these same "cultural remnants" and are further hampered by our lack of fluency in the English language. Both effects tend to disguise and subsequently aggravate our critical social problems.

The Tyranny of Numbers

One of the most pervasive misconceptions concerning Asian Americans in postsecondary education is the notion commonly held by educators and the lay public that, as an ethnic minority, Asian Americans have been successfully accomodated within the various sectors of higher education. Indeed, a cursory examination of raw statistical data would ostensibly support that assumption; however, upon close examination a disturbing picture begins to emerge.

Public institutions and agencies that collect statistics concerning Asian Americans often do not enumerate consistently the various ethnic groups included under this general heading. In several instances the category is merely designated "Oriental" or "other non-White." According to researcher Gary Smigel of the Bureau of Inter-group Relations, the California Department of Education uses the term "Oriental" to designate Asian Americans. It comprises Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans, and Korean Americans. The Bureau utilizes the category "other non-White" to comprise Pilipino, Eskimo, Polynesian, Aleut, and Malaysian persons. University of California terminology, on the other hand, encompasses all Asian Americans within the term "Oriental."

The United States Census Bureau is one of the few public institutions that does compile statistics for Chinese, Japanese, and Pilipinos independently of one another, although Koreans, Thais, Burmese, Cambodians, Laotians and Vietnamese are classified as "others." An examination of the census data reveals the value of such precise record-keeping because it provides a realistic profile of an ethnic minority's situation, and it discloses evidence contradictory to suppositions made about the educational attainment of Asian Americans.

In writing this report, we have been forced to rely on 1960 census data because 1970 data concerning ethnic minorities was not yet available. The possibility of significant statistical change re the 1970 census data is left open pending publication of profile data for these minorities. The 1960 data indicated that although the percentage of Japanese and Chinese Americans who have finished

four-year colleges exceeds the percentage for the White majority, this is not true for the Pilipinos.[1] Further, the number of individuals from all three groups--Chinese, Japanese, and Pilipino--who have had no formal education exceeded that of the White population.[2]

As is the case with many of the sources we consulted, the Pilipino statistics are invariably recorded in arbitrary categories. Such a procedure decreases the possibility of drawing valid conclusions regarding this particular group. The effective result is that one ethnic group is neglected or ignored because the data which would support its position is included, indiscriminately, within the total figures of a different group which may be, in comparison, moderately successful.

This paucity of consistently reported data lends serious doubt to the credibility of generalizations based on such indiscriminate statistics. Being unable, therefore, to develop consistent statistical verification leads us to conclude that a great deal of rigorous investigation remains to be undertaken before any programmatic alterations are feasible.

Bilingualism and Chinese Americans in Higher Education

For individuals whose second language is English the problems of access to postsecondary education in the United States are almost insurmountable. While bilingualism is not specifically a factor for some segments of the Asian American community, it is a pressing problem for individuals who are themselves recent immigrants or who come from homes where English is seldom spoken.

Currently there are numerous programs designed to cope with this problem, particularly in Chinatown in San Francisco. However, it is too soon to assess the effectiveness of these programs. In San Francisco the Chinese Bilingual Education Program maintains a professional staff of 23 persons, and 21 teachers are assigned to schools.

> At the junior high level, more than one half of those needing special English instruction were not receiving it.[3]

In 1969, 942 or roughly one-third of the approximately 3,000 Chinese students enrolled in the San Francisco Unified School District did not receive the necessary English instruction.[4] If these students are unable to get this essential special training the chance that they will attend college is minimal. This identifiable number of students is only the tip of the iceberg of the Chinese, including adults, who cannot speak English.[5] As a potential source of students, the various institutions of higher education are unable to tap this source and, consequently, this human potential is wasted. As the number of newly arrived Chinese immigrants grows, this need will become increasingly difficult to deal with and will constitute an ongoing problem for the Chinese American community.

The Japanese American

For the Japanese American the major issue in postsecondary education revolves around the question of quality and choice rather than access, per se. We examine this problem within the context of our discussion on current status in Section III. We would argue

that the range of occupational choices should be consciously expanded through more effective counseling in order to allow a greater range of possibilities for Japanese Americans given their culturally reinforced motivational patterns.

The Sin of Omission and The "Etcetera People"

Discussion of these two problem areas constitutes a major focus of this project. Because of stereotypic notions concerning Asian American homogeniety, many members of the less numerous ethnic minorities are totally overlooked both statistically and programmatically. We discuss the implications of these omissions throughout the body of the report whenever it is appropriate. The cases of the Pilipinos, Koreans and Asian American women are particularly significant since it is in these areas that there is currently growing interest in altering the status quo.

The Carnegie Commission

From the outset in American Society, Asians were generally understood to be "docile, quiet, uncomplaining, hard working and untroubled." Only after we became involved in the preparation of this report did we fully realize how pervasive and institutionalized are these stereotypes.

In New Students and New Places, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education compared the status of Asian Americans with other ethnic minorities and reported:

> Racial minority groups--including Black Americans, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians--were seriously under represented in American higher education in 1970. This was not true, however, for Japanese-Americans and Chinese-Americans, who were well represented in higher education and are not now educationally disadvantaged.[6]

On the surface, the statement appears to be accurate. When we analyzed the relevant data that does exist, we found that the statement is at best, misleading, and at worst, untrue. The Commission's "findings" failed to consider that several segments of the Japanese American and the Chinese American populations; e.g., Chinese American women, have been historically, and continue to be, one of the most educationally disadvantaged minorities in the United States.[7]

The Commission's statement does not consider the effect that the recently liberalized immigration laws have had on the problems of Asian Americans who are newly arrived immigrants. Nowhere in the Commission's report is the effect of this present influx of immigrants explored or analyzed.

We contacted the Carnegie Commission and requested clarification of the above mentioned statement. We received the following response from Clark Kerr:

> ...In the Carnegie Commission's report, New Students and New Places (1971), the statement is made that Japanese-Americans and Chinese-Americans are "well represented in higher education and are not now educationally disadvantaged" (p. 25). We did not intend to imply by that statement that there are no problems among Asian Americans with respect to access or performance in higher education. The statement was based on 1960 Census data and on scattered data for more recent years, which shows that enrollment rates of Japanese-Americans and Chinese-Americans in higher education are relatively high

> and that the proportions of these ethnic groups who are college graduates are also high.
>
> However, it must be kept in mind in this connection that Chinese-Americans and Japanese-Americans who enter and graduate from colleges and universities are not, for the most part, recent immigrants, but second- or third-generation Americans. Recently, there has been substantial immigration of Chinese with low levels of education. This group is decidedly handicapped in gaining access to higher education. Filipinos are another group of Asians who are very much under-represented in higher education. More generally, young people of Asian ancestry are likely to encounter special problems if their parents are recent migrants and English is not spoken in the home. [emphasis added]

This response from Clark Kerr illustrates a sophisticated understanding of some of the problems affecting Asian Americans in higher education. But such qualifying remarks were not included in the context of the original statement and therefore do not temper its conclusions for the reader who does not have direct access to the Carnegie Commission.

There are undoubtedly many influential persons who assume the conclusions of the Commission reflect solidly researched perspectives. In the instance cited above, had the statistical base been articulated, fruitful dialogue might have ensued. Fortunately, we were able to elicit a response from the Carnegie Commission which clarified their position and provided a more accurate interpretation of their conclusion. (Several points raised in Kerr's letter are germane to later sections of our report and will be addressed at that time.)

The Coordinating Council for Higher Education

We have found that researchers who study the development of

Asian American Studies programs frequently draw erroneous conclusions both conceptually and statistically. In a review of the effectiveness of Ethnic Studies in accordance with Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 78 (Recognizing the Contribution of Ethnic Minorities), Russell L. Riese, Chief Higher Education Specialist for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education (CCHE) notes in the "Staff Comments" that "...enrollments in degree programs in Ethnic Studies have been unusually small."[8] Further, the Review contends,

> ...there may be an over-abundance of degree programs in Ethnic Studies, particularly if viewed on the basis of student enrollments...in place of these degree programs, courses in art, music, drama, literature, psychology, anthropology, social sciences, history, and other academic disciplines should be modified in content to reflect the contributions of various ethnic minorities in these areas.[9]

While their conclusions were based on data for the 1971-72 academic year, they omitted from consideration the problems attendant upon the inception of new academic programs. Apparently they disregarded the fact of the very brief existence of most ethnic studies programs. Several of these are still in the elementary planning stage.[10] They are only now beginning to fill faculty appointments, hire staff, secure necessary equipment, gather materials, initiate research, generate courses, and recruit students. Rather than holding these infant programs accountable for failing to emerge as mature academic disciplines instantaneously, we would rather recognize the efforts being undertaken to establish the rigorous criteria of academic viability.

Based on their research assumptions and data, the CCHE staff simply recommended relegating ethnic studies to the periphery of

traditional academic disciplines. It is suggested that ethnic contributions in the areas of "art, music, drama, literature, psychology, anthropology, social sciences, history and other academic areas"[11] be mentioned. In recommending this "modification of traditional course content"[12] the legitimate and particular needs of ethnic minorities have been effectively bypassed. Ethnic studies in this view are narrowly construed and severely restricted. The result of this recommendation is the speedy elimination of that forum in which students explore academically and professionally the dimensions of their ethnicity in all its ramifications.

Limiting ethnic studies to an adjunct roll in traditional disciplines implies at least the following presuppositions which form the hidden agenda of the CCHE Staff Report:

(1) American scholarly communities share a unifical educational perspective.

(2) That perspective is largely fixed and not amenable to ongoing reinterpretation.

(3) That the sources which constitute the stuff of the classroom are generally known requiring only occasional modification.

(4) That minority perspectives are embellishments which do not fall within the mainstream of contemporary analyses. That is, they assume no autonomous status in an institution of higher education.

(5) Numerical representation is the chief indicator of the value of a specific academic program.

At best, such presuppositions reveal a condescending pre-

disposition toward minority studies per se which abridges rather than fulfills the spirit of ACR 78. Instead of trying to salvage the severely debilitating recommendations suggested by the CCHE Staff Report, we urge that ethnic studies programs be evaluated according to professionally sound criteria which have been subjected to the critical warrants of their academic colleagues.

We submit that any evaluation of ethnic studies programs should consider at least the following assumptions:

(1) The number of matriculated students is not the most significant indicator of the value of an ethnic studies program in its initial stage of development.

(2) Ethnic studies programs should develop appropriate interdisciplinary affiliations built on the model of mutual exchange rather than on the model of subordination/domination.

(3) Rather than predicating the success of an ethnic studies program upon a terminal bachelor's degree, it is essential to create advanced degree programs thereby developing one of the mechanisms through which full academic maturity may be achieved.

(4) Ethnic studies programs should be one place where ethnic identities may be fully explored.

(5) Ethnic studies programs focus on particular ethnic histories as primary vehicles of ethnic self-understanding. This broadening of the historical record is, itself, a value.

(6) As autonomous programs, ethnic studies should incorporate community action programs as an integral part of their professional and academic commitment.

NOTES

1. State of California, Department of Industrial Relations, Californians of Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino Ancestry--Population, Education, Employment, Income (San Francisco: Division of Fair Employment Practices, 1969), p. 25.

2. Ibid.

3. Bay Area Social Planning Council, Education and Lang Training, Working Paper VI of Background Information on the S. of San Francisco's Chinese Newcomers (San Francisco, June 1970), Permission to quote given by Mr. Martin Gerber, Associate Executive Director, December 7, 1972.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

6. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New Students and New Places (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), p. 25.

7. Evidence for this contention is presented in Section III.

8. Russell L. Riese, "Brief" on ACR 78: Recognizing the Contributions of Ethnic Minorities, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, October 3, 1972, p. 3.

9. Ibid.

10. Our evaluation of ethnic studies programs in Chapter VII reveals that most programs are still experimenting with methodological approaches. It is interesting to note that in one instance, at least (University of California, Davis), funding for ethnic studies programs is on a year-to-year basis. This denies to those programs, in part, the academic security which is needed to attract matriculated students.

11. Riese, Op. cit.

12. Ibid.

II. THE PRE-COLLEGE EXPERIENCE

An individual's attitudes and expectations of higher education are largely determined by his prior educational experiences. These attitudes can be channeled in a positive and meaningful direction by an educational system made up of informed and sensitive teachers, counselors, and curricula. Because primary and secondary schools are the only formal educational institutions that all youngsters, immigrants and natives, citizens and aliens alike, are required by law to participate in, the public schools must reflect accurately the multi-cultural character of this nation, and respond to the unique and specialized needs of all of its citizens. For many Asian American students, these needs go unmet, and it is our subjective appraisal that this results in informal and often unintentional educational and occupational "tracking."

A recent survey conducted at the Davis campus of the University of California indicated that 58.8% of Asian American undergraduate students are majoring in the natural and physical sciences (with 22% in the humanities and social sciences, and 19% undeclared). The figures for non-Asians showed only 38% in the natural and physical sciences.[1] A similar survey conducted on the Berkeley campus reflected to a greater degree, the tendency of Asian American students to select disciplines of study which require little or no verbal expression.[2] We believe that this trend continues beyond formal education to influence and limit choice of occupation as well.

Although, as pointed out in Section I of this report, the ethnic groups comprising the racial category "Asian American" are heterogeneous and the solutions to their individual problems must evolve independently of each other, most Asian Americans share similar experiences in the educational system as a result of three shared characteristics:

A. An Asian heritage with fundamental values incongruous in some respects with those of the dominant American culture. The Asian immigrant to the United States brought with him many customs and beliefs from highly structured social environments. To varying degrees, depending upon generation, these thought and behavioral patterns continue to influence and affect Asian American children. Inherent among these beliefs was the notion of unqualified and undoubting respect and deference to social and familial authorities. Emphasis was placed on actions which resulted in the collective rather than individual success. Thus, within the family, Asian children seldom question the wisdom of their parents.[3] At school, the Asian American student rarely challenges his teachers or classmates and avoids active participation in class discussions. Rather than recognizing the possibility that the student's reticence may be related to his cultural background, and subsequently seeking different means to encourage him to participate, the often well-meaning teacher attributes this silence to diffidence and fosters the student's interest in areas not requiring verbal self-expression.

Similarly, when an Asian American youngster receives counseling, it is not difficult for the counselor to suggest a course of

study that is "acceptable" to the student. Since the advisor gets little verbal response, he naturally assumes that the student agrees with his suggestion. Ironically, because many Asian American students thus counseled never return for more advising, and further, because they oftentimes succeed educationally, the counselor's guidance to the next non-verbal Asian American student is to a large degree based on his past "successful" advising. A basic understanding of the Asian American student's ancestral heritage would vastly improve the quality of education and supportive services that the student receives.

B. An ancestral language other than English which impedes the development of English language skills. Language and culture are inseparable to the extent that a language reflects the norms and values of the culture. This, coupled with the difficulties of bridging the structural differences between the English and Asian languages, causes basic linguistic difficulties for many Asian American students. As children of Asian language-speaking or bilingual parents, or bilingual themselves, many Asian American students are caught between two radically differing linguistic self-understandings, and are not totally comfortable in either environment.

In a study of 160 monolingual and bilingual Chinese American junior high school students in Oakland, California, Martin Chen found that the level of linguistic skill -- reading, vocabulary, comprehension -- was significantly lower for bilingual children than for the monolingual.[4] Without these basic skills, not only is the

Asian American student at a disadvantage in the classroom, but he is without the tools necessary for forceful and creative expression. The small number of Asian American poets and novelists points to this problem. English teachers who recognize and respect the Asian American student's ancestral language and culture could help provide the solution.[5]

C. A history of discrimination in the United States. The initial Asian immigrants, at first welcomed as a source of cheap unskilled labor, became the victims of racial discrimination and attempts at exclusion by the white majority who felt their economic interests threatened by these newcomers. As the abuses against them mounted, the immigrants banded together and formed segregated communities, establishing their own social, political, and economic organizations. The Asian immigrant quickly learned that silent acceptance of physical and verbal indignities resulted in less severe treatment by the larger society than any overtly aggressive action. The dominant white society began to view Asian non-violence stereotypically as a sign of docility and compliancy.

The remnants of over a century of racial and social discrimination remain today in the form of negative stereotypes and myths about Asian Americans. Asian Americans today must bear the psychological burdens of these false assumptions. Asian American students, throughout their lengthy experience in the public schools, are confronted with sometimes well-meaning but insensitive teachers and counselors, and a curriculum which mirrors the negative biases of a largely uninformed society.

Michael B. Kane in an analysis of social studies textbooks in 1970, found that

> Asiatic minorities, such as those of Chinese and Japanese origin or descent, were frequently treated in a manner implying they were racially inferior. Offensive generalizations were applied to such groups and positive material about their current status and contributions was omitted.... None of the 45 texts examined gave equal treatment in terms of factual information on Americans of Asiatic origin compared to that accorded other groups in the United States.[6]

Socorro C. Espiritu uncovered similar inaccurate and misleading distortions in the textbook treatment of Pilipinos.[7] There is little evidence to indicate that changes are occurring in the situation. Roger Zuercher in his 1969 study, "The Treatment of Asian Minorities in American History Textbooks,"[8] found virtually no improvements in the ten years since Lloyd Marcus published his findings on the misrepresentation of Asian Americans in textbooks.[9] It is small wonder that, without positive feedback, many Asian American students turn their thoughts and perceptions inward.

