DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 713 PS 020 457

AUTHOR Siu, Sau-Fong
TITLE Toward an Understanding of Chinese-American Educational Achievement: A Literature Review. Report No. 2.
INSTITUTION Center on Families Communities, Schools and Children's Learning.; Wheelock Coll., Boston, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Feb 92
CONTRACT R117Q00031
NOTE 49p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning, Publications, The Johns Hopkins University, 3505 North Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21218 ($5.40).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Adjustment (to Environment); *Chinese Americans; Cultural Background; *Cultural Influences; Educational Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; *Family Influence; Folk Culture; *High Achievement; Literature Reviews; Minority Group Children; Parent Attitudes; Parent Student Relationship; *Public Education; Socialization; Social Values; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Confucius; Historical Background; Immigration; Immigration Legislation

ABSTRACT

This literature review addresses the relatively recent perception of Chinese-Americans as superachievers by examining empirical research studies, statistical data, historical accounts, fiction, biographies, autobiographies, and newspaper stories. It is argued that only with a historical perspective can the myths be sorted from the realities about Chinese-American educational achievement. In an effort to look at structural factors that may constrain or extend options for individual families, the review discusses events and traditions in the homeland that illuminate the roots of cultural values and practices that are conducive to school success. Also discussed are the interactions of the Chinese community in the United States with mainstream American society. It is contended that these interactions have shaped Chinese-American families' values and practices and the ways in which Chinese-American families define social reality for their offspring. A discussion of the history of Chinese-Americans is divided into four periods: (1) the pre-exclusion era; (2) the exclusion era, 1882-1943; (3) the period from the repeal of the exclusion law in 1943 to the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965; and (4) the post-1965 era. For each period, discussion concerns immigration policy, American society's treatment of the Chinese, and the Chinese community's adaptation and coping. The review concludes with a consideration of implications for teachers, policymakers, and individuals concerned with education. Appended is a bibliography of 126 references. (GLR)

CENTER ON FAMILIES, COMMUNITIES, SCHOOLS & CHILDREN'S LEARNING

Toward An Understanding of Chinese-American Educational Achievement

A Literature Review

Sau-Fong Siu

Report No. 2 / February 1992

CENTER ON FAMILIES,
COMMUNITIES, SCHOOLS
& CHILDREN'S LEARNING

Consortium Partners

Boston University, School of Education,
Institute for Responsive Education,
605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215 (617) 353-3309 fax:(617) 353-8444
The Johns Hopkins University,
3505 North Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218 (410) 516-0370 fax:(410) 516-6370
The University of Illinois, 210 Education Building,
1310 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, IL 61820 (217) 333-2245 fax:(217) 333-5847
Wheelock College,
45 Pilgrim Road, Boston, MA 02215 (617) 734-5200 fax: (617) 566-7369
Yale University,
310 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06520 (203) 432-9931 fax: (203) 432-9933

For more information on the work of the Center, contact:
Owen Heleen, Dissemination Director,
Institute for Responsive Education,
605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215 (617) 353-3309 fax:(617) 353-8444

Toward an Understanding of Chinese-American Educational Achievement

A Literature Review

Sau-Fong Siu

Report No. 2

February 1992

Published by the Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning. The Center is supported by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational, Research and Improvement (R117Q 00031) in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The opinions expressed are the authors' own and do not represent OERI or HHS position on policies.

CENTER ON FAMILIES, COMMUNITIES, SCHOOLS & CHILDREN'S LEARNING

The nation's schools must do more to improve the education of all children, but schools cannot do this alone. More will be accomplished if families and communities work with children, with each other, and with schools to promote successful students.

The mission of this Center is to conduct research, evaluations, policy analyses, and dissemination to produce new and useful knowledge about how families, schools, and communities influence student motivation, learning, and development. A second important goal is to improve the connections between and among these major social institutions.

Two research programs guide the Center's work: the Program on the Early Years of Childhood, covering children aged 0-10 through the elementary grades; and the Program on the Years of Early and Late Adolescence, covering youngsters aged 11-19 through the middle and high school grades.

Research on family, school, and community connections must be conducted to understand more about all children and all families, not just those who are economically and educationally advantaged or already connected to school and community resources. The Center's projects pay particular attention to the diversity of family cultures and backgrounds and to the diversity in family, school, and community practices that support families in helping children succeed across the years of childhood and adolescence. Projects also examine policies at the federal, state, and local levels that produce effective partnerships.

A third program of Institutional Activities includes a wide range of dissemination projects to extend the Center's national leadership. The Center's work will yield new information, practices, and policies to promote partnerships among families, communities, and schools to benefit children's learning.

Abstract

The disparities in educational achievement among various racial/ethnic groups continue to baffle and disturb scholars, politicians, and social reformers. Whereas the public school system seems to be failing where African-Americans and Hispanics are concerned, the schools appear to be working for Asian-Americans in general.

Once called nonassimilable, uneducable heathens, Chinese-Americans are now perceived as the "model minority." What happened to bring about the relatively recent phenomenon, Chinese-Americans as super-achievers?

This review examines reports of empirical research studies, statistical data, historical accounts, fiction, biographies, autobiographies, and newspaper stories and argues that Chinese-American educational achievement can be understood only within a historical perspective. In an effort to look at the larger structural factors which may constrain or extend options for individual families, this report discusses (a) events and traditions in the homeland, which illuminate the roots of those cultural values and practices that are conducive to school success; and (b) history of the Chinese community in the U.S. and its interactions with mainstream American society. These interactions have shaped how Chinese-American families have defined social reality for their offspring, the values they emphasize, and the practices they adopt.

Only with this perspective, this report asserts, can we sort the myths from the realities about Chinese-American educational achievement.

Acknowledgements

Sau-Fong Siu is Co-Investigator for the Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning project, An Ethnographic Study of Family Support for Young Children's School Success, and an Associate Professor of Social Work Education at Wheelock College. She would like to thank her research associate Anping Shen for his help with library research and her colleagues Susan McAllister Swap, Nitza Hidalgo, and Theresa Perry for their insight and support.

Introduction: Why Study Chinese-American Educational Achievement?

..to understand the experience of Chinese-American
youth in this country, it is necessary not only to understand childrearing strategies of Chinese and Chinese-American parents but to comprehend the impact of restrictive immigration laws in the 1900's, of miscegenation and exclusion laws, which were only recently repealed in the 1960's, and of racism and discrimination. These larger issues have an impact on Chinese-American families, the composition of these families, their descendants, and the community as a whole. Similarly, Confucian traditions, passed from one generation to the next, thus becoming increasingly diluted and "westernized," still impose an Eastern philosophy of order on the family."

L.N. Huang and Y.W. Ying (1989)
"The Chinese-American Family" in
C. Mendel and R. Haberstein (eds.)
Ethnic Families in America
New York: Elsevier.

In this "land of opportunity," the disparities in educational achievement among various racial/ethnic groups have continued to baffle and disturb scholars, politicians, and social reformers (Ogbu, 1983; Erickson, 1987; Trueba, 1988; Foley, 1991). Where the public school seems to have failed where African-Americans and Hispanics are concerned, the school appears to have worked for Asian-Americans in general. In spite of the rather insignificant proportion of Asian-Americans in the U.S. population (2.9%), their educational experience is worth studying because it represents to the public an example of a visible minority apparently overcoming discrimination and doing well in school. Furthermore, certain family processes identified in research studies (Dornbusch & Wood, 1989; Schneider & Lee, 1990; Holloway, 1990; Okagaki & Gordon, 1991) as important to school success seem to lose their explanatory power when applied to Asian-Americans. In fact, many Asian-American parents adopt practices opposite to the following variables that contribute

to academic achievement of Whites: involving children in mealtime conversation, involving children in family decision-making, an authoritative rather than authoritarian parenting style, emphasizing diversity rather than conformity in communication styles, and frequent participation in school activities.

Tsang and Wing (1985) note that American educators and business leaders, rather than turning to Japan and other foreign countries for enlightenment about solving the problems in the U.S. school systems, would be better advised to tap the research on educational achievement (or lack thereof) of Asian-Americans in order to improve our education system for all students in this country.

According to the 1990 census ("Census Bureau releases," 1991), there are over one and a half million Americans of Chinese descent in the United States, comprising 0.7% of the U.S. population. That is a rather small proportion of the total population, yet Chinese-Americans' experience may shed the most light on social mobility and educational achievement because, of all Asian-Americans, Chinese-Americans have had the longest history in this country, constitute the largest ethnic group, and were the best educated overall. Their image in America has endured tremendous vicissitudes. Depending on the economic and political reality of the times Chinese-Americans have been alternatively praised and welcomed, or reviled and rejected. Once called nonassimilable, uneducable heathens, they are currently perceived as the "model minority." What happened to bring about the relatively recent phenomenon of Chinese-Americans as super-achievers?

Purpose and Structure of this Literature Review

What began for me as a search for ethnographies of Chinese-American families and studies on Chinese values and practice has taken me on a path to find pieces of the historical puzzle. The initial question that drove the literature search, "What cultural values and family practices contribute to Chinese-American success in schools?" has been shifted to "Why did Chinese-American educational achievement occur at a particular point in time?" It became clear as I examined a variety of works (reports of empirical research studies, statistical data, historical accounts, fiction, biographies, autobiographies, and newspaper stories) that Chinese-American educational achievement can be understood only within a historical perspective. This literature review departs, therefore, from the typical. Research findings from studies on achievement in general and minority achievement in particular will not be the focus. Instead, information from sources mentioned above, organized around periods in the history of Chinese in America, will be selected to illuminate my thesis about Chinese-American educational achievement. Despite the unusual format of this literature review, it will fulfill the most important function of any respectable literature review, i.e. reframing or refining a research question through discovering layers of a given topic.

The thesis presented in this literature review has drawn heavily from the insightful works of Suzuki (1977, 1988), Hirschman & Wong (1986), Park (1990), Wang (1991), and Ogbu (1981, 1983, 1990). No parent raises children in a vacuum. All racial minority parents use their resources to socialize their children to function in two worlds: mainstream society and the ethnic community. One must look at larger structural factors which may constrain or expand the range of options for individual families. Thus, any reflective analysis of Chinese-American achievement must take account of the role of the following factors: (a) events and traditions in the homeland, which illuminate the roots of those cultural values and practices that are conducive to school success; and (b) history of the Chinese community in the U.S. and its interactions with mainstream American society. That interaction shapes how Chinese-American families define the social reality for their offspring, the values they emphasize, and the practices they adopt.

In this review of the literature, we will begin by sorting the myths about the reality of Chinese-American achievement and go on to examine the most popular explanation of that educational achievement, the "family values and cultural traditions" thesis, despite the limitations of this explanation. We will then place values and traditions in the context of the history of the Chinese in America. For these traditions, values, and practices to influence success in American schools, something else needs to happen when they are brought to the new country. How did the new country perceive and react to the Chinese cultural repertoire? How then did the Chinese family and the community respond?

Though some of the facts of the history of Chinese in the U.S. may already be familiar to the reader, how these facts relate to school success may not be as obvious. Although Ogbu (1983; 1990) makes little attempt to address differences within each minority group, his work on minority groups and educational achievement is considered seminal. We find Ogbu's theoretical framework (1990) particularly useful in examining the 150 years of history of the Chinese in America because it makes a connection between society's treatment of a minority group and that group's instrumental and expressive coping pattern, a connection that attempts to explain the context of educational achievement.

In Ogbu's framework, instrumental barriers refer to the fairly overt and visible discriminatory activities that the dominant group directs toward the minority group. Expressive barriers refer to the conscious and unconscious derogatory treatment of the minority group. To survive and cope with the dominant group's treatment, each minority group develops some behavioral patterns and adopts certain attitudes. These patterns and attitudes become embedded in the minority group's tradition and are passed on to the next generation. For some minority groups, these patterns and attitudes are oppositional to school success. For others, such as Chinese-Americans, the homeland traditions and the coping patterns and attitudes

developed in the U.S. are conducive to school success. When these are combined with an opening in the social and economic opportunity structure, they make school success possible.