Many Asian American students in primary and secondary school prepare themselves for the discussion of World War II in social studies or history by feigning illness on the day of discussion, or by being as inconspicuous as possible. One student recalled:

> ...in the seventh grade, we started to read about World War I and World War II. I knew that in World War II, Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. So I worked real hard on World War I. I answered every question I could. But when it came to World War II, I never answered any question. I would just slouch in my chair. I guess I was feeling shamed and embarrassed at the atrocities of Japan during World War II. But what I didn't understand was why the textbooks and the teacher glorified America's bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. My teacher said thousands of civilians, including women and children,

were killed by the atom bombs thus making Japan surrender. She then added that the bombings had saved many American lives. I then asked my teacher, "Wouldn't that be considered an atrocity since so many civilians died? That's the way you describe Japanese atrocities." I'll never forget the way she stared at me and said, "There's a difference." Today that episode is still clear as a bell. It's something that I've never forgotten.[10]

It is a sad indictment of the educational process that the student was made to feel responsible for the actions of a foreign country.

For many Asian Americans, entry into the school system signifies the first frightening step away from, not only the family and home, but from a familiar and friendly culture. It is not uncommon that on the first day of school an Asian American child hears himself called by his Christian name for the first time, or more distressing, hears his Asian name cruelly mispronounced and even ridiculed. For others, the initiation into the educational process marks the first painful awareness of his "difference" and implied inferiority. An Asian American college student recounting her experiences in primary school recalled:

I can distinctly remember the first blow as being considered "different" from the white kids. It all started in kindergarten. During the first few weeks or so, the kids would come up to me and ask me, "Why are you different? Why do you have a flat nose?"...All through elementary school, my nationality engulfed me because of the kids at school who would come up to me and slant their eyes with their fingers, chanting "Ching Chong Chinaman!" I felt like going up to those kids and beating them up, "Don't you know the difference? I'm Japanese!"...I felt like concealing my whole culture. I just couldn't live on that way. I even started hating to walk with another Japanese, even my own cousins! ...I thought my seventh grade core teacher was prejudiced...because everytime he would speak about Chinese Communists, he seemed to accusingly look at me, as if I were a Chinese Communist...as a result of this, I did very poorly in my studies.[11]

Most Asian Americans carry with them memories of similar experiences in the public school system. All of these forces--physical difference, language barrier, cultural difference, discriminatory treatment--combined to produce a population of Asian American students who demonstrate an aversion for fields of endeavor requiring strong self-expression, verbal and non-verbal. The constraints which act to limit alternatives and options for Asian American students will continue to operate as long as teachers, counselors, and administrators remain ignorant of the experiences of Asian Americans in the social, economic, and cultural milieu of the United States, because they cannot look beyond the commonly-held assumptions and stereotypes.

Existing Asian American Studies and ethnic studies programs must receive support and encouragement for their continued development, and new programs implemented, to educate all prospective teachers and counselors of the situation of Asians in America. Such trained personnel will be better prepared to meet the particular needs of Asian American students.

***

We recommend that Asian American Studies and ethnic studies be made a mandatory part of the course of study for all prospective teachers and guidance counselors.

We also recommend that the State initiate and fund research to review and revise as necessary existing curriculum material being

used in the public education system, particularly in history and social studies, to insure an accurate representation of the participation of Asian Americans and other ethnic minorities in the development of this country.

NOTES

1. Beverly Low, "Breakdown of Asian and Non-Asian Undergraduate Students by Majors," Project Report, AAS 33, Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences, University of California at Davis, Fall 1972, n.p.

2. Colin Watanabe, "Culture and Communication: Self-Expression and the Asian American Experience," Asian American Review, Spring 1972, p. 10.

3. Ibid., p. 12.

4. Martin K. Chen, Intelligence and Bilingualism as Independent Variates in a Study of Junior High School Students of Chinese Descent, Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.

5. The Asian Studies Division at UC Berkeley offers a course entitled "Asian American Identity" which satisfies the English Subject A requirement. This course, emphasizing the student's own experiences and ethnic background has met with great success. This is an example of the kind of courses which can be developed to teach language skills to Asian Americans.

6. Michael B. Kane, Minorities in Textbooks: A Study of Their Treatment in Social Studies Texts (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970), pp. 112, 129.

7. Socorro C. Espiritu, A Study of the Treatment of the Philippines in Selected Social Studies Textbooks Published in the United States for Use in the Elementary and Secondary Schools, Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1953.

8. Roger Zuercher, "The Treatment of Asian Minorities in American History Textbooks," Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, 22, Autumn 1969.

9. Lloyd Marcus, The Treatment of Minorities in Secondary School Textbooks (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1961).

10. From a collection of brief autobiographies compiled in an Asian American Studies class. This class was taught by Professor Magoroh Maruyama at California State University, Hayward, in 1969.

11. Ibid.

III. CURRENT STATUS OF ASIAN AMERICANS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

We conclude that it is extremely difficult to analyze precisely the current status of Asian Americans in postsecondary education by using currently available statistics. Our reasons supporting this conclusion are given below. We contend that commonly cited figures on Asian Americans are unintentionally misleading if they are taken at face value. Indeed, the analysis which emerges when these statistics are used without correcting for variables in reporting format seemingly substantiates the position that Asian Americans, as an ethnic minority, are no longer educationally disadvantaged. Our remarks will address an alternative method of dealing with many of these statistics in order to present a more realistic perspective on our situation.

We have divided this chapter into four sections. First, we present a general and an educational statistical profile of Asian Americans. Second, we discuss and evaluate these statistics from several points of view. Third, we report on a survey that we conducted as part of this project, and finally, we move to a discussion of our conclusions.

Asian Americans: A Statistical Profile.

According to the 1970 Census data Asian Americans constitute less than 1% of the total population of the United States. The Department of Commerce provides the following figures for Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans and Filipinos:

Asian Americans in the General Population[1]

	National Total	Percentage of Nation
1. Japanese Americans	591,290	.29%
2. Chinese Americans	435,062	.214%
3. Pilipinos	343,060	.169%

Currently available statistics from the 1970 Census are incomplete and do not enumerate specific categorical information. This is especially true regarding statistics on Koreans, women and members of other Asian nationalities such as Laotians, Thais, Burmese and East Indians.

The inclusion of statistics for these categories would increase the reliability of our data base and strengthen our conclusions re Asian Americans in postsecondary education. Such additional delineations must await the publication and dissemination of the abovementioned information. At that time it should be taken into account in any subsequent discussion of this topic.

Asian Americans constitute a larger percentage of the total population of California than of the United States. Our figures for Asian Americans in California include the numbers for "others" in addition to the totals for Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans, and Pilipinos. This category includes statistics for Koreans, Hawaiians, Aleuts, Eskimos, Malayans and Polynesians. The inclusion of this category gives us totals and percentages that are significantly higher than if only Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans, and Pilipinos are considered.

Asian Americans in California[2]

	State Total	Percentage of Total Population
1. Japanese American	213,280	1.07%
2. Chinese American	170,131	.85%
3. Pilipino	138,895	.696%
Subtotal	522,270	2.6%
4. Others	178,671	.89%
Total	700,941	3.5%

Asian Americans with a statewide population between 522,270 and 700,941 in 1970 constituted between 2.6% and 3.5% of the population. Expectationally, these figures should be mirrored in the percentage of Asian Americans attending secondary and postsecondary schools throughout the state. In fact, public secondary school enrollment for grades 9 through 12 expressed in percentages fall individually and collectively within the 2.6% and 3.5% range.

1972 Asian American Statewide Public Secondary School Enrollment, Grades 9-12[3]

Grade	Oriental*		Other**	
	Number	Percentage Enrollment per Grade	Number	Percentage Enrollment per Grade
9th	7,761	2.1%	3.218	.9%
10th	7,773	2.2%	3,056	.9%
11th	7,754	2.4%	2,917	.9%
12th	7,236	2.5%	2,518	.9%
Sub-total	30,514		11,709	
Total	42,223			

Whites. No breakdown by sex is provided.[5]

When we examine the percentages of Asian Americans enrolled in the three segments of public higher education, a trend is noted. In the University of California system, where the voluntary reporting system records Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, Pilipinos, and Others under the general heading "Oriental," Asian Americans constituted 7.4% of the undergraduate student body and 4.2% of the graduate students.[6] Their combined percentage for the total student body was 6.4%.[7] Numerically, there were 5,659 undergraduates and 1,268 graduate students, a total of 6,927 students out of a total of 106,662 recorded at the University of California's nine campuses.[8]

According to Clarence Lust, Office of Institutional Research, California State University and Colleges (Los Angeles), approximately 4.9% of the students enrolled at the 19 CSUC campuses in 1970 were "Oriental."[9] Mr. Lust indicated that this percentage was unofficial and possibly not reliable since the study which was used to generate this information proved to be unsatisfactory.[10] More recent figures are not available from this segment. But a new study was undertaken in the Fall, 1972, with a reporting deadline of December 1, 1972. The information from that study was not available for our use at the time this report was in progress.

On the community college level, a survey in 1971, which received responses from 68 community college campuses showed a total enrollment of 703,282, of which 316,884 were officially classified

as fulltime students.[11] 3.6% of the fulltime students were designated Asian.[12] This percentage was equivalent to 11,408 students. According to this source,

> In most instances Asians are enrolled as fulltime students in proportions that closely approximate their estimated community representation. One exception is San Francisco, where they exceed their estimate community representation percentages.[13]

This survey lends support to the stereotypic notions concerning Asian American occupational choices by noting that "Asians have a larger enrollment in the landscape gardener and lawn sprinkler trades than their community representation."[14] Since the qualifying figures are not given for this assertion, we might conclude that stereotypic thinking is operational in this section of the analysis.

The community college is complete in its examination of minority participation in all phases of institutional life. The report states:

> Asians represent 0.6% of all administrators (0.5% in 1970). 1.6% of all teaching and certified staff (1.5% in 1970), and 1.7% of all classfied staff (1.6% in 1970)[15]

There are two serious shortcomings of this report which it shares with nearly all the sources we have consulted and cited: omitting a definition of the term "Asian" and failing to provide a breakdown according to sex. The latter is particularly critical because it precludes any conclusions regarding the representation of women at any level. Of the materials which we were able to obtain from the three segments in public higher education, the report on the community colleges was the least readable. This was due, in part, to the cumbersome manner in which the statistical materials were

presented for comment, and the absence of a section in the report dealing with the problem of definition.

We have maintained throughout the course of this report that the problems faced by recently arrived Asian immigrants oftentimes go unnoticed because these people do not show up in most statistical reports. Their inclusion in categories which mask their presence or their exclusion from the studies altogether belie the fact of their growing numbers. The following table, compiled from 1967-1971 Annual Reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service affords a precise delineation of this segment of the population:

Table I

Immigrants Admitted from Asia by
Country or Region of Birth
1967 - 1971* 16

	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	Total
Chinese**	25,096	16,434	20,893	17,956	17,622	98,001
Japanese	3,946	3,613	3,457	4,485	4,457	20,458
Filipinos	10,865	16,731	20,744	31,203	28,471	108,014
Koreans	3,956	3,811	6,045	9,314	14,297	37,423
Burmese	NA***	NA	NA	NA	1,068	1,068
Indonesians	470	583	805	825	677	3,360
Ryukuans	369	525	519	621	869	2,903
Thai	NA	645	1,250	1,826	2,915	6,636
Vietnamese	490	590	983	1,450	2,038	5,551
Total	45,192	42,932	55,196	67,680	72,414	283,414

* This table does not include persons on student visas or other non-permanent residents.

** Includes those born in China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan.

*** NA = Not available.

Pilipinos, Chinese and Koreans constitute the largest groups of Asian immigrants. All other immigration figures including the Japanese have remained relatively constant for the past five years. Institutional response to this influx of new immigrants has been insufficient. Recognized bilingual/bicultural educational programs for Asian immigrants exist only for the Chinese. No such programs, to our knowledge, serve the needs of the Pilipino or the Korean, groups which are growing rapidly. We address ourselves specifically to these neglected groups in the next section of this chapter.

Evaluation of Asian American Subgroups

1. Case Study: The Sin of Omission--The Pilipino

Of Asian Americans in graduate and professional schools, Pilipinos constitute the smallest group. Returns from our survey (see below) indicate zero Pilipinos in graduate or professional schools.[17] We know, however, through personal sources, that there are at least 10 matriculated Pilipino graduate/professional students in various California institutions of higher education. We anticipate that the figure will show an increase as late questionnaires are returned. Nonetheless, we are confronted with the abrupt realization that fewer than 1% of the Pilipinos who receive their baccalaureate degree go on to graduate and professional schools.

Access to the higher degree levels for the Pilipino is an urgent problem, accentuated by the relative success of Chinese and Japanese. Pilipinos are often subsumed as a sub-category of the general classification "Oriental" or "Asian American." A review of

the reporting nomenclature which accompanies the data in the first section of this chapter reveals no consistency in signifying Pilipinos. The variable formats within which statistical data on Pilipinos are reported obviates an accurate evaluation of their position vis-a-vis the Census data and their participation in any of the three segments of public higher education. This condition is constant for the Korean American and the other Asian Americans we designate as "The Etcetera People." Similarly, statistics on women vis-a-vis higher education are sparse if they exist at all.

Further, because of four centuries of Spanish colonial rule, numerous Pilipinos bear Spanish surnames and therefore, can also be enumerated as Mexican Americans or Chicanos. The resultant confusion is obvious. Some non-Pilipinos claim the confusion is a positive factor because these people may choose their "ethnic" identification from either of the two groups. In practice, however, the confusion is a negative factor. Ethnic identity is a potent cultural force, not an object of political expediency. Conceived ambiguously, the Pilipinos receive little or no attention at a time when schools are initiating recruitment programs for under-represented minorities. Overlooked in the recruiting process, Pilipinos are also disadvantaged at the undergraduate level by the same process of exclusion. This problem is slowly yielding to the efforts of Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) recruiters, but much remains to be done before the minimal goal of parity is achieved.

The change in undergraduate recruitment pattern was new beginning in the academic year 1968-69. An interview with a former

recruiter for the Urban Crisis Program (precursor to EOP) disclosed that Asian Americans were not considered to be an "urban crisis minority group." Asian American students including Pilipinos were nonetheless recruited and subsequently became, de facto, a minority group for recruitment purposes.[18]

Students who have entered higher education since that time are now juniors and seniors. Whether they intend to matriculate further is conjectural. But on the basis of numbers, an increase in the total enrollment of Pilipinos is predicted. This increase in numbers is, however, offset by the large influx of Pilipino immigrants since 1968 when the immigration quota for the Philippines was effectively removed. During the period 1967-71, 108,014 Pilipinos immigrated to the United States. Of these, 33,447 were under the age of nineteen, and presumably potential candidates for higher education. The remainder of the 114,107 Pilipinos are generally between the ages of 20-39. Most of these people are wives, husbands, or children of U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens.[19]

The highest occupation category for Pilipino immigrants is "professional, technical, or kindred."[20] Many of these people find it necessary to obtain further academic training in American institutions of higher education in order to practice their professions.

Since approximately one-third of the immigrants cite California as the intended state of permanent residence,[21] it follows that the state system of higher education will inherit a commensurate number of student applicants. Consequently, the State of California should be fully prepared to respond to the specific needs of a new immi-

grant population.

2. Asian American Women

Asian American women are confronted with a three-fold discrimination pattern. They are women and subject to all the biases accruing to that sex. They are Asian American women and subject to the stereotypes directed at Asians. They are Japanese American, Chinese American, Pilipino American, Korean American, etc. women and subject to the biases and stereotypes reserved for the women of each ethnic group.

The consequent list of stereotypes, both positive and negative, that accrue to an Asian American woman is legion. They are regarded in paradoxical terms, depending largely upon the favor or disfavor their particular ethnic group is experiencing. These stereotypes have a long history; most find their origin in the Anti-Chinese period of 1870-1900 in America. The deliberate misconceptions and outright slander directed toward Chinese American women were used at later periods with Japanese Americans and Pilipino American women. Only the ethnic group changed. The following quotation highlights several stereotypes that were then operative.

> The literature concerning the history of Chinese women in that earlier society views them either as degraded animal-like creatures spreading disease and corrupting young white boys or as untouchable objects of leisure and irresponsibility. Their roles were limited as merchant wives, domestics, or prostitutes.22

The stereotypes have expanded considerably from that time. American social imagination developed new and derivative stereotypes.

Some of these were derived from popular notions about women in Asia. When the erotic art and literature of China and Japan became known to Americans, the erotic aura associated with women in Asia was transferred to Asian American women. The notion of the courtesan, skilled in the art of love, supplanted the earlier "lewd and debauched" stereotype of the Chinese prostitute.

U.S. soldiers of World War II brought back glowing impressions of Japanese women. Their wifely virtues and male-pleasing attributes were widely discussed. Because Japanese women made "perfect" wives, this stereotype has been associated with Japanese American women. The illogical belief that Japanese American women are the same as Japanese women is clearly operative and therefore clearly discriminatory. The Japanese American woman, like her Asian American counterparts, has deep cultural ties with Asia, but is culturally distinct from it and her Asian American cousins.

Of the stereotypes that have been most detrimental to Asian American women in graduate and professional education, several stand out. One is that Asian American women are domestic and excellent homemakers. Another is that they are obedient, quiet, and subservient. They win Betty Crocker awards for "Future Homemaker of Tomorrow," but are intellectually uninspired. These stereotypes are unconscionable and arrogant in their presumptuousness and yet many American educators continue to believe them. Thousands (6,682 in 1959) of Asian American women graduate annually from colleges and universities in California,[23] but few continue on to graduate school or professional schools. Most of these women take their baccalaureate

degrees and become secretaries, clerks, or technicians.

Those Asian American women who advance to graduate and professional schools appear most frequently in the health sciences, and technical research areas. Like Asian American men, they are clustered in disciplines with minimal emphasis on aggressive verbal behavior. Academic tracking begun in the pre-collegiate experience and continued through undergraduate and graduate advising is a major contributor to this unequal distribution. Asian American women are counseled and directed on the basis of sexual and racial stereotypes into academic disciplines that will most readily accept them. Stereotypes play an undue part in the counseling process: they reflect the biases shared by counselor and institution.

Asian American women are severely hindered by such negative images based on sexual and racial criteria. Any resolution to solve the problems encountered by Asian American women in California's graduate and professional schools must be thorough and expansive enough to include the many subtle facets of sexism and racism.

3. The Japanese American Dilemma

Japanese Americans are a statistically successful group; 17.6% have completed four or more years of college and rank second to the Chinese with 22.2%. Whites are third with 17.3%[24] having attained this level. Data relative to Japanese American participation in graduate and professional schools is unavailable. Statistics are compiled for the general category of Oriental or American with no further delineation.

What follows is in part strong conjecture which is posited to invite dialogue and to point out areas where further research is needed to gain the holistic perception essential to an overview of the Asian American population.

With a history in California of gross anti-Japanese discrimination, Japanese Americans have attempted numerous methods of escaping the debilitating effects of such severely negative attitudes. One of the methods has been the vehicle of higher education.

Japanese Americans have historically perceived higher education as a socializing and vocational institution leading to social and monetary security outside the confines of the Japanese American community. Japanese culture, since the Meiji Restoration (1868) with its emphasis on universal education, provided cultural incentive to the Japanese American's predilection for higher and professional education.

The notion of graduate and professional education merely as a body of knowledge without vocational or status considerations was a rare phenomenon and remains so today. Japanese American scholars in the humanities are rare. Japanese American pharmacists, dentists, doctors, optometrists, engineers, chemists, nurses, laboratory technicians, clinical technicians are common. 24% of the Japanese American working men and women are in the occupational category of "professional, technical and kindred workers."[25] All are financially remunerative, white collar, high status positions. None requires verbal facility as a primary occupational asset. Japanese Americans in fact tend to select graduate and professional fields of study

that lead to essentially non-verbal, high status, financially secure occupations.

In order to clarify the situation of Japanese Americans in graduate and professional education, it is imperative that enrollment figures for graduate and professional students and their respective fields of study be generated and analyzed in terms of disciplinary choices and not simply gross totals. Breakdown by sex is also necessary.

4. The Chinese American Experience

The Chinese American experience partially parallels that of the Japanese American in graduate and professional education. Chinese Americans, too, have conceived of higher education as a way to higher income and status. Like the Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans have discovered that higher education does not yield all the rewards they had anticipated.

Recognition of the thesis that Chinese Americans constitute a distinctive and autonomous ethnic group with its own unique cultural traditions is, however, essential to a cogent understanding of their situation vis-a-vis graduate and professional education.

The question of access to higher education is two-sided. On the one hand, statistics indicate that 22.2% of Chinese Americans have completed four or more years of college. On the other hand, statistics show that 34.5% have completed zero years of school, the highest of any ethnic group in the state.[26] Research should be initiated immediately to determine why so many Chinese Americans

fail to complete a single year of education. Equally important, the state should be vitally interested in what these people are doing and the disposition of their children in terms of their education.

Part of the solution to this question relates directly to the potential respresented by the 22.2% of Chinese Americans who have completed four or more years of college, some of whom have presumably continued their academic training in graduate or professional schools. There exists a movement among Chinese American students to obtain skills for the purpose of assisting their natal and/or psychological communities, e.g., San Francisco Chinatown.

Considerations of status and income are a lower priority than community needs for these students. They are demanding curricula change that will facilitate immediate responses to the communities as well as curricula that will ensure the sustained institutional effort required for a long range community commitment.

Current academic programs are not sufficiently cognizant of the cultural uniqueness of Chinese American communities and their consequent problems. Bilingual problems seriously affect these communities. Yet, only a few campuses offer courses in the Cantonese language. Cantonese and its various dialects is the major language spoken by Chinese in the United States. Mandarin Chinese, which is spoken by a small minority is taught at every campus that offers a Chinese language. The bilingual problem is currently being compounded by the steady arrival of more new immigrants from Hong Kong and Taiwan, many of whom are professionals or highly skilled technicians.

The arrival of professionals and technical workers presents a special problem. Their talents and skills are often passed over owing to their lack of facility in the English language. Employers are hesitant to employ them for that reason. Or, these new immigrants are unable to pass state licensing board examinations that are heavily weighted on verbal facility and American academic training.

New immigrants entering as semi-skilled or unskilled labor are confronted with similar problems. Their lack of English language skills contributes substantially to their negative employment possibilities. They are forced to compete for the limited number of jobs available to non-English speaking people. Most of these jobs are in Chinatowns where competition for jobs is already fierce. Generally these jobs are menial involving long hours and meager pay. The need to provide a level of income adequate for subsistence occupies most of their time and effort. Education is difficult to pursue under these ci cumstances. A child's time spent in school is wages lost and income expended. An adult's time is even more expensive. These circumstances undoubtedly contribute to the incredible percentage of Chinese Americans who have completed zero years of formal schooling.

Education and bilingual difficulties within the ghetto context of Chinatown are not the only problems. There are serious public health problems that, optimally, require medical personnel who are linguistically and psychologically able to deal effectively with Chinese Americans who speak little or no English, and who have been

subjected to the strains of ghetto life.

Chinatown ghettos are unique yet little is known about them. They have been the subject of scattered studies undertaken by some government agencies, a few students, and individual faculty members at institutions of higher education. These studies have disclosed provocative information that signals the need for further research.[27] Overall, California's institutions of higher education have not supported a systematic study of Chinatowns in California.

These institutions have an opportunity to respond innovatively to a segment of the society they serve. On the graduate and professional level, curricula for a wide variety of academic disciplines can be developed emphasizing bilingual proficiency and establishing the foundation for positive interaction with the Chinese American communities. Programs to facilitate the retraining of immigrant professionals and technicians can be initiated through the University of California Continuing Education Program. Non-professionals who have had their educational opportunities delayed by poverty and/or the language barrier should not be neglected by programmatic educational outreach. At the present time, the Continuing Education Programs as well as the Educational Opportunity Program could expand their services to meet these community and individual needs.

***

We recommend that the State immediately increase financial aids to all qualified low-income persons who seek but are presently economically excluded from access to higher education.

That the State expand opportunities for vocational training and adult education for Asian Americans and other ethnic minorities by locating learning resource centers within urban and rural communities in which concentrations of ethnic minorities are found.

That the State expand successful minority recruitment programs such as EOP and GOP with the specific charge of seeking out Pilipinos, Koreans, immigrant Chinese Americans, and Asian American women for admission to postsecondary educational institutions.

That the State immediately institute a coordinated research and evaluation program, with cooperation from all ethnic studies programs, to investigate the discriminatory practices regarding women in undergraduate, graduate, and professional education.

Questionnaire on Asian American Studies

In order to determine the nature and extent of Asian American involvement in higher education, we developed a test instrument designed to generate consistent and substantive statistical information concerning our present educational situation. It included an extensive section in the questionnaire (Part II) requesting information about Asian American Studies programs. A review of the literature disclosed that non-representative statistics had been previously collected and used when discussing our relationship to public postsecondary education. Several segments of the Asian American population had been omitted from consideration.

We distributed copies of our questionnaire to the following campuses: University of California (9), California State University and Colleges (19), California Community Colleges (94), and private institutions (47). A complete list of institutional contacts is included in Appendix D.

The Test Instrument

The introductory remarks to Parts I and II instructed the respondents to answer only those questions which related specifically to their particular institutional context. The questionnaire, 23 pages long, was distributed on October 9, and the deadline for its completion was October 17, 1972. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix E.

Part I of the questionnaire was designed to gather systematic information re Asian Americans in twelve categories: (1) student

enrollment, (2) ethnic breakdown, (3) undergraduate major enrollment, (4) graduate and professional school enrollment, (5) enrollment in Subject A or its equivalent, (6) financial aids for undergraduates, (7) financial aids for graduates, (8) student services, (9) student organizations, (10) faculty, (11) non-academic support staff, and (12) administrators.

Part II of the questionnaire addresses itself to four categories of concern: (1) institutional setting, (2) educational objectives of Asian American Studies, (3) curriculum, and (4) special programs for Asian American students.

Evaluation

Our evaluation procedure for Part I of the questionnaire was divided into four phases: tabulation, inter-sector analysis, intra-sector comparison, and construction of composite profile. Work on Part II was undertaken in three parts: tabulation, categorization (model identification) of Asian American Studies programs, and comparative analysis. For this part of the questionnaire, comparative analysis is potentially the most significant since it involves a careful appraisal of Asian American Studies programs according to purpose, structure, support, and curriculum.

Factors Affecting the Reliability of Data and Conclusions

An evaluation of the questionnaire prior to our initial mailing lead us to identify two potential problem areas which we felt might adversely affect the validity of our data: the problem of

inconsistent data reporting, and the problem of inadequate reporting time. We felt that it would be difficult for a respondent to gather the information we requested in the time allowed. Due to the pressures under which we were operating, it was not possible for us to allot more than two weeks for the completion of the questionnaire. We anticipated that many institutions would not be able to respond within that time, and we determined that a 60-75% return from each of the sectors under investigation was necessary before we could suggest that our data and conclusions were valid for the total sample.

Results

The institutions responding to Part I of the questionnaire were the following:

	Total Responses	Responses with data	% Responses with data
1. University of California	6	5	55 %
2. Calif. State Univ. & Colleges	12	9	48 %
3. California Community Colleges	53	39	36 %
4. Selected Private Institutions	25	19	40 %
Total	96	72	44.5%

We began our tabulation of results with a sample which represented only 44.5% response and rapidly found that because of a lack of uniform reporting procedures, as well as inconsistent nomenclature, systematic consideration of data in eleven of the twelve categories in Part I of the questionnaire was impossible. With regard to item L., The Administration, we report that of 1,023 administrators

on 72 campuses, 20 individuals or 1.95% were identified as Asian American. Further research is indicated in this area since we did not inquire as to the range of positions held by these persons, or the distribution of Asian Americans within the administrative structure.

Institutional responses to Part II of the questionnaire were the following:

	Total Responses	Responses with data	% Responses with data
1. University of California	6	5	55.0 %
2. Calif. State Univ. & Colleges	12	6	31.5 %
3. California Community Colleges	53	17	6.1 %
4. Selected Private Institutions	25	3	18.0 %
Total	96	31	18.34%

Given these small percentages we cannot recommend far-reaching programmatic changes regarding Asian American Studies on the basis of this or other presently available data.

***

We recommend that the State of California mandate a uniform system of statistical reporting for each of the three segments in higher education; that the information include data on (a) the specific ethnic composition of students, graduate and undergraduate; faculty and staff, academic and non-academic including department, position, and sex; (b) the ethnic distribution of graduate and undergraduate students by age, major, and sex; (c) of administrators including position and sex; and (d) the ethnic and sexual distribution of students receiving financial aids, counseling, and placement services.

Asian Americans and the Master Plan: An Evaluation.

The Master Plan for Higher Education in California does not speak directly to the problems of Asian Americans, Asian American Studies Programs, or to Ethnic Studies Programs in general. Given our varying sources of information on Asian Americans in public postsecondary education, we are able to address ourselves to an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Master Plan in an indirect manner.

One gauge of success regarding Asian Americans in higher education is to note the increase in enrollments of Asian Americans in the three sectors of public higher education. A statistical evaluation of this kind is worthwhile if the following conditions concerning the data are met. (1) The group (s) under discussion should be homogeneous, or at the very least, all of the investigators should agree as to the composition of the category. (2) If, as is the case with Asian Americans, more than one ethnic group is included in a single category, separate statistics should be maintained for each subgroup within the classification. (3) The kind of information sought about the group (s) in question should be specified in detail, and (4) collection of the required data should be conducted periodically over a given time period.

If all these conditions had been met, an evaluation of Asian Americans with regard to the Master Plan could have been easily accomplished. As the matter stands presently, conflicting formats being used to report data, lack of agreement on the con-

stituent part of the category "Asian American," and an emerging variable pattern of data collection initiated by the three segments of public higher education, and the frequent omission of Asian American sub-groups, meaningful interpretation of such irregular data based on a standard statistical evaluation format would be misleading and probably inaccurate.

Given these limitations, we are nonetheless able to make sound observations about Japanese Americans and Chinese Americans. To varying degrees members from the more affluent segments of these two ethnic groups have been able to participate in the educational process to a greater extent than their total number would indicate. This does not mean, however, that Japanese Americans and Chinese Americans do not have unique educational problems, e.g., the Chinese bilingual education project sponsored by the San Francisco Unified School District.

As various sectors of the Asian American population reach or exceed parity in terms of numerical representation in institutions of public higher education, the problems which subsequent generations of students will raise will probably involve qualitative rather than quantitative concerns of access and initial participation. To a degree the revisions of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California should be prepared to (1) include specific recommendations which will ease the transition of Asian Americans from a special status to regular status, (2) create and encourage creative programs for the exploration of ethnicity, and (3) anticipate problems which may arise when numerous ethnic minority groups achieve numerical parity and begin to level

charges of racism based on a fixed quota system.

***

We recommend that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education (CCHE) be delegated the task of collecting statistical data in a consistent and uniform manner from the three segments of public higher education for the purpose of analyzing and evaluating the participation of Asian Americans and members of other ethnic groups in public postsecondary education.

NOTES

1. United States Department of Commerce, News (Washington, October 20, 1971), p. 1.

2. Ibid.

3. Gary Smigel, Bureau of Intergroup Relations, Department of Education, State of California, Telephone Interview, December 5, 1972.

4. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, OCD-72-8, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data From Institutions of Higher Education, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, Fall, 1970), p. 202.

5. Louise Lucas, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Civil Rights, Washington, D. C., Telephone Interview, December 12, 1972. In addition, the high percentage and numerical figures cited led us to conclude that Whites were included in this category to the extent that they precluded the possibility of retrieving information on Koreans and Pilipinos.

6. Joseph W. McGuire, Fall 1970 Ethnic Survey Results, (Berkeley: March 19, 1971).

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

9. Clarence Lust, Office of Institutional Research, California State University and Colleges (Los Angeles), Telephone Interview, December 5, 1972.

10. Ibid.

11. California Community Colleges Agenda, Item 7, October 18, 1972, p. 5.

12. Ibid., p. 9.

13. Ibid., p. 10.

14. Ibid., p. 13.

15. Ibid., p. 17.

16. Source: United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Annual Reports, 1967-1971.

17. Robert B. Yoshioka, et. al., Questionnaire on Asian American Studies, Part I, October, 1972, p. 7.

18. Interview with a former Urban Crisis Program recruiter, Name withheld upon request, October, 1972.

19. United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Annual Reports, 1967-1971.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid.

22. Gayle Louie, "Forgotten Women," in Asian Women, (University of California, Berkeley: 1971), p. 23.

23. This figure is computed from information contained in: State of California, Department of Industrial Relations, Californians of Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino Ancestry; Population, Education, Employment, Income, (San Francisco, California: 1969), pp, 19, 25.

24. Ibid., p. 25.

25. Ibid., p. 33.

26. Ibid., p. 25.

27. See, for example, Report on the San Francisco Chinese Community Citizen's Survey and Fact Finding Committee, (H. J. Carle and Sons, 1969).

IV. PLACEMENT

Because occupation determines to a large extent how one spends his time, energies, and ta' 'ts, it also affects one's view of his social environment and hi· participation within it. In order to develop a realistic perspec ve of the significance of educational attainment for Asian Americans, it is necessary to examine it in relationship to the kinds of occupational alternatives available to Asian Americans as a result of their educational training.

The first generation of Asian immigrants to this country were relegated to menial labor as a result of the inferior status accorded them by an intolerant society, and their lack of facility with the English language. Coming from cultures that traditionally valued education as a means of social mobility, many became convinced the second generation should seek higher socio-economic status through education. These parents were not unaware of the economic barriers facing their children, despite their American citizenship and higher level of education. The first generation Asian immigrants quickly learned that college degrees provided their children with little assurance of economic or social success.

Job opportunities outside ethnic communities were virtually non-existent, forcing many Asian Americans to depend on their communities for employment. Although doctors, lawyers, accountants, and other self-employed professionals, few in number, were able to utilize their educational skills and provide their communities with much-needed services, the educated Asian American in general had

few choices. He could accept the realities of prejudice and assume inferior tasks of occupations that the majority population did not want, emigrate to his ancestral homeland, although there was no guarantee of economic success there either, or "if he tried very hard, he could get a job at a higher level, but far below his actual qualifications."[1]

The types of social discrimination which restrict the choice of vocation for many Asian Americans still exist. The San Francisco Chinatown Survey and Fact Finding Committee found that employers consistently avoid considering Asians for positions requiring contact with the public. They rationalize that the public at large will not deal with Asian Americans.[2] Although the provision of the Second Constitution of the State of California, which prohibited corporations from hiring Chinese and prevented Chinese from occupations in public works except in the case of punishment was later declared unconstitutional, "the spirit and attitude"[3] of such blatant racism continue to circumscribe vocational opportunities for Asians today. It is still extremely difficult for Asian Americans to gain access to union membership.[3]

Even George L. Farmer, who is understandably impressed by the statistics on the educational attainment of Asian Americans, notes that Asians who have "succeeded" educationally, often find themselves in "dead-end" jobs.[4] Few Asian Americans are in managerial or administrative positions on all levels of employment, in both public and private sectors. Those who are, often have little opportunity for promotion.