In an earlier work, Ogbu (1983) says the key to Chinese-American school success is their perception of their status and objectives in the U.S. This affects how they respond to American education. One ethnographic study (Gelormino, 1986) of college-educated Polish-Americans and African-Americans lends support to Ogbu's thesis that immigrants' perception of status in this country is related to their view of education. Polish-American parents in that study felt secure about their ethnic group's place in the U.S., were more relaxed in their childrearing, and viewed schools as agents of socialization, teaching civics, ethics, and life skills, whereas African-American parents' emphasis on teaching and disciplinary behaviors reflected their perception of education as the means to achieve and maintain middle-class status. To these African-American families, the three R's were used to prepare for mainstream culture and the job market.

To highlight diversity in background, experience, perception, and identity within the group called "Chinese-Americans," this literature review will examine the different kinds of Chinese people who were in the U.S. at various times. The identity issue is an especially vital one because some scholars as represented by Ogbu (1983) view Chinese immigrants' sojourner identity as a significant contributing factor in their educational success. Yet, as Wang (1991) points out, "sojourner" is but one of several types of Chinese-American identities: total assimilator, accommodator, the ethnically proud, and the uprooted are others. Wang's typology of Chinese-American identities goes beyond the usual dichotomy of American-born Chinese and overseas-born Chinese. Regardless of place of birth, parents' ethnic identity will to some extent determine how they define social reality for their children, what they expect of their children, and how they approach education.

For each period in the 150 years of history of the Chinese in America, we will give an overview of the immigration policy in force at the time, the socioeconomic background, country of origin and motivation for immigration as well as some indication of the size of the Chinese community. These factors had a significant impact on how the American public (including teachers, labor unions, prospective employers, and legislators) treated the Chinese in America. We will also examine Chinese-Americans' access to education, jobs, housing and other opportunities, noting instrumental as well as expressive barriers that Chinese immigrants had to overcome in each period. We will then discuss Chinese immigrants' coping and survival strategies. We will attempt to identify: (a) any parallel structures (in schooling or employment) that were established as a result of the barriers encountered, (b) status mobility system -- the way of getting ahead in a society, (c) role models available, (d) collective or social identity, and (e) the folk theory about getting ahead in America developed or maintained within the Chinese community as a whole and within any given Chinese

family. Finally, the effects of interaction between the dominant society's treatment and Chinese-Americans' responses and perceptions on education will be highlighted. Before proceeding to present the historical context of Chinese-American educational achievement, we need first to answer a fundamental question: Have Chinese-Americans really achieved educationally?

Chinese-American Educational Achievement: Myth or Reality?

Much has been written recently about Asian-Americans as superachievers and the model minority. The same descriptions are applied to Chinese-Americans. From average figures available, it is quite clear that Chinese-Americans do exceedingly well, but one must be careful in interpreting averages, which are affected by extreme values and which often give a misleading picture of the distribution. To say that Chinese-Americans are superachievers is to oversimplify reality.

Commonly accepted indices of educational achievement include dropout rates, median years of completed schooling, rates of enrollment in programs for gifted students, high school or college graduation rates, S.A.T. and G.R.E. scores, percentages of Ph.D.'s, acceptance to more demanding colleges, representation in more difficult and demanding fields such as mathematics and science. On all these indices, Asian-Americans have outdone other racial groups including Whites (Tsang & Wing, 1985; U.S. Department of Education Center for Educational Statistics, 1987; Hirschman & Wong, 1986; Hsia, 1988; and Park, 1990).

Although the data sets have limitations -- for example, lumping foreign students with Asian-Americans who are permanent residents of the U.S., or including only U.S. citizens and not permanent residents -- the consistent finding is that Asian Americans start school earlier, stay in school longer, drop out less often, have larger percentages of high school graduates, are over-represented in gifted student programs and under-represented in programs for the learning disabled, manifest fewer disciplinary problems, are better prepared academically for college than candidates overall. (Since details of the 1990 census are not yet available, any discussion of statistics on educational level, income, and occupation is based on the 1980 census.) These statistics are all the more remarkable in that more than one quarter of Asian-American high school students report that English is not their best language.

The above data on Asian-Americans probably apply to Chinese-Americans, too. Ethnic breakdowns are not always available, but those that exist indicate that Chinese-Americans fare well in general. In one area in particular, school enrollment, Chinese-Americans do best among Asian-Americans and better than Whites. The college completion rate among White men was 21.3% while the rate for Chinese men was 52.8%. In 1980, 74% of Chinese-Amer-

icans of college age were enrolled in school. This was a higher percentage than for Japanese (62%), Koreans (55%) or Filipinos (38%). Thirty-seven percent of Chinese-Americans were college graduates -- a proportion outdone only by Asian-Indians (Hsia, 1988, pp. 13-14).

However, media portrayal of Asian-American educational achievement ("Success story of one minority group," in U.S. News and World Report, 1966; Kasindorf in Newsweek, 1982; Williams in Newsweek, 1984; McGrath & Zagorin in Time, 1983; Brand in Time, 1987) obscures the bipolar distribution (Chang, 1988; Hu, 1989). "Asians, in my view, are the only major racial group that can be best characterized as a double minority. Depending on which Asians you choose, they fit both the pattern of a privileged 'overminority' and a disadvantaged 'underminority' " (Hu, 1989, pp. 244-245).

According to Park (1990) the polarity is especially extreme for Chinese-Americans. The polarization is manifested in several ways: age, country of origin, current geographical area of residence. It must be remembered that the proportion of illiterate Chinese-Americans in the 1970's was three times greater than for Blacks and seven times greater than for Whites (Chen, 1981, p. 228).

Kwong (1987) further points out that when we talk about Chinese-Americans, we should be thinking of two very distinct groups: the "Uptown Chinese" and the "Downtown Chinese," each comprising roughly 30% of the Chinese-American population. The former are entrepreneurs or professionals, both American-born and new immigrants, living outside of Chinatowns, enjoying higher incomes and having more education than the national average. These "Uptown Chinese" tend to come from Taiwan and Hong Kong. The "Downtown Chinese," on the other hand, tend to be manual and service workers, more recent immigrants, speak little or no English, lack a high school diploma from the homeland, and live in Chinatowns. Some of them come from Hong Kong, but most have immigrated from the rural areas of Quangdong Province in mainland China. Using New York's Chinatown as an example and drawing upon data from the 1980 census, Kwong (1987) notes that 71.4% of the Chinese-Americans in Chinatown had no high school diplomas and 24.7% of them lived below the poverty level. These proportions were much higher than the overall city statistics.

The educational polarity manifests itself in age as well as geography, favoring the younger generation and those living in the South and the Midwest. New York as a state has the worst literacy rate and lowest figures for both high school and college education for Chinese-Americans (Chang, 1983, p. 88). Cities, especially those in traditional Chinese population centers such as New York City and Boston, also report a lower proportion of those pursuing college education than suburban Chinese communities. The disparities in education and income also split along the line of length of stay in the U.S. with those who have been here at least five years doing much better (Tsang & Wing, 1985; Kan & Liu, 1986). It is gener-

ally believed that assimilation aids educational achievement (Neidert & Farley, 1985); both the length of stay as well as being American-born is related to assimilation (Fong, 1965 cited in Sue & Sue, 1971).

Chang (1988) views the bimodal pattern as a post-World War II phenomenon and points out two major causes for the bimodal pattern among Chinese-Americans: (a) improved opportunities for Chinese-Americans in some high status professional occupations while employment barriers persist in other occupations; (b) changes in immigration policies which favor more educated Chinese immigrants.

Another way to answer the question "Is Chinese-American educational achievement a reality?" is to examine the word "achievement." What do we mean by achievement? Park (1990) argues that if achievement means current status then Asian-Americans have indeed attained a high level of education, but if achievement means spectacular progress made, then it is difficult to conclude that Asian-Americans have come a longer way than other ethnic groups. Given the initial advantage of Asian-American immigrants in terms of education and skills, their offspring's educational attainments are to be expected. Chang (1983) reaches a similar conclusion: the overall rosy picture of the education of Chinese-Americans has been a function more of the very high level of education of new immigrants than of any unusually rapid progress made by the veteran Chinese settlers.

After describing the educational system in Taiwan and examining who immigrated, Kwong concludes, "These Uptown Chinese of Taiwanese origin possessed a first-class education before they came to the United States. They were able to move into relatively high-income professional careers after further study here. They did not start from scratch. To suggest that they made it by quickly moving upward misrepresents the facts" (Kwong, 1987, p. 62).

Another piece of evidence supporting Park's "initial advantage" theory (1990) is found in the background of top winners of the Westinghouse Science Talent Search. While it is true that in recent years almost a quarter of the top winners were students of Chinese descent, the background of the parents of these youths is often overlooked. Of the nine Chinese-American finalists (out of forty nationwide) in 1987, five were born in Taiwan or had parents who came from Taiwan. What is more, the parents of six of the nine finalists held jobs that require a high level of education such as research scientists, college professors, or physicians (Kwong, 1987, p. 73).

The Cultural Values and Traditions Thesis

Virtually every article discussing Chinese-American school success includes some reference to Chinese cultural values. Values usually mean those based on Confucianism and encompassing respecting one's elders, a sense of family obligation, deferred gratification, hard work and discipline, and reverence for learning. The conventional explanation of Chinese-Americans' school success is: (a) immigrants brought a cultural respect for learning and value of education for its own sake even if it does not lead to a good job; (b) hierarchical and closely-knit family structure and relationship encourage children to work hard in school and make parental monitoring of child's homework and whereabouts much easier; (c) the parent-child relationship is congruent with the teacher-pupil relationship in the public school, which means that behaviors socialized at home are valued by the teacher. There is, of course, some truth in all this.

Education

Valuing education is by no means a unique claim of Chinese-Americans. For almost all immigrants, education represents probably the only avenue that can offset their disadvantage in a new country (Chang, 1983) and the only hope for the second generation (Blakely, 1983; Muir, 1988). After all, there is a relationship between level of education and income. What is perhaps unique is the tendency of Chinese-Americans to define their cultural identity in terms of academic achievement (Lee, 1983; Lau, 1988); to do well in school is to be Chinese.

According to Erickson (1987), the most fundamental factor in school success is the school's being perceived as legitimate by both parents and children. Chinese-Americans have a tradition of according legitimacy to school and teacher in their homeland. This tradition is passed down to their children, who do not associate the acquisition of literacy with betrayal of their ethnic identity.

In traditional Chinese society there were four classes: scholar, farmer, laborer, merchant. Every parent traditionally dreamed of having a scholar in the family, for, in China, education was the road to fame and material success. Since the Sui Dynasty (581-617 A.D.), a system of selection of officials through an examination system has been in operation. The tradition of valuing education has been reinforced by folklore -- exemplified by stories of poor children who "made it" because they studied hard, and sayings such as "A gold mansion and a beautiful girl await you inside your books" and "Compared to scholarly pursuits, everything is lowly." Confucianism also promotes a belief in human malleability (Chen & Uttal, 1988): ability is considered an accumulation of skills and knowledge and perseverance is seen as the key to educational as well as other kinds of success. Confucius himself believed that the general population should and could be educated. Innate ability determines the rate one

acquires knowledge, but those of lesser intellectual power may eventually acquire it through sheer effort.

Within the Confucian tradition the teacher is revered. Teachers are authority figures second only to parents. Both as "dispenser of knowledge" and as "molder of character" the teacher's role is an exalted one (Sung, 1987, p.77). Every fall, on Confucius' reputed birthday, Teacher's Day is still celebrated in Chinese communities all over the world. Instead of spending lavishly on proms and graduation trips, graduating high school classes in Hong Kong pool their money to give banquets to honor their teachers. The respect for education and educators is a significant contributing factor to Chinese-Americans' school success.

Although examinations had a long history of more than one thousand years in China, access to education was quite limited. Theoretically everyone, no matter how poor, could become an official through education. In fact, however, no more than 1% of the candidates were successful (O'Neill, 1987, p.87). The small chance of success did not discourage people from trying because the possible reward was a profitable as well as prestigious government career.