The summary of the testimony of Mrs. Ming H. N. Moy before the California Fair Employment Practice Commission (FEPC) in December of 1970, exemplifies the kinds of injustices confronting Asian Americans in the existing social system:

> Mrs. Ming H. N. Moy, who holds an A. B. degree from George Washington University and an A. M. degree in economics from Duke University, has worked in the budget department of McClellan Air Force Base near Sacramento since 1955. She has experienced the frustration of being passed over for promotion many times. Less than two years ago, she was again considered for promotion for the post of budget analyst at the GS-12 level in her department. Again she was passed over, this time by a Caucasian man with only a high school diploma. The official reason given by her supervisor, Mrs. Isabel Storey, was that she could not communicate with others because of her Oriental accent. However, according to her attorney, "Mrs. Moy speaks precisely and her grammar is impeccable."
>
> Although she advanced from a GS-5 level to a GS-11 level in four years, she received no further promotion in grade level for the next 9 years, even though her official personnel folder contained large numbers of commendations. She decided to file a complaint. She said, "I decided to pursue the matter on principle. A person can come to the point at which they lose hope. It does tend to affect one's morale."
>
> Assisted by an attorney, she filed her complaint first with the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer for the Department of the Air Force. Her attorney contended that racial discrimination not only was a factor, but was the sole reason for her non-selection. The EEO officer disagreed.
>
> She then appealed to the Board of Appeals and Review, United States Civil Service Commission. After carefully reviewing her case, the Board ruled that Mrs. Moy was passed over for promotion because of racial discrimination and ordered that she be promoted immediately and that evidence be forwarded to the Board that these recommendations have been put into effect. It further ruled that Mrs. Moy's supervisor, Mrs. Storey, be reprimanded and her personnel decisions "be pre-audited for the next year to make certain that the policy of equal employment opportunity is being carried out."
>
> ...This is yet another example of civil servants of Chinese ancestry having a difficult time getting promotions to higher positions, even though they have worked

> within the system. Unless responsible people in government, on federal, state and local levels, demonstrate otherwise, it will be hard to convince a majority of Chinese of the good faith of the civil service system.[5]

Discrimination against Asian Americans in employment also exists in the form of "positive" stereotypes. However, no one can deny that all stereotypes, both positive and negative, are debasing. On the basis of these prejudiced and fallacious notions, Asian Americans are denied the opportunity to maximize their full human potential.

Alan Jacobsen and Lee Rainwater, in their study of management representatives' evaluation of Asian American employees, found that "a lack of assertive and socially independent character" makes Asian Americans desirable to employers seeking employees "who will be both productive and conforming."[6] Frank A. Quinn, Regional Director of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), included the following in his testimony before the Fair Employment Practice Commission:

> A pattern that I have noticed...is the greater utilization of Oriental women, mostly as clerical workers. I recall once that an employer asked me if I could find him a "good Japanese or Chinese girl" for his secretary because after all, the secretary, as he put it, was the office wife and Oriental women have been well trained to be subservient to the man in the home and therefore would make good secretaries.[7]

This type of prejudice is destructive of the personhood, talents, and abilities of Asian Americans.

For the recently-arrived Asian immigrant, there are even greater obstacles to job opportunities. Ironically, many of them, despite a high degree of educational training in their homelands,

find themselves confined to the same vocational "options" exercised by their predecessors 100 years before: laundrymen, cooks, gardeners, and unskilled laborers. Not only does the new immigrant face old patterns of discrimination, he must also deal with the personal problems of adapting to a new society and adopting a new and difficult language.

A factor frequently overlooked by those interpreting statistics regarding Asian Americans in education is the equation between educational attainment and income. For the Asian in America, despite the superficial indications of statistics that show Asian Americans achieving a high level of educational attainment, scrutiny of income statistics illustrates that educational training does not necessarily have the equivalent income value for Asian Americans as it does for the white population. The Chinese, who rank highest in educational attainment of all groups, rank only fourth in median income. The Pilipinos have the lowest median income of all groups, including Blacks and Chicanos.[8]

Campus Placement Agencies and the Fair Employment Practices Commission

No statistics that show the degree of participation of Asian Americans in placement services are available. The statistical problem stems from the Fair Employment Practices Act, part 4.5, section 1420 (d), which reads:

> 1420. It shall be an unlawful employment practice, unless based upon bona fide occupational qualification, or, except where based on applicable security regulations established by the United States or the State of California;

(d) For any employer or employment agency [emphasis added] to print or circulate or cause to be printed or circulated any publication, or to use any form of application for employment or to make any inquiry in connection with prospective employment, which expresses, directly or indirectly, any limitation, specification, or discrimination as to race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, or sex or any intent to make such limitations, specification or discrimination.[9]

Further, the Fair Employment Practice Commission (FEPC) has published a "Guide to Lawful and Unlawful Pre-Employment Inquiries."[10] The guide is the result of numerous inquiries made by parties affected by the law, including "placement agencies."[11]

The guide emphasizes that it is for pre-employment purposes only, and lists in detail the inquiries which are lawful and unlawful. It is also made clear that "post-hire" records may include information otherwise prohibited.[12] However, in the FEPC "Statement on Surveys and Statistics as to Racial and Ethnic Composition of Work Force or Union Membership," issued in March 1965, the Commission explains "how the State FEP Act applies to collecting racial and ethnic information on employees and job applicants."

Nothing in FEP law or policy precludes tallying, for statistical purposes, the approximate numbers of applicants or employees of each main ethnic group, or making periodic surveys of the ethnic pattern of a work force, or keeping post-hire records including racial or ethnic data, provided they are never used for discriminatory purposes.[13]

The Commission suggests some principles to "observe firm safeguards against discrimination or misunderstanding" in the process of collecting tally data.[14] The information "should be obtained quietly, confidentially, and without questioning individuals orally or through questionnaires. Generally, visual observation plus

common-sense supplementary information is the simplest and most satisfactory method."[15] On another section dealing with a work force, it is stated:

> ...to be meaningful, a review or survey of the ethnic makeup...should reveal numbers of persons of each main group according to levels of skill or supervision, departments or sections, and other significant breakdowns. Grand totals alone will often be of little or no value in analyzing the results of the survey.[16]

Therefore, one can conclude that a detailed placement agency tally of ethnic groups (using the allowable methodology), in conjunction with a campus-wide ethnicity survey, can reveal the percentage of students in each ethnic group who utilize the agency. Should post-hire records with ethnicity data be kept, it would be possible to compare academic discipline with occupation attained. There are, however, numerous shortcomings in the above methodology.

Based upon our findings, specific directive would have to be issued before the inception of such a procedure because ethnicity survey data compiled by institutions of higher education do not reflect a pluralistic perception of Asian Americans. Of the institutions reporting in our survey, only 18 institutions (30% of those reporting) reported ethnic breakdowns beyond the general categories of Asian American or Oriental.[17] Without the total campus figure for each Asian American ethnic group, no comparative data is possible.

Assuming the availability of the above data, post-hire records with ethnicity data (the collection of which is presumably unlawful) must also be available. Of the placement centers contacted, those who keep post-hire records do not request ethnicity data.

In addition, the post-hire records are based on self-reporting forms, and there are implicit limitations in that methodology. The absence of post-hire ethnicity data precludes an analysis of academic discipline and occupation attained at this time.

A third shortcoming in using the method allowed by the FEPC is that tallying yields data of questionable accuracy. The FEPC statement on surveys and statistics relative to racial and ethnic composition suggests:

> Absolute accuracy is neither possible nor essential. In general, if an employee appears to the observer to be of a given racial group, that person will usually be so regarded and treated by others.[18]

The above suggestion places the criteria for ethnic group determination squarely on placement personnel. "Visual observation plus common-sense supplementary information" constitute their guidelines.[19] It is totally unreasonable to expect that any workable knowledge about Asian Americans could accrue from such determinations. Because of the visual observation methods, and "common sense supplementary information," the initial data would be skewed by the questionable ability of placement personnel to accurately identify members of the various Asian American ethnic groups. Most Asian Americans find it difficult to visually distinguish Japanese from Chinese or Korean. Non-Asian American placement personnel would find the task no less simple. Pilipinos are usually recognized as being physically distinct from the above groups, but are often mistaken for Chicanos, Mexican Americans, the Spanish-surnamed, or Blacks. The net effect of visual observation vis-a-vis Asian

Americans is to blur their cultural distinctiveness into a homogenized oriental pastiche.

Common sense supplementary information generally takes the form of surname identification, speech patterns, and information volunteered by the placement client. In the case of surname identification, numbers of Pilipinos have Spanish surnames, and Chinese Americans often have ambiguous surnames; e.g., "Lee," or "Young." Some placement personnel, conceivably, are able to ethnically place a client through recognition of particular speech patterns in conjunction with visual recognition. This is, however, by no means an accurate method of appraisal.

Ethnic identification is sometimes volunteered and provides the most reliable determination. Cases, however, where a client will actually state his or her membership in a particular ethnic group are relatively rare. The more usual case is where inferences are made from the casual remarks of a client.

In addition, clients who inquire about affirmative action programs of prospective employers sometimes raise the question of ethnicity themselves. In such an instance, it is questionable whether a counselor would be acting unlawfully to ascertain the ethnicity of his client in order to answer the question, particularly in cases where the ethnicity of the client was ambiguous; e.g., a Pilipino with a Spanish surname.

The ethnic identification of a client is also occasionally determined by concensus of the placement staff. This method is normally quite rare. In toto, the methodology allowable by the

FEPC is one that makes functional ethnicity data about Asian American ethnic groups difficult to collect.

***

We recommend that the State mandate uniform statistical reporting of placement activities--to include ethnicity data, post-hire records, and salary surveys--in order to generate an accurate appraisal of the ways in which Asian Americans and other ethnic minorities are integrated into employment positions.

NOTES

1. George L. Farmer, Education: The Dilemma of the Oriental American (University of Southern California: School of Education, 1969), p. 37.

2. Report of the San Francisco Chinese Community Citizens' Survey and Fact Finding Committee (San Francisco: H. J. Carle and Sons, 1969), pp. 60-61.

3. Ibid., p. 60.

4. Farmer, Op. cit., p. 55a.

5. State of California, Fair Employment Practices Commission, Chinese in San Francisco--1970, Employment Problems of the Community as Presented in Testimony (San Francisco, December 1970), p. 28.

6. Alan Jacobsen and Lee Rainwater, "A Study of Management Representative Evaluations of Nisei Workers," Social Forces, 1(October 1953), p. 32.

7. State of California, Op. cit., p. 37.

8. State of California, Department of Industrial Relations, Californians of Japanese, Chinese and Filipino Ancestry--Population, Education, Employment, Income (San Francisco: Division of Fair Employment Practices, 1969), pp. 11, 14.

9. State of California, Fair Employment Practice Commission, Fair Employment Practice Act, FEPC Rules and Regulations, Guide to Pre-Employment Inquiries, n.d., pp. 6-7.

10. Ibid., p. 23.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., p. 24.

13. State of California, Fair Employment Practice Commission, Statement on Surveys and Statistics as to Racial and Ethnic Composition of Work Force or Union Membership, March 1965, p. 1.

14. Ibid., p. 2.

15. Ibid., p. 3.

16. Ibid.

17. Robert B. Yoshioka, et al., Questionnaire on Asian American Studies, Parts I and II, October 1972.

18. State of California, Fair Employment Practice Commission, Statement on Surveys and Statistics as to Racial and Ethnic Composition of Work Force or Union Membership, March 1965, p. 3.

19. Ibid.

V. ASIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITIES AND HIGHER EDUCATION

For many Asian Americans, the sense of community is derived from both geographical and psychological environments. For some, the community is the physical location in which their social interaction occurs, where their jobs are, and where their friends and relatives live--the Chinatowns, Manilatowns and Little Tokyos. Others, who are spatially removed from the ghetto still derive their sense of community from earlier ghetto patterns of social interaction. This is evidenced by the number of Asian Americans who will drive miles back to the ghetto community to buy foodstuffs readily available in their local supermarkets. More significant is the growing number of Asian American students from middle-class suburbs such as Carmichael, San Mateo, and Gardena, who are obtaining training in order to serve urban communities like Chinatown, Manilatown, or Little Tokyo.

We solicited responses from community organizations and community leaders regarding their concerns with respect to Asian Americans in higher education. A thirteen-item questionnaire was sent to 105 community organizations and/or community leaders. Our selection criteria for this sample was based on two considerations: (1) organizational involvement with young people in their respective communities, and (2) identifiable organization or individual interest in education as it relates to community problems. The questionnaires were sent to the following general geographic areas:

San Francisco, Los Angeles, Sacramento, Stockton, Marysville, and San Diego.

Twenty-seven questionnaires were returned. Our information and conclusions for this section are based on these responses. Before interpreting the data, it is necessary to note existing biases in this study. One of the major biases comes from the unclear definition of "Asian American Communities." Our test instrument was sent to Japanese, Chinese and Pilipino organizations, and in addition, to Sihks (2), Koreans (1), and Samoans (1). We excluded Indonesians, Thais, Burmese, Cambodians, Laotians, and Vietnamese from our sample because we were unable to locate community organizations which drew their predominant membership from these latter ethnic groups.

Most of the questionnaires returned were from the Chinese (n=13) and the Japanese (n=12) communities. Only two Pilipino communities responded. We received no response from any other ethnic communities included in our sample. Therefore, the statistical data largely reflects the concerns of the Chinese and Japanese communities. With only twenty-seven responses, it is difficult to construct a coherent and consistent composite picture of the educational issues which concern Asian American communities. A statistically significant response to this study might have been illicited had the time frame within which we worked, allowed for follow-up letters and telephone calls. As a sample study, our results point to the dearth of information currently available about Asian American community organizations.

Asian American Communities--What Are They?

As indicated in an earlier chapter, when we speak of "Asian Americans," we are not describing a homogeneous ethnic group; rather, we are addressing ourselves to several ethnic groups whose experiences in America have been as diverse as the multiple cultural and historical contexts from which our immigrant forefathers sprang. Acculturation is not so much related to the date of arrival in America for each ethnic group, but rather is more synchronous with each group's emphasis on assimilation into the prevailing cultural milieu.

The data collected from our community respondents supports our contention that Asian Americans do not share a singular view of themselves. When we inquired about a community's perceived identity, the responses fell into ten categories. In several instances, the respondents' personal identity differed from the identification they felt members of their organization had of themselves. Of the twenty-seven responses, 34% felt their communities perceived their identity as Asian American, 14% believed their community identity to be Americans of Asian Descent, while 10% identified themselves and members of their community as Orientals and another 10% felt their primary identity was as Chinese; 8% saw themselves as Chinese Americans, while 4% answered that they were Japanese Americans. Six percent defined themselves as Pilipinos and another 4% felt that they had no specific ethnic identity at all.[1]

Asian Americans in Higher Education

When asked if Asian Americans have been "successfully accommodated within the various sectors of higher education," a large majority, 78.5% responded negatively, 14.5% felt Asians have been successfully accommodated, and 8% did not respond.[2] However, in answer to the question of how many students continue their education beyond high school, the cumulative average was 62%.[3] (The small percentage of returns does not allow for any further breakdown ethnically.) With regard to the question of fair access to and equality of opportunity in higher education, nearly all respondents felt there were neither equality of opportunity nor fair access, two respondents felt the existing system was fair, and one did not answer.[4] One of the greatest concerns expressed on the questionnaire was the need for increased financial assistance to defray the rising cost of higher education.[5]

The chronic problems created by poor housing, inadequate health care, and lack of desirable employment opportunities are not exclusively Asian American problems, but in ghetto circumstances, these difficulties pose almost insurmountable obstacles to individuals caught in the vicious cycle of poverty.[6] When a disadvantaged Asian American is fortunate enough to be given the opportunity to break this cycle by attending an institution of higher education, often the shock of entering a totally alien environment has a detrimental effect on the person's academic performance. For the bright but poor Asian American, the culture shock

is aggravated by the problems of bilingualism as well as oftentimes inadequate academic training. These problems, unless given special attention, can seriously hamper a student's realization of his academic potential, as well as his ability to compete successfully with students from middle and upper-middle class backgrounds in an institutional context which is not as strange or intimidating to this latter group.[7]

Counseling

When we asked if counselors tended to influence Asian American students to major in the natural and physical sciences rather than in the humanities or social sciences, 88% responded affirmatively.[8] One of the common reasons given was that counselors have this bias arising from the fact that many bilingual children have difficulty with English, therefore excel in the sciences which require a minimum of verbal expression. This kind of reasoning reinforces the weakness of the educational system in dealing with this multi-cultural society and its tendency to impose singular career limitations on large segments of the population.

The results of this kind of educational experience tends to strip the ethnic communities of trained and culturally sensitive leaders. It would be safe to conjecture that one of the reasons many Asians do not return to serve their communities is that the changes forced on an individual in order to advance educationally compels him to abandon his cultural affinity for his ethnic community. There is a great need for community leaders and professionals,

especially if they are bilingual, in communities with a large population of recent immigrants and elderly citizens, many of whom speak no English and need social services.

Immigrant Concerns and the Need for Bilingual Education

Since the quota system for immigration was altered in 1965 to more equitably allow for the admittance of immigrants from Asia, large numbers of new Americans have been arriving annually (see Section III). The problems of employment, housing, social adjustment, and language are especially severe for these newcomers, but they can be alleviated by trained personnel and appropriate programs. By setting priorities in the areas of cultural education, practical language training, educational and social counseling, public higher education could contribute significantly in creating a more dynamic and viable adaptive mechanism for the newly-arrived.

The need for language training programs is of paramount importance. Our perception of this situation is reinforced by the responses we received to our questionnaire. Of the individuals and organizations who answered, 92% felt that inadequate efforts were being made toward alleviating the linguistic needs of Asian American children, while only 8% responded that the existing bilingual education programs were satisfactory.[9]

The existing language training courses for Chinese newcomers in San Francisco are hampered by lack of adequate funds, trained instructors, instructional materials and equipment, and physical facilities and cannot provide services to all who need them.[10]

From what information we have gathered thus far, we conclude that there remains much to be done in terms of educational reform in California. We have cited a number of problem areas in higher education that directly concerns Asian American communities. The authors of the current Master Plan for Higher Education could not have foreseen the dynamic changes in society, nor the volatile emergence of minority concerns developing in the 1960's. The fight against social inequities and racism must begin somewhere. The most appropriate place to begin this undertaking is in the public school system.

While our sample for this questionnaire is statistically insignificant, the individual subjective responses falling into definite categories can give valuable insight into the possible avenues of response open to educators and legislators as each group in their own way tries to meet the demands of the culturally diverse, heterogeneous, and pluralistic minority called Asian Americans.

***

We recommend that the State acknowledge that those directly involved with and affected by the public school system can best define and articulate areas of specific need, and pursue a course of action which would result in the return of a measure of control over education, especially at the primary and secondary levels, to the local communities.

commend that the State initiate bilingual and bicultural training programs in order to sensitize those involved in education to the special needs of Asian Americans and other ethnic minorities, and simultaneously place many of these teachers in minority communities where their talents are most vitally needed.

NOTES

1. Robert B. Yoshioka, et al., Asian Americans and Higher Education, Community Questionnaire, October 1972, item 4.

2. Ibid., item 1.

3. Ibid., item 2.

4. Ibid., item 9.

5. Ibid., item 11.

6. Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau with Eve Pell, To Serve the Devil, Vol. II: Colonials and Sojourners (New York: Random House, 1971), p. xxxi.

7. Bay Area Social Planning Council, Education and Language Training, Working Paper VI, June 1970, pp. 1-2. Permission to quote received from Mr. Martin Gerber, Associate Executive Director.

8. Robert B. Yoshioka, Op. cit., item 10.

9. Ibid., item 5.

10. Bay Area Social Planning Council, Op. cit.

VI. CONTINUING EDUCATION AND RETRAINING

One of the most important trends in American higher education today is the move to solicit new students -- who fall outside the traditional 18 to 24-year-old age group -- to participate in the educational process. The desire on the part of a growing number of educational institutions to recruit students from traditionally non-student generating sources is realistically promoted by three considerations.

For varying personal and occupational reasons, people are seeking access to higher education on a continuing basis. Many individuals missed the opportunity when they were young because they lacked the motivation. Some were not able to attend school because they could not afford it, while others were unable to participate because they married and were occupied with raising their families. Many individuals are eager for a second chance, having dropped out before finishing, and there are those whose professional competence demand retraining in light of new technological advances in their occupational fields. For these individuals, according to the President's Task Force on the Extended University:

> ...their work or other responsibilities will not allow them to study except on a part-time basis -- and such study they are likely to find, is discouraged by .. schedules and residence requirements, and by their own lack of proximity to centers of learning.[1] (emphasis supplied)

Older individuals are not the only ones who are interested in meaningful part-time (continuing) education. There are growing numbers of young people who should have the option of defining their college experience, in essence, "stopping out." These people should be allowed to "acquire work or community experience and to return later when they are more certain of their goals."[2]

The third reason for pursuing continuing education is more pragmatic. Public higher education has reached a plateau in its growth, yet with constantly escalating costs, colleges are fiscally hard-pressed and

> ... increases in enrollment will substantially add to the University's base of needed resources .. The Task Force is ... convinced ... that further study and experience with these programs (in continuing education) will reveal ways of reducing unit costs of instruction ... as a whole.[3]

It is interesting to note that even in crisis situations, segments of public higher education will seek to alter the whole fabric of fiscal responsibility by proposing new programs, rather than attending to the problem of reallocating scarce resources "in house." It would be more reasonable to re-evaluate present institutional expenditures rather than hoping that additional programs will find the solutions to budgetary problems not of their making, yet ipso facto, with the existence of an autonomous and powerful departmental structure in all sectors of public higher education, it may well be that new programs are the only realistic way to make structural alterations in the briefest time. It is a telling commentary that the thrust for significant institutional innovation comes from outside the traditional academic context.

This particular posture is because traditionally American higher education has responded to financial crisis by delaying expenditures rather than addressing itself to the problem of "productivity." According to Ms. Virginia Smith:

> Substantial increases in productivity will likely be achieved only through changes in the educational process itself. Certainly the significant advances in productivity in industry have involved the process of productivity rather than support functions. In higher education, such changes can occur only with experimentation and innovation in academic programs, in instructional techniques, and in the relationship of the student to the institution.[4]

Accordingly, some form of accessible continuing education will serve to solve institutional difficulties by addressing itself to the following points:

> (1) The introduction of late afternoon, evening and weekend classes should significantly increase the utilization of existing campus facilities;
>
> (2) The more aggressive use of various new educational technologies, especially when coordinated ... will be facilitated by the enrollment of part-time students in multi-campus programs ... and
>
> (3) The extension of ... degree programs off the campus will reduce the need for the full panoply of additional capital facilities that would be necessary to accommodate a residential student body in conventional ways.[5]

Continuing education programs are particularly important to Asian American communities because we believe that vigorous implementation of such programs signifies a <u>real</u> institutional commitment to the often articulated position that public higher education is a <u>service</u>. While speaking specifically to the University of California's situation, the following remarks are germane to all sectors of public higher education:

> Since the concept of extended degree programs itself springs from a sense of service to the community, we can make a major contribution to the total community by designing new programs in areas of great social need. The demand for educated people in these broad areas will continue to grow, and the University will play an important role compatible with its purposes and particular competence.[6]

Additionally, the report continues:

> The field of urban studies offers ... (an) ... area in which extended degree programs would appeal not only to people building careers in the field but also to those who are seeking to improve their ability to undertake leadership roles of various kinds in their communities.[7] (emphasis supplied)

This articulated sector-wide goal would serve the interests of Asian American communities and complement Asian American/ethnic studies programs within a more traditional institutional context by providing a mechanism for the dissemination of information to those who are most in need of it so that we may affect positive and constructive changes in the structure and function of our social environment.

Extended education would have particular impact upon our communities since expanded accessibility would give special consideration to individuals in the following categories:

> --Those whose intellectual potential is far greater than their formal school record
>
> --People of lower-income groups, including members of minority communities and returning veterans
>
> -- Residents of the inner city on the one hand and of small towns and rural areas on the other.[8]
> (emphasis supplied)

Asian American communities are filled with non-English speaking individuals whose intellectual potential far exceeds culturally and linguistically biased educational measurements. These

individuals may be newly arrived immigrants or older immigrants who have never left the linguistic boundaries of their communities. Some of them are professionals or highly skilled technicians and require specialized curricula within the context of the continuing education program. Courses must be geared to respond to the language difficulty and to specific professional or technical requirements needed to ensure their positive entry into the job market.

Many of our number are poor and only nominally in the labor market. They are squeezed into pockets of poverty, in both urban and rural areas. They are working in sweat shops and farm labor camps, and their intellectual and creative potentials are being wasted to provide cheap labor for the garment industry and agribusiness interests in the state.

Our problems are acute and most critical in the inner city and rural areas of our widespread communities. Off-campus extended learning centers should therefore be located within urban and rural Asian American communities. Multi-sector coordinating learning centers of the type envisioned below should be seriously considered.

> These centers will be of various sizes. A few located in areas serving a large population at a considerable distance from any of the University campuses, should be of a substantial scale. Others, much smaller, could be created without major expenditure of funds. Typically, they would provide a few classrooms and offices for seminars, tutorials, and counseling; also learning carrels; viewing facilities; and a small library. Facilities of this kind could be established by leasing and remodelling small buildings, or in some cases, by securing use of space for evening and weekend use of existing educational facilities.[9]

It is imperative that Asian Americans be given favorable consideration in all deliberations concerning the establishment of learning centers, either within or with close proximity to our various urban and rural communities. Further, it is essential that these learning centers provide, through the innovative use of technology, meaningful vocational and academic educational courses of study which would serve community needs.

The theoretical consideration of the problems facing Asian Americans with regard to continuing education and retraining does not address itself to the practical implementation of this program by the three segments in public postsecondary education.

Media proximity and appropriateness of resources to each identifiable learning situation should be the prime directive in determining segmental participation. Given ideal circumstances a single learning center in a depressed rural or urban area might incorporate educational programs sponsored by each of the three segments which would appeal to three distinct audiences. Such learning centers would open the door for more cooperative undertakings that would maximize resource utilization and create an environment where learning environments would be complementary rather than competitive.

***

We recommend that the State undertake a feasibility study in coordination with the various sectors in public higher education and those directly affected, to establish the realistic parameters for continuing education programs in the urban and rural Asian American communities.

We also recommend that the State create increased opportunities for vocational training and adult education for Asian Americans and other ethnic groups in urban and rural situations, with emphasis on the special needs of new immigrants, as well as for the undereducated and the unskilled.

NOTES

1. President's Task Force on the Extended University, Degree Programs for the Part-Time Student: A Proposal, University of California, Davis, November 1971, p. 1.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 31.

4. Virginia Smith, "More For Less: A New Priority," Universal Higher Education: Costs and Benefits, (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education. Background papers for participants in the Fifty-Fourth Annual Meeting of the ACE, 1971), p. 127.

5. President's Task Force on the Extended University, Op. cit.

6. Ibid., p. 11.

7. Ibid., p. 12.

8. Ibid., p. 6.

9. Ibid., p. 15.

VII. ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES

There are many institutions of higher education in California that are attempting to respond to the educational needs of Asian Americans. Some campuses can point to several programs, formal and informal, which they have established to increase the enrollment of Asian American students. A few campuses list modifications they have made in their curricular and research programs in order to facilitate instruction in aspects of the Asian American experience, and investigation of the problems of Asian American communities. When viewed in its totality, however, the response of higher education can only be seen as unimpressive.

Our survey of the 169 campuses in the community colleges, State University and Colleges, and University of California system revealed that only 27 campuses reported that they offer courses in the area of Asian American Studies.[1] Only one campus in the community college system reported the establishment of a separate instructional unit charged specifically with offering courses in Asian American Studies.[2] Campuses in the State University and Colleges and University of California systems reported the establishment of two and two such programs respectively.[3] Because these programs are in their developmental stages--none has been in existence for more than three years--it is not possible for us to make a definitive or even useful evaluation of their educational effectiveness at this time. We have included a tabulation of Asian American Studies curricula at institutions within the three segments and have

put these tables in the Appendix. With only a handful of notable exceptions, however, these efforts seem to be guided not by long range and thoughtful planning, but by the initiative of individual faculty members or the demands of "activist" students. There are campuses making either no attempt, or only minimal efforts to develop instructional programs in Asian American Studies. These campuses claim that they have not developed Asian American Studies programs because of a lack of Asian American student enrollment or because of a lack of student interest.

The survey also revealed that almost no effort is being made to launch research programs to study the problems of Asian American communities. Only one campus reported the establishment of such programs. Moreover, those programs that have been started are largely dependent on vagaries of outside financing and are particularly vulnerable to changes in national and local funding priorities. Further, these programs do not appear to be designed to deal with the complex operational and conceptual problems associated with academic and field research conducted in and on Asian American communities, and seem to be incapable of designing and executing critical interdisciplinary and long-range research.

We are not so much concerned with the actual structure of an Asian American Studies component within the various sectors of public higher education in California. Nor are we concerned ab the manner in which individual Asian American Studies programs will be implemented. These considerations will have to be determined largely by individual campuses on the basis of such factors as

funding limitations, availability of qualified faculty, and students' interests and needs. Rather we are addressing ourselves to the broad problem areas within the general classification of interdisciplinary ethnic studies units. We turn now to a discussion of general issues and questions which should help to clarify and define the parameters of Asian American Studies.

What is Needed: Institutional Response

Education is a service. The public institutions which comprise California's system of higher education are service institutions. No social institution has ever been called upon to change the society that created it, yet this is precisely what is being asked of the Community Colleges, State University and Colleges, and the University of California. Asian Americans, along with other minority groups, are asking higher education to provide relevant services and training that will lead to widespread social change.

Institutional responses to the need for action-oriented programs, unless supported and financed by prominent individuals who speak for powerful institutions, have usually proceeded on a haphazard basis guided by individual faculty decisions or the plans of individual academic units. For Asian Americans, often overlooked by social scientists because of the absence of relevant data, the general unavailability of research or support funds, this type of response has not been effective.

What is needed is for higher education to initiate a focused, systematic and responsible concern for Asian Americans and their

problems. To do so, all sectors of higher education must re-evaluate and redirect their activities on an institutional level.

Design of Institutional Response

In designing an educational program for Asian Americans, planners at the campus level will be faced with the question of whether it is better to establish a separate unit to oversee the entire program, or whether it is preferable to incorporate the requisite activities into existing units. Both responses are needed.

An effective response to the educational problems of Asian Americans requires that a fully-organized, integrated system of teachers, researchers, and community representatives be established as a permanent part of the campus. A single unit will be able to guide and develop activities more effectively than several uncoordinated agencies. It will be highly visible and responsive to Asian American students and community residents with needs and proposals, and it will be directly responsible for the success or failure of the total program.

At the same time, campus planners must realize that only a fully-developed intelligentsia of Asian Americans, with training in every discipline can meet the deepest needs of the Asian American communities and Asian American students. It is of paramount importance that institutional planners be made aware of this dual need, and that they plan creatively to incorporate appropriate courses, research programs and community action projects into their campus-wide or system-wide educational academic plan.

Asian American Studies Programs

Our call for Asian American Studies programs needs no elaborate explanation. It is justified by the unique and dual nature of the experience of Asians in the United States. Unlike white immigrants, Asian immigrants have been and are being excluded from access to the mainstream of American life, and as a result, have a special history and suffer from particular problems with a profoundly national-cultural dimension. We have yet to examine these areas with the respect and intellectual rigor they demand. As a result, Asian Americans, even those who have seemingly "made it," suffer from severe educational, cultural, and personal problems, and Asian American communities fall prey to the widest possible spectrum of social ills.

Asian American Studies' research, instructional, and service programs will perform several important functions. They will provide a setting within which Asian American students can learn about their heritage. They will provide necessary and specialized instruction to help students overcome educational deficiencies. They will provide a means by which the troubles of Asian Americans and their communities can be examined. They will contribute to the education of white students as well as non-Asian minority students.

By performing these functions, Asian American Studies programs will help to develop individuals equipped to provide the leadership on the various levels of political and cultural action required to forge sensitive and lasting solutions to the problems of all Asian Americans.

The sense of exclusivity articulated at this juncture should not be taken as racist injunction. What is implied is that the Asian American Studies programs should service the entire educational community with continuing primary responsibility for teaching to be placed on serving Asian Americans.

Instructional Program

Asian American curricula should have three thrusts. The first should focus on an examination of Asian American identity and contemporary problems. Because of the nature of the subject matter, it is envisioned that this thrust might be profitably integrated into educational skill-building programs. The second thrust should be designed to give the individual a sense of his cultural-historical milieu with the emphasis placed on current research and active participation in community activities. The third thrust should be designed to give all students, Asians and non-Asians alike, an understanding of the Asian American experience.

Coupled with the three academic missions just mentioned must be a comprehensive, attractive, and non-threatening academic and personal counseling resource center where students would be challenged to question their educational priorities and possibly redefine their career aspirations. The counseling which is held necessary is sadly lacking on many college campuses with the result that many students remain educationally unfulfilled in spite of the fact that numbers of Asian Americans graduate from college every year. An Asian American Studies program provides a place

within the institution for young people to more freely explore their options.

In designing an Asian American Studies curriculum, faculty members should be particularly concerned with what will be offered to the students who come from poverty stricken inner cities and rural areas. The first job of the program is not to introduce these students to a strange new world with an ancient language as one requirement, plus a selection of Plato and Aristotle as another, and then some science, mathematics, and literature for which they are ill-prepared to understand.

The faculty must realize that many, if not most, of the students will need a great deal of remedial work in such basic areas as English (reading and composition) and mathematics. The faculty must plan the programs with the awareness that the decision for many students was made for them long ago that they were not going to meet the educational or social standards of several fields. Therefore, they were guided into less intellectually demanding or more socially secure educational pursuits. These students should be given every opportunity to gain the confidence and skill necessary to benefit fully from the campus' entire curriculum. The faculty should either offer courses to fill the gaps in the students' educational preparation, or at least, ensure that other campus units assume this responsibility.

A substantial portion of the curriculum should deal with the students' own history. Students should be taught the history of Asian American communities, their physical growth in relation

to economic growth, the many migrations which the growth reflects. Instruction in this area will require broader instruction in the history, sociology, and economics of the state and of the nation. Instruction in these areas, however, should be presented with a far different focus than that offered in conventional social science courses. Students should see clearly the reason for the historical and contemporary treatment of Asians in the United States. Courses in this area should be invaluable for students who wish to learn about how American society has treated minority groups.