In old China (pre-Communist Revolution) working-class children had practically no opportunity to get an education. Eight out of ten people were illiterate. Only 3 out of 10,000 people could attend college ("Education: Facts and figures," 1985). One of the Communist government's goals set in 1949 was to eradicate illiteracy, but the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) left many schools in disarray and a whole generation suffered from the disruption of education at all levels. The 1982 census showed that 23.5% of China's population was illiterate (O'Neill, 1987, p. 172). By the mid-1980's, however, universal primary school education had been achieved in most cities and in 24% of the rural counties. Still, college education is far from being accessible to the majority of Chinese youths; only 4 to 5% of those taking the National College Entrance Examination are admitted to college (Hawkins, 1983 cited in Chen & Uttal, 1988).

In Taiwan, literacy is practically universal (O'Neill, 1987, p. 172). There are 116 institutions of higher learning (universities, colleges, and junior colleges). A joint college entrance examination is administered every year. Only about 35% of those taking the examination are eventually granted college admission (Yearbook of Republic of China, 1990). In Hong Kong, until 1963 there was only one accredited degree-granting college and as recently as 1986 there were only two. Competition for four thousand or so freshmen places was intense (Hong Kong 1991: A Review of 1990).

Actual access notwithstanding, the Chinese regard for educational achievement above all other kinds of achievement is reflected in autobiographies, fiction, biographies, and research

reports. The following was written by an immigrant from Taiwan, a mother with a kindergarten-age daughter:

> Unfortunately, I was raised to believe that only grades in academic subjects count in life. Teachers and parents pay lip service to sports and leadership, but in reality every one could see that only the hardworking and obedient student gets ahead.... Even for us young parents who once hated the kind of schooling we had, when we become parents, we impose the same burden on our kids. If our child falls a little behind in one subject, we parents cannot accept such a "blow." Yes, I was a little disappointed in my daughter's progress because she could not reach my standards and fulfill my expectations. (Chou, 1991, translated by Siu.)

The award-winning writer Yep (1991), whose mother was an American-born Chinese, writes in his memoirs, "My own family had grown up as much American as Chinese... And yet there was something that remained Chinese that went beyond speech patterns and food preferences. My parents always put studies before anything else and always showed deep respect for any of my teachers" (p. 55-56).

Perhaps it is this traditional valuing of education that made Chinese-Americans choose the pursuit of higher education as a means for advancement in the face of job discrimination, eschewing the political activities or other avenues other ethnic groups have chosen.

Family

The importance of family influences in school achievement has been extensively documented (Entwistle & Hayduk, 1978; Genova, 1981; Watson, Brown, & Swick, 1983; Marjoribanks, 1984; Marjoribanks, 1986; Phillips, 1987; Wood, Chapin & Hannah, 1988; Dornbusch & Wood, 1989; Lareau, 1989; Steinberg, 1989; Crouter et al., 1990; Snow et al., 1991). The influences come in various forms, including expectations, creating a stress-free home environment, and literacy activities. How does the family contribute to school success in the case of Chinese-Americans?

The "typical" Chinese-American family does not exist. It is more appropriate to seek out major characteristics of different types of Chinese-American families. Family structure and orientation vary according to socioeconomic class, the homeland, length of stay in the U.S., degree of acculturation, the availability and accessibility of other Chinese-American families and institutions in the community. It is extremely important to remember that the Chinese American family is shaped by many forces, including past traditions and current life experiences, and ongoing political and economic events in the Far East and the United States (Lee,

1982, p. 529). A number of scholars have created typologies of Chinese-American families (Hsu, 1971; Wong, 1976; Ho, 1987; Lee, 1989). The three or four that emerge are similar in many ways in that they lie on a continuum: traditional, transitional, bicultural, and Americanized (Lee, 1989). The literature also contains references to mutilated families (Sung, 1987) and "ghetto" families (Huang, 1976).

The traditional family is male-dominant and hierarchical, with clearly delineated roles for parents and children. It has a cohesive, extended family structure and stresses duty, obligation, sacrifice, importance of family name, respect for elders, and ancestor worship. More emphasis is placed on the parent-child bond than on the marital bond. Suppression of emotions, modesty, and maintaining interpersonal harmony are valued.

It is commonly believed that educational success is advanced by the way Chinese-American children are socialized. It has been shown (e.g. Lau, 1988; Yep, 1991) that even American-born Chinese parents retain some traditional Chinese parenting values and practices. In bringing up their children, Chinese-American parents may draw upon traditional methods and values such as teaching the child to value educational achievement above all other kinds of achievement, to respect authority, to feel a strong sense of responsibility for relatives, to blame oneself when failing to live up to parental expectations, to learn self-control. Shaming the child and arousing guilt in the child are preferred modes of socialization; these are seen as preferable to physical punishment (Sue & Sue, 1971, p. 36). The desire to please one's parents is "an impetus potentially stronger than direct parental pressure" (Pang, 1990, p. 63). Based on a sample of Hong Kong adolescents, a study (1985) by Cheung and Lau reveals that the Chinese adolescent's self-esteem is tied more closely to the family environment than to the school environment.

How are Chinese-American parenting practices different from those of other cultural groups in the United States? Findings from studies conducted in China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong as well as those conducted in the U.S. (Sue & Sue, 1971; Steward & Steward, 1973; Kessen, 1975; Lee, 1980; Sung, 1987; Chin, 1988; Lin, 1988; Strom, Daniels & Leung, 1988; Chen & Uttal, 1988; Stevenson & Lee, 1990) are surprisingly consistent. Chinese parents, whether here or abroad, tend to exercise more control over family members, be more protective of children, emphasize more obedience to the parents, provide a higher proportion of enthusiastic positive feedback when teaching young children, value grades more than general cognitive achievement in children, evaluate more realistically a child's academic and personality characteristics, be less satisfied with a child's accomplishment, hold children to higher standards, and believe more in effort and less in innate ability than their American counterparts.

The comparative study by Chen & Uttal (1988) yields an interesting finding. In spite of Chinese parents' stronger belief in the importance of teachers in influencing the child's academic performance, Chinese parents spent considerably more time helping with or monitoring their children's homework than their American counterparts, who believed that parents were more important than teachers.

There is some disagreement over what really motivates Chinese and other Asian-Americans to pursue education. Chen & Uttal (1988) and Schneider & Lee (1990) hold the opinion that non-economic rewards such as self-improvement, upholding family honor, and self-esteem are important incentives for Asians to acquire more education, while others (Suzuki, 1977; Ogbu, 1983) believe that Asian-Americans study hard for pragmatic reasons. Nevertheless, many Chinese-Americans, especially first-generation immigrants, could probably identify with the following accounts. Chou (1970) said in her autobiography, "In my elementary and high school period, all I wanted to get were good marks for all subjects. There was a chain reaction: to study was for examinations and examinations were for good marks, and good marks were for the happiness of my parents, the fondness of my teachers, the admiration of my schoolmates and pride of myself" (p. 172). One of the women featured in Chinese American Portraits (McCunn, 1988), a collection of personal histories, recalled that when she received her master's degree her mother was so proud that she kissed her for the first time in her life.

The coincidence of some if not all traditional Chinese values with those encouraged by the American school culture presents another advantage. Such a congruence results in (a) the Chinese-American child being viewed positively by the teacher and (b) the child's ability to devote energy to learning rather than to coping with discontinuity and dissonance.

What the cultural thesis fails to explain is why in earlier periods of the history of Chinese in America, the wonderful emphasis on family and education did not bring about phenomenal achievement for Chinese-Americans. Certainly, Chinese-Americans as a group did not become more traditional after the second World War. Another limitation of the cultural thesis is that it fails to explain satisfactorily why Chinese people who strongly valued the family and education did not have a large proportion of highly educated people in China, Taiwan, or Hong Kong. Obviously, the values in themselves are necessary but not sufficient conditions for success.

To say that this thesis has limitations is not to deny the significance of the role of cultural values and traditions. As Hsu (1971) points out in his book The Challenge of the American Dream, "The tradition of each people is likely to be embodied in myths which are enjoyed, dramatized, and transmitted from generation to generation. They are inspirational and are used as justification for present and future behaviors" (p. 40). Kawahara's study (1990) of

Asian-Americans finds that culturally-based values and attitudes did not change until the fourth generation. Those values, deeply rooted at a gut level, are "powerful, non-verbalized and subconscious forces" that continue to shape a person's identity and behavior (p. 119). However, Park (1990) shows with his painstaking analysis of statistical and historical data that the cultural thesis is overemphasized because the reported socioeconomic status of Asian-American families is often misleading, causing us to underestimate the importance of socioeconomic class advantage. Given the initial downward mobility of many immigrants and the fact that Asian-Americans often hold jobs and have incomes that are not commensurate with their levels of education, we should be cautious about conclusions from studies (such as Sowell, 1981; Rumbault & Ima, 1987) that correlate parental socioeconomic class with indicators of educational achievement of their children.

Interaction between Social Structural Factors and Family Perceptions and Practices: A Historical Perspective

Hirschman and Wong (1986) point out that the social structural and cultural values theses are not mutually exclusive. Social structural factors include socioeconomic class, immigrant/nativity status, kinship organization, and opportunity structure, which act in conjunction with cultural values to influence educational attainment. Instead of being viewed as causal variables for achievement, Asian-Americans' cultural values should be viewed as "intervening variables" (p.4).

We will now turn to the social structural factors affecting Chinese-Americans' perceptions and practices during different periods of their history. What will be clear from this discussion is that a series of events in the homeland as well as in the United States has led to a less hostile attitude toward Chinese-Americans and to a wider opening in the American opportunity structure. They have in turn influenced the way Chinese-American parents define socioeconomic reality for themselves and their children. Despite a history of privation, prejudice, discrimination, and harsh treatment, it is significant that Chinese-Americans have basically accorded legitimacy to the American public school and persisted in the belief that education is the key to success. Throughout the history of Chinese in America, even during the Exclusion Period, there have always been Chinese students and scholars studying in the United States, a constant affirmation of faith in schooling unmatched by any other racial minority group in this country.

The history of Chinese-Americans can be conveniently divided into four periods: (1) Pre-Exclusion era, (2) Exclusion Period from 1882 to 1943, (3) Repeal of the Exclusion Act of 1943 to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, and (4) The post-1965 era.

Period 1: Pre-Exclusion Era

Overview of Immigration Policy. The earliest settlers from China (1785-1848) were skilled craftsmen and merchants, with some hired out as cooks and servants. Prior to the Gold Rush of 1849, the small number of Chinese in the Western states were well-bred urban merchants, artisans, builders, restaurateurs, and hotel keepers. Almost all males came from two provinces in South China. The immigrants who came during the Gold Rush were mostly poor peasants, propelled by economic hardship, the Taiping Rebellion, local riots, and general social discontent in China. In spite of a less than cordial reception, the Chinese population continued to grow, accounting for 10% of California's population from the 1850's to 1870's. In 1870, there were approximately 60,000 Chinese in the U.S. (Chen, 1981, p.79). Immigration was spurred by the Burlingame Treaty (1868) between the United States and China which guaranteed for the U.S. a steady flow of cheap labor through immigration. Not all who came under this treaty were poor peasants; a few newcomers were officials, students, and merchants with capital.

American Society's Treatment of the Chinese. While the earliest Chinese to arrive were regarded as objects of curiosity, they were quite well received by Americans because they provided the labor needed in railroad construction, fishing, and factories, without competing with Whites. They were confined to low-status, low-paying "immigrant jobs." In fact, documentary evidence suggests that the early Chinese laborers were touted as being cheerful and clean (Chen, 1981, p. 3), hardworking, frugal, and intelligent. They were held up as models for Black and White workers alike (Takaki, 1991, p. 81). It was not until the Chinese began digging in the gold mines that anti-Chinese feeling emerged, and it accelerated during times of economic depression. Eventually, shifts in employment opportunities led to legalized discriminatory practices against the Chinese in the West and Midwest. These included local and state taxes affecting only the Chinese, banning citizenship by naturalization, disallowing court testimony by Chinese against Whites, prohibiting land ownership, legalizing segregated housing, forbidding interracial marriage, and promoting segregated schools. Physical violence against Chinese was widespread.

Access to American education was extremely limited for some Chinese and non-existent for others. Private schools were set up by Christian missions to serve Chinese children. Petitions from Chinese for admission to San Francisco's public schools had been consistently denied on the grounds that "[Chinese] are not of that kind that Americans can ever associate or sympathize with. They are not of our people and never will be, though they remain here forever" (cited in McCunn, 1988, p. 41). In California, after 1866, Chinese children could attend public schools if White parents did not object. However, about 1% of the Chinese in the U.S. -- those who were born in the United States -- were allowed to attend American schools. The exclusion of Chinese immigrants from American schools was a violation of the

Burlingame Treaty of 1868, which provided that the Chinese who came to the U.S. "...shall enjoy all the privileges of the public educational institutions under the control of the government of the United States."

In the 1870's, as part of Imperial China's effort at modernization, a special program called the China Educational Mission was launched in New England under the leadership of Yung Wing, the first Chinese to graduate from an American college (Chu, 1987). The program was successful in placing 30 Chinese children per year from affluent, educated backgrounds in integrated local schools. These students were accepted by the community and were in fact quite popular at church socials (McCunn, 1988). However, the program was very limited in scope and was eventually discontinued by the Chinese government, when the U.S. government would not admit any of these young men into West Point or the U.S. Naval Academy. It is safe to state that until the 1940's, Chinese in America did not really have full access to American public education, even though by 1918 all the states had enacted legislation mandating free public school and compulsory school attendance.

The Chinese Community's Adaptation and Coping. In the face of an increasingly hostile environment, the Chinese turned to one another, forming an ethnic network for survival and support. Since access to American public schools was limited, alternative strategies were pursued, for example, in the mid-1850's the Six Companies (indigenous district benevolent societies) organized education courses for Chinese children. According to Chen (1981) there were indications that most Chinese merchants in California in the early 1870's could read Chinese. It was they who helped maintain the scholarly tradition and provided the young with a traditional education.

Chinese men who came during this period developed a sojourner identity, because of traditional pride in and loyalty to one's village, and the inhospitality and even hostility of the Americans. Their only goal was to make enough money to support their families back home and eventually return to their ancestral village to retire (Wang, 1991). Such a mentality basically expressed a yearning; in reality, not all those Chinese immigrants returned to China. The sojourner mentality resulted in a willingness to accept discrimination and prejudice because such suffering was only temporary. Although their pay was less than that of White workers, the Chinese rarely complained. American money had more buying power in China, and they realized the futility of a strike, which could easily be broken up by hiring White children, who would work for less than the Chinese.

Period 2: Exclusion Era 1882-1943

Overview of Immigration Policy. The most significant legislation in the history of the Chinese in America was the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882; it essentially shut down the labor source no longer needed by White employers. Chinese immigration decreased to only ten persons admitted in 1887. Those Chinese in America who had saved enough money returned to China. Even during this period, a small number of Chinese students, chosen by competitive examinations in China, were admitted to the U.S. at various times to attend college. This was possible due in part to China's westernization movement, with the help from the Boxer Rebellion Indemnity Fellowship program set up by the U.S. government (Tsai, 1986). The majority of these students paid their own way; some were supported by Protestant and Catholic missions. Most of these students returned to China. Federal legislation in 1924 allowed only those coming to do graduate work to enter the United States, further limiting the number of educated Chinese in this country. In 1930 there were roughly 77,000 Chinese in the U.S. with 71% of them living in cities (Tsai, 1986, p. 105).

American Society's Treatment of the Chinese. The first Exclusion Act was followed by more stringent ones in 1892 and 1902. During this period, Chinese were required to carry identification cards. The Angel Island detention center was established to crack down on fraudulent Chinese immigrants. Parties in Chinatown were raided without warrants. Even exempt class Chinese immigrants (i.e. non-laborers) were harassed. American unions, the gatekeepers of skilled jobs, totally excluded the Chinese from these occupations. There was continued discrimination in housing and land ownership.

Access to education continued to be restricted. One couple's unsuccessful fight to enroll their American-born daughter in a San Francisco public school in the 1880's illustrates American society's unjust treatment of the Chinese. The school trustees maintained that they had the power "to exclude children of filthy or vicious habits, or children with contagious or infectious diseases" yet made no attempt to determine if the girl indeed had such habits or diseases. Later, the Board of Education threatened to dismiss any principal or teacher who dared to admit "a Mongolian child" (McCunn, 1988, p. 41).

Chang (1983) describes the educational experience of the Chinese in the United States as woeful because Chinese immigrants encountered numerous obstacles to obtaining decent education for their children. Chinese children were often grouped with Blacks and excluded from public schools. Anti-Chinese sentiment in some localities even led to attempts to exclude Chinese students from private schools.

In addition to the instrumental barriers mentioned above, the American public held an extremely negative view of Chinese throughout this period. Some telling quotes by politi-

cians and labor leaders of the time illustrate the dramatic shift in public opinion. Now instead of being a model, the Chinese in the U.S. epitomized all vices. "[The Chinese are] as inferior to any race God ever made... There are none so low. I believe that the Chinese have no souls to save, and if they have, they are not worth the saving" (cited in Chen, 1981, p. 153). "Chinese brought with them nothing but filth, vice and disease...all efforts to elevate them to a higher standard have proven futile...Every incoming coolie means so much more vice and immorality injected into our social life" (cited in Chen, 1981, p. 153). As late as 1932, a survey of Princeton University students showed that a third of them thought Chinese were sly and superstitious (Karlins, Coffman, & Walters, 1969). The portrayal of Chinese in the mass media was so negative that it was small wonder that in rural towns in California, even though Chinese children were allowed to attend integrated schools, they were subject to daily taunts and harassment by White children.

Between the two World Wars, however, White Americans' anti-Asian sentiment was directed toward Japan, a much greater threat, so that Chinese-Americans were left in "benighted neglect" (Tsai, 1986, p. 105).

Chinese Community's Adaptation and Coping. Starting in the late 1880's, Chinese began to move to the larger cities in the East in pursuit of better economic opportunities. The period from the late nineteenth century to 1943 was a period of urbanization of the Chinese population. By 1940 there were approximately 28 established Chinatowns in various parts of the country. The Chinese-American community was at its first stage of evolution (Sung, 1987, p. 54) -- a more or less closed and separate system, on which American mainstream institutions, media, values, and government had little impact. While some Chinese might work outside of Chinatowns, almost all lived in a geographically well-defined, insulated, and isolated community. This was a ghetto; to its residents, it was both a haven and a prison.

What were some social effects of the Exclusion Laws? The racial stratification of Orientals and Caucasians in the U.S. was essentially complete (Bloom, 1984). This period saw the creation of a bachelor society among the Chinese in America, creation of "mutilated families" in which fathers were in the U.S. while mothers and children were in China, heightened resistance to acculturation, development of segregated housing and business, and increased importance of regional/clan associations and secret societies providing mutual aid as well as social control.

With regard to education, some Chinese families during this period attempted to solve the problem of access by hiring a White teacher to tutor their children at home. Obviously this solution was confined to those who had the financial means to pay the teacher and the luck to find a White willing to teach Chinese children. Unwilling to send their children to the inferior segregated schools provided for Blacks, Chinese in the South established separate

schools for their own children, as well as youth organizations much like YMCA. The Chinese community raised the funds for these schools with the support of White churches. Some of these schools even had dormitories to accommodate out-of-town children. McCunn (1988) noted that these schools were not equal to White schools in quality, but were better than the all-Black schools. Unfortunately, the White teachers in these schools were often criticized and ostracized by their own community for teaching Chinese children. No data are available to indicate how Chinese students fared in those schools.

The secondary job market in Chinatown also served some useful functions with regard to education. According to Hirschman and Wong (1986), Chinese-Americans faced with job discrimination developed their own economy by becoming small business owners or service providers. This economy had two functions: providing an inspiring example that occupational advancement was possible albeit in a secondary labor market, and investing individually and collectively in education. The ethnic economy is seen by Hirschman and Wong as the key to understanding educational progress of second-generation Asian-Americans in the early part of the twentieth century. There is reason to believe that an ethnic economy helped to prepare a new immigrant for confrontation with the larger society. Although education did not seem to pay off in this country, some Chinese still felt that an American education would be helpful to China or could be a means to personal advancement upon return to China.

Faced with legally sanctioned social segregation, economic discrimination, and political disfranchisement, the Chinese in America during this period were not concerned with openly fighting for justice and equality although there was an anti-American goods boycott in 1905. Tsai (1986) notes that unlike the Japanese and Filipinos, the Chinese in the U.S. did not produce any local labor leader or radical intellectual. Only minimal gains were made in unionizing.

What kinds of Chinese-American identity surfaced during this time? In addition to the sojourner identity prominent earlier, the assimilator identity became the survival strategy of some Chinese-Americans in the later part of the Exclusion Period. As noted earlier, a small percentage of American-born Chinese received an American education, either through mission schools or in the public school. One of the major functions of the school was to Americanize immigrant children. Some Chinese-Americans, ashamed of the backwardness of China and of their own community, made it their goal to be assimilated into mainstream American society. According to Wang (1991), they "vigorously pursued education, joined Christian churches, and participated in the social and recreational activities of their white peers. It also meant the need to acquire a new identity, one based on what they thought to be desirable and acceptable to whites" (p. 197). Some second-generation Chinese-Americans Anglicized their Chinese family names, refrained from speaking Chinese, and moved out of Chinatowns

if possible. Of course, all this effort did not result in complete acceptance by White society, not even for the college-educated, and some became disillusioned over their second-class citizenship status.

While some Chinese attempted to assimilate, others turned their attention to their homeland. They linked their powerlessness and mistreatment in the U.S. with the weakness of their home country. The solution for their plight was the strengthening and modernization of China. Thus, they responded enthusiastically to pleas for contributions of money and skills from leaders of reform and revolutionary movements in China. During the Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945), some Chinese returned to help China defend herself against Japanese aggression.

The personal histories compiled in the book Chinese-American Portraits, 1828-1988 (McCunn, 1988) indicate that not all Chinese-American parents in the 1930's and 1940's encouraged their children to attend college, because they could see how racial discrimination had made it impossible for Chinese-American college graduates to find work in their fields. Some of those who nevertheless chose to attend college were not thinking of employment and success in the United States; instead, they had a sense of mission about contributing their skills to reconstruct China, the homeland of their parents (McCunn, 1988, p. 110). Teachers in Chinese evening schools encouraged such plans, which kept the young motivated to study while recognizing the almost insurmountable barriers to success in the United States. In fact, between 1927 and 1932, 100 Chinese graduates returned to teach in universities in China.

Given the consistent denial of access to public and private education, it is small wonder that during this period the Chinese in America were not noted for being highly educated. Eighty years after Chinese immigration to the U.S. began, in 1940 one out of every four Chinese had no schooling at all and only half of those over age 25 had received some elementary education (census data cited in Chang, 1983, p. 81). As late as the 1930's, more than 60% of all Chinese workers in the U.S. worked as cooks, waiters, domestics, and laundrymen (Tsai, 1986).

Period 3: From Repeal of the Exclusion Law in 1943 to the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965

Overview of Immigration Policy. During this period, the laws regarding Chinese immigration were primarily selective, favoring the more educated, professional, and technically skilled. Even with the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act and the enactment of the Magnuson Act, the number of Chinese immigrants admitted remained small -- only 105 per year. In addition to those immigrants, a steady stream of students came from China between 1943

and 1949. They were from the highest echelon of Chinese society, had a strong sense of ethnic pride, and commanded respect from their professors and associates in the United States. The Magnuson Act of 1943 and the War Brides Act of 1946 made it possible for Chinese wives of U.S. citizens to enter the U.S. The composition of the Chinese-American community changed accordingly. After the fall of China to communism, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 enabled some Chinese to immigrate to the United States. Some 5,000 stranded Chinese students and scholars from China were also able to become permanent residents. In 1950, there were roughly 150,000 Chinese in the United States; in 1960, the numbers jumped to 237,000 (Tsai, 1986, pp. 140-141).