The curriculum should include courses which examine the current circumstances of Asian American communities. Students should study the forces at work: the governmental structure, the actual working political structure, the cultural and religious groups, the ethnic complex and its effects. A large part of this section should be concerned with understanding the processes of changing institutions, and the tools by which change can be achieved. Students should gain insight into the special needs of Asian American communities for social psychologists, city planners, doctors, lawyers, teachers, and researchers. In addition, this section of the instructional program should provide training for those students who are interested in directly intervening in community problems. These students should be given the basic knowledge and common language needed to understand the communities. Much of this training should be carried out in the communities themselves where students will be exposed to real problems and issues.

Finally, Asian American Studies programs should offer curricula leading to advanced degrees. The fact that in the past so few Asian Americans have been recruited into the ranks of graduate students in fields concerned with the Asian American experience means today that Asian American communities are handicapped by the lack of people with the interest, knowledge, and motivation needed to carry out some of the most critically necessary kinds of research and service programs The proliferation of students who were trained as professionals would ultimately result in the solution of many of those problems as those individuals with advanced degrees returned to their home environments.

An instructional program such as the outlined would obviously be highly complex. Coherence, however, would be provided by the fact that it would be based on the educational needs and aspirations of Asian American students. The program would help provide the opportunity for students to follow any line of college study for which they have the capacity and motivation. Further, the program would ensure that several students, many more than in the past, will direct their energy and attention toward the search of solutions to the manifold problems of Asian American communities.

Research Programs

Research programs in Asian American Studies should be organized to promote the kinds of multi-disciplinary and long-range studies needed to understand the social problems of Asian Americans. The

guiding objective of all research programs concerning Asian Americans should be to improve society's total competence to deal with the multi-faceted problems it faces. To reach this objective, Asian American Studies programs should promote both basic research in order to obtain the knowledge required to accomplish this improvement and mission-oriented research in order to help resolve specific problems.

It is not possible to list all of the specific problems, or even all of the general problem areas that research organizations should study. There are, however, several obvious ways in which research programs could contribute to the betterment of the welfare of Asian Americans.

Research in these areas would have immediately practical as well as more theoretical importance. Such research would contribute importantly to increasing the efficiency, adaptiveness, and sensitivity of social institutions which influence the development of Asian American communities. It would help social planners to understand where the most severe problems lie, what their causes are, and what kinds of social change programs are most likely to be effective in resolving them.

The development of a viable program in Asian American Studies cannot reasonably be expected to succeed unless, as is the case in cultural anthropology, the educational unit is given the freedom to actively engage in field research. Unlike the cultural anthropologist, the researcher in Asian American Studies should be

encouraged to use his newly-gained knowledge to affect change: (1) within the institution, and (2) within the community.

Philosophically and methodologically, this commitment to social change through academic research is one of the touchstones of any serious ethnic studies program. Unless pure academic research results in a significant positive alteration of a community's ability to survive and prosper, there is a real danger that ethnic studies per se will not be useful to the communities which ethnic scholars study. If that situation develops, then Asian American Studies as a solely academic exercise merely reinforces the inertia within the instruction which mitigates against change.

This is not to say, however, that ethnic studies should not deal with questions of scholarship, pure research, or philosophy. The various institutions of higher education are the only places where these sorts of activities are subsidized and encouraged. Just as it is not reasonable to call for change without any insight into a situation, neither is it tenable to pursue research questions and not make the results of one's findings available to the research objects.

A commitment to social change through coordinated research and a clear vision of community needs is what potentially distinguishes Asian American Studies from the theoretical academic model in higher education. Academicians argue against the inclusion of ethnic studies within the system citing the various arguments mentioned above. Their positon is predicated on an out-of-date appreciation for the goals of higher education. The scholar, for

example, is no longer the single guardian of the sacred flame of knowledge. Life goals of individuals from different economic, social, political, and emotional environments vary greatly. While one may still speak of great scientific truths, it is becoming increasingly clear that social "truths" are relative, variable, and transmutable.

Public Service Programs

In order for Asian American Studies programs to provide effective public service to Asian American communities, its faculty and students must establish close, collaborative relationships with community residents. Only when such relationships are established can the faculty be certain that the severest problems of the Asian American communities receive and continue to receive urgent attention on Asian American Studies programs' public service agenda.

To insure that productive relationships between the communities and Asian American Studies programs are established, faculty members should work with community control, extra-murally funded, with several functional and financial links between these centers and the campuses in the immediate vicinity. Operated properly, such centers would meet the immediate needs of the communities, and in addition, would generate a greater degree of community understanding and appreciation for the kinds of services that higher education can provide. The close working relationship between town and gown would be beneficial and psychologically supportive of mutually agreed upon working relationships.

Public service programs invariably generate controversy and adverse criticism. These prospects, should not deter the faculty and students from active participation in community affairs. Because of their training and experience, the faculty and students could help all parties become aware of the broad implications of their activities and oftentimes preclude the dominance of local and narrowly parochial views.

Responsibilities of the Campus Community

It is essential that the entire campus community assume the responsibility of meeting the educational needs of Asian Americans. Unless all sectors of the campus participate in this effort, there is a great danger that the Asian American Studies program will become a cultural and intellectual ghetto on campus which mirrors the conditions found in society at large; less than total campus support for ethnic studies will drastically curtail program success.

Many concerned faculty members, particularly those from minority groups who deem public service important to their overall academic performance, find their academic careers jeopardized by the singular dependence upon research as the indicator of academic competence and professional growth. Understandably, these faculty members are hesitant to undertake research and public service of value to Asian American communities where research findings and publication would be in the distant future. As a result, relatively little research and public service of value to Asian American communities is being done. Clearly, alternative models for aca-

demic recognition and rewards are needed.

Not only must the campus re-evaluate its traditional criteria for faculty recognition and promotion, but it must also review its criteria for allocating faculty positions and research support funds. Consideration should be given to the question of whether the present emphasis upon research in the physical, agricultural, and engineering sciences consumes resources which could be better employed in research on community problems. Unless adequate financial support is provided, teaching and research programs concerned with Asian American communities are bound to fail.

***

We recommend that the State appropriate funds toward a curriculum development project that will generate new Asian American Studies and ethnic studies materials.

We further recommend that any and all research conducted on the Asian American experience and that of other ethnic groups be done by and with the full cooperation of those directly involved and affected.

We strongly recommend that Asian American Studies within the context of ethnic studies programs be made an integral part of the new Master Plan for Higher Education in the State of California, and that these programs receive both financial and moral support for their progress and development on all levels of public higher education.

NOTES

1. These campuses are

Community Colleges:	Barstow College
	Butte College
	Cabrillo College
	Contra Costa College
	DeAnza College
	Laney College
	Los Angeles City College
	North Peralta College
	Sacramento City College
	San Francisco, City College of
	Santa Rosa Junior College
	Yuba College
State University and Colleges:	Hayward Campus
	Long Beach Campus
	Los Angeles Campus
	Pomona Campus
	Sacramento Campus
	San Francisco Campus
	San Jose Campus
	Sonoma Campus
University of California:	Berkeley Campus
	Davis Campus
	Irvine Campus
	Los Angeles Campus
	San Diego Campus
	Santa Barbara Campus
	Santa Cruz Campus

2. Yuba College.

3. State University and Colleges: San Francisco and Sonoma campuses; University of California: Berkeley and Davis campuses.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Asian American Independent Consultants recommend the following to the California State Legislature for immediate consideration and action:

Chapter II:

1. We recommend that Asian American Studies and ethnic studies be made a mandatory part of the course of study for all prospective teachers and guidance counselors.

2. We also recommend that the State inititate and fund research to review and revise as necessary existing curriculum materials being used in the public education system, particularly in history and social studies, to insure an accurate representation of the participation of Asian Americans and other ethnic minorities in the development of this country.

Chapter III:

1. We recommend that the State immediately increase financial aids to all qualified low-income persons who seek but are presently economically excluded from access to higher education.

2. That the State expand opportunities for vocational training and adult education for Asian Americans and other ethnic minorities by locating learning resource centers within urban and rural communities in which concentrations of ethnic minorities are found.

3. That the State expand successful minority recruitment programs such as EOP and GOP with the specific charge of seeking out Pilipinos, Koreans, immigrant Chinese Americans, and Asian American women for admission to postsecondary educational institutions.

4. That the State immediately institute a coordinated research and evaluation program, with cooperation from all ethnic studies programs, to investigate the discriminatory practices regarding women in undergraduate, graduate, and

professional education.

5. We recommend that the State of California mandate a uniform system of statistical reporting for each of the three segments in higher education; that the information include data on (a) the specific ethnic composition of students, graduate and undergraduate; faculty and staff, academic and non-academic including department, position, and sex; (b) the ethnic distribution of graduate and undergraduate students by age, major, and sex; (c) of administrators including position and sex; and (d) the ethnic and sexual distribution of students receiving financial aids, counseling, and placement services.

6. We recommend that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education (CCHE) be delegated the task of collecting statistical data in a consistent and uniform manner from the three segments of public higher education for the purpose of analyzing and evaluating the participation of Asian Americans and members of other ethnic groups in public postsecondary education.

Chapter IV:

1. We recommend that the State mandate uniform statistical reporting of placement activities--to include ethnicity data, post-hire records, and salary surveys--in order to generate an accurate appraisal of the ways in which Asian Americans and other ethnic minorities are integrated into employment positions.

Chapter V:

1. We recommend that the State acknowledge that those directly involved with and affected by the public school system can best define and articulate areas of specific need, and pursue a course of action which would result in the return of a measure of control over education, especially at the primary and secondary levels, to the local communities.

2 We also recommend that the State initiate bilingual and bicultural teacher-training programs in order to sensitize those involved in education to the special needs of Asian Americans and other ethnic minorities, and simultaneously place many of these teachers in minority communities where their talents are most vitally needed.

Chapter VI:

1. We recommend that the State undertake a feasibility study in coordination with the various sectors in public higher education and those directly affected, to establish the realistic parameters for continuing education programs in the urban and rural Asian American communities.

2. We also recommend that the state create increased opportunities for vocational training and adult education for Asian Americans and other ethnic groups in urban and rural situations, with emphasis on the special needs of new immigrants, as well as for the undereducated and the unskilled.

Chapter VII:

1. We recommend that the State appropriate funds toward a curriculum development project that will generate new Asian American Studies and ethnic studies materials.

2. We further recommend that any and all research conducted on the Asian American experience and that of other ethnic groups be done by and with the full cooperation of those directly involved and affected.

3. We strongly recommend that Asian American Studies within the context of ethnic studies programs be made an integral part of the new Master Plan for Higher Education in the State of California, and that these programs receive both financial and moral support for their progress and development on all levels of public higher education.

Appendix A

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

American Council on Education, A Fact Book on Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: ACE, 1971.

Arensberg, Conrad M. and Solon T. Kimball, Culture and Community. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

Asian American Research Project, Asians in America: Bibliography of Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations. University of California, Davis: March 1970.

Barron, Milton L. (ed.), Minorities in a Changing World. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

Berkeley Unified School District, Sojourner II. Agora/Berkeley High School: Asian Writers' Project/Asian Media Project, June 1972.

Blalock, Hubert M., Toward a Theory of Minority Group Relations. New York: Capricorn Books, 1967.

Buaken, Manuel, I Have Lived with the American People. Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1948.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New Students and New Places. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Conrat, Maisie and Richard, Executive Order 9066, the Internment of 110,000 Japanese Americans. California Historical Society, 1972.

Crossland, F. E., Minority Access to College. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Daniels, Roger and Harry Kitano, American Racism. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Farmer, George L., Education: The Dilemma of the Oriental American. University of Southern California: School of Education, 1969.

Fellows, Donald Keith, A Mosaic of America's Ethnic Minorities. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1972.

Galedo, Lillian, Laurena Cabanero and Brian Tom, Roadblocks to Community Building: A Case Study of the Stockton Filipino Community Center Project. University of California, Davis: Asian American Studies Division, 1970.

Gerth, Hans and C. Wright Mills, Character and Social Structure: The Psychology of Social Institutions. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1964.

Gittler, Joseph V. (ed.), Understanding Minority Groups, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1963.

Haslam, Gerald W., Forgotter. Pages of American Literature, New York: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1963.

Horinouchi, Isao, Educational Values and Preadaptation in the Acculturation of Japanese Americans. Sacramento Anthropological Society, 1967.

Hosokawa, Bill, Nisei: The Quiet Americans. New York: William Morrow, 1969.

Jacobs, Paul and Saul Landau with Eve Pell, To Serve the Devil, Vol. II: Colonials and Sojourners. New York: Random House, 1971.

Kane, Michael B., Minorities in Textbooks: A Study of Their Treatment in Social Studies Texts. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970.

Kitano, Harry with E. Jung, C. Tanaka, and B. Wong, Asian Americans: An Annotated Bibliography. University of California, Los Angeles: Asian American Studies Center, April 1971.

Klingelhofer, E. L., Impact of the New Student on Higher Education. University of California, Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.

Klingelhofer, E. L., Psychology and the New Student. University of California, Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.

La Violette, Forrest E., Americans of Japanese Ancestry: A Study of Assimilation in the American Community. Toronto: The Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1945.

Lee, Calvin, Chinatown, U. S. A.. New Jersey: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1965.

Mar, David and Joyce Sakai (eds.), Asians in America: Selected Student Papers, Working Publication #3. University of California, Davis: Asian American Research Project, 1970.

Marcus, Lloyd, The Treatment of Minorities in Secondary School Textbooks. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, 1961.

Marden, Charles F. and Gladys Meyer, Minorities in American Society. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1968

McWilliams, Carey, Brothers Under the Skin. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1964.

Report of th San Francisco Chinese Community Citizens' Survey and Fact Finding Committee. San Francisco: H. J. Carle and Sons, 1969.

Rose, Peter I., They and We: Racial and Ethnic Relations in the United States. New York: Random House, 1964.

Smith, B. Othanel and Robert H. Ennis, Language and Concepts in Educations. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Company, 1961.

Tachiki, Amy, Eddie Wong, Franklin Odo and Buck Wong (eds.), Roots: An Asian American Reader. University of California, Los Angeles: Asian American Studies Center, 1967.

Vose, Clement E., Caucasians Only. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1967.

Yamamoto, Kaoru (ed.), The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Periodicals

Anonymous, "They Never Stopped Laughing," Gidra, Monthly of Asian American Community, III, No. 9, September 1971.

Bender, Eugene I., and George Kagiwada, "Hansen's Law of 'Third Generation Return' and the Study of American Religio-Ethnic Groups," Phylon, The Atlanta University Review of Race and Culture, Fourth Quarter, 1968.

Burton, Robert A., "The New Chinese in America," American Universities Field Staff Service Reports, East Asian Series, 7, No. 8, August 1959.

Daniels, Roger, "Westerners from the East: Oriental Immigrants Reappraised," Pacific Historical Review, 35:4 (November 1966), 373-383.

Fogel, Walter, "The Effect of Low Educational Attainment on Incomes: Comparative Study of Selected Ethnic Groups," The Journal of Human Resources, 1 (Fall 1966), 2.

Jacobsen, Alan and Lee Rainwater, "A Study of Management Representative Evaluations of Nisei Workers," Social Forces, 32 (October 1953), 1.

Leary, Mary E., "San Francisco's Chinatown," Atlantic Monthly, 225, No. 3, (March 1970).

Leong, Jeff, "Hong Kong Immigrants and the Public Schools," Asian American Review, University of California, Berkeley, Spring 1972.

Louie, Gayle, "Forgotten Women," Asian Women, University of California, Berkeley, 1971.

Lyman, Stanford, "Contrasts in the Community Organization of Chinese and Japanese in North America," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 1967, 51-67.

Portenier, Lillian G., "Abilities and Interests of Japanese American High School Seniors," Journal of Social Psychology, 25 (February 1947).

Spencer, Robert F., "Japanese American Language Behavior," American Speech, 25 (December 1950), 4.

Tong, Ben R., "The Ghetto of the Mind: Notes on the Historical Psychology of Chinese America," Amerasia Journal, v. 1, no. 3, (November 1971).

Watanabe, Colin, "Culture and Communication, Self-Expression and the Asian American Experience," Asian American Review, University of California, Berkeley, Spring 1972.

Zuercher, Roger, "The Treatment of Asian Minorities in American History Textbooks," Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, 22, Autumn 1969.

Documents

California, State of, Department of Finance, Total and Full-time Enrollment, California Institutions of Higher Education. Fall 1971.

California, State of, Department of Industrial Relations, Californians of Japanese, Chinese and Filipino Ancestry--Population, Education, Employment, Income. San Francisco: Division of Fair Employment Practices, 1969.

_____, California, State of, Fair Employment Practices Commission, Fair Employment Practice Act. FEPC Rules and Regulations, Guide to Pre-Employment Inquiries. n.d.

California, State of, Fair Employment Practices Commission, Chinese in San Francisco--1970, Employment Problems of the Community as Presented in Testimony. December 1970.

California, State of, Trustees of the California State Colleges, Employment of Women and Members of Various Ethnic Groups, 1970. April 1, 1971.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, For All The People, By All The People. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Final 1970 Census Population Counts By Race Announced by Census Bureau, Washington, D.C., October 20, 1971.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Characteristics of Ethnic Studies Programs, University of California, Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, March 1, 1971.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Learning, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, Fall 1970.