American Society's Treatment of the Chinese. This period was characterized by improved treatment of the Chinese by American society. Naturalization became possible for Chinese-Americans; laws restricting occupational and educational options were repealed, as were anti-miscegenation laws. Why did this change occur? The repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Law was a logical outcome of a changed relationship between China and the U.S. Under Nationalist rule, China was a U.S. ally in World War II. Later, under Communist rule, China was an enemy, but a world power to be reckoned with and a member of the United Nations Security Council.

Historians and social scientists agree that World War II was a watershed in the history of Chinese in America (Suzuki, 1977; Chen, 1981; Takaki, 1989; Kwong, 1987; Park, 1990). The outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War and subsequently of World War II did several things: it reinforced Chinese immigrants' attachment to their homeland; gave them a chance to leave Chinatown and prove their loyalty to their adopted country; opened doors to employment opportunities, especially in the defense industry; and forced the U.S. government to re-examine its discriminatory policies toward Chinese in America, which led to the repeal of the Exclusion Laws and to a more favorable public attitude toward the Chinese.

After Madame Chiang Kai-Shek's visit to the U.S. to seek support for China's war against Japan, the American public began to associate positive qualities seen in the popular Madame with Chinese-Americans in general: gracious, intelligent, modern, and proud. These quotes from Chinese men living during that period give a flavor of the importance of the War:

"To men of my generation, World War II was the most historic event of our times. For the first time we felt we could make it in American society" (cited in Takaki, 1989, p. 373).

"In the 1940's for the first time Chinese were accepted by Americans as being friends because at that time, Chinese and Americans were fighting against the Japanese and the Germans and the Nazis. Therefore, all of a sudden, we became part of an American dream...we began to feel very good about ourselves..." (cited in Takaki, 1989, p. 373).

This period was also one of expansion of American colleges. A college education gradually changed from a privilege for the elite to an expected middle-class undertaking. Technical jobs and low- or mid-level professional jobs now became accessible to both American-born and overseas-born Chinese. American government and businesses established programs to encourage students from China to come and study in the United States.

The Chinese in America did suffer a brief setback during the McCarthy era because of an intense fear of Chinese communist spies. Some Chinese-Americans were deported while others were so disgusted that they returned to China voluntarily.

The Chinese Community's Adaptation and Coping. With the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, Chinatowns all over the country were regenerated, beginning what Sung (1987) terms the second stage of evolution. Chinatown was still a well-defined geographic area, but it was no longer closed to outside influences. The impact of American institutions and values was felt both through the school and the community. Many Chinese parents worked outside of Chinatown. Media, tourists, social service agencies, and others provided the child with opportunities to interact with American society.

World War II brought an economic boom in defense industries and the first federal legislation for equal opportunity in employment. According to Tsang and Wing (1985), Asian-Americans had a certain "job market sensitivity," which influenced their decisions concerning education and employment. Asian-Americans, including Chinese-Americans, accepted the fact that union-controlled skilled jobs were still closed to them, but there were other sectors of employment in which they could and did find niches. To qualify for non-union-controlled jobs, Chinese-Americans invested in education. The result was a threefold increase during the decade 1940 to 1950 in the number of Chinese-American males in professional and technical jobs. This adaptational response was significant because these workers became role-models for their offspring, who later prepared themselves for Sputnik-stimulated occupations. The subsequent national prominence of some of the "stranded students" who opted to stay in the U.S. in 1949, such as computer expert An Wang and Nobel laureates in physics Chen-Ning Yang and Tsung-Dao Lee, provided additional evidence that effort in studying would pay off.

The Chinese individual or family's adaptation to the new reality was to no longer view the United States as "...Gam Saan, a place to work temporarily, but a new home where they hope to find greater economic opportunities for themselves and educational advantages for their children" (Takaki, 1989, p. 423). This, however, did not mean a desire for structural assimilation into American society.

The sojourner identity probably declined in importance during this period. Whereas early immigrants from China could (in theory) escape humiliating treatment by returning to their homeland, immigrants could not do so after the 1949 Communist takeover in China. Somehow they had to develop an identity that is neither sojourner nor assimilator. Accommodation has become a pragmatic survival strategy through which a differentiation is made between public and private life, with the former being American and the latter, Chinese. One may become a U.S. citizen, but fundamental values remain unchanged. The Chinese language is maintained at home while business is conducted in English. In short, permanent settlement is accepted without any attempt to assimilate (Wang, 1991). Of course, there were always Chinese-Americans who continued to strive for assimilation despite restriction of their movement up the occupational ladder.

Period 4: Post-1965 Era

Overview of Immigration Policy. The 1965 Immigration Law had two objectives: family reunification and an increased labor supply. Minor children and wives of U.S. citizens could be admitted outside of the quota system. In addition, a quota of 20,000 slots was assigned to each country. Several preference categories were set up for relatives of U.S. citizens and permanent residents and for professionals and other workers needed by U.S. employers. The Chinese population in America increased significantly during this period: a 240% increase between 1960 and 1980 (Kwong, 1987, p.4) and a 33% increase between 1980 and 1985, the year the Chinese population exceeded one million (Gardner, Robey, and Smith, 1985, p.5). Through legislation in 1979 and 1988, the number of slots for China Mainland and Hong Kong were increased.

Two compelling motives lay behind Chinese immigration in the post-1965 era: seeking political stability and obtaining better educational opportunities for the children. Wong (1990) asserts, "Their reason for coming to the United States is almost unanimously because of their children. Working-class parents realize that their children's chance of acceptance into limited college facilities are remote in Hong Kong" (p. 34). There is little question in the minds of Chinese immigrant parents that access to high school and college education is much better for their children in the U.S. than in China, Taiwan, or Hong Kong. Immigration, however, does not necessarily mean better economic opportunities for the parents themselves; in fact, many probably accept downward mobility as a necessary sacrifice for the sake of the children's future.

During the Cultural Revolution (1960-78), youngsters in China who did not have the correct political ideology or family background were denied admission to college. This lack of access was particularly frustrating to students of ability. Of course, until the normalization of relations between the U.S. and China, immigration for mainland Chinese was impossible.

Although the family reunification provision of the 1965 legislation brought Chinese of all socioeconomic classes, the preference based on professional expertise or technical skills favored the more highly educated. Between 1961 and 1970 at least 12,000 Chinese high school and college students from Taiwan and Hong Kong came to the U.S.; many later became permanent residents. The impressive educational profile of the Chinese-Americans was due largely to the influx of these highly educated students who stayed on. During the last few decades, the proportion of American-born to foreign-born Chinese has changed dramatically: from 61% American-born in 1960 to 63% foreign-born in 1980 (Takaki, 1989, p. 421). Chinese in America today are mainly an immigrant community.

American Society's Treatment of the Chinese. After the Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlawed many blatant forms of discrimination, Chinese-Americans faced fewer barriers to their effort to do well in school. A college education became more accessible. Compared to Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Mainland China, the U.S. seemed to be a land of educational opportunities, with free public education through the 12th grade and a wide choice of colleges.

It was during this period that the "Asian-Americans as a Model Minority" concept caught the attention of mass media and public officials. Let us look at how the "model minority" thesis originated. A positive image of Asian-Americans emerged in the mid-1960's in the wake of the Watts riots (Suzuki, 1977). The article "Success Story of One Minority Group in the U.S." in U.S. News and World Report (1966) drew a contrast between the nation's 300,000 upwardly mobile Asian-Americans and Blacks who needed uplifting by the government. Statistics on Chinese-Americans from the 1970 Census surprised the public, who did not expect Chinese-Americans to have a higher education level and a higher percentage representation in professional fields than the national average. Somehow the media and the public thought that Chinese-Americans had attained all this in a relatively short time, that they had pulled themselves up by the bootstraps without any government intervention, that they had been transformed from "coolies" to "engineers and scientists." Conveniently ignored were the changes in immigration policies and patterns as well as in the labor market.

The American public's acknowledgment that Chinese-Americans are conscientious and bright does not mean that Americans view Chinese-Americans as being successful in all areas. As Lau (1988, p. 3) points out, Chinese-Americans are also seen as less successful in face-to-face communication in mainstream American society because of the stereotypes of Chinese as "unfriendly, withdrawn, passive, secretive, and shifty."

Sadly, for Chinese-Americans and other Asian-Americans, educational attainments are not equivalent to economic success (Suzuki, 1977; Kwong, 1987; Hsia, 1988; Park, 1990). In other words, education has not brought economic rewards commensurate with the level of education because racial discrimination still exists. Chinese-Americans have lower incomes

than Whites with equivalent levels of education and similar professional positions. The glass-ceiling phenomenon is evident when Chinese are bypassed for promotion to management positions (Yu, 1985; Kwong, 1987, p. 60; Schwartz, 1987 in Newsweek). Some prestigious colleges also have reacted to the over-representation of Chinese-American students by adhering to an informal "quota" system in the admission process (Bunzel & Au, 1987).

In schools, Chinese as well as other Asian-American students are generally perceived as good students, meaning more emotionally stable and academically more competent than their classmates (Wong, 1980). With Asian-American students, teachers find that teaching them requires less effort and brings less frustration and conflict. Both elementary and secondary school teachers expect Asian-American students to receive more education than their White counterparts.

However, some teachers do find Chinese-American students' and parents' behavior or traits to be problematic. Sung (1987), in her survey of teachers of Chinese immigrant children in New York City, notes that even though a generally positive interaction prevails between teacher and student, teachers are not happy with "student passivity, a non-questioning attitude, discomfort in dealing with a relatively loosely structured classroom atmosphere, parental overprotectiveness and methods of treating the sick child, and a tendency to stick with their own ethnic group" (Sung, 1987, p. 92). The teachers in Schneider and Lee's study (1990) also tended to see East Asian students as lacking in social skills and less likely to do well in professions requiring verbal skills.

The Chinese Community's Instrumental Adaptation and Coping. What happened to the Chinese-American community during this period? Certainly with the liberalization of immigration policy in 1965 the nature and composition of the Chinese community changed. Many families were reunited; a large number of Chinese women immigrated to the U.S. Although Chinatown remained the social and economic focus of people's lives, the roles played by the clan and regional associations started to diminish. Anthropologist Weiss' study (1974) of the pattern of Chinese social organizations in the United States reveals a tripartite model consisting of traditional, modernist, and activist associations. The Chinese-American community has moved to what Sung (1987) labels the third stage of evolution -- a stage that has seen the rise of satellite Chinatowns, which are new formations where Chinese choose to live close to one another or shop in concentrated areas. Examples are Flushing and Elmhurst in Queens, New York City. However, the Chinese community nowadays is less well-defined. As Sung puts it, "It has a locale, but is loosely structured. Influences from the larger society have penetrated from all sides" (p. 54).

The contemporary Chinese community is also less readily characterized as compared to that of earlier times. Wong (1988) observes that the safest generalization one can make is that

it is no longer predominantly Cantonese, rural, and male. The linguistic diversity within the Chinese community sometimes means that Chinese-Americans cannot even communicate with one another. It is not simply a matter of different dialects within the Chinese language. Studies (Li, 1982; Veltman, 1983; Fishman, et al., 1985, all cited in Wong, 1988) have pointed to a rapid shift to the English language among second- and third-generation Chinese-Americans, for whom English is the only language they know. At the same time, a sizable proportion (28%) of Chinese-Americans still speak little or no English, according to the 1980 census data.

What role does the Chinese community play in education? Besides preserving Chinese culture through ethnic publications and mass media, as well as Chinese language schools, the community supports activist organizations that fight for equal access to education, employment, health and social services -- organizations such as OCA (Organization of Chinese Americans) and CAA (Chinese for Affirmative Action). Both traditional and newer community organizations also give scholarships to deserving Chinese-American students to pursue a college education.

Despite the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Chinese-Americans as a cultural group do not yet feel completely secure about their status in the U.S. The fear of subtle discrimination is ever-present. Both Ogbu and Suzuki stress that Chinese-Americans pursue education for very pragmatic reasons, not valuing acquisition of knowledge for knowledge's sake. (A mid-1970's University of California at Berkeley survey listed these reasons given by Asian-Americans for attending college: to make money, to get a better job than their parents had, difficulty in finding skilled labor jobs, other avenues for advancement closed to Asians in the U.S.) Choice of technical fields like science and math is really a kind of insurance against employment discrimination. In fact, education becomes a strategy to overcome job discrimination (Schneider & Lee, 1990). Working-class parents in Wong's ethnography of literacy behaviors in Chinese immigrant families in the U.S. almost daily tell stories about the benefits of education and use themselves as negative examples of "what not to aspire to." All this is done to encourage the children to stay in school so that they will not have to work as cooks or dishwashers (Wong, 1990, p. 225).

Fear of job discrimination probably affects Chinese-Americans' choice of majors in college. Data on Asian-Americans are available, but ethnic breakdown is not. The greatest numbers of Asian-Americans received bachelor's degrees in business and management, followed by engineering, both practical subjects. For Asian graduate students with student or permanent resident visa, engineering and science were the most popular fields of study. Asian-Americans were also over-represented in pharmacy, dentistry, and medicine programs. These are fields that practically guarantee financial security. Interestingly, traditional respect for educa

tion notwithstanding, very few Asian-Americans enter the field of education. By contrast, 23.6% of all Ph.D.s conferred in 1978-79 were in education, the largest representation of any discipline among post-graduate studies (Tsang & Wing, 1985).

"You have to be at least half as good again to make it in the U.S." This is what generations of Chinese-Americans have told their children. To motivate their children to do homework, Chinese-American parents have found it necessary not only to appeal to the tradition of respect for learning, but also to point out the possibility or probability of discrimination based on skin color. To compete with Whites for college entrance and employment, Chinese-Americans have to have more experience and higher qualifications. The extent of discrimination in some fields also becomes a consideration in Chinese-Americans' choice of fields of study and of occupations. "Rightly or wrongly, for instance, it is generally felt that a Chinese stands a better chance of advancement if he or she works in a job such as research where he or she does not have to deal with personnel problems..." (Chen, 1981, p. 226).

The realization that racial discrimination is prevalent can discourage youngsters, who will wonder, "What is the use of trying?" Therefore, one must examine how the parent frames that discrimination and what action the parent recommends. The following quotation from an interview with a Chinese-American father is instructive: "I've worked my fingers to the bones for you boys to get yourself an education. If you cannot be better than they are, try to be their equals anyway, because that way, one of these days, you can be up there too. But don't fight. You don't have to fight" (Mark & Chih, 1982, p. 75). There is a tendency for Chinese-American parents to socialize their children not to let disparaging remarks by White Americans distract them, not to fight verbally or physically. Instead the child is admonished to show White America "...how smart you are because you have a superior heritage" (Mark and Chih, p. 74).

What are the strategies used by Chinese families to encourage and support school success? It is remarkable that these strategies do not always require the parents to be English-speaking or knowledgeable about the American school system. Wong's ethnography on literacy behaviors in Chinese-American homes (1990) discovered that even parents with little education or proficiency in English did a lot to promote literacy in their children, e.g. accompanying their children to the public library, bringing home newspapers and magazines left behind by customers in restaurants, "making up" homework assignments such as copying lines from magazines, or asking children to recall all the words they know and then copy them over and over again, questioning the children about school, and providing space, however limited, for homework. Although these parents hardly ever participated in activities organized by the school, their whole-hearted support for education was undeniable.

As more selective colleges start to rely more heavily on non-academic criteria for admission, there is evidence that some Chinese-American parents are paying attention to social competence (Yee, 1983). Shen's study (1991) shows that highly educated Chinese-American parents, regardless of gender and length of stay in the U.S., attach almost as much importance to social competence as they do to academic achievement.

The Chinese Community's Expressive Adaptation and Coping. What type of expressive adaptation was observed in Chinese-Americans during this period? Deriving from the Black civil rights struggle, an indigenous Chinese-American movement occurred among Chinese-American college students in the late 1960's and 1970's. A new Chinese-American identity of ethnic pride emerged. Low's poignant personal account (1971) of his search for a Chinese-American identity is typical of many young Chinese-Americans of that era. The strength of the Chinese-American identity was not necessarily linked to a retention of the Chinese language (Woodell, 1973). This new identity was accompanied by a demand to be accorded a rightful place in America and a move to reclaim the history of the Chinese in America. Instead of rejecting Chinatowns with their myriad problems, the "ethnically proud" (Wang, 1991) attempted to contribute to the solution.

Many Chinese-Americans began to trace their own family histories. Others chose to express their new identity through writing and publishing novels, autobiographies, and biographies (Wong, 1975; Kingston, 1976; Telemarque, 1978; Ching, 1988; Tan, 1989; Yep, 1991; Lee, 1991) or filmmaking (Wayne Wang and Peter Wang). This new identity "...is grounded in the concrete and collective experiences of Chinese in the United States, in a community with shared interests and a common destiny in America" (Wang, 1991 p. 202). In response to pressure from Asian-Americans, many colleges have introduced Asian-American studies programs. The founding of the Chinese Historical Society of America (1963) and the Chinese Culture Foundation (1967) are but two examples of Chinese-Americans' attempt to reclaim their past and promote their culture.

Thus far we have discussed only positive adaptation and coping strategies. Unfortunately, not all Chinese-Americans find their niche in American society. Both Sung (1987) and Takaki (1989) contrast the achievement of "satellite youth, the children of Taiwanese scholars and professionals" with that of children of poor Chinese laborers in large urban Chinatowns. The latter, lacking adequate parental supervision, are still expected by their parents to produce school success to justify the parents' sacrifice. Unable to foresee a bright future for themselves, the children respond with alienation and anger. Fillmore et al. (1985) note that students who come from limited English proficiency homes are twice as likely to drop out of school. Chinese-American students are no exception. Chinese children who immigrate when they are older experience great frustration with the English language and in the absence

of parental support and guidance, peers assume greater importance. Some have turned to youth gangs instead of school books (First & Carrera, 1988).

More recently, after the Tiananmen Square Massacre of 1989, we have thousands of stranded students and scholars from Mainland China who have lost faith in their government and as Wang (1991) puts it, "become 'wandering intellectuals' away from their roots in historic China" (p. 204). They have been uprooted and may feel ambivalent about settling in the United States; their identity is somewhat ambiguous.

The 1970 census revealed to the public for the first time how well-educated the Chinese were. One out of every four Chinese over age 25 had completed four or more years of college. This 25% was much higher than the overall American average of 10.7% (figures cited in Chang, 1983, p. 84). At the same time the 1970 census also revealed an 11.1% illiteracy rate for the adult Chinese population, compared to the very low 1.6% for all Americans. When 21.4% of those with some elementary education were added to the 11.1%, one could say that as a result of the legacy of the past, one out of every three Chinese adults in the U.S. was poorly educated.

Implications for Teachers, Policymakers, and Individuals Concerned with Education

The Price of Being Educational Achievers

There are drawbacks to Chinese-American achievement, for both the cultural group and the individual. First, the reported remarkable educational achievements of Asian-Americans, of whom the Chinese constitutes the largest group, have become a disadvantage for them. The most selective colleges in the U.S. no longer consider Asian-Americans "minority" applicants or give them special admissions considerations (Schwartz, 1987 in Newsweek, 1987). Recently, Asian-Americans have challenged their lower rate of admissions to selective colleges (Bunzel & Au, 1987; Lindsey, 1987 in New York Times, 1988; Suzuki, 1988; Nakanishi, 1989). Federal investigations have confirmed discriminatory practices in some colleges; the University of California at Berkeley has decided to change its admission policy accordingly. Second, unlike African-Americans who have always approached education as a collective issue and viewed the school as an appropriate site to struggle for democracy and equality, Chinese-Americans have tended to approach education as an individual issue and to view achievement as beneficial primarily to the individual and the family (Siu's private communication with Theresa Perry, 9/30/1991). As a result, Chinese-Americans have not devoted much time or energy to the civil rights struggle, although they did benefit from the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Currently, despite a Chinese-American population of over one and a

half million, there is not one single U.S. Senator, Representative or Governor of Chinese descent. Only recently have Chinese-Americans begun to attempt to enter the political arena. For example, one Chinese-American was a candidate for the San Francisco mayoral race in 1991 but lost in the primary. Two Chinese-Americans (from Delaware and Texas) have declared their candidacies for Representatives while a third (from Virginia) is running for a seat as a U.S. Senator in the U.S. Congress. (Since the elections will be held in 1992, the outcome is yet unknown.)

Third, family support of success in school has been called "a two-edged sword" (Divoky, 1988, p. 221). There is a high cost of achievement in the form of stress and anxiety to individual students (Suzuki, 1989, p.18; Bagasao, 1989b). While many successful Chinese-Americans give credit to their parents for the sacrifices the latter make, others voice resentment of severe parental pressure. A Chinese-American teenager in Quincy, Massachusetts states, "I hardly talk at home. I go home and turn on the television. I don't feel close to my parents anymore. They think you're a robot...that they can set up a program and you will go to school and get good grades. College. Become a doctor. Maybe a lawyer...This is America, and if they want to be Chinese parents, why come to America?" (cited in Ketter, 1989, p.86).

Most importantly, educators need to be especially aware of the political implications of the portrayal of Chinese-Americans as well as other Asian-Americans as a model minority. It serves several useful functions: preserving the American dream, discrediting the demands of other minorities, and justifying the social agenda of conservatives. In recent years, Asian-American scholars (Wu, 1987; Bagasao, 1989a; Suzuki, 1989; Takaki, 1991) have vehemently decried the promotion of the "model minority" image. Takaki (1991) eloquently enumerates the harmful effects of overemphasizing Asian-American achievement: downplaying of the underemployment and underpayment of Asian-Americans; obscuring of tremendous diversity among Asian-American groups and even diversity within one Asian-American group; denial of services to Asian-Americans; pressure on Asian-Americans to fit the "model minority" mold; fueling anti-Asian sentiment and actions and shrouding such a backlash; serving as a tool for politicians and conservative citizens to attack affirmative action programs and to shame non-Asian Americans who suffer from poverty and lack of education. Finally, Takaki asserts that the celebration of Asian-American "success" only "reinforces illusions that we can solve complex economic problems through the old-fashioned remedies of individualism and hard work, and that we can overcome the persistent problems of race without confronting the reality of racism" (p. 84). Some have even gone so far as to call the "model minority" stereotype a technique of White racism (Taehiki, Wong, Odo & Wong, 1971, cited in Sue & Kitano, 1973; Wu, 1987).

Certainly, there is enough data (Tsang & Wing, 1985) to suggest that recent Chinese immigrant youngsters (here less than five years) are in dire need of educational intervention programs. Many of them are LEP (limited English proficiency) programs. Given the fact that two-thirds of LEP school-aged children in the U.S. are not receiving the language assistance needed to succeed in school (LaFontaine, 1987 cited in First and Carrera, 1988, p. 32), educators need to ensure that services such as tutoring and bilingual classes are not denied to those Asian-Americans who need them just because many Asian-American students evidence spectacular educational achievement (Bernstein, 1988 in New York Times).