U. S. Department of Justice, Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (from 1966 and 1971). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Miscellaneous

Bay Area Social Planning Council, Education and Language Training, Working Paper VI of Background Information on the Study of San Francisco's Chinese Newcomers, San Francisco, June 1970.

Bogardus, Emory S., Anti-Filipino Race Riots, Report to Ingram Institute of Social Science of San Diego, University of Southern California, 1930.

Chen, Martin K., Intelligence and Bilingualism as Independent Variates in a Study of Junior High School Students of Chinese Descent, Ed. D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.

Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Educational Opportunity Programs in California Public Higher Education, 1969-70, Council Report 71-5, April 1971.

Cross, K. Patricia, "Equality of Educational Opportunity," Position paper prepared for the Education Task Force of the White House Conference on Youth, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, n.d.

East-West, "Five Charge Civil Service Exams Maneuvered," September 16, 1969.

Espiritu, Socorro C., A Study of the Treatment of the Philippines in Selected Social Studies Textbooks Published in the United States for Use in the Elementary and Secondary Schools, Ph. D. Dissertation, Syracuse University, 1953.

Ferrin, Richard I., Barriers to Universal Higher Education. Palo Alto: Access Research Office, College Entrance Examination Board, March 1970.

Fujimoto, Isao, "Internal Colonialism: Its Impact on Asians in America," from Blauner, Robert, Troy Duster, Jack Forbes, Isao Fujimoto, and Octavio Romano (eds.), Third World Within: Internal Colonialism in America, Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1972 (forthcoming).

Gladwin, Thomas, "Institutional Racism at the University of Hawaii," Unpublished manuscript, University of Hawaii, Ethnic Studies Program, n.d.

Irving, Carl, "Universities Biased Against White Men," San Francisco Examiner, August 20, 1972.

Johanesen, Harry, "Where English is a Second Language," San Francisco Examiner, February 21, 1967.

Kerr, Clark, letter to Assemblyman John Vasconcellos, December 5, 1972.

Kitano, Harry, et al, An Assessment of Educational Opportunity Programs in California Higher Education, Coordinating Council of Higher Education, No. 70-1, February 1970.

Kono, Ayako, Language as a Factor in the Achievement of American-Born Students of Japanese Ancestry, M. A. Thesis, University of Hawaii, 1934.

Lee, Betty L. H., A Historical Study of Discriminatory Practices and Their Effects on the Education of American-Chinese in California, M. A. Thesis, Sacramento State College, 1966.

Low, Beverly, "Breakdown of Asian and Non-Asian Undergraduate Students by Majors," Project Report, Asian American Studies, University of California, Davis, Fall 1972.

Lucas, Louise, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Civil Rights, Telephone Interview, Washington, D. C., December 12, 1972.

Lust, Clarence, California State University and College Office, Office of Institutional Research, Telephone Interview, December 5, 1972

Mosk, Stanley and Harry Low, Chinese Newcomers in San Francisco, Bay Area Social Planning Council, San Francisco, 1971.

President's Task Force on the Extended University, Degree Programs for the Part-Time Student: A Proposal, University of California, November 1971.

Riese, Russell L., "Brief" on ACR 78: Recognizing the Contributions of Ethnic Minorities, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, October 3, 1972.

Robbins, Millie, "From Grief to Grievance," San Francisco Chronicle, May 6, 1971

San Francisco Department of City Planning, An Action Program for Chinatown, San Francisco, 1968.

Smigel, Gary, California, State of, Department of Education, Bureau of Intergroup Relations, Telephone Interview, December 5, 1972.

Smith, Virginia, "More for Less: A New Priority," Universal Higher Education: Costs and Benefits, (Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, Background papers for participants in the Fifty-fourth Annual Meeting of the ACE, 1971).

Weiss, Melford S., "Report on Chinese Students at Sacramento City College," Sacramento Area Chinese Community Research Project, July 1968.

Yoshioka, Robert B., Patrick S. Hayashi, Kirkman Lok, Kazuaki Ota, Joyce K. Sakai, Colin Watanabe, Asian Americans and Higher Education, Community Questionnaire, October 1972.

Yoshioka, Robert B., et al., Questionnaire on Asian American Studies, Parts I and II, October 1972.

Appendix B

ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES CURRICULUM: 1972-73 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Campus and Sponsoring Instructional Unit	Course Title
Berkeley Campus	
Contemporary Asian Studies Division: Ethnic Studies Department	Asian American Identity (Remedial English)
	Asian American Literature (English Reading and Composition)
	Third World Literature (English Reading and Composition)
	Asian American History
	Introduction to Asian American Communities
	Community Cantonese
	Community Tagalog
	Chinese American History
	Pilipino American History
	Approaches to Community Organization
	Japanese American History
	Asian American Communities and the Law
	Education in Asian American Communities
	Asian American Communities and Public Health
	Social Services and Asian American Communities
	Proseminar on Asian Women
	A Comparative Analysis of Racism in America
	Seminar on Selected Topics in Asian American History
	Alternative Institutions in Asian American Communities
	Directed Field Studies in Asian American Communities
Davis Campus	
Asian American Studies Division: Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences	The Asian Experience in America
	Ecology of Asian American Communities
	Asian Americans: A Case Study in Inter-Ethnic Relations

ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES CURRICULUM: 1972-73 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Campus and Sponsoring Instructional Unit	Course Title
Davis Campus (continued)	Alienation and the Asian America Speech Patterns of Asian Americans Pilipino American Experience Asian American Curriculum and Development
Irvine Campus	
Program in Comparative Culture	Asian American Community Life
Los Angeles Campus	NA*
Santa Cruz Campus	NA*
Santa Barbara Campus	NA*
San Diego Campus	NA*

*We are aware of Asian American Studies curricula on these campuses, but were not able to collect any information about course offerings since the campuses did not respond to our questionnaire.

ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES CURRICULUM: 1972-73 STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

Campus and Sponsoring Instructional Unit	Course Title
Hayward Campus	
Department of Sociology	Asian Identity in America
Los Angeles Campus	NA*
Sacramento Campus	
Department of Anthropology	Fieldwork in Ethnology--Japanese Americans
Department of English	Asian American Literature
Department of History	Asian American Experience
Asian American Studies: Ethnic Studies Center	Asian Women in America
	Asian Americans: Status and Identity
	Asian Americans: Asian Community
	Exploration in Tagalog
	Kayumanggi: Focus on the Pilipino American
Sonoma Campus	
American Ethnic Studies Program	Americans from Asia
	Chinese Americans
	Japanese Americans
	Filipino Americans
	Asian American Identity
	Identity Workshop
	Asian American Social Institutions
	Asian American Culture
	Asian American Folklore

*We are aware of Asian American Studies curricula on this campus, but were not able to collect any information about course offerings since the campus did not respond to our questionnaire.

Campus and Sponsoring Instructional Unit	Course Title
Sonoma Campus (continued)	The Oriental Exclusion Movement
	The Japanese American Internment Experience
San Francisco Campus	
Asian American Studies Program: School of Ethnic Studies	Cantonese
	Pilipino
	Introduction to Asian American Studies
	The Chinese in America
	The Chinese American Community
	Mental Health Problems in the Chinese American Community
	Chinese American Language and Culture
	Chinese Art and Its Meaning for Chinese Americans
	Selected Topics in Chinese American Studies
	Evacuation and Relocation
	Japanese American Sociological Profile
	Japanese American Personality
	Sources of Cultural Traditions in Japanese American Life
	The Japanese American in the United States
	Japanese American Community Workshop
	Pacific Rim: United States, Japan and Japanese Americans
	Pilipino History
	Pilipinos in America: Problems of Transition
	Pilipino Political Science: Governmental Institutions
	Pilipino Social Science
	Pilipino Literary Development
	Rizal and his Contemporaries
	Pilipino: East and West--A Comparative Study

ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES CURRICULUM: 1972-73 STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

Campus and Sponsoring Instructional Unit	Course Title
San Francisco Campus (continued)	Survey of Pilipino Art Fieldwork in the Pilipino Community Selected Topics in Pilipino American Studies Practical English Skills for Asian Americans Asian Americans and Juvenile Law Politics and the Asian American Community Problems and Issues Asian American Economic Patterns Curriculum and Instruction in Asian American Studies The Oriental in Literature and Film Asian American Media Workshop Asian American Workshop in Creative Writing Selected Topics in Asian American Studies Asian American Studies: Curriculum, Research and Evaluation Special Topics
Long Beach Campus	NA*
San Jose Campus	NA*
Pomona Campus	NA*

*We are aware of Asian American Studies curricula on these campuses, but were not able to collect any information about course offerings since the campuses did not respond to our questionnaire.

ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES CURRICULUM

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Campus and Sponsoring Instructional Unit	Course Title
Barstow Campus	
History Department	United States and the Far East
Butte Campus	
Sociology Department	The Asian American
Cabrillo Campus	
History Department	History of Asian Americans
Contra Costa Campus	
Social Science Department	History of Asians in the United States
Psychology Department	Psychology of Asian Americans
North Peralta Campus	
Social and Behavioral Sciences Division	History of Asians in America Sociology of the Asian American
Sacramento Campus	
Social Science Division	Asian Experience in America Psychology of the Asian American

ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES CURRICULUM

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Campus and Sponsoring Instructional Unit	Course Title
Santa Rosa Campus	
Sociology Department	Introduction to the Japanese American
Yuba Campus	
Asian American Studies: Ethnic Studies Division	The Asian American Experience in the United States The East-Indian American Experience in the United States Societal Patterns of Asian Americans The Philosophies of Asian Americans: A Study of the Religions of Asian Americans Research on Asian American Communities
DeAnza Campus	NA*
Laney Campus	NA*
Los Angeles Campus	NA*
San Francisco Campus	NA*

*We are aware of Asian American Studies curricula on these campuses, but were not able to collect any information about course offerings since the campuses did not respond to our questionnaire.

Appendix C

ASIAN EXPERIENCE IN AMERICA - A CHRONOLOGY

1785	The first record of Chinese in the United States.
1790	The Naturalization Act which allowed only "free whites" the rights of citizenship was passed.
1820	The first official record of Chinese immigration.
1849	The townspeople of Chinese Camp, California organized an attack on 60 Chinese miners.
1852	The Foreign Miners' Tax was enacted. It forced all Chinese engaged in mining activity to pay a special fee. Because "all Chinese looked alike" to many of the tax collectors, many Chinese had to pay the tax a number of times.
1855	The state enacted legislation that prohibited Chinese from testifying against whites in court.
1860	All Chinese engaged in fishing must pay a tax.
1862	All Chinese over 18 years old who did not pay the Miners' Tax were forced to pay a Police Tax.
1869	The transcontinental railroad was completed. This year marked the first reported Japanese immigration with the establishment of the Wakamatsu Colony near Sacramento.
1870's	The peak of mining activities and anti-Chinese agitation.
1870's-1880's	Denis Kearney and the Workingmen's Party adopt the slogan, "All Chinese Must Go."
1860-1880	This period marked the movement of Chinese laborers to agriculture, land reclamation, fishing, manufacturing and service industries. The Chinese were used as strikebreakers on the East Coast.
1878	The Second Constitution of the State of California included provisions to deny Chinese the right of naturalization, prohibited corporations from hiring Chinese, empowered the legislature to remove Chinese from cities and towns where they were not wanted.
1881	California Governor George C. Parkins proclaimed March 4 as a legal holiday for anti-Chinese demonstrations.

1882	The Chinese Exclusion Act was passed. The Legislature first barred Chinese and subsequently all Asians from both immigration and naturalization.
1885	The Scott Act which prohibited Chinese laborers revisiting China from returning was passed.
1892	The Geary Act extended the Exclusion Act for ten years.
1900	The Chinese in Hawaii were forbidden to go to the mainland. May 7 marked the date of the first anti-Japanese mass meeting in San Francisco.
1902	The Chinese Exclusion Act was extended indefinitely.
1904	Samuel Gompers of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) led the anti-Chinese and Japanese movement in unions.
1906	The San Francisco Oriental School Segregation ruling was made.
1907	Japan agreed to limit emigration to the United States in exchange for equal treatment of its citizens in the Gentlemen's Agreement. Filipinos as agricultural laborers began immigration to the U. S. Since the Philippines at that time was under U. S. jurisdiction, there were no restrictions on emigration.
1910's	The Japanese were used as strikebreakers.
1913	The Alien Land Act prohibiting aliens not eligible for citizenship from owning land was passed.
1920	This year marked a noticeable decline of the Chinese population - from 132,000 to 60,000. The Filipinos began to immigrate in large numbers.
1923	The Cable Act was passed. This provided that female citizens would lose their U. S. citizenship if they married aliens not eligible for citizenship. Widowed or divorced white women could regain citizenship, but Asian women could not.
1924	The Asian Exclusion Act was passed. This called for the total exclusion of all "aliens ineligible for citizenship."
1928	A bill was introduced in California by Congressman Richard Welch to exclude Filipinos. His action received support from the states of Washington and Oregon and labor unions.

1929-1930	Rioting against Filipinos on the West Coast.
1930	The immigration of Filipinos was restricted. The Reed Bill expressly excluded "citizens of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States."
1934	The Tydings-McDuffie Act limiting Filipino immigration to 50 per year was passed by the U. S. Congress.
1935	The Repatriation Law was enacted. This allowed Filipinos to return to the Philippines at the expense of the U. S. government.
1938	The depression and the aggressive stance of Japan in world politics caused a surge of anti-Japanese feeling.
1941	Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. The Japanese in the United States were classified as alien enemies, their bank accounts were frozen, travel restricted, and businesses closed.
1942	Presidential Executive Order 9066 calling for the mass incarceration of Japanese from the West Coast in concentration camps was issued.
1946	The camps were closed.
1950	The McCarran Emergency Detention Act was passed. This provided for the detention of persons in camps in times of national emergency.
1952	The McCarran-Walter Act repealing the Asian Exclusion Act of 1924 and eliminating race as a bar to naturalization was passed. The Alien Land Law was repealed.
1965	The national origins quota system for immigration was repealed effective July 1, 1968.

Appendix D

INSTITUTIONS RESPONDING**

I. University of California

Code No.	Responses[a]	Name of Institution
114	*	University of California, Berkeley
115	*	University of California, Davis
116	*	University of California, Irvine
117		University of California, Los Angeles
118	*N	University of California, Riverside
119	*	University of California, San Diego
120		University of California, Santa Barbara
121	*	University of California, Santa Cruz
122		University of California, San Francisco

Number of Questionnaires	
Total sent:	9
Total response:	6
With data:	5
55% responses with data	

---

[a]
* - Institution responded with data.

*N - Institution responded, but did not answer questionnaire. Typically this would mean only a letter.

(Blank) - Institution did not respond.

**Responses received after November 11, 1972, were not included in this study.

II. California State University and Colleges

Code No.	Responses[a]	Name of Institution
95	*	Calif. State College, Bakersfield
96	*N	Calif. State University, Chico
97	*N	Calif. State College, Dominguez Hills
98		Calif. State University, Fresno
99	*	Calif. State University, Fullerton
100	*	Calif. State University, Hayward
101		Calif. State University, Humboldt
102	*	Calif. State Polytechnic Univ., Pomona
103		Calif. State University, Long Beach
104	*	Calif. State University, Los Angeles
105	*	Calif. State University, Sacramento
106	*	Calif. State University, San Bernardino
107		Calif. State University, San Diego
108		Calif. State University, Northridge
109	*	Calif. State University, San Francisco
110		Calif. State University, San Jose

[a] * - Institution responded with data.

*N - Institution responded, but did not answer questionnaire. Typically this would mean only a letter.

(Blank) - Institution did not respond.

111	*	Calif. Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
112	*N	Calif. State College, Sonoma
113		Calif. State College, Stanislaus

Number of Questionnaires

Total sent: 19

Total response: 12

With data: 9

48% responses with data

III. Community Colleges

Code No.	Responses[a]	Name of Institution
1	*	Alameda, College of
2	*N	American River College
3		Antelope Valley College
4		Bakersfield College
5	*N	Barstow College
6	*	Butte College
7	*	Cabrillo College
8	*	Canada College
9	*	Canyons, College of the
10		Cerritos College
11		Chabot College
12		Chaffey College
13	*	Citrus College
14	*	Columbia Junior College
15	*	Compton Community College
16	*	Contra Costa College
17		Cosumnes River College
18	*N	Crafton Hills College
19	*	Cuesta College

[a] * - Institution responded with data.

*N - Institution responded but did not answer questionnaire. Typically this would mean only a letter.

(Blank) - Institution did not respond.