The majority of Asian-American students are neither super-bright nor exceptionally motivated. Stereotyping, even positive stereotyping, does not do anyone justice. To combat stereotypes of Asian-Americans and foster a better self-image among Asian-American students, there needs to be a stronger component that addresses Asian-American issues in the school curriculum. Study of art, literature, and history of Asian countries is insufficient; it should be supplemented by content on the experience of Asians in the United States, focusing on their encounters with discrimination and on their contributions. Writing from the perspective of a teacher, Solomon (1985) offers a number of strategies to analyze the classroom setting for non-pluralistic attitudes and to meet the needs of Asian-Americans. Furthermore, greater programmatic attention needs to be directed to the development of verbal skills among all Asian-American students, both at the elementary and secondary levels. On a college level, Bagasao (1989a) advocates preparing Asian-American students with a full set of skills (not just quantitative skills) as well as exposing them to a broad world of college majors and careers. Suzuki's fourteen policy recommendations (1988) are worth serious consideration by institutions of higher education and national data collection agencies.

A Formula for Success for Other Racial Minority Groups?

Some of the same forces that kept Chinese-Americans from school success in the earlier years of their history are keeping many racial minorities from doing well in school today: racial discrimination, limited employment prospects, teachers' negative attitudes, the public's hostility, being born to poor parents, feelings of alienation and anger. It is tempting to make recommendations for other racial minority groups based on what we have learned about Chinese-Americans. However, it is a temptation we must resist. Each ethnic group in the United States has a unique history and has developed certain patterns for coping with their historical treatment by mainstream society. The Chinese-American experience cannot even be generalized to all immigrant minorities, much less non-immigrant minorities. The history of "involuntary minorities" or "caste-like" minorities (Ogbu, 1983) has turned the education issue into an identity/legitimacy issue for them. Thus seemingly common-sense recommenda

tions such as "spend more time studying" and "foster greater awareness of work options and the preparation for certain employment" (Tsang & Wing, 1985) might not work for non-Asian-Americans at all.

Ogbu's conceptualization of racial stratification (1983 and 1990) has great explanatory power. According to Ogbu, what helped immigrant minorities such as Chinese-Americans to succeed is absent in the collective experience of involuntary minorities such as African-Americans. In the case of African-Americans, the initial coming as slaves rather than laborers has profound ramifications for both Whites and African-Americans. I would add another difference between the Chinese-American collective experience and the African-American collective experience: whereas there have been periods in history when Chinese-Americans were perceived favorably by the American public, African-Americans as a race have been denigrated throughout American history. Ogbu's generalizations about the differences in attitudes and perceptions of "caste-like minorities" and "immigrant minorities" can be turned into fascinating hypotheses to be tested through research; for instance, regardless of race or ethnic group affiliation, would we find educational achievement when the following conditions are present in the group being studied: a generally optimistic attitude; a belief that things are better in the United States than other countries; acceptance of the folk theory of the White middle class; a different but not oppositional social identity; a basic trust in White institutions; a situation in which culture and language do not have to be given up to succeed? Ogbu (1990) asserts that the Chinese-American's "accommodation without assimilation" response has clearly worked to their advantage. One wonders if such a response among non-Chinese Americans will promote educational achievement; conversely, would a subgroup of Chinese-Americans who are either unwilling or unable to "accommodate without assimilating" encounter more problems in school?

Although teacher expectation is certainly not the only factor in a child's school success, it is one important variable. The process of "self-fulfilling prophecy" has been described in detail in the literature (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Rist, 1970; Good & Brophy, 1973). The influence of race and socioeconomic status on both teachers' perception of students and their treatment of students in the classroom has been documented extensively for the last twenty-five years (Leacock, 1969; Goodwin & Sanders, 1969; Friedman & Friedman, 1973; all cited in Dembo, 1977; also Rist, 1970). In general, teachers hold more negative attitudes about most minority students than they do about White middle-class students. These attitudes only serve to reinforce the mistrust many students of color already feel toward school.

With good reason, involuntary minorities often come to the conclusion that merely playing the game by White Americans' rules does not necessarily lead to "making it." The deep distrust between involuntary minorities and the dominant White group has a long history which cannot soon be erased. Somehow, trust between involuntary minorities and American

public schools must be fostered before African-American, Hispanic, and Native-American students can attain maximum academic effort and success.

Educating All Children in America

Although it is totally inappropriate to recommend that families from other racial groups adopt Chinese-American values and parenting practices, this literature review on Chinese-American educational achievement provides food for thought on such issues as the importance of effort vs. innate ability, motivation, and parent involvement in children's success in school. Has too much emphasis been placed by both families and teachers in this country on the role of innate ability in achievement? Has this overemphasis on innate ability become an excuse for schools to write off many youngsters, especially those from racial minority and lower socioeconomic groups, as being unable to benefit from certain academic subjects? Discussion of the pros and cons of tracking and ability grouping is beyond the scope of this paper, but it may be worthwhile to ponder what might happen to children if we "...move away from the assumption that some students can't and won't learn and toward the assumption that all students can and will learn" (Rosario Anaya, School Board member of San Francisco, cited in First & Carrera, 1988, p.97).

The problem of motivating children to want to do well in school has no simple solution. We need to first find answers to these questions: Why isn't more effort expended by some students from certain racial/cultural groups? Are teachers' attitudes and behaviors towards students serving as a disincentive or an incentive for working hard? Is the curriculum serving as a disincentive or an incentive?

Given the diversity of sociopolitical experiences and value contexts of different cultural groups in the U.S. population, any attempt to identify one factor that will motivate all children to expend the effort needed to do well in school will probably fail. For some students, the prospect of a good job and high income may suffice. For others, it may be the prospect of leadership in a struggle for equality and democracy. Disparaging racial remarks are hard for children to deal with, but even these may be turned around to motivate some children to work hard and "show'em," as is the case with Chinese-Americans. Community workers and teachers, therefore, need to study the epistemological framework of each cultural group and to seek ways within that framework which will help access children's energy and unleash their potential for expending greater effort in school work.

Information about Chinese-American families, especially those who are recent immigrants, calls to question our common assumption about parent involvement, which has often been narrowly defined as parental participation in activities in the school building. This definition has led to a stereotype that Asian-American parents are inactive and unconcerned. Can a

parent care deeply about the child's education, do a lot to encourage and monitor the child's progress, and yet not be present at the school as volunteer, policy-maker, or participant in special presentations and other meetings? The answer seems to be "Yes" (e.g. Chen & Uttal, 1988; Wong, 1990). Like Chinese-American parents, many recent immigrant parents from other countries show tremendous respect for the teacher and encourage their children at home while maintaining distance from the school. School personnel would do well not to assume that all parents defined by the school as inactive are non-caring parents. How to forge a meaningful partnership with parents from diverse cultures by creating a variety of roles and redefining parent involvement to include involvement at home remains a challenge for school administrators and teachers.

The Need for Further Research

The nature of the status mobility system and opportunity structure interacting with parental values and practices offers a clue to disparities in the school performance of Chinese-Americans at various points in history. Parental values and practices are also mediated by parents' socioeconomic and educational backgrounds although the latter alone does not predict school success. We have discussed the collective adaptation and coping strategy characteristic of Chinese-Americans during each period in their history in the U.S., but ultimately each individual Chinese-American family has to develop its own ethnic identity and accompanying world view. We suspect that the family's perception of their roots and of American "soil" has a significant influence on how they socialize their children and on their approach to education. A Chinese-American parent's identity is not solely dependent on length of stay in the U.S. or country of birth. For example, an American-born parent may be an assimilator, accommodator, or ethnically proud. Yet to be examined is any possible link between specific types of Chinese-American identity and family socialization patterns that support school success. The whole issue of how acculturation affects achievement has certainly not yet been resolved, as findings from studies are sometimes conflicting (Kitano, 1962; Montero & Tsukashima, 1977; Hirschman & Wong, 1981; Neidert & Farley, 1985). Yee (1983) concludes from her study of parental attitudes and child's social competence that most helpful to a Chinese-American child's general adaptation would be the parent's ability to combine a stable sense of cultural identity with a simultaneous openness to American culture. Whether this applies also to the child's school success is a question that merits further study.

Bibliography

A = autobiography/biography
E = ethnography
S = analysis of statistics
F = fiction
H = history
N = newspaper/magazine story

All others = research reports or theoretical treatises

Alexander, K.L., Cook, M.A. & McDill, E.L. (1978). Curriculum tracking and educational stratification. American Sociological Review, 43: 47-66.

Bagasao, P.Y. (Ed.) (1989a, November-December). Editorial. Asians and Pacific-Americans: Behind the myths [Special issue]. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 21 (4-5).

Bagasao, P.Y. (1989b, November-December). Student voices: Breaking the silence. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 21 (4-5), 28-37.

N Bernstein, R. (1988). Asian newcomers hurt by precursors' success. New YorkTimes, July 10. p.16.

Blakely, M.M. (1983). Southeast Asian refugee parents: An inquiry into home school communication and understanding. Anthropology and Education, 14 (1),43-67.

Bloom, M. (1984). Configurations of human behavior: Life span development in the social environment. New York: MacMillan.

N Brand, D. (1987). The new whiz kids. Time, August 31, pp. 42-51.

Bunzel, J.M. & Au, J.K.D. (1987, Spring). Diversity or discrimination? Asian Americans in college. The Public Interest, pp. 49-62.

S Census Bureau releases 1990 census counts on specific racial groups. (1991, June 12). U.S. Department of Commerce News, Tables 1, 3A, 5A, 5B.

Chang, P.M. (1983). Continuity and change: A profile of Chinese-Americans. New York: Vantage Press.

H Chang, M.S.H. (1988). From marginality to bimodality: Immigration, education, and occupational change of Chinese-Americans, 1940-1980. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Chen, C. & Uttal, D.H. (1988). Cultural values, parents' beliefs, and children's achievement in the United States and China. Human Development, 31, 351-358.

H Chen, J. (1981). The Chinese of America. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Chen, V.W.C. (1988). Communication and conflict between American born Chinese and their immigrant parents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Cheung, P.C. & Lau, S. (1985, June). Self-esteem: Its relationship to the family and school social environments among Chinese adolescents. Youth andSociety, 16 (4), 438-456.

E Chin, A.P. (1988). Children of China: Voices from recent years. New York:Alfred A. Knopf.

A Ching, F. (1988). Ancestors: 900 years in the life of a Chinese Family. New York: William Morrow & Co.

A Chou, B.J. (1991). What is a child supposed to learn in preschool education? A Chinese-American parent's perspective. World Journal (published in Taipei, Taiwan), May 14, 15, 16, 1991. Original in Chinese; translated by Sau-Fong Siu.

A Chou, C.L. (1970). My Life in the United States. North Quincy, MA: Christopher Publishing House.

H Chu, D. (1987). Chinese in Massachusetts: Their Experiences and Contributions. Boston: Chinese Culture Institute.

Crouter, A., MacDermid, S.M., McHale, S.M. & Perry-Jenkins, M. (1990). Parental monitoring and perceptions of children's school performance and conduct in dual-and single--earner families. Developmental Psychology, 26 (4), 649-657.

Dembo, M.H. (Ed.) (1977). Teaching and learning: Applying educational psychology in the classroom. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing.

DiMaggio, P. (1982). Cultural capital and school success: The impact of status culture participation on the grades of high school students. American Sociological Review. 47, 189-201.

Divoky, D. (1988, November). The model minority goes to school. Phi Delta Kappan, 219-222.

Dornbusch, S.M. & Wood, K.D. (1989). Family processes and educational achievement. In W. Weston (Ed.), Education and the American family: A research synthesis (pp. 66-95). New York: New York University Press.

Entwistle, D.R. & Hayduk, L.A. (1978). Too great expectations: The academic outlook of young children. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Huang, L.N. & Ying, Y.W. (1989). Chinese American children and adolescents. In J.T. Gibbs & L.N. Huang (Eds.) Children of Color: Psychological Interventions with Minority Youth pp. 30-66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

S Kan, S.H. & Liu, W. T. (1986). The educational status of Asian Americans: An update from the 1980 census. Pacific/Asian American Mental Health Research Review, 5 (3/4): 21-24.

Karlins, M., Coffman, T. & Walters, G. (1969). On the fading of social stereotypes: Three generations of college students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13, 1-16.

N Kasindorf, M. (1982). Asian-Americans - A "Model Minority." Newsweek, December 6, pp. 39-51.

N Kawahara, Y. (1990). Changes: The acculturation of Asian Americans. Gidra, 20th Anniversary Edition, pp. 119.

Kessen, W. (1975). Childhood in China. New Haven, CT· Yale University Press.

Ketter, W.B. (Ed.) (1989). The Asians: Quincy's Newest Immigrants. Quincy, MA: The Patriot Ledger, George W. Prescott Publishing Co.

F Kingston, M.H. (1976). The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts. New York: Knopf.

Kitano, H.H.K. (1962). Changing achievement patterns of Japanese in the United States. Journal of Social Psychology, 58: 257-264.

Kwong, P. (1987). The New Chinatown. New York: Hill & Wang.

E Lareau, A. (1989). Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

E Lau, G.M.H. (1988). Chinese American early childhood socialization in communication. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Lee, E. (1989). Assessment and treatment of Chinese-American immigrant families. In G.W. Saba, B.M. Karner & K.V. Hardy (Eds.), Minorities and family therapy (pp. 91-122). New York: Haworth Press.

Lee, E. (1982). A social systems approach to assessment and treatment for Chinese American families. In M. McGoldrick, J. Pearce, & J. Giordano (Eds.) Ethnicity and Family Therapy (pp. 527-551). New York: Guilford Press.

F Lee. G. (1991). China boy. New York: Dutton (Penguin Books).

Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18 (4), 335-356.

Fillmore, L.W. et al. (1985). Learning English through bilingual instruction. (Final report to the National Institute of Education) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

First, J.M. & Carrera, J.W. (1988). New voices: Immigrant students in U.S. public schools. Boston: National Coalition of Advocacy for Students.

Foley, D.E. (1991). Reconsidering anthropological explanations of ethnic school failure. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 22, 60-85.

S Gardner, R.W., Robey, B. & Smith, P.C. (1985). Asian Americans: Growth, change, and diversity. Population Bulletin, 40(4).

Genova, W.J. (1981). A study of interaction effects of school and home environments on students of varying race/ethnicity, class, and gender: Executive Summary. Newton, MA: TDR Associates.

E Gelormino, J.E. (1986). The influence of education on childrearing perceptions and behaviors of castelike minority parents and immigrant minority parents in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Good, T.L. & Brophy, J.E. (1973). Looking in classrooms. New York: Harper & Row.

Hirschman, C. & Wong, M.G. (1981, Spring). Trends in socioeconomic achievement among immigrant and native-born Asian Americans. Sociological Quarterly, 22, 495-513.

Hirschman, C. & Wong, M.G. (1986, September). The extraordinary educational attainment of Asian-Americans: A search for historical evidence and explanations. Social Forces, 65 (1), 1-27.

Ho, M.K. (1987). Family therapy with ethnic minorities. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Holloway, S.D. (1990, May). The family's influence on achievement in Japan and the United States. Comparative Education Review, 34 (2), 126-208.

S Hsia, J. (1988). Asian Americans in Higher Education and at Work. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hsu, F.L.K. (1971). The Challenge of the American Dream: The Chinese in the United States. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Hu, A. (1989). Asian Americans: Model minority or double minority? Amerasia Journal, 15, 243-257.

Huang, L.J. (1976). The Chinese American family. In C. Mendel & R. Haberstein (Eds.), Ethnic Families in America. New York: Elsevier.

Lee, M.M.R. (1980). A study of classroom behaviors of Chinese American children and immigrant Chinese children in contrast to those of Black American children and white American children in an urban Head Start Program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco.

Lee, P.S. (1983). Intraethnic diversity: An exploratory study of ethnic identity of [illegible]se-American adolescents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University.

Lin, C.C. (1988). A Comparison of childrearing practices among Chinese, Chinese-American, and Non-Asian American parents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

N Lindsey, R. (1987). Colleges accused of bias to stem Asians' gains, New York Times, January 19, p. 8.

A Low, R. (1971). A brief biographical sketch of a newly-found Asian male. In Tachiki, A., Wong, E., Odo, F. & Wong, B. (Eds.) Roots: An Asian American reader (pp. 105-108). Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Study Center.

Marjoribanks, K. (1985). Families, schools, and aspirations: Ethnic group differences. Journal of Experimental Education. 53 (3), 141-147.

Marjoribanks, K. (1984). Ethnicity, family environment, and adolescents's aspirations: A follow-up study. Journal of Educational Research. 77 (31), 166-171.

Mark, D.M.L. & Chih, G. (1982). A place called America. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt.

A McCunn, R.L. (1988). Chinese American Portraits: Personal Histories: 1828-1988. San Francisco: Chronicle Books.

McGrath, E. & Zagorin, A. (1983). Confucian work ethic. Time, March 28, p. 58.

Montero, D. & Tsukashima, R. (1977). Assimilation and educational achievement: The case of the second generation Japanese American. Sociological Quarterly, 18: 490-503.

E Muir, K.L.S. (1988). The strongest part of the family: A study of Lao refugee women in Columbus, Ohio. New York: AMS Press.

Nakanishi, D.T. (1989, November-December). A quota on excellence? The Asian-American admission debate. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 21 (4-5), 38-47.

Neidert, L.J. & Farley, R. (1985, December). Assimilation in the United States: An analysis of ethnic and generation differences in status and achievement. American Sociological Review, 50 (6), 840-850.

Ogbu, J. (1990). Overcoming racial barriers to equal access. In Goodlad, J. (Ed.) Access to Knowledge: An agenda for our nation's schools (pp. 59-89). Princeton, NJ: The College Entrance Examination Board.

Ogbu, J. (1983, June). Minority status and schooling in plural societies. Comparative Education Review, 27 (2), 168-190.

Ogbu, J. (1981). Black education: A cultural-ecological perspective. In H.P. McAdoo (Ed.) Black Families (pp. 139-154). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.

Okagaki, L. & Gordon, E.W. (1991, April). Correlates of high and low achievement in minority students. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

H O'Neill, H.B. (1987). Companion to Chinese history. New York: Facts on File Publications.

Pang, V.O. (1990, Fall). Asian American children: A diverse population. The Educational Forum, 55 (1).

S Park, H. (1990). Interpreting the high educational achievement and socioeconomic status of Asian-Americans. Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.

Phillips, D.A. (1987, April). Parents as socializers of children's perceived academic competence. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Baltimore, Md.

Rist, R.C. (1970, August). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Education Review, 40 (3), 411-450.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalian in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Rumbaut, R.G. & Ima, K. (1987, September). The adaptation of South East Asian refugee youth: A comparative study. San Diego, CA: Office of Refugee Resettlement Final Report.

Schneider, B. & Lee. Y.(1990, December). A model for academic success: The school and home environment of East Asian students. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 21 (4), 358-377.

N Schwartz, J. (1987). A superminority tops out, Newsweek, May 11, pp. 48-49.

Shen, A. (1991). Chinese-American parenting attitudes towards academic and social competence. Unpublished manuscript, Boston University School of Education.

Snow, C.E., Barnes, W.S., Chandler, J., Goodman, I.F. & Hemphill, L. (1991). Unfulfilled expectations: Home and school influences on literacy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Solomon, I.D. (1985, Fall). Minority status, pluralistic education and the Asian-American: A teacher's perspective and agenda. Education, 106, 88-93.

Sowell, T. (1981). Ethnic America: A history. New York: Basic Books.

Steinberg, L. (1989). Communities of families and education. In Weston, W. J.(Ed.) Education and the American family: A Research synthesis (pp. 138-168). New York: New York University Press.

Stevenson, H.W. & Lee, S. Y. (1990). Contexts of achievement: A study of American, Chinese, and Japanese children. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 55 (1-2, Serial No. 221).

Steward, M. & Steward, D. (1973). The observation of Anglo, Mexican, and Chinese American mothers teaching their young sons. Child Development, 44, 329-337.

Strom, R., Daniels, S. & Leung, A. (1988). Parental expectations in Hong Kong. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 15 (1): 12-16.

Sue, S. & Kitano, H.H.L. (1973). Stereotypes as a measure of success. Journal of Social Issues, 29 (2), 83-98.

Sue, S. & Sue, D.W. (1971). Chinese American personality and mental health. Amerasia Journal, 2, 36-49.

Sung, B.L. (1987). The adjustment experience of Chinese immigrant children in New York City. New York: Center for Migration Studies.

Suzuki, B.H. (1989, November-December). Asian Americans as the "model minority" outdoing Whites? Or media hype? Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 21(4-5), 12-19.

S Suzuki, B.H. (1988). Asian Americans in higher education: Impact of changing demographics and other social forces. A paper prepared for a National Symposium on the Changing Demographics of Higher Education, the Ford Foundation, New York City, April 8.

Suzuki, B.H. (1977). Education and the socialization of Asian Americans: A revisionist analysis of the 'model minority' thesis. Amerasia Journal, 4 (2), 23-51.

N Takaki, R. (1991, September 8). Do Asian-Americans do all that well? Let's look at reality. Boston Globe, pp. 81, 84.

H Takaki, R. (1989). Strangers from a different shore. Boston: Little and Brown.

F Tan, A. (1989). The Joy Luck Club. New York: Ballantine Books.

F Telemarque, E. W. (1978). It's crazy to stay Chinese in Minnesota. New York: Thomas Nelson Co.

Trueba, H.T. (1988). Culturally based explanations of minority children's academic achievement. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 19, 270-287.

H Tsai, S.S.H. (1986). The Chinese experience in America. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

S Tsang, S. & Wing, L.C. (1985). Beyond Angel Island: The education of Asian Americans. New York: Clearinghouse on Urban Education (ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series, 90, Winter).

S U.S. Department of Education, Center for Educational Statistics (1987). The condition of education: A statistical report. (ed. J.D. Stern et al.)

S U.S. Department of Education, Center for Educational Statistics (1987). Digest of education statistics. (ed. T.D. Snyder).

Wang, L.L-C. (1991). Roots and changing identity of the Chinese in the United States. Daedalus, 120 (2), 181-206.

Watson, T., Brown, M. & Swick, K.J. (1983, March/April). The relationship of parents' support to children's school achievement. Child Welfare, 62(2), 175-180.

E Weiss, M.S. (1974). Valley City: A Chinese Community in America. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing.

N Williams, D.A. (1984). A formula for success, Newsweek, April 23. pp. 77-78.

Wong, B. (1976). Social stratification, adaptive strategies and Chinese community of New York. Urban Life, 5 (1): 33-52.

A Wong, J.S. (1975). No Chinese stranger. New York: Harper & Row.

E Wong, L.C. (1990). An ethnographic study of literacy behaviors in Chinese Families in an urban school community. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Wong, M.G. (1980, October). Model Students? Teachers' perceptions and expectations of their Asian and white students. Sociology of Education, 53, 236-246.

Wong, S.C. (1988). The language situation of Chinese Americans. In S. L. McKay & S.C. Wong (Ed.) Language diversity: Problem or resource" New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Wood, J., Chapin, K. & Hannah, M.E. (1988). Family environment and its relationship to underachievement. Adolescence, 23 (90), 283-290.

Woodell, T.M. (1973). The Chinese in Houston. Paper presented at the Mid-America Linguistics Conference, Iowa City.

N Wu, F.H. (1987). The model minority myth: Sometimes racism wears a smile. Detroit Free Press, August 6, 11A.

Yearbook of the Republic of China, 1990. (1990). Taipei: Republic of China Government Information Services.

Yee, J.H.Y. (1983). Social competence in the Chinese-American child, parenting attitudes and acculturation. Ph. D. Dissertation, Boston University.

A Yep, L. (1991). The lost garden. Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Silver Burdett Press.

N Yu, W. (1985). Asian Americans charge prejudice slows climb to management ranks. Wall Street Journal, 51, September 11, p. 35.

_____, Education: Facts and figures. (1985, November). China Reconstructs, p. 17.

_____, Hong Kong 1991: Review of 1990. Hong Kong: Government Information Services.

_____, N Success story of one minority group in U.S. (1966). U.S. News and World Report, December 26.

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Educational
Research and Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed
August 12, 1992