20		Cypress College
21	*	De Anza College
22		Desert, College of the
23	*	Diablo Valley College
24		East Los Angeles College
25	*N	El Camino College
26	*	Feather River College
27	*N	Foothill College
28	*	Fresno City College
29		Fullerton Junior College
30		Gavilan College
31	*	Glendale College
32		Golden West College
33	*	Grossmont College
34	*	Grove Street College
35		Allan Hancock College
36		Hartnell College
37		Imperial Valley College
38	*N	Indian Valley Colleges
39		Laney College
40		Lassen College
41	*N	Long Beach City College
42	*	Los Angeles City College
43		Los Angeles Harbor College
44	*	Los Angeles Pierce College
45		Los Angeles Southwest College

46	*	Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
47	*	Los Angeles Valley College
48		Marin, College of
49	*	Merced College
50		Merritt College
51	*	Mira Costa College
52	*N	Modesto Junior College
53	*	Monterey Peninsula College
54		Moorpark College
55		Mt. San Antonio College
56		Mt. San Jacinto College
57	*N	Napa College
58	*N	Ohlone College
59		Orange Coast College
60		Palomar College
61	*	Palo Verde College
62	*	Pasadena City College
63		Porterville College
64	*	Redwood, College of
65		Reedley College
66	*	Rio Hondo College
67		Riverside City College
68	*	Sacramento City College
69		Saddleback College
70	*N	San Bernardino Valley College
71	*	San Diego City College

72	*	San Diego Mesa College
73		San Francisco, City College of
74	*	San Joaquin Delta College
75	*	San Jose City College
76		San Mateo, College of
77		Santa Ana College
78		Santa Barbara City College
79		Santa Monica College
80	*	Santa Rosa Junior College
81		Sequoias, College of the
82		Shasta College
83	*N	Sierra College
84	*	Siskiyous, College of the
85	*	Skyline College
86		Solano Community College
87	*	Southwestern College
88		Taft College
89		Ventura College
90	*	Victor Valley College
91		West Hills College
92	*N	West Los Angeles College
93	*	West Valley College
94	*	Yuba College

Number of Questionnaires

Total sent: 94

Total response: 53

With data: 39

36% responses with data

IV. Selected Private Institutions in California

Code No.	Response[a]	Name of Institution
123	*	Armstrong College
124		Azusa Pacific College
125		California Baptist College
126	*	California Institute of Technology
127	*	California Lutheran College
128		Chapman College
129		Claremont Men's College
130		Claremont Graduate School
131		College of Notre Dame
132		Golden Gate University
133	*	Harvey Mudd College
134		La Verne College
135	*	La Sierra Campus - Loma Linda Univ.
136		Lone Mountain College
137	*	Loyola University of Los Angeles
138	*N	Marymount College
139	*N	Miller Community College
140		Mills College
141	*	Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies
142		Mount St. Mary's College

[a] * - Institution responded with data.

*N - Institution responded, but did not answer questionnaire. Typically this would mean only a letter.

(Blank)- Institution did not respond.

143	*N	Occidental College
144		Pacific College
145	*N	Pacific Oaks College
146		Pacific Union College
147		Pasadena College
148	*N	Pepperdine University
149	*	Pitzer College
150	*	Pomona College
151	*	Russell College
152		St. Albert's College
153		St. John's College
154	*N	St. Patrick's College
155	*	Scripps College
156	*	Southern California College
157	*	Stanford University
158		United States International Univ.
159	*	University of the Pacific
160		University of Redlands
161	*N	University of San Diego
162	*N	University of San Francisco
163	*	University of Santa Clara
164		University of Southern California
165	*	West Coast University
166	*	Westmont College
167		Whittier College
168		Woodbury College
169	*	Wright Institute

Number of Questionnaires

Total sent:	47
Total response:	25
With data:	19

40% responses with data

no._____

PART I

QUESTIONNAIRE ON ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES

This section of the questionnaire is designed to gather basic statistical information on Asian Americans in higher education. Since This survey is being sent to universities, four-year institutions and community colleges, we would appreciate it if you answer only those questions which you feel specifically relates to your own particular institutional context. If you need more copies of this section please do not hesitate to duplicate this packet.

Name of respondent(s)_____

_____

Title(s)_____

_____

Institution:_____

Address:_____

Phone Number: (____)_____

Please return the completed questionnaires to:

Dr. Robert B. Yoshioka
Asian American Studies
Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences
University of California, Davis 95616

Target date for completion: Tuesday, October 17, 1972

A. STUDENT ENROLLMENT

1. Total no. enrolled _____, male _____, female _____

2. No. of undergraduates _____, m _____, f _____

3. No. of graduate students _____, m _____, f _____
(if applicable)

4. No. in professional schools (if applicable)

Medicine _____, m _____, f _____

Law _____, m _____, f _____

Dentistry _____, m _____, f _____

Optometry _____, m _____, f _____

Engineering _____, m _____, f _____

Pharmacy _____, m _____, f _____

Business _____, m _____, f _____

Social Work _____, m _____, f _____

Others: Please specify

_____ _____, m _____, f _____

_____ _____, m _____, f _____

_____ _____, m _____, f _____

B. ETHNIC BREAKDOWN

1. Chinese: Total no. _____, m _____, f _____

American-born _____, m _____, f _____

Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

Foreign-born _____, m _____, f _____

Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

2. Pilipinos: Total No. _____, m _____, f _____

American-born _____, m _____, f _____

Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

Foreign-born _____, m _____, f _____

Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

3. Japanese: Total no. _____, m _____, f _____

American-born _____, m _____, f _____

Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

Foreign-born _____, m _____, f _____

Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

4. Koreans: Total no. _____, m _____, f _____

American-born _____, m _____, f _____

Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

Foreign-born _____, m _____, f _____

Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

5. Samoans: Total no. _____, m _____, f _____

Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

6. Hawaiians: Total no. _____, m _____, f _____

Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

7. Vietnamese: Total no. _____, m _____, f _____

   Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

   Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

8. Thai: Total no. _____, m _____, f _____

   Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

   Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

9. Burmese: Total no. _____, m _____, f _____

   Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

   Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

10. East Indian: Total no. _____, m _____, f _____

    Undergraduate _____, m _____, f _____

    Graduate _____, m _____, f _____

C. UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS: According to your latest statistical evaluation, what is the undergraduate Asian American enrollment in the following six areas?

1. Humanities: (Art, Music, Philosophy, Religion, Languages, English...)

   Total no. _____, m_____, f _____

2. Social Sciences: (Psychology, Sociology, Political Science, History, Anthropology, Ethnic Studies...)

   Total No. _____, m_____, f_____

3. Biological Sciences: (Biology, Botany, Biochemistry, Zoology...)

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

4. Physical Sciences: (Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics...)

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

5. Engineering: (Mechanical, Chemical, Electrical...)

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

6. Education:

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

D. GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT (if applicable): According to your latest statistical evaluation, what is the Graduate/Professional enrollment in the following areas for Asian Americans?

1. Humanities: (Art, Music, Philosophy, Religion, Languages, English...)

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

2. Social Sciences: (Psychology, Sociology, Political Science, History, Anthropology, Ethnic Studies...)

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

3. Biological Sciences: (Biology, Botany, Biochemistry, Zoology...)

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

4. Physical Sciences: (Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics...)

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

5. Engineering: (Mechanical, Chemical, Electrical...)

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

6. Education:

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

7. Law School:

   Total no. _____, m_____, F_____

8. Medical School:

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

9. Business School:

   Total no._____, m_____, f_____

10. Dental School:

    Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

11. Other (Specify) _____

    Total no. _____, m _____, f_____

E. SUBJECT A: According to your most recent figures, what was your yearly total enrollment in English Subject A or its equivalent?

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____.

Of that number, how many were Asian Americans?

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____.

F. FINANCIAL AID: UNDERGRADUATE.

1. Total number receiving financial aid: _____, m_____,f_____

2. Total number of dollars spent on financial aid $_____

3. Total no. of Asian Americans receiving financial aid:

   Total no._____, m_____,f_____.

4. Educational Opportunity Program (EOP):

   Total no. receiving aid: _____, m_____,f_____

   Total no. Asians receiving aid:_____, m_____,f_____

G. FINANCIAL AID: GRADUATE STUDENTS (if applicable)

1. Total number receiving financial aid: _____, m_____, f_____

2. Total number of dollars spent on financial aid $_____

3. Total no. of Asian Americans receiving financial aid:

   Total no._____, m_____, f_____.

4. Graduate Opportunity Program (GOP):

   Total no.receiving aid: _____, m_____, f_____

   Total no.Asians receiving aid_____, m_____, f_____

H. STUDENT SERVICES.

1. Are there any student services at your institution that are designed specifically for Asian Americans?

   yes_____ no_____

2. Total number of students who use counseling center/services:

   Total no. _____, m_____, f_____

3. Total number of Asian Americans who use counseling center/services:

   Total no. _____, m_____,f_____

I. STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS: Are there any student organizations of your campus (social, political...) whose membership is primarily Asian? Please list them below.

J. THE FACULTY: A major portion of our study deals with faculty composition. We are particularly interested in determining the number and locatinn of faculty members who are Asian American, as well as their rank, and tenure status.

1. Total no. of faculty: _____, m_____, f_____

2. Total no. of faculty with tenure: _____, m_____, f_____

3. Total no of Asian American faculty: _____, m_____, f_____

4. Rank of Asian American Faculty:

   Instructor: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Lecturer: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Assistant Professor: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Associate Professor: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Full Professor: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

5. Location of Asian American Faculty:

   Humanities: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Social Sciences: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Biological Sciences: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Physical Sciences: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Engineering: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Education: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Law School: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Medical School: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Business School: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Dental School: Total: _____, m_____, f_____

   Other (Specify)_____

   Total: _____, m_____, f_____

6. If already in force, we would appreciate having a copy of your institution's Affirmative Action mandate. Please attach same to back of this questionnaire.

K. STAFF.

1. Total number of non-academic (support) staff on your campus:

   Total no.:_____, m_____, f_____

2. Total number of non-academic (support) staff on your campus who are Asian Americans:

   Total no.:_____, m_____, f_____

L. THE ADMINISTRATION.

1. Total number of administrators on your campus:

   Total no.:_____, m_____, f_____

2. Total number of administrators on your campus who are Asian Americans:

   Total no.:_____, m_____, f_____

no._____

PART II

QUESTIONNAIRE ON ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES

This section of the questionnaire addresses itself to four categories of concern: (1) the institutional setting, (2) the curriculum, (3) the educational objectives of Asian American Studies Programs on your campus, and (4) special programs your campus offers for Asian American students. Please answer only those sections which you feel specifically relates to your own particular institutional context. If you need more copies of this section please do not hesitate to duplicate this packet.

Name or respondent (s)_____

_____

Title(s)_____

_____

Institution:_____

Address:_____

Phone Number: (_____)_____

IMPORTANT: IF YOUR INSTITUTION DOES NOT HAVE AN ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAM FOR ASIAN AMERICANS, PLEASE DO NOT ANSWER PART II. INSTEAD, DETACH THIS PAGE FROM THE REST OF THIS SECTION, AND RETURN IT WITH PART I TO:

Dr. Robert B. Yoshioka
Asian American Studies
Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences
University of California, Davis 95616

Target date for completion: Tuesday, October 17, 1972

A. INSTITUTIONAL SETTING OF ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES

1. What is the organizational structure of your campus' overall instructional program? (For example, there may be separate academic units for instruction in the social sciences and humanities, and within these units, programs which offer courses in literature, foreign languages, economics, etc.)

   Please attach an organizational chart if one is available.

2. Is there an instructional unit exclusively or primarily responsible for offering courses in Asian American Studies? (For the purposes of this survey, Asian American Studies is defined as an instructional program which has as its primary or exclusive objective the study of the experiences of Asians in the United States.)

Yes _____ No _____

IF YES TO QUESTION 2 ABOVE,

3. Where within the campus' overall organizational structure is the Asian American Studies unit located?

4. What is the rationale for the place of the Asian American Studies unit within the campus' overall organizational structure?

5. What is the rationale for having a separate unit in Asian American Studies?

6. When was the Asian American Studies unit established?

7. What budgetary support is provided to the Asian American Studies unit? (Do not include non-budgeted, extramural funds.)

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74 (estimate)
faculty salaries					
full-time faculty positions					
other support					
Total					

IF NO TO QUESTION 2, PAGE 9

8. What is the rationale for not having a separate unit in Asian American Studies?

9. Under what institutional arrangement are courses offered which study the experience of Asians in the United States?

B. EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES OF ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES

1. What are the campus' immediate and long-range educational objectives with regard to the study of the experience of Asians in the United States?

2. How successful has the campus been in reaching these educational objectives? Please give specific examples and reasons for the campus' successes and/or failures.

3. If there is a separate unit for Asian American Studies, what are its immediate and long-range educational objectives?

4. How successful has the Asian American Studies unit been in achieving its educational objectives? Please give specific examples of and the reasons for the unit's successes and/or failures.

C. ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES CURRICULUM

1. In 1969-70, what courses were offered in the field of Asian American Studies? Please list only those courses which dealt primarily or exclusively with the experiences of Asians in the United States.

	Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)
Lower Division			
Upper Division			
Graduate			

2. In 1969-70, what courses were offered in fields other than Asian American Studies; e.g., Ethnic Studies, Anthropology, Oriental Languages, which included study of topics relevant to the experiences of Asians in the United States?

	Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)
Lower Division			
Upper Division			
Graduate			

3. In 1970-71, what courses were offered in the field of Asian American Studies? Please list only those courses which dealt primarily or exclusively with the experiences of Asians in the United States.

Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)
Lower Division		
Upper Division		
Graduate		

4. In 1970-71, what courses were offered in fields other than Asian American Studies; e.g., Ethnic Studies, Anthropology, Oriental Languages, which included study of topics relevant to the experiences of Asians in the United States?

	Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)
Lower Division			
Upper Division			
Graduate			

5. In 1971-72, what courses were offered in the field of Asian American Studies? Please list only those courses which dealt primarily or exclusively with the experiences of Asians in the United States.

	Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)
Lower Division			
Upper Division			
Graduate			

6. In 1971-72, what courses were offered in fields other than Asian American Studies; e.g., Ethnic Studies, Anthropology, Oriental Languages, which included study of topics relevant to the experiences of Asians in the United States?

	Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)
Lower Division			
Upper Division			
Graduate			

7. In 1972-73, what courses will be offered in the field of Asian American Studies? Please list only those courses which will deal primarily or exclusively with the experiences of Asians in the United States.

	Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)
Lower Division			
Upper Division			
Graduate			

8. In 1972-73, what courses will be offered in fields other than Asian American Studies; e.g., Ethnic Studies, Anthropology, Oriental Languages, which will include the study of topics relevant to the experiences of Asians in the United States?

	Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)
Lower Division			
Upper Division			
Graduate			

D. SPECIAL PROGRAMS IN ASIAN AMERICAN STUDIES

1. What research programs nave been established to study the experiences of Asians in the United States? Please list only those programs which deal primarily or exclusively with the experiences of Asians in the United States.

Name of Project	Description (40 words or less)

2. What research programs have been established to study the experienc. of ethnic minorities in the United States that include the study of the experiences of Asians in the United States?

Name of Project	Description (40 words or less)

3. What special courses are offered to train students to provide public service; e.g., in such fields as education, social welfare, and health sciences, to Asians in the United States? Please do not list courses included in Section C.

Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)

4. What special courses are offered to train students to provide public service; e.g., in such fields as education, social welfare, and health sciences, to ethnic minorities including Asians, in the United States? Please do not list courses included in Section C.

Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)

5. What courses are offered to redress the educational imbalances or deficiencies of students of Asian descent? Please list only those courses which are designed primarily or exclusively for students of Asian descent. Please do not list courses included in Section C.

Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)

6. What courses are offered to redress the educational imbalances or deficiencies of ethnic minority students? Please do not list courses included in Section C.

Instructional Unit Sponsoring Course	Course Name and Number	Course Description (40 words or less)

Thank you very much for your assistance and cooperation. A summary of our findings may be obtained in January, 1973, from the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, Fifth Floor, State Library Building, Sacramento, California 95814.

ASIAN AMERICANS AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Community Questionnaire

1. In your opinion, have Asian Americans been successfully accomodated within the various sectors of higher education?

   1. Yes _____
   2. No _____

---

2. To the best of your knowledge, what percentage of young people from your community attend school beyond high school?

   1. _____%

---

3. Approximately what percentage of the students mentioned above attend the following schools?

   1. University of California _____%
   2. California State University _____% (State Colleges)
   3. Community Colleges _____%
   4. Technical/Trade Schools _____%

---

4. Do you and members of your community perceive your identity primarily as: (Please check one)

   1. Asian Americans _____
   2. Americans of Asian descent _____
   3. Asians _____
   4. Americans _____
   5. Orientals _____
   6. Other: Please specify _____

---

5. If there are bilingual children in your community, do you feel that the public schools are paying enough attention to their particular problems?

   1. Yes _____
   2. No _____

---

6. If you answered no to the question above, what do you think should be done for bilingual children?

7. Listed below are several possible problem areas that might have some impact on you and your community. Please number them in order of priority.

1. _____ Tracking of children in elementary and secondary school
2. _____ Making allowances for cultural education
3. _____ Sound counseling
4. _____ Language training programs in the schools
5. _____ Providing the community with professional services such as doctors, lawyers, etc.
6. _____ Other: Please specify _____

---

8. Do you think that school age youngsters in your community are influenced by their counselors to major in the natural and physical sciences rather than in the humanities or the social sciences?

1. Yes _____
2. No _____

---

9. In your opinion, do all youngsters in your community have fair access to and equality of opportunity in higher education?

1. Yes _____
2. No _____

---

10. Are such programs as the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) effective in helping to give Asians fair access to higher education?

1. Yes _____
2. No _____

---

11. What questions would you personally like the educational system to address itself to in the next ten years?

12. Are you aware of any recently completed research projects in your community or elsewhere that have dealt with the problems of Asians in higher education?

1. Yes _____
2. No _____

---

13. If yes, could you please include below basic information about the study or studies so that we might contact the author(s).

Thank you for your cooperation with this important project. We hope to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Robert Yoshioka, Assistant Professor
Asian American Studies
Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences
University of California
Davis, California 95616
(916) 752-3625

Name of Organization _____

Address _____

_____

Phone ( ) _____

Respondent _____

Title/Position _____